

# IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

**October 2014**

Vol.29, No.10 ISSN 0790-7672

and **Northern Star** incorporating **Workers' Weekly** Vol.28 No.10 ISSN 954-5891

## Flanagan Makes Mischief In The North

Charles Flanagan, the Irish Foreign Minister, launched a "scathing attack" on Sinn Fein in the North as part of Fine Gael's conflict with Sinn Fein in the South, in an interview with the *Sunday Independent* (Sept. 7). The attack was nominally on both Sinn Fein and the DUP for having "failed the North". He called on "those with a mandate" to "take the tough budgetary decisions that have to be made in government". That made it an attack on Sinn Fein for not doing what the DUP wants it to do: cut social welfare benefit. He wants Sinn Fein to cut social welfare in the North so that it can't criticise him for Fine Gael's austerity policy in the South. He calls its refusal to submit to DUP policy a "failure to create a functioning democracy in the North".

It is true that Northern Ireland is not a functioning democracy. It never has been, and it was never intended to be.

Under the old Stormont system, which Fine Gael denounced repeatedly and which its predecessor, Cumann na nGaedhael, made war on, there was a superficial semblance of democracy. The party that won an election governed those areas of public life that were devolved to the Six Counties by the Government of the democratic state, the United Kingdom. Because that system was widely recognised as being a travesty of democracy, a new system was set up in 1998 which did not even have the appearance of being a democracy.

Under the new system the majority party cannot govern as the devolved authority. It is recognised that the Northern electors do not constitute a body politic capable of sustaining even a Local Authority on the principle of majority rule. It is recognised that there are two body politics and that devolved government can only be conducted by agreement between them.

Party conflict in the North is not between the two communities, but within each of them. Sinn Fein and the DUP do not contest seats against each other. Sinn Fein contests seats with the SDLP. The DUP contests seats with the Traditional Unionist Vice and the Ulster Unionist Party.

*continued on page 2*

## Is Ireland Going Militarist?

A number of well-heeled influences are nudging Ireland towards militarism—towards a general disposition for war-making, or at least for cheering on the warmakers. As it is a state in the absurd position of not being able to manufacture the simplest kind of gun, it cannot aspire to being more than a cheerleader for warmongers and a supplier of cannon-fodder to them.

The leading militarist influences are

the neo-Redmondites. They praise John Redmond for committing Home Rule Ireland to Imperialist war without an electoral mandate. They regard war as being too important to be subject to electoral approval. They take the effectiveness of the recruiting campaign of Redmond and his colleagues to confer democratic legitimacy on it. They hustled people into the British Army, and the fact that people allowed themselves to be hustled

## Albert Reynolds and The Irish Times

The most remarkable aspect of *The Irish Times'* commentary on the death of Albert Reynolds was that there was no analysis of his political demise.

A largely successful tenure as Taoiseach came to a premature end and no attempt was made to explain why. This mystery is made more intriguing by the fact that *The Irish Times* itself played a key role in his resignation as Taoiseach.

What possible explanation can there be for such coyness in a newspaper that is not noted for its modesty? It is certainly not a reluctance to speak ill of the dead. Fintan O'Toole did not hesitate to put the boot in before Reynolds had even been buried. He managed to misrepresent the Beef Tribunal conclusions as well as giving the false impression that they had something to do with Reynolds' resignation.

Reynolds did not resign because of the Tribunal findings. His resignation related to something else entirely and *The Irish Times* led the media pack. When Reynolds

*continued on page 3*

established its democratic credentials. And Redmondism did not then, or since its revival, ever bother to explain what the War was about.

And then there's the Western Front ceremonial/propaganda operation. And the Reform Group. And others who prefer not to show themselves in the light of day. And penitent IRA man Eoghan Harris, who has seen the light and tells us in his *Sunday Independent* column that the futile slaughter on the Somme was a beneficial event while resistance to military Government by Britain after it lost the

*continued on page 7*

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>Flanagan Makes Mischief In The North.</b> Editorial	1
<b>Albert Reynolds And <i>The Irish Times</i>.</b> John Martin	1
<b>Is Ireland Going Militarist?</b> Editorial	1
<b>Trouble For The Good Friday Agreement.</b> Report	3
<b>Readers' Letters: Fighting Irish In USA?</b> Donal Kennedy	3
<b>Shorts</b> from <i>the Long Fellow</i> (Government Narrative; Previous Recovery; Current Recovery; Banking Recovery; Scotland; Economics Of Independence	6
<b>Paisley.</b> Editorial	8
<b>Death Of Irish Republicanism?</b> Pat Walsh on Anthony McIntyre's views	9
<b>Rural Ireland:</b> the mystery deepens. Jack Lane	12
<b>Tall Tales From Academia.</b> John Martin on Keogh's urban myth re Haughey	12
<b>Who Do You Think We Are?</b> Jack Lane on 'Mrs. Brown' in <i>Irish Bulletin</i>	13
<b>A Royal <i>Faux Pas</i>.</b> John Morgan (Lt. Col., retd.)	14
<b>Mansergh Nonsense On A Non-Sir.</b> Manus O'Riordan	16
<b>Ballagherdereen And The Great War.</b> Brendan Clifford	17
<b>Fifty Shades Of Grey.</b> Paul McGuill on Britain's Duplicit Dipolomacy	21
<b>Ghosts Of Empire.</b> Wilson John Haire (Poem)	23
<b><i>Biteback</i>: Public Spending Position In Northern Ireland.</b> Brian Campfield, General Secretary, NIPSA (Statement)	25
<b>Does It <i>Stack Up</i>?</b> Michael Stack (1916 & The Somme; John Bruton And John Redmond)	26

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

Apprenticeship: Learning A Trade

Mondragon, Part 34

(back page)

Is It Time To Keep Up With The Germans?

(page 29)

Health Issues by Seán Ó Riain

(page 28)

The SDLP agrees with Sinn Fein that the social welfare cuts should not be implemented.

Fine Gael supported this system when it was established by referendum in 1998. It was perfectly clear at the time that this was how it would function. If it has now changed its mind and wants a majority-rule travesty of democracy in the North in place of what it agreed to in 1998, it should say so. What it should not do is make mischief in the North in search of party advantage in the entirely different conditions of the South.

We were hoping that, with the ousting of Gilmore, and the end of Stickie feuding against the Provos, Dublin might take the trouble to figure out what Northern Ireland is and deal with it rationally on its own merits. That was apparently a foolishly hope.

The issue of social welfare cuts in the North did not arise within the politics of devolution in the North—the only kind that exists. It was foisted on the North by

Whitehall. Although the decision not to cut welfare benefits when they were being cut in Britain was made within the authority devolved to Stormont, Whitehall decided to override that authority. In line with its austerity policy, it imposed a cut of £1 billion a year in the North, over four years, starting in 2011. But on top of that, Chancellor of the Exchequer Osborne demands that welfare cuts be implemented in the North, largely on the same terms as in Britain. And when that wasn't promptly complied with, he imposed a fine of £87m for 2013/14. In other words, Belfast was absorbing the cuts imposed by Britain but, because it was protecting welfare, Westminster is fining it this October. The fine for the 2014-15 period will be £114m, with more in subsequent years. This is money taken out of its Budget allocation from London. In this way it is cutting the Northern Ireland Budget.

Northern Ireland does not have its own Budget as such. It never had. It is in the matter of raising revenue an integral part of the British state, though excluded from

the politics of the British state. We assume Foreign Minister Flanagan at least knows that much about the North. And yet he talks about "*their failure to create a functioning democracy in the North*"!!!

"*Bread-and-butter issues are not being acted upon in a manner that they should be in a functioning democracy*", he said. But a functioning democracy raises the money that it spends. So is he proposing that the devolved government should become a state?

He says: "*the people of Northern Ireland deserve a functioning assembly*". So why did Fine Gael agree to an arrangement in which "*a functioning assembly*"—we presume he means a Parliament to which Government is responsible—could not develop?

He says that "*16 years after the Agreement the devolved institutions should be self-sustaining, given the mandate secured by the biggest parties*". Why the plural, "*parties*"? It gives the game away. The biggest parties do not, in functional democracies, usually combine in government. They are obliged to do so in the North, on the understanding that they represent hostile communities.

"*I regret that, while there has been good progress over the last 16 years in civil society, the quality of change in political engagement has been less than many would have wished*". If this means anything, it means that the Unionist and Nationalist communities have been growing together in civil society but politics has remained stuck in the old rut. And that is fantasy, or empty verbiage.

The Dublin Government, instead of complaining that the Agreement is working as it was set up to work, should be criticising Whitehall for overriding devolved decisions with a State ultimatum.

Sinn Fein has made two proposals for resolving the social welfare issue: either let the Assembly, freed of communal voting rules, decide it, or put it to referendum.

The reason Whitehall stirred the whole thing up seems to be that Tories are cultivating the DUP as possible partners in the next British Government if they fall just short of a majority. But there's many a slip. And it reminds to be seen whether DUP voters would vote for social welfare cuts in order to spite Sinn Fein and the SDLP—and how the DUP stance in favour of cuts in pursuit of Whitehall ambitions would play against the Traditional Unionist Voice at the next election. ●

## Trouble for GFA

[The following extract from *Phoenix* magazine (12.9.14 ) highlights the fact that Petitions Of Concern can be brought within the Executive as well as on the floor of the Northern Assembly.]

"Last week the North's environment minister Mark Durkan [SDLP] announced he was giving the go ahead for the Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan (BMAP) which designates planning zones for retail, residential, industrial and commercial use. The plan stretches out to Carrackfergus to the north and Lisburn to the south of Belfast. It affects 40% of the North's population.

Immediately the announcement was made the DUP health minister Edwin Poots said he was 'shocked' that the decision had not been brought to the executive because the plan affected more departments than Environment. In short the DUP will block BMAP. Insisting that ministerial decisions are bought to the executive is a tactic the DUP has been using to stall any movement. Earlier this year they blocked Sinn Féin's Michelle O'Neill, the agriculture minister, in her attempt to distribute EU money to farmers.

When matters do go to the executive the DUP use a little known procedure written into the 2006 St Andrews Agreement which allows any three ministers (and the DUP have three plus Peter Robinson) to table a 'petition of concern' and prevent a measure from proceeding. The procedure was designed to prevent decisions being taken or implemented which adversely affected either the unionist or nationalist community. What the DUP are doing is an abuse of the process to stymie any decision not their own. Contrary to Irish foreign minister Charlie Flanagan's assertion last weekend at the British-Irish Association meeting in Oxford the DUP and Sinn Féin are not equally to blame for the North's impasse. The DUP blocks SDLP and Alliance plans as well as SF's.

Essentially the DUP have stopped operating the Good Friday Agreement..."  
(*Flanagan Falls Flat On Face*).

***Irish Times: Past And Present***,  
a record of the journal since 1859  
by John Martin  
€21, £17.50 post free  
<https://www.atholbooks-sales.org>

## Fighting Irish In USA?

I can't remember the *Maine*, the American battleship which blew up and sank in Havana harbour, killing 266 sailors and marines on 15th February 1898, nearly 44 years before I was born,

Cuba was at that time part of the Spanish Empire, then in decline and ripe for plucking by predatory Powers.

More than five tons of powder charges for the *Maine's* guns exploded but the cause of their ignition was not established. Nor was a human culprit for the tragedy identified. But a rushed US Navy enquiry reported that a mine had exploded under the ship. The American gutter press, with William Randolph Hearst to the fore, blamed the Spanish Government, and with the war-cry "*Remember the Maine!*" the United States declared war on Spain in April 1898.

Within ten weeks the war was over and Spanish overlordship of the Philippines and Guam in the Pacific, and Puerto Rico and Cuba in the Caribbean was replaced by that of the United States. In England, Rudyard Kipling hailed the coming of age of the United States as an Imperialist Power and urged it to "*Take up the White Man's Burden*", just as Britain girded herself for a war for South African Diamonds and territory.

A lesser poet than Kipling, Joseph I.C. Clarke, scanning the casualty list of *The Maine*, had already done his bit for American Imperialism. He noted the surnames, Kelly and Burke and Shea, boasted how they'd been featured in battles since antiquity, and how they would again feature, this time in the punishment of Spain. The name of his verse was "*The Fighting Race*". God only knows how many Irishmen were inspired by it to kill and die for worthless causes.

In 1976 Admiral Hyman G Rickover of the US Navy concluded that the sinking of the *Maine* was started by coal-dust spontaneously combusting, next to its guns' powder charges.

Thus the Spanish-American War was fought on a false pretext, and if anyone named Kelly or Burke or Shea perished serving with the American forces in it, they were, at best, dupes.

So, if Mr O'Bama wants the Macs and Os to help him take up the White Man's Burden, it might be wise for them to *Remember The Maine* before committing themselves..

**Donal Kennedy**

## Albert Reynolds

continued

had been toppled, the newspaper went gunning for Bertie Ahern. A story by Geraldine Kennedy led to the collapse of the Fianna Fáil/Labour coalition and its replacement by a Rainbow Coalition headed by the Redmondite Taoiseach John Bruton at a crucial period in Anglo Irish relations.

It is no small thing for a newspaper to topple one government and prevent another within a matter of weeks. In America the *Washington Post* is credited with the impeachment of President Nixon but even that newspaper could not prevent the Republican Party choosing Gerald Ford as successor. And yet the journalists Woodward and Bernstein were able to dine out on their journalistic *coup* for the rest of their lives.

But if *The Irish Times* dined out on the

resignation of Reynolds and the thwarting of Ahern, it did so alone or, at least, away from the gaze of the public.

In an RTE radio interview (23.6.07) Geraldine Kennedy, who had by then become Editor of newspaper, was asked about her return to the newspaper after her foray into national politics as a Progressive Democrat TD.

She said that her previous political engagement had required her to spend a period of time in "*quarantine*" before she could cover political issues. And even after that it was only after her stories leading to the collapse of the Fianna Fáil/Labour coalition that she was fully accepted by her colleagues in *The Irish Times*.

So this was not only a story of national significance, but a key point in her career development. And yet when she was asked to explain the collapse of the Fianna Fáil/Labour Coalition she did so in the following evasive terms:

"...I think that break up was all about the breakdown of trust between Dick Spring and Albert Reynolds and that it wouldn't have taken very much to do it at the time. And I don't think you need to get into the minutiae of things."

But that most definitely was not how it was described by *The Irish Times* at the time.

In 1994 Albert Reynolds wished to appoint Harry Whelehan to the position of President of the High Court. At a crucial time in Church/State relations this was a key position since the office holder would decide which High Court Judge heard constitutional cases. Spring opposed the appointment because Whelehan was a conservative judicial activist.

*The Irish Times* was of no help to Spring in his efforts for liberal reform. It refused to call for the resignation of Whelehan as Attorney General following the X Case, which the latter precipitated two years earlier and it also dismissed Spring's concerns about Whelehan's promotion.

But, when a British TV programme revealed that the Attorney General's Office had sat on an extradition warrant for the paedophile priest Father Brendan Smyth for seven months, *The Irish Times* smelled blood. Its target was not, of course, Harry Whelehan, but the Taoiseach Albert Reynolds.

Reynolds asked the chief administrator in the Attorney General's Office to investigate the matter. Matthew Russell found that the reason for the delay was that the case was unprecedented in that the crimes ranged from four and a half to twenty nine years before the extradition warrant.

Reynolds accepted this explanation and proceeded to ratify the appointment of Whelehan over the objections of Spring.

On 17th November 1994 Reynolds made a statement to the Dail explaining that the delay in the Smyth case was because of the length of time between the extradition warrant and the crimes.

Unfortunately, after he had made his speech in the Dail it emerged that there was another case involving what was believed to be a paedophile cleric—the Duggan case—which was processed expeditiously. At first sight this seemed to invalidate the reasons given by Matthew Russell for the delay in the Smyth case. If the Duggan case could be processed quickly, why was there a delay in the Smyth case?

However, the matter wasn't quite as

clear cut as might first appear. Firstly, the Duggan case related to crimes committed up to three and a half years before the extradition warrant: considerably less than the four and a half to twenty nine year period in the Smyth case.

Secondly, as Harry Whelehan pointed out, the Duggan case was, if anything, a vindication of the Attorney General's Office. Since both cases were believed to involve Catholic clerics, the fact that the Duggan case was processed expeditiously suggests that, whatever the reason for the delay in the Smyth case, it was not because Whelehan allowed his conservative Catholic beliefs hinder the application of the law (see note at end of article).

But *The Irish Times* was not prepared to engage in such a reasoned analysis. On the contrary it went berserk.

Its editorial of 17th November 1994 was headed "*Humiliating and Shameful*". It began by describing the events of the previous day as a "*saga of unprecedented shabbiness, deceit and ineptitude*".

It continued:

"It has been a humiliating and shameful passage in Irish public life. Leinster House has seen its fair share of dark days, perhaps more memorably in the wake of the Arms scandal and subsequent trials in 1970. But even that critical drama did not yield up the sleaze, the cringing efforts at self exculpation, the cowardly attempts to transfer blame to paid officials which have characterised this affair..."

"The demeaning of the Government and the Dail is now added to with the demeaning of the courts. The Taoiseach and Minister for Justice stand indicted of the most wanton dereliction..." etc

This is a hysterical rant, which achieved its objective of toppling a successful Taoiseach and a decent man. Kennedy's 2007 claim that the reason for the resignation was a "*breakdown of trust between Dick Spring and Albert Reynolds*" is a re-writing of history in which she played a prominent part.

On the day after the Reynolds resignation *The Irish Times* continued to kick the Taoiseach who had resigned and warned against anyone who might have personal sympathy for Reynolds:

"With the resignations of Mr Albert Reynolds as Taoiseach and Mr Harry Whelehan SC as President of the High Court, a considerable measure of dignity has been retrieved in the public life of the State. The resignations came not a moment too soon. Words can only inadequately describe the mixed emotions of anger, bafflement and shame that have been aroused among the public at large by the chain of events that started with

the revelations in the Brendan Smyth case..."

"On a personal level there will be sympathy for Mr Reynolds and there will be an acknowledgement that he performed his closing act well. But there will be no crocodile tears for a Taoiseach who was swiftly revealed as a political bully behind a smiling face, who showed a cynical indifference to those principles of public office which did not suit his purposes and whose actions, once in power, belied so much of the principle which he enunciated in his campaign to get there. Public life will not be greatly the poorer for his departure from office" (*The Irish Times*, 18.11.94).

The following day (Saturday, 19.11.94) *The Irish Times* turned its attention to the next task: to prevent the continuation of a Fianna Fáil/Labour coalition. In an editorial headed: *The Shame And The Shambles*, it made its case:

"But is it credible that the mere fact of his replacing Albert Reynolds as leader of Fianna Fáil can be sufficient to satisfy Labour, once again, that the party has been purged, purified and reformed."

The campaign continued the following Monday (21.11.94). Its editorial asked:

"Should the Labour Party, which now portrays itself as the guardian of high political standards, reward those Fianna Fáil Ministers who were guilty of such low standards in last week's Dáil debate".

But, as the days passed, it was becoming clear that there was no "*sleaze*" or undue influence involved in the Brendan Smyth case. At worst it was a case of mismanagement by an official within the Attorney General's Office. Also, the opinion polls were showing a recovery in support for Fianna Fáil. More significantly, on 28th of November a MRBI opinion poll showed that a massive 63% favoured the continuation of the Fianna Fáil/Labour coalition.

*The Irish Times* was becoming disheartened. Its editorial of 3rd of December sighed in exasperation:

"It is all over bar some details. Fianna Fáil and Labour will form another loveless—though mutually pleasurable—union."

However, the newspaper decided on one last throw of the dice. Conor Brady in his book *Up with the Times* describes Geraldine Kennedy's so called "*scoop*" which led to the breaking off of negotiations between Bertie Ahern and Dick Spring:

"On the morning of 4 December ... I received a telephone call from our political correspondent, Geraldine

Kennedy.

'They were all in on it', she announced. 'Who? In on what?'

'Virtually the whole Fianna Fáil side of the Cabinet. They knew about the Duggan case all along. It wasn't just Albert misinformed the Dáil. The others knew and they said nothing.'....

I discussed the story with her for a few minutes and then made one or two telephone calls to my own contacts. Nobody seemed to be aware of anything. Clearly someone had been marking her cards" (page 231).

It is interesting that Brady's own contacts seemed to be "unaware of anything" and he then makes the curious remark that somebody had been "marking" Kennedy's cards.

This suggests (in this writer's opinion) that Kennedy's source was not merely supplying information but telling her how to play her hand.

Certainly, Kennedy had no new information of substance. Well before 4th December *The Irish Times* had already reported that the new Attorney General had told Marie Geoghegan Quinn about the Duggan case and she had told other Cabinet members including Bertie Ahern about it. This was not a scoop of *The Irish Times* because it was revealed by Geoghegan Quinn in a statement to the Dáil on 16th of November (nearly three weeks before Kennedy revealed "they were all in on it"). But it is interesting to note how *The Irish Times* recorded the Geoghegan Quinn statement. The following is from a front page story by Geraldine Kennedy on 17th of November:

"The Minister for Justice, Mr Geoghegan Quinn, also revealed, in a personal statement to the Dáil, that she had been informed by Mr Fitzsimons by telephone on Monday 'that an important piece of background information, which had previously been given to me about this case, was incorrect'.

"She had asked Mr Fitzsimons immediately to join her and other Fianna Fáil Ministers who were meeting at the time....

"A spokesman for the Minister for Finance, Mr Ahern, the most likely successor to Mr Reynolds, acknowledged last night that he had attended the meeting...

