

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

March 2014

Vol.29, No.3 ISSN 0790-7672

and **Northern Star** incorporating **Workers' Weekly** Vol.28 No.3 ISSN 954-5891

The Ukraine

Pawn To King Four - "Fuck The EU!"

The appearance of the Ukraine as a state was an incidental by-product of the destruction of the Soviet State by the corrupt, demagogic, democrat, Yeltsin.

Corruption played an essential part in the construction and maintenance of the Liberal British State and its modification into what we now call democracy. The necessity of corruption in the stabilisation of the system of representative government was acknowledged for about a century and a half by British political writers. But the single-minded ideological expert on Irish political corruption, *Irish Times* columnist Elaine Byrne, who preferred to emigrate rather than stand by her vacuous principles in Court, didn't have a clue about the foundations of the ideology which she peddled childishly in the mysteriously-funded newspaper that employed her.

Yeltsin was not usefully corrupt. He was a Communist Party functionary who found himself, in a political crisis, in a position where he could pull the State down, and he did it.

He enacted national revolutions by destroying the multi-national State, and he enacted a capitalist revolution by giving big chunks of the nationalised property to cronies for a song.

The Ukraine was a component of the Soviet state, within which it was functional. Its appearance as an independent state was not the result of national struggle. It came into being as a product of disintegration. It had no long struggle for independence behind it, such as Ireland had when Britain denied it independence in 1919. Independence was conferred on it.

In its formal capitalist independence it had neither a capitalist ruling class nor a political system which had cut grooves in the society on which it might run. It had only a group of economic oligarchs who had never functioned as competitive capitalists. They were stinking rich through no effort of their own. To describe them as corrupt capitalists would be to flatter them

continued on page 2, column 3

What Unionism Wants

Lord Trimble as Unionist Party leader, signed the Good Friday Agreement under duress from Tony Blair, and then, advised by Lord Bew and Eoghan Harris of the Official IRA, did his best to prevent it from ever coming into operation. After two years he was obliged to toe the line formally. The Agreement limped along until the DUP, under Paisley's active leadership, made a deal with Sinn Fein which had displaced the SDLP. It was Paisley's personal prestige that enabled

this to be done. There was discontent within the DUP—as well as within the Unionist middle classes—and when Paisley retired the new leadership tried to row back on the Agreement. But when Paisley asserted himself, they thought it prudent to work the Agreement then.

Since then they have been busily eroding Paisley's influence both in his Church and in the Party, and it appears that they now feel free enough to start rocking the boat in earnest.

It is simply unbelievable that the DUP

The EU:

Breaking The Code

A lot of political dialogue is conducted in code. This is inevitable and necessary up a point. But a point can be reached when the code replaces realities. This is the situation with the EU Treaty change debate. The referendum on Lisbon was justified as summing up all other EU Treaties. But it is the Treaty that hardly dares speak its name. Despite all talk about EU Treaty change, any new provision must mean changing Lisbon.

Lisbon has a resemblance to the Irish 'Treaty' of 1922, in that neither was/is a Treaty in any real sense. The Irish one was actually a British imposed 'Articles of Agreement' and quite specifically not an agreement between equals and therefore could not be a Treaty. Lisbon was originally an attempt to have an EU Constitution but it was declared to be a Treaty when rejected by some members. In other words it is oxymoronic to call it a Treaty.

The EU structures and Lisbon could not cope with the Banking Crisis that threatened the Euro. So another method had to be adopted. This was the inter-

continued on page 2

leaders did not know that the Government—the one that has always been the real power of state in the North—had, in the spirit of the Good Friday Agreement, given guarantees of immunity to Republicans who might have missed out on the *de facto* amnesty of the GFA. Their cries of injured ignorance over the aborted Downey trial are for the birds.

Peter Robinson threatened to bring down the devolved system if the letters of immunity were not withdrawn. The Prime Minister has offered an Inquiry into

continued on page 3

CONTENTS

	Page
The Ukraine, "Fuck The EU". Editorial	1
The EU: Breaking The Code. Jack Lane	1
What Unionism Wants. Brendan Clifford	1
Readers' Letters: Maire, Not Muriel MacSwiney. Cathal MacSwiney Brughá	
Portillo's War. Peter Brooke	3
Developing The Shared History Syndrom. Jack Lane	4
Soiled Goods. Wilson John Haire (Poem)	4
Shorts from the Long Fellow (The Anglo 3; Sean Quinn And The Anglo 3; Contracts For Difference; Motive For Alleged Fraud; Perpetration Of The Alleged First Crime; Perpetration Of The Alleged Second Crime; A Shakespearean Tragedy)	5
Belfast In The 1970s. Wilson John Haire	6
A Critic Emerges From Academia. Michael Carragher (& Living History)	9
Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (Church Of Ireland)	13
The Spell Unwoven. Paul McGill, Rúnaí, INC	14
From Béalnabláth To Ballyseedy And Back Again. Manus O'Riordan (Some Collinses And Somervilles, Part 4)	17
Index To Irish Political Review, 2013.	22
Mr. Bean Falls Over Facts. Seán McGouran	24
Biteback: Ukraine: An Insight (Report of Jonathan Steele article)	25
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Renewable Energy; Global Warming)	26

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

Brentano v. Unwin

Mondragon, Part 27

(back page)

Leave That Kid Alone

(page 29)

Trade Union Notes

(page 27)

Finian McGrath On The Gardaí

(pages 28,29)

EU

continued

governmental arrangement based on a genuine Treaty called the Fiscal Compact. Yet I have never yet come across suggestions that this be changed and developed to facilitate the further development of the necessary fiscal and monetary integration to secure the Euro even though that is precisely what it was created to do.

Instead we have endless talk about EU Treaty change, particularly by the UK and Germany. The absurd notion is conveyed that they therefore have something in common because of this Treaty change talk. This goes on despite the fact that it is clear that each wants change for the opposite reason to the other. Double talk and double think is the result.

Germany seems unable to envisage or face up to the consequences of the fact

that the future of the Euro depends on the inter-Governmental arrangements, as enshrined in the Fiscal Compact and that EU structures have been, and will be, used to hinder the Euro. Changing Lisbon for the benefit of the Euro is like trying to fit a square peg into a round hole.

The two simply will not fit and never will while the UK remains in the EU and outside the Euro which is the case for the far foreseeable future.

But an EU without with the UK fills Germany with horror and is its "appalling vista". The fact is that the European project can now only be based on the consolidation of the Euro. The EU as it has developed is a hindrance to that. It is pure sentimentality and moral cowardice that prevents Germany from realising this and allows it to indulge in the nonsense that involves EU Treaty change. In current circumstances, this can only be displacement activity.

Jack Lane

Ukraine

continued

Russia, which had been prostrated before Western capital during the period of oligarchic anarchy created by Yeltsin, was restored to a degree of national economic and political existence by Putin. Oligarchs who tried to preserve the anarchy in which they flourished were imprisoned or exiled. The exiled oligarch, Berezhovsky, was a devout believer in an exceptionally debased form of Marxist economic determinism. He knew that economics determined politics, and that Putin must fail because the oligarchs owned the economy. When Putin succeeded, Berezhovsky formed a kind of Capitalist International, and made the "Orange Revolution" in the Ukraine its base for attacking the national restoration that was happening in Russia.

But the Orange Revolution was a bubble of illusion. The Ukrainian oligarchs fell out with one another and set about doing each other down. Julia Timoshenko was jailed for the corrupt crime of being soft on Russia by other oligarchs with other interests. And Berezhovsky was ruined by a libel dispute with another of Yeltsin's creatures.

Independent Ukraine has been dominated by oligarchs but it has not been ruled by an oligarchy.

Conservative elements in Germany in the late 1980s favoured assisting the incompetent Gorbachev in reforming the Soviet bloc, or a large part of it. But Washington decided to precipitate its collapse. And, when the Warsaw Pact military bloc, against which the NATO military bloc was supposed to be a defensive instrument, disintegrated, NATO was immediately given an international expansionist purpose. The EU fell into line with Washington policy. Yugoslavia, which did not fall with the Soviet bloc because it was independent and Western-orientated, was destroyed by incitement to national/religious war.

Similar things were done in the rest of the world. Suharto's Indonesia, allowed a protectionist capitalism during the Cold War, was destabilised; Muslim fundamentalism was encouraged, etc.

The last election in the Ukraine was not judged to be politically-corrupt. It negotiated favourable economic deals with Russia, while also establishing links with the EU. It tried to make an arrangement

for a closer arrangement with the EU, but wanted compensation for the destruction of its industrial economy which this would entail. But the EU would not put up the money. It expected the Ukraine to make sacrifices for the sake of being admitted to the European ideal. Russia also made it clear that a Ukraine in a free trade relationship with Europe would encounter tariff barriers at the Russian border. In this situation the Ukrainian Government accepted a Russian offer, which exceeded what the EU would put up. It was an offer that would enable it to preserve its industrial economy.

The occupation of the central square in Kiev began immediately. Fortifications were built in it. EU personnel—including the egregious Pat Cox, whose life achievement is the undermining of the Commission on which purposeful EU consolidation depended—went to Kiev in order to enhance demonstration into insurrection. Washington poured money in and took control of the insurrection.

The Government was overthrown by an insurrection in the capital, which was not representative of the country. It was like the action of the Paris mob at various points in the French Revolution.

The EU leaders became apprehensive about the consequences of what they were doing. They brokered a deal between the Government and the insurrection for the formation of a Coalition Government. "Fuck the EU!", said Obama (through Victoria Nuland, his Assistant Secretary Of State). The EU compromise was brushed aside overnight. The insurrection was intensified. Government buildings were occupied. Suddenly there was a new Government supported by Militias of various kinds.

When it became public knowledge that Obama was directing the insurrection, Yanukovich did not call in the US Ambassador and expel him and his extensive entourage. That fact, more than anything else, demonstrated his unfitness to govern.

There is now talk of the division of the Ukraine on the basis of nationality. But those who were disrupting government last week now insist, having become the Government, that the Ukraine is a national unity and must be held together under their rule.

The Russian population of Ukraine points out that the militant groups in the insurrection are Nazi. No doubt they are. Hitler in his half-hearted gesture towards destroying the Soviet Union by establishing national states in areas he had conquered found no difficulty in raising up

Máire, Not Muriel MacSwiney

A Small Correction to *The Holy Sacrifice Of The War* (*Irish Political Review*, February 2014)

It was not Muriel MacSwiney but her daughter Máire MacSwiney Brugha who asked Jack Lynch to commemorate 1919 in 1969.

"After the elaborate ceremony in 1966 to commemorate the 1916 Rising I was looking forward with some expectation to January 1969 which was the fiftieth anniversary of the setting up of Dáil Éireann, the first Irish Parliament (in the Mansion House in Dublin).

"To my mind this event had much greater significance than 1916 and so earned at least some form of recognition in January 1969. However as there seemed no sign of preparation I went to see the Taoiseach, Jack Lynch, to find out what, if anything, was being proposed. Apparently nothing was planned to mark the occasion. I pointed out to him that if nothing was done to mark the occasion then obviously the date on which the Free State Parliament met in 1921 would be commemorated as the first setting up of an Irish Parliament. This would be a matter of consternation to many people.

"The Taoiseach assured me that he would look into the matter. He organised a small reception in the annex of the Mansion House in January 1969 to which the surviving families of members of the first Dáil were invited" (pp.221-2 of *History's Daughter*).

As is known, Muriel would not have been inclined to write to Jack Lynch.
Beir bua,

Cathal MacSwiney Brugha

Portillo's War

Michael Portillo put out '*Great War of Words*' about the origins of the First World War on Radio 4 (11th February). Germany started it, and German refusal to face up to its guilt was the major cause of the 2nd World War. No mention of the embargo placed on Germany after the armistice. No mention of the war over the Ottoman Empire. Certainly no mention of the Round Table. Britain was too soft on Germany, its sense of the rightness of things being undermined by the war poets, Oh What a Lovely War, and Blackadder.

The worst offender on the programme was one, Heather Jones of LSE. She seemed to me to have an Irish accent.

Amusingly, Germany's war aims, presented as very wicked, included wanting to detach Poland, Lithuania and the Ukraine from Russia!

Peter Brooke

large bodies of Ukrainians for the project. The most recent tradition out of which a Ukrainian nationalism might arise is the Nazi tradition.

The Imperialist West in the late thirties apparently sought to use Nazism against Communism, but accident and poor calculation led to its becoming dependent on Communism to defeat Nazi Germany. So the important thing in our world is not Fascism *per se*, but whether it serves our interest. And the Interest to which our world is committed now, more than ever before, requires complete dominance of the world.

Robinson

continued

something different. Robinson pretends that his demand has been met and those letters are now not worth the paper they're written on. Jim Allister (Traditional Unionist Voice) ridicules this and says Robinson must resign.

Allister wants normal democratic politics in Stormont, like in Britain, with a Government and Opposition, and the possibility of the Government being defeated, in place of the GFA system, under which all parties are in the Government, each with its own Departments. He wants a system of government that is superficially like that in Britain, but he doesn't want British government, much though he treasures the "*British connection*", even though the Six Counties are part of the British state. We demonstrated that with the CEC (Campaign for Equal Citizenship) and CLR (Campaign for Labour Representation) back in the late eighties.

Constitutional formalities have little to do with what Unionism wants. It rejected substantive democracy in the political system of the state. What it yearns for is the feeling that the Nationalists/Republicans/Catholics have been put down yet again. ■

Developing The Shared History Syndrome

Minister for Heritage, Jimmy Deenihan (Fine Gael), explained his plans for the decade of commemorations in the Dáil recently: "*where there are opportunities to commemorate our shared history; we will do that*" But—"we are going to do this in our own very independent way". The report continues—

"Mr Deenihan was speaking as he outlined plans for a decade of commemorations with funding of €6 million. 'We will show proper respect to the people who died in 1916, the War of Independence and the Civil War and also to those Irish people who went to fight for Ireland, as they thought, in the first World War. They fought for Ireland in the First World War and they fought for Ireland in the War of Independence'..." (Irish Times, 31 January 2014)

With this Minister, football analogies spring to mind. He seems to look at it all as a game of two halves—WWI and the War of Independence. However, in the second half, the Irish changed sides and played against the team it had played with in the first half—and Jimmy still seems to regard it as playing the same game! I don't think Jimmy ever considered doing something like this in his playing career and could not even imagine doing so. Yet he blithely assumes that this explains what happened in these two Wars. It makes the whole thing look farcical, as it would in any game of football. Who needs Irish jokes with such a view from a Government Minister?

However, he gives a clue as to how this happened when he mentions "*those Irish people who went to fight for Ireland, as they thought, in the First World War*". In other words what they '*thought*' came into conflict with the reality of what they actually *did*. They discovered that they were on the wrong team and that discovery is the most crucial fact in the history of modern Ireland, as the War of Independence followed from it. But there are no plans to include that discovery in the decade of commemorations. And it can be located and dated quite easily—the day following the 1918 General Election result and the Government's non-response to it in 10 Downing St.

The important fact was, again, the dog that did not bark. The same Government reacted to the non-democratic 1916 rebellion with a big, all-singing, all-

dancing Irish Convention. But to the clear overwhelming result of a General Election—there was silence—which translated meant utter contempt for the electorate. And this from the Mother of Parliaments!

But Jimmy is not alone with the game of two halves approach to both Wars.

There is a theory along these lines being developed in academia by John Borgonovo. He said in a book review in the *Dublin Review of Books* that:

"Sometimes it seems that public engagement with the First World War has been reduced to angry newspaper letters exchanged every autumn over the wearing of the poppy. One can disagree over the proper method of remembering the Great War yet still recognise its impact on Irish history. The European conflagration fundamentally changed Ireland, creating the conditions that made possible the revolutionary events of 1916 to 1923" (No. 48, 27 January 2014).

There were two Wars that chronologically followed each other. Borgonovo's theme is that the first one created a lot of disruption and that seems to be sufficient for him to conclude that it led automatically to the second.

He points out some political changes, social problems, food shortages, class conflict, moral conflicts, etc. as factors that apparently led to the War of Independence.

But he conveniently forgets that Ireland did very well out of the Great War economically as it always did with British wars. The main industry, agriculture, always thrived in these situations. Armies march on their stomachs etc. Why did people who did well out of the war decide to go to war against the country whose war made them rich?

For any member of the working class that suffered there were proportionally many others who thrived and enriched themselves. His approach is a lumpen-Marxist approach of the economic determinist variety, which is simply intellectual laziness (to be kind) on his part.

The crucial event at 'half time' was the big non-event of Britain's ignoring of the 1918 Election result. The non-response added insult to the injury of the nearly 50,000 dead for the freedom of small nations. Insult was added to insult with

the introduction of martial law, the Auxiliaries and Black and Tans.

Technically it was not beyond the wit of the British Government to take a different approach to mitigate and possibly nullify the problems—Borgonovo's '*conditions*'—caused by the War and thereby change the political paradigm. That is what Governments are there to do and that particular Government had dealt with much bigger tasks.

But there was a definite political position taken to defy and suppress any follow-up by the Irish to that election result. The British thought it would be simply a police matter, but were to learn otherwise. The defensive War that was organised, fought and won by the Irish was not done on the basis of social and political problems that were stirred up by WWI. It was not organised and won by a people that felt themselves downtrodden and victims of such WWI disruptions. That would not have sustained such a determined and surprising War.

The fact is that the reaction to the 1918 Election is the crucial fact to be commemorated when it comes to the War of Independence. It is much more significant than the 1916 Rising itself. And the upsets of WWI pale into insignificance by comparison. But a veil is drawn over this, as if it was natural and expected for a Parliament to ignore an election result. The results in everything and anything being given significance as the reason(s) for the War of Independence.

A typical example of this approach is the perpetual reference to the affair at Soloheadbeg on 21st January 1919—as if Dan Breen and a few others would have been able to initiate and rouse the people for a two and a half year war against the most powerful State in the world. If that were the case, the Irish should be classified and dismissed as lunatics.

Jack Lane

SOILED GOODS

Bring on the sacred soil,
talk war and recoil
at child-soldiers in Africa,
young scouts for the 'RA.
But can you beat old England
for its military spirit of command
over its children
taught which nations to offend,
to remember wasteful WWI
that put the old Tsar on the run
and brought Hitler to Berlin
who then kicked Europe in the shins.

Wilson John Haire
2 November 2013

Shorts

from
the Long Fellow

THE ANGLO 3

There is a surreal quality to the trial of the Anglo 3. Anglo-Irish Bank has cost the tax payers almost 30 billion euro and yet the defendants are not being prosecuted for the loss of this money. Perhaps the charge of reckless trading is difficult to prove.

Sean FitzPatrick (Chief Executive up to 2005 and later non executive Chairman), Willie McAteer (Chief Risk Officer and Financial Director) and Pat Whelan (Director of Lending) are being charged for a highly technical matter. They are alleged to have used the bank in July 2008 to lend money to help 16 individuals buy shares in the bank. Pat Whelan is also charged with fraudulently changing loan documents to 10 of the individuals (the so called "Maple 10" group of developers).

It may not have been obvious in 2008, but by then the decisions that would destroy the bank and land the taxpayers with a 30 billion euro bill had already been made. With the benefit of hindsight the frenetic activity by Anglo Executives in the months leading up to July 2008 and afterwards was akin to moving deckchairs on the Titanic.

Indeed it could be said that the frenetic activity was evidence of innocence (in respect of reckless trading). They must have thought that the cause of Anglo-Irish Bank was not hopeless, otherwise they wouldn't have bothered.

SEAN QUINN AND THE ANGLO 3

We now know that the banking crisis was for the most part caused by loans to developers, which went bad as a result of the collapse of the property market. But that was not the perception of senior management of Anglo Irish Bank in 2008. In that year it thought that Sean Quinn could bring down the bank on his own as well as the Quinn Group. It had reasonable grounds for believing this was the case.

Last year there was a series of leaks of tape recordings of Anglo senior Executives, which seemed designed to portray them in an unflattering light. It was perhaps no coincidence that these leaks coincided with court proceeding brought against the Quinn family by the IBRC (the entity set up to handle the legacy of *Anglo Irish Bank* and *Irish Nationwide*).

However the trial of the Anglo 3 has not cast Sean Quinn in a favourable light. Selective leaks to the media is one thing; the application of the rules of evidence in a court setting is quite another.

CONTRACTS FOR DIFFERENCE

In 2007 Quinn had surreptitiously built up a 25% share in Anglo Irish Bank by means of *Contracts for Difference* (CFD). A CFD gives the purchaser the risks and rewards of ownership without legal title to the shares. There are at least two advantages to this form of investment. Since the purchaser does not legally own the shares, he doesn't have to: a) declare his interest to the stock market; and b) pay stamp duty on the shares.

There is an infinite variety of CFDs, but the type that Quinn indulged in appears to have been relatively straightforward. He gave an initial margin or deposit equal to 25% of the value of the shares to the CFD provider (an investment bank such as Morgan Stanley). This deposit of 25% is very high, reflecting the perceived risk of the Anglo shares. In a stable market the deposit is usually well below 5%. The deposit is retained by the investment bank as security in case the purchaser defaults on his obligations.

If the value of the share goes up the investment bank (or in plain language the bookie) pays out the "difference" or the excess of the capital value over the price of the share at the time the contract was made. On the other hand if the share price goes down—as it did with Anglo—the punter (in this case Quinn) has to pay the bookie the difference between the reduced price of the share and the initial contract price. The punter also pays interest charges (reflecting the bookie's capital outlay) and commission to the bookie.

Warren Buffet, the billionaire investor, has described CFDs as weapons of mass destruction, because for a relatively small initial outlay the investor can make massive profits or massive losses.

Finally, it is very important to understand that the normal way for an investor to "unwind" or extract himself from a CFD position is to first buy the shares and then sell them on the market. This detail is essential to grasp in order to assess the culpability or otherwise of the Anglo 3.

THE MOTIVE FOR THE ALLEGED CRIME

The law forbids a company manipulating its share price by lending to potential investors so that they will buy the company's shares. In the case of a company being a bank, the question is less clear cut. One of the defences of the Anglo 3 is that

the lending was done in the normal course of the bank's business. A second defence is the extraordinary circumstances that pertained in July 2008 when the deed was done.

There is no suggestion that Anglo executives were aware of Quinn's investment in the bank until they met him in September 2007. The discovery of his 25% involvement was a shock, which they immediately realised made the bank extremely vulnerable.

The nature of the vulnerability was twofold. Firstly, the control of 25% by one man could cause a collapse in the price, if the shares were suddenly sold on the market. There was a possibility that this could have been forced on Quinn as he racked up enormous losses. Alternatively, if he defaulted on his CFDs, control of the shares would have reverted to the investment banks, which in turn could pass them on to hedge funds betting against the share price.

Volatility in the share price is not normally a problem for the functioning of a company. However, these were not normal times. As the world financial crisis evolved, the collapse of Bear Stearns in March 2008 engendered doubt about the solvency of banks. There was a danger that the continuing decline in Anglo's share price would lead to a run on deposits leading to a liquidity crisis.

