

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

July 2015

Vol.30, No.7 ISSN 0790-7672

and *Northern Star* incorporating *Workers' Weekly* Vol.29 No.7 ISSN 954-5891

FIFA: Away Win For The US

Is the FIFA affair about football, or is it about United States *Globalism*?
The English *Guardian* commented editorially, on June 3rd:

"It is salutary that it was broken not by challenges from investigative reporters, not by the repeated but ineffectual challenges of Uefa, but by the fact that the reach of the FBI extends to all dealings in US dollars wherever they happen..."

Then it observes that Sepp Blatter's—

"claim that he was being ambushed by a western conspiracy will have resonated not only among Fifa clients who may now fear exposure, but also with ordinary delegates and football fans... care must be taken that the developing world is not stirred against the West by it... But for now, as FA chairman Greg Dye puts it, let's celebrate. Football is the winner..."

It is very unlikely that Football will be the winner. Football did very well indeed under Blatter's guidance. It became a world sport—the *only* world sport. And that clearly is what is wrong with FIFA in certain European eyes. It made football the world sport conducted by an interconnected world organisation which the elite countries did not control. It was humiliating.

FIFA, as developed by Blatter, is a federal body whose component parts did things according to their own ways, and each part had an equal say in the running of the whole. If the "*reform*" that is being demanded is carried through, FIFA will be made into a centralised organisation run by the world elite.

Blatter has been compared to Sir Nicolai Ceaseacu and other dictators. He was obviously not a dictator. Dictators don't get outvoted, as he often did. He was outvoted on siting the World Cup after next in the USA, rather than Qatar.

The purpose of the 'reform' is to establish a *de facto* dictatorship that will put the

continued on page 2

Bew On Irish Peasant Anti-Semitism !

Lord Bew recently gave an interview to the *Jewish Chronicle* (April 28th) about anti-Semitism in Ireland. It is reprinted below:

"Lord Bew: If we could bring peace to Ireland, why not Israel?"

By Sandy Rashty

Lord Bew has always admired Israel

An Irish-born, left-leaning academic who is not Jewish is not most people's idea of a high-ranking Israel advocate. But, as chairman of the Anglo-Israel Association, Lord Bew is working at the forefront of building bilateral relations between the two nations.

Born Paul Bew in Belfast, the son of two doctors, he first visited Israel as a 17-year-old. His father had recently died and so he travelled around the world with his mother "*to cheer her up*". "*It was more or less a year after the Six Day War*",

continued on page 4

Banking Inquiry

The Regulators

According to its protocols, blame is not supposed to be attributed by the Banking Inquiry to any particular individuals or institutions for the cause of the Irish crisis, but that restriction does not apply to anyone else. After Brian Cowen and FF, a large part of the blame has been laid at the door of the Financial Regulator who is often said to have been "*asleep*". Famously, Jose Manuel Barroso in the European

Parliament in 2011, in a singularly ill-tempered retort to Joe Higgins, asserted that:

"The problems of Ireland were created by irresponsible financial behaviour of financial institutions and a lack of supervision in the Irish market. It was not Europe that created this fiscally irresponsible situation and this financially irresponsible behaviour."

Barroso was undoubtedly playing politics and went on to paint Europe as the solution, which it may or may not prove to have been, but to what extent were the supervisory authorities actually responsible?

The Inquiry has now heard from various individuals involved in regulating the banks during the period leading up to the crisis and the picture seems to be a lot more nuanced than the media have made out in the years following the crisis. There are acknowledged to be two main approaches to regulating banks and financial institutions, the "*principles-*

continued on page 9

CONTENTS

	Page
FIFA: Away Win For The US. Editorial	1
Bew On Irish Peasant Anti-Semitism !. Editorial	1
The Regulators. Sean Owens (The Banking Inquiry)	1
Readers' Letters: Aer Lingus. Tim O'Sullivan (with Brian Berry letter)	3
Israeli Ministers About Palestine. Report from David Morrison	7
Shorts from <i>the Long Fellow</i> (Brexit; <i>Irish Times</i> Trademark; IBRC; Denis O'Brien; Public Interest; FIFA Corruption; FAI Corruption?)	8
Sean Murray. Wilson John Haire (Book Review)	11
'16. Wilson John Haire (Poem)	13
Irish Times Influence. John Martin (Book Review)	14
The King's Lament. John Morgan, Lt. Col. (Retd.)	17
Biteback: FIFA Shenanigans. Simon O'Donnell (Report of Letter)	19
'John Bowman'. Jeff Dudgeon solves a mystery	19
Collusion. Report	19
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Tomás Ceannt Commemoration; Waterloo; Lusitania Disaster; Our Brave New World)	20

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

German Guilds

Mondragon, Part 43

(back page)

'developing world' in its place. That place can be compared to the Olympic Games which, under its governing body, has avoided holding the games in Third World and Developing countries (see page 9). This has been made pretty clear by some of the reformers. FIFA has been compared to the General Assembly of the UN, without a Security Council. The point of the UN General Assembly is to give the world a flimsy appearance of equality in decision-making. The point of the Security Council is to disable the General Assembly and maintain Great Power dominance over world affairs.

Why is it necessary that the world organisation of football should be similarly disabled? Because, in the process of making football the world sport, a few individuals in a few Associations lined their own pockets. And that is corruption. And corruption cannot be tolerated in the perfect world of transparent market relations that Western society has created—or that it insists on for those parts of the world whose destiny is to be obediently subordinate.

Corruption is the reason the developing world is only developing. It has nothing to do with the treatment of it by the developed world. That is a moral axiom of our era

But corruption played an indispensable part in the development of the capitalist economies and states which now dominate the world, didn't it? Corruption was gross during critical centuries in the development of both Britain and the USA. "*Every man has his price*" was the maxim of Robert Walpole, the master of corruption who nurtured Liberalism in England by Government bribery which undermined conflicts of principle which had been causing revolution and counter-revolution for a century. Tolerance is today one of the British values boasted of by Britain. It did not extend to the British Government of Ireland, and within Britain it was the Siamese twin of Government bribery of honest men of principle to make them opportunists. And all that has changed is the style in which it is done.

Ireland has been given an international

reputation of being corrupt. People in England who know little else about Ireland know that it is corrupt and was run by Paedopheliac priests. This reputation is, in the main, an achievement of the *Irish Times*—of the Secret Directory of the paper and its hirelings. The paper has survived over the generations, without visible means of support, while maintaining full world coverage. Its own survival is the most dodgy thing in Irish public life, but it is the one thing its fearless investigative columnists never address.

Its mission is to brand as corrupt everything of substance in Irish public life that is out of tune with British requirements. Its campaign of the moment is against Denis O'Brien, who is a billionaire. What is objectionable about him is not that he is a billionaire, but that he is an Irish billionaire who doesn't seem to be yearning for a British knighthood, like Sir Anthony O'Reilly.

Sir Anthony squandered his billions acquiring newspapers around the world, but he gave free rein to the *Independent* to dream up stories about Sinn Fein and present them as factual reports. He displayed personal patronage lavishly in the *Independent* and pillaged its funds. Then he could not pay his debts to the Bank and had to go bankrupt. To ease his personal situation he concealed substantial assets from the Bank. Yet he was an ideal Irish billionaire and is charitably regarded.

O'Brien conducted his businesses successfully, and when the financial crisis struck, he transferred millions from abroad into the Irish Banks, to demonstrate his faith in the country. How could such a man be Irish at all!

Then he bought failing companies from NAMA, paying cash on the nail for them. Others had made complicated, conditional bids for those companies in which higher nominal sums were mentioned—sums that would be whittled away by negotiation and in the end-result yield less for the country. NAMA treated the unconditional cash bid as best. A great hullabaloo was raised. How could corruption not be involved! And now there is an Inquiry.

In addition O'Brien had loans from the Anglo-Irish Bank, and an agreement about rates and repayment. When it went bankrupt, the loans were transferred to IBRC. The interest is being paid on the loans and they present no problem. However, it is now alleged that he was given a preferential rate of interest. There has never been any question of him not repaying loans—like Sir Anthony. (*Irish Times* headline, June 6th: *AIB Accused Of*

Humiliating Sir Anthony O'Reilly: this was during legal bankruptcy proceedings when it emerged that O'Reilly had an undisclosed shareholding, which the Bank discovered by accident.)

Another issue is that O'Brien bought a minority share of the *Independent*, which under Sir Anthony's management was on the verge of collapsing, and with other shareholders put it on a sound footing. Sir Anthony had handed over the paper to the Official IRA to conduct their long-standing feud against the Provos in. Then the cry went up that that would be the end of the freedom of the press in Ireland. Though the Editor left at the expiry of contract, others remain in place, doing their thing more or less as before.

The *Irish Times* (Fintan O'Toole) declares that Denis O'Brien has accumulated excessive private power. He has been allowed to take effective control of the largest Irish newspaper group and of two or three talk-radio stations.

O'Toole's moment to speak out fearlessly came when this journal discovered that the *Irish Times* was liaising with Whitehall about Northern policy, that the British Ambassador had reported Director Major McDowell complaining that his Editor, Douglas Gageby, had gone native (had become "*a white nigger*"), and that the paper was then put under tight editorial control of its Oath-Bound Directors. What did O'Toole do? The title of his article just quoted is *Note The Loud Silence On Public Interest*" (June 2nd). We noted his silence. He did not bite the hand that feeds him.

He now reports that Eoghan Harris, the Official IRA columnist on the *Sunday Independent*, has indicated that he decided not to speak his mind on 'Brien out of prudence. He said it in Irish in the form of an anecdote about what an old man once said to him about putting "*dubh ar bán*" (black on white (IT 9.6.15).

The mere thought that the competent and public-spirited O'Brien had displaced the incompetent and humanly self-serving Sir Anthony was a mental torment to Harris, causing him to censor himself. Cruel and unusual punishment on top of corruption!

Back to Sepp Blatter: He gave five million euros to the Football Association of Ireland to ease its pain over Thierry Henri's hand ball in the play-off for the 2010 World Cup. Henri did what footballers do—even the self-righteous English ones who joined the chorus against

continued on page 4

Aer Lingus

Below is a letter published in the *Irish Times* on 29th May opposing the British Airways/IAG takeover of the company. It is a forceful and impressive letter. But it has been printed AFTER the decision was taken by the Government to accept the offer.

You have the impression this writer would not have left it so late to express his opinions in writing!

Online investigation shows the writer to be an airline executive with an address in Malahide.

Has the IT been playing games regarding Aer Lingus?

Tim O'Sullivan

Future of Aer Lingus

Your readers should be aware that the Government is selling its share in Aer Lingus to the International Airlines Group, which in reality is British Airways (BA), for a pittance. For an outlay of about €1.4 billion, BA inherits almost €1 billion in cash at Aer Lingus's last balance sheet date, December 31st, 2014. Given Aer Lingus's strong trading performance, that cash position has undoubtedly improved substantially since then. BA also inherits 23 Heathrow slots worth in excess of €600 million at current market values. That is before the value of the fleet and other assets is included.

Many people will be unaware that Aer Lingus has one of the strongest balance sheets of any airline in the world, up there with Ryanair. It handsomely trumps that of BA. To sell it for a return to Irish taxpayers of a paltry €350 million is an abomination. It demonstrates this Government's propensity to screw up on big financial issues, Irish Water being the benchmark so far, and to sell its assets too cheaply.

The share price offered by BA is 14 per cent higher than the flotation price of 2006, €2.20, but 25 per cent less than the takeover price (up to €3.30) offered by Ryanair at that time. Those prices reflected a much weaker balance sheet and now demonstrate the Government's abysmal judgment in this matter. This Government now expects shareholders to sell their shares at a substantial discount to the 2006 Ryanair price. Try that one at a cattle mart anywhere in Ireland.

It will surprise most people that the value of Aer Lingus's slots at Heathrow is not included in its balance sheet. This was confirmed to me and other shareholders by the chairman at the annual general meeting four weeks ago. The reason the slot values are not included is "as we did not pay for them, they are not recorded" (these slots were part of a "grandfather rights" arrangement for many airlines in the late 1980s on condition that "you use them or lose them").

In contrast, a paltry few million euro for slots at Gatwick are included in the accounts.

Many financial soothsayers claim that Aer Lingus cannot survive and grow in an intensely competitive international marketplace. This line has been trotted out by Ministers in support of a sale. If such were the case, Aer Lingus would have gone to the wall years ago. Any organisation that can repeatedly adapt itself to the changing demands of evolving markets will survive and prosper, irrespective of size. Aer Lingus is such a company.

For Aer Lingus to expand profitably, it can either borrow on the capital markets or launch a rights issue on the stock markets. I have absolutely no doubt that the strength of the balance sheet and its cash-generation capabilities would be a major attraction to investors and that funds to acquire additional aircraft to tap new markets would be readily forthcoming. Otherwise aircraft leasing opportunities are widely available.

Promises have been made by BA that Ireland's strategic interests would be protected. Utter nonsense. The only strategic interest that will be protected is that of BA itself. That is the duty of its board.

The Government has seriously misjudged its call on this bid. If it seriously wants to capitalise on Aer Lingus's financial value, then it should not countenance a sale until the company's market capitalisation is at least €4 billion.

Brian Berry

FIFA

continued

Blatter—he discreetly touched a ball down to his foot with his hand and scored, putting Ireland out of the competition and France in. Breaking the rules surreptitiously is part of a professional footballer's training. This causes create pain in an era when television sees everything, but decisions are made on the spur of the moment by the referee and the linesmen.

Blatter cheated Irish soccer out of part of its legitimate pain by paying it a kind of fine for the injustice. (We need to remind ourselves that in Ireland, as in the United States, it is still only 'soccer'. In Ireland "football" is catch and kick, and in the US it is a kind of rugby. But for the rest of the world soccer is football.)

Confidentiality was part of the deal. This is understandable. Injustices occur all the time on the field. If compensation were paid, the queue would be endless. But Taoiseach Kenny has slated the arrangement for lack of "transparency"!

The most serious thing about the FIFA affair is that it blew the whistle on "globalism". As we have often said, there is no such thing as *globalist capitalism*. There is only *Americanism*. It may be doubtful whether such a thing as autonomous global capitalism is a realisable ideal That it does not exist is certain.

When Britain launched a Second World War and made a mess of the world with it, it fell to America to take over the world, except for the parts occupied by the Soviet Union as the state that defeated Nazi Germany, and China where the Communist Party as the victor in the complex war of defence merged with a civil war.

In 1945 the world outside the Communist area was bankrupt and the USA was booming. In order to create a market for its commodities it provided money to the world to buy them. Forms of national money were re-established but they all rested on the dollar. The US has now asserted that all who use the dollar, or dollar-related currencies, or plastic money, are subject to US sovereignty.

The world market was established by Britain in the 18th and 19th centuries. German economic development after the unification of 1871 began to erode British hegemony of it. The problem was dealt with by world war.

The Second World War was a kind of British displacement activity. It had catastrophic by-products, but no coherent purpose. Its purpose certainly was not to bring Communism to power in central Europe and establish US hegemony over what had been the British Empire and its spheres of interest.

The capitalist world market has existed under US hegemony since 1945. Under the trading system of this market—sometimes called *free trade*—the US has the power to crush states which act contrary to its interests. When Britain made an attempt to rehabilitate its Empire in 1956, the US brought it to heel by threatening it with financial ruin.

A year ago British financial pundits were certain that the US would be able to do the same with capitalist Russia. That has now become doubtful, and therefore World War is again in prospect.

John Waters (formerly an *Irish Times* columnist, now writing in the *Sunday Independent*) has said outright that the world needs a master, and that the US master should be supported.