"Accepting that it was 'my particular responsibility as Minister for Justice to insist that a reference to the previous (Duggan) case should have been included in the Taoiseach's speech, she had offered her resignation to Mr Reynolds if it could save the government. The Taoiseach had turned down her offer."

It is interesting that the report goes out of its way to say that Bertie Ahern, "the

most likely successor to Mr Reynolds" was aware of the Duggan case. In this writer's opinion *The Irish Times*, or whoever was "marking Kennedy's cards", was already gunning for Ahern before Reynolds had even resigned.

But it is one thing knowing about the Duggan case, it is quite another understanding its significance. At the time Eoghan FitzSimons, the Government's legal expert, who had replaced Harry Whelehan, was unsure on this point. So is it reasonable to expect Fianna Fáil Cabinet members to second guess the Attorney General?

Again *The Irish Times* was in no mood for reasoned analysis. The whole Fianna Fáil party was contaminated. The editorial of Saturday 5th December 1994 declared that the resignations of the Taoiseach and the Attorney General were not enough:

"As the sequence of events surrounding the Harry Whelehan/Brendan Smyth saga become clearer, it is apparent that the misleading of the Dáil did not begin or end with Mr Reynolds's actions. Nor can it be expiated—much less fully explained—by his being unmade or by the resignation of Mr Whelehan from the Presidency of the High Court."

The campaign continued on the Monday 7th December 1994. That day's editorial was headed "Rogues or Fools" and commented:

"But if his (Fitzsimon's) evidence to the committee does not damn Mr Reynolds and certain of his cabinet colleagues as rogues, it will undoubtedly confirm them as fools. Indeed the latter indictment is hardly necessary. Never has the Dáil been presented with such pathetic, stumbling, self serving palaver."

And then on 8th December 1994 the editorial had the same contemptuous tone:

"...perhaps the only cheering feature of yesterday's proceedings in the Dáil was the fact that they took place, for the most part, while the school children of the country were at class and unlikely to be watching on RTE. No intelligent young person who watched could be left with anything but bafflement and disappointment at the workings of the institution which is at the centre of Irish Public life and which supposedly embodies the national strengths and virtues."

The campaign had succeeded and the editorial of 9th December 1994 was able to welcome the beginning of a new Government led by John Bruton. Game over!

So the resignation of Reynolds was not caused by a "breakdown of trust between Dick Spring and Albert Reynolds". And,

of course, the prevention of Bertie Ahern from succeeding him cannot be explained by Spring's relationship with Reynolds. *The Irish Times* at the time explained it in terms of stamping out "sleaze" among numerous other derogatory epithets.

But subsequent investigations of the matter show that there was no outside pressure (either from the Catholic Church or any other organization) on the Smyth case. Shortly after the events as the hysteria generated by *The Irish Times* had receded, people began to wonder what was all that about. The passing of twenty years has not revealed any sleaze or wrongdoing by Reynolds or Whelehan. It was as if Nixon had been impeached and Ford had been prevented from succeeding him, but no burglary at the Watergate building had been discovered or any other malfeasance.

The facts are that the source of the Smyth story originated with British television; *The Irish Times* generated the hysteria leading to the replacement of Reynolds with a Redmondite Taoiseach, which is what the British would have wanted.

No wonder *The Irish Times* with its British connections doesn't want to talk about it!

**Note:** It was believed at the time that Duggan was an ex monk and this was stated without contradiction in the Dáil. However, long after the events described it emerged in a libel trial—brought by Albert Reynolds against the Sunday Times—that this was not in fact true.

**John Martin**

## In the September issue of *Irish Foreign Affairs*:

The editorial traces the origins of one of the 'least safe places on earth.'

Manus O'Riordan reflects on Crimea's right of self-determination, Dave Alvey writes about Irish Television's place in British war culture and John Martin reviews an unusual book on the ex-leader of the French National Front. Historical research on WW1 continues with Eamon Dyas, and on WW2 with Philip O'Connor. Plus the Cork Echo Correspondence and other documents.

**Irish Foreign Affairs**  
is produced quarterly at **€5, £4**

Subscriptions:  
**4 issues. Electronic €10, £8.**  
**Postal Eurozone and World Surface:**  
**€24; Sterling zone: £15**

# Shorts

from  
*the Long Fellow*

## THE GOVERNMENT NARRATIVE

Finance Minister Michael Noonan made the following comments on the *Today with Sean O'Rourke* programme (RTE radio 1) regarding the economy:

"The success now is not an accident of nature or an act of God, it's a direct consequence of the policies that were pursued and they were the right policies ... If you look across Europe, the Baltic states, Germany, Denmark, Sweden all followed these kind of policies and they're growing well now at this stage. If you look at the countries that didn't follow, like Italy and France, who went down the road of tax and spend, they're floundering and they're still in difficulty" (*Irish Independent*, 4.9.14).

These remarks look like the opening salvo in the Government's campaign for re-election.

The narrative is plausible. It is true that those countries which adopted policies of budgetary adjustment (austerity policies) have weathered the storm better than those that did not. The crisis was caused by a level of consumption that was not sustainable by the productive output of the economy. Another way of putting it is people were unable to pay their debts. In Ireland the crisis first manifested itself in a banking crisis which was a crisis in private debt. The consequent collapse in income and tax revenue caused an immediate and dramatic crisis in the public finances. In such circumstances the idea that more consumption or a "*stimulus package*" could have solved the crisis was delusional.

## THE PREVIOUS RECOVERY

In some respects the current recovery resembles that instigated by the 1987-1989 Haughey Government. After years of vacillation by the 1982-1987 FitzGerald Government, which prolonged the recession, the Haughey Government dealt decisively with the problem of the Public Finances, which resulted in rapid economic recovery.

However the recession of the 1980s was different to the most recent one. There was no significant private debt back then. The problem was one of production caused by industrial unrest. The adjustment in the public finances was accompanied by

Social Partnership as well as other policies, which increased the productive capacity of the country.

## THE CURRENT RECOVERY

The most recent recession was not caused by problems in productive output. There was a dramatic fall in employment in the building industry and retail sector, but the rest of the productive capacity in the economy was unimpaired. The prophets of doom have proved to be wrong. The economy was not destroyed in 2007. If it had been, it would not have had the capacity to recover so quickly in spite of uncertain conditions in the world economy.

The current Government has not been as innovative as the 1987-1989 Government. Much of the 'heavy lifting' involved in rectifying the public finances had already been done by the previous Fianna Fáil/Green Party Government. Also, the presence of the Troika enabled politically-unpalatable but necessary decisions, such as the Property Tax and Water Charges to be implemented. Nevertheless, the current Government deserves credit for staying the course and resisting populist calls for 'burning' senior bank debt.

At present the Department of Finance is predicting GDP growth of 4.5%. This looks conservative. There will be a significant uplift in employment in the Construction sector as the recession caused an over-correction in economic activity in this sector. This should have positive knock on effects for the domestic economy.

Also, as private debt begins to be put on a more sustainable level (as indicated by the consistent annual balance of payments surpluses), there is likely to be an increase in domestic demand.

Other factors which should favour the economy are the weak Euro compared to Sterling and the Dollar, which will make our economy more competitive. Finally, it is likely that the debt/GDP ratio will begin to decline, which will give benefits in terms of lower interest costs as a proportion to national income. As the State's financial position becomes more secure the need for large cash reserves diminishes. The Government could be entering a virtual circle of declining relative debt and rising income.

## THE BANKING RECOVERY

This time last year as the economy was beginning to show signs of recovery there were fears that the vulnerability of the banks would drag us back in the mire. Having dealt with bad debts in development land loans, we were now facing massive write-offs in residential loans as

well as in the small and medium business sector, leading to rising unemployment. The Government's contingency plan was to seek re-capitalisation from Europe.

But these fears proved to have been misplaced. As discussed last month, the domestic banks have returned to profitability. Noonan has indicated that the State may receive more money from selling its share in the Irish banks to the private sector than by seeking European funding. When asked about European re-capitalisation Joan Burton suggested that there was "*more than one way to skin a cat*".

The Irish State is no longer (assuming it ever was) regarded as a charity case by the rest of the EU. The Government is therefore correct in seeking concessions that won't cost the rest of the EU money, such as replacing the expensive IMF loans with cheaper money available in the money markets. This will save us between 300 and 350 million a year in interest costs.

It would be interesting to know if there has ever been a case in the history of the IMF where a client state sought to pay its loans back early!

## SCOTLAND

At first sight the large vote for Scottish independence of almost 45% was surprising. In her three hundred year history of Union with Britain, her history of nationalist struggle does not compare with the Irish Struggle. The momentum for Independence has only gathered pace in recent decades.

Thatcherism, which was the ideology of finance capitalism centred in London, undermined the industrial base of the regions. In the 1980s Scottish voters were consistently voting for Labour which was out of Office from 1979 to 1997. By the time Labour had returned to power in 1997 it had become "New Labour", which represented a capitulation to Thatcherite values. So, in the 1980s the Scots were alienated from one of the parties of government and by the end of the last century they had become alienated from both. It is now not at all unusual for a Scottish voter in his mid-fifties to have never voted for a party that governed Britain, which would make him not much better off than his counterpart in Northern Ireland.

The British Political Parties are no longer performing their traditional function of unifying the disparate elements in the regions. Devolving more powers to Scotland and the regions will accentuate regional disparities. Britain is beginning

to look dysfunctional. The last time she was in such a mess the divisions were temporarily relieved by the war of 1914.

#### THE ECONOMICS OF INDEPENDENCE

The Long Fellow is grateful to a blogger called "John the Optimist" for a website comparing the experience of Scotland and Ireland since 1841 (<http://statsireland.blogspot.co.uk>). The website gives statistics seeking to compare Ireland since Independence with Scotland under the Union. This of course raises the vexed question of when we obtained independence. The website takes the conventional view that it was 1922. But of course Michael Collins believed the Treaty was only a stepping stone (i.e. we had not achieved independence in 1922) and the anti-Treaty side believed that it was a capitulation to British rule. A case could be made that we only achieved Independence in 1938 when the economic war ended and the British had left the Treaty ports.

Another quibble is that the front page quotes a London research institute to the effect that we "voted" for Independence in the 1920s!! This egregious error is uncontested although the quotation as a whole is rightly dismissed as "nonsense".

In 1841 the population of the area covered by the Republic was 6.5 million. (This accords with what I learned in school—i.e. 8 million in the whole island—but recent research suggests the all Ireland figure could have been more than 12 million).

The Famine/Holocaust and its after-effects caused a dramatic decline. By the 1920s the population of the 26 Counties dipped under 3 million. It then declined marginally to about 2.8 million by about 1960, but from then on we experienced rapid population growth to about 4.6 million today.

The Scottish experience has been less dramatic. In 1841 it had a population of about 2.6 million, rising gradually to about 5.2 million in 1961. But, since then, Scotland, unlike the Republic has had hardly any population growth.

On the economy the Republic's GDP grew by 600% from 1964 to 2014. The UK grew by just over 200%. The corresponding GNP figures are about 400% versus 200% (taking out repatriated multinational profits reduces the Republic's GDP figure).

In conclusion, this website is a wonderful antidote to the "failed State" thesis of *The Irish Times* and other Angophile political tendencies within our society.

## Is Ireland Going Militarist?

continued

1918 Election was an abomination. And Brigid Laffan, who helped to run the EU onto the rocks and is now Director and Professor of the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies and Director of the Global Studies Governance Programme, urges us to become open and proud members of NATO, instead of backstairs ones.

In the days when she was an apologist for self-destructive developments in the EU, Laffan's refrain was "*We are where we are*".

So where are we—who goes it in the world of contemporary militarism which she urges us to join?

Well, we—the we that she urges us to become—have in recent years destroyed a series of secular States which were doing their best to foster our way of life amongst their peoples. And we, in the actual world, played a small, but real, part in the first of these acts of destruction, the invasion of Iraq, which Martin Mansergh justified on behalf of Fianna Fail.

The Iraqi State had to be destroyed because Saddam Hussain was a tyrant. He imposed Western liberal values on society by force—at least force was involved in it. When the tyrant was overthrown the invaders called on the elements of society which he had suppressed to come out and welcome them. There was immediately an astronomical increase in the kill rate. The annual rate of political killing before 2003 is not mentioned anymore. It would be too embarrassing. 2006 is taken as the base year for subsequent comparisons. Political killing declined somewhat after that, but remained far greater than pre-invasion average. And the public utilities destroyed in 2003 have not been restored. And the suppression of women, made a big thing of in the campaign against the Taliban in Afghanistan, was *restored* under the post-2003 Occupation of Iraq.

The Saddam Tyranny was not overthrown by those whom it oppressed. They were apparently resigned to it, and were submitting themselves to a process of liberal development. It was overthrown by the liberal-democratic West, with the greatest display of "*Shock and Awe*" ever seen in the history of the world. And the "*fundamentalists*" were urged to assert themselves by the all-powerful invaders.

In Libya there was some protest against Gaddafi's Tyranny. In these protests, liberal children of the regime who had seen life in European cities and became discontented that Libya was not quite up to date with it, came out in street protests and were joined by Islamists who saw the advantage of letting the little darlings hog the media limelight. The Tyranny would easily have curbed these protests if the West had not recognised them as the democratic voice of the Libyan people and put NATO in to pulverise the regime for them. And now the West can't even maintain a diplomatic presence in Libya.

And then a similar mixture of liberal idealists with no sense of reality and fundamentalists with an acute sense of reality came out in protest against the Assad Tyranny, and was recognised by the West as the democratic voice of the Syrian people. But NATO was not put in to support them. The British Parliament balked at it. Tony Blair, in a major constitutional innovation, had referred the decision about making war on Iraq to Parliament, and had told it lies in order to make it decide for war, and, remembering this, Parliament would not vote for war on the Syrian Tyrant. But the funding and arming of the miscellaneous Opposition continued, with the arms being cornered by groups who knew what they were doing.

The liberal-democratic West has been nurturing 'Islamist terrorism' in one way and another for about a quarter of a century. It began with the subversion of the Communist regime in Afghanistan. What the Islamic State is doing today is implementing the world outlook cultivated by the West amongst Muslims in Afghanistan and Pakistan for use against the Communist Government in Kabul, which was encouraging secularist modes of conduct.

The difference is that Islamic State seems to have been developed by people who a generation ago had committed themselves to the liberal-secular mode of development in Iraq, only to see that secular State wrecked by an invasion that can only be described as frivolous, and have now decided to base themselves on the Islamism which the West deliberately brought to the fore in 2003.

As of now, the West is committed to destroying the Syrian State, and also to destroying the forces in Syria which it cultivated for the purpose of destroying the Syrian State.

As we go to print, Syria is being bombed by the USA with the encouragement of its fellow-militarists of the powerful

democracies. Assad is held to be responsible for the rise of Islamist State which he is said to have encouraged in order to crush the Western-supported Islamist opposition to his regime, as Rosemary Hollis of Chatham House explained on RTE's *Morning Ireland*. (Is there somebody somewhere who really did not know that the effective elements in the Syrian insurgency were Islamist?)

So now the West is committed to making war both on the Syrian insurgency, which it was supporting until a few weeks ago, and on the Syrian Government.

And the Shia Islamist Government in Iraq, put in place under the Occupation following chaotic elections is being held responsible for Islamic State because it failed to share state power with its opponents, the Sunna Islamists. \_The Baathists were not allowed in Iraqi political life by the Occupation.

What state power? Iraq was reduced to a geographical expression by the invader,

who deliberately destroyed the State apparatus as well as stirring up religious war. How can State power be shared when the apparatus of State has been destroyed?

The mushroom parties conjured out of the Occupation-induced anarchy of religious conflict did not come to power in a State. The only power there was was their own power as movements. The power of State, which Maliki is said to have monopolised instead of sharing, is a figment of the propaganda of the militarist democracies which systematically destroyed the Iraqi State, but which cannot possibly be held responsible for what they did because they are democracies.

Democracies don't do such things— not in an admissible way. If they did, our moral universe would collapse and life wouldn't be worth living. Would it?

Well, Professor Laffan, that's where we're at. That's what your kind has brought us to.

*Union Bill* as it was going through Parliament in 1798-1800, Samuel Neilson, the Editor of the *Northern Star*, doing so from prison. What they had organised against was the exclusive Protestant Ascendancy Parliament of the Anglican aristocracy in Ireland. They were reformers driven to revolutionary conspiracy by the aristocracy, and reckoned that the Westminster Parliament was sufficiently open to reform for their purposes. It was the Orange Order that opposed the Union in 1800, on the grounds that it endangered the Protestant Ascendancy operated by the Irish Parliament.)

\*

Protestant Ulster was an Anglo-Scottish colony in origin. It was the only one of the many British colonial efforts in Ireland that took root and grew.

Internal class relations in colonial Ulster were conducted in a different spirit, with a different outcome, than in what might be called Occupied Ireland, because the classes were developments out of the same society, while in Occupied Ireland the upper and middle classes consisted of foreigners imposed following a military conquest and protected from the Irish for many generations by the system of the Penal Laws. (The Penal Laws also touched slightly on the Presbyterian population but in a way that bears little resemblance to their effect on the Catholic, or Irish, population, which they were intended to break.)

Protestant Ulster participated in British politics as a matter of course from the Act of Union until the First Home Rule Bill in 1886, but British politics failed to get a grip on the Irish population after they were admitted to Parliament by the removal of the Anti-Catholic Oath in 1829. The Irish remained by far the largest population on the island, despite the drastic reduction in their numbers by British policy in the potato blight of the 1840s. The continuing experience of British rule by the Irish population fed the movement for Irish self-government by the Irish population until Home Rule was put on the agenda of British politics.

The 1886 Home Rule Bill caused the British in Ulster to suspend their participation in British party politics and organise a cross-party movement against Home Rule. This went on for 35 years until the country was Partitioned, with the Six Counties remaining in the British state, while the other Counties went their own way in another state.

The British were then in a two to one majority in the North and might have been

influence in the *Irish News*. It was a problem for him how the United Irishmen had collapsed into Unionism. That problem was known academically as the "transformation problem".

Boyd's explanation was the Trinitarian influence of Henry Cooke on Ulster Presbyterianism, which curbed the development of Unitarianism. Cooke imposed orthodox Christian doctrine on the Academical Institution (at the back of Athol St.) in the 1820s and that made Unionists of the children of the United Irishmen.

We couldn't see the connection, so we did a little investigation. We found that there was no correspondence between disbelief in the doctrine of the Trinity and participation in the United Irish movement. And we found that the leading Unitarian in the 1820s, the Rev. Henry Montgomery, who had given wholehearted support to O'Connell's Catholic Emancipation movement, declared himself content with the Union Parliament when O'Connell launched a movement for the Repeal of the Union. When O'Connell berated him and others for not supporting Repeal, he published a *Letter To Daniel O'Connell*, expaining his position, which was influential in its time—certainly more influential on radical politics than anything done by Henry Cooke. (It is reprinted in an issue of *Belfast Magazine*.)

Probing further, we discovered that many United Irishmen supported the

## Paisley

*Death Of A Demagogue*: That's what the *Irish News* said when Ian Paisley died. For 'moderate' Nationalists of the Hibernian variety—for Catholic-Nationalists—Demagogues on the Protestant side are the explanation of all their failures. In the 19th century there was Roaring Hanna, in the 20th century there was Ian Paisley with a whole series of lesser demagogues in between.

What is a demagogue? Somebody who gives expression to what is in the minds of the populace. Or to put it another way, somebody who panders to the baser instincts of the populace and prevents them from being uplifted by the better elements of society. In this instance, the meaning is somebody who plays on the religion of Protestants for the purpose of preventing them from being Irish nationalists—or for changing them from the Irish nationalists they were in the days of the United Irish movement of the 1790s and reducing them to religious bigots.

In the late 1960s, when the 1922 Stormont system went into flux and we entered the present era, the standard explanation was given by Andrew Boyd in *Holy War In Belfast*. Boyd came from the Protestant community, he had been a member of the Communist Party, Northern Ireland, and around 1970 he was the major



expected to resume participation in British politics. But Britain did not allow that. It insisted that the Six Counties must have a little Home Rule Government of their own, entirely under Westminster sovereignty; that Six County politics must be conducted in complete separation from British party politics; and that, to maintain this very strange connection/separation from Britain, the North must return a clear Unionist majority at each election.

British Ulster had no separate ideals to realise in its little semi-detached Home Rule system. In the 1918 Election the Ulster Unionist policy was to be simply part of Britain when Partition made that possible. Britain insisted that it should operate a separate, subordinate system of government outside British politics, in which there were two things it had to do: return a clear Unionist majority at every election, and police the Irish/Catholic minority, which had no outlet for its democratic energy into either British or Irish politics.

Nothing could go on in the way of politics within this arrangement, except what is called sectarianism—the raw conflict of the two communities between which there was no mediating medium: the Protestants and the Catholics; the British and the Irish.

We will not speculate here about what Whitehall's purpose was in setting up this destructive system.

What happened within it was that the Ulster British became less British through not participating in British political life, and came to be seen as weirdoes by the superior people 'on the mainland', while the Irish remained thoroughly Irish. Indeed what else was there for them to be?

The public life of the Protestant community became increasingly barren. It had no practical politics, except voting against the ending of Partition, an increasingly quaint Royalism, and dancing around bonfires on Eleventh Night, and banging a great big drum on the Twelfth. But in no

way did this make it amenable to approaches from 'moderate Nationalists', who often seemed its mirror image.

Paisley, "*the Demagogue*", seemed to be the only politician in the North who understood this.