Secondly, the fortunes of Anglo were tied in to the fortunes of Quinn. A barrister at the trial suggested that they were "joined at the hip". Between November 2007 and July 2008 Anglo lent 2 billion euro to Sean Quinn personally. By July 2008 the Quinn Group owed Anglo another 2.4 billion. The Financial Regulator had become concerned about the Quinn Group, which had its reserves reduced as a result of Sean Quinn's gambling debts. At a meeting in May 2008 the Financial Regulator asked senior management at Anglo to release the Quinn Group from a guarantee that it had given Anglo for a 200 million loan given to Sean Quinn. This would enable the auditors to sign off on the Quinn Group accounts. Anglo complied with this request, which made it even more vulnerable to the Quinn loans.

PERPETRATION OF THE ALLEGED FIRST CRIME

The overriding objective of the Anglo management was to reduce the bank's exposure to Sean Quinn. It is interesting to note that it received no help from Quinn himself. On the contrary, Quinn resented Anglo's attempts to reduce its exposure. He behaved like a gambler chasing his

losses. The former Chief Executive of the Quinn Group Liam McCaffrey told the court that Quinn refused to believe that the share price could go any lower. Quinn himself admitted that he did not want to sell the shares.

The first plan of Anglo management was to make a rights issue, which would have the effect of diluting Quinn's holding, but there was no appetite among existing shareholders to commit more money to Anglo. The second plan was to seek investment from the Middle East, but in 2008 the last thing any investor wanted was to invest in a bank (English football clubs seemed a safer bet!).

Since it could not achieve its objectives through the market, it decided to rely on the personal ties it had with some of its (then) wealthy developer clients. The evidence of the developers—if it can be believed—is at least consistent. They all felt that Anglo had been "good" to them and wanted to help. Each of the 10 developers (the so called "Maple 10") was asked to buy 1% of Anglo's shares from Quinn. This would reduce Quinn's holding from 25% to 15%. The Maple 10 investors were initially offered a loan from Anglo of 60 million euros each. But since the share price was in free fall, by the time the purchase was executed only 45 million was needed.

The developers may have wanted to "help", but they were not total idiots. Anglo felt that the offer would have to limit their liability. It was agreed that the bank would have a recourse of 25%. In other words if the shares dropped to zero (which they eventually did) the bank could only recoup 25% or 11.25 million of each of the loans. In the event some of the developers ended up losing less than this because they somehow managed to offload the shares before they were worthless.

Before the deal was implemented the question of its legality arose. The evidence of the developers is that Anglo management told them that it was legal and that it had received advice to that effect from *Matheson Ormsby Prentice*. Furthermore it was pointed out to them that the investment bank handling the transaction (the ubiquitous *Morgan Stanley*) would not have participated if this were not the case. Finally, they were also told that the deal had the blessing of the Financial Regulator.

On the last point, some corroboration for the Financial Regulator's support was given in the evidence of Matt Moran, the Chief Financial Officer of the Bank. Moran said that at a late stage in the proceedings the Financial Regulator appeared to "resile" from his initial support. When it

was put to him that the Regulator was attempting to give himself "*plausible deniability*", Moran conceded that this appeared to be so. Moran's evidence on this point is given greater significance by the fact that he is a prosecution witness and has also been granted criminal immunity.

The 15% shareholding that Sean Quinn was left with following the Maple 10 transaction was transferred to 6 members of the Quinn family.

PERPETRATION OF THE ALLEGED SECOND CRIME

As indicated, Pat Whelan, the Director of Lending, faces a second charge of fraudulently altering the loan notes. It is alleged that in October 2008 he altered the terms of the loans from a 25% recourse to zero. Had Whelan made a corrupt deal with the developers to the disadvantage of the bank?

Reading between the lines there may be a more innocent explanation. It appears that one of the ten developers wanted to take advantage of the situation. Remember the original loan offer was for 60 million euro but only 45 million was required because of the fall in the share price. However, one of the ten developers still wanted to borrow the extra 15 million. It seems that the loan document stated that the purpose of the loan was to buy shares, but it did not oblige the borrower to buy Anglo shares. This would explain why Matheson Ormsby Prentice could advise

that the transaction was not illegal. It is possible that this weakness was exploited to force the Bank to waive the 25% recourse clause (down to zero).

Whatever about this, 9 out of the 10 developers signed a document to reinstate the 25% recourse clause in January 2009. This suggests the claim that they were trying to "help" the bank may have been sincere.

A SHAKESPEAREAN TRAGEDY

The story of Sean Quinn has the elements of a Shakespearean tragedy. Shakespeare's tragic hero is not brought down by chance or circumstance but by a flaw in his character. He is the author of his own misfortune.

Quinn was a reckless gambler who lost 3.2 billion euro in his punts on Anglo Irish Bank. From being the richest man in Ireland and—according to *Forbes* magazine—among the top 200 richest in the world he has lost control of his business empire. He is now reduced to salvaging the vestiges of his former wealth.

He has no real grounds for complaint. The Anglo management did everything possible—even at the risk of breaking the law (allegedly)—to facilitate his exit from his investment in the bank.

At present Quinn is hoping that the Anglo defendants will be found guilty. If the transactions are found to be illegal, he may be released from some of his loan obligations. This would be an unjust and costly outcome for the State.

Belfast In The 1970s

I must first of all say how excellent was Angela Clifford's article: *The Smithwick Tribunal (Irish Political Review, Jan. 14)* and how convincing it was that there could be no Dundalk Garda Síochána collusion over the killing of

Chief Superintendent Harry Breen and RUC Superintendent Robert Buchanan on the 20th March 1989 by PIRA. She quotes PIRA's statement about the ambush at length and it appears PIRA was highly efficient in surveillance and communication technology. Maybe Judge Peter Smithwick couldn't and wouldn't acknowledge this. Thinking on the modern IRA can be quite primitive South of the Border. I have heard people there refer to the 30-year-war as one of merely shooting constables again, much like in the War of Independence. It is doubtful if these bitter begrudgers supported a historic event that made a good chunk of Ireland their nation.

An interesting point Angela brings up

is the religious beliefs of Supt. Buchanan and his fatalistic inability to take better precautions on his and his companion's cross-Border trips in Intelligence-gathering because God was in control. He used his own car continually. He had no armed police escort on either side of the Border. He was himself unarmed and, though he would not be allowed to go South over the Border with arms, he could have picked up a weapon when he returned North over the Border, as the article points out. More on his religious beliefs later in this article and a RUC police-sergeant with similar religious beliefs.

In a previous article I wrote about staying at the Europa Hotel in central Belfast during the early 1970s. One of my projects was a screenplay for BBC Television which was to be filmed on the streets of Belfast—a first in this *genre* with wide media interest in it coming

from the British, Irish, US, Canadian and Australian media.

The Europa was, as I have written previously, under constant attack by PIRA. The worst experience was the bomb in a holdall dumped on the reception desk. How anyone could get it through the security barrier at the entrance to the hotel was a mystery. It couldn't have been taken through the kitchen entrance for that door was alarmed. Yet here it was sitting at reception, primed to go off. Phone calls told the management that it had an anti-handling device. So it was best to tip-toe out in the evacuation of the hotel, as advised, without panic, and very slowly in order not to send out vibrations which might send the ball-bearing down the steel tube to make a fatal contact.

That meant a night away from the hotel while the British Army bomb disposal squad tried to deal with the device. We all had to find alternative accommodation. Those with the enough cash hired taxis to other hotels, while the rest of us searched for a B&B. The main thing was to get away from the Europa as quickly as possible in case of an explosion. Some guests were still in pyjamas because they had panicked and didn't dress quickly enough. Then it was a walk up Great Victoria Street to Balmoral Avenue to find a B&B.

Supt. Buchanan had God to protect him. My god then was Bacchus. The BBC had a an alcohol culture, with a private club near its headquarters in Ormeau Avenue. It wasn't unusual when meeting up with senior staff to have a drink even if it was morning. I was already half drunk during the evacuation of the Europa and now the B&B threw open its bar when some journalists demanded a drink to steady their nerves.

I was soon asleep, asleep so deeply I didn't hear the shouts to evacuate the B&B because of a possible PIRA car-bomb outside. I learned later that most of Balmoral Avenue spent the night in Botanic Gardens trying to sleep on the dew-soaked grass. The car-bomb turned out to be a hoax though the car had been parked at a 45 degree angle to indicate something unusual.

But it wasn't the end of a disturbing night for it stretched into morning. Opposite the B&B was an entry* and from it I watched from the window as the ambulance men carried a stretcher. On it was a disabled Catholic who had been stabbed to death during the night.

* A narrow lane, providing back entry. Ed.

Alcohol was an anaesthetic for many, while others were on tranquillisers in this war zone. With alcohol it had to be the right amount without one becoming incapable. Belfast was always a great place for discussion groups among strangers, held in cafes and pubs and even in specially-hired halls. In a city centre pub I fell in with a group of five Catholics who seemed interested in the literature of the B&ICO. After a few drinks the idea was to drive into the Protestant Shankill Road and drink there. Our god Bacchus was protecting us. A bit foolhardy for a bunch of middle-aged men but it could have been a last fling in pushing the boundaries. We drove there and parked and then entered a pub. There was a sudden hush and silence when we entered this mainly local pub where everyone seemed to know one another. We ordered drinks and then a few more drinks. Some of our group then began dangerously chatting up the women—who were possibly the wives, daughters and girlfriends of loyalist paramilitaries. One very drunken local approached us and said: "*Ye look like a bunch of fenians to me.*" One of our group then said loudly: "*He thinks we're fenians, can ye imagine that!*" After that we casually left with "*goodnights*" all round.

The group wasn't anti-Protestant because for the first time they were trying to understand them. Maybe we went a bit too far to the Protestant side at times, until a better balance was struck. I had grown tired of nationalism as it was with its one-nation-one-people outlook. I knew the Protestant was never going to take to Pearse or Connolly. I had been in the Connolly Association and every Irish revolutionary had been thrown into the one-nation pot. I was getting nowhere in my thinking and I had thought seriously of turning my back on Irish politics in general. The two-nation theory revived my interest. We could give better answers to the Protestant than the Protestant could make for his/herself. There could be a little bit of arrogance at the beginning and maybe a neglect of our own rights as Northern Catholics. It was all the result of an exciting new window being thrown open. Maybe this had to do with our sudden foray into a pub in a hard-line Protestant area. I didn't know who this group was for I never saw them again. I just hope they didn't go back there again.

I had written a simple screenplay for television and now BBC London was in Belfast to film it on the streets. The script was about a young girl bunking off school and innocently wandering areas she

shouldn't be in and meeting Catholic girls whom she had never met. BBC N.I. decided the British Army and RUC would be needed to protect the mixed-religion actors. I persuaded the director it was best to go to those who controlled the areas and ask their permission to film in their streets. He went along with the idea and so we met the reps of both Republican and Loyalist areas who give us immediate permission and seemed pleased to be recognised as the true controllers of their areas.

BBC N.I. was not too happy about this arrangement nor was the British Army or the RUC. We began to get threats of violence in the street from military-looking civilians with English accents: "*Be careful when you go out after dark.*" The director had shots fired over his head. To his credit he didn't decide to terminate the filming. He saw the situation in NI as laughable, he just wouldn't take it seriously even when bombs went off or the sky was full of gun-flashes late at night. He even said he wanted to take a look at Short Strand, a small Catholic area in a sea of loyalism. He had read about it somewhere. A bomb had gone off in a house there killing the bomb-maker some time ago.

One of his crew hired a ferry-boat. It was the same boat I had journeyed in from the Pollock Dock across a stretch of water in Belfast Harbour to Victoria Wharf in the shipyard. Fifty men at a time would stand in it for the five minute journey. Back and forth it went until the shipyard klaxon sounded at 8 am. Then it started again at knocking-off time at 5.30 pm.

The sturdy seemingly everlasting boat had been built in Arklow and here was the Catholic boatman owner again and not looking a day older than he did back in 1950. The price of the ferry was one old penny back then. He was well respected by the mostly Protestant shipyard workers for his seamanship and safety record and that's why he was still alive in his mainly Protestant environment. It was the lion taking the lamb under its protection.

Short Strand has one side of it overlooking the harbour. On land there were three look-outs standing very aggressively watching our approach. The director wanted the boat to go closer and closer to Short Strand. The director, then to my amazement, wanted to land but the boatman asked us if we wanted to be shot and swerved away in great arc. The director still wanted to see Short Strand but it being under constant siege from loyalists, there could be no negotiations about strangers entering it.

The next thing he did was to phone an

RUC barracks. As he was explaining what he wanted them to do for him, he was told the barracks was under attack and it was time to hit the bunker. I told him the police were not going to enter Short Strand except in tanks but he was insistent and kept phoning the barracks and they kept putting him off.

Finally he decided we would go to the barracks in person. We approached the heavily fortified barracks with its anti-missile screen surrounding it, its sandbags, razor wire, and thick anti-blast walls. He spoke to the policeman holding the sub-machine gun but he wouldn't let us into the barracks. After a while the director was let use an external phone and was admitted. I was to stay outside. I decided to get away as far as possible from the cop with the sub-machine-gun in case of a drive-by-shooting.

Then out of the barracks comes a police-sergeant as if on the beat with the sun shining on the three gold strips on his forearm. He is dressed in an ordinary uniform without a bullet-proof vest and is unarmed. He casually walks towards the main shopping area. It was very unusual to see the RUC walking in the streets at that time even when they were armed and in a group. They mostly went around in armoured land-rovers. I felt like calling after him and telling him not to take that risk until I realised he must have had God on his side. I envied him as a non-believer. I only had Bacchus with its nasty side effects but he was able to have a clear head in the morning. Though as a Catholic I looked on him as the enemy I still hoped he would be all right. I had a high regard for his courage. The cop with the sub-machine-gun was also watching the sergeant and seemed to be mouthing to himself: *'For fuck sake!'* over and over again.

Later in the week the director told me all was fixed for our visit to Short Strand. No, he had not negotiated anything, we were just going to go in there, and here was the taxi coming. We climbed in and I knew and the Protestant taxi-driver knew there was a battle-hardened IRA unit in there somewhere. The director said there would be no cops with guns. At that moment a car drew up and the driver was the same police-sergeant but now in civilian clothing. He just drove through the entrance to Short Strand and we followed. The taxi-driver kept saying to himself as if in a prayer: *'Ach sure they know me in here, they know I mean them no harm.'* He then said *'they know the sergeant as well and they know he means*

them no harm.' It was morning and there was no one around. It was like a ghost town with no look-outs anywhere to be seen. The sergeant had picked the right day, maybe through local knowledge.

It was unlikely that a major loyalist gun attack would be launched in a hurry again, not after what happened on the 27th of June 1970 when loyalists threw petrol-bombs at St Matthew's Catholic Church and then tried to force their way into this enclave in order to burn the houses.

They met with a PIRA unit led by Billy McKee and a gun-battle went on for five hours with two loyalists and one nationalist killed. McKee was shot five times and survived. An unknown number were wounded. McKee reckons he fired off 800 rounds. The loyalists retreated in the end.

The British Army and RUC didn't intervene. After that the British Army began to protect Short Strand by placing armoured cars opposite its entrance. The people of Short Strand weren't interested in this arrangement, considering that PIRA had declared war on the British State. Sometime later, to emphasise the ending of a PIRA ceasefire, an army sergeant poking his head out of one of the armoured cars was shot dead by a sniper from Short Strand one minute after midnight.

It was the old Short Strand of two-up-and-two-down houses, before it was rebuilt along the lines of military architecture where no area would be left externally where *gunmen* could hide. We roamed the few streets at speed. Passing a mound of old vehicle tyres I noticed a young man on top sorting them. When he saw the two cars he flung himself behind the mound out of sight.

The taxi-driver then foolhardily tells the director we are passing the house where the bomb went off. It is just a gap in the housing now but the director asks the taxi-driver to reverse back so as he can have a better look. In the meantime the sergeant is well ahead and now out of sight, probably clear of Short Strand and thanking God for a good deliverance. But we had lost the protection of God and I knew that, for the driver told us to get our heads down as we passed the end of a street. He himself was hunkered almost under the steering wheel.

Out of nowhere at the exit of Short Strand was a row of pre-school toddlers, some still in pyjamas and bibs, some sucking on dummies. They weren't going to let us out. The whole scene was grotesque as if we were watching some voodoo film of malignant dwarves. How

do you address toddlers? The drivers shouted out of the window: *'Let us through, loves.'* But they weren't particularly looking at us or at anything. Then I thought—these are Catholic children living under siege and it's being like that for a hundred years. Maybe it is part of their genetic make-up to automatically challenge intruders. Now they were waiting until the adults dealt with us.

The street-wise taxi-driver had a solution—he took from his pocket a handful of change and flung it out of the window. The kids dived for it and we were free. I looked around to see the young man who had been on the tyre mound chasing after us.

The taxi-driver must have made a report to the BBC about this incident, through protesting at being asked to face such dangers for there was much buzzing between Belfast and London about the director maybe getting us all killed. So filming was curtailed and we were ordered back to London much to the joy of BBC N.I.

Personally for me, not having lived in N.I. for many years, I had no base to operate from and from which I could gauge my own safety and prepare for it on a day-to-day level.

Territory was changing hands frequently and streets that were safe in the morning could become dangerous in the evening. The mixed estate where my parents lived had had its pogroms with most of the Catholics ousted and the rest hiding their identity by sending their children to Protestant schools. Strictly speaking to visit there was to endanger myself but parents have to be visited sometime. My parents being a mixed couple, my father's only hope was to emphasise his Protestantism which he did by attending local loyalist funeral parades or buying loyalist literature that was being sold around the doors. Also, I could have become a victim of PIRA as much as victim of the British Army, the RUC or the loyalist paramilitaries.

The early 1970s was one of the most deadly periods but PIRA, being one of the most sophisticated guerrilla movements and a force for the future, began to adjust and turn away from the tit-for-tat killing of Protestants. Séan McGouran, in an article in the December, 2013 issue of the *Irish Political Review* wrote of the early Gerry Adams maybe not approving of some of PIRA's tactics back then and places him far away from the Jean McConville case, when he was a minor

figure in Sinn Fein with little influence and certainly not the powerful figure he has become. So, with the end-game being politics, the armed movement grows up and becomes more selective and disciplined for the tasks ahead. In the end this is what won over the Democratic Unionist and saw the demise of the unforgiving Official Unionists.

Later the film was made, but in a London studio. The media said it should have been made on the streets of Belfast. Later I learnt that the BBC was erasing a number of films from its archives to make room on the shelves and to re-use the film. My film was one of those deletions.

Wilson John Haire

11 January 2014

Part Two

A Critic Emerges From Academia, Michael Carragher (and *Living History*)

What is BICO? The *Living History* internet operation, conducted apparently by Michael Carragher on behalf of some segment of academia, says it is a sinister organisation dedicated to the purpose of enslaving the nation by means of charlatanism, sophistry, and the deception of useful fools like Brian Murphy and Niall Meehan—though I notice in some of the material I have been sent that Meehan is himself described as a "*poisoner of wells*": which means, I suppose, that he must be in BICO.

Let me say—for all the good it will do—that Meehan is not in BICO. As far as I recall I have only met him in passing. And I understand that he disagrees fundamentally with BICO, both on Northern Ireland (which is chiefly what BICO has been about since 1969) and on the development of Russia after 1921, which gave rise to various strains of Marxism.

But, on Carragher's scenario, that could just mean that Meehan is a secret part of BICO's extensive network of deception.

I suppose the poisoning of wells was once a military device practised by armies which were compelled to surrender ground to an enemy. I first came across its figurative use in the Rev. Charles Kingsley's assault on Cardinal Newman for having deserted the Church of England for Rome. Rome permits the telling of lies, said the "*muscular Christian*" Imperialist, Kingsley. Fr. Newman was now allowed to tell lies with a good conscience, so one could no longer believe a word he said. I am now put, with relation to Carragher and *Living History*, in the same position in which Newman was put with regard to Kingsley and Anglican Imperialism.

There is the further similarity that Kingsley invented facts to serve his indictment, and Newman responded by dealing with the invented facts in detail.

Carragher denies that he is in any way connected with Eoghan Harris, who liber-

ated history from fact and copyrighted his rejection of "*factism*". I don't say his method was developed under Harris's influence. I only say that he invents facts.

To begin with a little one: In *Living History*, April 12, 2011, my contribution to the book on Coolacree is described as—

"plausible nonsense—exactly the sort of "*verisimilitude*" that Basil Clarke and his Dublin Castle propagandists would have been proud to produce—"

The first bit of *plausible nonsense* he identifies is a statement that Britain made war on France in 1793-1814 because France "*proclaimed the legitimacy of democratic government*". But he does not show that it was not the case that Britain made war in support of Monarchical legitimacy. He says: "*This forum is hardly the place for analysis of the French Revolution*". However, he analyses it to the extent of saying that there was initial sympathy in England with the French Revolution, but that, in France, "*Instead of growth of parliamentary democracy came the Terror and dictatorship*".

He does not indicate where I ever said that a functional system of democratic government was established in France. I have said the opposite repeatedly. And I have said that it was in Britain that the system of government that we now call democracy was brought into being gradually, during the century following the defeat of France, by the modification of the authoritative aristocratic regime that defeated France.

My second piece of plausible nonsense, that Basil Clarke would have been proud of, is my "*claim that war was Britain's primary business for centuries*"..." This, he says—

"distorts the priorities of 'a nation of shopkeepers'. Britain certainly was ready

to go to war in defence of her trade and other interests... but the notion that her "populace was highly adapted to the waging of war" is the sort of thing that everybody knows in the way that 'everybody knows' Ned Carson prosecuted Oscar Wilde—i.e. everybody but those who know what they're talking about. A few thousand Boers put Britain to the pin of her imperial collar..."

The last sentence is all that he presents in the way of refutation. It might be to the point if I had said that Britain was very good at fighting battles. I do not recall ever saying such a thing. In three centuries, during which it was almost always at war, it had two outstanding battle commanders, Marlborough and Wellington. The latter fought a series of comparatively small battles with exceptional skill, but his job was to maintain British military presence in Europe while Russia, Prussia and Austria wore down the French. And Marlborough's outstanding ability, at the start of those three centuries, was to keep an army together as he marched it up and down through Europe.

Some of Britain's greatest wars were fought chiefly by others. That was the achievement of the Balance-of-Power strategy it adopted around the time of Marlborough.

Where Britain excelled, both in the assembling of massive power and in the conduct of battle, was at sea. I have explained a number of times how the aristocracy of the Glorious Revolution disciplined itself in the early 18th century into mastering the command of ships in battles. They discussed the matter and decided they must become sailors themselves and not depend on professional sailors.

When Britain became the dominant world power at sea, it did not need to maintain a large standing army always prepared for battle. It could declare war and then prepare to fight it.

The populace was habituated over three centuries to living in a state that was almost always at war, and to taking pride in its wars. The only long period without war that I could discover was the generation during which Walpole was shaping and consolidating the Constitution—the 1720s and 1730s.

The "*nation of shopkeepers*" was Napoleon's jibe, as I recall. He lost the war to the regime of aristocratic militarists, to which the nation, including its shopkeepers, was deferential.

