

## Broken Promises on 1916

John Morgan  
page 12

## Connolly and the Etiquette of Power

Brendan Clifford  
page 14

## The First Modern Labour Class

*Labour Comment*  
back page

# IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

November 2014

Vol.29, No.11 ISSN 0790-7672

*and Northern Star* incorporating *Workers' Weekly* Vol.28 No.11 ISSN 954-5891

## Scandal-Politics!

Once again the leader of Fianna Fail—which gave up anything resembling Republicanism when it ousted Albert Reynolds—has joined forces with Anti-Agreement Anti-Provos in the North in stirring up an imagined sex-scandal in the hope of poisoning political opinion in the South against Sinn Fein coming up to the General Election next year. The "slightly constitutional" Fianna Fail, founded by De Valera for the purpose of transmitting the dynamic of the War against the Treaty to electoral politics, is now stone dead. Jack Lynch gutted it, but it remained for Micheál Martin to smear it with excrement.

The last time it was Gerry Adams' brother. This time it's Joe Cahill's niece. Máiría Cahill was an active member of Sinn Fein for many years. It appears that she broke with it when, following through on the 1998 Agreement, it accepted the PSNI as a legitimate police force. Recognising the police in an arrangement under which Ulster Unionist dominance had been laid to rest—that was step too far for her. So she went to the police with a complaint that she had been raped many years earlier by a member of the IRA. The police were, of course, happy to take up her complaint. Charges were laid against the alleged rapist. The matter was sent for trial. A date was set. The trial began. But she refuse to give evidence at it. The accused was found Not Guilty.

Then, having refused to take part in her day in Court, she went to the BBC.

The BBC—as an integral part of the apparatus of the British State, which is not at all happy at being fought to the negotiating table by the Provos and being obliged to agree to a form of devolved government which it would have rejected as being out of the question in 1970—made a programme about Máiría Cahill's alleged rape in which she was not questioned too closely about her failure to give evidence at the trial of her alleged rapist which the State had arranged for her.

A difference between a trial and a TV programme is that there are no rules of evidence on TV and only as much cross-examination as the producer wants.

*continued on page 2*

Máiría Cahill Case

## Irish Budget 2015:

### a middle class budget

In reviewing Michael Noonan's last four budgets the phrase "politically astute" comes to mind. Unlike past Fine Gael Finance Ministers, whose mistakes have entered into folklore (e.g. Gilligan's Widows' Pension cut, John Bruton's VAT on children's clothing etc) he has hardly put a foot wrong. It is remarkable that in a period of austerity the Minister for Finance is probably one of the most popular politicians in the country.

Of course, like a lot of successful people, part of his success is down to ability and part of it is down to pure dumb luck. In the course of his speech he remarked that in all his budgets he never had to increase income tax. Is that not a remarkable statement? The reason why that was possible is that most of the heavy lifting was done by his predecessor, the late Brian Lenihan. As the current Fianna Fáil spokesman on Finance Michael McGrath remarked, 75% of the budgetary adjustment was made by Lenihan from 2008 to 2011. Much of the remainder of the budgetary adjustment was achieved by the momentum created in those years.

*continued on page 5*

## Higgins and the EU's existential crisis

President Higgins has been giving his views of what's wrong with the EU. *The Irish Times* has been endorsing his analysis.

"Breathing life into Europe by addressing citizens' concerns on jobs and inequality" was the theme of an *Irish Times* editorial on the existential problems facing the European Union. (17 October). It was referring to a talk by Higgins on the same issue who said that:

"European integration is now on a

fragile path, torn between the requirements of fiscal adjustment and increasing social discontent". The *Irish Times* agrees with him and says that: "Mr Higgins' radical perception that the EU's legitimacy crisis is rooted in the sidelining of the idea of a social Europe and the domination of discourse "by mainstream economics and its key assumption regarding the sustainability of self-regulating markets" will not sit comfortably with our more conservative politicians. But his essential argument that reconnecting the European

project with citizens can only come from showing that the union can address citizens' concerns like jobs and inequality is largely going unanswered from that quarter."

The first thing one would expect when a problem is described is an explanation of how this problem has arisen as it is not usually possible to fix something if that is not done. Or indeed if it can be fixed at all.

Higgins elaborated, being quoted by the *Irish Times* as follows:

"From the outside, the 'European model' is often identified, not just as an

*continued on page 7*

## CONTENTS

<b>Scandal Politics.</b> Editorial on Mairia Cahill Case	1
<b>A middle class budget.</b> John Martin	
<b>Higgins and the EU's existential crisis .</b> Jack Lane	1
<b>Readers' Letters: Text without context can be misunderstood and abused.</b> Donal Kennedy	3
<b>Appointments Commission?.</b> Philip O'Connor	7
<b>Connolly, Poppycock and Remembrance.</b> Dave Alvey (Report: Discussion at Greaves Summer School)	8
<b>Shorts</b> from <i>the Long Fellow</i> (Political ineptitude; Political Cronyism; Tall Tales from Academia; Sinn Féin on Water Charges; Fianna Fáil on Water Charges; Michael FitzMaurice; Fianna Fáil Soul Searching?)	10
<b>Bye-Election Results.</b> Report	11
<b>Correction Re MI5 &amp; Frank Aiken.</b> Philip O'Connor	11
<b>American Policy Shambles.</b> David Morrison	11
<b>Broken Promises.</b> John Morgan reports on 1916 Relatives Association	12
<b>Policing In The Absence Of A State.</b> Pat Muldowney (Maíria Cahill Case)	13
<b>Connolly And The Etiquette Of Power.</b> Brendan Clifford (Part 2 of Ballaghaderreen And The Great War)	14
<b>Opposition To Budget.</b> Finian McGrath (Press Release)	19
<b>Fifty Shades Of Grey.</b> Paul McGuill (Britain's Diplomacy of Duplicity in the early 20th century, Part 3)	20
<b>Northern Ireland Budget Cuts.</b> Mark Langhammer	21
<b>Austerity And Growth.</b> Report	21
<b>Three Poems.</b> Wilson John Haire (Poppicide; In Parliament Square I Sat Down And Cried; If At First You Don't Succeed . . .)	21
<b>Biteback: Cothrom na Feinne.</b> Donal Kennedy	22
<b>Does It Stack Up?</b> Michael Stack (Interesting article; Lusitania: Roger Casement connection; The Great War; British Legion and Poppy Day)	23

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

[The First Modern Labour Class](#)

Mondragon, Part 35\_ (back page)

[Trade Union Notes](#) : Apprenticeships (page 25)

There is one obvious reason why a plaintiff might at the last moment refuse to give evidence for the prosecution—the appearance in Court of the probability of strong rebuttal evidence. It is hard to think of another. Intimidation of the plaintiff by the defendant has not been alleged and, if it had been a factor, she would hardly gone from the police/judicial operation of the State to its BBC function.

Maíria Cahill made this accusation of rape within Sinn Fein while she was a member, thus accepting *de facto* the authority which Sinn Fein had gained in the North after British authority collapsed in Nationalist areas in 1969 and Fianna Fail welshed on its 1969 undertakings in the early Summer of 1970. A Sinn Fein Inquiry was instituted. And then those who had conducted the inquiry ended up in Court, as well as the alleged rapist, charged with IRA membership—to be found Not Guilty because of the bizarre conduct of the plaintiff. (A similar thing happened when it was demanded that the Provos should investigate the Robert McCartney killing, only to find the invest-

igators charged with IRA membership.)

Now, there can be no doubt about the Provos usurping the functions of the State. Micheál Martin has been making a great song and dance about that, and comparing it in that respect to the Catholic Church.

We must say a word in defence of the Church on this point. The Church did not usurp the function of the State. During the period of the Union the Hierarchy usually condemned the movements that the State demanded it should condemn. In 1922-3 it denounced the movements that the Provisional Government/Free State wanted it to denounce. The excommunication of the movement from which Fianna Fail developed was issued in support of the Treaty State. The Treaty Party alienated a wide swathe of public opinion by its conduct, was desperate for the support of the Church Hierarchy, and allocated to the Church areas of public life that might have been run by State organisation—as the British regime had done earlier.

The Treaty disruption weakened the governing system of 1919-21, and the

Treatyites looked to the Church for support, and the populace, disrupted by the 'Civil War', was content with the Church/State arrangements that were in place when things settled down. The Church saved the State over the Treaty. But, when the Treatyites then seemed to be more interested in humiliating the militarily defeated Republicans, instead of opening the system to them—and applying the "*freedom to achieve freedom*" principle—elements of the Hierarchy used their influence to encourage the development of Fianna Fail. (Information about this can be found in Brian Murphy's *The Catholic Bulletin*).

(The British regime, applying the rhetoric of its own ideology routinely, deplored the evil influence of priestcraft on the populace, but the more considered view of those involved in the actual governing of Ireland was that it was the people who exerted a bad influence on the priests. And, whenever the Government tried to effect a liaison with the Church in order to establish a distance between priests and people, it was the people who prevented it.)

In the North, however, the Provos did begin to act as the State. But, when they did so, where was the State? It would be truer to say that the Provos came into being for lack of a State, than that they usurped the powers of an existing State.

The State behaved with total irresponsibility in the way it enacted Partition in 1921-2. It farmed out certain functions of government in the 6 Counties to the Ulster Unionist Party and cut the region off from the democratic political life of the state, which continued to operate the major functions of State from Westminster. What passed for politics in the North was disconnected from the governing of the UK state.

The local Unionist system blew up in August 1969. The Unionist populace, cut out of British political life for two generations, went berserk against the Nationalist populace. A Fianna Fail Taoiseach said he would not stand idly by, and for nine months he didn't. He supported the establishment of Nationalist self-defence in the North and established a liaison with the self-defence groups that had sprung into being in 1969. And he declared repeatedly that Partition was the cause of the trouble in the North.

The main organisers of Nationalist self-defence were British ex-Servicemen who got fed up with the treatment they received in Northern Ireland because they were

Catholics. It was a Fianna Fail Taoiseach, now lavishly praised as a moderate because he turned tail under British pressure in May 1970, who injected Anti-Partitionism into the Northern situation in August 1969, when there was little sign of it on the ground in the North. And then, in May 1970, he had a kind of Treason charge brought against John Kelly, who had been the liaison between the Government and the Northern Defence Groups—and also against senior Cabinet Ministers and an Army Intelligence officer who had been carrying out his policy.

In August 1969 there was a *de facto* Insurrection against the Northern Ireland system. It was not anti-Partitionist, but it was an Insurrection. Self-defence against Government force is Insurrection. And, when the force of the State is excluded from an area, certain functions of State have to be undertaken by those who exclude it.

Citizen Defence against the State, which did not dispute the ultimate authority of the State, seemed to be beyond the comprehension of the Fianna Fail leader. He could only understand it as a kind of Anti-Partitionism. Partition was his explanation of everything.

Out of sheer weakness of character, he sabotaged the Citizen Defence movement in May 1970. And it was then that the self-defence Insurrection developed into a Republican War, which absorbed every vigorous element in the Nationalist community into itself in the course of time.

The Fianna Fail leader condemned the War, while continuing to say that the ending of Partition was a precondition of peace. A paradox!—a useless paradox.

The War was brought to a close over a quarter of a century later by an arrangement that was in keeping with the self-defence Insurrection begun by Catholic ex-Servicemen in 1969. What caused the Insurrection was Ulster Unionist sub-government outside the democracy of the state. What ended the War was the structural negation of majority rule in the sub-government.

The region remained outside the democracy of the state. Our attempt to bring it within the democracy of the state failed in the face of hostility by Whitehall, Glengall St., and Dublin, and will not be revived. The basis of settlement is in the medium of the conflict of communities, but with the terms of that conflict altered to negate the majority status of the majority. Each community now has a piece of the devolved

## Text without context can be misunderstood and abused

The context of the comely maiden speech is rarely considered.

It was made on St Patrick's Day 1943, the 50th Anniversary of the foundation of Conradh na Gaeilge, as well as the feast of the Saint believed to have brought Christianity to Ireland.

The President of Ireland in 1943 was Dughbhlas de hÍde, co-founder of the Conradh, who had been unable to continue as its President after the Irish Republican Brotherhood had a resolution passed at an Ard-Fheis with which he could not agree. de Valera was instrumental in having de hÍde chosen as President of Ireland, perhaps partly as compensation for this. Dev was not entirely happy with IRB tactics. De hÍde was the son of a Church of Ireland clergyman and, like most Irishmen of his day, a committed Christian. So it was not inappropriate for Dev to speak of life as God meant it to be lived and enjoyed.

Outside Irish jurisdiction in 1943 not all was well. Indeed, to paraphrase General Pershing, much of it was the nearest thing to Hell. It's not as if everything was hunky-dory before the Battle of Kursk, Pearl Harbour, or before September 1939.

George Orwell may have exaggerated the misery in *The Road to Wigan Pier*, but hunger and penury was pretty widespread in the 1930s.

Frugal comfort in 1943 would have been pipe dreams in the Western world in 1943, as it is still to much of it, and most of the "Third World" today.

The Gobshites with Attitude who mock de Valera's civilised homily are oblivious of all this.

Besides, nothing in de Valera's homily suggested that the youths and maidens should isolate themselves from participation in the political life of their communities.

The following report from *The Times* (23 January 1913) shows what was expected of British subjects before de Valera got involved in politics -

"It is the real folk spirit that has set these eight young mechanics and artisans who were one of the charms of the performance at the Kensington Town Hall last night singing and dancing as Young England should, instead of lounging at street corners, or still more hideous thought, spouting at political clubs."

**Donal Kennedy**

apparatus of government proportionate to its size.

Because the War was ended without the ending of Partition, some of those who supported it turned against the leadership that ended it, regarding them as traitors. They set about subverting the Agreement by discrediting the leadership that made it. In this project they found themselves being facilitated by the State which was fed up at having had to negotiate because of failure to win the War, and were inclined to a bit of wrecking activity.

The Agreement is clearly transitional—transitional between states. The North is no more a state today than it was fifty years ago. It is an arena of communal conflict, as it was designed to be in 1921. Whitehall reckoned that this conflict would be of advantage to it in influencing Southern politics, and so it has proved. The South has all but destroyed its own political culture during the past thirty years

because of its refusal to see what Northern Ireland is, and to think about why the most experienced State in the world shaped a region of itself into such a strange thing.

The Agreement arrangement is transitional in essence. Northern Ireland, excluded from the democratic life of the state of which it was part, could have no autonomous political life of its own. It still can't.

Northern Nationalist politics is anti-Partitionist. The SDLP is inertly so, and Sinn Fein actively.

In the early 1970s the IRA tried to win the day by central assault. In the mid-1970s it found itself being manipulated into Catholic/Protestant war by Secretary of State Merlyn Rees and his "*Ulsterisation*" strategy, and subsequently reoriented itself strategically for an advance by stages. Having accomplished the first stage of equalising the terms of the communal conflict within the North, it set about establishing itself as a strong political presence within the Republic. It

is now an all-Ireland party in constitutional politics, and it is the only one.

"*Fianna Fail, The Republican Party*" made a token gesture towards becoming an all-Ireland Party but lost its nerve. Micheál Martin sees Sinn Fein capturing ground that used to be Fianna Fail ground in the South and he gets frantic. But, instead of reverting to some kind of meaningful Republicanism, he resorts to gutter-politics, aligning himself with the Anti-Agreement Republican fringe in the North in its efforts to discredit Gerry Adams with anything that comes to hand.

The Provisional movement certainly acted the part of a State in certain areas of the North. And it acted as peacemaker as well as warmaker. It did not fight a war and let things run wild otherwise. It kept the peace within its area.

Martin says that Máiría Cahill was subjected to the rule of a Kangaroo Court. Well, she was a member of Sinn Fein, and she made a complaint to Sinn Fein, and an inquiry was instituted. It was unable to reach a conclusion. However, she remained active in Sinn Fein for many years after that. A timeline of events shows that the alleged sexual abuse and rape took place in 1997 and lasted for a year. Republican investigations on foot of her complaint were set in train in 1999-2000. Some months later she met Gerry Adams about the matter. She remained in Sinn Fein till 2006, leaving after Sinn Fein made a deal with Dr. Paisley to stabilise Power-Sharing. The deal required SF to recognise the police. The following year Máiría Cahill became a leading member of the Republican Network for Unity, a Dissident Republican group.

Máiría Cahill went to the PSNI in 2007, resulting in three court cases against Republicans: that is, the investigators were charged with IRA membership; the alleged long-term rapist was charged with IRA membership and there was a separate case of rape against the same man. The trial of this man for IRA membership was to be taken first, to strengthen the rape case, on Crown Prosecution Service advice. On the day of the trial in April 2014 Máiría Cahill refused to give evidence when she saw who was to appear for the defence and the accused was cleared of the charge. All charges against the other four defendants were dropped in May 14, after prosecution presented no evidence. The issue entered a different region of public life with a BBC Spotlight programme in October 2014.

This timeline shows that Máiría Cahill remained in Sinn Fein for nine years after

the alleged sexual abuse and seven years after the alleged 'kangaroo court'.

The Sinn Fein inquiry wasn't a proper British Court, of course. But, when she got a trial set up in a proper British Court, she refused to give evidence at it.

She willingly took part in the Sinn Fein inquiry into her complaint—and then she swore witness statements for the proper British Court against those who took part in the Sinn Fein inquiry—and they were charged with IRA membership.

When she went to Adams with her complaint, it seems he advised her to go to Social Services or to the British police. Wasn't that an awful thing to do! But if he hadn't advised her to go to the police . . . ?

And it is alleged that he said to her that some sex abusers can be very persuasive and make you think you're enjoying it. He denies having said it. But, if he had said it, it would have been an awful thing to say! Wouldn't it? Why would it?

The Dail is about to engage in a self-indulgent and self-righteous discussion of Maria Cahill's experience of Kangaroo Courts—that is, about the usurpation of the lawful authority of the British State in the Six Counties of the United Kingdom by a criminal Provo gang.

We do not recall when it was that a Dublin Government told the Catholic minority in the Six Counties—the only section of the Northern population for which it had any right to speak, or which paid any heed to it—that they lived in a legitimately-established region of the British state, and should do as the State required them.

We do not recall a Fine Gael apology for Collins's invasion of the North in 1922, and for the Treatyite incitement of Northern Nationalists to boycott the Northern system, and for the fascist Blueshirt Anti-Partitionist mobilisation of the mid-1930s, and for the wild rhetoric of the Anti-Partition League on its return to Office in 1948, and for Peter Barry's characterisation of British rule in the North as the "*nightmare*" for Catholics. Nor can we recall an apology from Fianna Fail for its 1937 Constitution, which told the Northern minority that they lived in an illegitimate jurisdiction, and under which extradition warrants from the UK were not honoured all through the Provo War

The Dail throughout the period in question incited the Northern minority to disaffection, while evading the issue of what the disaffected should do.