At one point, in the early 1970s, he favoured 'integration'—which would mean taking the North back into British political life. He never revealed what went on behind the scenes that persuaded him to drop integration.

Some time after that it came to our knowledge that he called some Loyalist paramilitaries together for a discussion, told them in effect that a repeat of 1912-14 was out of the question, and that a united Ireland could not be prevented.

What damage did he do? He brushed aside Captain O'Neill, onto whom grand illusions were projected. But what was Capt. O'Neill when looked at closely? A

clanging cymbal, or whatever it is that the Good Book says.

And he broke David Trimble's Unionist Party—Poor David Trimble, of William Craig's Ulster Nationalist Vanguardism; who did a jig with Paisley at Drumcree; signed the Anglo-Irish Agreement under personal duress by Tony Blair, and then, advised by Lord Bew and Eoghan Harris, did his best to prevent its implementation. And then, having destroyed the Unionist Party, he used up his considerable influence to make the Agreement functional by doing a deal with the Provos.

This seems to have been an attempt to recognise necessity in a way that might exert some British influence on Sinn Fein.

Paisley used up his influence in making the deal and giving it a good start. The resentment it caused lost him the Party he created and the Church he founded. But the arrangement he made is still in place.

## Death Of Irish Republicanism?

Anthony McIntyre, on his website *The Pensive Quill*, has emphasised to his followers that he is of the belief that Irish Republicanism is dead. This is in an interview headed "*The 'Boston College Tapes' Document Northern Ireland's Murderous Past*". McIntyre when asked: "*What do you hope happens in Northern Ireland? Are you still a republican?*" replies: "*To me, republicanism is over, but can I see a future for republicans if they behave in a rational manner and pursue justice and politics. Unfortunately, there are still people who think that political violence is the way forward, but for me it's an absolute waste.*"

When questioned by his followers as to his belief that Republicanism should be therefore "*pronounced dead*", McIntyre said:

"There is nothing new in this view. I have held it and stated it for years.

"Republicanism is dead in my view because it lacks the capacity to overcome the bedrock of partition—the refusal of the unionists to consent. Republicanism as we knew it had a coercive attitude to unionism. Republicanism sought to coerce the Brits out of Ireland and the unionists into a united Ireland. It failed absolutely and nobody yet has put forward a plausible strategy for making coercion work. And once republicanism abandons coercion and acquiesces in the consent principle it is no longer republicanism, but merely embracing the Brit/unionist/constitutional nationalist means of getting

the Brits to leave and getting the unionists into a united Ireland.

"If coercion can't win and embracing the Brit perspective is not on what can republicanism do? The options are limited to assuming a non coercive stance which avoids acquiescence in the consent principle. And that makes republicanism oppositional (sound in and of itself) but lacking serious sovereignty changing potential...

"The unionist question is the central question and one that can't be wished away. The unbridgeable cleavage between the British state and republicanism was not on whether Ireland should or should not be united. It was on the terms it would be united. The Brits insisted on the partition/consent principle. Republicanism dissolved itself in order to acquiesce in the Brit position. Once the consent principle is accepted it is an acknowledgment that partition has a democratic basis and is therefore legitimate. That is something which is irreconcilable with the republicanism we knew...

"Republicans are... faced with a dilemma: how to assert the right of the Irish people to be free of partition but deny the Irish people's right to be free from republican armed force aimed at removing partition. It leaves republicans in the position of saying the Irish people only have the right to be free from [what] republicans say they can be free from.

"I can see no way republicanism as we practiced it can succeed. And I do not intend beating its drum so that others might march to it and lose their lives or end the lives of others."

### From *ATHOL BOOKS*:

\* Scripture Politics, **Selections From The Writings Of Rev. William Steel Dickson, The Most Influential United Irishman Of The North.** 12, £10

\* Billy Bluff And The Squire (*A Satire On Irish Aristocracy*) And Other Writings By Rev. James Porter, Who was Hanged In The Course Of The United Irish Rebellion Of 1798. 10, £7.

\* The Causes Of The Rebellion In Ireland And Other Writings By Rev. Thomas Ledlie Birch, United Irishman. 10, £8

Furthermore, McIntyre goes on:

"There are only two ways to unite the country: coercion of the North or consent. The republican position is one of coercion. The British state's position is one of consent. The coercive position does not have to be one of armed struggle. The Brits or the international community could arrive at a conclusion that the six counties are Irish territory and should therefore be returned... Republicanism can do everything... apart from signing up to the consent principle which legitimises partition. The entire philosophical basis of republicanism is that... no minority on the island has the right to rupture the national unity and that to recognise the consent/partition principle is to give them that right."

The thing which Anthony McIntyre says is dead and which he describes in his argument is actually Anti-Partitionism not Republicanism.

It is not surprising that he confuses the two. Dr. McIntyre wrote a thesis describing the Provisional Republican movement as a product of 'Northern Ireland' and he himself is a product of it. His Republicanism is better characterised as lapsed armed Anti-Partitionism.

When Anthony McIntyre was a Volunteer of the Republican Army his objective was the abolition of 'Northern Ireland'. His position was that 'Northern Ireland' had no right to exist—whether there was a majority in support of it within its territory or not.

But the 'consent principle' was not what distinguished Republicanism from Nationalism of the 'constitutionalism' before 1969, even within his own community in the North. Eddie McAteer, Leader of the Northern Nationalists had as little time for the 'consent principle'—if he had ever imagined such a thing—as his brother Hugh, who led the IRA in the North.

The 'consent principle' to all intents and purposes originated in the 1960s with John Hume and it was he who popularised it. The Dublin Government of the time did not accept it and their Constitution exerted a claim over the Six Counties against it. Neither nice Taoiseach Lemass, who is praised for his accommodationist politics in relation to the North, or saviour Taoiseach Lynch, who is supposed to have pulled his state back from the grip of the Republican die-hards in 1969-70, had any time for the 'consent principle'. They were Republicans to all intents and purposes (though not meeting Republican expectations in the North).

The reduction of Irish Republicanism down to the issue of the consent of the

Ulster Protestants is profoundly un-historical. It is a product of an understanding of things in which history began in August 1969.

And for many in Catholic Belfast history did indeed begin in August 1969. Or to put it more accurately August 1969 was such an *interregnum* in the history of the Northern Catholics that the past that went before was another country, and 1970 was Year Zero.

When McIntyre left prison he completed a PhD under Professor Bew in the Queen's University Department of Politics. In his thesis he rejected a historical approach to Republicanism, seeing it as very much as a creation of the events of August 1969 and a product of British State strategies in the Six Counties. And knowing the politics of Prof. Bew that position would undoubtedly have been encouraged.

Quite recently, after the Boston College Tapes had secured the show arrest of the Sinn Fein Leader, Prof. Bew, after being pointed out by Gerry Adams, clarified his relationship with McIntyre. The Prof. called him his "*personal peace process*".

Lord Bew was interested in Anthony McIntyre for his position within Republicanism and his contacts within the movement, people who were disgruntled at the Republican transition from war to politics.

There seems to have been very little attempt over the years by Anthony McIntyre to get to grips with the history of his community or its predicament in relation to the catastrophe it suffered in 1921 through being placed under the perverse political construct called 'Northern Ireland'. And Prof. Bew would have been the last person to encourage interest in this matter, having written several books pretending that 'Northern Ireland' is a state and was capable of normal evolution into something better.

As a result Anthony McIntyre has retained a very narrow notion of Republicanism and acquired an unhistorical 'political science' view of the 'Northern Ireland' problem. It is a rigid and dogmatic position which seems to have little understanding that, whilst Republicanism in the North is a distinct product of the historical experience of the Catholic community there, it also exists externally to it as a historical and political phenomenon on the rest of the island.

So there is much more to Republicanism than what it is reduced to by McIntyre.

Republicanism is essentially an inde-

pendence movement. And it might be hard to conceive in West Belfast but it is only marginally to do with Unionism and Partition. In 1921 there had been very little thought given to this aspect of things within the Republican/Independence movement. The Treaty debates demonstrated that: Partition and how to get round it were hardly mentioned. And Michael Collins did a great deal of harm to the Republican movement in the North when he attempted to overturn Partition by using the Northern IRA as his personal instrument whilst manoeuvring against the Treaty he signed.

De Valera was a Republican *and* a Partitionist. He never said that in so many words but that was the logic of his behaviour and he inferred it in at least one speech to the Dáil. He saw that 'Northern Ireland' had been constructed in 1921 with the purpose of exerting political leverage over the Republican/Independence movement. To gain the prize of the Six Counties the independence movement had to moderate its ambitions so that it stayed within British hegemony and that of the Empire. So he had a choice of independence or unity. That is why Irish Republicanism / independence had to be Partitionist.

That is not to say that Dev supported Partition. Whilst doing everything to minimise Northern influence in the 26 Counties and in shutting the Northern Catholics out of Fianna Fail, he always hoped to smash the Border, one day. And he maintained that armed resistance to Partition was entirely justified by the minority within the Partitioned area.

The issue of Protestant consent, which McIntyre sees as the litmus test of Republicanism, can only be conceived of as a characteristic marking Republicanism out from other Nationalism in the brief period of early 1970s Belfast, when the Provos and John Hume seemed to stand for something different. But Hume only held this position in substance for a brief period before moving on to the more subtle position that, whilst the Protestants had a final right to consent, they had no right to obstruct their being brought up to the gates of Irish unity in whatever way they could be manoeuvred.

Within a couple of decades it became clear that Hume and the Provos did not stand for anything different of any consequence. Hume realised the importance of the Provos and the Provos understood the importance of Hume. They came together and utilised each other for the mutual benefit and advancement of their common community and the rest is history, as they say.

It seems to be only Anthony McIntyre and the rump of Hume's former party which have learned this lesson so slowly.

McIntyre seems to think that Republicanism and a political accommodation with the Ulster Protestants could not possibly co-exist. Has he never heard of the Sinn Fein Vice President in 1916, Fr. O'Flanagan?

Father O'Flanagan in 1916 outlined the Republican alternative to Anti-Partitionism, which he could see, even at that stage, was bankrupt in relation to Protestant Ulster:

"We can point out that Ireland is a nation with a definite geographical boundary... National and geographical boundaries scarcely ever coincide; geography would make one nation of Spain and Portugal history has made two nations of them. Geography did its best to make one nation of Norway and Sweden; history has succeeded in making two nations of them. If a man were to contrast the political map of Europe out of its physical map he would find himself groping in the dark. Geography has worked hard to make one nation out of Ireland; history has worked against it. The island of Ireland and the national unit of Ireland simply do not coincide. In the last analysis the test of nationality is the wish of the people... The Unionists of Ulster have never transferred their love and allegiance to Ireland. They may be Irish, using Ireland as a geographical term, but they are not Irish in the national sense...

"We claim the right to decide what is to be our nation. We refuse them the same right. After three hundred years England has begun to despair of making us love her by force. And so we are anxious to start where England left off. And we are going to compel Antrim and Down to love us by force" (Freeman's Journal, 20.6.16).

Fr. O'Flanagan had the courage to recognise the complication that confronted Nationalist Ireland if it wished to build a single state on the island.

Fr. O'Flanagan's suggestion of the existence of Two Irish Nations was subjected to a great misrepresentation by the *Irish News*, which attempted to lay the blame for Lloyd George's Partition scheme at the door of Fr. O'Flanagan and Sinn Fein rather than the Parliamentary Party which had done so much to bring it about in its political activity in relation to both the Ulster Protestants and British Unionism.

Fr. O'Flanagan was arguing the Republican position that Ireland had an inalienable right to independence and that should be immediately recognised by Britain. Having conceded that right it was

then up to Nationalist Ireland to obtain the consent of those who felt themselves to be part of the second Irish Nation to be a part of an Irish State.

He understood nationality to lie with the subject, rather than being an external imposition. If anyone wishes to know another's nationality, wrote O'Flanagan, the ultimate test is "Ask him" (*The Leader* 12.8.16)

Fr. O'Flanagan was not "Partitionist" and was not arguing that Ireland should be dismembered. He was in favour of a united Ireland and wanted to bring it about through recognition of the facts of the matter that were preventing it.

He made explicit recognition of the two Irish Nations in order to try to overcome the complication in Ulster. That was a prerequisite for a functional policy on the issue. Redmond and Devlin would never take the necessary first step of recognising the national difference and as a result they never had a functional policy on Partition.

When Devlin demanded self-determination for Ireland in the British House of Commons in 1919, Lloyd George called his bluff by suggesting that he would give Ireland self-determination if he would consent to Ulster getting self-determination. Devlin was wrong-footed, being incapable of taking the British Prime Minister up on his offer and the self-determination argument was lost.

McIntyre traces the death of Northern Republicanism back to its birth:

"The death rattle is to be found in the birth pangs. It was not the British being here that energised the Provos but how they behaved while they were here. A change in behaviour, not a withdrawal was all that was needed to bring the Provos to heel... The Provos were essentially a northern phenomenon: thrown up by conditions in the north and not the absence of unity per se. There were structural limitations on the expansion of the Provo struggle. This is why O'Bradaigh and the Provos were an ersatz alliance—he was a republican and his politics would always see him stranded on a republican path once the Provos abandoned it. O'Bradaigh's republicanism predated the Provos and outlived their republicanism."

Of course, what is missing here is any notion of the perverse nature of 'Northern Ireland' in producing the Provos. The Catholic Insurgency that became a Republican war was not Republican. It was a rising of the community in response to its political predicament, triggered by the events of August 1969 when the local

security apparatus of the British State went berserk. The Provisionals emerged in January 1970 before the British Army was acting as a repressive force against the community.

The Republican Army certainly grew as a response to British military repression and the failure of Westminster to abolish the Unionist system it had established in 1921 and which was the root cause of the problem. But simply removing the British Army would certainly not have led to the end of the War.

The Provisional IRA began as quite an ambiguous movement during the Winter of 1969-70—a product of 'Northern Ireland', not of Anti-Treaty Republicanism. Within this development some old Anti-Treaty Republicans like O'Bradaigh gained a new lease of life. But they were really just incidental attachments that provided some continuity to the past and an all-Ireland dimension to what was fundamentally a Northern development. What was more significant was the development of a structure to replace that which the State had withdrawn, and an all-Ireland network for the provision of materials needed for defence, when Dublin pulled the plug on this aspect.

Given these thoughts from McIntyre (which are indeed present in his thesis) one wonders what all the fuss has been about—since surely the Provos concluded their war in the only way they could, given their origin.

But instead McIntyre has been condemning Sinn Fein as Republican sell-outs for over a decade for adopting the 'consent principle'. Martin McGuinness told a radio interviewer at the Sinn Fein Ard Fheis in 2012:

"I recognise that there are one million people on this island who are British and let me state here and now that as a proud Irish Republican I not only recognise the unionist and British identity, I respect it. People who think that a new Ireland, a united Ireland can be built without unionist participation, involvement and leadership are deluded... The war is over and we are in the process of building a new Republic" (*Irish Independent*, 23.6.12).

There is the spirit of Fr. O'Flanagan and it has returned to Irish Republicanism.

**Pat Walsh**

On-line sales of books, pamphlets  
and magazines:

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

## Rural Ireland: *the mystery deepens*

*The Irish Times* reports that at the Irish Society of New Economists' Conference at NUI Galway this year:

"A detailed study of responses given by more than 2,500 Irish participants in a European Social Survey four years ago has confirmed once again that satisfaction cannot be defined by the standard media concepts of "happiness". The analysis of the data by a University College Cork economist found that contentment was at its highest among residents of rural Ireland, among those over 65 but "not unemployed" and those with children and religion as a part of daily life. Having regular social contact and being a trusting person were also influential factors" (8 September 2014).

How is this possible, if we are to believe the usual *Irish Times* and media commentaries on rural Ireland? It is supposed to be some sort of hellhole of lonely people cut off from the world and every aspect of life there is cast in the most negative way possible. And older people in it are deemed to be in the worst situation of all.

I assume this report would reflect the situation a typical rural place like Aubane. In modern media terms it, and places like it, can only be described by what it has not got—not a street, not a shop, not a pub, not a post office, not a church, not a graveyard, not a police station, not a school. No sign whatever of urban life. In fact the place does not even officially exist—at least not since the 1830s when the Church of Ireland did ensure its official existence for the purpose of collecting the tithes there. But its official existence went, along with the tithes. A signpost has appeared recently to acknowledge its existence. If you blinked while driving through it you would miss it.

Yet, bereft of all these things, the people there and in places like it, and older people especially, are happy according to this report! And UCC economics lecturer Dr. Edel Walsh, who presented the findings, explained that *the data she analysed was first collected in 2010, during the depths of the recession*". The people must be getting deliriously happy now with the approaching end of the recession! They might be dancing in the streets—if there were any.

The report gives no explanation for this most peculiar situation. This is surely a challenge for the Irish Society of New

Economists. There must a career to be made out of explaining and solving it.

Can I suggest that Ms. Walsh take up that challenge.

If she investigated Aubane, as an example of the phenomenon, she would find that the place is a hive of social activity based on a community centre. When needed, the people of the area built a school and a creamery to serve its needs. Both are gone and have been replaced by the community centre. If it was burned down in the morning, there is no doubt it would be rebuilt. That would happen because the locals get pride and enjoyment out of socializing with each other. They do this through identification with their townlands which is the essential social

factor in their lives.

Ms Walsh could create a revolution in planning if she proposed and set up a Townland Planning Department—at least one—alongside the myriad Town Planning Departments in our Higher Education institutions. Then all the moaning and groaning about rural housing, septic tanks, infrastructure needs, etc. could be tackled in a sensible and positive way that would not be at loggerheads with the people who actually live in rural Ireland. The planners and the people could be friends. (Like the farmer and cowboy!) And it is most likely they would be even happier if this situation existed and Ms. Walsh would be a national heroine.

Jack LaneRura

## Tall tales from Academia

A new book by historian Anne Chambers on T.K. Whitaker resurrected the hoary old chestnut regarding Charles Haughey's injury that prevented him from delivering the Budget speech on April 22nd, 1970. The official story has always been that he fell from his horse at the stables in Abbeville. But there has persisted gossip to the effect that he was beaten up in a pub on the morning (?) of budget day, which in turn has led to lurid speculation about the motives of the attacker (perhaps a husband of a woman having an affair with Haughey!).

There has never been the slightest evidence to support the attack-in-the-pub story, but that hasn't stopped the rumour.

Chambers' book seemed to give life to the gossip when she attributed the story to the distinguished Civil Servant Dr T.K. Whitaker, who is frequently referred to as one of the "*architects of modern Ireland*".

Charles Haughey's family is probably used to lies being told about him. But this was different. A distinguished person such as Dr. Whitaker was giving credence to the gossip or so the book claimed.

The Haughey family's rebuttal was very specific and included the following details:

"On the morning in question Mr Haughey was returning to the stables in Abbeville on his horse. He grabbed an overhead drainpipe to dismount from the horse and it reared up and jumped forward when the pipe broke. Mr Haughey fell from the horse and became unconscious.

"We also wish to state that the version of events given by Ruth Henderson, who

was employed as a groom in Abbeville, in relation to this incident and as outlined in her High Court action in 1999 and other legal actions, is true and accurate.

"It should also be pointed out that several members of the Haughey family attended to Mr Haughey in the immediate aftermath of the accident in question."

Here we have a very detailed description of what happened which contrasts with the vagueness of the gossip (pub in question not named, person who attacked Haughey not named, no witnesses to the incident etc). What could the publisher (*Transworld Ireland*) do to salvage its reputation?

It might have been tempted to tough it out since Haughey died in 2006 and the dead can't be libelled. But the problem was that a living person—no less a person than Dr Whitaker—was associated with the malicious gossip. So it issued the following minimalist statement:

"The quotation taken from the text of the book, which was attributed to Dr Whitaker, was in fact a direct quotation from *Jack Lynch: A Biography* by Professor Dermot Keogh...The author and publishers wish to clarify that due to a reference error in the end notes the words were incorrectly attributed to Dr Whitaker. The reference will be amended accordingly in future editions of the book."

How could such a mistake be made? An extract from Keogh's book is attributed to Whitaker, the subject of Chambers' book? And once the "*mistake*" was made, how was it that the "*mistake*" was allowed to be publicised in the *Irish Independent*

(20.9.14) and *Sunday Independent* (21.9.14) and was only acknowledged after the Haughey family's strong rebuttal. There is a huge difference between a quotation from Whitaker and a piece of text from an academic historian.

But let's look at the Keogh quotation. On page 259 of his there is the following:

"Haughey did not report to the Department of Finance on the day of the budget, Wednesday 22 April, as he had been badly beaten up earlier that morning in a public house in unclear circumstances and for unconfirmed reasons. His injuries were so severe—an iron bar having been used by his attacker or attackers—that he had been admitted as an emergency case to the Mater hospital."

There is no source reference for this piece of text. It is stated as if it is an uncontested fact. There is no mention of

the official story that Haughey fell off his horse. Professor Keogh just decides to rewrite history based on idle gossip. Also Dr. Whitaker doesn't feature in this narrative so it is difficult to see how the Chambers' book could mistakenly attribute Whitaker as a source for this story.

Keogh's book was published in 2008, two years after Haughey's death and therefore a libel case could not be brought.

*The Irish Independent* tried to contact Professor Keogh to shed light on the source for the story, but he was unavailable for comment.

As we go to press it is reported that an Taoiseach Enda Kenny will be launching the Chambers' book. It will be interesting to see if in the light of what has been revealed, he is happy to be associated with such shoddy work.