Carragher appears to be an academic expert in military matters. I have only had basic training. But I know the difference

between a war and a battle. And in Belfast I found it necessary to get to know something about England. And I have yet to discover a corner of it that was not thick with naval or military institutions or memorabilia.

I have on a number of occasions drawn attention to Pitirim Sorokin, who was the subject of a famous article by Lenin: *The Valuable Admissions Of Pitirim Sorokin*. Sorokin's valuable admission was that he had been defeated by Lenin. He was the leader of the last hold-out in Russia against the Bolshevik regime. His admission that he had been defeated, and that the cause was hopeless, removed the last centre of internal resistance to the regime.

Sorokin escaped and went to the United States, where he became an influential sociologist—a sociologist of a different kind: one with extensive experience in the life of the world which he investigated. One of his projects was to count the wars fought by the various European states in recent centuries. England, since its Glorious Revolution, came in miles ahead of every other. It must be thirty years since I read about this, and I do not have my notes to hand, but the number 170 sticks in my memory. And, since Sorokin's study only came up to the 1950s, the number of Britain's wars must now be over 200. Does *Living History* expect us to believe that the populace of a state governed by a representative system could be unadapted to warfare after so many of them.

War remains a major preoccupation of British culture. There is never a day's television without it. And, when the Falklands War was launched after some years when only a very few small wars had been fought, the adaptation to it, in a mood that might be called excited relaxation, was instant—apart from a few sourpusses on the Left. And even those harmless 'peaceniks' were part of the normality of Britain at war.

And finally, in a demonstration that I am such a person as Basil Clarke would have been proud of:

"It's all good old fashioned Brit bashing which will always get you lusty cheers, and camouflage a corps of crackpot notions, and Mr. Clifford gets another cheer for infiltrating a new approach to conferring electoral endorsement on the Easter Rising (it's a new approach to me anyway, clever, but as spurious as such sophistry always is)..."

This is followed by four paragraphs, in which I can find no explanation of what my bright idea for conferring electoral endorsement on the Rising is.

What I find is:

"Mr. Clifford goes on to warn against how academic historians may be subverted by authority, a warning that might be worrisome had he not so comprehensively demolished the credibility of such alternative "historians" as himself. Academic historians are professionals who know what they're talking about. Mr. Clifford gives regrettable substance to David Adams' slur. {In the print-out I have been sent, there is a blank of half a line here.} The amateur historian in Ireland is often little more than a propagandist masquerading as an expert (Coolacree, p398)."

I don't know what David Adams' slur is. I understand that Adams is an Ulster Loyalist adopted by the *Irish Times* for a while. I was blackballed by the *Irish Times* because of the 'Two Nations' and my proposal that Northern Ireland should be included in the democracy of the state which holds it.

As to electoral endorsement of the Rising: all I can recall having said—and I said it a good many times—is that the electoral basis of British government was suspended in 1915 and did not resume until December 1918. The Rising happened during a hiatus in electoralism and representative government. Parliament decided that government should carry on without elections after the mandate of the 1910 Election ran out at the end of 1915.

This was not a matter of the Government that was in place in August 1914 carrying on to the end of the War. There were two changes of Government during the War. The first was in March 1915, while the 1910 mandate still ran. The second was in 1916, during the hiatus. The 1915 change brought the organisers of the Anti-Home Rule Army into a Coalition, while the 1916 change made them the dominant Party in the Coalition.

The Unionists who joined the Government in 1915 were elected MPs in good standing. In 1916 the entire Parliament was unelected. There was nothing illegal in this. Under the doctrine of Parliamentary Sovereignty, Parliament was under no legal obligation to renew itself according to rules observed by earlier Parliaments. The Parliament in being is always the supreme authority, and might do as it pleased as far as law was concerned.

The 1915 change of Government, while being enacted under the 1910 mandate, broke the rule, hitherto observed, that when an MP left the backbenches and joined the Government he must resign his seat and contest it again. Only the previous year the Prime Minister had done this when taking on the additional Office of

War Minister as a consequence of the Curragh Mutiny. (War Minister Seeley bought off the mutiny by making a deal with the Army leaders which was at variance with Government policy, though no doubt informally approved. He sacrificed his career in the Government interest and resigned. He could not be replaced easily because the secret arrangements with France for joint military action against Germany were known only to a few. So the Prime Minister took on the War Department himself, and there was no specialist War Minister to tend to the business when the opportunity for war presented itself three months' later. The possibility that this led to a different kind of war being fought than the one envisaged by the Committee of Imperial Defence is a very sensitive matter which, as far as I know, no professional historian—no historian paid by the State—has cared to dwell upon.)

Anyhow, Asquith re-fought his seat. But as far as I know the Unionists didn't when joining the Government in 1915.

I have certainly said that the Rising was enacted during a hiatus in the system of elected government, and that 'democracy' had no bearing on it.

I have also said that 'democracy', or at least representative government by a minority, might have been brought to bear on it by the Redmondite Party resigning their seats and re-fighting them in by-elections, which would have amounted to a general election in Home Rule Ireland. A repudiation of the Rising in such an election would, I'm sure, have had considerable influence on the subsequent course of events. And I can't see where the sophistry is in that. Carragher must condescend to explain.

Anyhow, the Redmondites preferred to hang on in unelected status as the electoral ground slid away from them during the next two years, whinging about the conduct of the Government but continuing to recruit for the Army—until they rebelled against Conscription in 1918 when the Ludendorff offensive threatened to put an end to civilisation: wasn't that the Home Rule position—civilisation would perish if the Hun was not defeated?

(I have now looked through my article in the Coolacree book. It contains no "infiltration" of a suggestion that the Rising was democratic. It explains that neither Sinn Fein, nor the Government, nor the Home Rule Party had current elected status in 1916. And I'm sure I made the same point in an Introduction to Sean Moylan's *Memoirs*.)

In view of the character assassination published by *Living History*, which compares me not only with Basil Clarke but with the Nazi publisher, Julius Streicher, I think the only thing to do is issue my chapter in the *Coolcrease* book along with the Living History critique of it so that readers can work out for themselves who is engaged in "demented shrieking".

On looking though the book, I can understand why it caused extreme irritation in academia. My contribution is called *Academic Evasions*, and it has a subsection called *Historians: Amateur And Mercenary*. The reason for this was that a number of well-known academics lent their authority to RTE's gross misrepresentation of fact, and were not challenged by their colleagues. And then anybody who was capable of thought had to admit that this book by amateurs demolished the credibility of the programme.

The book was a public event. It was launched at a mass meeting in Tullamore, where people had been made to feel guilty about their grandparents. They took it that RTE was exposing the awful truth which had been hidden for two generations. They had trusted the "national broadcaster", and the Professors. And they were outraged when it was demonstrated that RTE and its Professors had tried to load them with false guilt.

Even *Living History* admits that "the RTE Hidden History programme was a shabby job of work" and only tries to find a couple of nits to pick in the book that demolished it.

Aubane is a local history group set up by Sleeve Luacra members of BICO, after the attempt to democratise the North within the UK was seen to be hopeless, in which others in the locality became involved. In Belfast people from a wide range of political opinion, including Tories, were associated with Athol Street during its attempt at political democratisation. And so it was in other places on other issues. Whatever else, BICO may have been, it was not a closed ideological sect with a Bible.

I can see why Aubane and BICO publications should arouse feelings of unease in academia. Somebody must have asked why these are not academic publications instead of being produced by outsiders in conflict with academia.

The reason they are produced outside academia is that academia did not produce them. And the reason there is conflict is that academics could not just let the outsiders be, and draw their salaries quietly.

Aubane would be a quiet local history group dealing with very local affairs if, twenty years ago, the Establishment had not pounced on it as deviant and black-guarded it.

BICO was a small group of Communists got together by Pat Murphy in the mid-sixties. It had no connection with any Communist Party or State, or with any State of any other kind, or with any University, or with any rich patron. It was a group of workers with a somewhat basic class view of social affairs, which, however, proved to be adequate to the Irish situation.

It did not take it to be the business of bourgeois institutions to produce working class political literature. That would have been a very unrealistic view of things in England, but in Ireland of the 1960s it was spot on. The first thing we did was to discover and publish things that were referred to by socialist gurus but were not available. The first of these was Liam Mellows' *Jail Notes*. I went looking for them in the Dublin libraries but couldn't find them. Then somebody said that MacGiolla Phadraig, who sold holy pictures and statues in a shop around the corner from the Pro-Cathedral, knew where everything was, and I should ask him. I thought a Catholic repository was a strange place to inquire about Communist material. But I went and asked him. The Communism didn't bother him at all. He gave me a number and said if I put it on a ticket at the National Library I would get a collection of things which would include the *Jail Notes*. But, he said, leaving ideology aside, if I wanted to get the feel of the situation in the twenties and thirties, I should read the *Catholic Bulletin*. And he was right on both counts.

I copied out the *Jail Notes* in the National Library and they were typed up and published.

We bought an antiquated, hand-operated, table-top duplicating machine, that could be used in a rented furnished room, and a typewriter, and printed the *Jail Notes*. Then we found out something about the Republican Congress and published that. And we published a monthly magazine with the title *Irish Communist* to show that moral intimidation wouldn't work on us.

We didn't try to do anything on the 50th Anniversary of the Rising, but we got up a major agitation on the 50th Anniversary of the 1918 Election, in connection with homelessness. Denis Dennehy got himself imprisoned for homelessness (squatting

with his family in an empty property), and he went on hunger-strike, timing it so that it would be approaching crisis point on the 50th anniversary of the 1st Dail and its dishonoured Democratic Programme. The Mansion House celebrations were spoiled, the centre of Dublin was put in an uproar, and life began to assert itself in the dismal housing estates.

Suddenly Communism had arrived in Dublin. Denis was a Communist folk-hero. The agitation was prevented from running over into general revolutionism, and was kept focussed on the housing issue, with some effect.

Pat Murphy committed himself to fostering a self-help reform mentality in the working-class, through the Larkin Centre, while at the same time upholding the working class side in the ongoing Capital/Labour conflict. When he died some years ago, a park was named after him in North Dublin.

The incompetent middle-class fostered by Lemass felt the ground move under them in 1968-9, with the housing agitation, and the extraordinary student revolutionary movement called *The Internationalists*, much of which later merged into BICO. The hunger-strike brought them to their wit's-end, and it was only with the help of the Quaker gentry and the Jesuits that they got through it. The experience is probably partly responsible for their incompetence when the North blew up six months later.

BICO then bewildered them by making a case for the rejection of Redmondite nationalism by the Ulster Protestant community, and launching an agitation for the repeal of Articles 2 & 3 of the Constitution as a necessary precondition of North/South dialogue. Unfortunately all parties in the Dail believed their own propaganda about Ulster Unionism being a survival from feudalism maintained by the Tory Party, which would soon crumble. Articles 2 & 33 were not repealed until almost 30 years later, when the effect was negligible.

It was in 1970 that BICO began to undertake what in both Marxist and Liberal theory was the historic function of the national middle class. Much of what BICO has printed during the last thirty years—because it was nowhere else in print—is what in any proper nation-state would be the literary heritage of the bourgeoisie. Drennan, Steel Dickson, Sampson, Porter, Cox, Moore, Mangan, Gavan Duffy. Not to mention the *Irish Bulletin*. And then there is O'Connell, which we should get around to publishing

soon. All that is in print of O'Connell is his letters, and it was not by letter-writing that he changed the world.

Connolly, combining nationalism and socialism, said that the middle class could not sustain the national position. Can there now be any doubt that he was right? The natural tendency of the middle class is to become fake-British.

Pat Murphy used to say that the pillars of the nation-state were the GAA, the Catholic Church, and Fianna Fail. He said this as somebody who took himself to be a pillar of the state while Fianna Fail was collapsing.

So what is BICO? It is what it does. And what it does is there for all to see.

It is Stalinist. That is, it has argued that Stalin operated the system constructed by Lenin. Up to 20 years ago it used to be a widely-held opinion—held by Communist Parties as well as others—that Stalin destroyed the system of Leninist democracy. Who now talks about Leninist democracy?

There used to be a list of Stalin's Errors. The first of them was that for a period in 1917, when he was the senior Bolshevik in Russia, he wanted to commit the Party to an opposition role in the newly-established bourgeois system—until Lenin came back and showed that the thing to do was overthrow it. Not much has been heard of that Error recently.

It used to be said that he all but wrecked the Red Army three years before the German invasion, and then that he all but lost the war—i.e., he won it.

What has been going on in the pre-capitalist world since the collapse of the Communist State system a quarter of a century ago has greatly altered the way Stalin's Russia is written about, especially by American Universities.

BICO has no policy statements. It has publications. It acquired the habit of doing things a long time ago. It was never abolished. It would be meaningless to abolish it, because the habit of doing things would remain. It is freakish, of course, because it does things without 'funding'.

It is unbelievable that it does what it does without funding. I know that. It is old-fashioned. That can't be helped. It is producing the *Irish Bulletin* essentially as it produced the Jail Notes.

Funded radicals, who know that money moves the world, search for what is behind BICO, convinced that it cannot be what it appears to be. Brian Hanley has suggested that it is funded by the Official IRA. I suggest that anyone who is convinced that there must be something behind BICO should consult Hanley about it!

Apropos Julius Streicher and *Der Sturmer*: a few years ago I was shown a page of the Internet magazine, the *Dublin Review Of Books*, and have now managed to get a print-out of it. Here are the relevant sentences:

"We could follow Dr. Brooke into textual history of Lenin on George Berkeley, but to no greater advantage. Apart from indicating the reviewer's susceptibility to the Protocols of Athol (cf Angela Clifford's 2002 celebration of Karl Lueger, Vienna's anti-Semite mayor, a hero for Hitler), what does his diligent befuddlement signify? Perhaps it is enough to observe that Belfast radicals offer a broad range of narrow minds, from the murderers of Jean McConville to the gurus of BICO (R.I.P.)..."

The writers of this is W.J. McCormack, who was a playboy groupie of militant Republicanism in the early 1970s when it would have been useful, but unpopular, not to have been. He subsequently followed the Dublin middle class fashion by flipping over into verbose, mindless denigration of the North. He is disputing with Peter Brooke about something or other. Peter was once connected with Athol Street in its attempt to democratise the Six Counties into the political system of the British state, as a practical alternative to the Anti-Partition War. He has had no association whatever with Athol Street, or "*BICO (RIP)*" for a quarter of a century, but he remains forever tainted by having once been with Athol St. But McCormack, who supported militant Anti-Partitionism when opposition might have had some practical effect, gave himself absolution as he followed the fashion, and he adds his voice to the futile choir of denouncers of the Republicanism which set itself a more practical aim than the simple, impossible, one of directly ending Partition.

The "*Protocols of Athol*" can mean only one thing. The word *Protocols* lost its innocent meaning a long time ago. It cannot now be used without carrying the meaning of murderous Anti-Semitism. And the murderous Anti-Semite, who exerted a bad influence on Peter Brooke, Angela Clifford, is an officially recognised Holocaust survivor.

Karl Lueger was not only an anti-Semite. Merely being Anti-Semitic would not have distinguished him at all from the general run of humanity then. Hitler admired many things. His admiration of Britain was boundless. His great ambition was to emulate it. He wrote a chapter of *Mein Kampf* which was a hymn of praise to the unscrupulous British propaganda which was so much more effective than the amateurish German propaganda of the

Great War, which retained some concern with factual truth.

Lueger created modern Vienna with its social amenities. An attempt is currently in progress to remove that fact from the history of the city.

The Jewish problem—which was frankly admitted to be a problem by the British propaganda of the 'Anti-Fascist War'—was not created by Lueger. It was created by the wanton destruction of the Hapsburg Empire by Britain in 1919, and its division into a series of 'nation-states' by a Versailles decree. The Jews were the middle class of the Austrian Empire. They could not be the middle classes of the new nationalist states. And the undeveloped native middle classes, who had not created their states through their own efforts, set about ousting the Jews from their dominant position in commercial and academic life when they were placed in power.

I have had only one encounter with McCormack. That was in his capacity as the scourge of Casement. It struck me that he had taken on the destiny of reincarnating Bernard Shaw—but he was a Shaw without the humour and with a Dublin academic foundation in place of it.

He carries around a strip of "*Fascist*" sticky labels and looks for people to stick them on. At the same time he is the champion of Francis Stuart against the Philistines. The central fact of Stuart's is that he made his way, against considerable obstacles, to Nazi Germany at the start of the War and broadcast on Nazi radio.

In one of his Anti-Casement tirades he sticks a Fascist label on MacGiolla Phadraig—I suppose on the principle that a seller of Holy Pictures can only have been a Fascist. But MacGiolla Phadraig was Anti-Fascist at a time when it would have been very easy in Dublin not to have been.

A final word about Angela Clifford. Suspecting a report in the *Sunday Independent*, she set in motion the investigation which led to the exposure of the Coolacrease Deception. That must be hard to forgive.

Brendan Clifford

Seán Moylan In His Own Words. His Memoir of the War of Independence. With Index of Bureau of Military History Statements €21, £17.50

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

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

es ahora *

CHURCH OF IRELAND

In last month's *Irish Political Review*, my colleague Michael Stack reviewed *The Church of Ireland: An Illustrated History*, edited by various authors, with Booklink as its publisher and found it to be in essence—a polished exercise in propaganda. I however had more difficulties with it and would use the word "sectarian" in the way it excised Irish Catholicism and appropriated all its historic achievements and glory. But there is one aspect in this book, one that is truly Protestant which is almost excised itself and nearly buried but for the close examination of text given to it by me. On page 67, apart from the general text and on a little side-bar, is a bit on 'Hard Gospel', over which heading are lovely blue bubbles tripling on up to a white cross. Beneath the logo is the instructive phrase: "Love God: Love your neighbour". And beneath that is a photo of—

"Chair of the Hard Gospel Committee at a Service to initiate the project. From left: Philip McKinley, Stephen Dallas, Archbishop Eames, Rev. Earl Storey and Archdeacon (now Bishop) Patrick Rooke."

I would have thought that they would have put after Eames that he is now Lord Eames and has taken his rightful place in the House of Lords—the British upper House which of course forbids Catholic ecclesiastics—even British ones. The text goes on to reveal that:

"The Church of Ireland established the Hard Gospel Project in 2005 to tackle sectarianism and racism and to face the challenge of historic difference in the Ireland of the 21st century. Opportunity as well as challenge arises for the Church of Ireland, and all other Christian churches, in addressing two profound questions:

How should we as a Christian church regard ourselves and our role in a rapidly changing, multi-faith and multi-cultural 21st century Ireland (north and south)?

How should we as individuals in the context of 21st century Ireland (north and south) regard ourselves and our responsibilities as:

- + Individual Christians
- + Members of the Church of Ireland
- + Citizens of a wider community

and society –

living with our diverse 'neighbours'?

"The Hard Gospel Project represents a commitment by the Church of Ireland to examine not only the challenges of faith which arise for Christians in the 'vertical' relationship in loving God but also the practical implications for the outworking of faith in 'horizontal' relationships as expressed in Christ's command to 'love your neighbour'. The Hard Gospel Project is the Church of Ireland's response to the challenge to speak truth to, as well as to the world itself. Its core aim is clear—to strengthen the church for effective witness in a divided and changing society."

But, as readers of the *Church & State*, the *Irish Political Review* and pamphlets written by Jack Lane and others—will remember when the Church of Ireland in Cork under the auspices of Bishop Paul Colton had a meeting under the Hard Gospel Project in 2008—what transpired was anything but ecumenical and neighbourly. All the foregoing articles can be read on the www.atholbooks-sales.org/magazines.php

And—in his correspondence with Jack Lane—the Bishop adopted a tone that was anything but Christian and progressive. But then so much for propaganda!

In *The Church of Ireland* there is also a chapter titled 'Protestant charitable endeavour in Ireland' by Professor Maria Luddy. It is nothing other than a PR exercise entirely in keeping with its final paragraph:

"Protestant philanthropic endeavour has a distinguished history in Ireland. There was no standing still in the philanthropic endeavours of the Protestant community—their work in charitable provision altered with the needs of the times and Protestant philanthropists sought legislative change to improve welfare provision. Their endeavours touched the lives of millions of Irish people over the centuries."

Completely absent from this account is anything to do with Bethany Home—now finally in the news on account of people like Niall Meehan and Derek Leinster—the latter a survivor still without redress or apology from the State or the Protestant Church. In an account by the *Irish Daily Mail*, 31st December 2012, the newly appointed Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of All-Ireland, Dr. Richard Clarke, when interviewed on RTE radio, insisted that Bethany was "not technically a Church of Ireland home", and anyway that it "has not crossed my radar". There was no media howl-out from the commentariat and the matter again died a death. Can

anyone imagine a similar reaction or lack thereof if this was an Irish Catholic Archbishop? Perhaps someone might persuade the UK comedian/actor Steve Coogan to write about this subject but then we all know that will never happen and indeed why!

There was also in this book a chapter 'The Church of Ireland and the Irish language' by an Aonghus Dwane. As there were no notes on the contributors, I thought I wouldn't find out about this gentleman. But as luck would have it, a friend who knew I was looking into this book got in touch and told me a story that really threw me. Apparently Aonghus has profiles on many media social sites about which I know nothing and could care less. However Aonghus may have crossed paths with me on at least one occasion. He studied law at University College Cork and was an active member of the Fianna Fail Donogh O'Malley Cumann. At that time he was a devout Catholic and went on to work for Bass & Co in Cork's South Mall before he got a job working as a solicitor at the Office of the State Solicitor in Dublin. He was a great Gaelgoir and had a good eye for painting. But apparently that was then and this is now and he has gone over to the Protestant Church and there is no mention in his social sites of a Fianna Fail Republican heritage which is a pity but one can see why silence here is the better virtue! His chapter has a reproduction of Bedell's Bible and then he goes on a congratulatory fest about how good the Protestants were for the Irish language. Except for the part where the subjugated Irish were not allowed printing presses or very much else for that matter by their Protestant overlords.

"However, there was an additional sectarian element to this history. From 1571 to 1721, almost every book in the Irish language, published in Ireland, England or Europe, was a work of religious propaganda. Catholic works had to be published abroad, since they were banned in Ireland; they were printed in the Irish typeface, at Louvain and Rome. Proselytizing works on behalf of the Protestant religion were published in Roman type, although none appeared in the Irish language for almost seventy years between the mid-1720s and the mid-1790s. Since war and coercion made the creation of national fonts and a printing industry impossible, Roman type was used for a number of books in the Irish language by Catholics" (*'Strange Country', Modernity and Nationhood in Irish Writing since 1790*. Seamus Deane. Clarendon Press. Oxford. 1997, p.103; Italics mine- JH).

Julianne Herlihy ©

The Spell Unwoven

This 'decade of commemorations' has become the pretext for a litany of the most outrageous, obscene and offensive comparisons, primarily between the four-year long Saturnian orgy of imperialist butchery and genocidal extermination waged against the 'surplus' male working class population of Europe, sarcastically referred to as 'the Great War,' and a genuinely globally inspirational struggle for the freedom of a small nation known as 'the 1916 rising.'

How can anyone in their right mind find any moral, political or historical equivalence between the butcher of Omdurman and Kilmainham, Major General Sir John Grenfell Maxwell (1) and William Pearse the man he condemned to death by firing squad for the unforgivable offence of loving his country and his brother.