Southern Anti-Partition propaganda

was not the cause of minority disaffection in the North. The cause lay in the way Westminster arranged for the Six Counties to be governed. But the Dail never addressed that issue. Its Northern policy throughout has been one of duplicity and evasion. And now it is about to sit in judgement, Pontius Pilate manner, on those who could not live by evasion because they lived under the abominable system.

The Dail dare not hold the culprit responsible. He is too big for them, and he would make them feel small by dismissing realistic description of his handling of the Six Counties as Anglophobic.

Why is the Dublin Government concerning itself with this incident in British political life? Can it still not make up its mind whether the North is a region of a legitimate foreign state or is something else? The Taoiseach has indicated a readiness to meet the four members of the Republican 'Kangaroo Court' and discuss the matter with them. Does this imply a renewal of the sovereignty claim that was apparently discarded in 1998. Or is it a purely political move designed to counter the unexpected growth of an all-Ireland Party which is drawing on the Collins rhetoric which Fine Gael flirted with for three-quarters of a century without ever taking it in earnest? Is it a matter of chickens coming home to roost in the internal politics of the South? The lawyers of the members of the 'Kangaroo Court' have reason to be sceptical of the Taoiseach's motives and advise them to keep away from the morass to which Free State politics has reduced itself about the North. It is hard to disagree with that advice. ■

***The Catholic Bulletin And  
Republican Ireland***

*with special reference to*

***J.J. O'Kelly ('Sceilg')***

by ***Dr. Brian P. Murphy osb.***

314pp, Illus. Bibliog. Index. ⌘ 24, £20

***The Arms Conspiracy Trial.***

Ireland 1970: the Prosecution of Charles

Haughey, Capt. Kelly and Others

by ***Angela Clifford***

720pp. Index. ⌘ 42, £35

***Against Ulster Nationalism,***

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

by ***Brendan Clifford.***

88pp. Index. 1992. ⌘ 10, £8

Postfree from:

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

# Budget

continued

Another factor that has helped Noonan is the growth in the economy. Like all good politicians he has been claiming credit for this, but the truth is a little more complicated. As has been pointed out by the *Irish Political Review*, the media narrative of the period 2008 to 2011 is flawed. The Irish economy was not destroyed. The productive capacity remained intact. There was a collapse in employment in the retail and construction sectors. However, it is now clear that there was an over-correction, which was in part caused by the prophets of doom. The proof of this is that there is a chronic housing shortage in Dublin, which has caused rising rents and house prices.

Once confidence returned, it was inevitable that the economy would begin to make up the lost ground. All the Government had to do was to hold its nerve, which it deserves credit for doing.

As things stand, the Government's projections look quite conservative. It is predicting growth of 4.7% this year, which makes Ireland the fastest growing economy in the EU. For next year and beyond, growth of about 3.5% per annum is predicted. With the spare capacity given by a rate of unemployment of 11.1% as well as the potential for the return of recent emigrants these growth projections do not seem unrealistic.

Noonan is anticipating that employment will reach 1,920, 000 by the end of this year. This is 80,000 above the low point of two and a half years ago. Unemployment will average just above 10% next year with the number in employment reaching 1,968,000 by the end of 2015. By the end of 2016 the level of employment will reach 2 million.

In considering his approach to the Budget the Minister for Finance must first of all decide on the overall balance and then on the details of individual measures. This time last year the Government was projecting a Debt to GDP ratio of 120% for the end of 2014. The relative buoyancy of the economy (plus the inclusion of illicit economic activity in the GDP figures as sanctioned by Eurostat) has meant that the figure is more likely to be below 111%. The State has also accumulated significant cash balances. When these are deducted the net debt figure will be just under 91% at the end of this year. There

will be a primary budget surplus (the balance before interest costs) for the year of 0.3%. The deficit for the year will be a modest 3.7% of GDP, which is well below the target of 4.8% set this time last year. Earlier in the year the Government anticipated taking out 2 billion, but the economic recovery has meant that it can afford to pump 1 billion into the economy.

The *Fiscal Advisory Council* called for the target of a 2 billion adjustment to be maintained on the grounds that the overall national debt was too high and that the economic environment was uncertain, with no guarantee of interest rates remaining low. The ESRI took a more flexible line.

There is an argument that the economy needs an injection of confidence, which only the loosening of the purse strings can achieve, but it seems that the political temptation of a generous budget took precedence over economic considerations.

The 2015 budget is projected to bring in a deficit of 2.7% of GDP. This is below the EU target of 3%. It is expected that the gross debt level will drop below 100% of GDP by 2018.

This writer has no difficulty with the overall balance, but it is regrettable that more wasn't spent on the capital side and less given away in tax cuts. But, of course, increasing the current rather than the capital side is more likely to bring short term political benefits.

The interest rate on 10-year Bonds is currently a very low 1.72 per cent. There is an enormous amount of capital looking for a safe low return. This is an opportunity that should not be spurned.

In the 2015 budget current expenditure will amount to 50 billion euro, an increase of about 430 million or less than 1 percent. This seems reasonable, given the savings in social welfare as a result of reduced unemployment. The capital expenditure budget for 2015 is much smaller at 3.5 billion. This represents an increase of 6%. However, it is 6% on a smaller number. There is an obvious need for investment in affordable housing.

The Minister for Public Expenditure, Brendan Howlin, is planning on investing 2.2 billion on social housing over a 3 year period. In 2015 the investment will be 800 million. This will produce 2,500 houses next year rising to 6,700 by 2017. This is a help, but in this writer's view the plan could have been more ambitious. The Government has the opportunity to use such a powerful State institution as NAMA in its building programme.

There will be no cuts in social welfare, but not much of an increase either. However, there will be a Christmas bonus of 25%.

The emphasis seems to be on facilitating a return to work of the long term unemployed. This seems reasonable. 1.6 billion euro will be allocated to providing 300,000 training places as part of the Pathways to Work strategy.

The establishment of a Low Pay Commission is particularly welcome. 12 million will be allocated to the job path initiative to match the long-term unemployed with appropriate training and job opportunities.

The level of Child Benefit will increase by 5 euro per child per month. This is a reversal of previous policy when the argument was that the benefit was not targeted enough on the less well off. One of the strengths of the Irish economy is the high birth rate. The State should support this, but there is no reason why the Benefit cannot be taxed.

As was pointed out by Pearse Doherty of Sinn Féin the elephant in the room is the introduction of Water Charges next year, which will be based on data from 1st October this year. News reports in the months prior to the budget suggest that Fine Gael resisted demands from Labour for all welfare recipients to be exempt on the grounds that it would be a disincentive to come off welfare.

While the present writer is not against water charges in principle, greater account must be taken of the ability to pay. In this budget a 100 euro per annum subsidy per household was given to recipients of the household benefits package. These are people aged over 70 as well as some people in the 65 to 70 age bracket. The package is not means tested. It is not at all clear why such people are deserving of this subsidy. It looks like the Government is going after the 'grey vote'. The 100 euro subsidy will also be available to those eligible for the fuel allowance. There is no doubt that these people are deserving of such a household subsidy. While it is unclear how much households will be paying for water, the charge could amount to 500 euro depending on family size etc. The 100 euro subsidy for welfare recipients is not enough.

Minister Noonan, on the tax side, announced a Tax Credit for households paying the Water Charge. This tax credit will be equal to 20% of the Water Charge and will be capped at 100 euro.

Again, it is difficult to see why this Credit should be given to everyone. The

Government has belatedly realised that it has made a mess of this issue. There will be a significant number of people on low pay who do not pay any tax and therefore will not benefit from either the Tax Credit or the subsidy available to those on welfare. This is indefensible for a Government, which wants to encourage people to come off welfare and enter employment.

#### **DISTRIBUTION OF THE GOODIES**

It has been remarked in previous years that on budget day the Minister for Public Expenditure Brendan Howlin (Labour) was left with the bad news, while the Minister for Finance, Michael Noonan (Fine Gael), remained relatively unscathed. This year Howlin was spared the delivery of more bad news. However, the good news will be mostly associated with Noonan. The most attention-grabbing elements of the Budget are those that affect people's take-home pay.

The Opposition's charge that this budget benefited the better off is a little unfair. Our tax system is one of the most progressive in the OECD. Once it is decided to cut taxes, it is difficult to avoid an outcome where those who pay the most taxes benefit the most. Nevertheless, Joan Burton's claim that the Budget targeted low to medium income earners is accurate.

There follows a list of the tax cuts for 2015:

**a) Entry point for the Universal Social Charge [USC] raised from just over 10,036 to just over 12,012 euros**

This benefits people on low income without benefiting anyone on an income greater than 12,012. It is unambiguously supporting low income earners. However, it must be wondered who these people are that are on such a low income. Many of them are part-timers such as students and housewives. So they may not all be in dire economic circumstances.

**b) Reduction of lower rate of USC from 2% to 1.5%**

This benefits low and high income taxpayers, but benefits low income earners by a greater proportion than anyone else. If one wants to be pedantic, it doesn't benefit low income earners who are already exempt from the USC!

**c) Increase in the lower band of USC from 10,036 to 12,012**

Again this benefits all tax payers with an income greater than 10,036 euro. But, of course, those on low incomes will benefit by a bigger proportion of their income.

**d) Increase in second USC band from 16,016 to 17,056**

Again this benefits all tax payers with an income greater than 16,016 euro. But, of course, those on low incomes will benefit by a bigger proportion of their income.

**e) Reduction of 4% rate of USC to 3.5%**

Again, if one wants to be pedantic it could be said that people on less than 12,012 don't benefit from this reduction, while high income earners do. But this is a silly comment. As a proportion of income, the people who will benefit the most from the change are those on a low salary of 17,056 euro (equal to the minimum wage). Above that salary level the proportional benefit diminishes.

**f) Introduction of higher rate of 8% USC for salaries greater than 70,044**

This is unambiguously a progressive measure.

**g) Increase of top rate of USC from 10% to 11% for self employed salaries greater than 100,000**

Again this is unambiguously progressive. Lucinda Creighton, the ex Fine Gael Junior Minister, criticised this for discouraging enterprise. But entrepreneurs are usually employed by companies. Self employed people on a salary of over 100,000 tend to be solicitors, barristers (Lucinda's profession), accountants and medical consultants. Taxing such people will have no effect on enterprise.

**h) Reduction in top rate of tax from 41% to 40%**

This is not a progressive measure. However, there is a widespread perception that the higher rate kicks in at a too low salary (now 33,800 euro). In the UK, for example, the higher rate of 45% only begins at £150,000. Before this budget the higher rate in Ireland was, in effect, 52% (income tax 41%, PRSI 4%, USC 7%). For the self employed the rate was 55% for salaries over 100,000. After this budget the marginal rate will not have changed for those with a salary over 70,044, but those with a salaries between 32,800 and 70,044 will have benefited from an overall cut of 1%.

**i) Increase in individual tax band from 32,800 to 33,800 and married band from 41,800 to 42,800**

This is not a progressive measure but, as indicated above, there is a view that the higher rate kicks in at too low a salary. Before the budget there was a dispute between NERI (the Trade Union think tank) and IBEC (the employers organisation) as to how many people were on the higher rate of tax. NERI suggested that only one in six were on the higher rate. This seems to be based on all adults

including those on welfare. IBEC's figure of one in two seems to be based on tax payers only.

A look at the above tax cuts indicates that most of them benefit the low paid by a greater proportion than any other group. However, it should be said that the extension of the standard rate band by 1,000 euro is significant because, instead of the 1000 euros being taxed at 41% it is now taxed at 20%. This is worth 210 euros per year, while the combined effect of the cuts in the USC amount to only 156 euros per year. The low paid and all other tax payers benefit from the USC changes, but only those with a salary above 32,300 benefit from the increase in the standard rate band. Also, once a person's income goes above 33,800, the 1% cut in the top rate kicks in. If he is on 70,000 the extra savings will amount to 362 euro. So, while a householder on greater than 33,300 will have tax savings that cover his water charges, the low paid person may not. (Although the Child Benefit increase of 60 euro per child per annum might help him cross the line.)

Michael Noonan claimed in his budget speech that his reforms will increase the progressivity of the tax system. The top 1% of income earners will pay 21% of all income tax and USC. In contrast the bottom 76% of income earners will pay 20% of the total. He also said that the budget was supposed to help the "squeezed middle", which he defined as those on around 35,000 to 70,000.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Apart from the mess that was made of relief for water charges, which will be revisited by Joan Burton, this budget was politically astute. The low paid received something, but more was given to the middle class. It is cheaper to give to the middle class because those below the middle income salary don't benefit, whereas everyone benefits from tax relief to the low paid.

It seems that the Property Tax has been bedded down. The Water Charges appear to be the Government's only Achilles heel. There may be a justification for Water Charges on conservation grounds, but there is no doubt that such a tax is regressive. The burden tends to fall disproportionately on the low paid. In this writer's opinion this issue makes it all the more important for Labour to protect those on welfare and low incomes. The Party must resist Fine Gael pressure to reduce the top rate of income tax in the 2016 budget: the budget, which will most likely precede the next General Election.

The Labour Party has nothing to be ashamed about concerning this budget. However, it shouldn't try to oversell it. The "squeezed middle" is deserving of tax relief, but not any more so than the low paid. While the low paid received something, this was a budget for the middle class. Labour should demand that, if there is any more tax relief in the 2016 budget, it should focus *exclusively* on the low paid and resist Fine Gael calls for another cut in the top rate. If the Party does not do this, it will deserve to haemorrhage working class votes to Sinn Féin, Fianna Fáil and the independents.

**John Martin**

## EU

continued

'economic model', but as a way of life", a way of life that was associated with the idea of a Social Europe. At the heart of that were the cohesion policies that were Delors' political *quid pro quo* for the drive to complete the single market—now under threat "both for complex reasons of policy design, and because the current crisis has abruptly called into question the principle of solidarity between the various regions of the EU". "The very notion of a common good is one which Western modernity has rendered problematic", he says."

How and why was there a "*sidelining of the idea of a social Europe*", the sidelining of what he rightly says was central to the "*cohesion*" of the EU? How could such an obviously sensible policy be abandoned? To this there is no answer given. But such a thing could not happen by accident or unknown to people.

Neither Higgins nor the *Irish Times* can surely have forgotten that Delors lost the battle with Britain for the political soul of Europe on this issue, a battle initially launched by Margaret Thatcher—and continued consistently and more aggressively by her successors. The Heath pro-EU period has turned out to be an eccentric interlude in relations between Britain and Europe. Britain did all it could to prevent the formation of the EU in the 1950s and the European statesmen who founded it were quite clear that it was essentially an alternative to Britain's historic role in Europe. To them the European project and Britain was like oil and water.

But the working out of the victory of Thatcher victory over Delors is what created the crisis that has been ongoing since, with a Europe that no longer concentrates on the integration of Europe

but on the expansion of Europe. Its new purpose is to throw shapes in the world, with pathetic military ability that now boils down to aggravating Russia. The relationship with Russia is now its defining role in the world, its lodestar, its *raison d'être*. It is defining itself by what it is to Russia—not what it is to itself. Its purpose in life is external to itself. This is the source of its existential problems and its consequent social and ethical problems that Higgins blathers on about as if these problems came out of thin air or out of somebody's head. But for the cause of this—well that's something that dare not speak its name in Irish political circles just now.

The EU boasts about bringing peace to Europe for 50 years. The EU played no

part in that peace—it was a product of the peace not the cause of it. The peace was maintained by Russia and the USA: and was a peace that was needed after the European states had wrecked Europe and a lot of the world twice in less than 50 years.

And, when Russian power declined, the EU caused a war in the Balkans and helps aggravate every other conflict it takes an interest in—and this currently includes helping to wreck the secular developments that were evolving in the Middle East.

Old habits die hard for European states with their Imperial backgrounds. It is back to the future and the EU has become a new way of doing what Europe has always done best.

**Jack Lane**

## Appointments Commission?

Listening to Marian Finucane's interview with the new US Ambassador to Ireland (RTE, 11.10.14) put me in mind of the whole debate about political appointments and what Fintan O'Toole and others have decried as "*cronyism*" and alleged political corruption in the running of state bodies.

American ambassadors, of course, serve in their role at the invitation of the President, i.e. are selected and personally appointed by him without necessarily having any formal diplomatic qualifications at all. While some—unlike Finucane's guest—are 'career diplomats', many others have never darkened the door of the State Department. Democrat Presidents appoint loyal and, presumably, able Democrats, who while not necessarily professionally 'qualified' for the job, have the confidence of the President. Likewise with Republican Presidents. The appointees then work with professional staffs in doing their job, but doing so in the spirit of the political aims of the party which gained ascendancy in the election. Not only ambassadors, but key figures across the system are purely political appointees of this kind, and this is also what US voters know and expect when they cast their ballots.

In France, Italy and all other European countries, when people elect, for example, a Socialist, Gaullist or whatever Mayor to run their city, they do so on the understanding that the city will then be run by the Mayor's party along socialist, Gaullist or whatever lines. And this is

what French or other European voters actually vote for.

So why in the debate about related matters in Ireland do we tie ourselves up in knots, and condemn party appointments as "*cronyism*", unacceptable "*political interference*" etc.? Fintan O'Toole of *The Irish Times* and his many acolytes in the media have waged a veritable crusade on this question, claiming that the practice of political appointments—which in fact occurs here to a very modest extent compared to the US, France etc.—is a particularly Irish problem, a uniquely Irish form of awfulness, a symptom of "*corruption*" and "*cronyism*" which must be rooted out. This seems to me to be a mindless idealism which has no place in politics. Or worse, a form of cynical agitation designed to undermine further the democratic credibility of the state.

Political parties represent broad swathes of people and are the mechanisms through which politicians actually connect with meaningful forces in society. It strikes me that the campaign to root out politically aligned people from the running of things is a recipe for a political system of even less relevance and power in shaping public affairs than is currently the case.

I noticed that Finucane did not—O'Toole-like—berate the new US Ambassador about the nature of his appointment and denounce him as a beneficiary of "*political cronyism*". She presumably instinctively sensed the absurdity this would have represented. Indeed, if she had begun to berate him in this way, as O'Toole would require her to do if he had been an Irish Government appointee, I would imagine the poor Ambassador would have been

quite bewildered and bemused at her and thought she had taken leave of her senses.

I have been involved in party politics in Ireland at a modest level, though never actually served on a State Board. But I know of many people who did. They were a mixed bag of course, indeed a very colourful spectrum of people from all walks of life. Some were uninspiring but others were truly excellent, and were people who would otherwise never have had a role in overseeing the shaping of public institutions and services except that they had been asked to do so. And those services in many cases would have been the poorer for not benefiting from their insights and expertise. I have worked with people from all political parties who were in such roles and have very often been impressed by the patriotic commitment, intelligence and ability which many of them brought to such posts. In most cases, they made no money from such roles and indeed served at what was effectively a cost to them. Most had never sought the appointment, and served purely because they had been asked to.