The difficulty with US mastery is that

it behaved with utter irresponsibility when Russia was at its mercy under Yeltsin, and a remnant of the KGB had the power and the resourcefulness to pull the country together as a capitalist democracy capable to tending to national interests. Also, China has become a powerful capitalist economy outside the democratic order of things. The US, which is committed by its own dynamic to world hegemony, has an undeniable interest in breaking the will of both Russia and China, and that has given Russia and China a shared survivalist interest against the USA. Both remain committed to capitalism, but both understand that they must make themselves invulnerable to dollar sovereignty.

Other states have tried to do this. Saddam Hussein wanted to stop using the dollar to sell his oil. Libya under Gaddafi was trying to develop a kind of African money—and was reduced to a shambles. Only powerful states, which are immune to the democratic corruption practised by the United States through NGOs, and which in the last resort could wage a war of mutual destruction with the USA, could do it.

Bew On Irish Peasant Anti-Semitism !

continued

he recalls. *"I was very impressed. It was the Israel of kibbutz—not the start-up nation. It was a democratic Israel; it was the Israel of the Labour Party. It was the first time people saw cabinet ministers who did not wear shirts and ties."*

As a Cambridge University student, he read the works of Jewish academics and Marxists, including Ralph Miliband and Isaac Deutscher.

"You might describe me as a bog-standard left-wing intellectual", says Lord Bew, who was involved in the Irish civil rights movement. "None of us really thought about the Jewish world except for the Jewish intellectuals whose work we were familiar with and respected as young academics."

But the socialist position on Israel has dramatically shifted since Lord Bew was a student. It has turned from admiration of a new democracy in the Middle East to vehement criticism of a capitalist nation. The socialist movement is now littered with Israel boycott initiatives and

empathy for the Palestinian plight, which often crosses over into anti-Israel diatribe.

Lord Bew—a former member of the Workers' Association and who took part in People's Democracy marches, says it was *"quite common for young left-wing intellectuals to be pro-Israel because the Israeli political culture was so different. Israeli society and its economy have changed, that world has gone. Israel has to be what it is now to survive. It has to be a successful capitalist nation—the start-up nation, the hi-tech nation. But it is now less easy to defend in certain sectors of Western public opinion."*

I meet Lord Bew, 65, at the House of Lords for afternoon tea. Calm in manner, he is already waiting at the entrance when I arrive. Over crustless sandwiches and scones, he says: *"The argument against Israel tends to be purely negative and powered by antisemitism. I think the case against Israel has lost the socialist utopianism which Jewish left-wing intellectual signed up to. There is no longer a socialist utopian case against Israel."*

A full-time professor of Irish politics at Queen's University Belfast, Lord Bew has taken note of

the surge in anti-Israel activism on campuses across the UK. Of the boycott, divestment and sanctions movement against Israel, he says: *"I pay a lot of attention to it. It is profound among the student unions. Once I was looking at my students who were running a boycott of Israel campaign, and thought: 'If your mum needed an operation and the hospital was using technology that had been developed in Tel Aviv, would you then be for this boycott?'"*

"While I accept that it is possible to be very critical of the policies of the state of Israel, you do have to ask yourself whether the coalitions that are built up in student politics to create this campaign are obviously antisemitic. If you look at the tone of the demonstrations, some of the chants, it is very hard to say that the broader movement does not contain antisemitic elements. I think people have to face up to that."

"I do not think the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions Movement is going to work on universities. There are so many ties with Israeli scientists and academics that have real connections with each other that I think those ties are too strong to be broken by any campaign."

And Lord Bew, the former chairman of the British-Irish Association, recognises that some of the most vehement criticism of Israel comes from Ireland—where Israel's attitude to the Palestinians has been likened to the British colonial attitude to Ireland. *"It is related to old-fashioned peasant antisemitism and it is related to the 'we support the indigenous people, not the imperialists'" stance, he says.*

"Peasant Catholic antisemitism in Ireland is not too dissimilar to Poland—seeing Jews as outsiders with lots of money. On my own campus, there have been issues and of course it gets caught up in Irish politics—the unionists tend to be much more sympathetic to Israel and the nationalists not."

"The unionists were saying: 'if you attack Israel, you attack us because you know we support Israel'. It not an unreasonable argument, he laughs. Lord Bew was appointed a cross-bencher in the Lords in 2007 in recognition of his contributions to the Good Friday Agreement. If he could work through that, what would he do for the

ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict?

"Nobody can believe anything other than: we are stuck with these two people living close to each other and we must be looking to have the best possible relations", he replies. "There is no possibility of a utopian resolution of this place. This is about managing the level of hate downwards."

"I strongly believe in a two-state solution despite all the difficulties. My background in Irish politics was the Good Friday Agreement so I believe in the historic compromise between people. I find it quite exasperating that if I am quite clearly committed to historic compromise in an area, why people are convinced I am not committed to historic compromise in another area."

Lord Bew took up the position at the AIA in 2011 at the invitation of one of his many Jewish friends. So close are his ties with the community that he eats in a kosher restaurant at least once a week.

But advocating Israel in his position is not an easy feat. *"The hateful part of the defence of Israel is the assumption that you are opposed to Palestinian statehood or the human rights of Palestinians", he says.*

"I have always tried for a measured tone. You know that being an advocate of Israel is going to be difficult; it is a difficult time. I think you have to take the view that you are in it for the long haul. I believe Israel is a progressive democracy that should be defended. You have to take a long-haul view of it, and I do take a long-haul view."

"Israel has to be what it is now to survive"—that is almost true. It only needs a slight amendment to be true: If Israel has to be what it is now then it has to do what it does now to survive.

What is Israel now? It is a half-completed colonial conquest of Palestine. In its political dynamic it is committed to completing the conquest, and it is therefore a state without borders.

The reason why it is allowed to massacre Palestinians wholesale is that it says the Palestinians do not recognise it as legitimate and therefore it can't do a deal with them.

But Israel doesn't recognise itself as legitimate. No major Jewish party in Israel has a policy of limiting the borders of the state—of defining them short of the

Biblical boundaries. The Bible Kingdom of Israel stretched through what is now Syria, Iraq and Jordan into Egypt.

The Palestinian authorities are willing to recognise a state of Israel within definite borders, and on the condition of a Right of Return of refugees. What they will not recognise as legitimate is a state of Israel with undefined borders, which is committed to extending itself territorially until the whole of Palestine becomes Israel.

Lord Bew does not see Irish resistance to anti-Palestinian propaganda as being a response to the expansionism of the Israeli state, its treatment of Palestinians in the Occupied Territory, and the ongoing colonisation of that territory by Jewish settlers intent on phasing out Palestinian life. Not at all. It is related to old-fashioned Catholic peasant anti-Semitism as in Poland.

We'd be interested to know where the Irish peasants might have become anti-Semitic through contact with Jewish peddlers and money-lenders. They had their own gombeenmen, didn't they?

Who was the first leader of the Irish Catholic peasants? It must have been Michael Davitt. And Michael Davitt, we seem to recall, was a supporter of Zionism long before Britain adopted it as an Imperial instrument.

And, after Davitt, there was the gifted agitator and strategist of the peasant rights movement, William O'Brien, who led the movement to the abolition of landlordism and the establishment of the peasants as landowners. The Jews had nothing to do with it. The market value of landlord estates was devalued by tenant-right agitation, and then the Government put up the purchase-money in the hope that the landowning peasants would become Brits.

The only Jewish connection we know of was that O'Brien married a rich Russian Jew, who funded the production of a daily newspaper, the *Cork Free Press*, which represented the peasant interest.

Lord Bew, who is a fervent admirer of John Redmond, surely knows that it was not the peasants who raised the slogan *"Down With The Russian Jewess!":* It was the Redmondites.

Redmond's conduct of the Home Rule Party was criticised sharply by the *Cork Free Press* when it incorporated a Catholic secret society, the *Ancient Order of Hibernians*, into the structure of the Party, thus sectarianising it. The AOH was very much an urban movement, based in Belfast, and it was to the fore in the

Redmondite efforts to suppress the O'Brien dissidents.

We do not know if an anti-Semitic movement in Belfast lay behind the "*Down With The Russian Jewess!*" slogan or if it was just a personal jibe against O'Brien's rich wife. Whichever it was, it had nothing to do with the peasants. The AOH was a movement within the British industrial scene rather than the Irish agricultural scene, and it became a Friendly Society within the British *Insurance Act*, which the *Cork Free Press* regarded as an obstacle to the development of the weak native capitalism of the South.

The only other anti-Jewish element we can think of was the Limerick (City) 'Pogrom'. A boatload of Jews on the way to New York was dropped off in Limerick City and local shopkeepers protested against their competitiveness.

The transients in the Irish countryside in later times were Spanish onion sellers and Tinkers who mended pots. There were no landlords, no money-lenders beyond shopkeepers who extended credit, and no Jews. But there were well-known Jews in public life—in Fianna Fail: the Party made by the anti-Treaty peasants.

And there was one well-known Anti-Semite. He was in the top-people's party: Fine Gael. His son is now doing penance for him as Foreign Minister by being a strong Zionist.

Lord Bew is certainly right when he says that Ulster Unionist society is more sympathetic to Zionism than Nationalist society is. But that really has nothing to do with anti-Semitism or its contrary. It has to do with settlements or colonies.

Unionist Ulster, excluded from British political life in the early 1920s, could only understand itself as a frontier colony. It made the "*supreme sacrifice*" by agreeing to operate an 'Irish state' within the United Kingdom for the purpose of helping Whitehall to handle Sinn Fein. Its election programme in 1918 was for Six County separation from the rest of Ireland so that it might become an integral part of Britain, which the pressure of the large Nationalist majority on the island had been preventing. But the British Unionist Party of the time persuaded it to operate a subordinate Six County Government as a pseudo-state, maintained economically by Britain, but excluded from British political life.

In that situation it could no longer understand itself in British terms and follow the cultural side of British political developments. So it regressed to a colonial understanding of itself—a colony sited on

a frontier that had lost the capacity to expand and was under pressure to contract.

It ticked over for two generations, but after its outburst of 1969 it had to think about its position in the world. Looking around the world, it identified itself with minority settler communities, even though within its corner it was the majority.

Its sense of affinity was with Apartheid South Africa (before it threw in the towel), White Rhodesia and Israel. and Israel was the ideal. In the 1970s, when some critic compared Ulster Unionism with Zionism, John McKeague (an Independent Unionist) ridiculed the comparison by saying that, if they really were like Israel, they would long ago have taken Dundalk. They could only admire Israel. They could not emulate it.

Lord Bew "*strongly believes in a two-state solution despite all the difficulties*" and thinks it would have similarity to the Good Friday Agreement of 1998 about Northern Ireland.

The essential difficulty about getting a two-state solution is that Israel doesn't want it. About ten years ago a party leader in Israel suggested that the state should define its borders. It was a subversive suggestion and he backed away from it quickly. But, if Israel does not define its borders and end Jewish colonial action beyond those borders, there is no possibility of a two-state settlement.

The Israeli Prime Minister ruled a two-state settlement off the agenda at the last Israeli election. His purpose seems to have been to bring an uppity US President to heel by affronting him. Obama has only made some feeble gestures in response. A Jewish American has not been allowed to have "*Jerusalem, Israel*" as his place of birth on his passport.

The USA is impatient with United Nations formalities but does not yet feel that it would be advantageous to brush them aside.

Israel can do pretty well what it pleases without coming under Security Council censure leading to action, because it is protected by the US Veto. What it cannot do, because of other Vetos, is get Israeli conquests sanctioned as legitimate annexations. Israel can conquer and colonise, but it cannot get its conquests ratified by the UN.

US spokesmen have said, over the years, that they cannot see that Israel is doing anything different from what the US did. That is true, of course. But the United States is still not the world. It retains the UN for the time being. Therefore

Jerusalem cannot yet be the internationally recognised capital of Israel.

Israel rejects a two-state settlement, either implicitly like Netanyahu or *de facto* like the others. The USA will not yet authorise Israel's preferred solution. So *de facto* colonisation continues, and 'Palestinian statehood' is vetoed, despite the "*measured tones*" which Lord Bew erects between himself and the facts of the matter.

*

Let's conclude with a reminder of how that Middle East problem was brought about in very recent times.

Britain invaded the Eastern provinces of the Ottoman Empire in the Great War, which we are now celebrating, and brought them under British rule. Then it adopted the Zionist movement—the Jewish nationalist movement for the re-conquest of Palestine after an absence of two thousand years. Its purpose was to establish a secure base for itself in the form of a Jewish State which depended on it and which it could therefore direct. It did this in the knowledge that the Jewish States of two thousand years ago were catastrophic affairs, and that a restored Jewish State would probably be just as catastrophic if it was not subject to British direction.

In 1919 Britain brought the Zionist organisation into the Versailles Conference while locking the elected Irish Government out of it. It committed the League of Nations to do what was otherwise strictly supposed not to be done anymore in the affairs of the world—to do what was done in the Ulster Plantation centuries ago—to conquer another people, expropriate their property, and take their place. That authorisation might have been couched in evasive euphemistic terms but its practical meaning was understood.

The project was set in motion long before there was any Nazi Holocaust to justify it.

The Zionist colony that was built up in Palestine during the 1920s and 1930s launched an outright terrorist war against the British administration after 1945 and Britain surrendered to it. In 1947 the Zionist colony was awarded a piece of Palestine in which to form a Jewish state and the Palestinian majority was awarded a smaller bit to form an Arab State. The territory awarded for the Jewish State had a bare majority of Jews in it—if in fact a majority at all. A Jewish State with a minuscule majority of Jews, and possibly no majority at all, was not a practical project, and could not have served as a

base area for the full Zionist project. A massive clear-out of Arabs was therefore a necessary action. Hundreds of thousands of Arabs were cleared out by one means or another—what we now call *ethnic cleansing*. The Palestinian Arabs were a people made soft by their comparatively idyllic life in the tolerant, cosmopolitan, Ottoman Empire. They were easily panicked and pushed about.

Well, that's the way of the world. Or it used to be the way of the world until the League of Nations and the United Nations decreed that it should not longer be the way of the world. But a final instance of it was to be allowed in the special case of the Jews.

If the Jewish State had been established within the borders of the 1947 UN Resolution, and consolidated by ethnic cleansing, then Israel would have taken its place in history as one amongst the many states formed by brute force combined with political craft. But it was never the intention of the Zionist movement to build its state within 1947 borders. It was committed to Biblical borders and during the 1920s and 1930s it had, under British auspices, been spying out the land that God gave to Moses with a view to extending its power over it as the opportunity arose.

British capitulation to its terrorism in 1947 left it free to accept what the UN offered and to immediately go beyond it. The British Empire, having started the Zionist colonisation project in 1917, and having built up a substantial Jewish colony, abdicated in 1947 and left Zionists free to take the UN award of territory as a base area for expansionist operations. Britain knew very well there was no other Power capable of policing the UN decision.

A fairy story has been told about the Zionist movement beginning to settle down peacefully within the territory awarded by the UN, but being attacked by all the surrounding Arab states and being forced to expand in order to defend itself. But the Arab states were all British creations, either under current British control or disabled by Britain. What was presented as an Arab attack on 1947 Israel was a small British action to limit the Jewish expansion beyond 1947 borders and prevent it from overrunning the whole of Palestine..

British Imperialism sponsored the Jewish colonial development after 1918 and policed Arab resistance to it. Then it lost control of what it had created, and in order to retain some influence in the Arab world, it acted through its Army in Jordan,

the *Arab Legion*, to prevent Zionist expansion over the whole of Palestine in 1948.

The Ceasefire of 1948 left Israel in possession of a great deal of territory beyond its 1947 borders. It spent twenty years digesting this territory—and co-operating with Britain and France in a pre-emptive defence against Egypt in 1956. Then in 1967 it launched a pre-emptive defence against Egypt, Jordan and Syria and took possession of the whole of Palestine. (A pre-emptive defence is defence against an attack that never happened. In other words, it is an attack.)