The revisionist lie machine has been cranked into overdrive in an attempt to manipulate people's genuine sympathy for those who foolishly but courageously lost their lives in the killing fields of Flanders and the Dardanelles into a retrospective justification and celebration of the most pointless and unforgivable inter-imperialist slaughter, a bloodbath which directly led to a civil war in Russia from 1918-1920 that cost eight million lives and to the rise of genocidal regimes in Russia and Germany in the following decades.

This 'war to end all wars' is falsely being portrayed as a chivalrous and selfless crusade by a noble minded and peace loving 'mother of Parliaments' against a bestial and militaristic Hun to safeguard the neutrality and independence of tiny 'poor Catholic Belgium'. This myth conveniently ignores the fact 'small nations' like Belgium ruthlessly occupied and exploited an area in central Africa the size of western Europe where they openly practised, torture, mutilation and a form of slavery on their subjects, practices which were only exposed by Roger Casement, a leader of the 1916 Rising later executed by the British.

The image of the First World War presented to us by revisionist spin doctors is of the frozen and mud drenched 'Tommy' dutifully duelling it out with his Teutonic counterpart in the static trenches of the Western Front. But there was another war, one less well known, less static, more successful and altogether more profitable

for the conflicts' imperialist puppet-masters. British imperialists long had the ambition to crush its emerging 'Carthaginian' commercial rival on its doorstep, Germany, which was fast overtaking the 'workshop of the world' in trade, industrial production and military strength. Clearly, this upstart would have to be taught a severe lesson which would act as an example to others that might follow.

Fatefully, this necessity dovetailed with another British imperialist ambition of building a railway from Cairo to Capetown running entirely through British territory. Unfortunately, the German colonies of Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi stood in the way. The freedom of small nations was to become the fig leaf for a naked imperialist land grab. On 29th of August 1914, twenty-five days after Britain declared war on Germany, Britain's colony and ally, New Zealand, seized the German colony of Samoa in the Pacific Ocean (not a move of pivotal strategic significance to the war in Europe but an area the size of Luxembourg).(2) On 26th August 1914, the German Colony of Togo Land, an area the size of Croatia, was surrendered to British Lt Col. FC Bryant. (3) On 19th September 1914, the British Colony of South Africa invaded German South West Africa (Namibia), by May 13th 1915 at the cost of 1769 casualties. It succeeded in capturing this vast territory, the size of Spain and Italy.(4)

Another British colony, Australia, succeeded in capturing the German colonies on Papua New Guinea by 26th September 1914 and Narau within a matter of weeks at a cost of six Australian, one German and 30 native police lives.(5) Britain and France succeeded in capturing and partitioning the German colony of Cameroon by 18th February 1916. (6) Britain's conquest of the German colony of Tanzania was much more costly and protracted and it did not finally fall to Britain and her South African allies until December 1917. German Forces continued to fight on, led by Lt. Col. Von Lettow Vorbeck until 14th November 1918; the conflict cost the lives of 2000 Germans, 10,000 British and 130,000 civilians. At least two thirds of these died from disease.(7). Britain's ally since 1902, imperial protege, and enforcer in the pacific, Japan, was permitted to seize some minor German Pacific colonies such as Paula, Micronesia, the Marshal Islands

and Tsingleo in China in 1914. While poor little Belgium was given the German colonies of Rwanda and Burundi (an area the size of Albania and Macedonia combined).

These invasions were not a spur of the moment emotional reaction but part of a long planned strategy. In 1911, at a conference on imperial defence, South African Prime Minister, Louis Botha, promised Lloyd George to invade German South West Africa with 40,000 men as soon as a war with Germany began. The Australian and New Zealand governments were also urged to invade German possessions in the pacific at the start of hostilities. (8)

However, Britain's biggest prize was not Germany's colonies at all but rather the glittering mirage of the Turkish Ottoman Empire. All European imperialist powers had been greedily eyeing 'the sick man of Europe' with a view to stealing his valuable possessions as soon as he stumbled. Italy had already captured Libya, and the Greek islands of Rhodes and the Dodecanese following the Turkish-Italian war of September 1911 to October 1912, which cost 3380 Italian and 14,000 Turkish lives. Albania won its independence from the Turks that same year. Britain had already wrested Egypt from Ottoman control in 1882 and was establishing an 'Arab facade' of puppet emirates along the Persian Gulf such as Kuwait, which became a British protectorate in 1899. If a nation of dilettantes like the Italians could defeat the Turks, surely an imperialist superpower like Great Britain could easily do the same. As early as 1906, the Committee for Imperial Defence had plans to occupy Basra and southern Iraq and colonise it with Indian immigrants.(9) The arch imperialist Winston Churchill devised a scheme whereby the 'soft underbelly of Europe' could be split open through an attack on Istanbul via the Dardanelles. When the Ottoman empire dissolved, Britain could divide up the spoils. On 3rd November 1914, the French and British navies began an unprovoked bombardment of Turkish positions in the Dardanelles. This led Turkey to declare war on Britain and France the following day. Britain annexed Cyprus and Egypt the following month, leading to a failed Turkish attack on Suez in February 1915. Once again, the British and French bombarded the Dardanelles and landed 129,000 Irish, Australian and New Zealand troops at Gallipoli in April. After eight months of pointless slaughter in sweltering heat, 25,000 fatalities and 76,000 injuries, the allies gave up and evacuated Gallipoli on 20th December 1915.

This humiliating defeat did not deter Britain, however, which now tried to strike the decisive blow in the war in Europe. In Iraq, a British and Indian army invaded Mesopotamia from Kuwait along the river Tigris, occupying Basra in November 1914, while the Russians invaded from the north. After initial successes, British forces became bogged down and were besieged for 143 days in Kut el Amara, which was surrendered to the Turks with 13,000 British prisoners of war, including their commander, Major General Charles Townshend, on 29th April 1916.(10) Despite this setback, Britain persisted with her offensive in Iraq and, by 11th March 1917, Baghdad fell to British forces led by Lieutenant General Sir Stanley Maude.(11)

On the 21st June 1916, with British support, Grand Sherif Hussein of Mecca declared war on the Ottoman Empire in a bid to secure Arab independence. Strictly speaking, this was an act of 'treason' comparable with the crime Roger Casement would be sentenced to death for eight days later. In return for fighting the Turks, Britain promised the Arabs their independence; however, this was yet another cynical deception as Britain and France had already agreed to carve up the Ottoman Empire between them in the secret Sykes-Picot agreement on 9th March 1916. In an effort to win Zionist support for the war in America and Russia, Britain offered to create a Jewish homeland in Palestine under British administration and protection; this offer was made public with the Balfour Declaration on the 9th November 1917.

British forces invaded Palestine from Egypt in 1917, capturing Gaza by 27th March, and Jerusalem fell to General Allenby on 9th December. On 1st October 1918, Damascus fell to an Arab force led by British Major T E Lawrence and King Faisal. By 7th October, Britain had captured Beirut and Sidon and on 31st of that month Turkey surrendered. What followed in 1919 was the division of the spoils; France was given Lebanon and Syria, Britain got Palestine, Jordan and Iraq. As compensation, Faisal was installed as Britain's puppet king of Iraq, while his brother Abdullah was made puppet King of the artificially created state of Jordan and their father Hussein became Sultan of Nejd with a monthly British subsidy of £25,000 (12)

So why did Britain expend so much blood and treasure on what was essentially a side show in the Middle East compared to the main event on the western front? When dealing with a state which perfected the art of 'ruling by fooling', one could be

forgiven for believing that the side show was the main event and vice versa. As prime minister, Lloyd George told the House of Commons before Christmas 1917:

"The British Empire owes a good deal to sideshows. During the seven years' war, which was also a great European war ... the events which are best remembered by every Englishman are not the great battles on the continent of Europe but Plassey {Bengal} and the Heights of Abraham {Quebec}." (13)

Britain's self-appointed historic mission was to maintain 'the balance of power in Europe'. Less than ten years before the start of the Great War she had clashed with Russia over her expansion into Persia and with France over colonial disputes in Africa. Perhaps it was in Britain's selfish strategic interest to allow her allies and enemies exhaust themselves by slugging it out in the trenches of the western and eastern fronts, while Britain cherry picked the spoils of war. Despite having a greater population than France, Britain's fatalities (702,000) and those of her Commonwealth (205,000), were less than half the fatalities of her French allies (1.9 million) and a similar quantity as Italy (700,000) which only joined the war in April 1915. Britain lost 418,000 men or more than 40% of her entire war time casualties in the four-month Somme offensive of 1916, her first major offensive of the war .(14)

For over a century, Britain's primary interest in the Ottoman Empire and the Middle East was strategic. She seized Egypt to secure the Suez canal and her shortest route to India. She occupied Yemen as a coaling station on the route to India and the Gulf emirates to prevent them falling into the hands of potential rivals like Russia. She also sought to discourage the Turkish-German Baghdad railway and Russian expansion in Persia and Afghanistan as a potential threat to the Jewel in her crown, India. On 5th May 1903, Foreign Secretary, Lord Lansdowne, told the House of Commons:

"We should regard the establishment of a naval base ... in the Persian Gulf by any other power as a grave menace to British interests, and we shall certainly resist it with all means at our disposal." (15)

However, just when this strategic threat began to wane with the Japanese defeat of the Russian navy in 1905 and Britain's Entente with France in 1904 a new economic interest arose. On 8th May 1901, an English speculator, William Knox D'Arcy signed a 60-year deal that gave him exclusive rights to seek, produce and sell

natural gas, petroleum and asphalt throughout the Persian Empire for the price of £20,000. Sir Marcus Samuel, owner of the Shell oil company and a close friend of First Sea Lord, Admiral John Fisher, had convinced his friend that, in order to maintain the Royal Navy's supremacy over the German coal-fired Navy, British ships should be powered by oil. Securing a plentiful and secure supply of this black gold now became part of Britain's vital strategic interest. However, Samuel's company Shell had been taken over by a Dutch company in 1905, so another British source was needed, A Scottish oil company, Burmah Oil, entered into partnership with D'Arcy in Persia and oil was discovered on 26th May 1908 at Masjid es Suleiman in British controlled southern Persia and piped to the Gulf coast at Abadan. By 1919, this refinery produced 7.5 million barrels.(16) In 1911, Britain signed an exclusive monopoly concession for Bahrain's oil.(17) On 30th November 1913, Winston Churchill signed a deal with the Ottoman empire to exploit all the oil in Iraq, Arabia and Syria. Exploration began at the start of the century but Iraq's Kirkuk oil fields in Kurdistan did not start production until 1927. (18) In the spring of 1914, the British Government bought 51% of the shares in the Anglo Persian Oil company in order to control the oil price for the Navy.

Britain had yet another reason to prioritise her aggression against the Ottoman Empire. Throughout Britain's vast empire, whether it be Nigeria, Sudan, Malaysia or Bengal, the Empire had millions of devout and reluctant Muslim subjects, and the most primal fear of her imperialists was of a pan-Islamic uprising that would call Britain's unbeatable bluff and bring down her global empire. These nightmares nearly came true in November 1914 when the Ottoman Sultan, who also held the title of Caliph, or head of the Muslim religion, proclaimed a Jihad against Britain, France and Russia. While this provided a motive for the allies to knock Turkey out of the war as soon as possible, Britain probably had the most to lose as India alone had 57 million Muslims and the preponderance of her most strategic possessions, like Egypt and the Arabian sheikdoms, were Muslim lands. Britain needed a figurehead who could appeal against the jihad and Col. T E Lawrence's Hessonite ally and descendant of the Prophet Hussain Sharif of Mecca was the ideal candidate. With his voice and the appeals of various other Indian Princes and Emirs, the Muslim insurrections were kept to a minimum in Egypt in 1915 and Sudan in 1916. (19)

But before she could expand her empire, first Britain needed to pick a fight. Britain unexpectedly declared war on Germany on the 4th August 1914 on the pretext that, by invading neutral Belgium, Germany had violated the 1839 Treaty of London. Germany had earlier tried to ascertain British intentions regarding their well-known 1905 'Schliffen Plan' of a swift German hammer blow through Belgium encircling Paris and was left with the impression that this would not be seen as a cause for war with Britain. If Britain genuinely wanted to protect Belgian neutrality, and had she made her intentions known, Germany would have amended her war plans to keep Britain neutral. (20) However, what nobody knew was that, in 1908, a tiny cabal within the British cabinet comprised of Prime Minister Herbert Asquith, Foreign Minister Edward Grey and war Minister Richard Haldane had made a secret commitment to France to send a 160,000 strong British Expeditionary Force to aid the French in the event of a war with Germany. (21) This deal was kept secret from the public, the Liberal Party, Parliament, and the rest of the Cabinet (the cabinet was only informed in 1912). Sir Edward Grey went further and lied to his imperial allies at the 1911 Conference on Imperial Defence where Britain gained assurances of military assistance from her colonies in the event of war by stating Britain had no hidden understandings with any other power and would only become involved in a European war if there was a threat of 'Napoleonic' domination by one power. (22) Clearly, Britain was intent on war with Germany, even if Belgium had not been invaded (23), and, twice in 1904 and 1908, Admiral Fisher had proposed an unprovoked pre-emptive strike to destroy the German fleet before it became too big. (24)

Britain and her allies were no better at respecting the rights of neutral nations. Persia, though nominally independent, had, since 1905, been divided into northern Russian and southern British spheres of influence. With the outbreak of war, Britain disregarded this fiction of independence and sent troops into Persia. By 1918, 10,000 British troops were posted there guarding its oil wells. (25) On 3rd October 1915, British and French forces invaded neutral Greece at Salonika in order to fight Germany's ally Bulgaria. Greek politics had, since 1910, been divided by the 'National Schism' of a pro German King and a pro Allied Liberal Prime-Minister, Venizelos. In September 1915, the King sacked Venizelos over his pro-allied policies, but in August 1916 the

Allies backed Venizelos in staging a *coup* which deposed the King in June 1917, led to a civil war on the streets of Athens, clashes with allied troops, and the allied seizure of the Greek Navy. Greece eventually joined the war on the Allied side, but the war left bitter and deep divisions in Greek society which last until the present day. (26)

The war brought to the fore a strange trait of the British national character. Just as the Germans are seen as humourless and efficient and the Americans don't get sarcasm, so too the British have an incapacity for analogy and empathy. In the hands of a skilled propagandist, she can portray the same crime as either an unparalleled outrage or an unavoidable act of God. Britain can without a twinge of irony condemn with moral outrage German atrocities against Belgian civilians, yet remain indifferent to General Lake's 'pacification' of Ireland in 1798 with a pitch cap in one hand and a gibbet in the other, or General Sir Hugh Gough's rapacious rampage across China in 1842.

German unrestricted submarine warfare after 1915, which led to the sinking of 1,069 British and 134 French ships, (27) was depicted by British propaganda as a sign of German inhumanity. A single incident was highlighted globally, the sinking of the ocean liner *Lusitania* off the coast of Kinsale on 7th May 1917, with the loss of 1,198 lives (128 of which were American), was used by Britain to goad America into the war, despite the fact that the ship ignored warnings not to enter the war zone and was illegally carrying 4,000 cases of small arms in violation of its non-belligerent status. (28) Yet Britain ignored a greater crime than that; since 1908, Britain planned a naval blockade of Germany and did so from the very outbreak of war in 1914. Food was treated as 'war contraband' and was confiscated by the Royal Navy. This led to the deaths of 763,000 German civilians from hunger and disease during the war and another 100,000 after the war, as the blockade remained in place until July 1919 as part of a strategy of starving Germany into accepting the Versailles Treaty, war guilt and reparations. These deaths received less international attention as famine makes bad copy and typhus never makes the front pages.

Britain portrayed the 51 Germany's Zeppelin attacks against British cities, which cost Britain 2,000 lives, and her naval bombardment of English coastal towns as a new low in modern warfare,

ignoring the fact that in under one hour and forty minutes on 27th August 1896, British ships killed at least 500 people in its naval bombardment of Zanzibar (29) and British planes were used to mow down Iraqi civilians in 1919-20.

Germany was portrayed as an aggressive, militarist war-monger, yet when Pope Benedict XV made a peace plan in August 1917, which proposed the return of occupied Poland and Belgium in exchange for Germany's lost colonies, freedom of the seas and disarmament, the proposal was accepted by Germany and Austria but rejected by America and Britain. (30)

Some people call this British trait hypocrisy or double standards, yet it remains one of the most formidable weapons in her psychological arsenal. Britain's apologists in Ireland seek to draw a comparison between the 2,627 people who died as a result of Ireland's struggle for independence from 1916-1921 and the 15 million who lost their lives in World War One. Even if we add the 3,738 who have died as part of the current Northern Ireland conflict since 1966, it still does not come near the slaughter of 1st July 1916 on the Somme when 20,000 British soldiers were killed. The 50,000 Irishmen, Protestant and Catholic, who died fighting for Britain in the 'Great War' were the victims of a sordid and cynical swindle. They laid down their lives so that British corporations could exploit the oil resources of the former Ottoman Empire, and so that Britain could impoverish her commercial rivals and retain her hegemony in world trade for another 30 years. They died in a smash and grab, which went horribly wrong. This shabby reality would be too much for the public to take, so the truth must be dressed up in sincere solemnity of remembrance day and the mythology of 'our glorious dead'.

Paul McGuill, Rúnai INC,
July 2013

NOTES

(1) The Rise and Fall of the British Empire, Lawrence James, (1995) Page 283. (2) Chronicle of the 20th Century, (1993) Page 190. (3) Chronicle, Page 196. (4) Chronicle, Page 203. (5) Wikipedia (6) Chronicle, Page 212. (7) Wikipedia (8) Rise and Fall, Page 343 (9) Rise and Fall, Page 344 (10) Chronicle, Page 214 (11) Chronicle, Page 227. (12) The House of Saud, David Holden & Richard Johns (1981) Page 73-4 (13) Rise and Fall, Page 364. (14) Our Changing Times, Kenneth Neill, (1975) Page 79, Chronicle, Page 221, Rise and Fall, Page 367, Europe Since 1870, Page 120 (15) Saud, Page 29. (16) Saud, Pages 34-6, Rise and Fall Page 403. (17) Saud, Page 82. (18) Chronicle Page 183 and Rise and Fall Page 403. (19) Rise and fall, page 359-61. (20) Unionjackery, Brendan Clifford, Page 12 (21) The Crime Against Europe, Roger Casement, Page 39 (22) Rise and Fall, Page 342. (23) Europe Since Napoleon, David Thompson, Page 552 (24) Rise and Fall, Page 336. (25) Rise and Fall, Page 396. (26) Wikipedia (27) Chronicle, Page 251 (28) Europe Since 1870, Mark Tierney, Page 118-9 (29) Britain's Forgotten Wars, Page 402-3 (30) Chronicle, Page 231-2.

From Béalnabláth To Ballyseedy And Back Again

Wikipedia carries a very short entry for the actor Éamon Kelly (1914-2001):

"Kelly was born in Gneevguilla, Sliabh Luachra, County Kerry... Kelly left school at age 14 to become an apprentice carpenter to his father, a wheelwright ... (but in later years became interested in acting)... Kelly was an actor and storyteller who became a member of the Radio Éireann Players in 1952. He is best known for his performances of storytelling on stage, radio and television."

He was, of course, more than that, for he was also a member of the Abbey Theatre players who could turn his hand to anything from Shakespeare to modern drama. Yet the stage performances that most appealed to me were those closest to his storytelling roots, whether in the role of the Cork sculptor Séamus Murphy, in the one-player dramatisation of Murphy's autobiography *Stone Mad*, or in the twin-actor dramatisation of *The Tailor and Anstey*, joining with his wife Maura O'Sullivan to play the title roles in Eric Cross's account of the Gougane Barra, West Cork, storyteller and his wife. Yet, before I ever saw Kelly on stage, it was his voice that enthralled me during my early childhood of the second half of the 1950s, glued to the radio each week in order to hear "*Old Ned*", the *seanchaí* or storyteller, relate yet another marvellous tale from our rich Irish folklore heritage.

In 1995 Kelly published *The Apprentice*, the first volume of his autobiography, with its own gentle storytelling beginning:

"I was just six months old (in September 1914) when I was brought to the house in Carrigeen where I spent my life until I was twenty-three. I often heard about the journey and often too have I tried to imagine what it was like that morning as we drove in Danny Maurice O'Connor's sidecar from Shinnagh Cross to Carrigeen ... I would have seen the mountains that ring, or half-ring, that great saucer of land from Castleisland to the County Bounds. Their names are the first five beads on my rosary—the MacGillicuddy Reeks, Mangerton, Stoompa, Crohane, and to the east and looking down on our sidecar, the Paps. The old people called this twin mountain An Dá Chích Dannan, the two breasts of the goddess Dana ...

"Further upland towards Boherbue you can see the mountain range in its entirety and you can make out what looks like the torso of Dana stretched out in the sun.

One breast, they say, is something higher than the other, as if she were lying a little on her side. Up there Fionn MacCumhaill stood, and bending down, he washed his face in the waters of Doocorrig Lake. In the shade of the Paps were born the poets Eoghan Ruadh Ó Súilleabháin and Aodhagán Ó Rathaille. Each day as the sun shone they saw those perfect shapes against the sky, and maybe the old gods who lived up there inspired them" (pp 5-6).

Kelly's second chapter, "The Hands of War", is not so idyllic. His was a Republican household—his Uncle Larry would be a Republican hunger striker in a Free State prison. Kelly, however, emphasised the cruelty of war on all fronts. His mother Johanna Cashman's brother Eugene had been drafted into the American Army and never came home from the First World War, and his mother particularly cherished his last letter to her, which had been an outpouring of human sympathy for a dead German soldier.

As for the War at home, Kelly wrote of his parents' neighbour being dragged along the road by the Black-and-Tans behind a lorry until he finally died, and of neighbouring boys joining the IRA and going on the run. He also wrote of what his neighbours keenly felt to be a cruel wrong done to two English army deserters whom they had taken to their hearts as genuine, but whom IRA officers from outside the area accused of being spies, and duly executed.

Yet Kelly never doubted the essential character of the War itself: "*The 1918 election, with victory for Sinn Féin, put an end to that {Redmondite v AFIL—MO'R} era. And on the heels of the 1918 election came the first rumblings of the War of Independence*" (p 21).

The War that followed in 1922—called the Civil War in English but *Cogadh na gCarad* (War of the Friends) in Irish—was a different matter, summed up by Kelly's chapter title, "*Fighting among ourselves*". He wrote of the cruelty of both Republican and Free State killings. Having grown up with feelings of such warmth for Kelly's gentle storytelling, I was, however, taken aback by the controlled, but nonetheless consummate, hatred that he himself went on to express for one particular, named, Free State Colonel:

"Stories of horror vied with each other

for our attention: the blowing up of Republican prisoners at Ballyseedy, and forever etched in our minds remains the image of Dave Neligan, a military officer, taking off his cap and combing his hair as he walked down Fair Hill in Killarney at the head of his troops after they had blown to pieces young Republicans on a mined barricade at the Countess Bridge. The Civil War was a black time. It blackened the people's minds... and hatred was the prevailing emotion. Men in Tralee who were being given back the dead body of a Republican by the regular army refused to accept the remains in a Free State coffin. They went down to the town and brought a new one, and with hatchets smashed to pieces the coffin in which he had lain" (pp 28-29).