The idea that a bureaucratic machine like the Public Appointments Commission will come up with a better system, composed of people who put themselves forward for such positions, seems very doubtful to me. What type of individuals, divorced from any organised role in public life, will put themselves forward? And what kind of person will be selected by a grouping biased by purely bureaucratic concerns and bureaucratic conservatism? I shudder to think. The inspired, unusual and brilliant will certainly be disinclined to 'apply' and would anyway be disadvantaged in such a process. I am absolutely convinced that many of the excellent "*politically appointed*" people I have come across on State Boards would never even consider putting themselves forward in such a system.

Could we, when discussing Irish politics, have a bit of sense about this whole area before getting on our high horses about what should be a very natural and, indeed, essential and largely constructive part of democratic politics?

**Philip O'Connor**

and it later became impolitic for delegations from the Committee meeting Dev to include Jameson, according to Quinn.

The first proposal was that the gardens should be in Merrion Square facing the Dáil. This was opposed by Archbishop Edward Byrne who had his eyes on the site for a grand Catholic Cathedral for the city (to replace the "Provisional Cathedral" on Marlborough Street). De Valera eventually knocked that idea on the head, evidence that he was not the captive creature of the Church he is usually presented as. In the Cosgrave Government Kevin O'Higgins rejected the siting of a War Memorial on Merrion Square too.

Jameson was responsible for getting Sir Edwin Lutyens to design the War Memorial Gardens when the present site in Islandbridge was eventually decided on. Michael Quinn made the point that Lutyens' most famous work was the house of the Indian Viceroy in New Delhi designed to awe the population as a monument to British Imperial power.

When the Gardens were finished and the Committee wanted them to be officially opened Dev considered that the international situation in 1939 was not conducive to an official opening. He also mollified the Committee with a promise of an extra £10,000 (the Gardens were financed in the first instance by £50,000 raised by the Committee with a matching amount from the Government). Michael Quinn considered de Valera to have been an adroit negotiator. The result of his research was that the idea that the Irish war dead were ignored did not stand up to historical scrutiny.

#### **REAL REDMOND!**

Brian Hanley, the second speaker, was more fluid in his presentation, which made the points he made more difficult to remember. However, what he established from the historical evidence included that:

\* There was no clear divide between those who served in the British Army and those who supported Irish independence. Many ex-servicemen joined the IRA, as is well known, and as much as 30 per cent of the Free State army were former British Army soldiers, although atrocities against the Irregulars were mainly carried out by the Collins "Old Guard".

\* John Redmond had been a consistent supporter of the cause of Fenian prisoners and himself and his brother William had been active in providing job references for the likes of Tom Clarke. Redmondism as an alternative to Republican militarism, therefore, was not historically based. John Bruton would not approve of much of

#### **Report:**

## **Connolly, Poppycock and Remembrance**

### *Discussion at Greaves Summer School*

The Greaves Summer School was held over the weekend of 12th September 2014. The Friday night session was on the topic of 'The Ideology of Remembrance: Ireland and the First World War'. The speakers were Michael Quinn and Brian Hanley. Both talks were well researched, though there was a surprising gap in Brian Hanley's knowledge of the causes of the Great War. The meeting was chaired by Tommy Graham of *History Ireland* and the contributions in the discussion that followed were interesting.

#### **ISLANDBRIDGE**

Michael Quinn's area of research is Irish/Soviet relations. As a presenter he lacked fluency but his points were well made and were backed up by interesting slides. His theme was that the story of the National War Memorial garden in Islandbridge in Dublin reflected Irish foreign policy. From his research he concluded that De Valera was more independent of Church influence and more canny in his dealings with the Memorial Committee than is generally understood. In addition to describing the historical evidence, he offered a personal suggestion about the issue of remembrance: he thought that

Ireland should have a Peace Memorial Garden and that the precedent should be the Peace Garden in Sheffield, which commemorated the dead of the Spanish Civil War among other events.

His starting point was the membership of the Memorial Committee. Its first President was the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Field-Marshal Viscount French of Ypres, who was appointed following a meeting held in the Vice Regal Lodge (which now houses Áras an Uachtarán). Michael Quinn filled in exactly who Viscount French was, his disastrous military leadership during the Great War (he was forced to resign from the command of the British Expeditionary Force) and his efforts to enforce conscription in Ireland in 1917. The Committee was straightforwardly unionist for the most part with Major General William Hickie being its token Home Ruler.

During the 1920s the effective leader of the Memorial Committee was Sir Andrew Jameson of the distiller family. Jameson was the Governor of the Bank of Ireland and a financial conservative who had the support of W.T. Cosgrave. De Valera disliked Jameson's economic views



Redmond's politics.

\* Garda reports of the annual remembrance ceremonies in the 1920s describe them as provocative because of the wearing of poppies and Union Jack waving, to the extent that there was a case for having them banned. Garda officers making such suggestions included Eoin O'Duffy and David Nelligan.

\* The idea that Cumman na nGael politicians were pro-British during the twenties does not stack up. Kevin O'Higgins, the most pro-British of them, was critical of the War Memorial Lobby.

\* Two ex-servicemen who had joined the IRA after being demobbed assassinated Sir Henry Wilson in 1922. Hanley quoted from their statements to the effect that they had killed Germans on the understanding that they were doing so in pursuit of Irish self-determination and had returned from the Great War to see militarists like Wilson blocking the Irish demand for Independence.

\* Present day Redmondites liked to play up the role of Tom Kettle in Home Rule politics; they are less interested in the contribution of his widow, Mary Kettle, who advised returning soldiers from the Dublin Fusiliers to boycott the Armistice parade in Dublin outside College Green under the auspices of Lord Lieutenant French.

\* Something that should be remembered in this centenary year of 1914 was the disciplined protests of the Republican Congress in 1934 against the remembrance movement.

\* Sean T O'Kelly made an important speech in New York in April 1926 on the subject of the 1916 Rising in which he explained and defended the phrase, 'our gallant allies'.

On the basis of the presentations, if either speaker publishes their papers, they will be worth taking a look at.

#### SPAT ON CONNOLLY

Towards the end of his talk, Hanley focused on Connolly's pro-German leanings. He referred back to a paper he had delivered at the Greaves Summer School in 2005 in which he had demonstrated that the slogan *'We serve neither King nor Kaiser'* was not a true summary of Connolly's views. This aspect of Connolly's thinking, which was echoed in the phrase *'our gallant allies'*, needed to be faced up to in the debate and literature on Connolly.

When the discussion was opened to the floor, the present writer took up that point and stated that Connolly had been right to sympathize with Germany as Germany had invented the welfare state and its

Social Democratic Party (SPD) was the most important socialist party in the world at that time. Germany, then as now, was a complex place—on the one hand there was the increasingly popular Social Democratic Party and on the other the Kaiser who tended to surround himself with conservative figures. It was also incorrect to characterize Germany in 1914 as expansionist. Karl Peters, the Anglophile German Imperialist in Africa, was frustrated at the absence of German Government support for his colonial projects and was not popular in Germany in the way that people like Cecil Rhodes were national heroes in Britain.

When Brian Hanley replied to points made in the discussion, he rejected the view that the war had been engineered by England. He considered that none of the Great Powers were ready for war and all shared responsibility for causing it. He disagreed with Connolly's pro-German stance and said that he held to the conservative position that the Great War was a conflict of Imperialist powers for which they were all responsible.

#### OPEN DISCUSSION

The first speaker was Peter Rigney who made the point that the official neglect of the National War Memorial Garden was not a deliberately discriminatory act—many cultural issues suffered neglect in the period from the 1950s to the 1990s. I was the second speaker and I complemented both speakers for basing their criticism of the present Redmondite celebration of the Great War on solid evidence and research. Properly researched analysis was the best answer to Establishment figures who could only think in sound bites. I said another way of answering the Redmondites was to organize a celebration of 1916 that was independent of official bodies. My point in defence of Connolly's position on Germany I have already mentioned.

Other contributions ranged over a number of topics. A representative of a Francis Ledwidge Commemoration Group described his dealings over the National War Memorial Gardens. A poem by Rupert Brooke had not been chosen by Lutyens but had been inserted during the Bertie Ahearn restoration of the gardens. A speaker asked why his great grandmother who died of the flu in 1918 should not be commemorated; why only remember those who died fighting for the British Army? A student asked when the idea of celebrating the war in a mindless apolitical way had begun. Brian Hanley replied that World War One nostalgia and poppy wearing

were a relatively new phenomenon even in Britain. In the 1990s, for example, it was rare to see English football managers and celebrities wearing poppies.

A contributor who had served his apprenticeship in England with workers who had fought in the Great War said that those veterans took no pride in their participation in that war. In contrast veterans of the Second World War considered that they had fought in a noble cause. He knew of a bricklayer, John Whelan, who had been a Dublin Fusilier and had raised three sons who were active socialists. Whelan had concluded that Irish workers would have been better off if Ireland had remained in the UK because of the National Health Service. Towards the end a speaker referred to a publication called *The Great Fraud* by Pat Walsh (published by Athol Books and available in Books Upstairs in Dublin or from [www.atholbooks.org](http://www.atholbooks.org)). He had read the pamphlet carefully and followed up the references in it to see was it soundly based. From his research to date he had found that the references held up. The thrust of the work was that England played a major role in instigating the Great War. The Chair interrupted to say that we were running out of time.

In the concluding remarks Brian Hanley rejected the view that the Committee of Imperial Defence in England played a seminal role in planning and preparing for war against Germany as I described earlier. Tommy Graham accepted that the Irish participants in the Great War had not been marginalized before World War Two but asked whether they had been deliberately forgotten about after that war. Michael Quinn replied by suggesting that instead of blaming this on the Government the lethargy of the Memorial Committee in defending its *magnum opus* should be investigated. For example why had they not brought a legal action against the Government?

High points of the discussion included Brian Hanley's disavowal of Connolly's pro-German stance, Michael Quinn's answer to Tommy Graham's question on the alleged neglect of the Memorial Gardens by successive Irish Governments, in addition to the interesting background information he provided on the National War Memorial Garden, and the curiosity expressed by a member of the audience regarding Pat Walsh's pamphlet. Perhaps the most hopeful sign to emerge from the meeting was the question from a young student as to how long thinking about the Great War had been apolitical.

Dave Alvey

# Shorts

from  
*the Long Fellow*

## POLITICAL INEPTITUDE

The *Long Fellow* has some sympathy—but not a lot—for Enda Kenny on the John McNulty debacle. To improve McNulty's chances of being elected to the Senate through the Arts and Culture Panel, Kenny arranged for him to be appointed to the Board of a Museum. Kenny is also being condemned for appointing someone to an institution, which he wanted to abolish. If the people (and his critics) had followed his advice and abolished the Senate he would have been spared the temptation of doing anything to annoy them.

But perhaps the Taoiseach deserves his difficulties. The fact that he (and ultimate responsibility must rest with him) found it necessary to appoint his candidate to the Board of the Irish Museum of Modern Art (IMMA) betrays an elitist approach to culture. The idea that a two week stint on the Board of IMMA could somehow transform McNulty's alleged shortcomings shows breathtaking political ineptitude. It would be difficult to imagine Fianna Fáil in all its pomp making a similar mistake.

## POLITICAL CRONYISM

The idea that there is something wrong with political cronyism *per se* betrays a misunderstanding of the political process. Contrary to what some media commentators might have us believe, democracy does not begin with elections and end with the Dáil. There is no point in electing a Government unless it can be effective. In order to be effective it is necessary to have control of the levers of State power.

The ultimate believer in cronyism was V.I. Lenin, who advocated smashing the bourgeois State. However, unlike the anarchists he knew that political power is impossible without control of the State. So the bourgeois State was replaced by the proletarian State, which in effect meant the administration would be operated by communists. After the revolution the State remained subordinate to the Communist Party.

Even by the standards of Western democracy, the Irish State is conservative. It is operated by a class of well-paid civil servants with strong employment rights. It is not for no reason that it is sometimes referred to as the "*permanent government*". The advantage of conservatism is that it

ensures continuity, but the disadvantage is that the administration becomes ossified and unresponsive to social changes.

In France and America the idea of there being anything wrong with political appointments would be considered ridiculous. When a President is elected in the USA, his regime is not referred to as the Obama Government or the Bush Government, but the Obama Administration and Bush Administration. It is taken for granted that, on the election of a new President, there will be a rapid turnover of key positions in the State apparatus.

Why do the Irish have a problem with cronyism? The Long Fellow can think of two hypotheses. Firstly, senior Civil Servants since 1922 tend to be sympathetic to Redmondism/Cumann na nGaedhal/Fine Gael and have resisted democratic political encroachments. Secondly, *The Irish Times*, for most of its history has been opposed to an effective Irish State. What other explanation is there for its constant mindless denunciation of "*corruption*"?

It is a pity that McNulty, who appears to have been an excellent candidate, felt he had to submit to media pressure. As a result the Government has lost its majority in the Senate and therefore that undemocratic institution has increased its capacity to thwart the decisions of the Dáil which is unquestionably a democratic forum.

## TALL TALES FROM ACADEMIA

It will be interesting to see if there is any fall-out from the controversy surrounding the biography of T.K. Whitaker. Readers will recall that a yarn about Charles Haughey being assaulted in a pub on the day of the budget in 1970 was incorrectly attributed to Whitaker. It turned out that the source of the tall tale was an academic biography of Jack Lynch by Professor Dermot Keogh.

It has been established in the courts that Haughey's injuries in 1970 resulted from a fall from a horse. One of the witnesses to the incident, Ruth Henderson, has never hesitated to vindicate her good name, but admitted that Keogh's piece of pub talk had not come up on her radar.

The Long Fellow glanced at Keogh's book, which weighs in at almost 500 pages plus more than a hundred pages of footnotes. From what he can see it is more a hagiography than a serious biography. The events surrounding the Arms Conspiracy Trail are written from the perspective of the arrogant civil Servant Peter Berry, except where Berry's account is critical of Lynch, in which case Lynch is given the benefit of the doubt. There is nothing

about the sacking of Garda Commissioner Edmund Garvey by Lynch in 1978. This was only the second sacking (as distinct from resignation or retirement) of such a person in the history of the State: the other one was Eoin O'Duffy who was suspected of organising a military *coup d'etat* in 1933. It is widely believed that Garvey was working for the British. This may or may not be true but it certainly merits greater attention than Haughey's morning adventures on Budget day of 1970.

## SINN FÉIN ON WATER CHARGES

The Long Fellow may be one of the few people in the world who has read Sinn Féin's policy on water charges. What other explanation can there be for the following extract from its document dated September 2014 going unnoticed:

"Funding should be generated through mixed income of which the majority is through public subsidy from the government, in addition to non-domestic charges, commercial borrowing and equity investment."

The term "*equity investment*" means shareholding. A shareholder expects a dividend from his investment, which is usually related to profits. How can such a dividend be paid except by revenue generated from the utility? Such revenue can only come from the customer or householder in the form of water charges.

If there is a shareholding in the company the utility cannot be described as being completely State owned. Such an arrangement will facilitate the full privatisation of the utility.

## FIANNA FÁIL ON WATER CHARGES

Two days before the recent By-Elections the Long Fellow contacted Fianna Fáil's research department asking for its comment. It was unaware of the document but immediately grasped its significance. Within a few hours the Party's Environment spokesman Barry Cowen TD issued a press release. It claimed Sinn Féin's—

"...calls for equity investment means it is taking the road to selling off Irish Water to private global investment funds. We know this is Fine Gael policy but is Sinn Féin now joining in.

"Fianna Fáil is opposed to privatisation of water which is a precious resource and a national asset. Placing it in private hands will potentially jeopardise a vital economic and social resource."

Unfortunately, such is the state of public discourse that the press release was largely ignored.

**MICHAEL FITZMAURICE**

The Long Fellow knows nothing about Michael FitzMaurice, the recently elected Independent TD for Roscommon South Leitrim, but he likes the "cut of his gib". The successful candidate didn't bother attending the election count as he had tasks to perform on his farm.

In an interview on RTE's six o'clock news he came across as a reflective person. On the subject of water he commented that he was in a group water scheme that produced water more cheaply than Irish Water.

He also proposed that there should be a constitutional referendum preventing Irish Water from being privatised. What an excellent idea!

The Long Fellow thinks that most people are not opposed to paying for water as long as account is taken of the householder's ability to pay as well as usage. Also, they are vehemently opposed to the idea of someone profiting from this valu-

able natural resource. In accounting terms, Irish water should be a cost centre rather than a profit centre. Its mission statement should be to produce water as efficiently and cheaply as possible for the benefit of the Irish people and not to generate revenue or profits.

**FIANNA FÁIL SOUL SEARCHING?**

The failure of Fianna Fáil to win the Roscommon South Leitrim by election seems to have caused some debate within the party. Eamon O'Cuiv TD thinks the party should move to the left. Dara Calleary TD made the comment that maybe the party is too submissive towards Europe.

The Long Fellow is an enthusiastic Europhile, but maybe Calleary is on to something here. Membership of the EU has brought many benefits to Ireland but maybe—to use a phrase of a former Fianna Fáil leader—we should begin to impose "Irish solutions on Irish problems".

## Bye-Election Results

Two by-elections were held on October 10th, in Dublin South-West and in Roscommon /South Leitrim. In the former Sinn Fein topped the poll, while in the latter it was Fianna Fail. However, both parties were overtaken by Independents, after the counting of transfers. In Roscommon, Michael Fitzmaurice was supported by the outgoing Independent TD Luke 'Ming' Flanagan, who had been elected to the European Parliament. Fitzmaurice won the

seat on the seventh count, defeating Ivan Connaughton. The Dublin S-W election followed the election of Fine Gael's Brian Hayes to the European Parliament. Paul Murphy of the Anti-Austerity Alliance was elected on the eighth count, though Sinn Fein's Cathal King had been expected to win. It is notable that the three main parties were trounced in this seat.

Results for the main candidates given below.

### Dublin S-W

Paul Murphy, AAA, 6,540 first preferences, Final 9,565  
Cathal King, SF, 7,288 first preferences, 30.3%. Final 8,999  
Ronan McMahan, Ind, 2,142 first preferences, 8.9%.

### Roscommon

Michael Fitzmaurice, Ind. 6,220, first preferences, 18.7%. Final: 14,881  
Michael Connaughton, FF 7,334, first preferences, 22%. Final: 12,050  
Maura Hopkins, FG 5,593, first preferences, 16.8%

## Correction: O'Halpin, MI5 and Frank Aiken

In my article 'Frank Aiken: MI5-TCD character assassination debunked' (IPR, July 2014) the titles of different but related "official histories" of various branches of British Intelligence were inadvertently mixed up. My article referred to Christopher Andrew as "the 'official' historian of MI6" and as the author of the book, *MI6: The History of the Secret Intelligence Service 1909-1949*, which in fact was authored by Keith Jeffrey, Professor of British History at Queens University.

Andrew wrote the "authorised history" of MI5 (not MI6), *The Defence of the Realm: The Authorized History of MI5*. The comments ascribed to Andrew in the article are his own, however, both from his history of MI5, in which he also repeats the character assassination by MI5 of Jack Jones referred to in the article, and from his glowing Foreword to TCD Professor O'Halpin's book, *MI5 and Ireland, 1939-1945: The Official History*.

