

# IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

**February 2014**

**Vol.29, No.2 ISSN 0790-7672**

**and Northern Star incorporating Workers' Weekly Vol.28 No.2 ISSN 954-5891**

## **Haassta la vista**

*(We won't be back!)*

Richard Haass, with his assistant, Meghan O'Sullivan were sent to Belfast by the American Government, to help broker an agreement amongst the parties in the Assembly. They went home at Christmas, leaving a set of proposals but no agreement.

What the failure of the Haass talks has demonstrated most of all is that the 'Northern Ireland' system is not capable of autonomous functioning beyond anything but the mundane. It is a highly supervised system that requires active supervision from Whitehall (and Dublin to an extent) and, when necessary, Washington is needed to jump start it when it stalls. That is because, within its delegated affairs, it operates as two separate communal blocs voting on matters in parallel—so it is incapable of resolving issues of fundamental difference internally.

The Good Friday institutions lack the dynamic of internal development. Any dynamic that has existed has centred on the tying up of loose ends, of completing unfinished business from the 1998 Agreement. And it is incapable of following through on even this without the requisite muscle provided from London, Dublin and Washington. Thus the failure of Haass and O'Sullivan.

Mr Haass is an angry man, as angry as a diplomat can be, and is allowed to say. He seems to have believed that in presenting reasonable proposals to the NI political parties, that would make the majority of people better off, their political representatives would act like normal politicians and accept them. They would do the cost/benefit analysis and conclude the benefits outweigh the costs and they would sign up to them. But three of the parties did not see the benefits as outweighing the costs and they refused to play ball with the Americans and cut a deal. And the Americans were in the weird position of not having any force to back up their diplomacy.

The Haass talks proved to be a kind of negotiation by administration whereby it was thought that, if a series of documents were produced and continually amended, a form of words would be eventually found that all 5 parties in the Executive could sign up to. Then it would be Mission Accomplished! Doctors Haass and O'Sullivan had previously

*continued on page 2*

## **European Parliament Elections**

### **Another Beauty Contest**

The election for the European Parliament is gearing up for the usual beauty parade with no doubt another decline in the numbers voting in the election. Most people know in their bones it is a charade but, as it's a Parliament, people believe it must be a good thing—even if it's not clear exactly what it's good at.

This Parliament is not a good thing. It is a concocted institution. Normal parliaments arise on the back of the creation of a new polity, usually as a result of wars and/or revolutions. But the EU Parliament implements the established polity in the day-to-day running of its affairs but it does not create the basis of its own existence. The European project was a revolutionary project—to integrate the nations of Europe and create a European *demos*. That could not be done by normal democratic methods. People would not vote for something that did not yet exist! And also they would not vote for their own national dissolution before an alternative was on offer or in view in some clearly definable form. The project was not anti-democratic, it was simply a-democratic.

*continued on page 5*

## **The Holy Sacrifice Of The War**

In this first year of a decade of commemorations—from the illusion of a Home Rule Act in 1914 to the collapse of Treatyite illusions about Northern Ireland in 1925—a reminder of what should not be remembered or thought about is important.

Don't think at the War. Don't ask what it was about. Bear in mind only that war is sacrifice, and think only about sacrifice—the great sacrifice that was a Holocaust.

The great sacrifice of Gallipoli, the Somme, and Paschendale, that did not serve any earthly ambition and is therefore sacred.

Think a lot about the small, purposeful, sacrifice of the Easter Rising and agonise over the pitifully small handful of deaths it caused and puzzle over whether it was a crime. What justification could there be for such a trifling attempt at warfare when you could have done away with yourself,

without domestic disturbance, as an approved victim in the sacrament being performed in France—and get paid for it too.

The most important things not to think about are the Elections of 1918 and 1920, because they spoil the flavour of the Holocaust.

The 1918 Election was thought about too much on its half-centenary, and look at what that led to!