Can a war criminal be an otherwise decent person who, but for war, would have remained decent? Kelly's hatred of Neligan was fuelled almost as much by the sheer normality of combing his hair in the wake of the war crime he had been responsible for executing, as by the crime itself. In *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* (1963), Hannah Arendt wrote: "*The sad truth is that most evil is done by people who never made up their minds to be good or evil*". I would not agree that David Neligan (1899-1983) falls into Arendt's 'majority of evildoers' category. I truly believe he began with a predisposition to be good, to do the right thing. He had joined the Dublin Metropolitan Police (DMP) in 1917 and became a detective in G Division in 1919. In May 1920, however, in the wake of Britain's suppression of Dáil Éireann and the War of Independence that resulted, Neligan opted for the honourable course of action:

"My brother Maurice came up from Kerry to Dublin, to Liberty Hall. He was a labour organiser, and he persuaded me to resign. His argument was that I had no business being there, working for the British government, while there was a revolution going on... So I decided to resign... {But then Michael Collins sent for him—MO'R}... And he said, *I have something to ask you. I want you to go back to the G Division.*' I didn't fancy the role of a spy at all, so I said to him, *'Mr Collins, I'll do anything rather than go back to that bloody place. I'll do anything. I'll join a flying column.'* *'Listen, Dave, we have plenty men to join flying columns. The British trust you and we trust you. If you want to serve this country and the revolution, then go back.'* He was a very persuasive kind of man, and a very magnetic character. So, against my better judgement, I went back" (1976 interview with Neligan in *Curious Journey: An Oral History of Ireland's Unfinished Revolution*, 1982, by Kenneth Griffith and Timothy O'Grady, 1998 edition, pp 140-1).

Neligan's reluctance was that of a man striving to remain decent in all aspects of his life. No wonder he would have preferred to serve in a Flying Column. There was everything honourable about him serving the democratically elected Government of the Republic by functioning as a spy in the belly of the British beast in Dublin Castle. But the nature of the Intelligence work required of him would take its toll. There was no war crime involved in setting up for assassination those agents of what was in effect a British Fascist occupation of Ireland, but it involved the elimination of some former work-mates with whom he had been personally close, and it left him scarred. I know of no veterans of Tom Barry's Flying Column from either the Kilmichael ambush or the battle of Crossbarry who subsequently went on to commit war crimes. With Michael Collins's Squad and Active Service Unit, however, it was quite a different matter. Neligan spoke and wrote with sympathy of some of the casualties of his War of Independence Intelligence activities. But with regard to his Civil War activities, and the war crimes he had perpetrated therein, Neligan opted for silence.

It was in 1999, as the then Editor of the *Irish Times*, that Conor Brady provided a Foreword to a new edition of Neligan's memoir, *The Spy In The Castle*. Brady wrote, *inter alia*:

"It was David Neligan who gave himself the *soubriquet* {sic; the word is actually *sobriquet*—MOR} 'The Spy in the Castle'. When his account of his work for Michael Collins was published in 1968 it was greeted as a significant contribution to the history of the troubled 1916-1921 period in Ireland... His career began in the DMP... He graduated relatively quickly to the detective branch and it was in his role as a member of 'G' Division ... that he found himself uniquely placed to play a key role in Collins's intelligence war against the British... From within the centre of the British security machine he fed information to Collins, enabling the IRA to stay ahead of its enemies in intelligence matters at virtually all times throughout the conflict ..."

"When the War of Independence ended the Civil War began. The Irish Free State had to quickly raise a regular army and David Neligan, his role as a double agent never having been uncovered by the British, transferred to the National Army with the rank of colonel. He was a tough soldier, assigned to Kerry where the fight against anti-Treaty forces was bloody and dirty. Men under his command were involved in actions—reprisals perhaps—which led to the deaths of helpless prisoners. Anti-Treaty forces had rigged roadblocks with booby-trapped mines which killed several Free State soldiers

as they endeavoured to clear them. The Free State forces henceforth decided that prisoners would be used to clear barricades. In two incidents, at Ballyseedy and Countess Bridge, mines exploded killing and maiming prisoners. **Neligan's name was invariably linked to these accounts of the Kerry fighting. The extent to which he might or might not have been involved has never been publicly documented. But it is certain that his subsequent career gave every incentive to the opponents of the Treaty to blacken his reputation.** {My emphases—MOR}. He led the men of Oriel House, an ad *hoc* assemblage of gunmen operating as a secret police on behalf of the Provisional Government. After Kerry he served as Director of Intelligence until the end of 1923. He then returned to the Dublin Metropolitan Police, not as a constable, but as a chief superintendent... In 1925 Neligan... took command of a new, State-wide, armed detective branch... Neligan was given the task of pacifying those elements throughout the State which still refused to come to terms with the new order. It was not an easy task. He established the Special Branch throughout the State... Neligan's men gradually got the upper hand, albeit with the aid of stern emergency powers and a not-too-scrupulous approach to the policeman's powers at law... His influence was considerable. His estimation of the public mood and of the state of crime and subversion formed the basis of the Government's day to day security policy. He was responsible for preparing, at intervals, the exotically-entitled 'Confidential Report to the Government on Organisations and Persons Inimical to the State'... In 1932 the Cosgrave government was swept from power and a new Fianna Fáil administration under Éamon de Valera came to office. Among the earliest casualties, in career terms, were the Commissioner, Eoin O'Duffy, and Neligan himself. Neligan was relegated to an obscure post in another Government department and worked out his service there."

Neligan himself observed:

"The proscribed Dáil or Sinn Féin Parliament, most of whose members were 'on the run', was to hold a clandestine meeting in Dublin, which of course the British would be only too glad to surprise. This was in May 1921. They had consistently warred against it since its inception. Collins asked me to keep a sharp look-out against Castle agents in the vicinity of the meeting... The session lasted two or three days. So I took leave for that period and spent each day patrolling in the vicinity, but saw no suspicious touts about... Here was I, a member of the Castle political police, keeping watch over the rebel parliament at the behest of Michael Collins, the most hunted man in Ireland. The members duly dispersed. No inkling reached the

Castle. This Dáil which I protected, contained men who afterwards persecuted me and made my life a misery" (p 97).

In the War of Independence to defend that democratically elected Dáil, the Intelligence provided by Neligan identified British agents for elimination by either Collins's personal Squad or his Active Service Unit, described as follows by Neligan:

"The Active Service Unit was a formation of about fifty IRA men who received a small subsistence salary and were fully employed on warlike activities, operating in Dublin and its environs. Paddy Daly and Joe Leonard were leaders. The Squad consisted of about twelve men ('the Twelve Apostles') primarily responsible to Collins. The Squad engaged in executing informers and enemy agents and in counter-espionage. Liam Tobin, Tom Cullen and Frank Thornton were leaders. They were paid like the ASU" (p 179).

Neligan also described 'Bloody Sunday', 21st November 1920, as follows:

"For a long time, Collins and his staff, including James McNamara and myself, had been patiently collecting details of the British secret service... On Saturday night, 20th November 1920, Tobin and Cullen asked myself and McNamara to the Gaiety Theatre. They told us that those agents were to be shot next morning. In a box nearby were two or three of them with women. Cullen asked me was I going to Croke Park next day. There was an important match on. I said: '*No damn fear, and don't you go there either!*' He asked '*Why not?*' and I said that if those men got shot in the morning the Tans and Auxies would surely revenge themselves by shooting up Croke Park. The following morning DMP Chief Inspector Bruton came into the mess-room in Dublin Castle while we breakfasted. '*Terrible work in the city this morning*', he said with a white face. '*A whole lot of British officers shot*'. Squads of armed Volunteers had broken down bedroom doors in various houses about the city with 'sledgehammers' borrowed the night before from railway workshops. About fifteen or sixteen officers and agents had been shot, some of them in bed. One barricaded his door and thereby saved his life; a wife trying to save her husband was killed accidentally... Hundreds of Tans and Auxies concentrated on Croke Park, opening fire with rifles and machine-guns on the densely-packed crowd, killing and wounding a great number. In spite of my warning, Cullen went there and had to climb a tall fence to get away" (pp 122-3).

Neligan discussed the nature of the war that had to be fought:

"The British propagandists, including the lords and dukes, pretended that this was a campaign of murder; that the rebels

should 'come out and fight'. It is a very foolish fighter who obeys the advice of his enemy! 1916 provided an example of coming out, and taught people like Collins that a handful had no chance openly battling with an empire. It was a different story, of course, during the Second World War. Then the lords lauded the resistance to Hitler's hoards and found no difficulty in putting them on the side of the angels" (p 104).

But now fast forward to the Civil War, and Brady's *apologia* for Neligan's role therein. It is true, as he wrote, that there was "every incentive to opponents of the Treaty to blacken his reputation", particularly with regard to the March 1923 multiple massacres of Republican prisoners—eight outside Tralee at Ballyseedy Cross on March 7 (with a ninth prisoner, Stephen Fuller, being blown free by the explosion and providing an eyewitness account); four outside Killarney at Countess Bridge, also on March 7 (with a fifth prisoner, Tadhg Coffey, escaping and also providing an eyewitness account); and five outside Cahirsiveen on March 12. In May 1924 Dorothy Macardle published *Tragedies Of Kerry*, in which she wrote:

"(On March 6, Republicans) had, at Knocknagoshel, attached a trigger-mine to a dump. The following statement was issued on 10th March from IRA HQ, Kerry No. 1 Brigade: 'A trigger-mine was laid in Knocknagoshel for a member of the Free State Army, Lieutenant O'Connor, who had made a habit of torturing Republican prisoners in Castle-island. On Tuesday, a party of Free State troops, including Lieutenant O'Connor, proceeded to the place, and two captains, Lieutenant O'Connor, and two privates were killed.' Reprisals on prisoners, instituted by the Free State Government in Mountjoy on December 8th, 1922, had become a systematic practice in their jails. It was concluded that the slaughter of eight prisoners at Ballyseedy and of four at Killarney and of five at Cahersiveen were reprisals for the Knocknagoshel mine." (1991 edition, p 16).

Tom Doyle is no starry-eyed Republican apologist, finding much merit in Michael Collins's "stepping-stone" argument for the Treaty, and holding that the "die-hard" strain in Kerry Republicanism bore considerable responsibility for prolonging the Civil War beyond December 1922. In his 2008 book, *The Civil War In Kerry*, Doyle nonetheless explained how the March 1923 reprisals should be considered war crimes:

"The brutality of the Knocknagoshel trap mine and the horrendous deaths it inflicted on five members of the Dublin Guard, while appalling, was an act of war. The decision to inflict a similar fate

on unarmed prisoners who had surrendered and had in effect withdrawn from the conflict was an entirely different matter and violated both the Geneva and Hague Conventions on the treatment of prisoners that most European governments had ratified governing the conduct of war. While neither the nascent Irish government nor its armed forces had ratified the terms of these conventions, and thus might be legally absolved from complying with the standards of behaviour they established, it would not excuse them of the morality of ensuring humane treatment of non-combatant prisoners" (pp 291-3).

Dorothy Macardle's 1924 narrative had continued:

"Every precaution against disclosure was taken by the murderers; every preparation was made to make Ireland believe a lie; yet every detail of these massacres has been revealed. Nine prisoners were taken from Tralee to be killed at Ballyseedy, and nine coffins were sent out from the jail, but only eight men had been killed. Their names were John Daly, George Shea, Timothy Twomey, Patrick Hartnett, James Connell, John O'Connor, Patrick Buckley, and James Walsh... George Shea, Tim Twomey, John Shanahan and Stephen Fuller were captured on 21st February in a dug-out. They were taken, to be interrogated, to Ballymullen Barracks in Tralee. 'Interrogation' by Neligan in Ballymullen Barracks was an ordeal under which reason might give way... This time a hammer was used... When Shanahan came out his head was covered with blood and his spine was injured, but he was still able to walk. The hammer failed. The prisoners were taken out to be shot, and shots were fired round their heads... The prisoners were given some sort of trial in the Workhouse on March 3rd... They were kept there for three days more. Shanahan's back had grown weak since the beating in Ballymullen, and before March 6th he collapsed. His illness saved him when his comrades were taken out. Very early on Wednesday, while it was still dark, Stephen Fuller was called out of his cell... George Shea and Timothy Twomey were with him, and six more prisoners... They were put on a lorry ... {which} pulled up beside Ballyseedy Wood. They saw a log lying across the road. They were made ... stand in a close circle around the log. The soldiers had strong ropes and electric cord. Each prisoner's hands were tied behind him, then his arms were tied above the elbow to those of the men on either side of him. Their feet were bound together above the ankles and their legs were bound together above the knees. Then a strong rope was passed round the nine and the soldiers moved away. The prisoners had their backs to the log and the mine, which was beside it; they could see the movement of the soldiers and knew what would happen next. They

gripped one another's hands, those who could, and prayed for God's mercy upon their souls. The shock came, blinding, deafening, overwhelming. For Stephen Fuller it was followed by a silence in which he knew that he was alive. Then sounds came to him—cries and low moans, then the sounds of rifle fire and exploding bombs... The explosion that killed the two men to whom he was bound had severed the cords and thrown him, uninjured, into the ditch. The soldiers had no means of counting their victims. They went back to their breakfast, and Stephen Fuller crawled away to safety over the fields. The Military thought him dead; his name was on one of the nine coffins which they sent out" (pp 16-19).

So goes the account of the anti-Treatyite Macardle. "Well, she would say that, wouldn't she?" is what Brady implied, and yet he chose to ignore the testimony of those **Treaty supporters** who had also indicted Neligan, most notably that of Niall Harrington, architect of the Free State sea landing in Kerry. In 1988 the British historian Michael Hopkinson recorded:

"After the {civil} war, a Free State representative, Niall Harrington, investigated the Ballyseedy incident and concluded that it was a reprisal. He was not allowed {by Free State Minister for Defence Dick Mulcahy—MOR} to publish his conclusions. Lieutenant McCarthy, who later resigned from the Free State army, said of the Cahersiveen incident: 'There was no attempt at escape, as the prisoners were shot first and then put over a mine and blown up. It was a Free State mine, made by themselves.'" (*Green Against Green—The Irish Civil War*, p 241).

In November 1997 RTÉ screened a documentary researched, scripted and presented by Pat Butler, simply entitled *Ballyseedy*, in which Niall Harrington's specific indictment of Neligan was quoted *verbatim*, and which also carried eyewitness testimony against Neligan from another Free State officer, Bill Bailey. For Brady to have ignored all such published evidence, and written as he did in 1999, was unconscionable.

In his 2001 book, *Tans, Terror And Troubles—Kerry's Real Fighting Story 1913-23*, T Ryle Dwyer drew further on Harrington's investigations and also noted that the commander of the Free State Army's Dublin Guard that had occupied Kerry, Major General Paddy O'Daly (aka Daly), had very personal motives for seeking revenge at Ballyseedy:

"The Free State troops retaliated with a vengeance, killing no fewer than nineteen Republican prisoners in the next two

weeks. {Two of the Knocknagoshel dead} Dunne and Stapleton had served in the {Collins assassination} Squad with Paddy O'Daly... A mine was constructed by Captains Ed Flood and Jim Clarke in Tralee and, with the full knowledge and approval of Major General O'Daly, this was placed in a pile of stones in the middle of the road at Ballyseedy Cross, a little over three miles outside Tralee. Nine prisoners, who had been mistreated over a number of days, were taken from Ballymullen Barracks in Tralee. The men were not selected for having done anything in particular, but because they were on the Republican side. One of the main criteria in their selection was that they were not closely related to any priests or nuns, so as not to antagonise unduly the clergy or, to be more specific, the hierarchy... The prisoners were selected by Colonel David Neligan" (pp 368-9).

Dwyer further related:

"Niall Harrington was so disgusted with the conduct of the Free State troops that he prepared his own report for Kevin O'Higgins, the Minister for Justice... He feared for his own life once his colleagues learned that he had reported their barbarous activities ... {and in Tralee} spent a night in Benner's Hotel in an armchair facing the door, with two loaded pistols at the ready... With the publication of Fuller's story, Richard Mulcahy, the Minister for Defence, ordered an army enquiry, but this was always going to be a whitewash, because he selected Major General Paddy O'Daly—who was essentially behind the whole thing—to preside at the inquiry... The inquiry was a monumental charade ... a tissue of lies" (pp 372-3).

In his 2008 book, Tom Doyle observed:

"Niall Harrington's investigation concluded that all the deaths that occurred during the removal of three road blockages during early March were premeditated reprisals... Harrington's report only concerned itself with establishing the facts of what happened in Kerry in early March 1923. He did not have to address why such a sequence of events occurred... The military skills honed by the Squad during the War of Independence, displayed to lethal effect during the executions of fourteen intelligence agents in Dublin in November 1920 (Bloody Sunday), were part of the legacy the Squad members brought to their conduct of the Civil War in Kerry... Mulcahy's willingness to protect the reputation of the Dublin Guard {especially its O/C Daly and its Chief Intelligence Officer Neligan—MO'R} was the result of a huge debt of gratitude that he (as defence minister) and others owed to the men of that unit. In a sense, the entire Provisional Government owed its survival to the willingness of people like Paddy O'Daly to place their lives on the line in

the early days of the conflict. The fact that the war continued in Kerry for so long was a contributory factor to the level of bitterness the government's troops stationed in the county showed towards their republican adversaries" (pp 292-4).

Ernie O'Malley's notebooks in the UCD Archives contain interviews he conducted from the 1930s to the 1950s with fellow veterans of the War of Independence and the Civil War. In 2012 his son, Cormac O'Malley, and Tim Horgan jointly edited and published *The Men Will Talk To Me—Kerry Interviews By Ernie O'Malley*. While in the main consisting of interviews with Kerry Republicans, including leading 'die-hards', there is also a Free State presence, most notably an interview with Bill Bailey, a Free State Army witness at Ballyseedy, and a native of Ballymullen, Tralee, being also stationed himself in Ballymullen Barracks. Copied down in O'Malley's staccato note-taking style, Bailey provided yet more damning Free State 'character references' for both Daly and Neligan:

"Girl reported a dump in cave in Knocknagoshel. 6 men, 5 Officers and a sergeant, went off to collect the stuff. The fellows chosen, the Dublin Guards, were excited about war. Dunne, a captain, his remains fitted into his tunic afterwards. In the cave Dunne saw a rifle, shouted, 'Here it is.' He didn't know it was attached to a trigger mine. All killed save sergeant, I think... When news reached Tralee, Ballymullen Barracks, Daly, Paddy, Major General, they decided to take out 8 fellows that including Fuller {he should have said **plus** Fuller—MO'R} that night to pick up a mine at Ballyseedy. They left at 1-2 o'clock, brought to Ballyseedy by Crossley. Daly not on that job {presumably, not personally present—MO'R}—fellow on that job killed in USA... Brought out, tied around the mine. **I saw bodies and all had hands tied behind their backs.** {My emphasis—MO'R}. Only about 6 (Free Staters) on this... Bodies in barracks at 10.30 am in the morning... **All I saw was that their hands were behind their backs untied. A very curious thing.** {My emphasis—MO'R}. At 4 that evening, it had been decided to give up the bodies. The people knew of it earlier in the day—bits of flesh around... The relatives came up to get bodies and they brought their own coffins on donkeys and carts—all were waiting outside for the bodies, 3-400 people. Finally, procession of corpses passed through the gate. Bodies brought out in condemned coffins, painted boards. First as they came out, showed remains to people and put them in their own coffins. Just before coffins were given out, {the Free State Army} band lined up and played ragtime inside gate—I'm the Sheik of Araby' etc. on either side of the

main gate. Completely shocked and dazed the people. They smashed the condemned coffins and threw them into a marsh beside the barracks. Inquest held ... but I'm not sure about the verdict. War fizzled out practically immediately after this. I remember 2 fellows brought in, Cronin, and another, into Tralee, picked up or else came into surrender... Detention Cells. You couldn't lie down or stand up neither, 6 feet x 6 feet. Neligan decided that a few bombs should be thrown in. He never put a thing on paper or never took part, that's how he always functioned. Neligan in charge of intelligence. Kavanagh and Griffin, 2 of his men. 'At 11 o'clock we'll do this.' At 11 {am} my friend turned up, but didn't want to take part. During day he said, 'These are 2 damned decent men.' He met {Free State Army priest, Fr William} Ferris, command chaplain, and he wanted his advice. 'What's your rank', said Ferris, 'and what's the rank of the man giving you your orders? Don't you know you should obey your superior officers?' He was a very saintly man, my friend. At 11 then my friend reported to Neligan. 'You'll get bombs over there in a drawer.' My friend picked out bombs. 'How many will we take?' '6.' Griffin put 3 towards Neligan and 3 towards his pocket. 'Unfortunately', said Neligan, 'I'm waiting for a message from HQ.' So Griffin took bombs out of pockets and said then 'We'll go call it a day'... (pp 100-103).

"I rang up Cosgrave who was sick. O'Higgins said afterwards, 'Why didn't you come to me at first instead of Mulcahy, and I would have settled it for you'. {O'Malley and T Horgan editorial note: This page was not in sequence but is placed here to maintain the narrative. Bailey said he contacted Richard Mulcahy but was later told by Kevin O'Higgins that it was he whom he should have contacted as he would have acted on the information Bailey had concerning affairs in Kerry.} Gaol 330 yards away from barracks whence a fresh bunch of prisoners were brought in at night, taken from gaol... They were brought to Command in the HQ, lined up in a queue outside. First man brought in, Neligan—always present ... Kavanagh and Griffin, Jerry. The first fellow could see the reaction the interviewing officer would have a rifle in his hands and would hit him with clubbed rifle. Each removed, one by one, unconscious and thrown out unconscious in barracks square. It was generally that those you'd expect to talk would never talk and another who might not be expected to talk would talk. 'Let me at him with a bayonet', and {the} other {officer} would let him at the man to hit him with a bayonet... Decent men never appeared live in Intelligence, would be sent out when this was going on. The bad eggs had been blooded through murder. Daly's office was on top and roars could be heard all over the barracks and that got everyone's goat, the roars. This went on

for 5-6 months... Practically no information from these tortures. It was generally rank and file that were beaten up" (103-4).

Brady, when penning his 1999 Introduction to Neligan's memoir, would not have been aware of every one of these details from Bailey's witness statement. But he would already have been perfectly well aware, from Butler's 1997 documentary, that Free State Army personnel Harrington and Bailey had accused Neligan of war crimes, including confirmation of the fact that the Ballyseedy victims had their hands tied behind their backs. How on earth, therefore, did Brady have the gall to describe such tethered prisoners as being "used to clear barricades"? How could he dismiss the evidence against Neligan as being no more than anti-Treatyite propaganda "to blacken his reputation"?