I am grateful to Manus O'Riordan for pointing out my error in mixing up these two book titles.

**Philip O'Connor**

## American Policy Shambles

American Vice-President Joe Biden has been running off at the mouth again, blaming allies for nurturing extremists in Syria:

"And what my constant cry was that our biggest problem is our allies—our allies in the region were our largest problem in Syria. The Turks were great friends—and I have the greatest relationship with Erdogan, which I just spent a lot of time with—the Saudis, the Emiratis, etc. What were they doing? They were so determined to take down Assad and essentially have a proxy Sunni-Shia war, what did they do? They poured hundreds of millions of dollars and tens, thousands of tons of weapons into anyone who would fight against Assad except that the people who were being supplied were Al Nusra and Al Qaeda and the extremist elements of jihadis coming from other parts of the world. Now you think I'm exaggerating—take a look. Where did all of this go? So now what's happening? All of a sudden everybody's awakened because this outfit called ISIL which was Al Qaeda in Iraq, which when they were essentially thrown out of Iraq, found open space in territory in eastern Syria, work with Al Nusra who we declared a terrorist group early on and we could not convince our colleagues to stop supplying them. So what happened? Now all of a sudden—I don't want to be too facetious—but they had seen the Lord. Now we have—the President's been able to put together a coalition of our Sunni neighbors, because America can't once again go into a Muslim nation and be seen as the aggressor—it has to be led by Sunnis to go and attack a Sunni organization. So what do we have for the first time?" (See [Biden: Turks, Saudis, UAE funded and armed Al Nusra and Al Qaeda](#) by Sharmine Narwane.)

He was answering questions after delivering a speech on foreign policy at Harvard. The text is taken from an audio of his answers to questions.

He was also less than enthusiastic about the "moderate" opposition in Syria, saying there is no "moderate middle {in Syria} because the moderate middle are made up of shopkeepers, not soldiers". Sharmine Narwane comments:

"Keep in mind now that just two weeks ago Congress approved—at the request of this White House—\$500 million dollars to train and arm "moderate" Syrian rebels. Obama's second-in-command is saying there are none of those, so who exactly are US forces teaching to fight with heavy weapons in Saudi training camps today?"

But as far as I can see, the US means to vet and train its own 5,000-strong Syrian force, rather than arm existing groups.

AP reports Martin Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as saying: "before training can start, the U.S. and certain allies must screen potential candidates in Syria for competence and loyalty. Initially, they will be provided small arms and other light weaponry, Dempsey said, but that could graduate to more sophisticated weaponry—"once we know what's in their hearts". Ironically, Dempsey was once in charge of training the Iraqi security forces.

**David Morrison**

### Great Satan!

On the *Today* programme (10.1.14) Jack Straw was being interviewed as part of the delegation of UK parliamentarians who

visit Iran in order to support the current moves towards a normalisation of relations between the west and that country. He was asked about a recent statement by one of the main Islamic leaders that the US was *doing the work of Satan in the world*. His response was interesting. He said that he could understand that perspective as in his lifetime a democratically elected Government had been toppled with the assistance of the West, the Shah had been sustained in power by the West, and Iraq had been encouraged to go to war with Iran for what were seen at the time as Western strategic interests. He went on to say that we had to admit to this record and understand why some contemporary opinion in Iran adopts the position it does (E.D.).

belly-laughs of he who would fawn upon the stranger. Pearse spoke of honour. But today honour is but a trinket. And a promise is a bauble.

Pardon me. Sit up, Heritage Minister Heather Humphreys. Maybe you are the one. There amid all those tailors' dummies. Unknown, unreckoned. We await you. You must have read the files. You will know of the promises made. These people are citizens. Their forebears began it all. They brought honour to Ireland and now bring honour to themselves. But perhaps you are lost in the morass. The question is, are you complicit? We shall see. Minister Deenihan came and went. He made some sounds. But that was all. Over to Minister Humphreys. In you we must trust.

**Relatives of those who turned out in Easter 1916, disturbed at the Government's inaction in organising a suitable centenary commemoration, met in Dublin to organise an association which will take matters in hand.**

## Broken Promises!

On Sunday, 12th October, the 1916 Association held a meeting in Alexander Hotel, Dublin, attended by a large and enthusiastic audience. Meanwhile, it seems, the Government has gone into hiding. The Easter Rising presented the British Government with some dilemmas. The native replacement seems to be running scared. Of what? Of whom? Heretofore, it was promises, promises. But there has been no sign of any smoke. There has been no diamond-studded ring produced. Meanwhile, The Association seeks:

- \* To honour and pay fitting tribute to all those who fought in the cause of Irish freedom in the 1916 Rising.
- \* To ensure public participation in all 1916 commemoration events.
- \* To ensure the preservation of all remaining physical links to the 1916 Rising.
- \* To mark all locations directly associated with the events of the Easter Rising.

The Easter Rising was extraordinary. It contained extraordinary men and women. There are those who are sympathetic. The 1916-1921 Club has rallied to the cause. There are good friends in the Dublin City Civic Authority. Councillor Ring, of the famed Ring family of Ballybough, has been a standout. But lethargy pervades Dáil Éireann. Maybe more than is hidden. Some, of course, have desires, looking near East. But we have not been told. Perhaps we have not been made ready for the oven, yet. The Association continues, speaking for its

members: It will continue to seek to engage with Government parties.

Meanwhile, Mr. James Connolly Herron, and his associates, continue *The Moore Street Preservation* struggle, as indefatigably as his forebear bravely struggled. I do not think many mentioned will be over-ready. Ever. Anyway, time will flush out those who loiter. Their hand may become exposed.

The former Taoiseach, John Bruton, has blustered and poured cold water upon whoever might listen. His shameful words bring disgrace upon himself. *Et tu, Brute*. His foot-beagle, Senator David Norris, has of course abetted. As the chest-heaving barn-owl hoots, the corn-crake cackles. The ghost of Patrick Pearse looks down. *"You must not grieve for all this. We have preserved Ireland's honour and our own. Our deeds of last week are the most splendid in Ireland's history. People will say hard things of us now, but we shall be remembered by posterity and blessed by unborn generations."* And so it has come to pass. All that was good, was taken. His last thoughts were of his mother.

Before withdrawing from the GPO, on the Friday evening of Easter Week, the President addressed the assembled garrison. His words resounded, as they still do. *The Soldier's Song* rang out. Then, amid the tumult, they withdrew in small groups. They entered Moore Street. The last Redoubt of the Republic; Now, spoils desired by greedy money-men; Now the subject of the corn-crake's cackle, the

Meanwhile, all over the country television sets are jumping. Screens display the horrors of the Great War, now made lovely. Violence is being portrayed as the norm, *a la Brute* and the cackle. Sneaking regards proliferate. Huge outside influences dominate. A very jaundiced version of history pervades. Many were duped. Bribes, in many forms, dangled. The system played along. The Good and the Great supervised. The Establishments stood full square. Enemies were created for purpose. Sacrifices were offered. Thousands perished. Spoils were divided. Brutes grew bigger. But honoured then; honoured now. They will continue to be honoured. Here, there, all over. Especially on the television screens. Even as Pearse wrote:

Or children with bare feet upon the sands  
Of some ebb'd sea... on the streets.  
Near to the gate of Heaven.

But many took the shilling. Many were bought. When you are bought, they know you stay bought.

Freedom! *Is brá é Saoirse!* They are free to spout all they like. The cacklers and the fawners. Even as they lick the stranger's boots. Even as The Ghosts of Arbour Hill blanch. As they grow fatter. As some new-found hero is glorified in the other's cause. As the people's cause is smothered in the other's. As the lie is repeated and repeated until the truth becomes a mystery. But, Pearse said, *"We shall be remembered by posterity and blessed by unborn generations"*. Today, Pearse can be denigrated by Bruton. It is the way of things. *Is brá an rud é Saoirse!* Prophetic words, *"children with bare feet!"* Pop-eye sniggers. Their war is romanticised.

The heroes of the 1916 Rising seized the GPO and other strongpoints. Their

descendants will commemorate them. This will be done, anyway. With or without the stalwarts of Leinster House. A momentum has gathered. There is now a head of steam. This happened a century ago. The Hussars came galloping down Sackville Street. History awoke. The people will do it, if the others don't.

Let them string along, if they like. They are welcome, I think. The people have asked and been spurned. The Fat Man and the Corn-crake have spoken. But they only listen, those who would have the same said. Shame may descend upon those behind the walls of the Republic's facade. Shame may make the leaders follow. The Tricolour still flaps as the wind blows. Below the people pursue their legitimate ways, unhindered, their rights gained. To pursue that which they were owed.

Now our Taoiseach has spoken. He suggests a statue of John Redmond be erected in Leinster House. At his word, 50,000 Irish fell in war, in the Stranger's uniform. How many did they kill? How many? Redmond egged them on. They must have had mothers too. Who cries? Do these people cry? What motivates them? Why must they have others do the killing? They have no mercy.

Our great Proclamation refers to "*her exiled children in America*", and "*gallant allies in Europe*". These exiled children in America and allies in Europe have been long neglected by our Government. It is time they were invited to the 2016 Commemoration. This should be on behalf of the "*Association*". The Embassies of the nations involved should be part of the commemoration. At the behest of Government, for and behalf of the people. Spread out the celebration. Let it be inclusive. Where amends are required, amends should be made. Though some killed for another reason, let no one kill again in the other's cause. The advocates of the lovely war will someday—somewhere—be asked for answers.

*"In this supreme hour the Irish nation must... prove itself worthy of the august destiny to which it is called."*

Would that Dublin would emulate Boston with its own Freedom Walk.

*"The Proclamation of Poblacht na hÉireann. The Provisional Government of the Irish Republic. To the people of Ireland. Irishmen and Irishwomen":* With "*Amhreán na bhFiann*", it should be displayed in schools. There is much to ponder. Let us all read it. Let us observe it. Let us not fail in our generosity.

May the fallen in the city centre be the last to fall. Let the hand that felled them be held, And be ungloved, exposed to all. If your hand strikes down our sons and daughters, then never let it be extended. Symbols do not suffice. Let the sword be sheathed, save to defend. Let not the spurious prevail.

In defence of the Republic, all over the city, they fell. Freely, they gave their all. Seeking naught. In an eerie synchronicity of dates, others would fall, too, without alignment, in similar places, lately, at the hands of the same aggressors. *Praemonitus*,

*praemonitus*. It is ever thus. There are those who would have The Rising shrouded in the in-glory of their Master's War. But who are the dupes? There are those who want to be duped. Sadly, duplicity thrives. Arise now and let freedom out. Open the gates and let out a cry: The people know. They know. The fools, the fools, they have left us with our "*Fenian dead*".

Each Easter, on the 3rd of May, at 0330 hors, let a lark be released from the Stonebreakers' Yard, Kilmainham Goal. Let it be the National Day. Let it be "*la na Saoirse*".

**John Morgan, Lt. Col. (retd.)**

Letter Submitted to *Irish Times*, 28th October

## Policing In The Absence Of A State

Brian Feeney's article (25/10/14) on the evolution of non-state policing is a bit of a muddle.

The first "Catholic" no-go area was in Derry in August 1969. Republicans were not, as Republicans, particularly influential in policing it or keeping civil order at the time. That job was done primarily by Civil Rights stewards who were mainly trade union officers and activists with a tradition and philosophy of organisation. They knew how to get a team of volunteers to turn out, in time, at the right place, to perform agreed tasks. Also they were strongly inclined towards due process, including the 'law and order', whose official agents had become violent hooligans that had to be kept at bay in order to preserve life and limb.

This situation arose in the first instance out of misplaced Civil Righter faith, firstly in the socialist government of "Honest" Jim Callaghan, and then in their expectation of some kind of relief or protection or advocacy from the Irish government of "Honest" Jack Lynch. When governments failed to deliver, the first self-governing, self-policing arrangement, including an improvised prison, had to be quickly set up. Non-state authority figures such as clergy, teachers and solicitors did nothing. In 1969, as in later years, the task was undertaken by extraordinary ordinary people who would otherwise have busied themselves with their jobs, their families, sport, music, pubs, dance-halls.

The people who kept order in Civil Rights processions turned themselves into policemen to deal with everyday crime and disorder when no alternative was available. The main organiser of non-state policing in Derry, or "Chief of Police", was an English ex-serviceman, not a Republican or Catholic. He subsequently held high elected

office for many years. It is not likely that he knew of the First Dáil and its IRA courts and police. The authority for policing in 1969 was popular support. There were no beatings or shootings. There were no weapons worth talking about in the area.

Difficulties emerged such as accident insurance claims. Companies expected reports to be endorsed by the "official" police, and would not pay out otherwise. Eventually a kind of treaty or agreement was made with the British military that an unarmed, reformed RUC policing would take place in the area. The improvised police force was stood down for a while.

Though some members of the official police (RUC) were genuine policemen, the force as a whole was politicised and involved in military activity rather than police work *per se*. They were dangerous to know, no matter what your politics were. The new policing arrangement failed. By then the Provisional movement was influential, and they inherited policing for several decades. The RUC were a police force with a military function. The Provisionals were an army with a policing function. The position both forces were in was not ideal.

Policing by the Provisional movement was popular and effective, and there is still a certain nostalgia for it. Given its terms of reference and conditions of operation it probably had less bad apples than most police forces, and such thuggish elements as it contained were generally kept under strict political and military control. In some respects it delivered a relatively crime-free utopia. You did not need to lock your front door at night. The situation currently, while not too bad, is no utopia. You certainly don't leave your door unlocked at night.

**P. Muldowney**

## Connolly And The Etiquette Of Power

Eamonn Maloney, a Labour TD, brought down wrathful condemnations on himself when, in a letter to the *Irish Times*, he said he agreed with the opinion of James Connolly, a founder of the Labour Party, about Britain's reasons for making war on Germany in 1914, and quoted Connolly's opinion as expressed in the *Irish Worker* of 29th August 1914:

"The British capitalist class have planned this colossal crime in order to ensure its uninterrupted domination of the commerce of the world. To achieve that end it is prepared to bathe a continent in blood, to kill off the flower of the manhood of three of the most civilized great nations of Europe... Yes, this is the war of a pirate upon the German nation."

Maloney was certainly out of order. The proper relationship with Connolly of members of the Labour Party, and of members of the State, of which Connolly was also a founder, is to admire him as an empty icon, a plaster saint, whose actual opinions about anything are not worth bothering your head with, and whose opinions about the Great War it is particularly virtuous to remain in ignorance of. Biographies of Connolly have been written in which it is not mentioned that during the last two years of his life he was a consistent supporter of Germany in the War. Ruth Dudley Edwards accomplished that feat in a biography, and also in entries for a work of reference that she (being well connected) was commissioned to write.

And Connolly was hardly cold in his grave when the Redmondite Home Rule publishers, Maunsell, reissued his *Labour In Irish History* with a malicious Introduction by war-mongering Home Rule journalist Robert Lynd. Lynd explained that in August 1914 the affairs of the world got too complicated for Connolly's simple understanding to grasp, and therefore his opinions about the War are not worth considering. And Lynd gave the final word on Connolly and the War to pioneering war propagandist in the London Liberal press, Home Ruler Tom Kettle—who explained that the world had got too much for Connolly to cope with and he had relapsed in despair into a kind of wild anarchism. And Lynd's dismissive Introduction was reprinted with the book by the Communist Party.

Lynd wrote at a time when it was well known that Connolly had supported

Germany and the fact needed to be explained away. In April 1916 he had ceased to be a fringe agitator expending his talents in a hopeless cause. He had made the going for the Insurrection with his small Citizen Army, he had been the battle commander of the Insurrection, and the mode of his execution was particularly memorable, with the *Irish Independent* taking the British to task over the delay, and then the rush to the firing squad before he had recovered sufficiently from his wounds to be able to stand up to receive bullets.

A job needed to be done on Connolly in 1916. Lynd and Kettle did it to the best of their abilities as enemies who could feign a degree of sympathy with him. But the best thing would be the wiping out of knowledge of Connolly's opinion of the Great War. Ruth Dudley Edwards has demonstrated how thoroughly that was accomplished, as did Fergus D'Arcy with his entry in the *Dictionary Of Irish Biography*.

In doing the dirty on Connolly, Kettle only did his duty as a British militarist. The story which he fed the British Liberal backbenches (who were not eager for war in early August 1914) was that a new barbarism had arisen in the world, generated out of Nietzsche's philosophy of evil which had captured the mind of Prussia, and through Prussia the mind of Germany. So perhaps he thought he was doing Connolly a favour—in making the case that he did not know what he was doing in 1914-16.

At the same time it is fairly evident that Kettle knew in 1916 that his own work had been undermined by the Insurrection instigated by Connolly. His useful contribution to the imagined war of Civilisation against Barbarism would have been to continue in propaganda and recruiting, but he insisted on going into the trenches, where he was just one body among millions of bodies, and he duly got himself killed. And before he was killed he wrote a poem expressing the fantasy that the British Empire had launched this war for "*a dream born in a herdsman's shed/ And for the secret Scripture of the poor*".

So take your pick: A war to stifle German commerce and seize German markets (things already achieved by 1916); or, A war for the realisation of the vision of primitive Christianity as a means of defeating barbarism.

Eamonn Maloney's letter in the *Irish*

*Times* was denounced by the Religion Correspondent of the *Irish Times* (Patsy McGarry) in his *Rite & Reason* column. It struck me as very odd editorial practice to have condemnation of a letter by a columnist. For one thing, the pretence of discussion is displaced by *Ex Cathedra* pronouncement.

I commented on McGarry's pronouncement last month without having seen Maloney's letter, which was a response to another letter which accused him of dishonouring the memory of the Irish who died in the British Army because he questioned the cause for which Britain had gone to war.

Maloney is seriously at fault in raising the matter of the cause of the War, in the sense of the purpose for which the State went to war. The Centenary propaganda, which has all the weight of the Establishment behind it, insists on merging the purpose for which the State went to war with the agitational slogans it used to persuade millions of civilians, with no prior militarist proclivities, to enlist for the fighting of the War.

Ten years ago, when all of this started, I published a pamphlet about the practice of dissociating the purpose of the State from its recruiting agitation, and said that the way the matter was being dealt with could be summed up in one of Nietzsche's aphorisms: "*Do ye say that a good cause halloweth even war? I say to you: a good war halloweth any cause*".

A case could be made that, in the era of the absolute State, the propriety of the individual who responds to the call of the State to join the Army for the purpose of enabling the State to make war is not to be questioned. The State provides for the individual who, unlike the time when there was national self-sufficiency, could not exist without it, therefore the individual has no ground to stand on in opposition to the State. That became the case in Britain in 1915. Voluntary recruitment raised the Kitchener Armies. When they were used up—as they were in a few months—organised compulsory recruitment by indirect methods was introduced in 1915. When that proved to be inadequate, legal compulsion was applied in 1916. Legal compulsion was not applied to Ireland lest, under the bad example of the Easter Rising, it should precipitate revolution, but it was accepted in Britain with very little dissent. The will of the individual then became no more than a particular expression of the will of the State. The individual must sacrifice himself to the need of the State, and his action ceases to be governed by his opinions.