Muriel MacSwiney, the widow of Terence, was still around then. She noticed that, while there had been great hullabaloo

*continued on page 5*

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>Hassta La Vista (We Won't Be Back!).</b> Pat Walsh	1
<b>European Parliament Elections: <i>Another Beauty Contest!</i></b> Jack Lane	1
<b>The Holy Sacrifice Of The War.</b> Editorial	1
<b>Readers' Letters: Commemorations.</b> Wilson John Haire	3
<b>Shorts from <i>the Long Fellow</i></b> (Boom & Bust; J.B. Say; Paul Krugman; Fintan O'Toole; More On The Economy; NAMA; Francois Hollande)	6
<b>'Disappearing' The UVF.</b> Seán McGouran	7
<b>Paisley In The Spotlight.</b> Editorial	8
<b>Es Ahora.</b> Julianne Herlihy. <i>The Raj In The Rain</i> (Part 3)	9
<b>Irish Times Demands A New German Imperialism.</b> Philip O'Connor	12
<b>Come All Ye Ultramontane Anti-Revisionists.</b> Jack Lane	13
<b>Lethal Allies!</b> Angela Clifford (Review of Ann Cadwallader book)	14
<b>Did Borgonovo Miss This Point About The First Dáil And War?</b> Manus O'Riordan	19
<b>A Critic Emerges From Academia, Michael Carragher.</b> Brendan Clifford (Part 2)	22
<b>Biteback: The Problem With GM Plans.</b> Tim O'Sullivan (Unpublished letter about Dr. David McConnell, <i>Irish Times</i> )	26
<b>Does It Stack Up?</b> Michael Stack (Church Of Ireland History)	27
<b>Censorship, British Style.</b> Seán McGouran	28
<b>Digging.</b> Wilson John Haire (Poem)	28

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

Guilts And Corporatism

Mondragon, Part 26  
(back page)

Trade Union Notes  
(page 30)

Finian McGrath, Press Releases  
(page 29)

Due to pressure of space, we have held over a number of items, including the Index for 2013

constructed reports in the Baghdad Green Zone as Iraq deconstructed outside, presumably with the hope that the US military and the Yankee Dollar might put it together again. But all the President's horses and all the President's men couldn't put Humpty together again.

'Northern Ireland' was seen as a cake-walk compared to the mess in Iraq but, without any power at his disposal, it was just as frustrating for Dr. Haass, although not nearly as catastrophic for the inhabitants.

Meghan O'Sullivan was interviewed on RTE's *Prime Time* on 9<sup>th</sup> January by Miriam O'Callaghan. Miriam was much more respectful to Meghan than she was to Gerry Adams on an earlier occasion. There was no probing of the American, no hard questions asked about her performance in the North. Miriam was in the presence of a superior.

Dr. Meghan Lynch O'Sullivan, from Boston, former aide to Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Senior Fellow at Harvard University's John Fitzgerald Kennedy School of Government, told

Miriam that she was not an Irish-American rather just an American. Her father had read her a couple of Irish poems or stories but that was the extent of her Irishness. She was obviously aware of the mutterings that were going on in British Ulster about being screwed by Irish-Americans. When asked about the "*failure*" of the Haass talks, Dr. O'Sullivan said that, "*I'm not yet ready to acknowledge failure per se. These talks and the agreement is still open and in play*". A bit like Iraq.

Meghan O'Sullivan was introduced on BBC Radio Ulster's *Talkback* programme as the woman "*who helped broker the end of the War in Iraq*". That would have been a remarkable achievement—if it had actually happened. But there is no awareness in Baghdad or Fallujah etc. that the War is over as hundreds die every week. Presumably what was meant by the BBC was that she helped broker the extrication of the US from the mayhem it has created in Iraq, reducing its own body-bag count. O'Sullivan recently described Iraq, on the tenth anniversary of its liberation (from stability and order) as "*a mixed*

*bag*". That was diplomatic in the extreme.

Dr. O'Sullivan described the Haass negotiation process as "*different to the Good Friday Agreement process*". This, she explained to Miriam O'Callaghan, was primarily because, although the Irish and British Governments were kept informed of the talks, the talks were "*about internal political issues*". That kind of gave the game away—because the process was seen to be "*internal*" it was doomed to failure.

When asked by a BBC interviewer if they would be back to secure a settlement, Dr. Haass went into a fit of laughter and said that Prof. O'Sullivan and he had to go back to their important jobs in the States, O'Sullivan to lecturing at Harvard. A case of '*Haassta la vista... We won't be back*', to paraphrase Mr. Schwarzenegger.

Haass and O'Sullivan had wasted their highly valued time in Ulster because it wasn't backed up with the required Power of State—from somewhere. And where is the Power of State these days in relation to 'Northern Ireland'? Whitehall is unbothered with bombs in its precious City and has returned to its lethargy, Dublin is hunting for Gerry Adams who was responsible for all the trouble in the first place, and Washington has made another ass of itself, in Syria this time.

No wonder the Unionists wriggled away from it with ease.