**John Martin**

#### EX-OFFICERS OF THE BRITISH ARMY.

The following two men were assassinated by the Auxiliary Corps of ex-officers attached to the Royal Irish Constabulary. Mr. Lynch was selected for assassination because he held a high position in the Republican movement for East Limerick. He was purely a political and not a military leader. Mr. O'Carroll was assassinated because he refused to disclose to the Auxiliary Corps the whereabouts of his sons:-

1920.

Sept. 22nd. Mr. John Aloysius Lynch of Kilmallock, Co. Limerick. (Assassinated at the Royal Exchange Hotel, Dublin.)

Oct. 16th. Mr. Peter O'Carroll, (aged 59), Dublin City."

(Vol. 3. No. 35, *Irish Bulletin*, 19th October 1920)

"October 16th. PETER O'CARROLL (aged 59) of Manor St., Dublin, murdered by members of the Auxiliary Division of the Royal Irish Constabulary. At 2 a.m. a party of these auxiliaries knocked at the residence of Mr. O'Carroll who went down to admit them. He did not return and some time later Mrs. O'Carroll went down to see what had happened. She found her husband lying dead near the door. He had been shot through the head with a silent revolver. (It will be remembered that when County Councillor John Aloysius Lynch was assassinated by Auxiliaries in the Royal Exchange Hotel, Dublin, no reports were heard of the shots fired.)

Some nights previous to this murder auxiliary "police" raided the house in search of Mr. O'Carroll's sons. They were not at home and the father was informed that if they were not at home the next time the raiding party called it would "be the worse for him". After they had murdered O'Carroll these English Auxiliary "Police-men" fastened a card about his neck bearing the words "A traitor to Ireland — shot by I.R.A." O'Carroll was unarmed."

*Irish Bulletin*, Mon, 1st Nov. 1920).

"On Saturday, October 16th, Peter O'Carroll, aged 59, was shot dead in his home at 78, Manor Street, Dublin, by constabulary at 2 a.m. After the shooting the constabulary remained for over an hour about the house and ignored the screams of Mrs. O'Carroll for assistance. Owing to their presence none of Mrs. O'Carroll's neighbours could go for help as the Curfew restrictions were in force and they believed they would have been shot."

(Vol. 3. No. 69. *Irish Bulletin*, Thursday, 9th. Dec. 1920.)

These reports are very typical examples of the type of detailed information that was contained in the *Irish Bulletin* on a daily basis for over three years. It is simply the most useful source there is on the Irish War of Independence. The paper was

## Who do you think we are?

There was no expense spared by the BBC for the edition of the series "*Who do you think you are?*", presented by Brendan O'Carroll (star of *Mrs. Brown's Boys*) on the killing of his grandfather in 1920 shown on 28th August. It was much heralded and featured some leading historians shot in

appropriate locations in Dublin.

The theme was that the programme enabled O'Carroll to get the truth about the killing. This was a transparent scam for anyone with the slightest interest in the history of 1920. It seems hard to believe that, if O'Carroll knew about this killing all his life, he never seems to have taken the trouble to find out more about it—who did it and why. This is especially so as the information is very easily available and nothing was added by the programme that is not available by some basic research.

If O'Carroll had taken the trouble to view another paper at the National Library, when he consulted the *Irish Independent* there, he would have got all the essential information about the killing.

That information was in a number of reports in the *Irish Bulletin* as follows:

"THE REAL MURDER GANG.

*All Forces of the British Crown in Ireland Engaged in Murder and*

*Assassinations... ASSASSINATED BY THE R.I.C. AUXILIARIES --*

**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** slane.jack@gmail.com

originally published by the Government of the Irish Republic but no Government since has seen fit to reprint it and neither has any academic institution anywhere. But it is being reprinted by the Aubane Historical Society and the Belfast Historical & Educational Society, and this item comes from the forthcoming Volume, Volume Three. Place your orders now!

Curiously, the document by David Nelligan that was quoted in the programme as a great find and that named the killer, Hardy, has been available online for some time as the very efficient Bureau of Military History has made that available, along with the other 1,700 plus Witness Statements that they hold by participants in the War of Independence. It is also available in the National Archives.

So a few minutes on the Internet and a few minutes more at the National Library and Brendan O'Carroll would have got all he wanted to know.

The main guest historian was Charles Townshend, who could surely have told O'Carroll all this in a matter of minutes, as he is considered a great authority on the period.

His 'added value' to the programme was to explain to the seemingly dim O'Carroll (he is a good actor, after all) why law and order had broken down in October 1920. You see, the IRA had intimidated the judges and therefore the courts could not operate in the normal way. This logically meant that O'Carroll family members in the IRA had been among the perpetrators of the war at the time, were terrorists in fact, and that they could therefore justifiably be legitimate targets for the forces of law and order—as everybody is for law and order! O'Carroll did not seem to take this point and it was left hanging in the air, but it was the logic of what Townshend said.

Townshend seemed to forget to mention that the judges and courts he was referring to had been replaced by Republican Courts which represented the legitimate, democratically elected Government that had been voted into power two years earlier. The existing courts and judges following the Government were therefore usurpers, having ignored this election result and set out to defy the new Government.

It was they who were doing the intimidating and the new Government's army, the IRA, was determined to establish law and order as voted for. But Townshend and our modern bunch of historians seem to ignore the basic issues of cause and effect when it comes to the Irish War of Independence.

**Jack Lane**

## A Royal Faux Pas!

Suggestions that the British Royals attend the centenary celebrations of the Easter Rising may not be so groundbreaking after all. Amongst the staff officers of General Maxwell, General Officer Commanding British Forces in Ireland in 1916 was a member of the British Royal Family, Prince Alexander of Battenberg, *aide-de-camp* to General Maxwell. He was 'pictured' in a small group, content-looking, "*at the Royal Kilmainham Hospital [the British HQ after the suppression of the Rebellion]*" (see below). I believe Connolly and Mac Diarmada were both alive as the photographer snapped.

How nonplussed Irish 'Royalists' must now be. Is it not strange the way history returns to haunt? How inconveniently it keeps raising an ugly head?

O' mornings, The Prince may have been awakened by the Sherwood Foresters' Firing Squads, nearby in Kilmainham Goal. He could have heard the scraping spades as they spread quick-lime in Arbour Hill. Perhaps he looked at Pearse's paltry last effects. While, again, the Union Jack flew over the GPO. But was a Royal *Faux Pas!*

In May 1916 nearly 2,000 'rebels' were deported and interned. They were held in British jails throughout England and Scotland, before being incarcerated in Frongoch Internment Camp in Wales. Some 160 prisoners were tried by Field General Courts Martial (FGCM), held *in camera*. None was legally represented. None was allowed to give sworn evidence in their favour. Trials were cursory, each lasting some 20 minutes. Scant regard

was given to evidence. Mis-identifications were rife. Ninety death sentences were passed—fifteen were carried out by Firing Squads. Later, Roger Casement was hanged in England, and his memory smeared. Fourteen Firing Squads were conducted in the Stonebreakers' Yard in Kilmainham. One (Thomas Kent) was conducted in Cork. The Sherwood Foresters provided the Firing Squads for the Stonebreakers' Yard. Major Harold Heathcote supervised. It seemed, when the dust had cleared, that Casement's hanging would be the 'one for the road'.

The case of Countess Markievicz is interesting. Maxwell wrote: "*I intend to try her as she is blood guilty and dangerous. I am of the opinion that this is the case of a woman who has forfeited the privilege of her sex.*"

She was tried and sentenced to death. Maxwell had intended she be shot, but he was over-ruled. To say he was prejudiced would not be an over-statement.

The FGCM of Comdt. de Valera was curious. His unit, the Third Battalion, held positions in Dublin South East, on the Republican Eastern extremity. It did not surrender until the Sunday, as the British had to cope with a complicated situation. The British made no lists *in situ*. De Valera was the only one of his unit to be tried. His men were held in the Royal Dublin Society, Ballsbridge. Some said he was saved by his American (US) citizenship. William Wylie states he advised Maxwell that de Valera was not one of the leaders and unlikely to make trouble in the future. Some detractors said



From Left: Not identified, Brig. Gen. Hutchinson (Chief of Staff), Lt. Bucknill (Legal Adviser), General Sir John Grenfell Maxwell (General Officer Commanding British Forces In Ireland); Not identified, Prince Alexander of Battenberg (Aide de Camp); Brig. Gen. Joseph Byrne (Deputy Adj. Gen., in civilian attire), Not identified

he was spared as he had become an informer. Others state he may have made overtures to the US Consulate, but there is no evidence. Maxwell, they say, was swayed by the US citizenship of de Valera. But there is no evidence for this either.

It seems that he and his men (women were debarred by de Valera for reasons of chivalry) were marched to Richmond Barracks, across the city, in the afternoon of Tuesday, by which time G-Branch, Dublin Metropolitan Police and others there had made their assessments. Selections had been made already. Those selected for trial were by now numbered and sorted. It was by such a quirk that he, who was to dominate Irish political affairs for the coming fifty years, was spared.

On 11th May, after the debacle regarding the Sheehy-Skeffington murder, Asquith stated there would be no more executions, save those of the two remaining signatories. Thus was de Valera spared from death. Maxwell had been isolated. He was now a broken-docket.

Maxwell was considered to be able and pugnacious. Known to his troops as "Conky", he'd served in India and South Africa; in the Great War too, on the Western Front, and in Egypt. He'd been appointed Commander in Chief Ireland, when the Rising occurred. He had the appearance of a cage-fighter.

Brigadier General W. Lowe had retired before the Great War. He returned to hold command at the Curragh. He held command of British Forces in Dublin during the Rising. Lowe made the decisive moves in penetrating the city. He set up cordons around the positions held by the Irish forces, eventually extracting the unconditional surrender.

Brigadier General Blackader served as President of a standing Courtmartial. He was decorated in the Boer War, where he ran a Concentration Camp. He was known as 'Old Black'. He expressed his high esteem of Pearse to the Countess of Fingall, on the night he sentenced him, while at dinner.

Brigadier General Byrne was Deputy Adjutant General. He was a Catholic from Derry. He served in the Boer War. Later he was made Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary, but was suspended in 1920 for reasons unclear; the rank and file backed him. Subsequently he was Governor General of the Seychelles, then Sierra Leone, and, finally, Kenya.

**The Dublin/Monaghan Bombings, 1974,**  
*a military analysis,* by *John Morgan, Lt. Col (Retd.).* 248pp. 20, £17.50 postfree

Brigadier E. Maconchy CME, DSO, was President of a standing Courtmartial. He served in India. He came out of retirement to command a Brigade, including Foresters, who suffered heavy casualties at Mount Street Bridge as well as at South Dublin Union and Marrowbone Lane.

Lieutenant W. Wylie KC was a member of Officer Training Corps at Trinity College. An Establishment figure. He prosecuted many prisoners after the Rising. Opinions of him were mixed. His personalised attack on the Countess was counter-productive; similar to Maxwell's diatribe directed at same Countess.

The British Headquarters was at the Royal Hospital, Kilmainham. There were approximately 2,090 troops in Dublin when the Rising broke out. Others were stationed at the Curragh and in barracks throughout the country. 'A small unit' of artillery was stationed in Athlone. It was brought to Dublin and employed in the Rising, where it wrought havoc in the city, shelling away with abandon. (There is one mention of an 18 pounder artillery piece being used on targets in The Four Courts area.) The city centre was devastated by artillery fire coming from gun-positions at the Rotunda and Trinity College.

Approximately 10,000 RIC were stationed throughout the country.

The British used APCs (Armoured Personnel Carriers), locally constructed. They were employed mostly in the inner city, *circa* the Four Courts.

The National Volunteers, formed in 1913, had been split in 1914, when the Redmondite element supported Britain in the Great War. Those who stayed Loyal became known as the Irish Volunteers, to be later called the IRA.

Professor MacNeill's Counter-manding Order—which went out to units throughout the country to cancel the order to mobilise and deploy—proved a disaster. Some 1,300, with Cumann na mBan, answered the call on Easter Monday. As did 200 from the Irish Citizen's Army, formed in 1913 by the Unions. Approximately 30 personnel of the Hibernian Rifles (a wing

of the Ancient Order of Hibernians) participated, serving in the GPO.

Meanwhile, British troops were pouring in. They came most from North West England (Nottinghamshire, Staffordshire, Derbyshire). Sea-landings were made at 'Kingstown'. The troops were not battle-hardened. Entry into the city was fraught. Fierce resistance was the '*Fáilte*'.

The Relative Combat Power (RCP) lay with the British. Soon they had 30,000 troops in the City. The Republican positions were pounded. Surrender became inevitable. Another *Pax Britannica* down Irish throats. FGCMs followed. Then, in dribs and drabs, the executions. Humiliation after humiliation. Then a lull. Then resumption of the struggle.

The recent *fax pas* may not be the last: when the Queen visited on the anniversary of the Dublin/Monaghan Bombings of 1974. Especially regarding Royals. Let the people honour their own without intrusions.

Close by, on 17th May 1974, HRHQ's forces covertly conducted bombings with diabolic intent. Please see my book, published by the Belfast Historical and Educational Society, *The Dublin/Monaghan Bombings 1974, a Military Analysis*. The analysis showed the closed-eye collusion which took place. (Enquiries to [belfasthistedsoc@gmail.com](mailto:belfasthistedsoc@gmail.com).)

The British Royal Family, named Sax Coburg Gotha, because of anti-German feelings, changed their name to Windsor. The Battenberg branch also altered their name to Mountbatten. And so we come to Prince Alexander of Battenberg serving in the British Army, putting down the 'rebels' in the Easter Rising of 1916. *O tempora! O mores!*

**John Morgan (Lt. Col. Retd.)**

**Editorial Note:** During the first World War, on 18th July 1917, a Royal Proclamation was issued, dropping all German titles and dignities. Any Princes were reduced to Lords.

Joe Little of *Majesty* magazine reports: "Prince Louis of Mountbatten went to stay with his son at a naval base in Scotland and wrote in the visitor book: '*arrived Prince Hyde, left Lord Jekyll*'..."

94<sup>th</sup> ANNIVERSARY OF THE KILMICHAEAL AMBUSH  
1.30pm, 30<sup>th</sup> November 2014  
at the ambush site.  
Guest speaker  
Jack Lane  
(Aubane Historical Society)



## Mansergh Nonsense On A Non-Sir

Brendan O'Connor, resident Harrisite court jester at the *Sunday Independent*, had a spiteful little piece on the front page of the issue of 1st September, under the heading of *Albert Reynolds, John Major and me*. O'Connor had gone to the removal of the late Taoiseach's remains, but he hastened to add that it was just for family reasons, not out of any political respect. There was nothing in his column that would put him at odds either with his Editor, Anne Harris and the editorial of the previous week that deplored the fact that Albert Reynolds had embarked on a Peace Process without ensuring that it would have as a prior condition the bloody defeat of the IRA, or with the amplification of that theme by his fellow-columnist and the Editor's ex-husband, Eoghan Harris, in the same issue as O'Connor's "funny incident". So, Brendan the Bold hastened to explain: "The mother asked me would I go to Albert's removal. Albert would have been kind of an old friend of the family." The yarn continued:

"I saw this grey figure walking up the road on his own. He was in a smart suit, looked suitably funereal, so I figured it was someone heading up to Albert's removal. And then I looked again as I drove past him, and I thought, 'Hang on a minute. That's John Major!' ... I wasn't gone too far down the road before I decided to swing around and go back and ask him if he wanted a spin up to the church... But just as I slowed down next to him and was about to roll down the window, I realised that actually it wasn't John Major at all. I moved on pretty quickly once I realised it wasn't Major, but I think it might have been Martin Mansergh. And let's face it, if he had wanted a spin I'm sure he could have got one."

The *Sindo* contempt for Mansergh arises from his role in the Haughey-Reynolds-Ahern Peace Process. And it must be acknowledged that, in the wake of the death of Reynolds, Mansergh acquitted himself well on TV3 and in columns for both the *Sunday Business Post* and the *Irish Times*. Mansergh writes quite coherently about what happened twenty years ago. It is what happened a century ago that has driven him to incoherence, arising from his *volte face* on the 1914-18 Imperialist War, highlighted in the September issue of *Irish Political Review*, which now sees him acclaiming the "Allied victory" and even beginning to sound more and more like John Bruton on the illusions of the Home Rule "Act".

Patsy McGarry is the Religious Affairs correspondent of the *Irish Times*, and it was in that precise capacity that his "Rite & Reason" opinion piece entitled "Irish/British engagement in the first World War was morally right" was published by that paper on 26th August, and filed online under the category of "Religion and Beliefs". McGarry's "With God on our side" British Imperialist war propaganda was to issue an edict in condemnation of the courageous stand taken by Labour TD Eamonn Maloney in breaking ranks with the all-consuming "Our Great War" poppycock to which we are currently being subjected, in his letter published on 21st August, as well as the 15th August report of Maloney's views under the heading of "Labour TD calls for withdrawal of John Redmond war recruitment stamp". The *Irish Times's* own "Onward Christian soldier" Patsy was certainly in his element that month. On 17th August, under the heading of "Former adviser says Home Rule 'a missed opportunity' at Casement commemoration", and again filed online by the *Irish Times* under "Religion and Beliefs", McGarry could report as follows on an oration delivered by Martin Mansergh the previous day:

"Former adviser to a succession of Fianna Fáil taoisigh on the North... Dr Mansergh made his remarks in an oration at Glasnevin cemetery which he delivered at the graveside of Roger Casement who was executed on August 3rd 1916 for his part in attempting to bring in arms at Banna Strand Co Kerry to aid the 1916 rebels. It was 'easy, in the midst of controversy that often shows only a hazy grasp of the realities of the past, to overlook the real missed opportunity of Home Rule, as an historic compromise between unionist and nationalism', he said. Roger Casement was 'a man of extraordinary courage and intellect, who successively encompassed all traditions', he said. His work in the Congo and South America 'remains a shining example in the continuous and never-ending task of tackling humanitarian crises'. It was when he campaigned closer to home 'he got into trouble and indeed ended up paying a terrible price'."

It would be wrong to see anything in common between Mansergh's graveside oration and those earlier lines attributed by Shakespeare in *Julius Caesar* to Mark Antony in his funeral oration: "I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him. The evil that men do lives after them; The good is

often interred with their bones; So let it be with Caesar." What Mansergh said of Casement was more akin to the characterisation which followed from Antony of Brutus and his fellow Roman Republicans: "For Brutus is an honourable man; So are they all, all honourable men." But . . . And McGarry certainly saw Mansergh's oration as serving a similar purpose. Casement was an honourable man, so were they all, all honourable men, those leaders of the Irish Republic proclaimed in 1916. But, horror of horrors, how could the 1916 Proclamation be so "morally wrong", to draw on McGarry's "religious" classification, as to refer to Germany and Austria as "our gallant allies in Europe"?

Yes, indeed, that is how Casement "got into trouble" closer to home, to borrow Mansergh's euphemism for high treason against the British Empire. When Britain and Belgium were for a time Imperialist rivals in Africa, Britain was quite happy to award Casement a knighthood for exposing Belgian atrocities in the Congo. But when Britain caused a World War in the supposed defence of that same Belgium, and Sir Roger sought the freedom of his native Ireland, he became a traitor to Britain and was stripped of his knighthood before execution. Casement was, of course, more than content to face the gallows as a patriotic Irish non-sir.

I have no doubt that Mansergh retains a certain affection for Casement. But why did he utter such nonsense at his graveside? Why could he not have displayed the courage of his most recently acquired 'historical' convictions? He could, after all, have said:

"Sorry, lads. Thanks for the invitation to give the oration. There is, however, an insurmountable problem. My views and those of Casement on the Great War, for which he was found guilty of treason, are diametrically opposed to each other. Mr Casement went so far as to publish a book in which he categorised Britain's war against Germany and Austria as *The Crime Against Europe*, whereas I rejoice in the Allied victory over those central powers. So, in all conscience, I must decline the invitation. Much as I disagree with Casement, I care too much for his honour to insult him in such a manner at his own graveside."

But no! Mansergh went ahead with his "Allied" nonsense on the non-sir who should have not gotten himself "into trouble" for campaigning so close to home.

Charlie Donnelly was an Irish International Brigade volunteer, killed in action in Spain in the February 1937 battle of



Jarama. Donnelly was both an anti-fascist fighter and thinker. And precisely because he was such a thoroughgoing one, he adamantly refused to countenance any 'democratic' gloss ever being put on the stratagems of British imperialism. Such thoughtful, independent analysis was evident in his attempt to capture the mindset of Roger Casement in an article, simply entitled *Connolly And Casement*, which was published in the July 1936 issue of *Left Review*. In a fictional dialogue, Donnelly surmised what he believed were the reasons why Casement had in fact rejected the very real offer made by George Bernard Shaw to script the defence case for his 1916 trial on the charge of high treason:

*SHAW (for the defence):* "The fact that I served England well enough to have my services publicly acknowledged and especially rewarded shows that I have no quarrel with England except the political quarrel which England respects and applauds in Poland, Italy, Belgium, in short, in every country except those conquered and denationalised by England herself."

*CASEMENT:* "Yes I have. I deny 'England's' claim to India and Egypt even as I deny her claim to Ireland—on the very ground that what I claim for one country I should not withhold from others, and not aid them, too, to obtain. I am not only an Irish nationalist, but an anti-imperialist."