It is not that Brady has maintained any personal loyalty towards Neligan himself. Brady's preoccupation was to ensure that it was the Free State institutions of "law and order" whose reputation should not be "blackened". For, in order not "to blacken the reputation" of Eoin O'Duffy, during the period when he held office of Garda Commissioner, Brady was later prepared "to blacken the reputation" of the self-same David Neligan, but only when he was safely dead. Neligan had been of immense assistance to Brady in respect of the latter's 1974 Garda history, *Guardian Of The Peace*. Unlike Neligan, Brady was not consumed with a personal loathing of de Valera, and wrote with approval of Dev's gradual suppression of the IRA:

"The final incident which brought about the outright proscription of the IRA was the murder in March 1936 of 72-year-old Admiral Boyle Somerville followed by the killing in April of a young former IRA member in Waterford, John Egan. Admiral Somerville's crime was to provide references for local boys in the Skibbereen area who wished to join the Royal Navy and young Egan's offence was to disengage from his local IRA unit in Dungarvan" (p 229).

Brady also wrote of those personality weaknesses in Eoin O'Duffy which had led even the Cumann na nGaedheal Government to consider that he was no longer suitable to continue holding the office of Garda Commissioner and, following his sacking by de Valera, Brady further wrote disapprovingly of his Blueshirt period:

"The Army Comrades' Association {precursor of the Blueshirts—MOR} had been growing steadily since the end of 1932 and had already grown into a powerful national body by the time O'Duffy ceased to be Commissioner of

the Gárda in March 1933... The appointment of O'Duffy as head of the ACA was the greatest boost which the movement had received to date... The leadership of the ACA was a tempting offer to this vain and egocentric man and it was precisely the kind of challenge that O'Duffy would relish. Nobody had questioned his anguish and concern at the rise in violence and crime and the spread of what he saw as antichristian ideas under de Valera. Here he was being asked to lead a crusade against these evils; he was being entrusted with the task of rescuing and protecting the glorious heritage of the Catholic Irish people. It was a challenge which he took up with eagerness but which was to prove too much for his stability and balance... As early as April 1933 the movement had adopted as its symbol the blue shirt or blouse, and already de Valera had made it clear that he regarded this as a uniform and that, as such, its wearing would not be permitted" (187-190).

But nowhere did Brady acknowledge that O'Duffy was ever a Fascist, even as Blueshirt leader, and he wrote sympathetically of why O'Duffy, when still Garda Commissioner, should have viewed a de Valera election victory with such antipathy:

"{O'Duffy} was under no illusion as to his future under a de Valera government. He might have a brief respite while de Valera would get the feel of the ropes, but as soon as it was safe to do so, de Valera would replace him. Almost as soon as the results of the February 1932 election became known O'Duffy began to explore the possibility of keeping de Valera out of power. It would be less than fair to the man to suggest that O'Duffy's sole motive in this endeavour was to preserve his own office. His anguish at the spread of disorder and crime in the Free State in the previous five years was genuine and he drew little distinction between Fianna Fáil and the IRA in the allocation of responsibility for the state of the country. It would be tantamount to surrender to the forces of anarchy to allow people as unfit (in O'Duffy's view) as Fianna Fáil to take control of the destinies of Ireland" (p 167).

If Brady was not prepared to concede that O'Duffy was an actual Fascist as Blueshirt leader, by 2000 he was no longer prepared to countenance any suggestion that he had already contemplated a Fascist *coup* while still Garda Commissioner:

"According to David Neligan, O'Duffy had canvassed views among some senior army officers about establishing a military government if Fianna Fáil won the election. **But it is important to stress that no corroboration of Neligan's account has come to light.** According to Neligan's account, some of these officers had a proclamation printed at the Ordinance Survey Office in the Phoenix

Park, calling on the citizens of Saorstát Éireann to stand behind a military government under the leadership of Eoin O'Duffy and explaining why the normal democratic processes had to be suspended ... **If Neligan's account had any substance in reality, it is difficult to imagine what might have deterred O'Duffy from his planned course of action.** Neligan claimed credit for changing his commissioner's mind in the course of a discussion among a number of senior officers at the Depot mess some weeks before the election. According to Neligan, he was about to leave ... when O'Duffy, in a huddle with a group of officers at the other end of the room, rose and called him over. On the table was the proclamation to the citizens of Saorstát Éireann. O'Duffy indicated it with a gesture and said: 'Well Dave, what do you think?' Neligan read it quickly and replied: 'You don't expect me to have anything to do with this?' and walked towards the door. O'Duffy followed him as Neligan went down the steps towards the front door of the mess and said: 'You know, Dave, you'll be the first one to go under de Valera.' Neligan drove immediately to the home of Professor James Hogan {subsequently, a Blueshirt theoretician and, in 1935, author of *Could Ireland Become Communist?—MOR*} ... a mutual friend of O'Duffy and himself. He explained what he had seen and heard at the depot and asked Hogan to talk to O'Duffy. They argued and fought most of the night. Hogan drawing on the theory of democracy and the sacredness of its institutions, O'Duffy countering with the point that de Valera and his followers had paid little attention to the principles they now demanded for themselves. Finally, towards morning, the contest ended and Hogan emerged, exhausted but victorious. Ten days later Neligan was summoned to see WT Cosgrave who told him he had heard reports that O'Duffy was planning to do something foolish. Was it true, he wanted to know, was O'Duffy going to lead a coup? Neligan neither denied nor confirmed the report but simply assured Cosgrave that things were now under control. The President {Cosgrave} was apparently satisfied to leave matters at that" (all emphases mine—MOR; pp 167-9).

The 2000 edition of Brady's *Guardians Of The Peace* is, almost in its entirety, a facsimile of the original 1974 edition. In his 2000 introduction, Brady endeavoured to explain why there had been any deviation at all:

"There is one signal exception. It concerns the narrative in Chapter 10 of the supposed preparations by General Eoin O'Duffy to stage a *coup d'état* against the incoming Fianna Fáil government. Relying wholly as it did, on the information of one witness, this account should have been qualified when first published. The matter is addressed in this edition, I believe, with the balance and the qualifica-

tions which it lacked when first written"

The sentences which I emphasised in the previous paragraph quoted are those 2000 interpolations by which Brady set at nought his original 1974 narrative and effectively called Neligan a liar. At no time when interviewing Neligan for that 1974 book, or at anytime up to his death almost a decade later in 1983, did Brady ever query his account of O'Duffy's *coup d'etat* plot. To stab Neligan in the back *post mortem* was not a very convincing exercise in truth-seeking. If Brady demurs at acknowledging Neligan as a war criminal in 1923, he also demurs at acknowledging him as a committed democrat in 1932. Why not give Neligan the credit for doing democracy some service in foiling such a projected Fascist coup? For Neligan himself never went down the Blueshirt road. Neligan did, however, continue to champion, until the bitter end, and out of personal loyalty, the cause of an anti-Semitic murderer who later became a Fascist, who had been his former comrade-in-arms in Collins's Squad. The murder of the Jew in question cannot, however, be 'explained' as a war crime, since the Civil War had ended six months previously. It was Neligan who would be the architect of this particular Squad member's evasion of justice for his November 1923 wanton, wilful murder of the Department of Agriculture civil servant, Ernest Emanuel Kahan.

What has any of this to do with Collins's death in action at Béalnabláth? Quite a lot, actually. Michael Collins's personally handpicked circle of Intelligence/ASU/Squad assassins had formed such a tightly bound "*band of brothers*", that the death of their leader rendered them viciously vengeful, with some of them going mad, bad or both. Neligan's Ballymullen tortures had been well underway before Knocknagoshel, but Ballyseedy was not just his fierce revenge for those Republican killings, but for the one at Béalnabláth as well. And if we have taken a detour from Béalnabláth to Ballyseedy in order to follow the Civil War course taken by Collins's own "*Spy in the Castle*", Neligan also prompts us to take another look at Béalnabláth itself. Not named at all in most accounts, and only half named in others, the driver of the Crossley tender, who spent that fateful day of 22nd August 1922 drinking with Collins and fighting alongside him on the roadside where he met his death, would become the Jew killer protected and promoted by Neligan.

Manus O'Riordan

(To be continued)

Index To *Irish Political Review* 2013

Labour Comment is edited by Pat Maloney

January

Census Conflict. Pat Walsh
Irish Budget 2013. John Martin
The Prospect Of BREXIT. Jack Lane
Readers' Letters: The Euro Zone Or Britain?
Dave Alvey
Origins Of Capitalism. Jim Dixon 3,6
Trade Unions: Time To Grasp The Nettle. Edit.
The Long Road To Gaza. Wilson John Haire
Shorts from the Long Fellow (Green
Taxation; Taxes On Pensions; The
Euro Crisis; Emigration)
Remembering The First Dublin Car Bombings.
Jack O'Connor (Report)
The Liberty Hall And Sackville Place Bomb-
ings. Margaret Urwin (Report)
Mad Consumption Patterns. Report
Fact, Myth And Politics In Ireland's Property
Crisis. Philip O'Connor (Austerity Report, 2)
Politics Of 'The Famine'. Jack Lane reviews
The Famine Atlas and Tim Pat Coogan's
Famine Plot
Belsen And 'The Famine'. B. Clifford (Part 1)
World Day For Decent Work. David Begg
(Report)
Working Class Must Stand Up Against Welfare
Threat. NIPSA (Report)
Biteback: Keaveney's Principled Stand Recalls
That Of Michael Bell In 1922. Manus O'
Riordan (Report)
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Unemploy-
ment Statistics; Agrubusiness And Fishing;
Environmental Protection; Turf Cutting;
Fishing Industry)
Dail Report. Social Welfare; The Budget.
Finian McGrath (Report)
Yes You. Wilson John Haire (Poem)
Labour Comment: The Dublin Guilds,
Mondragon, Part 15
Trade Union Notes

February

Indigenous Democracy! *Editorial*
UK Kicking The EU Can Down The Road.
Jack Lane
Readers' Letters: Ratlines, *Wilson John Haire*.
It's All In The Genes! *Ivor Kenna*
Catholics In East Belfast. *Wilson John Haire*
Britain And The European Union. What
Raymond Aron said (*Report of Letter by
John Evans*)
Shorts from the *Long Fellow* (Exchequer
Figures; Revenue; Expenditure; Argentina;
Euro Zone Crisis; The UK Referendum;
Irish Property Market)
Cameron's Speech And Ireland. *Philip
O'Connor* (Unpublished Letter)
James Stewart. *Wilson John Haire* (Obituary)
Marketing Genocide. *Brendan Clifford*
The Treaty And Legitimate Authority. *J. Lane*
The Treaty: What British Signatories Said.
Report
An Anti-Fascist Volunteer And Some Other
Stories. *Manus O'Riordan* (Part 5)
The 'Famine' And Intentions. *Jack Lane*
Trinity Union Jackery. *Manus O'Riordan*
(Report of Letter)
Biteback: British Soldiers, *Philip O'Connor*
(Text to Pat Kenny Show). Popycock, *Pat
Maloney* (Letter, Evening Echo). Sad
Reflection, *Philip O'Connor* (Unpublished
Letter)
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Language
Skills; Legal System)
Labour Comment: The Dublin Guilds (II),
Mondragon, Part 16
Trade Union Notes

March

Promissory Notes, Croke Park, and the Euro.

Editorial
The Fiscal Union versus the European Union.
Jack Lane
Good Friday Agreement, Fifteen Years On.
Editorial
Readers' Letters: Pay Negotiations. Eamon Dyas
Old Crimes As New. Wilson John Haire
(Poem)
Is Ireland A Nothing? Jack Lane
Shorts from the Long Fellow (Promissory
Notes, Part 1; The Second 'Payment';
Farewell to Promissory Notes! . . . And To
The IBRC!; Hello To Long Term Bonds!;
Who Is To Blame? Opinion Poll)
The Intelligence Officer's Diary From Dunman-
way Located. Press Release, Barry Keane
Emergencies Here And There. Donal Kennedy
Still Fighting The Provos! B. Clifford (Review
of Ed Moloney's *Voices From The Grave*)
Remembrance Project. Report of Jack Lane of
AHS letter to Jerry Conroy of Project Group
Phoenix Park 'Child Murder' Myth Exploded.
Manus O'Riordan
Biteback: Ireland In The Great War. Pat
Maloney (Eve. Echo Letter)
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Court
Sentencing; Austerity; The Banking System)
Dail Diary. Dublin/Monaghan Bombings -
Finian McGrath TD. Ireland Leads OSCE -
Michael McNamara TD
Labour Comment: Practical Aspects Of
Mediaeval Guilds. Mondragon, Part 17
Trade Union Notes

April

Cyprus: Euro-Imperialism Or Rescue? *Edit.*
Angela Merkel And The Export Of Industrial
Democracy. *Philip O'Connor*
Hokey-Cokey Politics In Northern Ireland.
Pat Walsh
Readers' Letters: Irish Media's Eurosceptic
Fantasy Land. *John Martin*
Meath By-Election. *Report*
Mid-Ulster By-Election. *Report*
A State Of Chassis. *Wilson John Haire*: three
poems
Shorts from the *Long Fellow* (Vincent Browne
On The Tape; Context; Contents; Doncaster
Rovers; Irish Journalism; Cyprus)
Sleeping Gods And Demons. *Jack Lane*
McGurk Bar Bombing And British Policy.
Mark Langhammer reviews Ciarán MacAirt's
book)
Professor Fitzpatrick Explains..... *Jack Lane*
Did Britain Have A Proxy War Against Itself
In The North? Review Of An Unseen Thesis.
Brendan Clifford
Biteback: Tall Stories In The Name Of History.
(*Niall Meehan*, Unpublished letter)
How Fares Ulster? *Pat Walsh*
Brutality From Bantry To Ballycastle. *Seán
McGouran* (review of *Irish Bulletin*,
Volume 1)
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Chemical
Warfare)
Labour Comment: Guilds And The
Reformation. Mondragon, Part 18
Trade Union Notes

May

The Ruins Of Croke Park. Editorial on Social
Partnership
EU 'Treaty Change'. *Jack Lane*
Spot The Party Line! *Report*
Readers' Letters: Germany's Rethink On
Blame For Irish Bank Bailout. *Philip
O'Connor*
Margaret Thatcher. *Editorial*
What's Left. *Wilson John Haire*
That Rising Sun! *Wilson John Haire*

Shorts from the *Long Fellow* (Italy; The Lowry Tape; A Free Press; Fiona Muldoon) *The Irish Bulletin* And The Academy. Brendan Clifford (Part One)
An Irish Anti-Fascist Volunteer And Some Other Soldier. *Manus O'Riordan* (Part 6)
Biteback: Graves Vandalised. *Tom Cooper* (Unpublished Letter)
Eddie Linden, A Maverick Poet. *Seán McGouran* (Review)
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Farming; National Commemorations Programme; Walter Macken; IASIL; Syria)
All That Glitters. *Wilson John Haire*
Labour Comment: Jim Larkin by *Patrick Kavanagh*
Trade Union Notes

June

Irish, Poles And Czechs Plump For German EU Leadership. *Philip O'Connor*
Good Friday Agreement: Working Too Well! Editorial
Deserters And The Guardian. Joe Moylan
Readers' Letters: Austeria. Eamon Dyas
The Twentieth Century Was A Bloody Time For Ireland. Donal Kennedy
Irish Neutrality Was Noble. *Philip O'Connor* (Report of Letter)
Get Adams! Pat Walsh
When Gerry Met Miriam. *Wilson John Haire* (Poem)
Shorts from the Long Fellow (Colm Mac Eochaidh; The Mahon Tribunal; Ulster Bank)
The Irish Bulletin And The Academy. Brendan Clifford (Part 2)
Who's Afraid Of 1916? Report of article by Tom McGurk
When The US Endorsed The Use Of Chemical Weapons. David Morrison
Annette O'Riordan, RIP.
George Gilmore And The Republican Congress In Perspective. *Manus O'Riordan*
O'Riada's Receipt. *Seán McGouran* (Music Review)
Biteback: Food Supplies And The 'Famine'. Chris Fogarty (Unpublished letter)
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (Enda Kenny's Constitution)
Labour Comment: Guild Amalgamations. Mondragon, Part 19
Trade Union Notes

July

Special Victims. Pat Walsh
The State Of The EU. Jack Lane
Ruairi O Bradaigh. Editorial
Readers' Letters: The Sulán: In The Swim? Pádraig Ó Horgain
Story Of Empire. Donal Kennedy (Review of Paxman's Empire)
A Whitehall Diner Orders Blood, Sweat And Tears. *Wilson John Haire* (Poem)
Shorts from the Long Fellow (Opinion Polls; Government Electoral Prospects; Pent-up Demand?; A Different Coalition?; Pierre Mauroy)
Missing The Point. Jack Lane (Review of Borgonovo's Dynamics Of War)
The Politics Of Redmondism. Joe Keenan
Germany's Conservative Socialist Consensus. *Philip O'Connor*
Irish Electoral Politics. Donal Kennedy
Geoffrey Roberts And Stalin. *Brendan Clifford* (Review)
Joyce And The British Brothers. *Manus O'Riordan*
McIntyre's Thesis. Pat Walsh
Biteback: What Caused The Irish Crisis? *Philip O'Connor*
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (The State And The Family; Bankers And Others; *Labour Comment:* Trades v. Artisans. Mondragon, Part 20
Trade Union Notes

August

Making Trouble In The Middle East. Editorial
The Eurozone: Grand Plans And Real Plans. Jack Lane
Readers' Letters: Standards Of Justice. *Seán Farrell*
O Riada aris. *Seán McGouran*
Editorial Digest. (Terror Tuesdays; Syria; NI21; 1970 Arms Importation; Independent Group's New Policy)
Hezbollah Meets The IRA? *Wilson John Haire*
London-Derry Connections. *Seán McGouran*
Shorts from the Long Fellow (The Anglo Tapes; The Substance Of The Tapes; Fraud?; The Germans & The British; The Guarantee Again; Abortion; Dublin/Monaghan Bombings)
A Biography Of Omission. *Jack Lane* (Review of John Dillon's book on D.D. Sheehan)
Recollections Of Brian Earls. *John Minahane* (Obituary)
Corrections. *Brendan Clifford*
Some Collinses And Somervilles And The Big Fellow's Death.
Manus O'Riordan, Kay Keohane O'Riordan
Exporting The German Social Model? *Joe Keenan* (letter)
The Great Adventure. *Wilson John Haire*
Éire/Germany 1945: Some Good News. *Seán McGouran*
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (IMF & Growth; Honey Market; The Court System)
Some Facts, Putting Ivan Gibbons Of The Irish Post Right. *Donal Kennedy*
Slouch Somewhere Else. *Wilson John Haire*
Shop Stewards: Why We Left It. BICO Shop Stewards (Document, 1974)
Labour Comment: Them 'Forrainers'. Mondragon, Part 21
Trade Union Notes

September

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

October

The Viability Of The Irish State. *Editorial*
The Buck Stops . . . Where? *Editorial*
Mother Russia. *Jack Lane*
Return Of The Double Act, Patterson & Bew. *Pat Walsh*
A Bridge For Rosie Hackett. *Manus O'Riordan*

Hope. *Wilson John Haire* (Poem)
Shorts from the *Long Fellow* (Sinn Fein On Wealth Tax; Emigration; Unemployment & Employment; Balance Sheet Recession; The Irish Times)
'Pulling Hard Against The Stream'. *Malachi Lawless* (obituary for *Annette O'Riordan*)
The German Election Result. *Philip O'Connor*
Census And Nonsense. *Jack Lane*
Wake Up. *Wilson John Haire* (Poem)
Es Ahora. *Julianne Herlihy* (Seamus Heaney, Requiescat in Pace)
Reply From A Vile Accuser. *Joe Keenan*
Some Collinses And Somervilles, And The Knight Of The Levant. *Manus O'Riordan*
Biteback: Partnership Helped The Unemployed. *Philip O'Connor*
Cameron on World War Two. *Manus O'Riordan*
Does It Stack Up? *Michael Stack* (The Irish Holocaust; Russia Today. *Report*
Labour Comment: Loss Of Guild Power, Mondragon, Part 23
Trade Union Notes:

November

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

December

Gerry Adams And Jean McConville. *Seán McGouran*
Apprenticeship Review Must Not Miss The Point. *Philip O'Connor*
'The Disappeared': Scrapping The Barrel. Editorial
Cluane, Clancy, McKee Oration. *Paul McGuill*. (Press Release, Irish National Congress)
Readers' Letters: Gilmore Does A Redmond. *Donal Kennedy*
German Model And Apprentices. (Report: *Eoghan Harris*)
With Friends Like That. *John Morgan*, Lt.

Col. Retd. (Review of Lethal Allies)
 Digging. Wilson John Haire (Poem)
 Shorts from the Long Fellow (ACC Loan;
 Foreign Banks In Ireland; The Death
 Yugoslavia; Austerity Works; Political
 Implications; JFK Assassination; Dallas
 1963; 25 Years Of Fintan O'Toole)
 Anti-Semitism On The Increase? Nick Folley
 the last word on the last survivor. John Young,
 Jack Lane
 Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (The Raj In The
 Rain, Part 2)
 Did Borgonovo Miss The Point About The
 AFIL? Manus O'Riordan (Some Collines
 And Somervilles, Part 4)
 A Critic Emerges From Academia, Michael
 Carragher. Brendan Clifford
 Whatever You Say . . . Pat Walsh
 A British Undercover Unit. Wilson John Haire
 Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (The Banks;
 Public Servant Top-Ups; Irish Holocaust
Labour Comment: Destruction Of The Guilds,
 Mondragon, Part 25
 The Battle Of Clontarf
 Finian McGrath (Press Release)
 Labour Problems
 Trade Union Notes

Mr. Bean Falls Over Facts

Time Out a London listings magazine—probably the first such publication—interrupts its endless lists with other matter, among which are interviews. One appears in the March 19-23 2013 edition (No. 2220), under the over-all *Theatre* category. It is entitled *Backstage With... Richard Bean*.

He is author of the very successful *One Man, Two Govnors* (sic) a 'take' on the Goldoni play. Bean is a successful playwright—mostly of re-creations of novels and movies—like *The Count of Monte Cristo*, and *Smack* (clearly a long way from the respectable *Swiss Family Robinson*). An uncharacteristic product was *England People Very Good* (2009). According to *Time Out*, the "*National Theatre comedy about four generations of immigrants*" {surely only the first generation can be called 'immigrant'?} "*was hit by protests accusing it of racism*". Which was, naturally, not the case. According to Mr. Bean:

"It was basically one man who organised a campaign against the play, a Bangladeshi playwright. In fairness, he's possibly writing plays about the Bangladeshi community, and then I come along with a play whose fourth act is all Bengalis. But then he missed the central point of the play; it was about stereotyping."

What a wonderful guy you might be inclined to think, anent '*stereotyping*'. He meant that not all Bengalis are whatever they were deemed to be in the 'noughties'. It is difficult to know what that might have been—(Muslim) Bangla Deshis are

family-oriented, obsessed with 'education', and determined to make it on Britain's terms. Presumably Hindu Bengalis (from the state in the Indian Union—due to a sectarian partition in 1907) are largely the same sort of amiable people.

Mr. Bean's last outing was *The Big Fella* (2010), in *TO's* careful heading, tends to undermine his (and *TO's* assessment). Here is precisely what *TO* claims:

"A scathing satire on Irish American support of terrorism."