That would be an intelligible position on the War, defensible on the actual terms of modern existence. But that is not the position that is put. It is ideologically unacceptable though it is the actuality of things.

"*Sacrifice*" is the refrain of commemoration /celebration of enlistment in Britain, where it was obligatory, and in Ireland where it remained semi-voluntary, and "*sacrifice*" for the purpose of war is regarded as being self-evidently a good thing because it served the purpose of the State, whatever that purpose was—though a very bad thing in the case of the 1916 Insurrection, where it was entirely voluntary.

So Eamonn Maloney stirred up a hornet's nest by distinguishing between the cause of the State in making war and the reasons for which individuals enlisted under the influence of Redmondite propaganda.

The *Irish Times* Religion Correspondent was the first to buzz him (August 26), followed three days later by the Editor of *Phoenix*:

"Labour TD Eamonn Maloney's outburst against John Redmond—"who promoted, recruited and shamed Irishmen into killing for Great Britain"—must be the first time this intensely anti-Republican politician ever attacked cruel England for its role in "the thousands of Irish boys and men who were slaughtered during WW1. Perhaps Maloney recognises the precedent set by Redmond's fate in the 1918 general election at the hands of Sinn Fein" (*Phoenix*, Aug 29: *Joan Burton's DSP Comrades*).

The article, having done its bit for whatever cause it is that it serves, then wanders off into comment on personnel of the Democratic Socialist Party, which ceased to exist a generation ago, but of which Maloney had been a member.

The burden of it is that Maloney has discovered that the Great War was not a good war because his seat in Dublin South West is in danger from Sinn Fein:

"Maloney's Republican rhetoric against Redmond is an effort to get with the gathering SF storm but his former comrades in the Democratic Socialist Party will have been startled to read his denunciation of the Brits... The DSP, whose leading light was the late Jim Kemmy, was a two-nationist party... in the early eighties. It was a virulently anti-Republican group that believed even the Workers' Party (or Stickies) to be soft on Republicanism..."

Is Maloney bending to a Sinn Fein wind when he quotes Connolly against Redmond in rejection of Britain's Great War propaganda? It is news to me that Sinn Fein has adopted Connolly's view of

the War, or that it has distinguished itself clearly from Redmond's view. I have noticed an eagerness on its part to be in line with the neo-Redmondite celebration of the War—or of the "*sacrifice*" made by the Home Rule Irish for the War, which is not distinguished from the reason for which the State fought the War.

I can see why Sinn Fein is reluctant to take a distinctive stand on this and other matters. It operates as far as possible within the political culture of the State as it finds it, distinguishing itself only on one or two points which are judged to be politically advantageous. It does not exhaust itself on a wide range of issues which others should be dealing with. Its electoral success has a good effect on a political situation which had worn threadbare, and I wouldn't quibble with the means by which it has been achieved. But the suggestion that Eamonn Maloney expressed agreement with Connolly on the Great War following a fashion set by Sinn Fein is absurd.

And is it the case that agreement with Connolly, against Redmond, on the Great War is *ipso facto* "Republican"? Only someone who had not bothered to read Connolly's extensive publications on the War would take it to be so.

He deplored the fact that the War was being fought. He expected the Socialist International to live up to its promise to prevent European War by working class action, and was ready to play his part in such action. When the resolutions of the International proved to be all wind, he re-orientated himself quickly to the fact of war. He judged the British Empire to be the prime mover in the War and saw the German position as essentially defensive. And, looking at the social composition of Britain and Germany, he saw the condition of working class life as being immeasurably better in German capitalism than in British. He supported the German Empire on socialist grounds and indicted Britain as the disrupter of international peace.

It is only by dismissing his view of the War as a mere application of the *England's Difficulty* principle that his analysis of the War can be treated as self-evidently "*Republican*".

His case on the War was not essentially Republican, and was not kept alive by Republicans of later generations, nor even by the Communist Party—and is not being revived by Sinn Fein today. His alignment with German Socialism when the War got going in earnest was with the Right Wing that supported the war effort. At the outset he published an article in praise of Karl Liebknecht, who was rumoured to

have been executed for opposing the German war effort. That was when there was still some hope of international socialist action to prevent war from taking off. When it became clear that the Socialist International had collapsed, and that the British, French and German States had effective influence on their working classes to ensure the continuation of the War, he re-evaluated the situation and came down squarely on the side of Germany, giving reasons for doing so that had nothing to do with Republicanism. And he never again mentioned Liebknecht—who adopted a policy of Leftist quibbling.

"*The DSP... was a two-nationist party... It was a virulently anti-Republican group*"—If it was virulently anti-Republican, that was not because it was two-nationist, assuming that by "*Republican*" is meant anti-Partitionist. I know little about the DSP, but the idea that the Ulster Protestants should be treated as a distinct nation was proposed by me in 1969 as a factual description of social existence in the Six Counties. It has no necessary political implication. In the first instance I proposed it to nationalist Ireland, at a moment before there were either Stickies or Provos, so that it might develop sufficient understanding of what existed in the North to be able to say something to the Ulster Protestants that did not make the hair at the back of their heads bristle. When they were told that they formed part of a common nationality with Irish Nationalists, that cut away the possibility of communication with them before it started.

Fianna Fail, Fine Gael and Labour all denied the fact of national division in the North. So did the Official Republicans when they came about. The only people who did not deny it as a fact were some early Provos with whom I discussed it early in the 1970s. They accepted that it was a fact and were determined to overcome it by force. When that proved to be beyond them, they came to terms with it as a fact with which they would have to live.

Nationalist Ireland insisted on misunderstanding what Ulster Unionism was, and in 1970 it was convinced that Unionism would fall apart if political pressure, supported by a degree of physical pressure was applied to it. I rarely make predictions but I predicted then that Unionist unity would outlast the frantic Anti-Partition unity that was raised against it.

It took almost thirty years for the Southern State to revoke its assertion of sovereignty over the North, based on the groundless assumption of a common

nationality of Unionists and Nationalists. The result of doing in 1998 what might have been done with advantage in 1970 was negligible. And, even then, it was only done half-heartedly, as an empty formality, without any follow-through in the form of curiosity about what the Ulster Unionists actually were. Ulster Unionism remains as alien to the Southern political mind as it was in 1969. And it is only in Sinn Fein in the North that there is any sign of a will to understand it.

The damage done by the stubborn dogmatic denial of the fact of national division has done damage to the national political culture of the South. Ulster Unionism is undamaged by it.

I don't know what went on in the DSP. Before it was formed, I spoke in debates on the North organised by Jim Kemmy in Limerick. At one of them I was denounced as an Orange/Imperialist stooge by Eoghan Harris. He changed his mind some years later and denounced me as a small-minded Catholic-nationalist, even though I kept saying the same thing.

I had no contact with the DSP. As far as I could gather as a causal observer in Belfast, it took its orientation from Professor Richard Kearney's ideology of "post-nationalism" of which I could form no clear idea. I presume that post-nationalism was not two-nationist.

The only contact I ever had with the Editor of *Phoenix* was hearing him deliver a eulogy on Géry Lawless, who was, among other things, a police informer.

\*

In the second year of the War a socialist pamphlet published in Germany argued that the experience of the War demonstrated that the idea of the Socialist Revolution had been misconceived. It had been thought about in terms of barricades and *coup d'état*, but these were phenomena of the bourgeois revolution. A *coup d'état* might clear the political ground for an unobstructed development of capitalism, but socialism was something which had to be constructed rather than set free.

That, as far as I recall, was the general idea of it in a pamphlet by Paul Lensch. And it accorded with the understanding that socialism would be a development out of capitalist society—or a development within capitalist society that at a certain point would cause the cocoon of capitalism to fall away.

The material that Connolly published on Germany in 1915-16 had to do with the socialised forms that existed within the capitalist/monarchist state. And, of course, his own interest had been in Syndicalism,

which would be a kind of working class ownership of means of production which might begin within capitalism.

His publications on Germany assume a dissociation of Socialism from Republican barricade politics, at least in the case of Germany. But he went on the barricades in a bourgeois revolution! But this was in a situation in which a bourgeois national revolution remained to be accomplished—and in which a socialist element might be built into it at source.

I assume that his thinking was on these lines during the year and a half between the settling down of the Great War and the Insurrection. He went on the barricades (and was shot at the instigation of William Martin Murphy's *Irish Independent*), having commissioned William O'Brien to realise the social possibilities opened up by his part in the Insurrection. And, if the outcome was not Socialism, it was far removed from the 1913 situation in which Murphy could hope to free Capitalism from Trade Unionism.,

It is interesting to note that Eamonn Maloney, by quoting Connolly, touched a raw nerve in the Editor of *Phoenix* as well as in the Religion Correspondent of the *Irish Times*—the same raw nerve camouflaged by a veneer of difference. The inheritance from Connolly is awkward, and whoever takes it seriously must be rubbished. But Patsy McGarry must at least be given the credit for asserting a contrary view of the War to Connolly's, and not relying on abuse of personalities.

He says that Britain and Ireland went to war against Germany because "*the neutrality of Belgium had been violated*". He quotes the then German Chancellor as saying that it was necessary for the German Army to pass through Belgium and "*Necessity knows no law*", and describing the 1839 Treaty of Belgian neutrality as "*a scrap of paper*". Germany, McGarry says, launched "*an invasion with a distinctly anti-Catholic flavour*" in which "*an estimated 6,000 Belgians were slaughtered... Echoes of the Islamic State in Iraq today*". He concludes:

"Germany was unequivocally barbaric and the aggressor. This is the view of Germany itself. Its president Joachim Gauck said on August 6th last... in Liege: 'This war began in western Europe with Germany's invasion of neutral Belgium. The invasion only followed military logic, and it thus became apparent on the very first day that treaties were worthless and that the standards of civilisations had been rendered null and void'..."

I seem to recall, though McGarry does

not quote it, that the German Chancellor, when saying that necessity knows no law, also said that the march through Belgium was wrong and Germany would do its best to put things right when the emergency was over.

The conduct of the German Government in August 1914 does raise doubts about the fitness of the German State to exist. German development followed British development, up to a point. But what it did when it decided that a march through Belgium had become a military necessity after the Russian mobilisation and the activation of the Franco-Russian Treaty, was something that Britain would never do: it said what it did was wrong but necessary, and it would do its best to make amends.

Britain has fought about 200 Wars. Did anyone ever hear it say that what it did was wrong? Germany had fought a mere handful of wars and had not learned the British maxim that "*the truth is the casualty of war*". British media commentators usually recite this maxim at the outset of a war and switch over to the state of mind appropriate to war.

Churchill explained it frankly. He said the thing to do is devise an argument justifying what you intend to do on the highest moral principles, and it doesn't matter if the argument seems implausible to some at first, because if you win the war, the fact of victory will certify its truth, while if you lose quibbles about truth won't matter.

If Britain had found itself in a position comparable to Germany's, it would have declared self-righteously that Belgium had broken the Treaty conditions under which its creators had placed it in 1839, had forfeited its rights, and needed to be brought to order. And it would have elaborated a rhetoric of war on the basis of this argument—this "*pleading*" as they say in the English system of adversarial law on which English morality is moulded.

Such a pleading would have been easy to construct. The Belgian State in 1914 was very different from the State placed under obligation of neutrality in the 1830s. It had built itself an Army and frontier fortifications, as a normal state might do which had to think of defending itself. But it was not normal state. It was a state constructed by other states and placed under an obligation of permanent neutrality by them. The 1839 Treaty was not a Treaty *with* Belgium but a Treaty *about* Belgium. Belgium had no rights under it in the matter of its neutralisation. Yet it had begun to behave as a normal European



state—a European Power, which had large and exceedingly profitable Imperial possessions in Africa.

It had allowed its King to acquire a vast private possession in Central Africa for the purpose of civilising it by plundering it by means of the forced labour of the natives. The King played the diplomatic game so well that he got his Congo estate recognised as a sovereign state—the Congo Free State. So Belgium, a Constitutional Monarchy, had a King which it allowed to have his own private sovereign state, for the control of which he constructed an Army and fought wars. And, when the barbarity of the King's civilising mission in the Congo was made a European scandal by E.D. Morel and Roger Casement, the Belgian homeland helped him out, and eventually made the Congo Free State part of the little neutralised Belgium as the Belgian Congo. (But the barbarism continued: forced labour and indentured labour in the Congo were legislated for by Brussels.)

When Lenin declared, with regard to the Tsarist Empire, that he would overcome barbarism by barbaric methods, he was only saying what the capitalist democracies were doing. And there is no disputing that the backwardness of Russia was broken into many of the ways of carrying on that we called 'civilised'. But that was evidently not the case with Belgian conduct in the Congo. The main barbarism there was the barbarism of the civilisers.

And then the Belgian Government began playing footsie with one of the guarantors of its neutrality against another. And that was a great crime under the Treaty.

The Germans, while in occupation of Belgium, said they found evidence of Belgian collaboration with Britain with regard to foreign policy.

The German Government wouldn't have waited on the discovery of documents if it had studied Britain's leading example properly. It would have issued a strong moral indictment of Belgium for breach of trust and breach of Treaty. But unfortunately self-righteous moral duplicity in the service of power does not come easily to the Germans, saturated as they are with philosophy and music. So they said in August 1914 that they were wrong to cross the Belgian border, even though it was necessary for them to do so in the face of the Russian and French mobilisations against them.

They claimed later on that they had found documentary evidence that Belgian itself had broken the 1839 Treaty. That is

what they should have asserted in August 1914. They would have seen circumstantial evidence of it, if they had been paying attention. Circumstantial evidence would have been ample for Britain to base a powerful moral propaganda campaign on. But the post-Bismarck German regime hadn't a clue about the etiquette of power in these matters.

The Religion Correspondent of the *Irish Times* obviously sees no merit in the plea that a march across Belgium was necessary to prevent the German state from being crushed by the French and Russian armies, once the Russians were fully mobilised against it. He sees no merit in the time-honoured maxim that necessity knows no law: Germany should have known that it should resign itself to destruction, rather than try to save itself by outflanking the French fortifications by a march through Belgium. (That is what normal states do, is it?) But the Germans were barbarians and were not up to complicated reckoning like that. (That was the instant line of British war propaganda, inspired by Tom Kettle: The Germans had prevented the Roman Empire from conquering them two thousand years earlier and therefore they had remained barbarians.)

And yet, at the end of Britain's Good World War, Churchill made a point of saying in 1945 that, if it had been found necessary to invade the Irish state so that Britain could keep the war going, (instead of making a settlement), it would have done so. He did not put it quite like that of course, but that was the practical meaning. Germany was only at war with Britain because Britain declared war on Germany, and Britain might have made a settlement, and probably averted a series of catastrophes, without any loss of sovereignty over itself or its Empire. So what Churchill was talking about was not really necessity, only expediency. If he had become Prime Minister in 1939, he would probably have occupied Ireland. He argued for it in Cabinet. When he did become Prime Minister, the war in Europe had been lost, Ireland had got itself ready to resist an invader in alliance with his enemy, and invasion was too reckless a gamble even for Churchill.

It would be interesting to look up the *Irish Times* comment on Churchill's statement of the necessity principle in 1945 and see if it accords fully with its Religion Correspondent's current principle that a state should resign itself to destruction, rather than breach such a flimsy law as the 1839 Treaty about Belgium had become.

I referred in the last issue to Capt. Monteith's opinion that Casement's Report on Belgian atrocities in the Congo was used by the Foreign Office to oblige Belgium to play the part needed by Britain to arouse democratic enthusiasm for the war on Germany that it had under preparation.

Monteith's book, *Casement's Last Adventure*, was first published in 1932, privately printed in Chicago. It was issued again in 1953 by "*Michael F. Moynihan Publishing Co., 2 Capel St., Dublin*". It has not been printed since as far as I know.

Michael Moynihan published a handful of books in the early 1950s. I know nothing about him. I suppose the reason his Monteith book is never referred to is that it includes a Foreword by Franz von Papen, who had been tried in Nuremberg and found Not Guilty.

Monteith summarises Casement's Report on Belgian activity in the Congo:

"The story of the Congo, where the unfortunate natives had learned to hate the coming of the white man! Story after story of the ruthlessness of greedy commercialism. The killing of chiefs and their people; worse still, the maiming and mutilation of thousands of living persons. The staging of cannibal feasts in the terrorising of natives as incentive to the greater production of rubber, ivory and food stuff for the raiding parties" etc.

He comments:

"Covert threats of ousting Belgium from the Congo (in the sacred name of justice and humanity) did the trick. Belgium came in, the iron ring around Germany was forged. Casement's humanitarianism had been diverted from its purpose to serve the interests of the higher imperialism" (Chapter IX, p90 of 1st edn).

Casement's Report on Belgium was submitted to the Government in 1904. The Committee of Imperial Defence, whose purpose was to prepare for war on Germany, was established in 1904 by the Unionist Government. The Unionist leader, Balfour (who had, during the previous few years established representative Local Government in Ireland and abolished Irish landlordism in collaboration with William O'Brien, whom he had once imprisoned) asked the Committee to report on the possibility of a German invasion of England. It went into the matter and demonstrated that invasion was utterly impossible, but pointed out that, if food imports were stopped for a week, Britain would have to surrender. But Balfour wouldn't let go of the issue. He asked again a short while later and got the same technical answer.

The Liberals took over from the Unionists. Foreign policy was given to the small Liberal Imperialist group in the party—Asquith, Grey, Haldane—who ensured continuity with Unionist policy. And Erskine Childers published his famous novel, *The Riddle Of the Sands*, which reads like a response to the CID reports, imagining a way that all the defences they listed could be got around.

The *Entente Cordiale* accompanied the setting up of the CID. France was taken off the list of enemies and made an ally. The other Great Power enemy was also made an ally. When Russia was defeated by Japan in 1904-5, Britain called off the antagonism with it in northern India, divided Persia with it (leaving a remnant of the Persian state as a notionally independent buffer state between the two) and encouraged its ambition to gain a warm water port at the expense of Turkey, which it had always opposed until then.

What all of this amounted to was a change of enemies. It was unthinkable that a powerful Imperial State, such as Britain was then, should be without an enemy—at least not until it had got the whole world under its control, and even then . . . ?!

The Liberal Imperialists continued the preparations for war on Germany, knowing that they had active Unionist support for this project even when they approached the brink of civil war with them over Irish Home Rule, but that they had a serious problem with the back benches of their own party. A German march through Belgium—which was well known to be a possibility—was needed for bringing the Nonconformist ranks of the Party onside for the War. The fighting in Belgium, when the Belgian Army engaged with the German, clinched the matter for the Liberal Imperialists, but it gave the War the frenzied character of a crusade against Evil, which made it impossible to end it to Britain's long-term advantage with a functional Peace Settlement—as had been done in all Britain's wars for two centuries: ever since its first Balance of Power war in the early 1700s.