Back in October British Labour accused the Secretary of State, Ms Villiers, of having a "*semi-detached*" approach to the Haass initiative. But that has always been the norm of every British Government in relation to 'Northern Ireland', an approach that was only interrupted when the Republican Army forced them into applying themselves to the mess they created in 'Northern Ireland'.

Prior to the talks the British government had laid down a marker by ruling out any outcomes it would find unacceptable. In a speech to the British-Irish Association Conference in September the Secretary of State for 'NI' signalled that her Government would reject any proposals that that were too costly, were critical of state forces, or involved any public inquiries. She also declared that Whitehall would "*not be a party to attempts to re-write history by legitimising terrorism*".

It was clear from this that what was required was an "*internal solution*" not involving Britain, and in which history was not to be allowed to be 'rewritten' to put blame where it was actually due. It was a blame-limiting process confined to the two tribes.

For the record, Ms Villiers in her statement to Parliament said that *"the seventh and final draft produced by Dr Haass"*—

"... includes a new set of arrangements for regulating parades and protests, with responsibility vested for the first time in devolved hands. While there is no immediate resolution on flags and emblems, the document advocates a new Commission to engage the public in a wider debate around identity, culture and tradition. The proposals in the document on the past would see two new bodies set up, one to replace the Historical Enquiries Team currently run by the Police Service of Northern Ireland to investigate Troubles related deaths, and an Independent Commission on Information Recovery. The idea of an amnesty was rejected but statements given to the latter body were to be subjected to limited use and could not be used in any subsequent criminal prosecutions."

It is important to register her statement that:

"While the Haass negotiations had the support and engagement of the UK, Irish and US governments, unlike previous rounds of talks this was a process initiated by Northern Ireland's political leadership. That illustrates the relative stability of the devolved institutions and an admirable willingness to focus on issues which had proved intractable in the past. We are in a far better place now than we were 12 months ago when the protracted flags dispute had put serious pressure on crucial working relationships within the Executive. There is still the chance to achieve a successful outcome from the work started in the Haass group. I very much hope that Northern Ireland's political parties will endeavour to do this and live up to the challenge they set themselves when they initiated the process."

This shows why the Haass process was so welcome for Whitehall: It could watch the game of pass the parcel to its heart's content with no worry about repercussions.

The Haass talks failed because they were an *"internal"* effort and there was no bullying this time. The Good Friday Agreement was achieved by a great act of bullying practised on the Ulster Unionist Party in 1998. The bullying was done because the Republican Army presented the Brits with the possibility of a deal. The deal was that the Republican military campaign, which Britain had failed to defeat over 28 years, would cease on condition that Sinn Fein would be facilitated in refashioning the Six Counties into a place fit for Catholics, in preparation for a final transition into an all-Ireland state over a generation or so. Britain accepted that deal because its only other option was

## Commemorations

Will those Irish veterans of WW1 who joined the Black and Tans also be honoured this year? When I started work in the Belfast shipyard in 1946 there were still plenty of these middle-aged veterans working there. Some of them boasted about being in the Black and Tans. One in particular was nostalgic about the burning of Cork City and the shoot-on-sight policy, on house raids in the middle of the night—feeling the bedding of an empty bed for warmth and then searching the house more thoroughly, finding the suspect and using the word 'plugging' to mean shooting him. He forced local shops to give him cigarettes for free and pubs for free drink. Another of his capers was to pistol-whip males in the street who had their hands in their pockets. Hands-in-pockets wasn't allowed in case of someone concealing a weapon.

After service in the Black and Tans he tried to join the newly-formed RUC but was turned down on medical grounds, after having left half his stomach on the Somme, but the B'Specials took him. All in all he acted like he had had a grand time of it. I can still see his weather-beaten leathery face and the hollow in his midriff where most of his stomach used to be. At my young age back then I wouldn't have known what a psychopath was. To me he had been a soldier and he did what soldiers were supposed to do.

Back now from all that, working as a sawyer he was just a normal person, helpful at times and practised the old Belfast shipyard thing of sharing his sandwiches at lunch-time if someone had forgotten to bring his own, even if they happened to be one of the few overt Catholics working there. But he was always ready to do his duty again, as were most of his comrades. Oddly enough the veterans of WW1 and the veterans of WW2 didn't get along in the shipyard. The WW2 men were more cynical about war and were therefore thought of as milk-sops by the WW1 men, one or two of whom hopped around on their ill-fitting metal legs and gritted their teeth as that old war wound played up again. Maybe it was because most of the Northern WW1 men had been members of the UVF and motivated whereas the WW2 men were mostly career soldiers from the poor and ugly world of the 1930s.