Since 1967 the talk of a peace settlement has been on the borders set by the 1948 conquest, as if these were the borders set by the UN Resolution. But it has long been apparent that the Zionists have no intention of settling for the territory of their 1948 conquest. They have been colonising the territory conquered in 1967.

Report from David Morrison

Israeli Ministers About Palestine

[Richard Boyd Barrett made the following remarks when asking Taoiseach Enda Kenny a question in the Dail on 9th June:]

“The Israeli Minister of Defence, Moshe Ya'alon, said a couple of weeks ago that Israel is *“going to hurt Lebanese civilians to include kids of the family”*. He continued by saying that Israel *“went through a very long deep discussion ... we did it then, we did it in [the] Gaza Strip, we are going to do it in any round of hostilities in the future”*. The military chief of staff, Benny Gantz, who headed up the last two military assaults on Gaza, has said that *“the next round of violence will be worse and see this suffering increase”*. According to the Minister of Education in the Netanyahu Government, *“there will never be a peace plan with the Palestinians... I will do everything in my power to make sure they never get a state”*. He has also said that *“if you catch terrorists, you have to simply kill them ... I've killed lots of Arabs in my life and there's no problem with that”*.

This is the Minister of Justice:

“[Palestinians] are all enemy combatants... this also includes the mothers of the martyrs... they should follow their sons, nothing would be more just. They should go, as should the

physical homes in which they raised the snakes. Otherwise, more little snakes will be raised there.”

That was the Israeli Minister of Justice in the last few months. The Israeli deputy Minister of Defence has said that Palestinians *“are beasts, they are not human”*.

...According to the Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs, Tzipi Hotovely:

“My position is that between the sea and the Jordan River, there needs to be one state only—the state of Israel... There is no place for an agreement of any kind that discusses the concession of Israeli sovereignty over lands conquered [in 1967].

These are the official statements of several Ministers of the current Government of Israel. In one case, the genocide of all Palestinians, including children, has actually been advocated and they have been referred to as *“snakes”*. Does the Taoiseach agree that if we are defining terrorism, that is the language and thinking of terrorists? It is absolutely unacceptable in civilised politics and international relations for the Head of Government of a state with which we carry on normal relations to advocate those sorts of views, which we know have led to the deaths of thousands of innocent Palestinian men, women and children. Given that the Taoiseach met Mr. Netanyahu in Paris earlier this year, what does he have to say about the expression of such views by the Israeli Government?

The Taoiseach: The Deputy has read comments made by a number of Ministers in the Israeli Government. On the one hand, I suppose one might say they are all on-message. I find that message regrettable and most unhelpful. I do not agree with those statements. When I met Prime Minister Netanyahu briefly in Paris, I said to him that when I had an opportunity to go to Gaza a number of years ago with a delegation from here, I found the situation completely intolerable. I told him that I am a strong supporter of the two-state solution and that peace is always possible. I reminded him of the example offered by a small country like Ireland, where people were able to sit down and work out their differences after 30 years of violence, with the result that lives have been saved and a fragile but stable peace situation, which has to be worked on constantly, has been put in place.”

<http://oireachtasdebates.oireachtas.ie/debates%20authoring/DebatesWebPack.nsf/takes/dail2015060900021?opendocument>

Shorts

from
the Long Fellow

BREXIT

Coverage of the prospect of a British exit from the EU has tended towards the view that it will be disastrous for Ireland, but will have no damaging consequences for Britain. Ireland will be denied access to the UK market, but the UK will somehow retain unfettered access to the EU. Indeed the London-based *Open Europe* think tank, whose line is slavishly reported by the Irish media, thinks that Britain will receive an economic boost from exit since it will be released from the shackles of social protection legislation.

A small article in the *Sunday Independent* (7.6.15) might give Irish politicians some pause for thought before they rush to do Britain's bidding in Europe. *Renishaw*, a manufacturing company founded by an Irish inventor David McMurty, and an English engineer John Deer, is thinking of moving some of its UK operations to Ireland in the event of a British exit. The company is valued at 2.5 billion euro and operates in 32 countries, with 4,000 employees—2,500 of whom are employed in the UK.

The Long Fellow is inclined to take the views of such a successful company more seriously than a think tank with its own political agenda.

THE IRISH TIMES TRADEMARK

The Irish Times issued legal proceedings against the British company *Times Newspapers Ltd* because the latter intended setting up an online newspaper called *Times Ireland* which will offer a seven day subscription package, giving on-line access to the Irish edition of the *London Times* as well as the *Sunday Times*.

The Irish Times claimed that this is "a very serious infringement" of copyright because of the similarity between *The Irish Times* and *Times Ireland* names. It appears that *Times Newspapers Ltd* has conceded the case. Whatever about the legal case, the plaintiff has no moral case. *The Irish Times* took ownership of the *Ireland.com* name and sold it back to *Bord Fáilte*. The Long Fellow considers this a far more serious infringement of copyright than anything *Times Newspapers Ltd* has alleged to have done.

IBRC

So far nothing has emerged of substance to suggest any impropriety by the Board of IBRC (on which an official from the Department of Finance sat). As indicated last month, it looks like prior to the liquidation of IBRC there was a conflict between Secretary-General of the Department of Finance John Moran and Chairman of IBRC Alan Dukes. Dukes claims that Moran wanted a seat on the Board, so that there could be less meetings and decisions could be "readied up" between them. Is it possible that the Department decided to stir things up when its supremo failed to get his way?

According to Catherine Murphy TD, relations had deteriorated to such extent that communication between the Department and the board of IBRC was through their respective legal representatives. That is a dysfunctional state of affairs, but it does not follow that the fault lies with the Board of IBRC. It might very well have been the case that the level of interference by the Department was unwarranted and that the IBRC felt it necessary to prevent the Department from acting *ultra vires*. In any functioning organisation—whether a State or a small company—duties and responsibilities should be well defined. If they are not, it is impossible for people to be made accountable if errors are made.

The assumption in the media appears to be that, because the Department of Finance had concerns, those concerns must be valid. In relation to the sale of Siteserv, the concerns that have been raised have been answered. These concerned: a) granting exclusivity to the prospective purchaser; b) not offering the company to a trade buyer; c) the offer of 5 million to existing shareholders; d) the writing off of over 100 million (see last month's column). Unfortunately, there has been so much political and media capital invested in the proposition that there must be something "rotten in the State of Denmark" that no amount of explanations is likely to satisfy the sceptics.

DENIS O'BRIEN

Another assumption of the media is that, because Denis O'Brien is a billionaire, he is fair game. The argument is that he has accumulated private wealth; this gives him social or public power; and therefore he should be made publicly accountable. He has no right to privacy. RTE argued in court that, if they didn't include details of Denis O'Brien's private banking affairs, its intended programme on the IBRC would be boring; to which O'Brien's counsel responded that there was no constitutional right to be entertaining.

O'Brien's rights were vindicated in the Courts but it was a Pyrrhic victory since Dáil Privilege allowed his affairs to be aired in public with impunity. He claims the allegations made by Deputy Murphy are inaccurate and are a violation of his right to privacy. In an article in *The Irish Times* (2.6.15) O'Brien notes that the Fianna Fáil leader Micheál Martin was quick to denounce Mary Lou McDonald for 'abusing' Dáil privilege by making unsubstantiated claims concerning people who had Ansbacher accounts. And yet Martin did not hesitate to defend Murphy for doing likewise.

Dáil Privilege is necessary to facilitate public debate, but it should be used sparingly to avoid that institution being brought into disrepute. There are none of the checks and balances that apply outside the Dáil, such as libel laws and the right to know who one's accuser is.

It remains to be seen what will emerge from a public inquiry, but already there is some inconsistency in the stories of the Opposition politicians. Catherine Murphy says O'Brien availed of an interest rate of 1.5%, while Sinn Féin's Pearse Doherty says the rate charged was 3%.

THE PUBLIC INTEREST

What is the public interest in all of this? O'Brien's counsel said in court that, if O'Brien's banking affairs were not considered private, he would have to consider moving his considerable funds from Irish banks to foreign banks. That was considered a threat, but there is no doubt that it is an action that O'Brien is perfectly entitled to take.

Who could possibly argue against openness and transparency? But if the requirements of openness and transparency imposed on the State are too onerous, its effectiveness is undermined. At present it appears that there is an assumption that the State is guilty unless proven otherwise. That kind of burden is not imposed on the private sector.

FIFA CORRUPTION

To err is human; to forgive is divine. That maxim is even more true when vast sums of money are involved, but the facts remain that Sepp Blatter has done a terrific job in spreading the "beautiful game" throughout the world. Contrast the record of FIFA with that of the International Olympic Committee. When it is considered the enormous contribution African athletes have made to the Olympic Games, is it not extraordinary that the games have never been held on that continent?

The host cities for the modern Olympic Games, which was inaugurated in 1896, have been dominated by the United States and European cities. Mexico City in 1968 is the nearest the Olympic Games have come to South America. Next year—possibly piggybacking on infrastructure built for the 2014 World Cup—a Brazilian city will host the Olympic games for the first time.

The hosting of the World Cup, by contrast, has a closer correlation with the popularity of the game. So, since the games began in 1930, powerful countries (in footballing rather than financial terms) such as Brazil have hosted it twice; Uruguay once; Argentina once etc. Since Blatter became General Secretary in 1981 and later President in 1998 there has been a conscious attempt to spread the game to the weaker nations. The United States hosted the games in 1994; Japan and South Korea in 2002; and South Africa in 2010.

Since England failed in its recent bids to host the World Cup, it has been exercised by the issue of corruption and has been given enthusiastic backing by its Anglo-Saxon ally the United States, which since 1994 has developed a wealthy Football organisation. Its bid to host a World Cup was defeated in favour of Qatar, though Blatter himself voted for it. And, since the security forces of the United States have chosen to become involved in the corruption investigations, it is conceivable that a wider geo-political agenda is at play: lets get Russia, the 2018 hosts.

It is noticeable that investigations into corruption tend to serve a political purpose. The wealthy countries resent that the considerable largesse generated from the game is being distributed to the poorer countries. No wonder Blatter has such support in Africa, the Caribbean, Eastern Europe and Asia!

FAI CORRUPTION?

The Long Fellow remembers the "*hand of Henry*", in a Football World Cup qualifying game with France. This handball, which probably lost the game for Ireland, had none of the redeeming features of Maradona's "*hand of God*". It now emerges that, after that game, the FAI was looking for a "handout" on foot of (oh dear) the incident.

An injustice was done and was seen to be done on numerous action replays broadcast on television and the internet but, because FIFA, unaccountably, eschews video technology, no remedy was available at the time or afterwards.

It has to be said that Sepp Blatter humiliated the Irish by smirking at a

proposal made in the course of confidential discussions that the Republic of Ireland should be allowed participate as a 33rd nation in the World Cup Finals in South Africa. Also, while there was no legal precedent for the result of a match to be overturned, there was another matter on which FIFA was on less secure ground. After the "*best losers*" emerged from the qualifying groups, FIFA decided that the playoff fixtures would be designed on the basis of seeding rather than an open draw. The suspicion was that this was to give France a better chance of qualifying.

The Irish threatened legal action but by no means was there a cast-iron case. However, it was decided that FIFA would donate 5 million to "ease the pain" on condition of confidentiality. The money went through the FAI's books and there is no suggestion of any malfeasance. Some media commentators believe that money received on a *confidential* basis should have been openly and transparently described in the accounts! Taoiseach Enda Kenny has complained of a lack of "*transparency*"!

Thankfully, there is still some common sense in the country and it has been decided that this nonsense is outside the remit of any Dáil Committee.

Banking Inquiry

continued

based approach" and the "*rules based approach*".

The former rests on the idea that in general it is in banks' own interest to limit their risk, and the main task of the Regulator is to give the banks a set of general principles regarding their conduct, accompanied by guidelines to follow. The Regulator may later sanction an institution if he finds these guidelines are being abused.

This approach was adopted in Europe following the adoption of the *Basel II Accords* in 2004 and one of the primary functions of the Regulator in Ireland, the IFSRA, was to implement them. However, many European countries had historically much greater State involvement with the banking sector and retained a more intrusive approach. The Irish authority itself was created only in 2003 by carving out the responsibility for banking supervision from the Central Bank. Although it shared premises, IT systems

and Board members with the Central Bank, the Irish Financial Services Regulatory Authority (IFSRA) had its own board, CEO and Chairman and was supposed to be independent of the Central Bank while remaining part of it. The role of the Central Bank itself was thereafter limited mainly to ensuring "*overall financial stability*". There was considerable criticism at the time from the Central Bank of this arrangement and, following the failure of the Regulator to prevent the emergence of a banking crisis, regulation was transferred back to the Central Bank by the *2010 Central Bank Reform Act*.

The 1999 McDowell Report (formally the "*Report of the Implementation Advisory Group on the establishment of a Single Regulatory Authority*") was named after the PDs' Michael McDowell, who, before he became Attorney General in July 1999, chaired the committee which produced it. It expressly advocated an independent regulatory model based on the UK's *Financial Services Authority* (FSA). The objections to this arrangement from the Central bank, as mentioned above, were stated as follows in a press release on 24th June 1999:

"The Bank disagrees strongly with the main recommendation of the Advisory Group report. No convincing reasons have been put forward as to why existing regulatory functions should be transferred elsewhere. The 'green field' option represents a high risk strategy. The main risks include:

- * loss of regulatory expertise;
- * difficulty in establishing an international reputation as any new authority would lack international contacts and a proven track record;
- * duplication of supervisory effort as the Bank must, under the Maastricht Treaty, continue to monitor the stability of the banking system and act as lender of last resort;
- * loss of the important interaction and transfer of expertise between the Bank's regulatory and non-regulatory functions;
- * high start-up and operating costs. "

The hybrid arrangement which eventually emerged was a compromise, but the moral authority of the Regulator was undoubtedly diminished. While there may have been weaknesses with earlier Central Bank regulation, the authority of the Governor was considerable and could no longer be brought directly to bear on individual banking institutions. This came out in an exchange between former Chairman of the IFSRA Brian Patterson and Kieran O'Donnell:

"Mr. Brian Patterson: I... if you'll forgive me for a moment, I remember when I was studying my economics, I think at the feet of Garret FitzGerald in UCD, and he told us about moral suasion, he said that refers to the eyebrows of the Governor. So in other words, if, if the ... if you were having a conversation with the Governor and he raised his eyebrows--

Deputy Kieran O'Donnell: I suggest you should have listened.

Chairman: I suggest you get on there with questioning there, Deputy, and pull back on making remarks.

Mr. Brian Patterson: You asked me what, what powers we actually had. Moral suasion was one of them, but I honestly don't think that was working; the banks weren't listening. We could have attached conditions to licences; we could have done more in requiring capital requirements; we could have done more and done it sooner. What else could we have done? I suppose in extremis, we could have gone and asked for emergency legislation..."

While there has been considerable discussion before the Inquiry of the fact that Irish regulatory practice followed *Basel II* best practice, there is little mention of the fact that the structure and philosophical underpinnings of the Irish Regulator were laid down prior to *Basel II*. This was done in an atmosphere of free-marketsteering, "*closer to Boston than Berlin*" PD-style Atlanticist nonsense mixed with a naive West Britonism which overlooked the fact that, wherever it might be 'spiritually', Ireland was in a currency union with Berlin, derived great benefits from it and had responsibilities towards it.

As for the model on which the Irish Regulator was based, the FSA was set up to be independent of the UK Government, though its Board was appointed by the Treasury. It was financed entirely through fees charged to the financial institutions.

(The Irish authority was partially independent but also received 50% of its income through levies on the institutions).