Launching the War with the realistic support of the Unionist Opposition on grounds of material interest and the morally frantic support of the ranks of the Liberal Party led to the destruction of the Liberal Party in 1916. Lord Lansdowne—a demon in Redmondite mythology, who is supposed to have scuppered a supposed 1916 deal in which the Ulster Unionists were said to have agreed to Home Rule with a six year exclusion of the Six

Counties—submitted a Memorandum to the Cabinet and wrote a letter to the papers suggesting a peace deal which would have left Germany a functional State under the form of government to which it had become accustomed. The Prime Minister, Asquith, seemed favourably disposed towards this deal, and that seems to be a reason why he was ousted by Lloyd George, the radical upstart, with the support of the Unionists. The result was a split in the Liberal Party from which it never recovered, and the effective takeover of Government by the Unionists in conjunction with the Liberal rump of Lloyd Georgites.

Germany would have been deterred from going through Belgium if it had been given to understand that this would have brought Britain into alliance with France and Russia against it. It tried to find out the British position on the matter, and it could reasonably claim to have been deceived by the responses it got.. This, as far as I recall—and it is about thirty years since I tried to get to the bottom of it—is the context of the "*scrap of paper*" remark by the German Chancellor.

Now, suppose Germany had read Britain's intentions, despite Britain's attempt to conceal them, and had let Belgium be, and had coped with the Franco-Russian offensives, is it likely that France would have refused to try to gain advantage by a march through Belgium? And, if it had marched through Belgium, is it likely that Britain would have joined forces with Germany against it? The supposition that it might is historically illiterate. The reordering of Britain's world arrangements after the end of the Boer War marked down Germany as the strategic enemy, and no "*scrap of paper*" would have led it to join forces with its present enemy against the chastened former enemy and present friend because of a *faux pas* or a scrap of paper.

Capt. Monteith offers no evidence that Britain used Casement's Congo Reports to put pressure on Belgium to act as Britain desired—no evidence beyond a common-sense reading of the course of events. And to suppose that Britain made no use of that damning Report to influence the behaviour of the state which it had brought into being at a strategic location in Europe is not sensible.

I have never seen the need for evidence that what obviously happened happened. If something happens, I assume there is sufficient reason for the happening. When I was a teenage labourer in Slieve Luacra

I happened to read a little article by Schopenhauer on *Sufficient Reason* and thought it was a very useful idea. Later on I got interested in Balfour through William O'Brien and the Land Reform and came across a little talk he gave about *Progress*. He didn't believe much in Progress as a force which caused things to happen. He was inclined to think that things happened because of arrangements that were made. (An he himself made some diabolical arrangements in late life.)

So: Belgium is held up to the execration of the world by the Casement Report in 1904, and it behaves just as England wants it to ten years later and the British propaganda enlists the sympathy of the whole world on its behalf, and there is no causal connection between the two things!

Charles Dilke, who would probably have been Liberal Prime Minister after Gladstone if he had not been cited in a divorce action and fallen prey to the Nonconformist Conscience of the Liberal backbenches a few years before the same thing happened to Parnell, took a close interest in the Belgian Congo issue after his fall. Before his fall he had written an exuberant best-seller called *Greater Britain*, in which he praised England as the greatest exterminating force the world had ever seen, but after his fall he became a campaigner on behalf of native peoples which had so far escaped extermination. He was particularly concerned to hold Belgium to account over the Congo.

Dilke died in 1911. Stephen Gwynn wrote his biography. Gwynn was an Anglo-Irish gentleman, a Home Ruler and a literary man. In 1914 he became an enthusiastic British warmonger, and he joined Tom Kettle in adapting Thomas Davis's songs about Irish Brigades fighting on Continental Armies *against* Britain for the Redmondites who joined the British Army for what Roger Casement called *The Crime Against Europe*.

His biography of Dilke was published in 1917, the year after Casement was hanged, and he does not mention Casement in the section on the Congo. (There is a reference to "*the publication of our Consul's report in December 1903*" (Vol.2, p381). The Consul is not named.)

Britain formally put pressure on Belgium, on the basis of the Casement Report, to take responsibility for the Congo and enact substantial reforms in it. But nothing happened quickly Heels were dragged:

"After various obscure negotiations on the part of King Leopold to secure German support for his personal rule, there came

at length with the beginning of 1907 the announcement that the Belgians would annex the [Congo] Free State" (Gwynn, Vol.2, p382).

Gwynn gives an interesting footnote at this point:

"The delay which took place in the transference of the Congo Free State from the personal rule of King Leopold to the rule of the Belgian Government is dealt with in the following letter from Lord Fitzmaurice from the Foreign Office to Sir Charles:

"February 16th 1906... As you know I am not a believer in the King 'at all, at all', but one has to observe the forms of diplomacy. It is, perhaps, not unfortunate that this pause coincides with a moment when it is not in our interest to be having a row with Belgium also, if perchance we were having a row with Germany'..." (Vol.2, p382).

Fitzmaurice, usually referred to as Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, though the surname in reference works is sometimes given as Petty-Fitzmaurice, was a College friend of Dilke's and was Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office under Grey.

King Leopold died in 1909. The Congo Free State became the Belgian Congo. But Dilke kept pressing for substantive reform. In Parliament on 10th March 1910 it was pointed out that the Congo had not yet been opened to free trade and treatment of natives had not improved:

"...the Foreign Secretary replied in a somewhat ambiguous speech. Annexation, he said, had not yet received the sanction of Great Britain, and could not until improvement in the administration had taken place. But beyond this negative attitude of disapproval, Sir Edward Grey seemed to think that Great Britain could not wisely act alone, and that under the Berlin Act, isolated action was in some sense barred. This, in the temper of the moment, was construed as a hint that insistence on reform might drive Belgium in the arms of Germany" (p384).

Dilke said in reply to the Foreign Secretary that it was clear that pressure on the Belgian Government had been eased and—

"they treat us with contempt, with a sort of lofty scorn which is almost inconceivable. I have never known such a thing before... He says that we have not weakened our position, that we have given nothing away, that we have not 'recognised'! But it is not a mere paper recognition or a paper non-recognition to which we attach high importance and which we formerly thought we understood from his speeches... We have before us a Bill for the largest naval expenditure that our country has ever incurred, in time of peace. We add for the

first time to that expenditure colonial expenditure which swells out beyond that of our own Estimates. The House has supported those Estimates and the Empire is spending on land forces even a larger amount than it is spending on the fleet. None of us believe that war is probable, but we do think... that the armaments of this country, if they are to have weight in time of peace, ought to have weight behind our diplomacy; and... there is no reason why at this moment we should be afraid of our own shadow. We have been afraid of our own shadow in the Congo question... I think a little more courage would be desirable in a case like that of the Congo... We are shocked in the case of the Congo because that which would never happen is put as a conceivable danger at the end of a long train of hypothetical events. It is said that there might be an act of violence... There would not be an act of violence, and I beg the House not to be led away by the fear of trifling complications following upon our insisting, not upon anything now, but upon that which we have been insisting upon for years past in a matter in which our moral obligation is very weighty..."

Dilke, who had been away from the corridors of power for twenty years, saw no danger of war in Europe because he was not involved in the preparations for war in Europe, as the Foreign Secretary was. Dilke's view of the world belonged to a bygone era when there was no Power in the world capable of contesting the issue with Manchester Capitalism and the Royal Navy. And, looking at Germany, he could see nothing in its conduct that gave cause for concern—certainly no reason why Britain as the creator of Belgium and its guarantor should not supply enough pressure on it to compel it to enact substantive reform in the Congo.

The Foreign Secretary saw Germany blocking the expansion of the Empire by its assistance to the Ottoman Empire to modernise its administration in the Middle East, and by its recognition of Morocco as an independent state. And he saw a German Navy being built to defend the foreign trade on which the German economy had become dependent, thus establishing a *de facto* freedom of the seas, which was something Britain would not tolerate. And he saw the world market for German goods expanding at the expense of Britain. And, to remedy this state of affairs, he had, ever since he came to Office in 1905, been continuing the Unionist preparations for war on Germany in alliance with France and Russia. And that was the context in which he saw the issue of the Belgian Congo.

It might be that Dilke, after he was put

out of the running for the Prime Ministership, took up political issues single-mindedly, no longer saw "*the big picture*", was unaware of the strategic reorientation that had been arranged around 1905, and supposed that there was no probability of war because he could not see that Germany had any interest in disturbing the peace of Europe.

He died innocent in 1911. But I do not see how his biographer, having written this account of the Congo affair for a book published in 1917, could have been altogether untainted by knowledge.

**Brendan Clifford**

(The books commended by the Religion Correspondent of the *Irish Times* to Eamonn Maloney to enlighten him about Belgium, will be reviewed next month.)

**Press Release**

## Opposition To Budget

**Deputy Finian McGrath:** This budget should have been about our priorities as a society, one that cares about people, the disabled, children, the unemployed and senior citizens. It should have been about inclusion and spreading extra available resources to the most needy in society. On the ground, I see many people who have been left behind, despite many years of extreme hardship. The Government simply does not get it. Last Saturday, nearly 100,000 people marched on the streets to protest about water charges and the tremendous hardship they will impose on families across the State. Today, in this budget, nothing changed for the people concerned.

In recent years we have seen the vital role played in society by people with disabilities. We also have seen, sadly, that 45% of people with disabilities experience income poverty, while 36% experience basic deprivation. As 85% of working age disabilities are acquired, households headed by people with a disability are twice as likely to experience unemployment as those headed by a person without a disability. This issue cannot go unaddressed; we need to reduce this income poverty. Over half of those living in jobless households are either children or adults with a disability. People with disabilities must not become the new underclass of workers but be afforded an adequate working wage. Further cuts to the numbers of respite day care and residential places are not sustainable. In this budget we must act to increase the provision for these services. I call for an assurance that all people with a disability will be guaranteed a quality service as a right. I also demand an end to all cuts to front-line services and the appointment of

a new senior Minister with dedicated responsibility for disability inclusion. We need to prioritise the funding of disability services in line with the Taoiseach's and the former Tánaiste's solemn pre-election commitments to those with a disability.

Will the Minister pursue implementation of agreed measures, targets and timelines for disability services? Today, the chief executive officer of the Disability Federation of Ireland informed me:

- Families of people with disabilities have been under assault for the last eight years. They were in a bad position before the recession and this budget was the Government's opportunity to demonstrate its commitment to people with disabilities and their families with a focused multi-annual plan. We are disappointed that the available funding has not been targeted to those who need it most urgently.
- People with disabilities are hugely disadvantaged on poverty and deprivation ratings, and they have been left behind in budget 2015.

My colleagues have referred to the issue of water charges. Last Saturday, nearly 100,000 people were on the streets to protest against water charges because they are sick and tired of being hammered once again.

The Minister for Public Expenditure and Reform referred to the burdens on the people. They have suffered a lot and enough. I note he also said there would be no new cuts to social welfare schemes. He needs to wake up. He has been telling us that there were no cuts in the past three years but now there will be no new cuts.

He should ask the disabled and the unemployed about it. A jobseeking constituent of mine was on a Connect course and received a travel allowance of €5 to attend it. He had to travel from Darndale through Coolock to Ballymun to attend the course, with the cost coming to €42 a week in bus fares. When he had difficulty attending the course, his benefits were cut off. These are the cuts being made on the Minister's watch and the cuts which are affecting people who need our support.

Then there are those pontificating about the rate of unemployment coming down to 11%. The level of unemployment in parts of Dublin city is at 25% and 26%, while there are major areas of disadvantage in other cities and towns. The Minister, Deputy Brendan Howlin, had the neck to say:

"As a Government, we have never believed in austerity for austerity's sake.

Do not believe further cuts are necessary.

Economic and employment growth has always been the best solution to addressing the fiscal deficit."

Members on this side of the House have been saying this for the past three and a half years, namely, that we need investment, jobs and economic creativity, not austerity.

## Fifty Shades Of Grey : *Britain's Diplomacy of Duplicity in the early 20th century.*

**"Speech is silver, silence is golden: but to say first one thing and then another is Britannia metal." - Otto Von Bismarck**

### CONCLUSION

In the world of early 20th Century international diplomacy there are very few 'heroes'. Little except scale separates the Turkish genocide of 600,000 in Armenia from Belgian genocide of 2 million in the Congo, German Imperialist massacres in Namibia, from British Imperialist massacres in Sudan, or Russian suppression of her nationalities from those of Austria, the cynical auction diplomacy and side changing of Italy and Portugal.

Britain's hypocritical diplomacy of duplicity turned a crisis in the Balkans into a worldwide catastrophe which, apart from the 10 million killed, led directly to the Second World War, the Russian Revolution and Civil War, the break-up of the Ottoman Empire and ensuing chaos in the Middle East, the rise of insatiable Japanese and Italian Imperialism in Asia and Africa, and totalitarian regimes in Germany, Russia and China. She declared war on Germany for violating Belgian neutrality, yet she and her Japanese ally did exactly the same to China, weeks later, and America's violation of Mexican sovereignty months before was not a cause of concern. She declared war on Turkey for an 'unprovoked' attack on the Russian navy, yet less than 10 years before she had praised her Japanese ally for a much larger 'pre-emptive strike'. She accused Turkey of genocide in Armenia, yet her ally Belgium had slaughtered at least three times as many people in the Congo and her other ally Russia had killed thousands in State-sponsored pogroms against her Jewish and Armenian minorities years before.

Britain cynically held out the prospect of improving relations, benevolent neutrality, or even an alliance with Germany and Turkey up to a few weeks before War was declared, while for many years she had secretly devised detailed plans for war and the dismemberment of her adversaries. She lured countries like Italy, Romania and Japan into the War with promises of territorial aggrandisement she never had any intention of honouring. Britain made secret contradictory promises to Zionists and Arab nationalists, to encourage them to support the War, with the intention of deceiving both, and paid lip services to President

Wilson's 14 points, including freedom of the seas which she never intended to observe. Britain hypocritically accused Germany of seeking 'world domination' yet this was exactly the position Britain possessed both before and after the War.

The British media and their Irish lapdogs will seek to glorify this inhuman carnival of catastrophe as OUR 'great War'. Myles Dungan may shed a sentimental tear and Kevin Myers' voice may croak with emotion as they recount tales of individual suffering or bravery, but these histrionics should not be mistaken for history. They will offer no analysis of the causes or consequences of this conflict but instead serve us a draught of 'history light', focusing not on the big picture but on individual tales of valour and horror.

The First World War was not a 'War to end all Wars' or a War for the 'freedom of small nations': it was a War to maintain the *status quo* of British world domination through the utter destruction of her closest rivals, friend and foe alike. That the War lasted longer and cost more in blood and treasure than Grey and his comrades originally envisaged only served to raise the stakes to a point where they could not afford to lose. These are the points we must keep in the front of our minds in the decade of commemorations for *'those who forget their history are doomed to repeat it'*.

**Paul McGuill**

**The Great War And The Forced Migration Of Armenians** by Prof. Dr. Kemal Çiçek. 280pp. Maps. €24, £20

**Forgotten Aspects Of Ireland's Great War On Turkey. 1914-24** by Dr. Pat Walsh. 540pp. €36, £30

**The Great Fraud Of 1914-18** by Pat Walsh €12, £9

**Irish Bulletin**, a full reprint of the official newspaper of Dáil Éireann giving news and war reports, Volume 2, 3rd May 1920 to 31st August 1920. 540pp. Index. €36, £30 pbk, €55, £45 hdbk

**Ireland In The Great War, The Insurrection Of 1916 Set In Its Context Of The World War** by Charles James O'Donnell (1849-1934). Intro. Brendan Clifford. 116pp. €10, £8

## Northern Ireland Budget Cuts

Reported budget cuts of some £850 million, one pound in ten, will have a devastating impact on Northern Ireland. Nobody envies Simon Hamilton [Finance Minister] his task of balancing the books, but if cutbacks are not handled strategically, our most vulnerable will suffer.

The Executive paper remains to be agreed. Nor is it clear what conditions attach to the Exchequer's £100m "bail out" [the loan to cover the shortfall in income].

Faced with cuts on this scale, we need a transparent, adult debate engaging the whole society. Hard choices are required to generate additional revenue, and to mitigate cuts.

Is now the time to remove the Rates cap on larger properties? Why should small householders pay 100% of their rates, whilst those in houses valued at £800k pay less? Removing the rates cap would dampen damaging housing speculation in favour of homes for need.

What about water? The Trade Union campaign against water charges was more sophisticated than merely "*Can't Pay, Won't Pay*". Welsh Water is owned by *Glas Cymru* a single purpose company with no shareholders, run solely for the benefit of customers—reducing Welsh Water's asset financing, the industry's single biggest cost. By adopting *Glas Cymru*'s governance model, there would be no impediment to an independent assessment of systemic water costs—then charged, progressively, through the rates. The NIPSA Union have undertaken such an estimate, assisted by industry experts. Queens University's Professor Paddy Hillyard has undertaken detailed work on how best to protect the disadvantaged. Kissing goodbye to water privatisation is the stick for Executive parties, with the carrot of additional revenue raised, through the rates.

Another budgetary side effect is that the proposed £400m 'giveaway' of Corporation Tax [reducing it to 10%]—a measure with no social clauses attached and which will not guarantee even one single job—is surely a dead letter.

Neither can the "Costs of Division", estimated at £1.5 billion, be exempt. Reducing segregation costs should be central to the budget. For instance, we have five providers of Teacher Training. The recent, "*Aspiring to Excellence*" report of Finnish educational expert, Pasi

Sahlberg, sets out four options to tackle undue duplication. Politicians must bite the bullet on this, and other "costs of division" waste.

The principle of "*Invest to Save*" should run through the Budget narrative. The UK "Tax Gap" of tax evaded, avoided and uncollected is a staggering £120 billion! Counter intuitively, we should recruit additional new tax officers, targeting the worst corporate offenders. The multiplier effect, of income generated, would be significant. Another measure would be to debar firms who practice and advise on aggressive tax avoidance from tendering for Government contracts, as suggested by Margaret Hodge MP. With the British in the Talks, why not a Northern Ireland tax-compliance pilot?

Within education, let's protect Special Education, Early Years expenditure and teaching and learning generally. However, in current circumstances, blanket protection for education is a 'big ask'. Let's save on unproductive, overwrought accountability systems. Today's schools assess, test and examine pupils like battery hens. The expensive Key Stage Assessment system, which few teachers value, should bite the dust. Finland, Europe's leading education system, abolished their Inspectorate without adverse effect. A new Education and Library Board will make efficiencies, but with every sector represented, what need is there for sectoral support bodies for Maintained, Controlled, Integrated and Irish Medium education? Would they be missed?