"We know perfectly well that the Irish American Community supported the IRA for 30 years. And the core of that group was police and firemen, many of whom died in 9/11. That's the smacking big irony that I don't think anybody else has talked about."

The above is gibberish, and was dealt with in an *Irish Political Review* article reviewing with this drama. No element of the post-1969 splits were involved in 'terrorism' in the USA. There is the question of 'terrorism'—it can only mean military means of which one disapproves. (The INLA was a substantial, at least in numbers, 'split' from the 'Officials'. As was Republican / Sinn Féin / Poblachtach from the 'Provisionals'. RSF seems to have decided that a 'split' in the military end was not a smart idea.)

Throwing '9/11' in there is puzzling—it probably has to do with the elderly 'Anglo' notion that they are subtle and Nord Americanos are crude—Americans were quite capable of divining the difference between what was going on in Ireland and what caused 9/11. 'Terrorists' do not all come out of the same box. Except in the headline-obsessed world of Mr. Bean.

There is also the not-so-subtle fact that 'the Irish American community', is by no means the solid, substantial, and half-witted element he is claiming. The Senate's 'four horsemen' Edward Kennedy in the lead, sponsored the SDLP and John Hume. Who, in the 1980s, was probably in the US more often than in Ireland. He didn't loiter around the EU Parliament in Strasbourg, to which he was elected, much. Hume was invited to the White House and many US State Houses and City Halls when the President of Sinn Féin wasn't allowed into the country. (The President of RSF is not allowed in even today.) When Gerry Adams was eventually allowed in, he had to hang about 'Irish' bars and specifically Irish Republican venues, for years.

The various factions in Ireland had and

have their counterparts in the US. There are probably more 'Erps' (members of the IRSP / Irish Republican Socialist Party) on America's West Coast than in Ireland. Even the Workers' Party still has a small following, quite apart from being a 'sister-party' of the CPUSA. Many of the Trot groups pine for sisterhood with something 'live' in Ireland, one is stuck with Socialist Democracy (People's Democracy as was) in one of the 18 (at the last count), 4th Internationals. Sinn Féin, and as noted RSF, have support groups, the Democratic Socialists of America (part of the Democratic Party's structure) probably would, in terms of policy, and affiliation to the Socialist International, support the Irish Labour Party. The point of the above is that citizens of the USA can line up with just about every even vaguely Nationalist or Republican group in Ireland.

Ulster Clubs & Emerald Societies

Brookeborough (Premier of 'Northern Ireland' 1943-63) set up Ulster Clubs in America in the 1950s to counter the Republicans (at that time Fianna Fáil would emphatically have included itself-in, under the 'Republican' label). O'Neill tended to run them down as they had strong connections with what there was of an Orange Order in the US. Not that O'Neill was unhappy about the Order, but it was bad 'copy' to be seen in the company of a small and largely plebeian group, in the States. The Unionists, and the 'Loyalists', lost out in America, practically nobody wanted to line up with 'pro-British' elements. 'The British' are what the States united against. Not even the crazed 'Christian' (largely anti-Semitic, but also anti-Catholic, and racist) militias wanted anything to do with the Loyalists, who were 'Left' by their strange standards.

It is true to say that bands from 'Emerald Societies' in New York's police and fire departments marched in Republican Easter Rising ceremonies and internment commemorations. But never in Northern Ireland. Presumably NYC's City Hall did not want problems with UK diplomats, or the White House. The latter, until Bill Clinton decided to take an interest, simply followed London's lead. 'Westminster' resented Clinton's interest, but there wasn't much it could do when the 'Emperor of the West' decided to take a hand.

Bean's anti-IRA play *The Big Fella* is entertaining enough. But it is based on a static group of six in New York City, who do not change over a 30-year period. They

don't recruit new members, and appear not to be part of anything like a political 'movement' in America. (The British press was furious when Newt Gingrich, the Conservative-Republican Speaker of the US Senate practically embraced Gerry Adams on his visit to the Capitol in Washington.) They are 'misogynistic and homophobic', their motivation is zero. Why they hang together for three decades sending off money and plant to the Provisionals is unexamined.

It is probably that great Anglo standby when discussing Ireland—an emotional spasm—30 years is a hell of a 'spasm'. But it is Bean who is being emotionally spasmodic here. Echoing press headlines he is putting forward a notion that 'terrorism' exists as a thing in itself, like a microbe. There is no rhyme or reason for people fighting an overwhelmingly better armed opponent to take to the 'war of the flea'.

Britain likes to place itself in the victim-role (and gets very irritated if others get there first). It 'stood alone' in 1940, despite the fact that Churchill, who coined the phrase, knew (from the spy-centre at Bletchley) that Hitler did not intend to invade. And despite the fact that the Dominions declared war simultaneously, (more-or-less: Mackenzie-King of Canada delayed his declaration, and some Boers rose in revolt when the 'Dominion' Government did what England wanted. In India Congress was outraged that there wasn't even a show of consultation about the matter. Congress post-war turned the men who fought in Subhas Chandra Bose's Indian National Army into pensioned heroes of the independence struggle. The INA was not so much 'pro-Axis' as pro-Japanese / Asian.)

In 1939 Canada probably had a bigger navy than Germany, though in the 1950s the 'British film industry' consisted, practically speaking, of building the Nazi Realm into a major naval power. And, of course, Hitler's armies were always 'hordes' of mindless operatives who had to be told when to breath in and breath out. There was an extremely high degree of initiative from the lowest level upwards in the Wehrmacht (and in the Red Army). 'Standing alone' in 1940 the UK had the navies of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa at its disposal. The 'Indian Navy' was quite large, it policed the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf—Iraq and large chunks of Iran were run from New Delhi.

Seán McGouran

Ukraine: An Insight

The following sentence lets the cat out of the bag in this crisis:

"The deposed Viktor Yanukovich, for all his incompetence, corruption and abuse of power, was the first president to oppose Nato membership in his election campaign and then persuade parliament to make non-alignment the cornerstone of the country's security strategy, on the pattern of Finland, Ireland and Sweden. Nato refused to accept it." (<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/mar/02/not-too-late-for-ukraine-nato-should-back-off>).

That is from a *Guardian* article by Jonathan Steele, dated 2nd March, *The Ukraine crisis: John Kerry and Nato must calm down and back off*. Steele points out that:

"Underlying the crisis in Crimea and Russia's fierce resistance to potential changes is Nato's undisguised ambition to continue two decades of expansion.

Both John Kerry's threats to expel Russia from the G8 and the Ukrainian government's plea for Nato aid mark a dangerous escalation of a crisis that can easily be contained if cool heads prevail. Hysteria seems to be the mood in Washington and Kiev, with the new Ukrainian prime minister claiming, "We are on the brink of disaster" as he calls up army reserves in response to Russian military movements in Crimea.

"...he was over-dramatising developments in the east, where Russian speakers are understandably alarmed after the new Kiev authorities scrapped a law allowing Russian as an official language in their areas. They see it as proof that the anti-Russian ultra-nationalists from western Ukraine who were the dominant force in last month's insurrection still control it. Eastern Ukrainians fear similar tactics of storming public buildings could be used against their elected officials.

Kerry's rush to punish Russia and Nato's decision to respond to Kiev's call by holding a meeting of member states' ambassadors in Brussels today were mistakes. Ukraine is not part of the alliance, so none of the obligations of common defence come into play. Nato should refrain from interfering in Ukraine by word or deed. The fact that it insists on getting engaged reveals the elephant in the room: underlying the crisis in Crimea and Russia's fierce resistance to potential changes is Nato's undisguised ambition to continue two decades of expansion into what used to be called "post-Soviet space", led by Bill Clinton and taken up by successive administrations in Washington. At the back of Pentagon minds, no doubt, is the dream that a US navy will one day replace the Russian Black Sea fleet in the Crimean ports of Sevastopol and Balaclava.

Since independence, every poll in Ukraine has shown a majority against Nato membership, yet one after another the elites who ran the country until 2010 and who are now back in charge ignored the popular will. Seduced by Nato's largesse and the feeling of being part of a hi-tech global club, they took part in joint military exercises and even sent Ukrainian troops to Iraq and Afghanistan.

It is not too late to show some wisdom now. Vladimir Putin's troop movements in Crimea, which are supported by most Russians, are of questionable legality under the terms of the peace and friendship treaty that Russia signed with Ukraine in 1997. But their illegality is considerably less clear-cut than that of the US-led invasion of Iraq, or of Afghanistan, where the UN security council only authorised the intervention several weeks after it had happened. And Russia's troop movements can be reversed if the crisis abates. That would require the restoration of the language law in eastern Ukraine and firm action to prevent armed groups of anti-Russian nationalists threatening public buildings there.

The Russian-speaking majority in the region is as angry with elite corruption, unemployment and economic inequality as people in western Ukraine. But it also feels beleaguered and provoked, with its cultural heritage under existential threat. Responsibility for eliminating those concerns lies not in Washington, Brussels or Moscow, but solely in Kiev."

(We are indebted to Eamon Dyas and Pat Walsh for drawing this article to our attention.)

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

Does
It
Up

Stack
?

RENEWABLE ENERGY

Renewable energy is very attractive as a concept. We like to think our use of energy is not using up the finite resources of planet Earth. Hydro-electric schemes are attractive from that aspect. The water is there, it is flowing towards the sea and after generating hydro-electricity the water is still there flowing towards the sea. It is electricity from gravity. The cost is in building and maintenance of the hydro-electric station and the construction and maintenance of transmission networks.

The building and construction uses up enormous quantities of oil—to make concrete, and coal—to make steel, iron, copper and aluminium. And so the impact on the environment is considerable. But, because the activities necessary for the generation of hydro-electricity are hidden away from most people who do not live near Port Talbot in Wales or the Ruhr Valley in Germany, the public accepts the propaganda that hydro-electricity generation is a 'clean' activity. It is not. Ask the people of Cobh about the Irish steel site at Haulbowline.

It is the same with wind energy and wave energy. Huge infrastructure is needed. Access roads, concrete pylons, foundations, transmission systems, generators, all are the products of heavy industry using great quantities of oil and coal and steel and also quarrying and mining for materials such as sand, gravel, metals etc. Just because most of this construction activity takes place out of sight, people are thinking 'clean' energy when it is not clean. It is very dirty indeed behind the scenes.

The generation of electricity from the sea-tide is in principle similar to generation of hydro-electricity. The movement of water through the dam drives the generators; with hydro-electricity it is the force of gravity which is moving the water, whereas with the sea-tide it is the sun and the moon which cause the waters to move up and down, usually in most places twice a day. The most famous tidal generating station in Europe is The Rance near St. Malo in France where the tide rises 42 feet (about 13 metres) up and down twice a day flowing into an estuary named La Rance. A dam was built within which is the longest

generating hall I have ever seen—perhaps a kilometre long. The engineers use bicycles to traverse the hall inspecting the multiple generators. The Rance scheme avails of a free resource—the tide—but the maintenance costs are high and the construction used massive resources to build it. So no form of energy is free when it has to be harnessed. After all, coal is free until we go to dig it up.

All of this stuff about energy is very important politically. Nations have gone to war over sources of energy as they have over sources of food.

We are in the process of being heavily manipulated in favour of 'clean' wind energy. It is not cleaner than other forms of energy as we have seen, but all the oil and coal driven generating stations are up and running and are already owned and managed by existing entrepreneurial companies. So for new entrepreneurs the way is to create new demand for a new concept no matter how uneconomical it may be. And the heavy-industry countries who manufacture the generators are of course very pleased with the new customers in the generator market. These countries in Europe are Germany, France, Italy and Spain and to satisfy them, we are influenced to use more and more electricity. Instead of coal/steam trains we were persuaded to move to diesel driven trains, then to diesel-electric and now to electricity-driven trains. It is a matter of driving the economics of Europe more intensively all the time which involves increasing the usage of electricity and making all of society more dependent on electricity. That is why, for example, we must all be believers in global warming, we must be subservient to computers, automatic doors, burglar-alarms, microwave cookers. We are being hooked on electricity.

GLOBAL WARMING.

A report by international scientists last September 2013 had great difficulty showing that the world is warming. In fact, the draft report circulated to countries prior to the UN Climate Change Conference in Stockholm shows that the world's temperature has not risen for 15 years and 1998 is the hottest year on record. Though the report was compiled by hundreds of scientists all over the world and is 2000 pages of science, the politicians are trying to alter it. Shades of IRAQ, Tony Blair and the late Dr. David Kelly! The politicians have been making a lot of money out of Global Warming—carbon credits and promotion of supposedly clean energy

projects.

The US delegation wants the scientists to explain away the lack of global warming by using the theory that the oceans are supposedly soaking up the heat and "*getting warmer*". The Hungarian delegates said the report would be used by Global Warming deniers to deny global warming! The German delegates went into (for them) very dangerous territory by saying the references to slow down in warming should be deleted because, they said, looking at a time span of ten or fifteen years was "*misleading*" and the scientists should focus on longer timespans of decades or centuries.

This is dangerous for the politicians because the record from geological cores going back millions of years shows that before ever there could have been man-made climate change, there were in fact big climate changes and some of the dramatic climate changes, unassisted by humans, took place quite suddenly over ten or twenty year periods. Geologists say the climate changes were due to natural causes such as volcanic eruptions, forest fires and changes in the temperature of the sun. Principally changes in the heat from the sun.

It was the reduction in heat from the sun which caused the ice ages. It was increased heat from the sun which caused jungles of vegetation to grow so thick and for so long that the weight of rotting vegetation made the coal seams. The reserves of coal and oil are so great that there is no danger whatsoever of them being depleted in the foreseeable future and so it does not stack up at all not to use coal and oil to generate electricity to power our cities.

It is time for us—each of us—to open our minds to reality and to ignore propaganda. It makes great sense, for example, to economise on the use of electricity. No matter what the price of it is. So that we need to generate less of it and conserve our resources. Lighting should not be needed in daylight hours if architects do their job properly. It makes us fitter to use stairs instead of a lift wherever we can do so. Cut down on computer use and have more productive time or more enjoyment time. This all makes sense for a healthier, longer life. But it needs us to go against the incessant propaganda. It needs us to think about what we are doing and why we are doing it. Then it might stack up properly for us all.

Michael Stack ©

TRADE UNION NOTES

Union Recognition

Fine Gael and Labour are still at loggerheads about collective bargaining despite a pledge by Tanaiste Eamon Gilmore to deliver the legislation by Easter 2014.

The coalition partners have still not agreed a definition of what collective bargaining is and are both under pressure from their respective lobbies, in the Trade Union and Employer groupings.

Employers are warning that any move to force them to recognise Trade Unions could cost jobs by scaring off US multi-nationals which want to remain non-Unionised.

Currently, workers have a legal right to join a Trade Union, but employers are not obliged to negotiate with them.

At the Labour Party Conference on February 15th, in Co. Meath, Gilmore declared that the Government would legislate for collective bargaining. However, he gave no details of what the legislation would contain.

Jobs Minister Richard Bruton is in further discussions with bodies such as IBEC (Industry Employers) and the American Chamber of Commerce, which represents multi-nationals in Ireland.

"A senior Labour source said there was a commitment in the Programme for Government [2011] to reform the law on employees' right to engage in collective bargaining to comply with recent judgements of the European Court of Human Rights" (*Sunday Business Post*, 23.2.2014).

Pensions

The Government has come up with a name for a new mandatory occupational pension but has not given any date for its implementation.

The new **MySaver** scheme is designed for those without any pension in place other than the state pension, Minister for Social Protection Joan Burton stated on 11th February 2014.

The minister said that less than half of those in a job, who are between the ages of 20 and 69, have a private pension.

"This is why the Programme for Government includes a commitment to reforming the pension system to progressively achieve universal coverage, with particular focus on lower-paid workers without occupational pensions" (*Irish Independent*-12.2.2014)

There are 5.3 people of working age for every pensioner, but this is set to fall to 2.1 by 2060, the Minister said. She favours an auto-enrolment scheme.

This is where all those without an occupational pension are signed up for one, and they will have to sign out of it

if they do not want it.

"While the Government is committed to the introduction of a comprehensive occupational pension scheme—a **MySaver** for those without pension coverage—the actual go-live date will depend on the economic circumstances," the Minister stated" (*Irish Independent*-12.2.2014).

The Society of Actuaries in Ireland said this country should make pensions mandatory by 2019.

Long Pension Wait

Meanwhile, workers are going to have to wait longer than anyone else in Europe to get a State Pension, a Dail Committee has been told.

These changes are being foisted on private sector workers by politicians who will get elite pensions years before they do, the Irish Congress of Trade Unions said.

These have seen the state pension age rise to 66 this year, rising to 67 in 2021 and to 68 in 2028—meaning workers will either have to stay in their jobs longer or find some other way of bridging the financial gap till they qualify for a pension.

The changes mean those who would normally have expected to get a pension at 65 will lose between €12,000 and €36,000 in state payments which they had contributed to through PRSI all their working lives.

Fergus Whelan of the Irish Congress of Trade Unions (I.C.T.U.) said citizens were being "*deprived of a significant benefit they earned and paid for*" through rapid increases to the state pension age. And he said the politicians introducing these changes would not have to wait till their late 60s and settle for a state pension of €12,000 a year. (Contributory: €230.30; Non-Contributory: €219.00 per week.)

The Irish Congress of Trade Unions accepted the need for pension reform but claimed that Ireland was going further and faster than every other country in the European Union including Britain and Germany.

"No one has explained to the Irish public why we must have the highest public pension age in the EU," Mr Whelan told the Oireachtas Committee on Social Protection. (*Irish Indep*, 13.2.2014).

But the Department of Social Protection said that the changes were essential to tackle the rising cost of pensions as the population ages and lives longer.

Pensions already accounted for 30% of social welfare spending and the ratio of workers to pensioners is set to halve by 2050, with the number of older people rising from 12% of the population in 2012 to 23% by 2050, said assistant secretary Orlaigh Quinn.

The Society of Actuaries in Ireland said this country should make pensions mandatory by 2019.

Enjoy Your Cuppa

Indian tea plantation workers employed by a company that owns Tetley are paid less than €1.82 per day and live in inhumane conditions surrounded by cesspools, according to a report released yesterday.

The workers live in the north-east state of Assam on 24 plantations owned by a company controlled by Tata, the Indian conglomerate that also owns Jaguar Land Rover, and backed by the World Bank.

The report—by the Columbia Law School's Human Rights Institute—alleged that plantation workers were bullied over sick leave, denied free health care and subjected to excessive deductions from their meagre pay for "*fringe benefits*".

"The living conditions on the plantations presented some of the most conspicuous violations of Indian law", the report found.

"On every plantation visited, workers showed researchers dilapidated homes lacking protection from rain and wind, each dwelling often housing the families of several workers."

Workers were forced to make three visits to a company-funded hospital before being allowed to take sick leave and visits from friends and relatives outside the plantation were vetted by the company, staff told the researchers.

Workers reported the killing of two employees by the armed forces, which intervened in a protest over the death of a worker in an apparent industrial accident at the Powai plantation. The workers believed their colleague had died from poisoning after spraying the plants with chemicals, a claim the company denied.

At the Borhat plantation in Dibrugarh district, researchers said overflowing latrines had created "*a network of cesspools throughout the labour lines, the living area for employees and their families*".

Senior plantation managers told the researchers not to listen to the workers because they had "low IQs" and were "like cattle".

"The report, the result of a three-year study in which researchers visited 17 of the company's 24 plantations in Assam, also criticised a widely welcomed employee share-ownership scheme established with finance from the World Bank's lending arm, the International Finance Corporation (IFC). Workers said the scheme was pushed by a company called Amalgamated Plantations Private Limited (APPL) with "*threats and duress*" but little information or independent advice" (*Daily Telegraph*, London, 12.2.2014).

continued on page 28

TU NOTES continued

It's TATA to Tetley from here on!

The Society of Actuaries in Ireland said this country should make pensions mandatory by 2019.

Long

Transport Minister Leo Varadkar has been asked by a United States Union body to "*carefully consider*" the implications of awarding the long-haul arm of Scandinavian airline Norwegian a licence to operate its service using a base in Ireland.

"In a letter sent to Mr Varadkar over the weekend and seen by the Irish Independent, the head of the Washington DC-based Union umbrella group Transportation Trades Department, Edward Wytkind, claims that the Irish Aviation Authority and the Commission for Aviation Regulation should reject the licence application by Norwegian Air International (N.A.I.)" (*Irish Inde.* 11.2.2014).

Norwegian Air International. is controversially hoping to base its long-haul service to the US and Asia in Ireland in order, it's claimed by opponents, to bypass rules in its home country that would prevent it from hiring cheaper Thai staff and to avoid other tougher labour rules.

Norwegian Air Shuttle—the company behind Norwegian—recently injected \$53m (€39m) into its Irish subsidiary, Norwegian Air International. The long-haul arm has rented office space near Dublin Airport and started hiring staff but would not offer flights from Ireland.

A spokesman for the Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport also said it would be "*inappropriate to comment*".

Huge pressure is being put on US and EU authorities, as well as those in Norway, to prevent NAI from gaining an Irish AOC or proceeding with its base here.

"NAI is also seeking to establish itself as an Irish carrier precisely to avoid application of Norway's labour laws to the pilots and flight attendants who operate its aircraft," claimed Mr Wytkind.

"Several other European countries, included the UK and Sweden, were considered before Norwegian's management and board decided to establish the company's fully owned subsidiary Norwegian Air International in Ireland."

The Society of Actuaries in Ireland said this country should make pensions mandatory by 2019.

Luxury Back!

The 'good times' are back! Buyers are going on waiting lists of up to seven months for expensive luxury cars. This

follows a surge in demand this year that hasn't been seen since the boom.

"The level of orders for vehicles costing upwards of €80,000 has taken many dealers by surprise, the *Irish Independent* can reveal." (17.2.2014)

Production lines are struggling to cope with orders globally—and that is pushing waiting times for Irish buyers further out into the year.

Sales are 32% ahead of the same period last year.

But the most resounding signs of big money being spent on cars are highlighted in the volume of prestige and luxury makes being ordered.

If you want a €119,000 Range Rover, for example, you could have to wait five months before it arrives. In the case of the Range Rover Sport (€84,000+), there is now a seven-month waiting time.

The Society of Actuaries in Ireland said this country should make pensions mandatory by 2019.

Squeeze

The income squeeze has left half of households with less than €35,000 a year to live on—out of which they have to pay mortgages or rent, energy bills, property tax, food and other costs of running a home. That's according to research done by the Trade Union backed Nevin Economic Research Institute. It found that 800,000 household surveyed had a disposable income of less than €35,000.

Employment

Ireland saw the largest fall in Unemployment in the EU last year, new Eurostat figures show.

The joblessness rate here fell from 14% in December 2012 to 12.1% a year later.

This means unemployment is now just marginally ahead of the eurozone average of 12%, though still ahead of the EU-wide average of 10.7%.

Other countries which saw big unemployment drops included Latvia followed by Portugal, Hungary and Lithuania.

However, Greece saw its unemployment rate climb even higher to 27.8%, while a staggering 59.2% of people under 25 are now out of work.

Spain also has extremely high youth unemployment of 54.3% and the general joblessness rate is 25.8%, though both have declined slightly in the last year.