They may therefore have been independent from the Governments and Central Banks to a greater or lesser degree, but they were not independent from the banks they were supposed to have been regulating and in both cases there was said to have been a great deal of "*regulatory capture*". They suffered from "*pushback*" whenever they did try to step up regulation. Both embraced a principles-based approach, both failed to regulate effectively and in both cases Prudential Regulation was handed over to their respective Central Banks after this failure.

In the Honohan Report, and in his evidence to the Inquiry, he makes much of the failure of the Regulator and the Central Bank to regulate, but largely downplays the fact that the Regulator was designed, in accordance with free-market principles, and UK 'best practice', NOT to regulate.

In contrast to the above, "*Rules-based regulation*" relies on the imposition of strict, clear, often legally binding rules for companies and financial institutions and is exemplified by the *Sarbanes Oxley Act*, which governs publicly listed and other companies in the United States and was imposed following the Enron and other scandals. Financial sector regulation in the US is split among various agencies—including the Federal Reserve, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency—while the securities industry is governed by the Securities and Exchange Commission. It is subject to a vast range of legislation at both Federal and State level. This regime is widely criticised for its high cost of compliance, reduction in innovation and excessive litigation giving rise to a large legal industry devoted to finding ways to circumvent the laws. This arrangement also has been proven not to work very well, and of course failed to prevent the meltdown in the US which triggered the collapse everywhere else.

A law that actually did seem to provide protection from excessive risk-taking was the *1933 Glass Steagall Act* which was abolished during the deregulatory frenzy of the 1990s. (However its effectiveness had arguably been reduced by then due to other regulatory decisions.)

A handicap suffered by the Irish Regulator was the inclusion in its remit of a requirement to "*promote*" the Irish financial services industry. This has been widely criticised in much of the evidence given and was also revoked in the 2010 Central Bank Reform Act. According to Patrick Neary, it resulted in the Regulator being seen as more of a 'can do' facilitator. This however cannot be said to have been the fault of the Regulator, but of the legislation which created his position.

An additional difficulty arose when it came to regulating the "*large aggressive UK banks*" operating in Ireland, a subject that is carefully avoided by the local '*crisis was made in Ireland*' media. According to Brian Patterson, Chairman of the IFSRA from its inception up to 2008, the Irish Regulator could not, or was reluctant to, increase the capital requirements of the Irish banks (the main tool open to it to

control the extent of lending) for fear that the Irish subsidiaries of the UK banks would restructure to become mere 'branches' in Ireland. In such a case their regulation would become primarily a matter for the UK Regulator and that would make it difficult for the Irish Regulator to control their activities. Such a policy would have placed the Irish banks at a major commercial disadvantage compared to their UK rivals.

Evidence was also given of the lack of resources both in terms of personnel and IT available to the regulator. Mary Burke, who became Head of Banking Supervision in 2006, stated that:

"In that regard, in 2006, BSD (Banking Supervision Department) had an approved staff complement of only 53.5, with actual numbers averaging around 50, to supervise approximately 80 banks, 50 Irish-licensed and 30 EU branches."

This is however entirely consistent with a structure which is designed not to regulate.

A considerably larger number were involved in the regulation of banks in their relations with customers rather than the prudential regulation of the banks themselves.

Prudential regulation, after *Basel II*, required the monitoring of vast amounts of data supplied by the banks concerning their lending and the capital reserves available to cover losses from bad loans, sudden runs on deposits etc. The IT systems in place were described as inadequate, having been inherited from the Central Bank. Not only were the numbers of staff inadequate, they were also under-qualified and lacked banking sector expertise. Recruitment of suitable staff was gravely hampered due to the fact that qualified people preferred to go and work for the banks themselves because of the much higher salaries on offer—salaries at the Regulator offices was bound by civil service protocols in this regard. The situation is apparently much improved today.

So was there no effective regulatory action from the Regulator?

Well, contrary to popular belief, there was. Con Horan became the Director of Prudential Regulation in 2006 (replacing Patrick Neary who became CEO at this time), having previously served as Head of Banking Supervision. In 2005 he proposed increasing the bank's capital requirements on high loan-to-value mortgages:

"This sought to put more capital aside in the event of a downturn and to establish a standard in the market for prudent lending. However, the proposal was not accepted. My understanding was that senior management in the Financial Regulator and the Central Bank had considered the matter but did not believe the action was necessary. Macro-prudential analysis on mortgage growth conducted around this time suggested that the developments could be explained by economic fundamentals."

After his appointment as Prudential Director he took action again:

"my first week as prudential director, I presented proposals to the authority for capital measures to address high loan-to-value lending ... mortgage lending. This was the first time in almost a decade of an exceptional property market that regulatory intervention was instigated."

There was considerable resistance to these measures; the *'pushback'* mentioned above:

"The speed and level of consultation in the introduction of the measures led to me being rebuked by the statutory financial services consultative industry panel. The panel considered the lack of consultation with its members in the preparation of the measures as regrettable and retrogressive. The chairman of the panel wrote to me reflecting those concerns."

Having dealt with the most dangerous aspect of mortgage lending, he moved on to commercial property lending exemplified by Anglo:

"Later in 2006, I followed up these mortgage measures with the introduction of the most stringent capital requirements in Europe for speculative commercial property lending and additional requirements for buy-to-let mortgages. There was also resistance to these measures. Clearly the majority view at the time was that the property market was going to have a soft landing as interest rates increased. There was fear about the message that regulatory intervention would communicate in terms of the property market in Ireland and how it might affect the competitiveness of the banking system."

But the property market was beginning to cool down by then, and in any case the damage had already been done, as he says: *"regrettably, however, these measures were too late and were not sufficient to reverse the excesses of the previous decade and save the financial system when the global financial crisis struck."*

Sean Owens

Review: *Seán Murray, Marxist-Leninist And Irish Socialist Republican*
by *Seán Byers*, Irish Academic Press

Sean Murray

Seán Murray was a name I was familiar with from a young age. My father was a member of the Revolutionary Workers' Group back in Belfast in 1931 when Seán was the leading figure in it. Murray had been to the International Lenin School in Moscow, going there in December 1927 aged 29. He already had ten years of political activity under his belt, including his role as commandant in the IRA originating in the mainly Catholic Glens of Antrim during the War of Independence.

The International Lenin School, directed by Bukharin, was no holiday camp, as the author says, it had a 72-hour week of intense study. My father was one of those chosen to be part of the next Irish batch to be sent to Moscow. He failed to take up the offer, due to his recent hurried marriage and me being in a hurry to join the world. Remaining active, he was to become a member of the newly reformed CPI. He left that early on in the 1930s but remained a communist until his death.

When I joined the Young Workers League in 1950 I asked Murray why my father had left the movement yet remained attached to its basic ideas. Seán was very coy about it all. I suggested maybe my father had become a parlour socialist. He smiled at this, but the truth was another matter. Seán said if we had everyone who had passed through the ranks of the communist movement here right now we would have quite a party.

Other young members in the YWL also had parents and relations who, like my father, had been in the RWG and the CPI. They didn't seem able to answer my question: why, when they still claimed to be communists had they left in the 1930s?

The curiosity grew in the YWL and the then CPNI went all-out to suppress that curiosity. We weren't at all savvy about the idea of research into archives that would have existed in libraries like the Linenhall Library or at Queen's University. Then a young Protestant Bob Heatley, whose father had also left both organisations in the 1930s, began to push the YWL to consider the plight of the Catholics of Northern Ireland. Though meetings of the YWL were unified, it was when the meetings were over that the split began: with the Catholic members, plus the one Protestant Bob Heatley, meeting

separately in a cafe in the lower Falls Road to discuss what was to be done. It was there we came across Catholic Action and members of Maria Duce, severely anti-communist and anti-socialist. But they were intellectually inclined and the Maria Duce members knew more about 1930s communism in Belfast than we did. That version of the Party back then they said they had a bit of respect for, but the present loyalist-run CPNI they saw as a Fifth Column for the Soviet Union.

That certainly made us think that the situation of Catholics weren't too high on the agenda of the CPNI, that it was now a Protestant party—but then again, yesterday, it had been a Catholic party, despite the sloganising of class war. A number of Protestants had stuck with the 1930s CPI, some of them prominent in Trade Union affairs, and a few of them had suffered imprisonment.

Murray himself had almost been stabbed to death and he was one of a number of socialists who had been put under siege by a mob of thousands of anti-communists in Dublin. At times he carried a gun in his pocket for his own protection. The problem was that, in the late 1940s/early 1950s, Belfast there was nowhere to go politically. Catholic West Belfast was having rallies on May Day of Joseph the Worker, the Republican movement was anti-communist, anti-socialist. The Northern Ireland Labour Party was just another unionist party. The CPNI—though, with its Protestant bias and occasional outbursts of sectarianism by one of its EC members Annie Bruton—had Seán Murray, and the Protestants Betty Sinclair, her brother Billy Sinclair, NI organiser for the Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers, Eddie and Sadie Menzies, Billy McCullough, all from the 1930s CPI.

But they remained silent about the 1930s history of the party and that was starting to annoy members of the YWL. We did observe that Murray was an isolated figure, with very little to do until he was made lecturer to the YWL. He was quite professor-like in his knowledge of communist theory but had the clarity of communist articulation. He was to us teenagers a dignified person with a lot of wisdom. Occasionally one of our members would interrupt his lecture to throw out a

question about the role of the party in the 1930s. That's when the jovial Catholic small farmer of his character would kick in with some joke irrelevant to the lecture and we knew then it was a subject we were not going to learn about.

At an AGM of the CPNI one of us raised the matter of the suppressed 1930s history and she was shouted down. Continuing to ask the same question, we were subjected to threats of violence from three men and their wives. We knew they were involved in some kind of gangster activity in East Belfast and we couldn't understand why they were allowed to be members of the CPNI. First they sent their wives over to warn us to shut up and when that didn't work the husbands, walked over in their sharp gangster suits and sunglasses and raised their fists but not in the manner of the communist salute. So the YWL walked out of the AGM and became the Socialist Youth League with a notepaper heading in Irish. Seán Murray just sat silently through this ruckus but looked pleased. There was nowhere for any of us to go so we stayed within the orbit of the CPNI.

Similarly, you get this from the book though it was probably not intended—that Murray also had nowhere to go once he became a communist. The WW2 split in the party, due to 26 Counties going neutral and the 6 Counties joining the war effort, must have seen his Leninist discipline put to the test, with the CPNI co-operating with the Unionist Government in its efforts to avoid industrial strikes and at one time bringing over Harry Pollitt, head of the CPGB, to speak to the striking workers at Mackies Engineering Works in order to persuade them to return to work.

The CPGB was hostile to the Irish party in the 1930s and treated it as something that should be more subservient. Pollitt in particular didn't like Murray and tried on many occasions to sabotage his elevation to various positions in the CPI. The veteran communists Bob Stewart and Willie Gallagher were used as the hit-men of the CPGB against the Irish party. Murray had bad advice from the Comintern about an Ireland they knew very little about. Sometimes they used the CPGB to send directives to Murray on how to conduct the affairs of the CPI, the CPGB themselves not understanding the very complicated politics of Ireland North and South. Left alone Murray would have opted for a United Front when his class antagonism policy didn't seem to be working. There were times of course when he had ideas that must have seemed bizarre to the

Protestant population of the North—a united neutrality during WW2 to cover the island of Ireland.

Much of his republican socialism was never going to appeal to the Protestant population of the North. He was also being battered from the Catholic side like, for example, an incident at the Bodinstown Commemoration when members of the republican movement wouldn't let the Communists unfurl their socialist banners and, when they did, attacked them and tore up their red flags. Amazingly, this handful of Northern Protestants stuck by Murray through thick and thin during the 1930s. Those who left the CPNI because of the nationalist/republican nature of the party still had high regard for Murray, and that included my father who was basically a reformist unionist in communist clothing.

My father was in correspondence with Murray during my teens. On a few occasions I had been delegated to attend a communist cadre school in Sheffield for a week. When my father heard of it, he wrote to Murray and said I wasn't to go as I had an apprenticeship to serve and going to Sheffield could endanger it. The CPNI never had any funds to spare and what I was given from my apprentice wage by my parents didn't amount to much. I was advised by a member of the CPNI to start saving for my boat fare to Liverpool. Then, outside Liverpool, on a certain road where milk tankers ran I was to thumb one of them to Sheffield. I was told that Picasso would be there. I had never heard of Picasso and thought they were talking about some well-known parrot.

Murray said my father was right, I had to get on with my apprenticeship or I would end up like him. But, on the other hand, I should go as an active communist. Communists were dying in the world for their beliefs and the least I could do was to make some effort and go to Sheffield. I didn't go and Murray said under his breath and with some menace that I would go next time. But there was to be no next time when I was again delegated; and Murray said I was becoming like my father. The next day he apologised, or in communist terms, he went in for a bit of self-criticism, while I answered with self-criticism. Not too difficult for Catholics to go confessional.

Seán Byers, the author of this book, also has respect for Murray, with his deep research into the man, his politics and his times. He sees Murray's very desperate struggles and his courage both as an IRA Commandant and a Communist. His research is indeed breathtaking, with

acknowledgments, bibliography and index. Every quotation is recorded and qualified in his notes which take up many pages. It is a work that must have taken up to five years to research and write. I had myself been interviewed by the author as far back as St Patrick's Day, 2011, by email and I had forgotten all about that interview so much time had passed

At some point the Comintern took Murray off the payroll. It seemed they had someone else in mind to head the CPI. I don't know how much he would be getting but I would imagine—unless you had secrets to sell—you would be receiving just about a living wage. The CPI and the CPNI were always in financial trouble. The problem was they had sometimes to ask the CPGB for help and the CPGB sure took advantage of that.

Murray was always, in the Leninist tradition, aware that a party must have its own newspaper. He did manage to get one off the ground but its lack of circulation caused the Irish party to adopt the *British Daily Worker* as its paper. Murray, off the payroll, then had to find work in a Northern Ireland—which always managed to keep its unemployment numbers steady. Even during WW2, with all the war work available, the unemployed figures were a constant 16,000. The author finds in Murray's archives adverts for unskilled jobs circled in ink. Murray worked as a barman for two months at the Empire Theatre, Belfast, helped to build air-raid shelters, and spent four years in the Belfast shipyard as an electrician's mate. He already knew what hard work was when he worked on his parent's small farm in the Glens of Antrim but he had no knowledge of industrial work. He was always anxious that the people of Ballybrack, where he came from, wouldn't be told of his having to work as a labourer. Things in the labour market then weren't as versatile as they are today.

During Murray's time the gulf between the skilled and the unskilled was almost like the working class being divided into upper and lower. In Belfast there was the kitchen house for the unskilled, streets of them, the parlour house for the skilled, also streets of them. Murray must have felt he would never get out of his situation. He had been the courageous and capable IRA leader with a huge respect from the population where he born, then the student in Moscow, the RWG and CPNI leader, and now it looked as if he had been flung down the stairs without much of a helping hand from the CPNI, except that an

influential Electrical Trade Union official had swung him this job in the shipyard. We did have a few people well-off in the CPNI but they were too busy building new homes for themselves.

He already had had to swallow one humiliation from the Comintern after he married a Russian girl in Moscow called Katya. She was refused a passport to accompany him home to Belfast, no reason given, though it did seem to be mean-spirited. Another student, Pat Breslin, at the Lenin School, had married a Russian girl, surrendered his Irish citizenship and become a Soviet citizen. He was expelled from the Lenin School for unusual political ideas, which drew criticism from his fellow students. He was refused permission to go home to be with a wife he already had in Ireland. In the end he died of ill health in a prison camp in Soviet Kazan in 1942. Some people, not exactly friends of communism or socialism, expected Murray to have something to say about this but again, as a fully-fledged communist apparatchik where was he to go after he protested about Breslin's end and was maybe cold-shouldered or expelled.