**Wilson John Haire**

a continuation of War—so it did the necessary bullying of David Trimble to put it into place.

That bullying took various forms quite aside from the rumoured physical incident on Trimble when the talks had reached a critical juncture. It encompassed harnessing the considerable power of Washington and a great propaganda offensive directed by Tom Kelly, aimed at manipulating the emotions of the public, particularly the Unionist population within which a majority for the Agreement was very hard to obtain.

When the bullying stopped, or was relaxed, the Protestants and the Unionist parties naturally began to return to their senses and took up their former positions. So more bullying had to be applied, encouraged by the Republican refusal to give up their military capacity until the Agreement had been mostly honoured by the Brits.

Trimble pretended to be for the agreement and a willing participant in it, but in his heart of hearts he was an unbeliever and a reluctant participant. He spoke of Republican defeat and marshalled disgruntled and lapsed Republicans around

him to bolster his argument. But his constituency would not believe him and they saw through his argument. And so Trimble's party was decimated and the Protestants began to shift toward the DUP, which stood outside the Agreement. It was only then that the Big Man of the DUP, deciding to take a leaf out of the Sinn Fein book, and considering it wise to make a functional settlement with the enemy, decided to attempt to wrong-foot Trimble. The DUP came into the settlement, making it functional in conjunction with the enemy—and left its member Jim Allister on his own, outside, as he would not enter the Executive with Sinn Fein.

So, what can be said about the *"internal"* struggle that Haass set up between the two tribes of 'Northern Ireland'?

The Haass talks were something of an unwelcome development for Unionism. It was aware that no good could come of talking about issues on which further concessions would have to be made if the talks were to be successful. It was a lose/lose scenario whatever the outcome and the only thing possible was damage-limitation.

Robinson and McGuinness called in

Haass presumably in order to implicate the Ulster Unionists and DUP rank-and-file in a deal on the issues that were destabilising the functional settlement in 2013—the past, marching and flags.

The Nationalist bloc delegates from Sinn Fein and the SDLP expressed satisfaction with the final Haass report (no.7) and agreed to recommend it to their parties. The Unionist delegates, from the DUP and UUP, left sheepishly and waited for the Americans to leave before fully dishing it.

The Nationalists made some compromises, feeling able to compromise because they had no one outside the negotiations to worry about. But the Super-Pros of Jim Allister MLA, Willie Frazer, Jamie Bryson and the volatile yahoo element of Unionism lay in wait for the Unionist bloc delegates and they dared not make the necessary compromises in signing up to Document no.7.

The Unionist discomfort over issues like flag-waiving, parading, and coming to terms with the past was clear during the Haass talks, despite the ‘hush-hush’ nature of the negotiations. When the Americans had left, it was revealed that the Super-Pros had all been consulted, and had even been shown the actual negotiation documents, by the worried Unionist parties, to see what they would tolerate. Similarly, the Orange Order.

Mr. Bryson, an emerging Super-Prod, told the *Belfast Telegraph*:

"I think they are petrified, really scared... The derailing, for the time being, of the Haass process is a victory for those of us within the Protestant community that are fed up with the continuous appeasement of Sinn Fein/IRA and who are opposed to the peace process in its current format. The DUP/UUP are no doubt looking over their shoulders at the coming elections. It is no secret that the DUP are becoming increasingly concerned about a growing anti-Agreement movement which has grown from a tiny minority of us to a much more sizeable number" (6.1.14).

Ah! "*Sinn Fein/IRA*." We haven't heard that phrase for a few years now.

Mr Bryson is a flag-protester. We have pointed out on a few occasions now that a kind of turning point in the flag protests was the Special Advisers episode, in which the SDLP were manoeuvred by Jim Allister of the TUV into fragmenting the Nationalist bloc. The issue of Special Advisers in itself was minor but the Unionist victory had significant repercussions. A one-man Unionist army had scored a moral victory over the Nationalist

bloc. And from the contributions of some of the DUP in the Assembly it was clear that they greatly enjoyed this sojourn into the past and the indulging of their instincts, rather than the accommodationist position to which they had been led by Peter Robinson. The First Minister had to retreat from the Long Kesh peace centre and blood has been scented ever since.

The Deputy First Minister has claimed that this is the loyalist tail wagging the Unionist dog. If it was only so simple as that.