In Ireland around 52,000 young people were out of work at the end of 2013, but this was 10,000 lower than a year earlier.

This pushed the youth unemployment rate down to 24.6% in December 2013 from 28.7% a year earlier.

However, critics have pointed out that

without high emigration and large numbers staying on in third-level education this rate would be much higher.

Unemployment in Britain fell to 7.2% last year, the Eurostat figures show, while Germany saw its rate fall to 5.1%

Meanwhile the unemployment rate in Iceland, which like Ireland also suffered a massive banking crash in 2008, is now down to just 5.2%.

Press Release: Deputy Finian McGrath states he has contacted the Minister for Justice again (26.2.14)

McGrath & James Sheehy Case

I have met James on many occasions and I am convinced James Sheehy was set up. Judge for yourself:

1. Arrested on 17th August 1989 when a gun was planted in the open glove compartment of his car and 12 rounds of ammunition was planted on his mantelpiece 8 hours after his arrest.
2. A direction to charge James Sheehan with firearms offences was issued by the DPP on 1st March 1990 but re considered on 31st May 1990 and the charges were withdrawn (he was never charged)
3. After 11 years his solicitor wrote to the Gardaí requesting not to destroy the evidence, namely the gun and ammunition. The reply from the Gardaí stated that the gun and ammunition had already been destroyed 4 weeks before they had received the solicitors letter.
4. On 14th March 2001, Jim Higgins Fine Gael T.D. asked the Minister for Justice why 'the weapon was destroyed at a time when the complaint was the subject to a Garda Complaints Board Investigation'.
5. During a civil case brought by the plaintiff March 2006 to 2009 the Garda Síochána Complaints Board confirmed that on August 2008 they destroyed both complaints relating to the planting of the gun and the ammunition.
6. Parliamentary question 628 26th June 2005 states the storage site 'Clancy Barracks' where the gun and ammunition in question were being kept had been sold in July 2000. Parliamentary question number 417, 7th February 2012 states the storage site 'Clancy Barracks only accepted an offer for the sale of the Barracks in June 2002, 2 years later than the above date.
7. Parliamentary question 586, 12th February 2008 by Finian McGrath states the company who destroyed the gun and ammunition kept at Clancy Barracks on 19th July 2000 had to win a tender competition. Parliamentary question number 585 and 521 dated 12th May 2012 states that the company who tendered for the competition for destroying weapons at Clancy Barracks 2000/2001 did not in fact win the tender completion until January 2002.

Finian McGrath

Leave That Kid Alone !

Is one of the primary comforts of early 21st century life the fact we live longer and that we can rely on cradle to grave services that are appropriate as regards infrastructure and staffed by people of a trustworthy calibre? Or could it be that—when one scratches the surface a little—we find the foundations of our hopes are built on sand?

Over-prescription of pharmaceuticals by many medics, along with the lack of accountability by the giant chemical companies themselves, might lead one to a more distressful view of things.

In the United States as early as 1993 *The Los Angeles Times* had highlighted that Poopulsid could cause cardiac aristhmias. Several years later it was prescribed to a seven-year-old Canadian child, Terrence Young, for heartburn leading to his fatality. For a decade his family fought for justice. Then last year they finally got a bill C-17 passed in the Canadian Parliament to better govern the use of similar medicines on children (Wordpress.com, Dec 6, 2013).

Over time the Medical profession has not covered itself in glory. The elite try to sideline any member who tries to point out the emperor's lack of clothing. Dr. Nancy Andreassen was a former editor of *American Journal of Psychiatry*. She spearheaded a critical study: *A longitudinal study of First Episode-schizophrenic*—Arch Gen Psychiatry 2011, Feb G8(2)12837. Ever since she has been pilloried and her work traduced by the benchmark of our near neighbour the Royal College of Psychiatrists.

Andreassen's work pointed to the strong possibility that in cases of diagnosed schizophrenia or psychosis, depending on dosage and when the patient was initially put on the treatment "*the antipsychotic drugs they have been exposed to can lead to brain shrinkage*". It seems that the over-sensitivity to commercial bad publicity by the medical elite is immense.

Or how about the fact that we possibly poison our children regularly, often based on the highly dubious methods for diagnosing A.D.H.D [attention deficit disorder]. One of several studies now accumulating strong data on the subject include *The importance of Relative Standards in A.D.H.D diagnosis* (J Health ECON 2010, September 29(5); 641-656).

This looked at just one variable fact and how it could affect, by a large percentage, whether a child member of a cohort is likely to be diagnosed with the syndrome using contemporary common practice. The variable is age i.e taking classes or grades of pupils and comparing the youngest whose date of birth was closest to the school start of the year date and the oldest whose date of birth was farthest from school start of year date.

Over a number of grades: diagnoses in the younger group was 8.4% while for the eldest it was 5.1%. When returned to later 5th to 8th graders, younger pupils were twice as likely to have been prescribed with stimulants than the elder group.

Provision of psycho-stimulants to children in the United States grew by 700% between 1991 and 2005.

According to a Bloom & Cohen report 2007, up to the year 2006, 4.5 million children in the United States had been diagnosed with A.D.H.D and a cluster of similar syndromes and that regularly 2.5 million are being given medication to treat the syndrome.

The now notorious Ritalin, which is methylphenidate, as well as the amphetamine based Adderall and Dexedrine, are very big business. The Early Childhood Longitudinal Kindergarten Cohort Study points to alarming incidences of persistent cardiovascular changes among children on such medication.

What the more even-handed commentators have consistently been saying is that the use of so much medication is questionable when the syndrome is "*not solely based on neurological conditions*" (American Psychiatric Association, 2000).

So we are told that in the noughties the average spend in the United States economy on the above medications went from an annual \$1.6 billion dollars to \$2.5 billion dollars, 20% of which was paid for by Medicaid. There is the admission that the commonly-used criteria for ADHD diagnosis is "*deeply flawed*".

Many academic statistical problems are presented; important factors that have to be looked at include sibling issues, maternal education, race, birth weight and other factors.

If someone gets to the age of 20 without seriously being messed up : one is lucky!

Seán Ó Riain

Finian McGrath On Gardaí

Reports of Unlawful Surveillance of the Garda Síochána Ombudsman Commission: Statements In The Dáil

Deputy Finian McGrath: "This is a strange little country, particularly when—according to the Government, the Minister and many others—the victim of a crime is being placed in the dock and blamed for an alleged offence... That is what is happening in this instance..."

I wish to make it clear that I am standing with the Garda Síochána Ombudsman Commission in respect of the unlawful surveillance of its activities. Many of us have for a long period supported the principle of having a watchdog in place in respect of the Garda. More than anything we have demanded accountability, professionalism, impartiality and equality in law for all of our citizens... sadly it is not happening on the Minister [Shatter]'s watch.

During the past three years I have raised with him many cases involving citizens who were let down and to whom grave injustices were done...

I have major concerns regarding the future of the Garda Síochána Ombudsman Commission, particularly in the context of the attempts that are being made to undermine the organisation. We were promised reform, change and accountability. Now however, good and fair people are being hammered and whistleblowers are being taken out. This is another national scandal

...

What is happening is not on and it is certainly not good enough. I demand action and I support the call made by colleagues for the establishment of a proper inquiry.

Our justice system must work in a fair and balanced way. I am sick and tired of paying fines or taking the hit in respect of penalty points when a cosy elite of insiders walk away scot free. A good police force does not demand respect, it earns respect. The same is true of all public service organisations, the Minister and the Government. I say to those opposite to be fair and honest.

If they cannot honour those principles they should not remain in government.

The Minister stated that the GSOC has concluded that no definitive evidence of unauthorised technical or electronic surveillance of its offices was found."

NOTE: The Government has now been forced to concede a review on the alleged bugging of the Garda Ombudsman offices, under retired High Court Judge John Cooke.

BRENTANO continued

words he *"broke away from the insular tradition which, till recently, had been the misfortune of English economic history, {and} set the growth of industrial organization in England against the background of continental movements"*.

"Scholarly reactions to the book were mixed. In the later edition of their history of trade unionism, published in 1920, the Webbs continued to maintain that they saw no evidence of unions being descended from medieval craft guilds, a judgment echoed in the 1950s by G.D.H. Cole, who argued that guilds were 'essentially associations of masters, with journeymen and apprentices holding an entirely subordinate position under their control.' Academic historians, reviewing his book in learned journals, concentrated on the gaps in Unwin's supposedly unbroken descent of trade unions from guilds: they maintained that only the felt-makers and hatters could be assumed to have had a continuous existence, and even that was not capable of being conclusively proved" (Corley).

Unwin's second work, for Methuen's Antiquary's Books series, *The Guilds and Companies of London* was published in 1908:

"Its scope was broader than that of the previous work, relating the topic to England's, as well as London's, economic and political history; it also covered the entire period from the 12th to the 19th centuries. In the first chapter, on *'The place of the gild in the history of Western Europe'*, he stated that in the West, the gild's principal importance was in having been an organ of progress. He then expounded his fundamental law:

"The progress of Society, like the progress of the individual, is a moral fact which cannot be ultimately derived from any cause outside of itself; but it rests on psychological conditions."

CHURCH AND STATE

Under the Roman Empire (he continued), society had tended to become the creature of the State. Then during the dark ages, and even more in the middle ages, society became fragmented, as Church and State tended to separate, local and central government drew apart. Hence the political liberty of Western Europe has been secured by the building up of a system of voluntary organizations, strong enough to control the State, and yet flexible enough to be constantly remoulded by the free forces of change. *"It was in the gild that voluntary associations first came into a permanent relation with political power."*

EDINBURGH

"In 1908 he obtained his first permanent academic job, as lecturer in economic

history at the University of Edinburgh. A lecture he gave there that October authoritatively sums up the Unwinian credo, showing what he could achieve at the peak of his powers. Entitled *'The aims of economic history'*, it argued that that discipline owed more to history than to political economy, being concerned not so much with individuals as with groups, which in more distant periods were far from predominantly economic in functions or aims" (Corley).

"Tawney characterized Unwin's historical work as combining 'minute investigation with daring speculation in a manner which is not very usual'. In a breath-taking generalization during that lecture Unwin declared, 'The tribe is an organ of real or nominal kinship, the feudal manor is an incipient organ of local government, the gild is partly a religious fellowship, partly a political club, and partly an organ of municipal administration'. He perceived a 'transformation of social forces into political forces which is an essential feature of what we call progress. We see class after class constituting itself a social force by the act of self-organization'. Against these 'forces from below, the forces of spontaneity, of germination' were those from above, authoritarian ones which could only retard economic progress" (ibid).

FACTORY LEGISLATION

As to the Factory Acts, most adherents of the Manchester School favoured outlawing or restricting the employment of young people; yet they could see little reason to interfere with adult labour. Unwin, on the other hand, cordially endorsed factory legislation as *"perhaps the most striking modern instance in which the values of the market were made in some degree subordinate to those life-values which are ultimate"*, or paramount. He was thus not an out-and-out supporter of *laissez-faire*, despite his well documented hostility to such official action. He once claimed to support three-quarters of the socialists' programmes, which would necessarily entail state intervention. Yet to him legislation sometimes appeared to usurp the functions of his cherished voluntary bodies, as the Trades Board Act of 1909—providing for minimum wages in so-called sweated industries—took steps which he felt would be better carried out by Trade Unions.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

"Social development involved a broadening and deepening of human relationships. To proceed smoothly, there should be no restrictions on the forming of such relationships, and no barriers to their cultivation. These coalesced into voluntary groups, which by working together harnessed the creative powers

of their various societies. The original and fundamental group was the family, while others were based on kinship, fellowship, collaboration in work, religious worship, and cultural activities in their widest sense. Typical groups were churches, trade unions, the co-operative movement and societies promoting art and science. Their ethos was that of fraternity, with social development fostering the horizontal extension and vertical deepening of fraternal sentiments. According to his own researches, the most representative and robust examples of voluntary associations had been the mediaeval guilds" (Corley).

"As the growth of such associations was organic and long drawn-out, it could neither be forced nor imposed from outside. Any external coercive power, whether by central or local government, could only be counter-productive. Over time, a country's economic and financial system was bound to become more complex; as a result, some associations would decay, but then be replaced by others better attuned to the new conditions" (Corley).

WIKIPEDIA

Brentano's own research was on European Guilds and Trade Unions. He not only produced an overwhelming amount of exceptional historical work, but also extended it to policy conclusions, arguing that Trade Unions and other labor organizations could do very well by themselves without state assistance. However, he explored how the essential glue of the economic units—fraternity—came apart over time with the development of capitalism.

In 1868, Brentano made a thorough study of Trade Unionism in England, resulting in the publication of his *Die Arbeitergilden der Gegenwart* (1871-72; in *English Workers' Guilds of the Present*). In it he argued that modern Trade Unions were the successors of the mediaeval Guilds. The book soon became an authoritative source on industrial-era work associations. His other works, which are of a more theoretical nature, relate chiefly to political economy.

See also: Lujo Brentano and Annexationism During the First World War (journals.cambridge.org/article_S0008938900016447) by EA Menze, 1984.

War Aims and the Liberal Conscience: Lujo Brentano and Annexationism During the First World War, Ernest A. Menze: This paper examines the war aims advocated during the First World War by Lujo Brentano, one of the founding members of the Verein für Sozialpolitik, the organization serving as the forum for the sociopolitical activities of the Katheder-sozialisten. Though Brentano's career has been surveyed, James J. Sheehan's necessarily brief account of his attitudes and conduct during the First World War does not fully explore the impact of wartime annexationism on Brentano. A lifelong Anglophile and advocate of liberal ideals in social, economic, and political questions, Brentano serves as a case study of the impact of nationalism in times of stress on individuals who, on the basis of their previous record, might have been expected to be more resistant to its appeals. ■

BRENTANO continued

1867 from the University of Göttingen and was Professor of Political Theory from 1871 to 1931, successively, at the Universities of Berlin, Breslau, Strassburg, Vienna, Leipzig, and Munich.

In 1868 Brentano made a thorough study of Trade Unionism in England that resulted in his *Die Arbeitergilden der Gegenwart* (1871–72; "Workers' Guilds of the Present"). In it he argued that modern Trade Unions were the successors of the medieval Guilds. The book soon became an authoritative source on industrial-era work associations. His other works, which are of a more theoretical nature, relate chiefly to political economy.

"His theoretical work, as a member of the German historical school of economics, opposed the theories of both classical and Marxist economics. He was not afraid of controversy, challenging the theories of Max Weber and Karl Marx.

Brentano's own stance echoed the views of the 'modern liberals' with whom he was associated, arguing for freedom of the individual and, at the same time, for the State to be responsible to provide public services, such as education and healthcare, that were essential to ensure human rights for all members of the society. Brentano believed that social improvements would be achieved through negotiation and mutual collaboration, not violent revolution" (*Wikipedia*)

After the revolution of November 1918, he served in Prime Minister Kurt Eisner's Government as People's Commissar (Minister) for Trade, but only for some days in December 1918.

"His influence on the social market economy, and on many Germans who would be leaders just after the end of World War II, can hardly be overrated" (*ibid*).

Brentano ardently opposed the rise of German militarism and was for many years an outspoken pacifist in Germany. He remained a strong advocate of Trade Unions. In 1927, he was awarded a Nobel peace prize.

Brentano has been described by E. A. Menze as "A lifelong Anglophile" in *Cambridge Journals on-line* 1984.

A LIBERAL INTELLECTUAL

George Unwin (1870–1925) held the chair of Economic History at the University of Manchester—then the only one of

its kind in the British Empire—from 1910 until his death in 1925.

Unwin was a pacifist and greatly influenced by Sidney and Beatrice Webb. He wrote a number of works on British economic, social and business history, including *Industrial Organization in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (1904), and *The Guilds and Companies of London* (1908).

"During that decade and a half at the University of Manchester, he built up the reputation of economic history in Britain by a unique combination of two distinct qualities. He is credited as having had one of the most penetrating and philosophical minds ever to be attracted to this discipline. He also brought to his research an intellectual rigour, involving a scientific approach through intensive study of original sources. His influence over the development of economic and social history was thus a far-reaching one" (*George Unwin: a Manchester economic historian extraordinary*, T.A.B. Corley, University of Reading, 2002).

Born in Stockport, six miles from Manchester in 1870, the eldest of six children of a failed publican. His mother was a spirited character who imbued Unwin "with a sense of purpose, which in her case took the form of a Calvinist iron will" (*ibid*). He attended a Wesleyan Day School and a local Baptist Sunday school. He later defected to the Unitarians. At the age of 13, he became an office-boy in a hat factory. At the age of 20, he won a scholarship to Cardiff University and later to Oxford.

"Unwin spent the first half of 1898 in Berlin as an economics student... this exposure to entirely novel academic challenges proved to be what Tawney called 'a turning point in his intellectual development', allowing him to broaden his philosophical ideas to encompass economic and social history. Germany was then a generation ahead of Britain in building up economic history as an academic subject, one in any case still treated at home in an insular way. Unwin's professor was the distinguished economist, Gustav von Schmoller, who taught him how to chart the progress of societies with scholarly rigour, by extracting the maximum possible information out of the research documents. Unwin reacted against Schmoller's pronouncements about the state being the main promoter of economic progress and about the benefits to society of enlightened paternalism" (*ibid*).

THE WEBBS

In 1898, he returned to Britain in dire need of a steady income. He was introduced by Sidney and Beatrice Webb to

Leonard (later Lord) Courtney, whose wife happened to be one of Beatrice Webb's eight sisters. Courtney, then in his mid-sixties, was a Liberal MP who had on conscientious grounds resigned from junior ministerial office when on the brink of a cabinet post; as a back-bencher, he was recognized as perhaps the most able politician since Richard Cobden never to have headed a government department. Unwin became his private secretary in July 1899.

GUILDS FORERUNNER OF TRADE UNIONS

Unwin developed a hypothesis which was to preoccupy him for a number of years:

"that these London livery companies and the earlier craftsmen's guilds were the direct ancestors of the country's trade unions".

"A possible historical link between those guilds and unions had been a topic of scholarly debate since Luigi Brentano had published his work on the subject (without conclusively accepting that link) in 1870. Unwin was the first to attempt a serious solution by working systematically through gild records. The Webbs, in *The History of Trade Unionism* (1894) had begun their detailed discussion of the forerunners of unions in the eighteenth century. Unwin's book of 1904 on *Industrial Organization in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* thus sought to bridge the intervening gap" (Corley).

In 230 pages of text, closely packed with information from the unpublished records, Acts of Parliament, calendars of state papers and similar sources, he traced a 'real, significant and vital' line of development between guilds and trade unions, but one with complex intermediate links. In a diagram, he offered an outline genealogy of trade unions. The 'modern wage earner' was shown to be the issue jointly of the journeyman and small master, themselves descended from the 'yeomanry organization' of journeymen, and hence from the 'Craftsmen (Early Gild)' who headed the diagram. The immediate antecedents of the trade union he found in the diminished status of the 17th century small master, carrying out domestic manufacture, subservient to the large master or trader, and gradually declining into mere wage-slaves. Hence the following century's labour troubles compelled the 'reduced' small masters, together with the journeymen, to organize themselves in combinations of work-people" (*ibid*).

"INSULAR TRADITION"

Here was a pioneering work of great authority. As Unwin included relevant examples taken from European countries, mainly France and Germany, in Tawney's

continued on page 30



Brentano v. Unwin

Two of the greatest exponents of "social partnership" during the 19th and 20th centuries mirrored in their own background the Catholic and Protestant ethos or Pre-Reformation and Post-Reformation direction of Western society.

Lujo Brentano was a Bavarian academic of substantial German-Catholic intellectual background.

George Unwin was the son of a failed Stockport publican of English Midlands Protestant stock. Their origins could hardly have differed more!

Both were avowed Pacifists!

LUJO BRENTANO

Historians have studied the effects of the formation of the Guilds and through their writings have recognized competing theories on the origin of Guild formation. Lujo Brentano's *English Guilds: The Original Ordinances of more than one hundred Early English Guilds* (London: N. Trubner & Co., 1870), is an interesting and thorough look into the origins of the Guilds and their regulations. Within his body of work there are quite a few return ordinances of English Guilds, each explaining their origins, properties, and usages, or daily procedures, of everyday activities. What is useful from the study are the two introductions: one by his daughter, Lucy Toulmin Smith, and the second by him, an essay "On the History and Development of Guilds and the Origin of Trade Unions", in *English Guilds: The Original Ordinances of more than One Hundred Early English Guilds* (London: N. Trubner & Co.-1870-cxv-cxvi.), written prior to the book being published. Due to an untimely death, his daughter wrote an introduction examining her father's ideas, and Brentano's main argument on the origins of the mediaeval Guilds.

Lujo Brentano studied the bonds of brotherhood and the associations of fraternity. He believed "it is an essential

characteristic of the system of local self-government, that its constant tendency is, to bring men together continually, with feelings of brotherhood" (Lucy Toulmin Smith, introduction to *English Guilds: The Original Ordinances of more than One Hundred Early English Guilds*, Lujo Brentano, London: N. Trubner & Co., 1870, xxvi.)

In the introductory essay, he also noted familial bonds that created the strongest "natural union". (Brentano, *English Guilds*, lxxx) His theory then expanded into the formation of licensed Guilds and eventually Trade Unions, believing if a bond is strong enough between brothers, neighbours, or friends; it will survive the creation of "restricted association{s}." (Ibid. lxxi.) "His romanticized view of history, at times, makes it difficult to find historical accuracy with psychological insight into the formation of natural bonds" (*Origin and Creation: London Guilds of the Twelfth Century*, Katherine Payne, 2011).

GEORGE UNWIN

George Unwin's methodology was similar to Brentano, as both studied

primary documents of the time. However, Unwin's argument is in contention with Brentano's idea of brotherhood and fraternity. Unwin wanted to take it one step further into an idea of the "voluntary association", instead of an obligatory familial bond. He believed this aspect of the natural bonds came "into relationship with political power" (George Unwin, *The Guilds and Companies of London*, London: Frank Cass & Co., 1963-14.). To Unwin, willing participants of an association, much like the Guild system, would lead to the progress of Western Europe as a whole, not just England. "This approach seemed to be a stretch when trying to relate it to the whole of Europe, but it does fit the historical aspect of the medieval twelfth century" (Katherine Payne, 2011).

INTELLECTUAL CATHOLIC

Lujo Brentano, byname of Ludwig Josef Brentano (born 1844, Bavaria, Germany-died 1931), was a German economist, associated with the historical school of economics, whose research linked modern Trade Unionism to the mediaeval guild system.

Brentano was born into one of the most important German-Catholic intellectual families, originally of Italian descent.

Descended from the same bloodline was Heinrich von Brentano (1904-64), a founder of the Christian Democratic Union with Konrad Adenauer, and Foreign Minister of Germany. Brentano resigned when Adenauer had to form a coalition government with the Free Democratic Party (FDP) after the federal election of 1961 and had to accept the appointment of a FDP state secretary in the Foreign Office.

After graduating from his schools in Germany, Lujo Brentano enrolled in the Protestant Trinity College in Dublin from 1861-1862.

He received his Ph.D. in economics in

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