Bob Stewart, whom I have already mentioned, attended a social evening I was at in Swiss Cottage, London. My then mother-in-law was Scottish and thought of highly in the CPGB. She and I were talking to Bob when he suddenly said his daughter's Russian husband, an official, in the Soviet political system, had disappeared. This was 1956. It isn't acknowledged that during this anti-Stalin period people were disappearing without trace, for they were too busy talking about Stalin's 'disappeared'. Stewart said he didn't want us to mention this to anyone else. Naturally he was deeply upset and now his task was to extract his daughter from the Soviet Union. He would have to go there and plead with someone in the Khrushchev Government as a pro-Stalinist, when they knew his form. I said nothing to anyone about what I had been told and neither did my then mother-in-law. I wasn't willing to raise the matter with my communist branch for I also had nowhere to go if I had of been expelled.

Later I bumped into Bob Stewart in a pro-communist Italian restaurant on Tottenham Court Road in London and I delicately asked him about his daughter. He pretended not to know what I was talking about and merely acted the elderly man that he now was. Much like Seán Murray became he sat there looking isolated and lost, as de-Stalinisation went on the rampage in the CPGB.

I had noted the continuing anti-Irish tinge to the CPGB when it was telling people like me to forget the Irish Question. Also some of their anti-Catholicism was so blatant it had to translate into anti-Irishism. It seemed the hard-working Irish labourer was a fascist in some quarters. I still had nowhere to go but at least I now had a healthy disrespect for the CPNI because of its treatment of Seán Murray and of the CPGB because of its inability to help Bob Stewart. It was easy now to leave the CPGB in the late 1960s.

Among notable people Seán Murray had been in contact with were Roger Casement, another Glens of Antrim man, a great inspiration to him, and his good long-life friend Peadar O'Donnell. Peadar stuck by his old pal through every difficulty.

The author has truly given me the background to the 1930s CPI, all those questions we wanted answered as teenagers are now answered. But sadly most the members of the old YWL are gone. What a feast this would have been for my teenage friends Bob Heatley and Declan Mulholland who wanted to know the truth about this party.

In my opinion, the CPI of today has now returned to its Catholic roots. Would Seán Murray be happy with something that doesn't menace anyone to any great degree?

I can't even feel nostalgia when I look at its website.

The author does see Seán Murray as non-sectarian in his attitude to the Northern Ireland Protestant population. Well, yes, if you have nowhere to go. But you must be allowed an opinion. Once, when walking with him down Corporation Street, past the Labour Exchange, with its long line of the unemployed, he said, Catholic to Catholic: "*I suppose the wind in their empty stomachs is probably playing The Sash*". His intellectual self said something different from what he truly felt about the miserable NI situation, while implying these were workers on the wrong course. Such was the dual hell of communist thinking in a sectarian society. Twelve more years of life at least for Murray and he would see a truly startling phenomenon developing into the long-war, that would begin to make all those changes Murray really wanted with his Glens of Antrim background.

And the end of that life on the 25th of May 1961: Cirrhosis of the liver due to alcohol.

Back then there was a drinking culture in Belfast, as there was in Dublin and other Irish cities, and also amongst the Irish in Britain. It was thought of as quite an enjoyable way to spend a Saturday night, and it was. I had to smile when I read in this book about Jim Prendergast, a former International Brigade veteran, say of Seán, when he got drunk on the outbreak of WW2: "*Murray should pull himself together*". I used to drink with what we called the Dublin Crowd—all on the left and working as electricians—along with Jim Prendergast, decked out in railway guard's uniform with cap, British Rail issue pocket watch, whistle and signalling lamp, knocking back the pints in a pub adjacent to Kings Cross railway station. At one point he realises he has drunk too much and won't be able to make it to his train. We didn't help him either—in ordering up yet another round and telling him he'd be all right when he went into the fresh air. The least drunk of us ended up phoning British Rail to tell them that one of their guards had taken ill and wouldn't be on the Glasgow run tonight. The answer was:

"Same as last Saturday night?"

This was once the most intelligent of our race, with nothing much at the end of it all in personal terms, but now saved by this magnificent tombstone of a book.

Wilson John Haire
30 May, 2015

'16

While bullet wounds remain
fresh
the nation lives on
don't try healing them at the
behest
of those cynical of their country's
history
those who wish the national heart
to expire
finding more interest in a nearby
power
to gain trinkets and bric-a-brac
titles
their very souls
recycled
betraying their birthplace
their race
yet hoping to flower
in their native bower
but only to grow as
weeds
on those graves that rejected them
through thought word and
deed.

Wilson John Haire
21 June, 2015

Irish Times Influence

The author of this book is a retired Professor of Anglo-Irish literature in Trinity College Dublin. He was asked to write this book by the Chairman of *The Irish Times Trust*, Professor David Mc Connell. While he received financial support from *The Irish Times*, he denies that this is an official publication.

In his Preface he generously acknowledges previous books on the subject such as Mark O'Brien's "*conscientious*" work, this reviewer's "*contentious*" book, and a book by Dermot James which he says helped shape his narrative.

The Preface also defines the parameters of the book. The author says it is not an institutional history (i.e. concerning the finances, business affairs and administration of the newspaper) but rather an account of how the paper has "*reported and reflected on Ireland and the world*". This is a pity since an insider such as Brown would have access to internal documents and key personnel that would not be available to other researchers. For example, he remarks that he dined with Major McDowell and was given access to Geraldine Kennedy's recording of an "*excellent*" interview with the Major, which has never been published.

So, whatever about the merits of this book, Brown has indicated from the outset that no secrets will be given away. The photographs in the book reflect the text. There are pictures of scenes from the First World War; the 1916 Rising; the Eucharistic Congress; and even a photograph of Gerry Adams and Martin Mc Guinness announcing an IRA ceasefire. But the camera never turns around and focuses its gaze on *The Irish Times* itself. There are no pictures of R.M. Smyllie, Douglas Gageby, Major McDowell or any of the other personalities of the institution.

How an institution or even a person sees the world can be very revealing, even if it is not the full picture. So, while this reviewer would have preferred if Brown had written a different book, the book that he has written is a valuable contribution to our understanding of *The Irish Times*.

The book is particularly strong on the early period of the newspaper's history. He suggests that the *Dublin University Magazine*, a Trinity College publication founded in 1833, was an intellectual forerunner to the newspaper. Regarding

the magazine the author remarks that "*it did not shy away from espousing Protestant supremacism*".

The Irish Times itself started out (and continued) its life as an elitist, conservative and unionist newspaper. When this reviewer was researching its early period, he was amazed to discover that it saw itself as being at the heart of the nation. All other ideological tendencies were invisible to it or, if they existed at all, they were distortions of the true meaning of being Irish. This delusional attitude of mind persisted well into the twentieth century.

Although Brown might not put it in quite the same way, the content of his analysis confirms this view. Indeed, this distorted view of reality extended to its reporting of foreign stories, as the author demonstrates. The newspaper was highly critical of Abraham Lincoln during the American Civil War. It claimed:

"... the Union troops and the Union gunboats are to favour a servile revolt. The hot blood and cruel temper of the negroes are to be aroused against the families of the planters, and horrors which the pen refuses to describe are to be perpetrated by the Federal authority" (14.1.1863).

The Editorial continued:

"Throughout the whole war nothing is so remarkable as the unexpected loyalty of the negroes to their masters. They have adhered to their owners with affectionate fidelity, they have followed them to the armies, joined with them in the encounters, nursed them in sickness, cultivated the fields and guarded the families of the planters. Mr Lincoln's proclamation will have no effect on the great body of these men."

In an earlier Editorial (5.1.1863) it predicted that the Federal cause was doomed to failure because of its reliance on Irish and German mercenaries:

"As yet neither Northerners or Westerners had been called upon to pay the cost of the war. They have been enjoying a Fool's Paradise and are about to be crudely awakened to their real condition. When war had to be maintained by the expenditure of 'cash' and when the Irish and Germans refuse to be led out as sheep to the slaughter, then the war must end."

We see here three themes, which were echoed in the newspaper's coverage of Irish affairs in the nineteenth century. Firstly, the State authority's attempts at

reform were unrepresentative; secondly, the oppressed were happy in their lot; and thirdly, the conflict had an external source (in the above case Irish and German mercenaries).

Brown shows that in 1867 the newspaper believed that Fenianism had a foreign source, and not just Irish emigrants. The members "*bore strong resemblance to the dilapidated specimens of humanity which were landed on our quays from the purlieus of the manufacturing towns in England*" and "*the leaders of this most insane and wicked raid in Kerry are Americans*". The newspaper also believed that the Fenians were the "*debauched English artisans—the roughs who stab and wound in midnight brawls—the wife beaters of English manufacturing society*".

The real Irish people would have nothing to do with such organisations as the Home Rule Party or the Land League. It even claimed that the Irish peasantry was against the dis-Establishment of the Church of Ireland. Brown refers to an *Irish Times* review of Dion Boucicault's *Colleen Bawn*, which describes it as a "*thrilling picture of rural life*" rather than a piece of stage-Irishry.

From its foundation *The Irish Times* was avowedly unionist in its orientation. However in the 1860s it was not hostile to the idea of Home Rule, but the demand for Home Rule in that decade was very different from what it became. Brown quotes the leader of the Home Rule movement, Isaac Butt, who was a radical Tory MP, as follows:

"Ireland's future is best secured within the empire by a native parliament"

□

Home Rule was not incompatible with Unionism. At that time the Home Rule movement was largely led by Protestants, some of whom hoped that a "*native*" Parliament composed of the Protestant Ascendancy would be a bulwark against land reform.

Brown recognises that the death of Butt was a watershed moment. The new leader, Charles Stewart Parnell, who was also a Protestant, mobilised the Catholic masses for Home Rule.

Brown contrasts the eulogy to Butt on his demise to the barely concealed hatred that the paper had for Parnell, which was not assuaged by his death as this Editorial shows:

"As to the estimate of Mr Parnell which those not of that political connexion {the Irish Party} will be justified in entertaining, it is enough to add that his errors were great and the injustice which he did to his own social class flagrant, and

excused in its extravagance in no measure by faults of theirs" (8.10.1891).

Was Parnell an early example of the "white nigger" species?!

As the century drew to a close *The Irish Times* not surprisingly supported the British side in the Boer War. The overwhelming majority of Irish Nationalists, including John Redmond and his brother Willie, supported the Boers. Yet again we see the disdain that the newspaper had for an opposing political view. In response to a rally of 20,000 in support of the Boers, the newspaper claimed that Irish support was "the product of some obscure tenement". The real Irish could not possibly be opposed to Britain!

At the end of the War the newspaper concluded with the following comment which in this reviewer's opinion has racist undertones:

"Boer cunning has been defeated by superior intelligence"

The Irish Times supported the employer interest in 1913 and yet published a famous denunciation of the employers by the writer George Russell. Brown astutely observes that the article was acceptable to the newspaper because it was an indictment of nationalist Ireland and the emerging bourgeoisie that had helped to topple the Protestant ascendancy in the countryside.

The overall impression of *The Irish Times* in this period was of a newspaper that had a tenuous grip on political realities. Contrary to what the newspaper believed, it was not the nationalists who had no support within the society, or who relied on foreign support for their influence. That description could more accurately describe its own position in Irish society. It relied on the British State to maintain the Union and when the British State wavered, as was the case when the Liberals were in power, it depended on the Ulster Unionists to do its bidding. However, by the second decade of the twentieth century, the spectre of partition emerged. From *The Irish Times'* perspective, the nightmare scenario was that the Unionists in Ulster would remain within the United Kingdom while its own hinterland would be isolated in a political entity dominated by Catholic Nationalism.

In an Editorial of 11th October 1911 it hoped that Ulster:

"...would never make a mockery of her unionism by an inglorious and base attempt to shelter herself within a separate parliament."

The newspaper took comfort from the Ulster Covenant:

"They {the Unionists—JM} had convinced every open mind in the United Kingdom that the men who sign the Covenant today will keep their word. This is the only fact that counts. They may be right or wrong, loyal or disloyal, patriots or rebels; but they have taken a course and nothing will turn them from it" (28.9.1912).

However, *The Irish Times* was in for a nasty shock the following year when the Dublin-born Edward Carson moved an amendment excluding Ulster from the Home Rule Bill. It was no consolation to the newspaper that the amendment was lost; it indicated that Ulster Unionists would not hesitate to ditch the South. The newspaper commented:

"Ulster rejects a Home Rule parliament. If it is not to be forced into such a parliament—a coercion which we believe to be impossible—it must find a better plan than Sir Edward Carson's for rewarding the trust and loyalty of its brethren in the South. Ulster must stand or fall with the rest of Unionist Ireland".

Its Editorial on the Third Home Rule Bill (April 1914) described it as "calamitous and anti national" (2.4.1914). To support Home Rule was "anti national"! This is in fact typical of the newspaper's comments on the Home Rule Bills. As indicated above *The Irish Times* believed that it represented the true Irish nation. All other political manifestations were invalid.

In spite of its disappointments of the previous year, the newspaper still held out hope for armed resistance from Ulster:

"Ulster will be absolutely justified in resisting it by every means in her power. She'll be in fact the champion of British liberties against an unexampled tyranny" (16.7.1914).

The First World War averted Civil War in the United Kingdom and *The Irish Times* was particularly cheerful concerning the consequent slaughter of the young:

"For Ulster Unionists and Southern Nationalists in the Irish regiments the Somme is undoing the dismal work of the Boyne... thousands of lads, still almost schoolboys have gone to their deaths ... as proud and happy as when they were leading their teams to victory at cricket or football..."

Brown notes that *The Irish Times* was active in encouraging recruitment and was disappointed at the numbers from farmers' sons and shop assistants. In 1918 it supported conscription when it was a live issue.

But, of course, the 1916 Rising represented another view of the Irish Nation. When the Irish leaders were captured *The Irish Times* urged the Government to be merciless.

"The State has struck, but its work has not finished. The surgeon's knife has been put to the corruption in the body of Ireland, and its course must not be stayed until the whole malignant growth is removed."

The newspaper continued this blood-curdling tone even while the executions were in train. Following criticism from the *Freeman's Journal* and after eight executions it commented:

"We said, and we repeat, that the surgeon's knife of the State must not be stayed "until the whole malignant growth has been removed"... (6.5.1916).

The Irish Times covered the War of Independence as if it was a criminal conspiracy. This is evident in its coverage of Bloody Sunday (21.11.1920). While the newspaper noticed that there were deaths in Croke Park, its Editorials were only concerned with the killing of British agents by the IRA which it described as "callous and cowardly murders" reaching a "nadir of moral and political degradation".

This book is particularly interesting on how *The Irish Times* responded to Independence. In the light of recent debate about centenary commemorations it is interesting to note that, in November 1924, 100,000 assembled in the capital to commemorate the dead of the 16th (Irish) division of the British army. The Free State Government was represented at the wreath-laying ceremony.

The Irish Times Editorial commented:

"Loyalty to the Empire is seen to be consistent with perfect loyalty to the Free State.... Today the cross in College Green—the very fact of its presence—is proof that within the Free State itself men of all parties are coming together in a new and broader creed of patriotism."

This suggests that—contrary to some current views—the Irish who died in the First World War were not forgotten by the new State. But the Editorial might also hint at why such commemorations declined in popularity. Many of the relatives of the dead soldiers might not have wished that their presence at such commemorations would be interpreted as "loyalty to the Empire".

Another consistent theme of the newspaper was its opposition to compulsory Irish. In a hysterical Editorial of November 1924 it warned:

"...our children's minds may be cramped within a new-fangled and barbarous jargon".

The Editorial continued:

"Greatest condemnation of compulsory Irish lies... In the fact it is a sin against nationhood" (22.11.1924).

The nationalists were against the nation!?