*SHAW (for the defence):* "If you persist in treating me as an Englishman you bind yourselves to hang me as a traitor before the eyes of the world. Now, as a simple matter of fact, I'm neither an Englishman nor a traitor; I am an Irishman captured in a fair attempt to achieve the independence of my country, and you can no more deprive me of the honours of the position than the abominable cruelties inflicted 600 years ago on William Wallace in this city ... My neck is at your service if it amuses you to break it; my honour and reputation are beyond your reach. I ask for no mercy, pardon or pity."

*CASEMENT:* "Shaw's version is all right: but he does not understand one tenth-part of the issue the Crown has in view. They are not after me—except in so far as they have to keep in with public feeling. They are out to befoul Germany first of all; to show up the 'German plot' and 'Clan-na-Gael' plot and then to belittle me personally and point to the trio as fine guides and helpers for the Irish people. The reaction is to have this effect—glorification of goodwill of the Irish fighters who fought and died in Ireland—misled and deceived by Germany and me—but contempt and scorn for those who misled them and later (in the aftermath of a hopeless delusion) to get all the Irish Nationalists into the war on England's side, and satisfy 'legal Irish

Nationality' by some promise of Home Rule—that nauseous fraud—when the common enemy, Germany, is beaten."

Shaw did not die until 1950, and never objected to Donnelly's 1936 article as in any way misrepresenting his position. How could he? Shaw's personal affection and respect for Casement, when coupled with his own support for Britain's Imperialist War, led him into such a mass of contra-

dictions. Lenin once described Shaw as "*a good man fallen among Fabians*". But how should we should we now describe the born-again Mansergh? Perhaps Martin is a good man whom this "*decade of centenary commemorations*" has so disorientated as to collapse him into the ranks of British Dominion Home Rulers and his fellow celebrants of British Imperialism's "*Allied victory*".

**Manus O'Riordan**

## Ballaghadereen And The Great War

Patsy McGarry, the Religious Correspondent of the *Irish Times*, had a very sheltered childhood, youth and early manhood. He never knew that nationalist Irishmen had been recruited by the scores of thousands into the British Army by John Redmond's Home Rule Party to make war on Germany and Turkey! "*I never heard of them growing up*", he says. And that was in "*my home town Ballaghadereen*".

He was kept in ignorance of this elementary fact of the history of the Home Rule movement by something which "*has to rank as one of the great feats of ideologically-driven collective amnesia in history*" (26.8.14).

Ballaghadereen is one of the places I have never been in. But I seem to recall that it was the ancestral home of John Dillon, joint-leader of the Home Rule Party with Redmond and Joe Devlin until the dove descended on Redmond in his seat in the House of Commons on 3rd August 1914 and whispered to him that he should send the Irish to war for the Empire and let the Party read about it in the papers. Redmond then became The Leader. But Dillon was loyal to him, despite having been suspicious of British foreign policy for many years, and he gave him the green light to recruit Irish cannonfodder for use wherever Whitehall thought best, and no questions asked.

The Religious Correspondent of the *Irish Times* must be a learned man. And he's from Ballaghadereen. And he doesn't know about the Home Rule movement and the Great War!

I'm not learned. I was never at a University. I barely had National Schooling. But I have always known that the Home Rule Party siphoned a generation of Irish off to the British wars. If I've always known it and the Religion Correspondent of the *Irish Times* doesn't, doesn't that mean that the Murder Machine is still in operation? I imagine that the Religion Correspondent

of the *Irish Times* entered the education system at an early age and left it late and that accounts for why he didn't know what everyone knew.

I realise I am using the language of a bygone era when most people were not educated and did not want to be, and did not look to education for knowledge of real life. But I can only say that, in my generation, and in the generation after it, people knew that Irishmen were slaughtered by the tens of thousands in the Great War to no useful purpose.

My next-door neighbour had a Gallipoli Medal, and I believe a Gallipoli wound. And he was the Postman for half the Parish. He was a jovial man. The only name I knew him by was Carthy. He had a certain distinction for having been in the great indiscriminate slaughter, where individual survival was entirely due to luck and not to fighting ability, and survived.

To have been amongst thousands of men in a great meaningless battle, in which some were killed and some were not, through no fault or merit of their own—that was something to think about, and to wonder at. But it was altogether exotic—an event in another world. And we lived amongst men who had made their own Army, and had fought a war for an intelligible immediate purpose, and fought not in a military mass in which the individual had no distinctive part to play, but in small groups in which individual resourcefulness could not be done without.

I suppose the Religion Correspondent of our British newspaper—which is now trying hard not to appear what it is—cannot be expected to bend his mind down to petty considerations like that.

I have never been in Ballaghadereen, but I know about it because of a piece of our history that has in fact been wiped out in the national memory—the dispute between the Land Purchase movement of

1903, which brought about the abolition of landlordism in conjunction with the Unionist Government, and the Home Rule leadership which feared that the loss of the land grievance would weaken nationalism; the follow-on dispute between the All-For-Ireland League and the Home Rule Party over the sectarianising of the Party through its merger with a Catholic secret society, the Ancient Order of Hibernians; the abrasive attitude of the Redmondites towards the Ulster Protestants, which was driving the situation towards Partition; and the Redmondite tactic of close alliance with one of the British Parties against the other, on purely British issues, as a means of getting Home Rule.

John Dillon and Ballaghadereen figure prominently in those disputes. For that reason, I have been meaning to have a look at it for forty years. But, since the Religion Correspondent of the *Irish Times* tells me that Ballaghadereen has wiped out the memory of what John Dillon did in the Great War, maybe I won't bother.

But I won't rush into not going to see it, because another matter causes me not to have implicit trust in the word of a Religion Correspondent of the *Irish Times*.

He wrote a biography of Mary McAleese when she was President. It was published by the O'Brien Press in 2008 under the title *First Citizen*. In it he describes a libel action brought by McAleese against the *Sunday Independent* in 1988. There was a last-minute settlement of the action:

"The amount was never disclosed but it was sufficient to allow the McAleese's to put a deposit on an apartment in Dublin's Ballsbridge as well as to afford holidays for relatives and to donate some money to charity.

"In the midst of that action much the same libellous material was repeated by *A Belfast Magazine*, an ultra right-wing publication, in its August/September 1988 edition. It said that Charles Haughey had got her the job as director of the Institute of Professional Legal Studies. It also lifted material from the *Sunday Independent* article. When she saw how the libel had travelled into a second one, Mary McAleese decided she could not afford to allow this kind of story to go further. She sued them too. The magazine was cited on nineteen counts for defaming her. The resultant action put it out of business" (p124).

I would have thought that the memory of McAleese's libel action against me was something she would have been glad to see lost in amnesia as the memory of Home Rule recruiting of the Great War was lost in Ballaghadereen—at least for

McGarry. I published nothing about it until Martin Mansergh got a distorted version of it published against me in the *Irish News*, and the Editor refused to publish a factual correction that I sent him. I then drew up a detailed account of the action, with all the documents, and published it in *A Belfast Magazine*. Her libel action did not put it out of business. It kept it in business. The purpose for which it was published had ended, when her libel writ arrived, and but for the writ it would have gone out of existence with scarcely a whimper.

If the article I published about her was libellous, then I assume that my republication of it in my account of the action was libellous. And, if I had settled the action out of Court for undisclosed damages, I assume that my categorical statement that she did not get a penny from me in costs or damages was libellous. But she took no action against me on either count, and did not even issue a statement contradicting me.

Her libel action against me cost her a lot of money, assuming that she paid the premier solicitors in Belfast, L'Estrange & Brett, for their work, and likewise her two barristers, of whom I understood one was eminent and therefore highly priced.

The action up to the eve of the Trial involved a number of appearances at Master's Courts (Masters seem to be minor judges who deal with preliminaries), and a couple before Judges.

A little over a week before Trial I gave her solicitors an ultimatum to end the action within 24 hours, or else there would be no further negotiation. They nearly fell over themselves to do it. I handed in the letter in Chichester Street, Belfast, in the late afternoon and the thing was done by 10 or 11 the following morning.

At the end the action there was a handwritten document, written by one of her barristers with my help in the lobby of the High Court, saying that she was to receive neither costs nor damages from me.

About a year later I got a letter from the High Court asking what had happened to the action. I assume that meant the handwritten document giving up the action without costs or damages wasn't put into the Court. I replied describing what had happened, forget about the matter, and did something useful until a different story began to be told in biographies of McAleese after she became President.

McGarry did not contact me about the affair. I suppose he told the story that had been told to him. That is the kind of

investigator of the truth he is.

It is curious—or maybe indicative—that he doesn't mention my name. The Writ was issued against me by name, and was defended by me in person as I could not hire lawyers—as McAleese's solicitors were informed before the Writ was issued. Some lawyers I discussed it with thought a libel action against somebody who couldn't even afford to hire a solicitor was the height of eccentricity. Libel was about making money.

In fact, I wrote to the solicitors that, if they started the action, I would make things easier for them by getting legal representation on Legal Aid. But, when the Writ was issued I found there was no Legal Aid for libel, either for attack or defence. Possibly L'Estrange & Brett did not know that. I'm sure, from the way he carried on about the nuisance of litigants in person, that one of the Judges didn't know. I had to tell him—saying if I was wrong, let him point me to it and I'd go for it. Prosecution for libel of people without money just seemed to be unheard of, though people did sometimes prosecute libel actions as litigants in person.

The article was written by a solicitor who, having completed the academic law course of the University, went to the Institute of Professional Legal Studies for a year to acquire practical experience in a classroom. It was a cockeyed system. The reason for it was that there were too few solicitors and barristers in Belfast to operate the apprenticeship system when it was decided to treat the Insurrection as a criminal outbreak. Belfast had been exceptionally law abiding in the matter of ordinary crime for two generations, and Republican events had been mere political escapades after 1922. Then after 1969 there was an explosion of demand for lawyers, and not enough practising lawyers to produce enough new ones to meet the demand by apprenticeships, which was the proper way of doing it. So the Institute was set up by the law profession and Queen's University Belfast to make good the deficiency. The idea was that its Director was to be a solicitor or barrister in successful practice who would communicate the tricks of the trade to people who had completed the academic course in law.

It limped along for a while, but then there came a moment when the position fell vacant and nobody applied for it when it was advertised. McAleese, who had a made-up Professorship at Trinity College, did not apply for it because she did not have the necessary qualification of being

in successful practice. She was only an academic law lecturer. And David Trimble of the Law Department of QUB did not apply for it for the same reason, even though he was Acting Director of the Institute.

What the Legal Profession and the University did then was solicit applications from Trimble and McAleese, telling them the job was now available for law lecturers. But the job was not re-advertised so that law lecturers might apply for it.

McAleese was given the job even though she was only a law lecturer in another jurisdiction.

The article I published was written by a solicitor who had completed the academic course and was spending the year at the Institute expecting guidance from an experienced lawyer. That was McAleese's first year as Director, and she did not show up in the classroom at all to transmit her experience.

The reason, of course, was that she didn't have any to transmit.

For a year McAleese didn't do the job that she was being very well paid for.

The article was accurate as far as public knowledge of a public appointment went. She didn't have the advertised qualifications for the job, and she didn't do the job for a year. And there was possibly a suggestion that she was in breach of contract.

Her solicitors informed me that the terms of her contract exempted her from actually doing the job for a year. In other words, she had a year on the job to learn the job that she was appointed to do.

But that fact was not made known to those who were spending their year at the Institute expecting guidance from her. The writer of the article, who went on to become a successful solicitor, did not know it, and could not know it. It was not something the authorities cared to reveal during that year when their contentious appointment was arousing Unionist comment. Still, it meant that the article was not entirely accurate—and I'm rather more careful about accuracy than the Religion Correspondent of the *Irish Times* seems to be—and I was willing to make a concession on the strength of it.

I was of the opinion that the Institute was basically misconceived, and that it might well be that McAleese was the best person for the job as amended, but the amendment was not advertised and the appointment was made—by the employer, who was effectively the State, and certainly not McAleese herself—in gross breach of

the Fair Employment rules that the State was imposing as law.

I indicated all of this to her solicitors. And I told them it was an action I did not want to win—which would I imagine have ruined her career—but that I wasn't going to be trampled on by somebody with more money than sense.

After I entered my Defence—in which I put everything I knew about McAleese—her solicitors indicated to me that they were anxious for her to stop the action, but she was proving stubborn. It took many preliminary Court hearings, and the imminence of the Trial, before they could get her to see reason in the matter and get off my back.

McGarry, apparently quoting McAleese, says the issue was "*Why did this Catholic get the job when it was supposed to be the exclusive reserve of Protestants*". This is with regard to questions raised by Ulster Unionist MPs. And by describing *A Belfast Magazine* as an "*ultra-right wing publication*", he suggests that it belonged to that Ulster Unionist stable. And that implied that he never looked at the magazine or couldn't read it if it did.

The issue as far as I was concerned was: Why were the Fair Employment rules, which were being imposed on private employers as criminal law, broken in the making of this public appointment by the law authorities?

Two basic rules of the new order were broken in the appointment. Applications for the job were solicited by the employers—this was held by Bob Cooper to be a mechanism of religious discrimination and banned. And the job specification as advertised was changed, and applications were solicited on the basis of the change, but the changed job-specification was not advertised so that all who met the new terms might apply for it.

I had discussed these things with the architect of the Fair Employment Commission, Bob Cooper. He maintained that if the soliciting of applications by employers were banned by law, and all job specifications were clearly advertised and applicants were interviewed by a bureaucratic interviewing body, employers would always get the best person for the job, and the distribution of employment in all businesses would be strictly proportional to the population in religious terms—would be as if a quota system was applied. But the applying of a quota system was also banned by law.

All of this flew in the face of business experience. An employer with a vacancy to fill might ask a good worker if he had a

mate who would be suitable, and more often than not would be satisfied with what he got. But that was made a prosecutable offence in the North.

Society consists of a multitude of networks. Bob Cooper's vision of equality required that Northern Ireland should be reduced to a mound of disconnected atoms to be allocated for employment by a bureaucratic interviewing board, with the proviso that the outcome should be as if the religious quota system was applied.

A religious quota system would have been appropriate for what Northern Ireland actually was. But Britain would not allow what it actually was to be admitted so that realities could be dealt with. It would not allow it to be said that Northern Ireland was an undemocratically governed region of the British state with abnormalities resulting from that fact.

British democracy does something much more than give everybody a vote every five years for one of the two parties in contention to form the Government, and the functioning of the party structure of the democracy prevents the abnormalities produced by the Northern Ireland system. In the North one didn't even have the vote for a major party every five years, not to mention the rest.

Whitehall had its own reason for arranging it this way. The reason as far as I could see was that it gave it leverage on Southern politics by offering an illusory hope of unity. And Southern politicians, pursuing that illusory hope, actually opposed democratisation of the North within its state. They had the strange idea that the advent of normal British politics would diminish the prospect of unification, which they hoped to achieve through the conflict of the Catholic and Protestant communities in the isolated political life of the North.

For saying this kind of thing over forty years ago I was blackballed by the Southern Establishment, including the *Irish Times* (whose reasons were Whitehall's reasons), so I'm not surprised to find its Religion Correspondent writing rubbish about me.

The strange thing was that the Editor allowed him to use his column to condemn, with the affected superciliousness of an upstart, a letter about the celebrations of the Great War that had appeared in the paper.

Eamonn Maloney, a Labour TD, ridiculed the neo-Redmondite notion that the Irish state—established in place of the Home Rule devolution which Redmond failed to deliver—had prevented the people

from knowing that Redmond was a major recruiter of Irish cannonfodder for the British Army in the Great War. He said he always knew that vast numbers of Irishmen were killed in that War. McGarry said he didn't know, dogmatically extended his ignorance to people at large, and blamed it on a State conspiracy.

Maloney also quoted James Connolly on the War, which he described as a British war on a trade rival made dangerous by its progressive social arrangements.

It was surprising that Maloney's quotation from Connolly was allowed to be published. A historical fact that was truly suppressed was Connolly's active support of Germany on Socialist as well as international grounds, from September 1914 until he was killed in 1916.

McGarry did not dispute Connolly's reasoning. Nobody in the academic/journalistic Establishment of the State has ever done so. They prefer to ignore it, or react against it with a kind of emotional spasm when it was forced on their attention.

McGarry just trots out a couple of cliches from the 1914 British war propaganda which is currently being regurgitated all round. and he gives a long quotation from the German President blaming Germany.

Germany is a broken country—a country with a broken spirit—as a result of being defeated in two World Wars raised against it by Britain, the Wars being prosecuted most viciously after it had become defenceless: by mass starvation when the blockade was tightened during the six months *after* the Armistice of November 1918 in order to compel the new German Government, one approved by the Allies, to sign a false confession of German guilt for the War', and by incineration of the populations of undefended cities by fire-bombing in 1945.

The British historian, Andrew Roberts, who says what's on the British mind, said that the purpose of the fire-bombing of Dresden and other cities was to burn the moral fact into the German mind that Germany must never again act independently of Britain. It's almost a pleasure, after the mealy-mouthedness of the Anglophile Irish parroting of British propaganda, to hear moral truths stated bluntly by an authentic Brit.

The burn is still felt in Germany.

In the first post-War generation, Germany had a Government which acted with a degree of independence of Britain because of Adenauer who despised Britain, as an anti-Nazi who had seen Britain

collaborating with Hitler in the 1930s. But Germany under the post-War generation has been politically spineless, afraid to think—a backbone being necessary for the action to which thought might lead

*"The immediate reason why Britain and Ireland went to war"*, says McGarry against Connolly, *"was because the neutrality of Belgium had been violated"*, and Belgian atrocity propaganda was very effective in Irish recruiting. Connolly was well aware of that. Belgian, a little Catholic country, was violated and the Irish rushed to its defence.

The Christian Brothers, a grossly maligned institution by fashionable historians and journalists of recent times, took the *"immediate reason"* to be the actual reason, and they were good Redmondite militarists in 1914. But they were not an insular institution. And when Britain in 1916 violated Greek neutrality, overthrew its Government in order to get a base for operations against Austria, and pushed it into war against Turkey, overcoming its reluctance with the offer of a restoration of the ancient Greek Empire at Turkey's expense, the Brothers remembered the 1914 propaganda and copped on. The Redmondites didn't bat an eyelid.

Belgian neutrality might have been ensured by Britain in 1914 if it had told the Germans that it would make war on Germany if a German Army was passed through Belgium. The Germans wanted to know but the British wouldn't tell them, because the British Government needed a violation of Belgian neutrality in order to overcome the Gladstonian resistance of its backbenches to Balance of Power War in Europe. The breach of Belgian neutrality provided it with the moral cause to put to the Nonconformists who filled the backbenches.

In the Centenary Lecture to Parliament on the War this year, historian Vernon Bogdanor said it would have been a tragedy for Britain if Germany had not violated Belgian neutrality. The real Brits don't want to lose themselves in their diplomatic deceptions.

Back in 1914 the *Economist* magazine, which supported the War once it was declared, asked why, if violation of Belgian neutrality was the Government's reason for joining the European War, it did not make it clear to the Germans that Britain would make war on them if they did not respect Belgian neutrality.

The Government needed the violation of Belgium as a moral cause for the

Nonconformists, so it misled the Germans instead of deterring them. Does the Religion Correspondent of the IT regard that as authentic morality?

And is he entirely truthful, mentioning the 1839 Treaty about Belgian neutrality, but failing to mention that Belgium, an inoffensive sectarian secession from the Netherlands, had by 1914 become a monstrous Empire which worked millions of helpless Africans to death?

Casement, as a British diplomat, investigated the Belgian atrocities in Africa. McGarry says German conduct in Belgium in 1914 was *"barbaric"*. Taking the propagandist exaggeration as the sober truth, those German atrocities in Belgium appear slight on the scale of Belgian atrocities in Africa—unless weighting for 'savages' enters the equation.

Casement draw up a Report on Belgium's Imperial conduct against a helpless people. It caused a very brief sensation. Casement's later associate in Germany, Captain Monteith, said the British Foreign Office used that Report to put pressure on the Belgian Government to resist by force a German attempt to pass a German Army through Belgium to outflank the French fortifications—Belgium had a very strong Army for its size, far larger than Britain's. In return for Belgian agreement to do this, the Foreign Office undertook to marginalise Casement's Report.

The Report was certainly a Nine Days Wonder. Token Belgian gestures towards reform were taken to be substantive change. Catholic influence tried to discredit the Report as Belgium was the prime Catholic state in the world. And by 1914 the monstrous Belgian Empire was again made usable as *poor little Belgium*

Monteith's contention tallies with the course of events. Documentary proof is not to be expected—not from the Archives of the British Foreign Office; the British State does not malign itself, as an Irish Minister for Justice and Defence recently maligned the Irish State, with the consent of the Cabinet.

McGarry recommends three books to Eamonn Maloney, the first being *German Atrocities* by Trinity academics Horne and Kramer.

If Germany caused the War in pursuit of some expansionist aim, which is the feeling that is put into the atmosphere, that aim needs to be specified. Nobody has specified it. Deeds done in the course of the War cannot have been its cause. In discussion of who caused the War, what Germans did in Belgium when its passage to France was contested is irrelevant.

McGarry says "6,000 Belgians were slaughtered". Bomber Harris, defending himself against criticism of his incineration of the populations of cities by fire-storms in the 2nd World War, retorted that the Royal Navy caused half a million Germans to starve to death by its food blockade and nobody was bothered. Is the killing of 6000 by "slaughter", in the presence of actual or believed civilian resistance, worse than the killing of eight hundred times that number of civilians far from the scene of the action by slow starvation?

And what percentage were the German atrocities in Belgium of the Belgian atrocities in Africa which were committed purely for profit, in peacetime, in the presence of no hint of African resistance?