With school budgets relatively protected, are we comfortable that pupils, aged 16-18, get Grammar school places, whilst less advantaged 16-18 year olds cannot secure places on the excellent, groundbreaking, system of Apprenticeships. I'm not!

Hard choices are required to raise revenue, not just cut. We must tackle the cost of division. We must 'invest to save' and protect our most vulnerable. The Trade Union movement, for one, will meet the challenges with these in mind.

**Mark Langhammer**

This article first appeared in the *Belfast Telegraph* of 31st October. Mark is Director of the Association of Teachers and Lecturers and an elected member of the NI Committee of the ICTU.

## Austerity & Growth

The following figures are relevant to the current debate over the merits of 'Austerity'. They are produced by 'John The Optimist', an Internet commentator. He says they show "*why Ireland's growth is soaring and the country is oozing with optimism, while continental Europe is mired in low growth and pessimism*".

The figures show the **growth** in Government spending in REAL terms between 2007 and 2013:

<b>Ireland</b>	<b>- 13%</b>
<b>Spain</b>	<b>+ 3%</b>
<b>Finland</b>	<b>+ 4%</b>
<b>Denmark</b>	<b>+ 6%</b>
<b>U Kingdom</b>	<b>+ 6%</b>
<b>Netherlands</b>	<b>+ 8%</b>
<b>France</b>	<b>+ 9%</b>
<b>Germany</b>	<b>+10%</b>

(<http://www.irisheconomy.ie/index.php/2014/10/15/budget-2015/>  
October 15th, 2014 )

However, while figures are valuable in coming to a conclusion, they do not show other factors such as national cohesion, modes of economic organisation and, above all, the strength of the State.

## POPPICIDE

When Butcher Haig sent them  
over the top,  
that throbbing meat,  
cold steel against machine-gun heat,  
sandwiched between earth and sky  
to rot.  
Then the Earl Haig Fund  
and that red blotch pinned to  
the chest  
like a bullet-wound target request  
from World War One.  
As branded cattle they appear on the TV,  
each dumb beast ready  
to appease  
that battlefield horror with ease.  
The nation grins - suicide pleases?  
26 October 2014

## IN PARLIAMENT SQUARE I SAT DOWN AND CRIED

Mention democracy and it gives most people a rosy glow,  
the will of the people you know.  
But there are consequence,  
offences:  
invasions, atrocities abroad,

things always remembered:  
the dismembered.  
I shouted and shouted: Not in my name!  
Voted for democracy  
but got hypocrisy.  
No you didn't, democracy also applies  
overseas,  
voted for carrying it in bombers and drones.  
Yes you did.  
Never mind the shattered bones  
it's not happening to you.  
Go on a demo, go against the will of the  
people,  
that's democracy too.

**Wilson John Haire**  
12th February 2013

**IF AT FIRST YOU DON'T SUCCEED  
FAIL FAIL FAIL AND FAIL AGAIN**

They came to Afghanistan  
thinking it was cloud-cuckoo-land,  
there wasn't much of a plan,  
maybe they should have thought  
of something  
beforehand,  
some plan but not as brainless as  
Piltown man,  
nor as brainless as  
newsman  
anchor man,  
permatan man  
conman  
stuntman  
bagman  
adman  
the old hand  
the yes-man  
the Abominable Snowman  
the hired hand  
Superman  
caveman.  
All into a quicksand,  
the glove-puppet hand  
hand-to-hand or  
underhand  
sharing contraband  
in crash-land  
in wasteland  
in never-never land  
giving the backhand,  
offhand,  
in dreamland,  
all to down  
the dollar-a-day man.  
Then England,  
back to England  
with the dead man  
the without-a-limb man,  
to England-can-take-it land  
to anthill land,  
still without a plan,  
but ravenous  
for another land.

27 October 2014

**Wilson John Haire**

· Biteback · Biteback · Biteback · Biteback · Biteback · Biteback · Biteback · Biteback

**Unpublished letter to Irish Times, 23rd Octobre**

*Cothrom na Feinne*

When an Irish Court acquitted Charles Haughey, his fellow-Deputies attempted to re-try him in the Dail Chamber..

The Supreme Court upheld his rights as a citizen. Chief Justice Cearbhaill O Dalaigh condemned the irregular proceedings in the Dail as a case of "*Clocha ceangaite agus madraí scaoilte*" or "Stones tethered and dogs let loose".

Ms Cahill made accusations against four Republicans and had her chance to testify against them in a Belfast Court. The Court found them Not Guilty when she declined that chance— *and it should be inferred that the verdict would have been no different had she testified and subjected herself to cross-examination.*

It seems to me that Messrs Kenny and Martin are reprising the conduct that earned former Deputies the Magisterial rebuke of Cearbhaill O Dalaigh, and that they have no concept of *Cothrom na Feinne*.

**Donal Kennedy**

**ATHOL BOOKS Launches All Welcome**

## **Irish Bulletin**

Dáil Éireann's official paper with war reports, first reprint

Volume 2, 3rd May 1920 to 31st August 1920. 540pp

Paperback €36,£30; hardback €55,£45

**Friday, 21 November, at 8 pm**

## **The Great Fraud Of 1914-18**

by **Dr. Pat Walsh** 50pp, €12,£9

**Saturday, 22 November, at 8 pm**

Teachers' Club, 36 Parnell Sq., DUBLIN

Also Available:

The Catholic Predicament In 'Northern Ireland',  
**Catastrophe, 1914-1968** by **Pat Walsh**

Volume One: 334pp €24, £20

**Puritanism And The Theatre,**

by **Brendan Clifford.** 156pp €15, £12

**ATHOL BOOKS**lane.jack@gmail.com



## **Church & State, 118**

Redmondite Soirée at the  
Embassy transcript

Augustus: 2000 years on!

Spanish Colonial Debate

Paisley

Bernard Shaw defended

and much else!

## **Subscriptions:**

**4 issues.**

**Electronic** ⌘8 (£6).

**Postal**

**Euro-zone & World Surface:** ⌘20;

**Sterling-zone:** £15

**94<sup>th</sup> ANNIVERSARY OF THE KILMICHAEL AMBUSH**

**1.30pm, 30<sup>th</sup> November 2014**

**at the ambush site.**

**Guest speaker**

**Jack Lane**

**(Aubane Historical Society)**

Does  
It  
Up

Stack  
?

#### INTERESTING ARTICLE

The quotation below is from *'Lord of the Files', Working for the Government. An Anthology* (edited by Michael Mulreany and Denis O'Brien. Institute of Public Administration. Published in 2011). It reproduces an extract from the book *The Irish Army in the Congo: 1960-1964*, edited by David O'Donoghue (2005):

"Lt Colonel Mortimer Buckley was the first Irish commander to enter the newly independent Congo, leading the 32nd Battalion there in July 1960. He looks back at the practical difficulties in initiating the army's first UN peace-keeping mission.

"We had about four days in which to prepare for our departure. I was appointed on 17th July 1960 and the battalion was formed on 19th July. They met in the Curragh. One day all the officers were brought up to Áras an Uachtarán to meet President de Valera. We had tea and coffee with him. He was talking to the Chief of Staff, General McKeown, and myself. Then, de Valera pulled me aside because he wanted to say a few things to me. 'I will give you this advice', he said. 'Wherever you go, go in such strength that everybody will be aware of your presence and strength, and not your weakness.' That is a very good solid principle of war, of course: to go with as many as you can and to make sure that you have enough. But when you are travelling long distances, you have to cut your cloth according to your measure. If you bring an extra jeep it means extra petrol, and bringing extra men means bringing extra food. Therefore, you have to cut down and balance the thing and take a calculated risk at times. De Valera's second piece of advice to me was: 'If you fire the first shot in any situation you've lost the battle. Don't ever forget that.' Of course, he was so right. I never forgot that and I saw it proved several times. I recall that occasion very well. I was an admirer of de Valera's. As President, he was Commander in Chief of the Army. That is what he told me and I was very impressed by it"..."

#### THE LUSITANIA:

##### ROGER CASEMENT CONNECTION

In the *Irish Daily Mail*, 21st June 2014 there was a piece titled *'Lusitania rises from the mists of history'* by Senan Molony. According to the paper,

"the Government is to invite the son of the man who sent a torpedo into the steamship Lusitania to next year's

centenary events—to mark the sinking off Kinsale in 1915. Christian Weisbach, a professor at Tübingen University, is the son of Raimund Weisbach, the torpedo officer on the U-20 submarine who sent the warhead into the star-board side of the Cunard liner, after receiving the order to fire from his commander Walther Schwieger. A total of 1,198 people died in the sinking, with hundreds of victims buried in three mass graves in Cobh, Co. Cork.

"The German, Irish and British naval services are expected to be represented at the centenary ceremonies, with Cunard mounting a commemorative cruise to the site through its newest vessel, the Queen Victoria. Captain Schwieger died in World War 1 when his sub was caught in a British net in the North Sea, while the U-20 was separately wrecked on a sand-bank off Denmark. Weisbach survived however and shortly after the Lusitania sinking, he was promoted to his own command—that of the submarine U-19. A year later it was Captain Weisbach and the U-19 that brought Roger Casement to Banna Strand in 1916, in a prelude to the Easter Rising. As it turns out, both

Raimund Weisbach and his son were at the 1966 commemorations of the Rising. The senior Weisbach died in 1970, having survived the Second World War. He even served in peacetime in the Hamburg Philharmonic Orchestra".

His son told the columnist:

"It is quite a couple of years ago that I was at Banna Strand for the unveiling of the Casement memorial, at which time my father was too old for a second journey to Ireland.

"As to the circumstances of the Lusitania sinking, my father had a good recollection and he told me his memories of this important event."

Captain Weisbach himself told of witnessing two explosions on the Lusitania, even though they had fired only one torpedo.

The British have always denied she was carrying munitions for the Western Front, even though it was soon admitted she had four million rifle bullets on board, Molony added.

Michael Stack ©

## The Great War

The 1914-1919 war was a great war for the English ruling class. To deny the English propaganda which has been drilled into the heads of everyone in the English-speaking world, we need to examine carefully our conceptual framework within which we think of the 1914-1919 war. Whose war was it? Certainly it was not *'our war'*. We had nothing to do with the making of it. It did not *'break-out'*—it was declared by the King of England's Imperial Parliament (as the English called it) at 11 p.m. on 4th August 1914 against his cousin the Kaiser of Germany. The war against Germany had been in the planning by the English ruling class for the previous twelve years for commercial reasons. During the War several attempts were made to stop it, but England's rulers had so demonised the German people as *"evil Huns"* that the English could not stop until they had pounded the Germans into the ground.

The English would not stop, even when the Germans agreed to the Armistice to take effect on 11th November 1918. No, the English Navy continued the war by blockading German ports until the ending of that Great War. If the propaganda, masquerading as history, were to be written by others, that war could more fairly be described as the *Great Fraud*; or as the *Great Shame*. Because, not only did England declare war with malice aforethought, England pursued the war by

targeting civilians as it had during the Boer Wars and as it had in Ireland during the Land War, and sacrificed lives on the liner Lusitania so as to get the USA to join in the War. And—eventually at the Treaty of Versailles—England so humiliated the German people and State as to make them susceptible to the nation-building rhetoric with which Adolph Hitler made them amenable to his concept of *Lebensraum*. Hitler was a great admirer of the English ruling class and he imitated the English in many ways. Baden-Powell's boy-scouts, the Girl Guides, and the Boys' Brigades became in Germany, the Youth Movement for example. The British concentration camps of the Boer Wars were imitated by Hitler's concentration camps, etc etc.

#### BRITISH LEGION AND POPPY DAY

The so-called 'Great War for Civilization' gave birth to two organisations which, while they were necessary because of all the killing and wounding, have been heavily used by the English for propaganda purposes. These are the Royal British Legion—and the Commonwealth War Graves Commission. One to look after the living and wounded, the other to look after the graves of the dead soldiers of the British Commonwealth. The War Graves Commission began as a unit of the British Red Cross, which by October 1915 committed itself to providing payment for more durable inscriptions on graves. Some

graves were in existing cemeteries but these quickly filled up and most graves were scattered in gardens or fields where men were killed. Mass graves were in bomb craters hastily filled-in and many were buried, at night, in bomb craters which were again bombed and bombed again. General Macready appointed the Red Cross Mobile Unit as the sole organisation for *"the question of the locality, marking and registration of the graves of the British officers and men"* and it was to operate under the title of the 'Graves Registration Commission'. This was in response to letters to *The Times* of London complaining that graves were not to be found where they were said to be. One lady had tried to find the grave of her brother. His *"Comrades in his regiment had given her particulars of the exact locality and even described the temporary wooden cross and its inscription, erected over the grave. She found the place, where quite a number of victims's had been interred but every trace of the identifying crosses or other marks had disappeared ..."* (Note the word "victims"! It is unlikely they were not armed themselves, to kill.)

General Haig wrote to the War Office that the organisation has *"an extraordinary moral value to the troops in the field as well as to the relatives and friends of the dead at home"*. This was code for *"do not disturb the ladies and keep the men joining up"*.

These British Generals were thinking about something other than being able to afford 500,000 casualties in the battle for Pozneries Ridge, which they lost. They were thinking of where to dispose of the bodies and how to placate the relatives at home in England. Believe it or not! They planned over brandy and cigars to bring over to France a *"practical man"* from Kew Royal Botanic Gardens to advise on gardening work in the cemeteries, to spend three weeks in France and give general advice about *"shrubs, grasses and so on which would give the best results having regard to the soil and aspects of each cemetery"*.

These men knew that, no matter how long they could keep it going, the war would end some time and bodies would be looked for. And so no less a personage than Arthur Hill, Assistant Director of the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew, was sent over to France.

"He visited thirty seven cemeteries, held long conversations with Ware and Messer (both of the Red Cross) and finally submitted a full report listing plants that were suitable to soil and climate. A programme of horticultural work was

now possible, but money had to be found for it. The Army could not be expected to pay {!}, but the Red Cross agreed to extend its support. As a result sixty cemeteries were planted and ... extra staff to allow the work to be extended to a further 150. The men were to be recruited from among those ineligible under the Military Service Act, but full establishment was refused. {It would cost, old chap!} The work continued nevertheless. {The men needed the jobs}. Arthur Hill returned to France in August 1916, where he discussed plans for ninety cemeteries and autumn sowing."

"The sowing of annuals, wrote Hill, is of considerable value; they help to brighten places often barren and desolate (the battlefields) they cheer our men who are constant visitors to our cemeteries and who frequently pass these cemeteries when on the march."

Poppy flowers and Roses of Picardy indeed!

*"By the autumn of 1917 four nurseries had been established well stocked with excellent plants purchased from firms at Orleans, Versailles and also England."* The money was well spread around. War is a money-making enterprise after all.

"But the Army would not provide the necessary transport, and for this, as well as for funds for plants, seeds and tools, the branch had to depend on the Red Cross" and on "some thirty women of Queen Mary's Auxiliary Army Corps."

Who paid the Red Cross? Well, it was the ordinary people in the streets who thought their money was going to buy food parcels and winter socks. Instead it was being spent on gardening in the middle of a war to make the Generals and their Government look good afterwards! The British Army would not allow bodies to be brought home to England for burial—it would not look good and would affect recruiting of young men for the killing.

The Office of Works tried to get in on the war business and there was quite a lot of political manoeuvring as to who would maintain the graves after the war. General Macready decided the Office of Works were not *"sensitive enough"* and that a new Imperial body should be set up, which it was under a Royal Charter from the King of England on 21st May 1917.

Under the Royal Charter the *Commonwealth War Graves Commission* functions to care for all members of the Imperial Forces who *"died from wounds inflicted, accident occurring or disease contracted while on active service on sea or land"*. The Commission is funded by the UK Government and the Dominion Governments in proportion to the numbers of

soldiers buried.

The British Legion on the other hand was established on Sunday 15th May 1921 by the amalgamation of four organisations set up after the war by aggrieved and disillusioned ex-soldiers.

"When war's declared and danger's nigh  
God and the soldier is the people's cry.  
When peace is once more made and all is  
righted  
God is forgotten and the soldier slighted."

Fifteen million working days were lost in the UK in 1919 and industrial unrest was widespread.

The industrial unrest was controlled and ameliorated through the British Legion. From the beginning the Patron was HRH The Prince of Wales, the President was Field Marshal Earl Haig and the National Executive was packed with a Brigadier General, several Majors and Captains, Major-Generals, a Lieutenant-Colonel and a Lieutenant Commander.

In the General Strike of 1926 the British Legion took the Establishment side.

One of the stated objectives of the British Legion is:

*"The Legion shall exist to perpetuate in the civil life of the Empire and the World the principles for which the nation stands to inculcate a sense of loyalty to the Crown, Community and Nation...."*

And the principal objective is to maintain and look after the interests of all those who have served in His Majesty's Navy, Army, Air Force or Auxiliary Forces and their dependants. The members of the British Legion think of it as a benevolent association for members of the British Forces, which it is. It is also hugely used by the UK rulers to inculcate a sense of British nationalism and for publicising how proud the British should feel to be British and to be part of the great British Commonwealth. The Queen of England, her Family, her Courtiers and her Government are at the core of the War Commemoration at the Cenotaph in London. It is *their* celebration, it is for *their* wars.

The wars were not ours and, in view of the undoubted fact that many of their wars were waged against the Irish people, it is most inappropriate that the Government of Ireland has authorised to send the Irish Ambassador Mr. Daniel Mulhall to represent the Irish people in what is a triumphant celebration of British militarism.

We may forgive all the injuries done to us but surely we must not forget.

Michael Stack ©



## GUILDS continued

by the masters and the journeymen. Similar institutions were conducted by the French *compagnons*. (20)

### 10 YEAR STRIKE

*Sheltn*, or reviling, was the weapon used by the Journeymen Guilds. It was a system of black-listing, by which a Guild member was not allowed to work for a master or with a journeyman who had been "*reviled*", until they had atoned for their offence and been restored to favour. So, too, in case of strikes, warning was sent to the journeymen of neighbouring towns not to seek employment in the strike centre until economic peace had been restored. These strikes were never directed against the existing system, nor even against the hours of work, though the question of holidays was raised and wages at times became a very vital issue. Often however it was merely a matter of Guild honour. Such was the famous ten-years' strike of the Colmar {France} baker journeymen, which began with a question of precedence at a Corpus-Christi procession, and ended finally in a complete victory for the journeymen, without a single issue of economics being raised throughout all this period. It lasted from 1495 to 1505. Hence the reason for admitting under such circumstances Brentano's happy description of these disagreements in early Catholic times as "*family disputes between parents and children*".

This condition can be best understood by noting the fact that although abuses existed, yet Guild regulations were no less severe in regard to masters than to servants. If the latter were to conduct themselves "*properly*" and respectfully, the former too were strictly punished by their own Guild authorities if they held back the wages of their men. These wages were determined, in England, by the Guild or its wardens in a manner which, Ashley remarks, "*was fair in itself in so far as the master's own remuneration was fixed by legislation or civic ordinance*".