The impression is sometimes given by Irish Times journalists of the present day that the newspaper was an oasis of liberalism in a desert of Catholic authoritarianism. But nothing could be further from the truth. It was quite at ease with authoritarianism. An Editorial welcomed the accession to power of Mussolini:

"Under her new autocrat Italy is a well managed, peaceful and economically progressive land" (29.3.1926).

It took at face value fascist propaganda concerning the burning of the Reichstag on 27th February 1933. An Editorial of 4th March 1933 commented:

"Communist extremists were almost certainly to blame"

While recoiling from Hitler's "*unreasoning anti-semitism*", the newspaper was prepared to cut him some slack. After all, "*Omelettes cannot be prepared without the smashing of eggs*". The Editorial (4.3.1933) concluded its view of Hitler by saying

"...at the moment he is Europe's standard bearer against Muscovite terrorism and although some of his methods are certainly open to question, nobody doubts his entire sincerity."

R.M. Smyllie, who was Editor from 1934 to 1954, wrote in his "*Nichevo*" column:

"there is no doubt whatsoever that Adolf Hitler has done great things for the German people" (6.11.36).

The newspaper was consistent in its opposition to de Valera. In an Editorial it claimed the policy of the Fianna Fáil Government was:

"...a crude, merciless and progressive proletarianism. Its deliberate aim is to submerge capital; to annihilate the right to property and to establish a common standard of low living in an isolated land" (4.7.1933).

Just over a week later the paper's Editorial continued in the same vein:

"...it's not too much to say that if Lenin or Stalin had sought to prepare Ireland—a Christian and conservative country—for communism, his plans would have coincided largely with the Free State's Government's present policy" (13.7.1933).

Needless to say, these Editorials were not meant to be supportive of de Valera. While the paper was not against authoritarianism in principle, one gathers that fascist authoritarianism was good and communist authoritarianism was bad; and Irish Republicanism—whether authoritarian or not—was always bad.

Brown notes that the newspaper had sympathetic Editorials on the fascist leader General Eoin O'Duffy as well as on the Eucharistic Congress of 1932.

The author comments rather shrewdly that the newspaper may have been trying to enlist Catholic Church support in order to curb de Valera's Republicanism. But the strategy was in vain, since de Valera made his peace with the Church during the Eucharistic Congress in order that he could pursue his republican objectives unhindered.

If *The Irish Times* was trying to curry support from the Catholic Church, it would not have been the first time. The newspaper gave extensive coverage of the Catholic Church's views on Charles Stewart Parnell's relationship with Kitty O'Shea in 1890.

In the aftermath of the Second World War there is not much evidence of the newspaper being a beacon of liberalism. In 1950 the Judges in the Tilson Case found that promises made by non-Catholic partners to educate their children as Catholics were legally binding. The Editorial response could hardly have been milder.

"...it is difficult to avoid the impression that the philosophy underlying Irish jurisprudence is tending slowly but surely to be informed by the principles of the Roman Catholic Church. A priori there can be no great objection to that so long as the issue is faced squarely by everybody concerned (7.8.50).

It is likely that the Protestant community in Ireland was not any more enamoured of mixed marriages than the Catholics.

The newspaper is famous for its Editorial denouncing Church power following the resignation of Noel Browne. It commented:

"It seems that the merits of a theocratic Twenty six counties outweigh those of a normally democratic Thirty-two. Has the Government made its choice?" (12.4.51).

Interestingly the *Church of Ireland Gazette* came out against this Editorial. Also the newspaper's humorist (Brian O'Nolan aka Myles na gCopaleen) thought the Bishop's intervention was "*legitimate*", but should have been done "*overtly*".

This reviewer agrees with the author's

assessment that:

"what had happened may have been more revelatory about the miscalculations of a headstrong if idealistic minister than an exposure of rule from the Vatican".

The author also thinks that the newspaper's denunciation of the Inter Party Government had more to do with the latter's declaration of a Republic than its submission to Clerical influence.

The book is interesting on Douglas Gageby. It was certainly noteworthy that the newspaper gave extensive coverage to Vatican II. This contrasted with its traditional stance of ignoring Catholic matters except when such coverage served an anti-Republican purpose. While in many ways Gageby was admirable, this book confirms this reviewer's opinion that he had some blind spots in relation to the North. In particular he thought that the Sunningdale Power Sharing Agreement would survive despite loyalist opposition. Brown says that Gageby ignored his own reporters, who were well aware of its imminent collapse.

The weakest part of the book is Brown's coverage of the last 30 years. In this reviewer's opinion, the author abandons his impressive intellectual rigour and suspends his critical faculties. Perhaps recent events are too close to obtain historical perspective.

For example, on the X Case, the Martyn Turner "*internment in Ireland*" cartoon is reproduced, but the reader is not told that the newspaper refused to call for the Attorney General's resignation.

Apart from one sentence in parenthesis suggesting Fianna Fáil had a right to be sore, the book is not critical of the newspaper's coverage of the collapse of the Reynolds' Government and the thwarting of Bertie Ahern's attempts to succeed Reynolds. Even the then Editor Conor Brady is embarrassed by (or at least "*regrets*") his comment following Albert Reynolds resignation that "*public life will not be the poorer for his {Reynolds—JM} departure from public office*". More than 20 years after the event, the most common reaction to these events is: "*what was that all about?*" In this reviewer's opinion the hysterical Editorials in that period have not aged well.

As readers of this magazine will be aware, there was one dramatic occasion when the focus of attention was on *The Irish Times* itself. This was following the

publication of what became known as the "white nigger" letter, in which the Chief Executive Major McDowell in 1969 requested help from the British State because he felt his Editor Douglas Gageby was a "white nigger" on Northern matters.

Brown describes this incident as the "...the most vexed in the history of the newspaper". And yet he doesn't examine how the newspaper dealt with this vexed question. He begins by saying that correspondence became "available" in December 2002. The facts of the matter are that the correspondence *became available* in December 1999 in the Public Records Office in England under the 30 year rule. *The Irish Times*, like every other paper, failed to 'notice' the white nigger letter—even though its journalists did notice other correspondence relating to Major McDowell at that time. *The Irish Political Review* first published the correspondence in early January 2003. *The Irish Times* only published the details following publication in the *Sunday Independent* in late January of that year.

Brown gives a reasonably even-handed description of the issues involved, quoting from this reviewer among others. The defence of Major McDowell appears to be that he was a fool rather than a knave. Brown quotes approvingly from James Downey (a former Deputy Editor of the newspaper) who says that Irish officials fed information to McDowell on the assumption that it would be passed on to the British. So he was involved in Intelligence work, but just wasn't very good at it! Brown is also of the opinion that there is no evidence of a change in the Editorial line following the 1969 meetings.

And yet this naïve person became the most powerful person in *The Irish Times* following the setting up of the Trust in 1974.

Brown's treatment of the Trust is quite superficial. He lazily quotes an unnamed commentator (presumably Kevin Myers) to the effect that Douglas Gageby was guilty of malfeasance. There is no evidence of any impropriety by Gageby. Gageby was never a member of the Trust and, contrary to what Brown says (quoting Mark O'Brien's book on *The Irish Times*), the setting up of the Trust didn't enable Gageby to maintain control along with McDowell. On the contrary, it presaged Gageby's departure from the newspaper.

Nevertheless, notwithstanding the shortcomings on the newspaper's recent history, this scholarly book is essential reading for anyone interested in the history of *The Irish Times*.

John Martin

The King's Lament

British Royals hold their noses in the air. They have strong stomachs, too, watching Irish subject bowing and scraping. Soon we'll have Charles hugging trees and risking splinters. The Mayflower is in full bloom. You can watch the cattle scratching their flanks, moving in pleasure and swishing their tails. Charollais, probably.

Recently debate about the Rising has surfaced. A portly politician had derided the event. So has his cackling side-kick. An independent lady politician has cautioned that it be commemorated, not celebrated.* Nice and easy does it. A famous personality gaily called it "*the little skirmish at the GPO*" (*Irish Political Review*, June 2014). His da had scoffed at it and its sparsity of bloodshed. The da had been riding about France, restoring order. Anyway, what would the Queen think?

Now, a Royal might attend the 2016 commemoration, they say. No longer a matter of the *King's Lament*. Such troublesome subjects, the Irish. On 4th May 1916, the English King George V sent a telegram to General Sir John Maxwell, General Officer Commanding in Ireland. "*Now the recent lamentable outbreak has been finally quelled I wish to express to my gallant troops in Ireland, to the Royal Irish Constabulary and to the Dublin Metropolitan Police my deep sense of the wholehearted devotion to duty and spirit of self sacrifice with which throughout they acted.*" Phew!

Some of the rebels had already been put to the sword. On the previous day, Pearse, MacDonagh and Clarke were executed, with barely a pause.

No telegram was sent by Queen Elizabeth on the occasion of the Bombing of Dublin and Monaghan in 1974 by her gallant troops in Ireland, together with the participating loyalist paramilitaries. Different times, different needs. Anyway, there were no official executions then. The Royals had closer links to the Rising than some thought. Prince Alexander of Battenberg (later renamed Mountbatten) served in the British Army while quelling the rebels. His photograph appeared in *Irish Political Review*, see *A Royal Faux Pas*, October 2014), along with other British Officers, looking pleased as punch.

* Catherine Murphy TD (Ind.), Kildare N.

The *King's Lament* ran deep.

The Brits were taken by surprise. Fairyhouse was a distraction. Military parades were common. War fuelled the background. They were locked in combat with their German cousins. France and Belgium were dotted with white crosses. The Ulster Volunteers were marching to a Lambeg drum. The National Volunteers had proliferated.

The Ulster Volunteers procured arms through the Clyde Valley landings. The Asgard Gun-running at Howth procured weapons. The Brits watched.

Then the Volunteers split. The Redmondites joined in the Anglo-Saxon blood-letting. The Irish Volunteers stayed true.

The Ulsters became immersed in the War of the Saxons. The Redmondites joined in. The Ulsters sought 'British' freedom; the Redmondites a version within the British system. Home Rule, it was called. Orange and Green, blood was spilt, copiously, foolishly. With great futility it flowed. Others too spilt blood. The Rivers all ran red.

The Irish Volunteers struck. The Rising erupted. Dublin, "*the second city of Empire*" was devastated. Unsparringly it was shelled and battered. The British Army let it all out. They poured in reinforcements. They came from posts all around Ireland (though not neglecting their rear). North-West Command of the British Army—Nottinghamshire, Staffordshire, Derbyshire—provided large contingents.

The rebels had been put on the back foot by a Countermanding Order issued by E. MacNeill, who had dissented. It was no time for wobbling. Fierce fighting ensued throughout the city. Highly-populated areas were subjected to heavy firing. The British were merciless. Civilians were fair game. It is how Empires were won and held. Nerves jingling and jangling, unused to urban warfare, there were bound to be atrocities by the "*gallant troops in Ireland*". The North King Street massacre was the worst, though ignored by neutered pundits nowadays.

Women and children were not exempt. The South Staffordshire Regiment disgraced itself. It was commanded by Lt. Col. Taylor. They fired on everyone and everything. They sought to penetrate from

the city Western extremity, on the North side of the Liffey, towards the GPO, by-passing the Four Courts where the rebel First Battalion was ensconced. By Friday, the British had attained Capel Street. They would now enter Mary Street. They were staring down Henry Street. The GPO was within sight. Shells were raining down on it. Fires raged all about. The air was filled with tumult. On the Friday night the GPO rebels evacuated and re-grouped in Moore Street. In these less than salubrious environs, the last headquarters of the Provisional Government of Ireland was set up. Here, in Number Sixteen, the Military Council of the Republican Forces sat in consideration. Outside, like clawing tigers, the British were baring their teeth.

There would have to be some kind of a conclusion. Firing was to be heard all around the city. The Irish positions were now isolated. Though no major posts had fallen, the British were piling in reinforcements. Their supply system was the more advanced. Ammunition was resupplied as needed. Rations were also available. Reserves and human resources were poured in as necessary. The RCP (Relative Combat Power) was in favour, on all counts, of the British. Conversely, the rebels had to fight without relief, with inferior weaponry, devoid of any real supply system, and running low in ammunition. It was a matter of time.

The stamina of the rebels was being sapped, but their spirits never succumbed. They would not falter. The British were now manning a large barricade across Henry Street. Their machine-guns were chattering away at the Irish positions. The sky had been alight through the night. Now, a new day. It was Saturday. A young Irish officer, Lieut. Seán Mac Laughlin, suggested to Pearse that he would charge the British Henry Street barricade, in a "*Death or Glory*" affair. By now, he had emerged as a vital field commander. Pearse ordered him to stand by in readiness. There were matters to be considered. A new estimate of the situation was required. Pearse, at this stage, was being deferred to. In moments of desperation, people will turn to the one they look up to. Real leaders emerge from chaos. Automatically, office-holders stop aside. This mutual regard is instant and does not require expression or official recognition.

In No. 16, the Military Council conferred. Present were Pearse, Clarke, MacDermott, Plunkett, and Connolly. (MacDonagh was at Jacob's; Ceannt was in the South Dublin Union.) They discussed the various courses of action.

Pearse had leant over to help a wounded British soldier who, lying there, had cried out in pain. They decided to surrender in order to spare lives. Clarke was the one dissenter. Negotiations were initiated with the British Field General, Brigadier General Lowe, with Nurse Elizabeth Farrell bravely acting as intermediary. Lowe insisted the surrender be unconditional. And so it had come to pass. The Rising had run its course, the rank and file prepared to continue, the leadership seeking a resolution for them somehow.

The GPO Garrison, now captive, reformed. They were marched down Henry Street and into Sackville Street. They were bruised and battered, but their heads were held high. They were marched towards the Rotunda, passing the Gresham Hotel. They were shepherded into the grounds of the Rotunda. There they would spend Saturday night, trying to come to terms with their situation. They were unkindly treated. G-Branchmen came amongst them, questioning, observing, identifying. Animosity lay heavily about. Wounded and injured got scant regard.

One British officer distinguished himself above all others. He had the ageing Tom Clarke stripped naked and displayed before the nurses in The Rotunda. (Later, this British officer was shot dead.) Clarke had three more days to live. His shop at the Northern tip of Sackville Street had also become the British Field Headquarters. It was "*lá na gaoithe*" (The day of the winds), alright.

The new days brought no more hope. They were marched to Richmond Barracks, there to be sorted out. The Finger of Death was pointed at some. They knew they were doomed. Most would travel abroad, to be incarcerated in British Prisons and Internment Camps. Frongoch was the main Internment Camp. It was here the British erred grievously. Here the Volunteers were transformed into the IRA. They were getting ready for the next phase, already: bodies healing, minds focussed.

At home relatives were scanning Internment Lists. Who was where? British places of incarceration entered the vocabularies of Dubliners. Strange-sounding places: Stafford, Lewes, Knutsford, Frongoch, Wandsworth and, of course, London and the Scrubs. The King's Lament undoubtedly found some kind of a response in these places of inhospitality.

Doing the rounds regarding the firing of weapons—or their non-firing—is a false interpretation. It has been stated that

Pearse did not use a weapon. He probably never did. This often is so with commanders. It may depend on the situation. Command may entail standing back, taking an over-view, making changes. Considering a fluid tactical situation may be the vital consideration. It is unlikely that the British Commander used a weapon either. The further a commander is removed from the combat game, the more unlikely that he become personally involved. Few military commanders would make 'hit-men'. Those who wallow in it present more regards to their own. Those involved in the fighting in the GPO had to inflict less and absorb more. In the South Dublin Union, Mount Street and Church Street, though, the fighting entailed constant use of weaponry, until often gun-metal burned the users' hands. Sometimes it's John Wayne. Other times it's Woody Allen.