In Belfast in the seventies and eighties I saw that atrocity-mongering is the lowest form of political thought—or as an antidote to thought. And, as for "barbarism" in the sense used by McGarry, modern civilisation seems to be based on it. Britain, in many ways the pioneer of modern civilisation, was the biggest slave state and the biggest slave trader in the world during a critical century or century and a half of its development, and well within my lifetime it fought to wars by barbarous methods, in Malaya and Kenya, after the defeat of Nazism.

The USA is based on multiple genocide celebrated in a rich genocide culture produced by Hollywood. France fought a torture-war against the Algerians. The Spanish were charged by US writers with producing an inferior civilisation in South America because they had been insufficiently barbaric in their treatment of natives. If it wasn't for Switzerland, and perhaps Norway, one would have to wonder whether what we call civilisation was possible without barbarism.

This article is written out of reach of libraries. All the books recommended by the Religion Correspondent of the *Irish Times* for Eamonn Maloney to remedy his ignorance, as far as I recall, focus exclusively on the conduct of the War in Belgium in August 1914, and do not, as he does, present conduct after the War started as its cause. And, despite McGarry's approval of them, they contain much that is interesting. I'll review them when I get another look at them.

**Brendan Clifford**

**A Reply To Senator Martin Mansergh  
On The Case Of (President) Mary  
McAleese vs B. Clifford**

by *Brendan Clifford.*

**84pp. A Belfast Magazine No. 30.**

£12, £8

## **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**

### **APPROPRIATE ALLY?**

In 1906 Grey negotiated an end to Britain's 'Great Game' with Russia by dividing neutral Persia into spheres of influence and secretly entering into an alliance with Russia—an autocracy, which one year before, on 22nd January 1905, had shot down at least 500 peaceful protesters in the streets of St Petersburg on 'Bloody Sunday'. In suppressing the ensuing revolt, the Russian State killed 15,000 people and arrested 70,000 by April 1906. Russia under Tsar Nicholas II became a State of repression and intolerance, his wife Tsarina Alexandria assured him that "*Russia loves to feel the whip*". In 1907 Prime Minister Stolypin had 3500 people hanged and in some villages every 10th man was flogged, 100,000 were sent into exile and beginning in Kishinev in 1903 there were frequent State-sponsored anti-Semitic pogroms. Russia's 5 million Jews weren't the only minority to be suppressed: 1000 Armenians were massacred in Baku in September 1905, the Poles, Latvians, Estonians, Ukrainians, and Lithuanians all had their culture and language suppressed. In June 1910 Finnish autonomy was ended. Muslims were forced to convert to Christianity while non-Orthodox Christians faced religious discrimination.

In order to win over the Russians, Britain was prepared to jettison a former long-standing but equally blood-stained ally, Turkey. The old order in the Ottoman Empire was overthrown by the westernised and progressive 'young Turk' revolution in 1909. They opened schools and universities to women, expanded public works and public transportation, and modernised the army with the aid of 40 German officers. This raised the suspicions of Britain (despite her own role in training the Ottoman navy) and her allies. Britain successfully insisted the senior German General be moved to a less sensitive post.

The Young Turk triumvirate were strongly Anglophile and on six separate occasions from November 1908 to June 1914 proposed alliances with Britain and her allies, only to be rebuffed. Britain's strategy needed a Russian steamroller against Germany in the east, more than a Turkish ally who had already been beaten

by the Italians in 1911 and the Serbs, Greeks and Bulgarians in 1912. Britain thought Turkey would remain neutral but secretly hoped she would join Germany as this would give her a pretext to annex her more valuable provinces.

Britain also feared that reforms in the Ottoman Empire would be used as a precedent for her own Muslim subjects.

Fearing aggression from Britain's ally, Russia, Turkey signed a secret treaty with Germany on 2nd August 1914. Ironically in 1913 Britain, France, Italy, Austria and Germany held talks to establish zones of economic influence in the Ottoman Empire which could act a political blueprint for the future partition of the 'sick man of Europe'. In August 1914 Britain further sought to provoke Turkey, in breach of international law, seizing two Turkish warships being built in Britain. Germany offered to sell Turkey two of her warships instead, Churchill wanted to sink these ships and seize the Dardanelles but was overruled by Kitchener who wanted to maintain Turkish neutrality until British troops were safely transported from India to the Western Front through Suez. On 27th September 1914, without any justification Britain's navy ordered a Turkish torpedo boat back into the Dardanelles, to which Turkey replied by closing and mining the Straits. On 28th October 1914 Turkish ships attacked Russian Navy in Odessa and Sebastopol. Forgetting the same actions of his Japanese allies against Russia in 1905, Sir Edward Grey commented "*never was there a more wanton, gratuitous and unprovoked attack by one country on another*" and one week later Britain and her allies declared war on the Ottoman empire.

**SO FAR FROM GOD !  
"Poor Mexico, So far from God and  
so near the United States."**

- President Porfirio Dias

Like many other Third World countries, Mexico's natural resources were to become her greatest curse as the country was to become a pawn in a geo-political game between the world's 'Great Powers'. The power play would lead to revolution and civil war from 1911 to 1917 which would leave a quarter of a million people dead. Oil was first discovered in Mexico in 1869 but it wasn't commercially exploited until the turn of the 20th Century. Sir

Weetman Pearson a Yorkshire business tycoon, Privy Councillor and Liberal Party MP, later to be known as Lord Cowdry, set up the Mexican Eagle Petroleum Co., which began commercial exploitation of Mexican oil in 1899. It was the biggest oil field in the world, producing 110,000 barrels a day. By 1913 Mexico supplied one quarter of the world's supply of oil and Lord Cowdry owned the entire Royal Navy's supply of oil. Despite its oil riches, Mexico was a land of illiteracy and extreme poverty, where 85% of the population were landless peons. From 1876 until 1911 Mexico was ruled by the dictatorial and corrupt President Diaz, until he was overthrown in a revolution led by the reformist Francisco Madero. However, in February 1913 to the delight of foreign investors, Madero was overthrown in a counter-revolution by the drunken, Amerindian, reactionary General Victoriano Huerta. One of his first acts was to have Madero and his former Vice President Pino Suarez assassinated while in custody. This act alienated him from the newly inaugurated idealist, President Woodrow Wilson of the USA, who insisted Huerta not run for President. In response, Huerta dissolved Congress, arrested 110 of its members, and was predictably elected Mexican President.

Cowdry's friend, British Ambassador to Mexico Sir Lionel Carden, urged Britain and 16 other nations to recognise President Huerta, which they did on the 3rd of May but, despite the urgings of his Ambassador, Henry Lane, Wilson President Wilson refused to recognise the new Mexican regime and backed an insurrection in the north, led by General Carranza and his 'constitutionalists', lifting the arms embargo on him in February 1914.

Japan's Imperial ambitions collided with those of the USA in Hawaii (where Japanese immigrants were a majority), the Philippines, and Guam—which the USA had conquered from Spain in 1898. Many in both countries believed that war was inevitable. So Japan looked towards Mexico as the soft underbelly of the USA. On 28th October 1908 Japan and Mexico signed a secret Treaty. In February 1911 a German spy in Paris, Horst von der Goltz, got the Mexican Finance Minister, Jose Yves Limantour, drunk and stole a copy of the Japanese/Mexican Treaty and passed a copy to the US Ambassador to Mexico, Henry Lane Wilson. The Japanese fleet visited Mexico, the Mexican Foreign Minister, De la Barra, visited the Emperor and the Japanese agreed to supply the new Huerta regime arms to defeat the US-backed insurrection.

In this they were not alone, Germany had long desired to set up a naval base on the

Mexican coast. Ambassador Admiral Von Hintze offered to supply arms the new Huerta regime, if he would cut off Britain's supply of oil in the event of war. In early 1914 Germany sent three ship loads of weapons from Hamburg: the Ypiranga, Bavaria, Kronprinzessen Cecilie destined for Veracruz in Mexico. However, on 6th April 1914, 8 sailors from the USS Dolphin, flagship of US Admiral Mayo, went to the Mexican port of Tampico to seek supplies. As the port was under martial law due to the rebellion, the US sailors were detained and returned to their vessel. The Admiral took offence and demanded a 21 gun salute from the Mexican authorities, but as the US did not recognise the Mexican Government they refused. Washington saw this insult as an opportunity for 'regime change' and to prevent German arms reaching Mexico. It issued an ultimatum. With the passing of the deadline, President Wilson arranged for a midnight telephone conference of his Cabinet in which they agreed to invade the Mexican port of Veracruz and illegally seize the German arms ship Ypiranga. The following morning of 22nd April 1914 saw the first unprovoked attack of that momentous year. Under orders of from the idealist President Wilson and his pacifist Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, the USS Prairie shelled the city of Veracruz, while US marines seized key buildings, resulting in 19 American dead and 71 injured and 126 Mexicans killed and 95 wounded.

Although the US Secretary of state was forced to apologise to the German Ambassador and allow the German ships off-load their cargoes of 200 machine guns, 16.8 million rounds of ammunition and 8327 rolls of barbed wire, the American attack succeeded in undermining the rule of President Huerta who fled into exile in Spain on the German ship Dresden on the 17th July 1914, to be replaced by Wilson's protégé Carranza. Nine days later Austria would declare war on Serbia and Mexico would again find herself a pawn in a game of geopolitical intrigue.

By early 1915 it was clear that the war on the Western Front was bogged down in a stalemate. To defeat the French, the British would have starved out of the War, by U-boat attacks cutting off her supplies. Such a strategy risked provoking the massive power house of the United States into war with Germany. However, if the US were embroiled in a war in Mexico, she would be unlikely to have the resources or wish to become embroiled in European affairs. Also, if Japan could be tempted by more territorial gains in China to switch sides and declare war on Russia, this would take the pressure off the Central Powers in the East. When Germany

approached Japan with this offer, she leaked it to her ally Russia. In February 1915 German Captain Franz Von Rintelen offered to support a military *coup*, to restore General Huerta to power in Mexico. Germany arranged for Huerta to travel to the USA, paid for his services and those of his supporters, and bought arms for his insurrection. However when the US became aware of Huerta's plans to cross into Mexico to lead a revolution, he was arrested and died in custody amid accusations of poisoning on 14th January 1916.

However, Huerta's was not the only rebellion in Mexico at this time. In the north a former potential ally of the USA, Pancho Villa, believing he had been betrayed by the USA in their support for Carranza, massacred 16 American engineers at Santa Ysabel on 10th January 1916. On 9th March 1916 400 of Villa's men invaded the town of Columbus, New Mexico, killing scores of its residents. The ensuing political and media frenzy forced President Wilson to sanction a punitive raid into Mexico led by General Pershing and 6600 men.

Germany found herself in the ideal position of encouraging Villa to provoke a US invasion, while encouraging President Carranza to assert Mexican sovereignty. On 21st June 1916, 12 US troops were killed and 23 captured when Mexican Government troops opened fire on them at Carrizal. German investment and propaganda in Mexico increased and President Carranza once the puppet of America, moved ever closer to Germany and her diplomat in Mexico, Eckhardt. By November 1916 80% of the US regular army or 12,000 troops was tied down in Mexico.

Britain warned Mexico not to allow her ports to harbour German U Boats or there would be '*drastic action*'. Japan, which had agreed only to sell arms to her allies, now openly courted Mexico and offered to sell her arms. At this crucial moment, Arthur Zimmerman a 50-year old bachelor who drank 3 bottles of Moselle wine each day at lunch, was appointed Germany's first non-aristocratic Foreign Minister. He favoured the policy of all-out U-boat warfare, even if this provoked America into the War. He had a mis-placed faith in the power of America's 1.3 million German born citizens to keep the USA out of the War. He once warned "*in case of trouble there are half a million trained Germans in America who will join the Irish and start a revolution*", to which US Ambassador Gerard retorted: "*in that case there are half a million lamp-posts to hang them on*".

In December 1916 President Wilson

was re-elected under the slogan, 'he kept us out of the war'. He immediately made a peace proposal, and asked the combatants to state their war aims. The War was at this stage costing Britain alone \$10 million a day, most of which she was spending on supplies and munitions manufactured in the US, with massive loans from American banks like J.P. Morgan which, in October 1915 alone, granted France a half a billion dollar loan. President Wilson thought he could use the Allies' dependence of US supplies to force peace. However, as far as the US banks were concerned, their bet on an Allied victory was 'too big to fail': any outcome other than an Allied victory would cripple the US economy.

Britain's national debt increased twelve-fold from 1914-1918 and the total cost of the War for all belligerents was estimated at \$186 billion. US exports increased from \$824 million in 1913 to \$2.25 billion in 1917. The Allies of course did not plan on repaying their debts out of their own resources but from crippling reparations imposed on the vanquished foe. Therefore the Allies rejected Wilson's peace proposal on the 12th January 1917. Germany was willing to risk all on one last gamble: at a conference in the Castle of Pless in Poland, the head of the German Navy Admiral Von Holtzendorff outlined in a meticulously-detailed 200-page report how, if German U-boats could sink 600,000 tons of Allied shipping a month, Britain could be brought to her knees before the next harvest in six months' time. It was impossible for the US, whose standing army was little more than 20,000 men, could recruit, train, equip and transport enough men to Europe within that time frame to prevent defeat and certainly not if she was embroiled in a war with Mexico.

Germany knew well how effective hunger was as a weapon: Britain had imposed a naval blockade on Germany and her allies since the outbreak of the War. In 1915 Britain had extended her blockade to the neutral Netherlands and seized Dutch ships in Allied ports. By 1915 bread rationing had been introduced in Germany, and her imports and exports had fallen by 55% of their pre-War level, by 1918 the German meat ration was only 12% of the pre war level, the supply of cheese, rice, eggs and cereals was only 20% of the pre-War level and fish supplies were non-existent.

Although Germany sought to counteract these shortages with 'Kriegssozialismus' or Walter Rathenau's War Socialism. Turnips and potatoes were mixed with flour to make bread, Germans went without meat two days a week and were compelled to invent *ersatz* materials like cellulose

and rayon. Shortages, even of coal, were exacerbated by Germany's imprudent conscription of experienced farm workers and miners. In all, 424,000 German civilians would die of malnutrition and 209,000 more from flu during the War and another 100,000 in the six months of continuing blockade after the War's end.

Germany proposed to Mexico that, if the US joined with the Allies in the War, Germany would back a Mexican invasion of the USA to re-conquer the States of Texas, New Mexico and Arizona. Zimmerman originally planned to send this message on the German merchant submarine, 'Deutschland', but this plan was cancelled at the last minute and it was decided to send the message by coded telegram instead. On the 16th January 1917 this fateful proposal was sent by Foreign minister Zimmerman to his diplomats Bernstorff and Eckhart in Mexico. On the 31st January 1917 Germany told the USA that unrestricted U boat warfare would commence in eight hours. On the 3rd of February America broke off diplomatic relations with Germany. On the 5th of February Zimmerman sent a second telegram which proposed German support for a Mexican invasion, even if the USA did not join the Allies. On the 25th of January Wilson ordered the withdrawal of all US troops from Mexico which was completed on the 5th February.

Even still Germany had reason to be hopeful, on 13th February Carranza called for all neutral nations to embargo war supplies to belligerent countries and toyed with the idea of taking back sub soil oil rights for Mexico: this in effect would cut off the Royal Navy's oil supply, bringing it to a halt. The oil fields themselves were defended by an Indian bandit warlord Palaez, whose services went to the highest bidder. On 26th February the liner Laconia was sunk by U boats, with the loss of two American lives, while Congress was debating a Bill to arm American merchant ships: this Bill was passed by 403 votes to 13. The future of the War and world history hung in the balance. Would America fight Mexico at home or join the Allies against the German's in Europe?

#### THE SECRET WAR

Germany foolishly believed that its codes were unbreakable. However, as early as 1912, the British Committee of Imperial Defence had a plan to leave Germany without direct cable communication with the outside world and force her to transmit her diplomatic and military communications by wireless from Nauen, where they could be intercepted by British Naval Intelligence. Britain declared War on

Germany at midnight on the 4th August 1914 before the sun rose the following morning Germany's five transatlantic telegraph cables were cut by the British ship Telconia off the Dutch coast at Emden. Her remaining transatlantic cable from West Africa to South America and her cables in the Mediterranean were owned by the British firm Eastern Telegraph.

From this moment on all German encrypted communications were intercepted by 800 wireless operators and 80 cryptographers and clerks in 'Room 40' of the British Admiralty, who intercepted 200 radio messages a day. The decryption team was led by a Scot, Alfred Ewing. The encrypted code was wrapped inside a cipher: if they could break the code they could read Germany's messages before the intended recipient. Until then, Britain had every German message but couldn't understand them. In August a German cruiser the Magdeburg was accompanying mine layers when it ran aground near the island of Odensholm off the coast of Finland. Despite an order to destroy their code book, it was recovered by the Russian Navy and passed to the British Admiralty on the 13th October 1914, which now set about cracking the German codes.

In December 1914 another code book recovered from a German destroyer sunk by the British on the 13th October was also recovered. All of this was overseen by Admiral Sir William Reginald 'Blinker' Hall, a man who looked like a demonic Mr. Punch and earned the nickname 'Blinker' because of an involuntary facial twitch. On 5th February the Anglo-Persian oil pipeline was cut by a German spy and ex-Consul to Bushire called William Wassmuss, who was on a mission to get Persia to join with Germany and throw off their Anglo-Russian yoke. In the provincial capital Shiraz he had

#### GHOSTS OF EMPIRE

A thousand armies march, scheduled to clash,  
in a thousand uniforms that don't match,  
brass, silver accordion flutes reech,  
the colours through the grey streets become  
a rash,  
banners say the British Empire still exists.  
(India lies at the feet of Victoria)  
In deluded minds breeds euphoria:  
'This time we force them into the abyss-'  
'Palestinian flags flying in Belfast!  
Don't we have enough Catholics of our own?'  
But surely a handy scapegoat to blast,  
think how we can curse them till our  
mouths foam,  
call them cockroaches and wish them  
crushed. At last!  
And all the time it's that fenian syndrome.

Wilson John Haire

16 August 2014



led an attack which captured the British Consul and killed the Vice-Consul. He had been captured by the British but escaped after they learned his identity.

In violation of Persian neutrality and sovereignty, the British raided the German Consulate in Bushire and seized Wassmuss's documents, including his diplomatic code book which was brought to Hall in London and provided another piece of the puzzle. By April 1915 Britain had the final piece of the puzzle, thanks to Alexander Szek, a 20 year old radio engineering student, born in Britain of Austrian parents and living in Brussels. He had repaired the damaged powerful Belgian radio transmitter on Rue de la Loi after the invasion and worked in the station with access to the German codes. British Intelligence put pressure on his family members still living in England to persuade him to steal the codes. This he did over a period of three months, only to disappear never to be seen again. His father accused British Intelligence of his murder so that he would take his secret to his grave.

Hall was also instrumental in the failure of the 1916 Rising. John Devoy's dispatch, sent to the German General Staff from America was intercepted and decoded by Room 40. It revealed that the rising would be around Easter. In early 1915, British Intelligence used a yacht, the 'Sayonara', to survey possible landing sites for German arms along the West coast. Hall's code breaking led to the capture of the Aud and of Roger Casement. Hall even played a role in interrogating Roger Casement and in smearing him with the 'Black Diaries'.

Germany too was fighting a secret war. Captain Franz von Rintelen was a German spy who arrived in New York on 3rd April 1915. His mission was to deny the Allies vital supplies of American manufactured munitions: the American Bethlehem Steel Company produced 20.1 million artillery shells for the Allies, 40% of the shells used in the War. Germany planned to achieve its objectives by sabotage, industrial unrest, and embroiling America in a conflict with Mexico, Japan or both, which would divert resources away from Europe. Rintelen funnelled \$500,000 into 'Labour's National Peace Council', run by David Lamar who organised strikes and slowdowns at ports and munitions factories. He also had a German chemist, Dr Scheele, make time bombs, to be placed in the holds of Allied munitions ships.

Germany assisted Indian nationalists living in America, which led to a mutiny of Indian troops in Singapore. Germany

was also funding former President Huerta to stage a *coup* in Mexico: \$800,000 was deposited in his German bank account in Havana and \$95,000 in his account in Mexico.

The British were able to learn this information from their intercepts, but also from the 'Bohemian Alliance' spy ring, led by former Czech President Masaryk and a Czech Socialist called Voska who had 80 agents acting as mail clerks in the Austrian Consulate, the maid to the German Ambassador's wife, as well as a chauffeur in the German Embassy. This group also bugged the German spies' favourite meeting place, the Manhattan Hotel.

All of this information was passed to the British naval attaché, Captain Guy Gaunt, who in turn passed it to Admiral Hall who passed much of it to the Americans. This led the American President to instruct Secretary of the Treasury Mc Adoo to order the head of the Secret Service, William J. Flynn, to bug the phones of the Austrian and German Embassies. Much of the information uncovered by the British would be published in an American newspaper, the *Providence Journal*, edited by an Australian-British agent, John R. Rathom, in an attempt to turn US public opinion against Germany.

On 24th July 1915 a German diplomat, Dr Heinrich Albert, forgot his brief case on the subway. It was recovered by Secret Service agent Frank Burke and contained details of German sabotage in America. In August 1915 the British arrested an America courier for the Central Powers, John J Archibald on board the ship 'Rotterdam'. He had 110 documents detailing the German plot to install Huerta in Mexico, plots to stir up strikes, as well as details of payments to saboteurs and propagandists. When this information was published, President Wilson expelled the Austrian Ambassador, Count Drumba.