The journeymen Guilds, in fine, were, until the Reformation, religious societies, and indeed remained such in Catholic countries. They were established "*in honour of Almighty God, His Blessed Mother Mary and all the Saints*" or with some similar sacred dedication. They created funds for the lighting of candles before the altars on Feast days and other occasions. They provided Masses for their dead comrades and solemnly attended the

funeral services. They donated precious vestments, chalices and missals, and even built their own chapel, as did the bakers' journeymen at Strassburg with the aid of liberal donations given them. Special vaults were set aside for their dead in church or monastery, as in Freiburg and Frankfurt. Nor, as we have seen, was Christian charity neglected. They provided beds for the sick in their own inns or founded funds for this purpose in some established hospital. Thus in 1524 the Schaffhausen Guild of journeymen smiths gave its entire capital to the *Seelhaus* that every sick journeyman might there be cared for until he was restored to health. A permanent official was appointed to supervise this task. At times the Masters' Guild itself provided for such needs.

*"If any serving man of the said trade", read an ordinance of the Braelers' Guild, "who has behaved himself well and loyally towards his masters whom he served, shall fall sick or be unable to help or maintain himself, he shall be found by the good folks of the said trade until he shall have recovered and be able to maintain himself". (21)*

At times contributions were made by masters and journeymen to a common foundation that was equivalent to a social insurance fund for sick and disabled journeymen. Thus everywhere the Catholic creed of faith and works was applied in action so far as the influence of the Church extended.

### (To be Continued)

Bohmer, "*Beitrag zur Geschichte des Zunftwesens*."

Etienne Martin Saint-Leon, "*Histoire des Corporations de Metiers*."

H.T. Riley, "*Memorials of London*," p.251

Georg Schanz, "*Zur Geschichte der deutschen Gesellen-Vereine*," pp. 67, 68.

*Ibid.*

W.J. Ashley, "*Introduction to English Economic History*," II, pp. 101, 102.

Gross.

Etienne Martin Saint-Leon, *op. cit.*, p.92

Lugo Brentano, "History and Development of Guilds."

Georg Schanz, *op. cit.*, pp.56-66.

Bruno Schoenlank, "*Soziale Kämpfe vor 300 Jahren*," pp.51, 72, 143, 146. (2nd Edition).

E. Levasseur, "*Histoire des Classes Ouvrieres en France*," II, p.92

Ashley, Pesch, Schoenlank., etc.

Schanz, *op. cit.*, p.28

*The Journeyman Barber*. Mss. of gild statutes at Benedictine Monastery, St. Meinrad, Spencer County, Indiana, U.S.A.

Riley, "Memorials," 480, 495

W. J. Ashley, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 101-103.

*Ibid.* Note 163.

Schanz, *op. cit.*, pp. 37-40.

Brentano, etc.

Riley, "Memorials," 277.

## TRADE UNION NOTES

### APPRENTICES

The number of new apprentices in Ireland plummeted during the recession, but has since begun to recover.

At the peak of the boom in 2006 : 8,300 workers started apprenticeships. Over half these workers worked in construction and a further 2,200 started work as electricians. The number of workers in building trades had the most dramatic fall, dropping to just 200 in 2012. Bricklaying has normally been considered one of the most lucrative trades, but just 13 young people have taken it up over the past three years

In some trades, including floor and wall tiling and cabinetmaking, there have been no new apprentices since 2012.

The number of apprenticeships rose last year, and there is expected to be a further increase this year.

The Government and employers hope to broaden the range of apprenticeships available in a range of different industries, including Computing and IT. Even in construction there have been warnings of a future skills shortage,

The Construction Industry Federation said the country may find it hard to find suitably qualified tradesmen and women as building activity increases to meet the housing shortage. Apprenticeships are seven-phase programmes run over four years.

The phases are split between on-site training, where trainees gain first-hand experience of working in the trade, and classroom phases.

Applicants can only take part if a company has agreed to sponsor them for the entire apprenticeship.

A recent Government Review recommended that the system should be more flexible and not all apprenticeships should last four years. Critics of the old system suggest that the time taken to do an apprenticeship should depend on the skills involved. They say there is no reason why a plasterer should have to train for the same period as an aircraft mechanic.

Figures from the training authority SOLAS, which has replaced FAS, show that 24 people started training as printers over the past five years. During the same period the same number of apprentices started training as farriers. (*Irish Independent*- 18.09.2014)

## GUILDS continued

attaining to mastership, and the Journey-men Guilds were rather religious and social than economic in their nature. Later, however, when the number of apprentices was increased and more capital was consequently required for competition, fewer could attain to economic independence, and even the work itself of the journeymen might be threatened. The worst conditions arose where the craft Guilds themselves had lost their religious principles, or failed to put them into practice, and became capitalistic and exclusive.

In proportion as this took place, the Journey-men Guilds became militant organisations and the conflict between the oligarchic Merchant Guilds of the Continent and the early Trade Guilds was repeated, but with far less success for the organisation of the journeymen that now really represented the labour class. Although this situation reached its climax after the Reformation, it had already become serious enough in many instances before this time. In France, it became necessary, as early as 1456, to insist that masters must personally supervise their shops. (12)

### CONCILIATION

In the beginning, even where conflicts developed, a tolerable understanding existed between master and journeymen. The old disputes, says Brentano, seemed merely like family disagreements, between parents and children. The situation could not be stated more exactly. Nowhere was there a trace of opposition to the existing system, or of a class struggle, in the Socialistic sense of the word. (13) In most instances a working agreement was gradually arrived at between the Journey-men Guilds and the masters' organisations. Masters, journeymen and apprentices still worked side by side at the same tasks, sharing the same labours and exchanging their mutual confidences with one another. Hence the family spirit that abided among them. So long, indeed, as the principles of their Catholic faith strongly influenced both masters and men it was possible always to effect a reconciliation between the various interests. Thus at Strassburg in 1363 we find a board of arbitration appointed to decide all disputes between masters and journeymen, made up of five members from each of these two classes. (14) Another arrangement, made by the Tailors' Guild at Aschaffenburg, 1527, was the settlement of all difficulties by a commis-

sion appointed jointly by the Journey-men's Guild, the Master Tailors and the Archbishop. (15)

That attempts to suppress the journey-men organisations must have been frequent in the beginning, when their economic demands were first set forth in opposition to their masters, we might well surmise. Thus in London, a proclamation was issued by the city authorities in 1383, forbidding all "*congregations, covins and conspiracies*": on the part of the workmen for fear that they would seek to raise their wages. Four years later, three journeymen cord-wainers, in the same city, combined with a Friar Preacher to found a fraternity. The latter was to bring their case to the notice of the Pope, but the men were seized and confined in Newgate prison before the plan had matured. (16) It shows how here, as at all other times, the Church supported the workingman in his just rights.

In Germany, too, the Church was with the journeymen. The monks of Nurnberg excited the ire of the masters by permitting the secret meetings of the former to be held in their monastery, while the Bishop of Eichstaat championed the cause of the journeymen belonging to the various cutlery trades. In mentioning such instances, Schoenlank with an unconscious bias concluded that such a course must have been to the Church's interest. But alignment with the rich and powerful masters might have far more advanced her cause in a temporal manner. She was following in the footsteps of her Master. So, too, she had been with the crafts in their early trials. It was with the help of the Church only that Journey-men Guilds were ever formed at all.

After a period of conflicts or strikes, such as now often took place, a working agreement was usually found, or the Journey-men Guilds, as in England, were gradually brought under the supervision of the Craft Guilds and various arrangements were made to deal with their grievances. Often they simply ceased to exist and in not a few instances the journeymen were in some way admitted into the Masters' Guilds, whose wardens or other officers would adjudge their case when brought to the notice of the Guild. In England, a class of journeymen, as Ashley says, became a permanent part of the Guild system and remained so for centuries. (17) In the Council of Keyserberg, on the other hand, we find them established with their own courts and laws. It was in Germany that the Journey-men Guilds flourished most and gave rise to an entire series of imperial and territorial decrees. (18)

### WORKERS' CLAIMS—15TH CENTURY

As a typical instance of the claims set forth by these journeymen we may take the following list summarised here from the demands made by the journeymen tailors of Strassburg towards the end of the 15th century. They were drawn up in connection with a new set of regulations which the master tailors were seeking to obtain from the City Council. The journeymen demanded: (a) The maintenance of the customary fourteen days' trial before entering upon a contract. (b) The maintenance of the fourteen days' wandering, a period of time within which the journeymen as well as the masters were at liberty to dissolve their contract. (c) The continuance of the old custom which permitted the journeyman to provide a substitute to take his place if he desired to leave his occupation, instead of being subject to fine and black-list. (d) The abrogation of the vague ruling that journeymen and apprentices must pledge themselves to prevent the master's losses and further his gain, since this might give an opportunity for the latter to dismiss his journeymen without pay. (e) The clarifying of a certain clause regarding the wage-contract. (f) The righting of the disproportion between the wage and the high fine inflicted on the journeymen for absenting themselves from work through idleness. (g) They admit that they are to do no independent work, but are to receive all work through their masters, and they further agree with the latter that no journeyman should do piece-work. (h) They finally demand greater precision in regard to another wage clause which arouses their shrewd suspicion. (19)

The journeymen's headquarters were the inn, or Herberge, as it was called in Germany, where organisation had progressed exceptionally in this regard. Both masters and journeymen co-operated in this institution. Here the journeymen met, consulted and held their feasts. The *Herbergsvater* found accommodation in the inn for every wandering journeyman. It was the YMCA, and far more than that, of the later mediaeval times. Here were listed the names of the masters in need of men. They who applied first were served first, but precedence was given to the master with a smaller number of journeymen, so that the old Guild principles were still kept in view. Beds, too, and hospital care were provided here for the sick, while travelling journeymen who could not find employment were often paid a sum sufficient to bring them to the next town. The fund for this was jointly contributed

continued on page 25

## GUILDS continued

### WAGES

Nowhere perhaps is the Christian spirit of these early Guilds more evident than in some of the regulations made by the Guild masters for the wages of their assistants. Thus, while the master tilers of London, according to the regulations drawn up in 1350, were to receive 5 and one-half penny a day during summer, and 4 and one-half penny in winter, their journeymen were allowed 3 and one-half penny during the longer season and 3 penny during the shorter. Considering the additional burdens resting on the master worker, and understanding that both laboured equally hard and long, the division of the payment may well be considered adequate. Even better terms were made by the master daubers, to whose 5 penny and 4 penny corresponded the 3 and one-half penny and 3 penny of their *garcons* or journeymen. (3)

Since the master and his assistants usually worked to the order of their customers, except in seasons of lax trade, provisions were often contained in the Guild statutes of this period that payment must be made directly to the journeyman by the party engaging his services, and not through the master. By a particular arrangement the Builders of Nurnberg, both masters and journeymen, stood immediately under the city council, were equally independent, and received equal wages. (4) At the head of the stone-masons stood a skilled monk, who drew the plans and supervised the buildings. No difficulties occurred in the cities where these conditions prevailed until the monastery leadership passed into the hands of secular masters. Even then the old traditions were not entirely lost. (5)

### GERMANY AND ENGLAND

But we now come to a period when the number of journeymen was growing larger and capital became of great consequence. The time arrived when it was not possible for every journeyman to become a master. Such men could obviously no longer remain part of the master's family and must provide their own homes. They alone correspond to the labouring class of later years. (6) Hence the reason for a new form of organisation : the Journeymen Guilds. These arose at the end of the 14th century, and under the name of *Gesselenverbande* became well nigh universal in Germany.

They were wide-spread also throughout France, England and western Europe in

general, but the contrast and often the conflict between Masters' Guilds and Journeymen Guilds was most marked in Germany. In England these Guilds, where they survived, seem finally to have become merely subsidiary organs to the masters' organisations. (7)

When these new institutions first appeared in their full strength, the deterioration of the Masters' Guilds had already begun. The great influx of country population into the towns had helped, economically, to aggravate the situation. The craft Guilds themselves were slowly entering upon a policy of exclusiveness. Entrance fees were raised until in later days they often became extravagant. In the meantime, comparatively slight fees were exacted from those belonging to the Guildsmen's own families. In some instances membership became hereditary. Thus a monopoly might be created by the leading families. Entire classes were excluded by various legislations from even entering upon apprenticeship. Such laws were at times directed by the State itself against the children who had, for a certain period at least, worked upon the farms. Their object was to prevent the depopulation of the agricultural sections. In German, France and Scotland the execution of a masterpiece was demanded of the journeymen before he could be admitted to the Craft Guild.

Hence the *chef d'oeuvre*. (8) The idea was in itself excellent, but with the decline of the Guilds the conditions set were at times such as to make this task not merely difficult, but very costly, while the article produced was often unsaleable. To this was added in Germany the expensive *Meisteressen*, or inaugural dinner, after the journeyman had completed his prescribed years of travelling and produced his *Meisterstück*. (9)

Such were some of the abuses that arose as the influence of the Church was lessened and her principles of charity and social justice were in part disregarded. The climax was reached with the Reformation and the years that followed. Thus at Strassburg, the centre of the new religion, as Schanz recounts, the holidays were cut off, wages instead of being raised between Christmas and St. James's Day {July 25} were lowered and other restrictions were enacted. Cromwell abolished the feasts of Christmas, Easter, "and other festivals called holidays", as superstitious. The fixed "play days" given later were no adequate substitute.

### CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH

"The Reformation", says Bruno Schoen-

lank, a foremost non-Catholic authority upon this subject, "was drawing its social conclusions, the golden age of the labourer was coming to an end, capitalism began to bestir itself". There was a tightening of the autocracy of the State regime. The free holidays of Catholic times were done away with. Journeymen "were obliged to produce a far greater amount of work, without having their wages raised. They were strained far more than before and were far more intensively exploited."

Difficulties of every kind were put in their way that they might not become masters, and their right to marry was unconscionably postponed. Thus, according to a decree of October 9, 1613, the pamphlet-maker journeymen were not to marry until they had practised their trade 12 years without interruption. Anyone violating this law was to be "entirely deposed from his trade and might never again be helped to resume it". Finally, the silk-weavers' journeymen were commanded by the Nurnberg City Council, about 1650, to observe "the fear of God and a fifteen-hour work day". Such was the economic result of the Reformation, as vouched for by Protestant and other non-Catholic authorities. (11)

The Journeymen Guilds began as religious confraternities, and indeed retained this character even after the Reformation in Catholic sections. In the meantime they were gradually developing economic features and championing the interests of their members. There was at this early period no evidence of what might be called a conflict between capital and labour. The number of journeymen who might be employed by any single master was very restricted. Until the day of their absolute decline the craft Guilds sought to prevent the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few.

Hence the number of journeymen that could be engaged by even the most prosperous Guildsman was usually restricted to two or three, together with a proportionate number of apprentices. Frequently, in the early statutes, the master was limited to a single servant. No craftsman, at this period, was likely to have more than two journeymen and as many apprentices. Considering the methods of production then employed, such measures did not interfere with the quantity of the output, while they greatly enhanced its quality and absolutely prevented every form of capitalism. Under these conditions apprentices and journeymen could still have every reasonable opportunity of

continued on page 26



**LABOUR**

# Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 32 No. 11

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

MONDRAGON Part 35

## The First Modern Labour Class

(Joseph Husslein, SJ, PhD, *Democratic Industry, A Practical Study in Social History*, New York, P.J. Kenedy & Sons, 1919).

Craftsmen, Apprentices and Journeymen formed the triple alliance of labour in the Middle Ages. All these classes did not however spring into being at once, and it was long before they had developed into distinct parts of a complete Guild system. Apprenticeship was already becoming a necessary preliminary for mastership while the journeymen were as yet rarely mentioned in the Guild statutes.

As a class, they may be said to have come into existence during the 14th century. The most detailed reference is made to them in the German Guild statutes of the middle of this century, at which time they also first appeared in England as a definite body of workers with distinct interests. They were then variously known as yeomen, journeymen, valets or servants. The German *Geselle* and the French *compagnon* express more perfectly the intimate relation of fellowship and family association that existed between master and journeyman.

### MODERN LABOURER

Of the three grades within the Guild system, the journeymen alone corresponded, in a certain degree, to the modern labourer. Yet even this correspondence was vague and entirely wanting in the beginning, when the journeyman, though labouring for wages under an employer, was really looking forward to the day when he would open his little shop in one of the narrow, winding streets of his own cherished town, and be honoured as Master Guildsman.

The reason for the rise of a journeyman class is obvious. It was not always possible or desirable for the apprentice, upon completing his appointed term, to practice his craft as an independent master. Hence, he would often remain for a space of years as an assistant to his former master or to

some other craftsman in need of his service. The number of these journeymen was at first comparatively small and their condition one of the closest intimacy with their employers. The journeyman was as the elder son of the family in which he lived and worked. In dress and conduct he was obliged to do honour to the Guild, even as the master's wife was to sustain the fair name of his craft by her virtue and decorum. Both journeymen and apprentices were under the protection of the Craft Guild.

The journeyman, in brief, was looked upon as a member of the household for whose conduct and religious behaviour the master was accountable before God. The same responsibility was considered to rest upon the Guild itself. Gambling, late hours and worse vices on the part of the journeyman could not therefore be ignored by the master, and were strictly guarded against by the Guild rules. Disobedience or irreverent behaviour were to be seriously punished. Since, at this early period, the journeyman was bound

to live beneath the master's roof and was hardly less incorporated into his family than the apprentice himself, it naturally followed that he could not be married. Thus a statute of the Bakers' Guild of Mainz, 1352, reads:

"We are agreed that whatsoever journeyman marries a housewife is no longer to be kept by his master than his contract lasts. He should then pay for his shop (*er enkeuffe danne den marcket*) and become master." (1)

### INDEPENDENT MASTER

Such regulations can be readily understood, if we remember, as was already stated, that the journeyman, like the apprentice, was merely in a transitional stage of his career which would last only until he could becomingly provide for a family in a manner to bring honour to himself and credit to his Guild. In France, such a transitional stage, known as *le compagnonnage*, was made a definite condition for mastership towards the end of the 14th century. The journeyman might, however, freely choose his master and freely make his terms, in so far as these were not regulated by Guild statutes. Like the master himself, he might count on Guild assistance in his need. (2)

The time would soon come when he would marry and become an independent master craftsman. He could then set up his own shop, take his place in the Guildhall and be honoured in the land, until the insignia of his trade would at last be laid upon his grace, and the prayers of his brethren and the Masses offered for his soul by them would be presented at the Throne of God. Nor would his family be forgotten, if through any misfortune, he left them in want, since the charity of the Guild would provide for them.

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

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

1 Sutton Villas, Lower Dargle Road  
Bray, Co. Wicklow or  
33 Athol Street, Belfast BT12 4GX or  
2 Newington Green Mansions, London N16 9BT  
or *Labour Comment*, TEL: 021-4676029  
C/O Shandon St. P.O., Cork

### Subscription by Post:

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

### Electronic Subscription:

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

You can also order from:

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

continued on page 27