It is a soldier's duty to die. Or to kill. Commandant Eamon Ceannt was the only Garrison Commander to kill a British soldier. He commanded the Fourth Battalion. His main position was in the South Dublin Union Poorhouse (SDU). He also occupied Marrowbone, Roe's Distillery and Watkin's Brewery. These were close to one another. They were all on the rebel western flank. They were occupied at 1200 hours on the Monday. At the latter two posts, the volunteers were assailed verbally. Principally by women. After exerting some force, the posts were occupied, the tirade of abuse coming to an end.

The fighting would soon begin. Roe's was a hopeless position. It was intended to defend the northern approaches from the British moving towards SDU. But, the men were poorly armed and deficient in ammunition. (The Countermanding Order was having effect.) They were dominated too from the Royal Hospital, Kilmainham. The windows in Roe's made firing positions impossible. They extended to the floors and left firers exposed. They had no provisions either. It appeared like a hurried positioning, with little recce. On Tuesday they evacuated. Some made it to safe havens. Others made it to Marrowbone Lane.

That same day, the Watkins Garrison also joined with Marrowbone. Tactically, they'd found themselves ineffective.

Meanwhile battle had been joined. The Brits gained entry into SDU. The grounds here were extensive. They consisted of some sixty acres. They included accommodation, billets, wards, poor houses, staff

quarters and supply stores. The British became bogged down. They were taking heavy casualties.

Fighting was acute. It was house to house. Floor to floor Extraordinary deeds took place. The battle see-sawed. One had the upper hand, one moment. The other, at another moment. The Brits tried to outflank the Irish positions, but were halted by the Marrowbone Garrison in Fairbrother's Field. Here several British were killed. They could not penetrate any further. In SDU the battle raged on, ebbing and flowing. Grenades were exploding. Gun-fire was being exchanged. It would be a fight to the finish. There was no resolution, it seemed.

Elsewhere, developments had occurred. Ceannt received orders to surrender. These were accepted with great reluctance. He fell-in his men, that Sunday. Nearby, Marrowbone was similarly forming-up. They were then marched down James Street and Thomas Street. They were escorted into St. Patrick's Park, near the Cathedral. There they were joined by the surrendered Second Battalion, from Jacob's. Both were marched off to Richmond Barracks. This—along with the Third Battalion to the East—was the last surrender. The extremities saw the last of the fighting.

Ceannt would face the firing-squad. Con Colbert, from the Marrowbone Garrison, would too. So would O' Hanrahan, MacDonagh and MacBride from Jacobs. The remainder would wind up, mostly, in Frongoch.

It was at an end. Random sniping continued around the city for several days. But, really, the guns were silent. Except for the firing squads. The King's Lament followed. Prince Alexander was regaling the other officers in the Mess: Peace, Perfect Peace!

John Morgan (Lt. Col. ret'd.)

PS: There is some debate regarding who was in Command in Marrowbone Lane. During the course of Easter fighting, the Watkins Brewery Garrison, commanded by Con Colbert, for tactical reasons merged with Marrowbone. At the surrender on the Sunday, Con Colbert handed over to the British, though the Commanding Officer at Marrowbone, during the week, was Capt. S. Ó Murchadha. Both, Ó Murchadha and Colbert, figured prominently during Easter Week and remain above criticism. Colbert would perish before the firing squad. Ó Murchadha would be deported. The Britannic wheel of Justice was hiccupping.

FIFA Shenanigans

Is the US investigation into corruption in Fifa genuine or is it about trying to prevent Russia from holding the World Cup in 2018 as a continuation of the new Cold War?

I am not aware of any concern from the US government about the 2,000 workers who have died building the Qatar football stadiums, or any unease from them about the on-going working conditions there.

Simon O'Donnell

[*Irish Independent*, 30.5.15]

'John Bowman'

We have received the following response to our appeal as to the identity of 'John Bowman' pictured in the April issue of *Irish Political Review* with other members of the Workers' Association for the Democratic Settlement of the National Conflict in Ireland who chained themselves to the railings of the Department of Foreign Affairs

John Bowman (why did he take that name?) is Colin McAteer and I claim my free sub to IPR.

The address was fake too.

He was in the YS, PD, and NILP as was his mother Ellen.

I think he ended up in Zambia but may be back here.

Jeff Dudgeon

Report

Collusion

RTE put on a television programme on Collusion on 15th June. The producer was Ed Moloney, the Boston Tapist. It was disappointing, reporting virtually nothing not aired before; in fact, much already in the public domain was not brought out. Despite the fact that the Republican movement was to the fore in highlighting the existence of collusion in earlier years, the only people it interviewed on the nationalist side were SDLP= oriented, with Seamus Mallon to the fore. The only exception was the Finucane family, who could hardly have been left out of the picture.

As for the Dublin/Monaghan Bombing, there was no explanation of the rationale of the bombing. Any British involvement was all very much a matter of 'a bad apple in the barrel', unfortunate exceptions, rogue individuals. In view of BBC exposures, there had to be mention of the Force Research Unit, but there was no discussion of where it came from or what the purpose was.

"The Road to Reality" : Next Steps Towards a Real Economy.

Bevin Books, 2009. 56 pages.

€7, £5 postfree

"A successful model of trade union participation in running a state? 20 years of Social Partnership in the Republic of Ireland" by Philip O'Connor.

"The end of consensus politics? How can the Left solve the economic crisis?" by Mark Langhammer.

www.atholbooks-sales.org.

**Look Up the
Athol Books**

archive on the Internet

www.atholbooks.org

Does
It
Up

Stack
?

TOMÁS CEANNT COMMEMORATION

On 9th May 1916 Tomás Ceannt became the sixteenth man to be murdered by the British forces in Ireland after the Easter Rising. He and members of his family were involved in a gun battle with the RIC (Royal Irish Constables) and British soldiers in the day of the Easter Rising. One of his brothers was killed on the day, another died of wounds two days later and Tomás was carried to Victoria Barracks in Cork for interrogation under torture and he was put to death on 9th May 1916.

A commemoration ceremony organised by the Thomas Kent branch of the Organisation of National Ex-Servicemen (ONE) is held every year at the grave in Cork Prison. Cork Prison was formerly the British forces detention barracks. The Kent family have made it clear that they require the remains of Thomas Kent to be buried in the family vault in Castlelyons with full military honours. The remains are to be removed there after verification.

It is rumoured that the site area of the present grave is required for State building purposes. So this year's Commemoration, which took place on Saturday 9th May 2015, is likely to be the last commemoration at the Cork Prison site. The National Monuments Service archaeologist Tom Condit will carry out the exhumation. He was responsible for exhuming the bodies of Kevin Barry, Patrick Moran, Frank Flood, Thomas Whelan, Thomas Traynor, Patrick Doyle, Thomas Bryan, Bernard Ryan, Edmund Foley and Patrick Maher—all of whom had been killed by the British in Mountjoy Gaol in the course of the War of Independence 1916-1921.

This year's Commemoration of Tomás Ceannt was excellently arranged by the Irish Defence Forces and Organisation of National Ex-Servicemen (ONE) and was attended by a representative group of the Lord Mayor of Cork who laid a wreath, the Kent Family, Meda Ryan, historian and biographer of Tomás Ceannt, the General Officer Commanding Collins Barracks Cork, the Head of the Defence Forces Admiral Mark Mellet DSM, Séamus Lantry, historian, Seán Sherwin, spokesman for the Kent Family. Tomás Ceannt was the 16th prisoner to be killed in prison by the British in May 1916 and the only one to be so killed outside Dublin. The Cork Railway Station was named Ceannt Statún in 1966 in his honour.

WATERLOO.

The low-key commemorations in Ireland for Irish patriot heroes contrasts sharply with the high profile commemorations in Ireland for British heroes, such as the Duke of Wellington who is being honoured, quite wrongly, for winning the Battle of Waterloo on Sunday 18th June 1815. The Duke admitted himself that he was losing that battle by 2 p.m. on the day and it was the arrival on the scene of General Blucher and his army which produced the victory in the Battle of Waterloo. But it would not be good British Propaganda to credit the great Prussian General with the victory and so General Blucher is erased from British history. He is honoured as the winner of the Battle of Waterloo in school history books throughout Europe.

The media in Ireland is completely subservient to British propaganda interests, even to the detriment of Irish State interests. For example, *'Ireland's Own'*, which used to provide a pleasurable, comfortable reading experience and was immersed in Irish culture, has for the past three years been promoting British World War propaganda and the issue of 26th June 2015 had a eight-page spread on Wellington and the Battle of Waterloo and the Union Jack on the front page. No mention of General Blucher whatsoever. And, of course, no mention of the plundering of Europe to pay for Wellington's and Nelson's forces and to enrich both the General's and the Admiral's family coffers.

Wellington's campaign against Napoleon in Spain and Portugal yielded rich rewards for him and for his officers who were drawn from the wealthy landed families in England. England did not pay her soldiers well but there was in place a system for dividing the spoils of war including land and estates of defeated enemies. To this day Wellington's descendants hold and enjoy extensive estates in Spain and Portugal which Wellington seized at the time of the Peninsular War against Napoleon's armies. Similarly, many English families benefited and their Spanish and Portuguese interests are evidenced most publicly in their ownership of Port and Sherry Lodges and Quintas:—Taylors Port, Cockburns Port, Grahams Port, Warre, and Sandeman are some of the names which demonstrate English ownership. Others are Mackenzie, Robertson Brothers, South Woodhouse, Thadgate & Yeatman, Tuke Holdsworth *et cetera*.

The Duke of Wellington's headquarters during the Peninsular War was the Quinta da Insua in the Dao district. Nothing like

having your Port wine handy. And these tough men had their superstitious piseógs too— you had to pass the bottle of port from right to left clockwise around the dinner table or if you didn't— you would draw up the Devil and bring misfortune on yourself and on your family. To pass the Port across the table was to invite the greatest misfortune!

The Rights of Conquest, as practised by the Normans in Ireland since the 12th century, were continued and practised by the English up to the 19th century—which is why English cities like London, Leeds, Manchester etc have such huge luxurious architecture in public as well as in private buildings. All from plunder abroad.

Napoleon was pilloried for trying to unite Europe but at the time 200 years ago England was not ready to be marginalised and so England initiated the War and demonised Napoleon to achieve England's objectives. It was all about money as most wars are. Napoleon was a great man; he was trying to build his vision of a European Union. His mistake was to try to include Russia in it and, incredibly, he had not taken account of the Muscovite Winter which is what defeated his project. Wellington and Nelson were destroyers whose objectives were to prevent other nations from improving their position and also to maintain England's so called *'Balance of Power'* as long as the balance was weighted in England's favour.

THE LUSITANIA DISASTER.

The coroner and the jury at the Coroner's Inquest in Kinsale were deceived and lied to about the true nature of the ship Lusitania. They were given to understand the ship was a passenger liner when in fact it had been designed and built as a warship and in fact was being operated under the instructions of the British Navy as a military supply ship. The *bona-fide* passengers were used as a decoy to cover up military operations. Two books recently published effectively demolish the British contention that the Lusitania was purely a peaceful passenger liner. They are the *'The Sinking of the Lusitania'* by Patrick O'Sullivan, published by The Collins Press, Cork, and *'Sinking The Lusitania. Shadows of Doubt'* by Rod Hunt and Eugene Gillan published by themselves on the Internet and issued also in a print edition.

The British propaganda story does not stack up at all in light of the evidence now available. Captain Turner of the Lusitania was a British Navy man who acted on British Navy instructions as did his senior officers on board. There is no doubt now that there were several thousand tons of war materials on board.

The discovery of the cargo manifest in the F.D. Roosevelt Archives suggests that the President of the United States knew the Lusitania was carrying war material and, if he did, he knew that the *bona-fide* passengers including US citizens were being used as "human shields" to use their own war propaganda expression these days. Rod Hunt and Eugene Gillan's book refers to a British submarine surfacing in Glandore Bay i.e. not too far from where the Lusitania was sunk, and that the German U-20 was in a damaged condition and that, although an U-20 torpedo did strike the Lusitania, expert opinion is that one such torpedo on its own would not have sunk the ship. There were two explosions. Was the second caused by the highly explosive cargo of gun cotton? Or there is the possibility mentioned by the authors "whether a British submarine was stationed at the Old Head of Kinsale to torpedo the Lusitania if she escaped the U-20 with the intention of drawing the United States into the Allied Forces of World War 1 and to forestall the Irish Rebellion?"

As Patrick O'Sullivan in his book quotes an American journalist of the time—

"Britannia not only ruled the waves but also waived the rules."

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Taoiseach Enda Kenny was quick to go to France to join the '*Je Suis Charlie*' propagandistic stunt of world leaders against so-called Muslim extremism last year. Where was he when Claire Daly's freedom of speech in the Dáil was challenged by friend of Fine Gael billionaire and media conglomerate Denis O'Brien? He was not to be seen. Has the Taoiseach principles or principals?

OUR BRAVE NEW WORLD

The sexual revolution of the West is continuing apace with political/media support. What was once deemed unthinkable is now happening and if anyone steps outside the consensus, they can expect the most terrible retribution by way of vilification across the social media etc. Only last week a Nobel Laureate professor lost his job in the University of London because he made some truly inane comments about *his experience* of working with women in the laboratory. When feminist and author Germaine Greer recently criticised gay parents and powerful celebrities Elton John and David Furnish for listing a man as the mother on the birth certificates of their two sons— there was outrage against Greer and not against the two men. She made the very sensible suggestion that the whole concept of motherhood had "*been deconstructed*" before going on to critique the process of IVF.

Elton John is a very rich singer. He is listed as the father and Furnish—his husband is listed as the mother [sic] on both birth certificates of their two sons— Zachary, four and Elijah, two. The singer has stated that they engaged the services of a woman surrogate in California and paid her for her egg donations and carrying/birthing the children. Under the law apparently in the State of California it is legal to have a man registered on the birth certificates as the "mother". Greer, who authored the seminal feminist book '*The Female Eunuch*', spoke recently at the Hay Festival in Wales and commenting on the famous couple stated that such behaviour "will give you the idea of how *the concept of motherhood has been emptied out. It's been deconstructed*" she said. She went on:

"We now have a "genetic" mother, who supplies eggs. It depends entirely on where she is if she is going to be allowed to know what happens to the eggs. In

some places you are allowed to know what happens to them. In other places you're not. And women tend to care. An egg is not a sperm, we don't produce 400 million of them in one go."

It really needn't be said that wealthy gay parents end up using economically deprived women thereby ensuring and perpetuating the old poverty/colonial style trap.

When the Italian gay fashion designers Domenico Dolce and Stefano Gabbano also labelled such IVF children "*synthetic*", there was a huge hue and cry from their opponents (all liberal card-carrying celebrities) calling for their fashion label to be boycotted, thus destroying their business. As the back-lash continued, it fell to the hapless pair to hire a major PR firm to cravenly apologise and backtrack on their statements saying they had been taken out of context and they never meant to hurt anyone's *feelings*. *Je suis Charlie* indeed!

Michael Stack ©

GUILDS continued

through their working lives and into retirement.

Germany's health care system dates to 1883—only a dozen years after Otto von Bismarck welded a disparate collection of kingdoms and duchies into the German Empire. The "*Iron Chancellor*", as Bismarck was known, persuaded the country's Parliament to enact a national system of health insurance based on the Guilds' sickness funds.

The 1883 statute was Bismarck's first social entitlement, followed by disability coverage and then old-age pensions.

While this speaks to the deep roots of Germany's system of job-related health insurance, it doesn't explain how the system has endured for nearly 13 decades surviving world wars, political upheaval, demographic challenges and spiralling medical costs.

CONSTANT REFORM

To understand its longevity, one must appreciate Germans' penchant for perpetual health care reform. This constant tinkering represents the country's effort to keep its health system fair and affordable. To an impressive extent, it's worked.