Germany attempted to acquire more secure and reliable methods of transmitting secret messages. The Germans bribed the Mexican Minister for Telegraphs, Mario Mendez, for \$600 a month to illegally send coded messages to German agents in America. The Swedish Charge d'Affaires in Mexico, Folke Cronholm, was bribed with a German decoration, the *Kronenorden*, second class, to transmit messages over the Swedish diplomatic cable to Stockholm where they were relayed to Berlin: this method was known as 'the Swedish roundabout'. However, as Britain also intercepted Swedish diplomatic cables, it was of no use.

In December 1916 President Wilson attempted to negotiate peace in Europe

offering 'peace without victory, and only a peace between equals can last'. Germany offered to send their terms for peace to the Americans but asked if they would be allowed to transmit communications to their Embassy over the American diplomatic cable in German code: this permission was given on 28th December. On 12th January 1917 the Allies rejected the US peace offer and on the 16th January Germany sent the infamous Zimmerman Telegram, offering a German alliance with Mexico in the event of an invasion of the USA to Ambassadors Bernstorff and Eckhart in Washington and Mexico over the American cable.

British Intelligence intercepted this message by all three routes and had it fully decoded by 19th February. The British Foreign Secretary and former Prime Minister, Arthur Balfour was afraid that, unless Britain revealed that they had cracked the German codes, the Americans would think the telegram a fraud. He gave the telegram to the pro-British US Ambassador Page on 23rd February who passed it to the President and allowed Americans to decode it for themselves, on the condition that they do not reveal that Britain had cracked the codes.

The Mexican Foreign Minister lied by denying knowledge of the Zimmerman telegram. The telegram was now circulating among US politicians and in the media but most Americans believed that it was a fake until the 3rd of March when, inexplicably, Zimmerman admitted at a press conference that he wrote it. The American public was outraged that Germany would secretly plot with Mexico, using their own telegraph lines, to invade the USA: the West and Mid West now joined the East coast in demanding war on Germany.

On 9th March, without the backing of Congress, Wilson issued an executive order to arm US merchant ships. Yet he still resisted the demand for war until the Russian Revolution of the 19th March in which Kerensky overthrew the Tsar. The following day the US Cabinet voted unanimously for war (with Wilson abstaining) and, on 2nd April 1917 the US Congress voted by 373 to 50 for war. In the coming months the USA was able to use its overwhelming economic power to recruit train and transport up to 10,000 troops a day plus supplies to Europe, where they would give the Allied Powers the will to hold on, break the will of the German army and people, and overwhelm a German army which at that point had been forced to conscript 15 year olds.

**Paul McGill**

**Next Month: Conclusion**



## Public Spending Position in NI

This year's 2014/15 public expenditure settlement for Northern Ireland was always going to be the most difficult.

Over recent weeks in particular, there has been considerable controversy surrounding the public expenditure position with some politicians blaming the current recent renewed public spending cuts across the public sector on the non-implementation of the UK Government's welfare reform measures. It is important to remember that this year's 2014/2015 public expenditure settlement for Northern Ireland was always going to be the most difficult. The 4 year settlement determined by the UK Coalition Government in its first budget after the 2010 election back-loaded the cuts in Northern Ireland and while we have experienced significant and damaging cuts since then, the financial allocation for Northern Ireland in the financial year 2014/15 was substantially less than in the first three years of the 4 year spending review period. The table below is based on figures provided to NIPSA by the Department of Finance and Personnel in 2010. It is clear that the plan was to involve additional cuts of around £863m for Departmental Expenditure Limits and cuts of around £538m in Capital Expenditure both these figures represent real terms change to take account of the normal inflationary pressures.

UK Spending Review Outcome (20 October 2010)					
Real Terms Change from 2010-11					
	£m				
	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	Cumulative Real Change
Current DEL	-237.9	-447.4	-647.2	-863.7	<b>-2196.1</b>
Capital DEL	-342.7	-415.9	-527.3	-538.2	<b>-1,824.1</b>

While some marginal adjustments were made to these financial allocations as a consequence of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's 2013 Autumn Statement and the 2014 UK Budget, the fundamental point is that the UK Government's austerity policies were always going to move to a new level this year and that explains why most government departments and public bodies are reaching crisis point with their finances.

The Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety have identified a £120m shortfall to maintain services at the current level and to provide adequate levels of service provision a figure of £400m has been mentioned. Other Departments except for the Department of Education are having their budgets cut by 2.1% in the June 2014 monitoring round. These cuts are to all public services operating within the remit of the parent civil service department and are not confined to the NI Civil Service budgets themselves.

The cuts are separate from the cut of £87m which is the amount of the reduction which will be required if welfare reform is not implemented. It is important to note that the reason for the existing cuts listed above arise exclusively from the implementation of the 4th year of the UK Coalition Government's austerity post 2010 election budget and public sector spending settlement.

Since the creation of the Conservative/Liberal Democrat Coalition Government after the May 2010 Westminster election Northern Ireland will have experienced cuts to its public expenditure of around £4billion in real terms. This is the reality we are faced with.

It is important to put the current attack on public services, public sector employees, pay, pensions and social security in the right context. Since the early 1990s, following the election of the late Margaret Thatcher, the Conservative Government set out to remake UK society and to overturn the post war consensus on economic and social policy. The central objectives were, among other things, to shrink the "state" ie to slash spending on public services, to privatise public assets, industries and services, to weaken the trade unions as the only force standing in the way of this reactionary and anti-working class agenda, to reform the taxation system to favour the wealthy and to deregulate the economy, the financial sector in particular.

The deregulation of the finance sector contributed substantially to the financial crisis of 2008/2009 and the subsequent near economic collapse. The current UK coalition has used this crisis as a smokescreen to push even further these objectives of the Conservative Government and the 2010 public spending settlement reflects the escalation of the attack on public service spending and provision.

This is the real explanation for the current crisis faced by Northern Ireland Government Ministers and Departments and the real backdrop to the current rows among the political parties in Northern Ireland. Instead of the internal in fighting, bickering and point scoring it would be more appropriate if all parties in the NI Executive recognised the need to campaign against the UK Government's austerity programme and pushed opposition to this agenda on the political front.

In this way the people of Northern Ireland would be served much better by our political system and such an approach from the NI Executive would provide the basis for a united approach involving all the political parties at Stormont, something which would undoubtedly be welcomed and supported by the community generally.

NIPSA, for its part, will continue to oppose the out-workings of the anti-working class austerity agenda; we will continue to defend public services and our members interests as best we can and we will campaign against the privatisation of services which serves to bolster the profit margins of the big corporations and the private profit sector.

As a union we will oppose reductions in the social security safety net system, as is the purpose of the so called welfare reform programme, because these changes impact negatively on our members and their families, especially those in low and middle income categories as well as the unemployed, the sick and the disabled...

**Brian Campfield**  
General Secretary

Does  
It  
Up

Stack  
?

### 1916 AND THE SOMME

The British current propaganda campaign about how great they were in their Great War does not fit in at all with their horrible habit of making wars for control of other nations' raw materials and for purposes of commercial aggression and exploitation. Making war seems to be hard-wired into the British mind due to relentless pro-war propaganda. Other nations have learned the lesson that in the long run war does waste vast resources. Britain and the USA think they can profit from wars by making the victims pay for the wars. And the victims do pay and they do suffer. But Britain and the USA suffer more—the British Empire is gone due to its wars and the USA economy is suffering and its empire is going the same way. They are massaging their GDP figures by commodifying everything so as to show the GDP is increasing but it is not really increasing. They are finding new things to put a money value on and to add to their GDP. Illegal drugs have been commodified as have prostitution services, although the national statisticians refuse to say where they get the figures from. GDP is no longer what it used to be. It does not measure productive production. It has just become merely another propaganda tool.

The lesson to be learned from all the great empires of the past is that, once they began fighting wars, the only way was down in the long run. That is a philosophical thought for statesmen. And statesmen are in very short supply in any 'successful' empire. Once an empire gets to be a 'success', it is run by politicians who answer to capitalists, the owners of accumulated wealth. It is said that some very wealthy Italian families can trace their affluence back to their ancestors in the Roman Empire. The wealthy families of the former British Empire are very much in existence today and are still holding the strings of power in Britain and no doubt will continue to do so for perhaps a thousand years to come if they stay on top of their game. And to get where they are, they cannot afford to care who they hurt or kill. Those who are wealthy or who intend to become wealthy do use the ordinary people as cattle—to be used as factory workers or field workers or as 'boots-on-the-ground' in wartime. Wealthy

people, on the whole do not care what happens to the State as long as their interests are protected.

Just take a few examples: The *Peterloo Massacre* of ordinary people in St. Peter's Field, Manchester when on 16th August 1819 a peaceful meeting, to discuss parliamentary reform in Britain, was attacked by British cavalry on the orders of the magistrates. The magistrates were landowners and wealthy businessmen. The cavalry were used because they were mostly from a wealthier horse-owning class. The infantry could not be trusted to do the killing because the infantry was drawn from the same class as those to be punished. The infantry were cannon fodder. There was no system to issue warm clothing or overcoats to infantry in the eighteenth century. They were allowed to freeze and many died of exposure. The Connaught Rangers lost over 200 men on the night of 16th January 1795—they froze to death according to *The Connaught Rangers* by Lt. Colonel H. Jourdain, CMG. And, in case you think that was then, well things have not changed. The British Royal Navy in a survival film admits that two out of every three deaths in the Second World War in the Royal Navy were due to hypothermia—exposure—and that one of the most diabolical soothers on their ships were Carley Rafts to which sailors could cling until they went into a coma and drowned. The major use for the killer Carley Rafts was as an essential medium for bribery and contracts for their Manufacture by industrialists friendly to politicians.

In the first six months of 1916 British General Haig and his 300 hundred staff officers at Montreuil planned how to break through the German lines at what the British now commemorate as the Battle of the Somme. Six months to plan a massacre! Haig carefully calculated that he would need 700,000 men. They called it the 'Big Push'. They calculated the number of men available who could be expended as casualties i.e. dead and wounded. The numbers calculated **prior** to the 'Battle of the Somme' was they could afford 500,000 dead and wounded. And the battle was not on the Somme. The French fought on the Somme. The British fought in an area north of the River Somme, up the valleys leading to the Pozieres Ridge which the Germans occupied. The British acted as if the Germans were blind and stupid. British big guns, 1,537 big guns fired 1,738,000 shells into the German front-line trenches for eight days. The Germans simply backed away and left the guns at it, they knew as

long as the shells kept coming, the British troops could not come up there. When the guns stopped, the Germans re-occupied their trenches fastish and watched the British troops advance at walking speed four deep in lines across the Germans field of fire. This was the order given by Haig's colleague General Sir Henry Rawlinson—to walk steadily and not to charge. He told his officers that, after the big guns had done their job, it was only necessary to walk over and occupy the German trenches. This stuff was after six months of military planning!

The British did not bother to attack at dawn which would have been about 5 am. They took their time and on 1st July 1916 at 7.30 am. after breakfast the attacking lines of men got out of their trenches and walked forward. Four deep on a 13 mile front. The Germans watched, having brought up their machine guns. A German wrote:

"we were surprised to see them walking, we had never seen that before. The officers were in front. I noticed one of them walking calmly carrying a walking stick. When we started to fire we just had to load and reload. They went down in their hundreds. We didn't have to aim, we just fired into them."

Wave followed wave, all going down. 60,000 were killed or wounded on 1st July 1916. 20,000 of these were dead. The field hospitals were overwhelmed by the wounded. It was butchery of ordinary soldiers and it was planned for by Douglas Haig and Henry Rawlinson and their 300 staff officers who were in safety miles away. After the first wave were butchered—there was no senior general to shout "Stop"! It went on and on and any soldier who turned back was shot by his own officers. That is what a British officer's revolver is for—to stop the soldiers turning back. The MC (Military Cross Medal) was awarded to some officers who shot the poor shell-shocked men who tried to turn back when they couldn't take any more of the butchery. Read *The Men I Killed* by General F.P. Crozier. Published by Athol Press. 2002. Also *Fit to Lead* by H. L'Etang. 1980; *The Great War and Modern Memory* by Paul Fussell. Published OUP. 1975 and *The Wet Flanders Plain*. Published Beaumont Press. 1929.

Haig suffered from HCI—Heavy Casualties Inevitable and he was not disturbed by the 60,000—after all they were expendable. Haig had friends in the London newspapers, such as Lord Northcliffe in the *Times* who stated:

"Sir Douglas Haig telephoned last night that the general situation was favourable".

The General in charge of the heavy guns in the eight days before the 1st July butchery was General Sir Aylmer Hunter-Weston. He had previous HCI form. He was known as "*the Butcher of Helles*". When Hunter-Weston was in Gallipoli at one point, after a lot of killing, the Turks asked for a temporary truce so that each side could collect their dead and wounded. Hunter-Weston who was in charge of the British side refused and so wounded men in 'no-man's-land' were left there calling out in agony and parched with thirst, to bleed out and die. The British and Colonial forces lost 43,000 dead in Gallipoli. Factually, there was not any need for deaths because the mere fact was that Turkey had to keep an army there to guard Constantinople and the Dardanelles and Gallipoli and the threat of attack was enough. An actual attack was not needed.

Where Hunter-Weston earned his sobriquet "*Butcher of Helles*" was, when the Turks attacked at Helles, he had 25,000 Australians, New Zealanders, Ghurkhas and Sikhs to fight them. He was advised that it would be good tactics to cross the danger zone at night and overthrow the enemy in the grey dawn. Instead, he gave the Turks (and himself of course) plenty of time to get up and have breakfast and he attacked in broad daylight at 11 a.m. Sorry, he didn't attack, he ordered his men to attack. The troops were massacred. This was on 6th May 1915. He repeated this on 7th May starting at 10 a.m. instead of 11 a.m. with the same result—rivers of blood. But not one drop of his own blood of course. He did the same on 8th May for the third day. Same result. On the evening of 8th May he wanted to do it again. He ordered another attack and in his decision he was supported on this occasion by General Hamilton, the Commander-in-Chief. There was a loss of 6,000 men on the night of 8th May. On the 24th May Hunter-Weston was promoted to Lieut. General and given command of all the British units at Helles. He went from one blundering massacre to another and seemed to suffer no professional damage.

Lies in reports were routine to pander to officials back at Whitehall in London and for the British public so that recruitment for the Great Fraud could continue. The wealthy families were doing well out of the war as they and new entrepreneurs amassed great wealth from supplying guns, tanks, uniforms, boots and the other supplies needed to progress

the War. Ordinary private soldiers were needed to carry all this stuff. The wealthy class had a good war. And the longer it went on—the better it got—for them!

The British historian A.J.P. Taylor puts it this way:

"Those British Generals who prolonged the slaughter kept their posts and won promotion" (*In the First World War*. Published by Hamish Hamilton, 1963).

The shameful and dishonourable result of Britain entering into the War against Germany on 4th August 1914 was battle casualties of British and Empire ordinary soldiers—2,571,113 men. A huge number of men were wounded and in bad health for the rest of their lives. The British leaders were despicable, evil and class supremacists. The Roses of Picardy and the Poppy flowers are a propaganda mockery of the men who died, blown to smithereens and trodden underfoot in the mud and filth of the trenches. There were no poppy flowers for them.

The 'Battle of the Somme' went murderously on from 1st July 1916 to 18th November 1916. The British and Empire armies had suffered 420,000 casualties. Haig had planned for 500,000 to be expendable. What object was achieved by all this slaughter? On the entire front of this great butchery only 125 square miles of country had been captured from the Germans! An incredible incompetence on Britain's part and Britain was the aggressor. They did not have to do it but they wanted to do it. They did it to us ordinary people and we did not learn our lesson yet it seems. The British politicians and Generals killed our people (it was not the Germans because they had to defend themselves when attacked and many Germans were killed also). When the British say "*Cheer*" we cheer. What is there to cheer about? It does not stack up at all.

And so, Remember in November that 420,000 casualties were designed to be so, were factored in as it were and that nothing worth anything was achieved by all the slaughter. Nothing, that is, except the enrichment for generations to come of the few wealthy families who controlled and still control it all.

#### JOHN BRUTON AND JOHN REDMOND

In September the former Taoiseach of this country, John Bruton, Fine Gael, was to the fore in denouncing our great patriots of the 1916 Rising for their actions in achieving independence for our country. In the main, he has been supported by our media, the political elite and our politi-

cians, with just a few exceptions. Allow me to quote the following passage from *Margot Asquith's Great War Diary 1914-1916: The View from Downing Street* (published by Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2014.):

"Wednesday 29th July 1914.

I went to the House in the afternoon, and saw Redmond and Dillon going to H's room. I asked him afterwards if they were reasonable.

H. Poor devils! They're anxious not to be dropped down too much. I should think there must be a settlement. The others (Bonar Law and Carson) are also in a funk over the situation.

M. Is the situation really so serious Henry?

H. I'm afraid so. In any case, we must not be caught napping.

"Sunday 1st August 1914.

I wrote to Redmond and told him he had the opportunity of his life if he made a great speech, offering his Volunteers, or if he were to write to the King ... On the 3rd August, he made a wonderful speech. I told no one, as I was so anxious Redmond should be fully appreciated. F. Lawson and masses of old, crusted Tories, raved about the speech. I heard it and was thrilled by the words and the delivery."

The footnote reads as follows:

"Redmond was the second member to speak, after Bonar Law, in reply to Sir Edward Grey's statement of 3rd August. In keeping with the patriotic spirit of the moment he pledged the Irish Volunteers to the defence of Britain..... As civil war loomed over Home Rule the two volunteer forces stood in opposition to one another, but in his speech on 3rd August Redmond proclaimed:

"I say that the coast of Ireland will be defended from foreign invasion by her armed sons, and for this purpose armed Nationalist Catholics in the South will be only too glad to join arms with the armed Protestant Ulstermen in the North."

(Parl. Deb., 3rd August 1914).

The footnote continues:

"In the event a significant minority of the Irish Volunteers rejected his leadership, and supported the Easter Rising of 1916."

Michael Stack ©

**General F.P. Crozier:**  
***The Men I Killed* (1937), *Irish Memoirs* and other writings.**  
Introduction by *Brendan Clifford*.  
152 pp. **€14, £11.50**, postfree  
<https://www.atholbooks-sales.org>

## HEALTH ISSUES

### PFIZER DEAL FAILS

So the Pfizer deal fizzled out! The attempt to take over the British-based Astra Zeneca would have formed the largest pharmaceutical business in the world. It would also have been the largest ever takeover of British business. Pfizer ended its six-month effort to buy Astra Zeneca on May 26th last, following the London-based company's May 19th rejection of its last bid of £55 a share in cash and stock. While UK takeover law prohibits Pfizer from making a new, unsolicited offer for the next six months, the deal could be revived in three months if AstraZeneca invites talks.

British politicians had gone into overdrive for a few months. Ed Miliband, the Labour leader, was keen to stress the need for a British industry to remain vibrant and not just become an adjunct for the main players in the sector. So people should be able to aspire to have developments and inventions brought from the moment of theory through the lab and further on to development and eventual delivery to the market in a train of production maintained in the United Kingdom. Prime Minister Cameron accused the Opposition of endangering the deal by amateurish dramatics. For him it's all about 'big is beautiful' cross Atlantic partnership and free trade. What is true is that many backers of the Tories in the City of London were salivating at the promise of the share price they might make in the sale.

It is also the case Miliband and his colleagues were impotent a few years ago, when Pfizer took over Wyeth. The case of Wyeth is clear: despite promises, the numbers of good jobs were not maintained in house at the newly merged firm. Also research and development money available for the Wyeth arm to utilise were slashed. Pfizer gave up the ghost in early summer. Market sources suggest they now have their eye on Glaxo. And then they tell us there are no cartels in the legal drugs business. Such entities have long since dropped the pretence of worrying about mere Governments.

### DRUGS RIP-OFF!

The *Sunday Business Post* featured good coverage of issues on successive weeks, August 3rd and the 10th. Firstly they covered the continuing scandal of medicines sold in the same pharmacies on both sides of the Border at shockingly different prices. Customers in the Six Counties are charged £5.00 for Olanzapine

(brand name Zyprexa) while in the South one had to stump up €85.40. In some cases the Health Services Executive are paying pharmacists up to ten times what the pharmacies are paying to the manufacturers.

The following week we were reminded that the current running costs of the super new quango, Irish Water, are more than twice the average for similar water companies in the United Kingdom. TD Thomas Pringle described the organisation as top heavy with management. The Donegal Independent Deputy had been involved in group water schemes in his own County over the years.

A week after the initial news story the new Minister for Health, Leo Varadkar, brought out a statement giving an undertaking to join forces with health Ministers in other European countries trying to negotiate cheaper prices for new medicines. There is already separate negotiations at European level with big Pharmaceutical companies concerning high prices of blockbuster drugs, including the treatment for hepatitis C which is called Sovaldi. Economists at the OECD and the London School of Economics regard Irish prices as extraordinarily high.

It seems strange the above is so rare in being discussed while there is so much disproportionate coverage in newsprint in particular, covering regularly the cost of social welfare fraud. Some doctors are also whinging that earnings here are not enough to stop young MDs leaving for careers abroad.

### IRISH WATER

Meanwhile, on the provision of water, the new company 'Irish Water' is going into spin-doctoring and marketing overdrive. They have spent a fortune on advertising to educate the public about their billing process and the units that they are deemed entitled to for an average family. Many would call this rationing. Many issues arise from this. Firstly what is the point in front-loading a new company like this with cash when it has no comprehensive plan to deal with the historical leaks issue? If there was a jump start on the latter, we might not need so much rationing in the first place. Secondly, it is hard to defend the idea of an average family when dealing with utilities as the matter is akin to the cost of spuds: it is very hard to know what demand will be in two or three years time.

Irish Water spokespersons are also featuring in heavy volume participation on talk shows etc., especially on RTE. While several parts of Cork city have recently had health scares because of decaying lead pipes, Irish Water will only

concede that it will look into residents' bills for next year, to see if slight readjustments can be made. The only significant localities to not pay water charges next year will be in Roscommon. Huge tracts of the County have been under a continuous 'boil water' notice for over twelve months. It seems remedial action to restore service to top grade in the County grinds on at a slow pace.

The idea of a nationwide plan to replace all remaining lead pipes in the country is forecast to take several years. Why this was not programmed in as a matter of priority in the process of the formation of Irish Water remains a mystery. It appears all the more probable that the method of Water Tax being unrolled in Ireland will be a simple revenue-raising act. The pursuit of public health excellence is not the priority nor is any realistic opportunity to raise the expectations of citizens to a top class service in utilities which could be justified by the Water Tax and Irish Water in their current form.

### FLUORIDATION

Meanwhile we are still wasting money on the general fluoridation of the entire national bank of drinking water. Report after report by serious researchers now show that there is no benefit what so ever to the Irish population who are provided with this addition to the water. In fact it may even lead to a reduction of oral health and well being. It would seem one of the crying shames of the recent evolving political process in Ireland has been the complete lack of real reform in Local Government in our state. That as a prerequisite should go in tandem with introduction of Property Tax and Water Charges. Also, while there is a suggestion that charges are unlikely to be raised over the next five years, should not reductions be offered to people if expected standards are not reached in a given year and should not oversight of the attainment of these targets be carried out by an independent expert?

There is also breaking news that Phil Hogan Euro Commissioner nominee may have lied about when he saw certain documents and advice notes leading to the instigation of the Water Charge plan. This could lead to interesting discussion in the European Parliament. The Establishment here seems to be rowing in behind him based on rumour that he could get the Agriculture portfolio in the new Commission. So much for the superior type of discourse at the European level or that the ideological groups in the Parliament are somehow superior to our tradition of the parish pump.

**Seán Ó Riain**

## GUILDS continued

special class in which they are marked as outside the sphere of opportunities for culture. The second observation is that the system of vocational training should not operate as to weaken in any degree our parochial schools or any other class of private schools. Indeed, the opportunities of the system should be extended to all qualified private schools on exactly the same basis as to public schools. We want neither class divisions in education or a State-monopoly of education.

"The question of education naturally suggests the subject of child labour. Public opinion in the majority of the States of our country has set its face inflexibly against the continuous employment of children in industry before the age of 16 years. Within a reasonably short time all our States, except some stagnant ones, will have laws providing for this reasonable standard." (10)

So, from first to last, has the Catholic Church ever been eager to champion the interests of the working classes, beginning with their earliest education and devoting herself to them unstintedly with all her zeal and love.

1. Bain, "Merchant and Craft Guilds", p.204
2. W. J. Ashley, "English Economic History and Theory", Part II, p.84.
3. Huber-Libenau, p.23
4. Janssen, "History of the German People", II, p.20
5. *ibid.*
6. William Herbert, "Livery Companies of London", pp. 36, 37.
7. Carlton J. H. Hayes, "A Political and Social History of Europe", II, pp. 85, 86.
8. London Universe, May 3, 1918
9. "The Cry of the Children", Elizabeth Barrett Browning.
10. January 1, 1819

## Is it time to keep up with the Germans?

**Some experts argue everyone from bakers to bankers should start their careers as apprentices.**

*Ireland needs to improve its apprenticeship schemes in order to meet the country's skills needs and boost career opportunities for young people.*

That is the view of IBEC's {Irish Business and Employers Confederation} education officer Tony Donohoe as the

Government hopes to encourage workers to "earn and learn".

In Germany two-thirds of young people become apprentices when they are starting out in their career, and the vast majority of these trainees stay the course.

In Europe's most powerful economy, there are 350 recognised trades where staff have to become apprentices.

In Ireland, by contrast, there are only 26 trades and these are still largely concentrated in construction, which is just recovering from its decimation in the crash of 2008.

Last year, just under 2000 young people started in one of the officially-sanctioned on-the-job training schemes. That is a drop from a boomtime peak of over 8,000.

The relatively low status of apprenticeships is partly down to cultural attitudes.

In some circles they are seen as a make-work scheme for those who are not qualified to go to university.

Tony Donohoe of IBEC says:

"Apprenticeships tend not to enjoy parity of esteem in a society that defines educational achievement in terms of CAO points".

While in Germany apprenticeships are a standard part of working life across the class divide, in occupations ranging from plumbing to banking, in Ireland degrees are regarded as the be-all and end-all.

The Chief Executive of Aer Lingus, Christoph Mueller, has criticised the Irish belief that everything but a university education is inferior.

Since he took over as boss of the national flag carrier, he has revived apprenticeships for maintenance engineers at the airline.

In an interview he said: "*We have to promote non-academic education as something equal to academic training, if not better.*"

He said institutes of technology are often seen as places for people who did not get into university, and we need to move away from that idea.

"We need to incentivise employers to offer apprenticeships and internships. Irish graduates are not necessarily fit for their jobs. There should be on-the-job training as part of academic education."

In some ways the reservations of Irish parents are understandable, because the range of apprenticeships available is so narrow.

FAS schemes trained workers in trades that were hit heavily during the recession, and the reputation of the training body suffered heavily as a result of a expenses

scandal and a perception the training body was wasting public money.

Tony Donohoe says: "*The current apprenticeship system, which is limited to 26 occupations, does not reflect the broader skills needs of the Irish economy. Female participation in apprenticeships is negligible.*"

Last year German Chancellor Angela Merkel urged other Governments to use apprenticeships as a solution to European youth unemployment .

So should we try to keep up with the Schmidts and try to copy the German model?

According to Tony Donohoe, copying and pasting the German strategy is easier said than done.

"The apprenticeship model in Germany took centuries to develop. The Germany economy is very different to the Irish one, but that doesn't mean we can't learn from it."

A recent Government review said the range of apprenticeships available should be expanded dramatically.

On-the-job training schemes should be available in areas such as computing, IT, retailing, hotels and restaurant, medical devices, childcare, financial services and accounting. According to the report, this will require a strong commitment from employers to identify their skills needs and to pay apprentices.

The review says that the expansion of apprenticeships should be accompanied by a campaign to boost their image among learners, parents and employers.

In devising new apprenticeship schemes, the training bodies will have to ensure that they are meaningful and not just used by bosses to hire cheap employees with Government subsidies.

*The Economist* recently reported on the situation in England when it was discovered that one in 10 apprenticeships were created at one shop chain.

It emerged that the chain was using a Government subsidy to put over 50,000 of its staff through six-month courses in operating tills and other basic tasks that required little expertise. Tony Donohoe of IBEC said apprenticeships should not just be done as an alternative to going to college.

"They should be available at all skill levels from school leaving to advanced degree level. In Denmark there are industrial PhDs." (Kim Bielenberg, *Irish Independent*, 18.9.2014)

indigent Guilds, the members of the former gaining a political as well as social pre-dominance, and being privileged to wear a special livery. (6) In 1489 we meet with a regulation enacted in London by which the Guildsmen "out of clothing", i.e., not wearing liveries, might employ one apprentice and no more, except they had good reason for complaint, while those "of the clothing" might have two apprentices and no more. He who had been warden might have three, and the upper warden, four. These distinctions were henceforth to become more accentuated, and the name of "crafts" and "mysteries" came into common use in place of "gilds".

#### FEES

Another sign of decline was the levying of large fees both upon the entrance to apprenticeship and to mastership. Such abuses, too, reaching their climax in the post-Reformation days, while they were unheard of in the period of true Guild development. "It was a great matter in former times to give £10 to bind an apprentice", says Stowe, referring even then to the days of the decline, "but in King James I's {1603-1625} time they gave £20, £40, £60 and sometimes £100 with an apprentice. But now these prices are vastly enhanced to £500, or £600, £800". Brentano remarks that reference is probably made here to the Twelve Great Companies.

#### CHILD LABOUR

Finally, the famous Statute of Apprentices, drawn up in "the spacious days" of good "Queen Bess", and technically known as "5 Eliz. cap. 4", sought to reinstate the institution of apprenticeship which had then largely fallen into disuse. It was at last to be replaced, under the old name, by pure child labour. The hours of work were fixed by her at twelve, as a minimum; but a labour day of fifteen and sixteen hours was not considered unnatural for children in their teens by the new Individualism in which the Reformation culminated on its economic side. Pauperism, which arose at the same time, was to extend its abhorrent effects equally to the unhappy little ones. Says Professor Hayes of Columbia:

"There was a law by which pauper children could be forced to work, and under this law thousands of poor children, five and six years old, were taken from their homes, sent from parish to parish to work in factories, and bought and sold in gangs like slaves. In the factories they were set to work without pay, the cheapest

of food being all they could earn. If they refused to work, irons were put around their ankles, and they were chained to the machine, and at night they were locked up in the sleeping huts. The working day was long—from five or six in the morning until nine or ten at night. Often the children felt their arms ache with fatigue and their eyelids grow heavy with sleep, but they were kept awake by the whip of the overseer. Many of the little children died of over-work, and others were carried off by diseases which were bred by filth, fatigue and insufficient food." (7)

Boys and girls alike were subjected to the same slavery. "Harnessed and chained like dogs to go-carts", as another writer says, "these poor little slaves might be seen half-naked and ill-fed crawling on all fours dragging after them the coal-trucks filled". So hour after hour they made their way through the dark, low tunnels of the coal pits.

"But why did not the churches interfere? asks Father Vaughan. "I am afraid", he is obliged to answer, "that the established Church at the time was on the side of capital. Methodism was all for Quietism, while the Catholic Church had not yet emerged in England from her catacombs. She was hardly allowed to live, let alone utter." (8)

Voices like those of Mrs. Browning were at a later date to arouse the land:

"The young lambs are bleating in the meadows;  
The young birds are chirping in the nest;  
The young fawns are playing with the shadows;  
The young flowers are blooming toward  
the west—  
But the young, young children, O my brothers,  
They are weeping bitterly!  
They are weeping in the playtime of the others,  
In the country of the free." (9)

Anti-slavery orators dilated eloquently upon the miseries of the negroes, while the child of Englishmen at home, as Sir Robert Peel said in 1816, "torn from their beds were compelled to work, at the age of six years, from early morn till late at night, a space of perhaps fifteen or sixteen hours", under the lashes of even more heartless slave-masters. Such was the institution that had replaced the apprenticeship system of the Catholic Guilds of the Middle Ages.

#### THE FUTURE

The possibility of a system of apprenticeship such as existed in the best days of the mediaeval Guilds is indeed no longer to be realised. But it does not follow that we cannot apply their principles in our own times, by a true craft education,

combined with morality and religion. Christian schools are here, as elsewhere, of the highest importance. Unfortunately a vast proportion of the industrial output under capitalism has been such that articles were made merely to sell at the biggest profit. Perfect and durable work was often not even desired. The joy and satisfaction of expert craftsmanship could not longer be realised in the specialised factory work, requiring only a momentary instruction. Entire classes of skilled labour were cast helpless upon the labour market by the invention of new machinery.

Yet a wide field remains for the expert and the craftsman. For the rest, we must take modern conditions as we find them and seek to reproduce, so far as we can, the spirit of joy, charity, justice and religion that were found in the crafts when Guildhood and brotherhood were still in their perfection. The teachings of Christianity are for all time and can never become obsolete or inapplicable in any rightful system of industry adapted to the existing periods of economic development. Under no circumstances must factory and workshop be permitted to become schools of immorality and irreligion, where heart and intellect alike are perverted and the whole man is degraded to a level that makes him the fit tool of godless agitators and anarchistic revolutionists.

With the conscientiousness of the mediaeval Guildsman we must watch over our youth, preserving for them their true inheritance and opening to them their just opportunities both industrially and religiously. In their programme of "Social Reconstruction", the American Bishops thus expressed their attitude towards the particular modern phase of this subject known as vocational training, showing their keen interest no less in the intellectual than in the religious and physical welfare of the labourer and his children:

"The need of industrial or, as it has come to be more generally called, vocational training is now universally acknowledged. In the interest of the nation, as well as in that of the workers themselves, this training should be made substantially universal. While we cannot now discuss the subject in any detail, we do wish to set down two general observations. First, the vocational training should be offered in such forms and conditions as not to deprive the children of the working classes of at least the elements of a cultural education. A healthy democracy cannot tolerate a purely industrial or trade education for any class of its citizens. We do not want to have the children of the wage earners put into a

continued on page 29

## GUILDS continued

It was often, however, no more than the equivalent of a modest allowance of pocket money. In some cases the apprentice, after concluding his term, was to remain with his master for another year at a set wage. Tools, food and other necessities, often including also clothing of a stipulated kind, were furnished by the master.

### APPRENTICESHIP: A NOVITIATE

Apprenticeship was the novitiate of the craftsman. It was even preceded in many instances by a probation, as we find was the case in Germany where frequently a full month was required for this preliminary test of fitness. The youth to be admitted was moreover to have been born in honest wedlock, for it was not considered befitting that any one should be a master craftsman whose fair name was blemished by even the slightest stain. Everywhere the general principle was received that the artisan who would aspire to the dignity of masterhood must hold his reputation as sacred as the honour of a king.

### GUILDHALL

The admission therefore into this Guild novitiate was often conducted with the most impressive ceremonies. It took place in the Guildhall before the assembled masters, or even in the Town Hall itself in the presence of the public authorities. The apprentice now solemnly pledged himself *"to begin his future calling in the name of God, to be obedient, faithful and attentive to his master, and by his moral conduct to render himself worthy of becoming in time a worthy member of the gild and of civil society"*.<sup>(3)</sup> His name was then enrolled among the Guild apprentices. Such was the importance given to this function when the Guilds were in their perfection.

The young apprentice now lived in the master's house as a member of the family. He was to be subject to his master in fidelity and obedience as a son to his father, and was to receive a corresponding care and attention in return. Nothing was to be kept secret from him that might further him in his trade. But above all he was to be protected with scrupulous watchfulness, so that, like his Divine Model, he might advance in wisdom and grace as well as in age. His moral conduct and his observance of religious duties were to be foremost in the master's eye. If in any way he failed he was to be chastised, *"so that through the pain of the body the*

*soul may receive good"*. In the good old days men did not believe in our modern educational principle of sparing the rod and spoiling the child. In France, however, there was a special rule that he must not be beaten by the master's wife. The English statutes required that he be chastised *"duly, but not otherwise"*.

The true spirit of apprenticeship, as inculcated by the Church, is nowhere more beautifully expressed than in the book of *"Christian Exhortation"*:

"No trade or profession can succeed honourably unless the apprentice is early taught to fear God, and to be obedient to his master as if he were his father. He must, morning and evening and during his work, beg God's help and protection, for without God he can do nothing; no protection of men is of avail without the protection of God, and often even hurtful to the soul. Every Sunday and holy day he must hear Mass and sermon and read good books. He must be industrious and seek not his own glory, but God's. The honour of his master and of his trade he must also seek, for this is holy, and he may one day be master himself if God wills and he is worthy of it."<sup>(4)</sup>

The duties of the master are laid down with no less discernment:

"The master must not be weak-hearted towards the apprentice, but neither must he be tyrannical nor too exacting, as often happens. The master shall protect the apprentice from railleries, ear-pullings, and abuse from the journeymen. Masters, think of your duties. The apprentice has been entrusted to you by the Guild to care for his soul and body according to the laws of God and the corporation. You must account for your apprentice and care for him as if he were your own son. You are not master only to govern and to do masterwork, but also to command yourself as Christianity and your trade require. Remember, masters, your must be an example to your wife and children, to your apprentices and servants."<sup>(5)</sup>

The Guild did not fail, as the historian remarks, to provide the young man with securities against an unworthy master. As the bans are proclaimed before marriage in the Catholic Church, so before an apprentice was committed to a Guildsman the question was asked in the full assembly of the craft if any fault could be found with the future master either as a Christian or a craftsman. Again, when the term of service was over, the apprentice was publicly to bring his charges, if any injustice had been done him, or else *"remain forever silent"*. He was now amid further solemnities freed from his obligations to his former master

and furnished with his diploma. His status, however, was not perfect until, in later times, he had been received into the brotherhood of journeymen, a reception which took place amid much merriment, but not unaccompanied by serious admonitions and sage and religious advice.

### PROTESTANT REFORMATION

Like all human institutions the system of apprenticeship was subject to abuses which rapidly accumulated in the days of religious decline and of the Reformation. The term of apprenticeship was at times made unconscionably long, extending in England to as many as twelve years. In France, it varied from two to twelve years. In Germany, where the indenture was for a lesser period than in England, the years of *"wandering"* were often unduly prolonged. They were known to extend even over seven years and more.

Technical skill was evidently not the only object where such conditions prevailed. Care, too, was taken at a later date to exclude those of *"villein estate or condition"*. Attempts were made in the reigns of Richard II {1377-1399} and Henry IV {1399-1413} to prevent the vast emigration from country to town by legislating that children who had been employed upon the farm until the age of 12 were to remain in that occupation.

### APPRENTICE QUOTAS

Strict limitations were set regarding the number of apprentices that could be employed by a single master. It usually varied, according to the different periods or conditions, from one to three. In later years, with the more complete development of industry and commerce, a certain proportion was to be preserved between the number of apprentices and journeymen. The reason was evident. Apprenticeship was then degenerating into child labour and the adult workingmen were obliged to protest in self-defence. Before this stage had been attained, however, the object of limitation had been to provide a good technical training and later to avoid an overcrowding in the various provinces of skilled labour. The true Guild idea was that no master should have more apprentices than he could properly *"keep, inform, teach and maintain"*, that he might make of them good craftsmen and excellent Christians.

### WEALTHIER GUILDS

Towards the end of the reign of Richard II {1377-1399} a distinction began to be drawn between the wealthier and the more

continued on page 30





**LABOUR**

# Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 32 No. 10

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

MONDRAGON Part 34

## Apprenticeship— Learning A Trade

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

Considerable attention has been given in our day to the problem of apprenticeship. Never was this so perfectly solved as in the days of the mediaeval crafts. Apprenticeship was one of the wisest and most important Guild institutions of the Middle Ages. It was meant to be a religious and moral, as well as an economic schooling for the future craftsman. It was in effect a striking application of the principle of brotherhood and mutual helpfulness everywhere taught by the Church.

No similar institution is known in all preceding history. Individualism was the marked characteristic of ancient paganism as of modern liberalism. In spite of the workingmen's unions, which for centuries existed in ancient Greece and Rome, there was no systematic attempt at trade education. The task was left to the individual. There was neither joy nor dignity in labour. It was regarded as fit for the slave only. Catholicity restored it to honour, and gave it those high ideals which were first to be fully developed under the *aegis* of the Church in the Middle Ages.

The rudimentary conceptions of brotherhood which paganism contained, and which were perhaps nowhere more perfectly expressed than in its Guild life, were not sufficient to abolish the stigma which rested upon labour. It was only when the Son of God Himself came in the Person of a Labourer, that men recognised the full sacredness of toil and its appointed place in the plan of Providence. Jesus Himself was the Divine Apprentice. The Builder of the universe learned in all obedience the trade of a carpenter in the shop of Joseph, his foster-father.

**FIRST TRADE SCHOOLS**  
The first trade schools where the crafts

were systematically taught, where apprenticeship and industrial training may be said to have begun, were the monasteries. The monks themselves were the first great master craftsmen. *Ora et labora*, "Labour and pray", was their motto.

With the development of the Craft Guilds, the institution of apprenticeship likewise gradually came into being. It was not at first obligatory and men might be admitted to a Guild and the practice of a trade upon the testimony of the craft officials, provided the latter had carefully assured themselves of the proficiency of the candidates. In the course of time this alternative was no longer accepted; but the term of apprenticeship and the conditions under which it was to be made varied largely for the different countries, or even for the different trades themselves. An English ordinance of 1261 forbids having an apprentice for less than 10 years. This was considerably more than the

ordinary period. Soon seven years came to be received as the normal length of apprenticeship in England. "*No apprentice shall be received for a less term than seven years*", was the London ordinance. A similar rule obtained in France, although the term still varied largely. Five or six years as "*prentice*" was the Scotch Guild law, "*and one year for meat and fee*". (1) During this time a complete knowledge of the trade was to be acquired.

The temptation might naturally arise to turn apprenticeship into child labour, but this the Guild regulations strenuously combated. No one, moreover, was to practice a trade without having first been apprenticed. So the English Guild of Leathersellers ordained that: "*From henceforth no one shall set any man, child, or woman to work in the trade if such person be not first bound apprentice, and enrolled in the trade*". The master's own wife and children might of course be of assistance to him. (2)

In Germany the period of apprenticeship varied from two to six years; but in addition to this there was imposed upon the young journeyman who had just completed his term, the obligation of travelling, and practising his trade abroad. These years of "*wandering*" were to give him experience and varied knowledge of his craft. They were meant to be the completion of his technical education. This practice, though likewise observed in France, was not known in England.

During the term of apprenticeship proper, the remuneration, if any, was frequently insignificant. In many instances it was very slight in the beginning of the term and regularly increased with the years.

continued on page 31

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>