In the past 20 years, Germany has enacted no fewer than six health care reform laws—one about every three years.

These reforms have required Germans to pay modest out-of-pocket co-payments for doctor visits, hospital care and drugs. They've put doctors on budgets and told them where they may set up practice.

APPRENTICESHIPS

Another major legacy : the Germany apprenticeship and training system emerged out a long tradition of Guilds and apprenticeships. Through the Guilds, craftsmen were trained by master craftsmen. As far back as 1898 the Chamber of Crafts was established.

The Germany system of vocational education and training is known as the dual system of training. The system rests on two legs. One leg is the institution-based theoretical training and general education.

The second leg is that the theoretical training and the general education are linked to the acquisition of the required job experience. A trainee spends some time in a vocational training centre. The rest of the time is spent in a firm or workplace. At the workplace a trainee receives supervised experiential learning.

The Guilds and apprenticeship systems were combined in the *Vocational Training Act* of 1969.

The Germany system of vocational education and training absorbs many young school leavers. It is estimated that of the age cohort 65% choose apprenticeship training. According to Ms Kathrin Göggel of the Germany Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, each year the system absorbs 500,000 trainees. The Federal Germany Government spends about €3.1 billion Euro annually on the apprenticeship system.

(To be continued)

References: "*Catholic Encyclopaedia*" On-Line

GUILDS continued

and had Masses offered up for the living and the dead members. The religious observance of Sunday and holy days was commanded by most of the Guilds. Whoever worked or made others work on those days, or on Saturday after the vesper bell, or neglected to fast on the days appointed by the Church, incurred a penalty. This union of religion and labour was a strong tie between the members of the Guilds, and it was of great assistance in settling peacefully the differences arising between masters and companions.

SOCIAL CARE

The Guilds were also mutual and benevolent societies; they helped the impoverished and sick members; they took care of the widows and orphans; they remembered the poor outside the society. Many benevolent institutions owed their foundation to some Guild, as, for instance, St. Job's Hospital for smallpox patients at Hamburg, which was founded in 1505 by a Guild of fishmongers, shopkeepers, and hucksters. There were a large number of these benevolent associations of tradesmen in the Middle Ages; at the close of the 15th century there were seventy at Lubeck, eighty at Cologne, and over one hundred at Hamburg.

WORKMEN'S CLUBS

In connection with the Guilds should be mentioned the workmen's clubs, which were very common at the end of the 15th century. So long as the German journeyman remained at work in a city, he belonged to one of these clubs, which supplied for him the place of his family and country. If he fell sick he was not left to public charity, but taken into the family of some master or cared for by his brother members wherever he went he could make himself known by the society's badge or password, and receive help and protection from the local branch of the association to which he belonged. Thus the journeyman was, in the first place, associated with the family of his employer, in whose house he generally lodged and boarded; in the second place, he stood in close relation with his associates of the same age and trade, co-members with him of the society which protected and helped him; finally, he enjoyed special connection with the Church, because he generally belonged to one of the sodalities which were ordinarily, but not necessarily, a part of the society's organization.

MERCHANTS' GUILDS

Side by side with the artisans' Guilds, there were also merchants' Guilds, organized on the same plan as the former, and having similar objects in view with respect to the communal life of their members and their moral and religious well-being. But they differed in their attitude towards trade; for, while the chief object of the artisans' Guilds was the protection and improvement of the different trades, the merchants' Guilds aimed at securing commercial advantages for their members and obtaining the monopoly of the trade of some country or some particular class of goods. Not alone in the German cities, but also in all foreign countries where German commerce prevailed, corporations of this sort, Guilds, or *Hansa* (the word *Hansa* has the same signification as Guild), had existed from an early date and had obtained recognition, privileges, and rights from the foreign rulers and communities. By degrees these *Hansa* in foreign countries became banded together in one large association forming an important and rival commercial body in the midst of the native merchants and traders. Such was the case in London, where the merchants who had come from Cologne, Lübeck, Hamburg, and other cities formed an association of German merchants.

A vast corporation, calling itself the Society of German Merchants of the Holy Roman Empire, was the foundation of the general German *Hansa*, or *Hanseatic League*, which by degrees embraced all the cities (at one time more than ninety) of Lower Germany, from Riga to the Flemish boundaries, and those in the South as far as the Thuringian forests. This league attained the summit of its power in the 15th century, and Dantzic was then universally acknowledged as its most important city; in the year 1481, more than 1100 ships had gone from its harbour to Holland.

After a time, the Hanseatic League was broken up into separate sections whose centres were Lübeck for the Slavonic country, Cologne for the Rhenish, Brunswick for Saxony, and Dantzic for Prussia and Livonia. The *Hansa* lasted from the 13th to the 17th century: its last meeting took place in 1669, and the cities of Lübeck, Bremen, Brunswick, Cologne, Hamburg, and Dantzic were the only ones that had sent representatives. The causes of the ruin of this once so powerful association were the growth of the commerce of Holland and England, the Wars of the League, against Denmark and Sweden in the 15th and 16th centuries, and the Thirty

Years' War, which was so detrimental to German commerce and manufactures. Lübeck, Bremen, and Hamburg are still called the Hanseatic cities.

ARTISTS

The history of the German Guilds of artists is closely connected with that of the Guilds of artisans. For a long time the artists were incorporated in the trade associations, and their organization into independent corporations took place only at the close of the Middle Ages. The architects were probably the first to have their own organization.

In Germany, as in the other countries of Europe, the Guilds were compulsory bodies, having the right to regulate trade, under the supervision of the civil authorities; but the system was not injurious in the Middle Ages. It was so only at the close of the 16th century, when the Guilds became narrowly exclusive with regard to the admission of new members, and were nothing but a mere benefit society for a small number of masters and their associates. The abuses of the German corporations were brought to the attention of the Imperial Government in the diets of 1548, 1577, and 1654, but it was only in the course of the 19th century that the Guilds were successively abolished in the different States of Germany. In the last thirty years or so, there were enacted in that country a number of laws whose aim was not the re-establishment of the old corporations, which had each its special domain and privileges, but the protection of the labourers, who had been left without organization and defence by the abolition of the Guilds.

GUILDS AND HEALTH INSURANCE

Surely one of the greatest social legacies bestowed on modern Germany by the Guilds was health insurance. It originated in mediaeval craft Guilds. Groups of blacksmiths, goldsmiths, carpenters and bakers banded together to make rules on who could practice their crafts. They also evolved a response to illness and injury—something that threatened every member's livelihood.

Each Guild member paid into a fund to support the families of those who became sick or were injured and paid funeral expenses for those who died. These death benefits existed until 1989, when they were dropped, much to the consternation of German undertakers.

Such early "*sickness funds*" gave rise to the non-profit health insurers that today cover 88% of all Germans from childhood

continued on page 21

GUILDS continued

THE MINERS

A class of brotherhoods which deserves special mention is that of the Guilds of the mining trades, which from an early date were very important in Saxony and Bohemia.

"No politician or socialist of modern times", says H. Achenbach (*Gemeines Deutsches Bergrecht*, I, 69, 109), "can suggest a labour organization which will better accomplish the object of helping the labourer, elevating his position, and maintaining fair relations between the employer and the employed than that of the mining works centuries ago."

The statutes of these mining Guilds show, indeed, a remarkable care for the well-being of the labourer and the protection of his interests. Hygienic conditions in the mines, ventilation of the pits, precautions against accident, bathing houses, time of labour (eight hours daily—sometimes less), supply of the necessaries of life at fair prices, scale of wages, care of the sick and disabled, etc.—no detail seems to have been lost sight of.

GERMANY AND ENGLAND

Between the 12th and the end of the 15th century, the great majority of the serfs of England became free tenants, that is, they were gradually relieved from the fines and petty exactions imposed upon them by the lord, and from other disabilities, economic and civil; they were permitted to pay their rent in money instead of in labour or produce; they were no longer bound to the soil, and their possession of their holdings was secured by law, or by custom which had the force of law.

Reform was effected much more slowly in Germany. At the beginning of the Reformation the condition of the majority of the tenants there was that of serfdom, and a particularly oppressive form of serfdom in the case of a considerable number. As a consequence of their revolt and its bloody suppression, their emancipation was set back for at least a century. The majority of the German peasants were still serfs at the end of the 18th century.

From the Reformation until the industrial revolution at the end of the 18th century, the history of labour for the most part records a decline from the conditions of the 14th and 15th centuries. In Germany much the same process of spoliation and impoverishment occurred, although it had begun in that country before the time of Luther. Their condition was as a whole

less happy than in the 14th and 15th centuries. This is particularly true of England, where, in the first half of the 16th century, the Guild lands were confiscated, and the Guilds themselves all but disappeared.

PROTESTANT REFORMATION

Although they continued in France until the Revolution, and in Germany somewhat later, their control over industry in these countries was not as thorough as it had been before the Reformation. It must be remembered, however, that the power of the Guilds would have been checked even if there had been no Reformation; for they were becoming too exclusive and too indifferent to the welfare of the consumer. In fact, these tendencies had already caused a great decline in the English Guilds before the end of the 15th century. Nevertheless, it remains true that both in England and Germany, the Reformation inflicted great injury on the Guilds, and through them upon the whole labouring class. There was no legislation during this period that was of any marked benefit to the labourer. In France and Germany laws were passed restricting the activities of the Guilds.

In the other countries of Europe the change from the system of handwork to the factory system came somewhat later and somewhat more slowly than in England, and consequently caused less hardship to the weaker members of the labouring class. Moreover, the theory of legislative non-intervention was not so fully carried out, except in France and Belgium, where the political philosophy of the Revolution had obtained a strong foothold. The Guilds were abolished in France in 1789, and labour unions, strikes, and lock-outs were prohibited during substantially the whole period between that date and the year 1884.

In Prussia the complete abolition of the monopolistic privileges in certain trades enjoyed by certain towns, classes, and organizations took place in 1845, while a general code providing for industrial freedom was adopted in 1869 by the North German States, and afterwards extended to the whole of the present German Empire. In 1881, however, a law was passed which gave to the volunteer Guilds a certain privileged position, and the tendency since then has been to confirm that position. Austria likewise retained the Guilds and the old industrial regulations longer than England or France, and enacted new legislation during the first half of the 19th century. At no time did Austria attempt to carry out the disastrous policy of "*complete industrial freedom*".

STRUCTURE

As to their organization, government, and relations with the public or the civil authorities, the German Guilds did not substantially differ from those in other European countries. The members were divided into apprentices, journeymen, and masters. At the head of the corporation was a director assisted by several officers. He was the sworn and responsible power of the Guild, called the meetings, presided at them, had the right of final decision, managed the property of the Guild, led it in case of war. Each Guild had its fully equipped court of justice and enjoyed complete independence in all private concerns, but all the Guilds were subject to the town council and town authorities, and were obliged to submit their statutes and ordinances to them. In the event of quarrels, either within or between the Guilds, the civil authorities exercised the rights of a commercial judge; in conjunction with the Guild, they also made regulations for the markets and police arrangements, fixed the prices of wares, organized the supervision of traffic and the protection from fraud or dishonest dealing.

The purchase of raw material was managed by the Guild as a body so as to prevent monopoly. Strict regulations protected the rights of every one. There was equality between all the members with regard to the sale of their productions. The protection of purchasers and customers was assured by the city authorities; the Guild was held responsible for the quality and quantity of the goods which it brought for sale to the market.

RELIGION AND THE GUILDS

In Germany, as elsewhere, however, the most striking feature of the Guilds was the close connection they established between religion and daily life. Labour was conceived by them as the complement of prayer, as the foundation of a well-regulated life. We read in the book "*A Christian Admonition*":

"Let the societies and brotherhoods so regulate their lives according to Christian love in all things that their work may be blessed. Let us work according to God's law, and not for reward, else shall our labour be without blessing and bring evil on our souls."

Each Guild had its patron saint, who, according to tradition, had practised its particular branch of industry, and whose feast day was celebrated by attending church and by processions; each had its banner, its altar, or chapel in the church,

continued on page 22



German Guilds

In the June, 2015 issue of *Irish Political Review*, we made mention of the visit of John Swift, a leader of the Irish Bakers' Trade Union to Germany in the 1930s and his outline of the baking industry there and the role of the Guilds. In contrast to the ultimate degeneration and "*corruption of Dublin's medieval guilds*", of which he wrote : his visit must have proved an astonishing experience. Just 14 or 15 years after World War I, Guilds were playing a major role in the re-development of that nation which suffered such obliteration during "*the war to end all wars*".

Below we highlight a number of main aspects of the Guild movement in Germany.

AN IRISH VIEW

"The French revolutionary law abolishing guilds did not operate in Germany. So tenaciously did the guilds persist there that as late as 1931 there were 17,668 of them with a membership of 977,618.

"Whether owing to the guilds or not, domestic and handicraft industry survived much longer in Germany than in England. Factory or large-scale industry was not considerable until the middle of the 19th century, but then spread rapidly and brought with it the development of associations for the protection of the interests of the new employer and working classes. In 1915 there were 483 associations of employers each extending over the whole Empire as well as many regional associations. In 1922 these had increased to 1,294. The Alliance of German Employers' Associations comprised in 1913, 69 associations employing 2,000,000 workers; in 1919 it comprised 130 associations employing 4,000,000 workers.

"Trade unions in 1914 had 2,300,000 members; in 1919 they had 9,000,000. They were organised according to political or religious principles so that there were liberal, Christian and socialist unions and federations of unions; while differing on social principles, they collaborated in matters of strictly industrial or economic import.

"When the German Republic was established by the Weimar Constitution in 1919 it found in existence this network of vocational organisation and utilised it to create a National Economic Council, the first of its kind" (*Eire, Commission on Vocational Organisation 1943*, Report-p.83-87, Dublin: published by the Stationary Office).

"The great word with the Germans is "Foresight", you rarely see a German go out without his overcoat. With foresight you may go safely but not far; and Germany is the land of moral mediocrity. The basis of English morality is Insight. With insight you may go far and do great things: but you must walk by faith. England therefore is the land of moral extremes. 'For if the light which is within you be darkness, how great is that darkness'..." GEORGE UNWIN. 1908

The first well-known German Guild is that of the Watermen of Worms, its charter (*Zunftbrief*) dating from 1106; the shoemakers of Würzburg received theirs in

1112; the weavers of Cologne, in 1149, the shoemakers of Magdeburg, in 1158. But it was not until the 13th century that the German Guilds became numerous and important. *Zunft, Innung, Genossenschaft, Brüderschaft, Gesellschaft*, are the terms used in Germany to designate these associations. Here, as in Italy and the Low Countries, the most conspicuous Guilds were those connected with the manufacture of linen and wool. In Ulm, for instance, towards the end of the 15th century, there were so many linen-weavers that the number of pieces of linen prepared in one year amounted at one time to 200,000. In the year 1466 there were 743 master weavers in Augsburg (Herberger, *Augsburg, und seine frihere Industrie*, p. 46). In the large cities, the linen and the wool-weavers formed two distinct corporations, and the wool-weavers again were divided into two classes: the makers of fine Flemish or Italian goods, and the makers of the coarser homespun materials.

Other important Guilds were those of the tanners and the furriers; the latter included the shoemakers, the tailors, the glove-makers, and the stocking-knitters. In the shoemaker's trade there was a sharp distinction between the *Neumeister*, who made new shoes, the cobbler, and the slipper maker. The most striking example of an elaborate classification according to craft is found in the metal-workers: the farriers, knife-makers, locksmiths, chain-forgers, nail-makers, often formed separate and distinct corporations; the armourers were divided into helmet-makers, escutcheon-makers, harness-makers, harness-polishers, etc. Sometimes they went so far as to have special Guilds for each separate article of a suit of armour. This accounts for the remarkable skill and finish seen in the simplest details.

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>