Surrendering ground on unrestricted flag-waving and unrestricted parading through enemy territory is a painful experience for an Ulster Unionism whose remaining Britishness is almost entirely based on such things.

For Unionists the Union was reduced to the mere ceremonial symbols of the State—the Crown, the Queen, the Union Jack, etc.—in 1921 when ‘Northern Ireland’ detached them from the British State. And one of the chief petty concerns ever since has been the flying of flags—or more accurately the flying of them in the face of the Fenians—presumably to show who still holds the whip-hand—or doesn't as the case may be.

It is unsurprising that flag-waving proved the most difficult compromise to make for Unionists. It is a sign of insecurity as flag-waving has to be done to reassure themselves that they are still ‘British’ and still top-dog in ‘our wee Ulster’ as it is sometimes put. In Wales and Scotland the Union was maintained incidentally through mass participation in the party conflict of Labour and Tory by people who frequently expressed contempt for such symbols. The Ulster Unionists were deprived in 1920-1 of everything but the symbols. So they cling tenaciously to them, seeing any dilution of them as a threat to existence itself.

Apparently both Unionist parties went into the Haass negotiations on a united platform, determined not to let the other leave with the words "*Sell-out*" or "*Lundy*" on its lips. For both the DUP and UUP there was the realisation that any compromise with equality could be used opportunistically by the other to grab the vote of the yahoos. But then there was the awful thought that, if both were to compromise, Jim Allister, standing apart, could be the winner, after the Super-Pros strutted their stuff on his behalf.

But then there was the fearful thought that increasing ‘respectable’ Protestant withdrawal from politics after more

Super-Prod mobilisation would only benefit Sinn Fein electorally, turning it into the dominant party in ‘Northern Ireland’. the territory carved out for Unionism.

Brian Feeney in his Irish News column on New Year's Day column saw the failure of the Haass talks as another victory for Sinn Fein:

"Sinn Fein is going to recommend Haass's report to its ard chomhairle. Sure this is a smart move to wrong foot the DUP because Sinn Fein knows none of it will ever see the light of day and knows once the party fully accepts it the DUP cannot. With four elections coming up between now and 2016... there's no prospect of any advance on the present stalemate. The so-called commission on culture, identity and traditions will go nowhere. We're left in the extraordinary position that it appears Sinn Fein is taking the lead in trying to make the North work for all its people. It seems that... as the nationalist vote increases Sinn Fein will take ownership of the North. The DUP can stall change but they can't stop it... before they become a minority." (IN 1.1.14)

The Haass talks represented another wrong-footing of Unionism by Sinn Fein's engagement within the enemy citadel.

It seems that Sinn Fein has taken up the position of General MacMahon—'*Here we are: here we shall remain*'—after capturing the Malakoff Fort at the siege of Sevastopol. It was this position that an editorial in the *Irish News* urged Nationalists to take up back in 1925 after the Boundary Commission condemned them to their fate within 'Northern Ireland':

"We are here; there are 450,000 of us. We can recover all that has been lost within the past half-decade, win the respect of opponents while contending manfully for our rights, and help and hasten the realization of national hopes by proving our lot in the land where our lot is cast. But we shall sink lower and suffer more sorely if we keep on railing at others and groaning on our own account instead of coming together and putting our hands to the work that must be done."

The reference to the Malakoff Fort concerned General MacMahon's taking and holding of an important redoubt during the siege of Sevastopol in the Crimean War. This was a defining moment in the fall of the city to the French after the British had failed to take it. MacMahon had been ordered by his commander-in-chief to evacuate the redoubt he had captured but replied with the legendary response: "*J'y suis, J'y reste*". MacMahon was a descendant of the Wild Geese who

rose to become Chief of State in France and the First President of the Third Republic.

The *Irish News* presumably meant that the Northern Catholic presence, if kept solid and redoubtable within the Unionist citadel, would ultimately result in its fall.

The *Irish News* had been worried about the Boundary Commission because it feared the isolation of the Catholics of eastern Ulster, including Belfast, if the Border Nationalists joined the Free State. It wanted the greatest number of Catholics in the Six Counties, in order to maximize nationalist influence in the area they were marooned in and to maintain the possibility of outnumbering the Unionists some time in the future. And it had opposed the Boundary Commission on the basis that the Catholic minority needed to be as large as possible so that eventually Irish unity could remain a possibility.

Perhaps its relief at retaining the maximum numbers of Catholics within the Six Counties produced its greatly optimistic reading of what might be accomplished, given unity and organisation. It had to wait for the best part of a century to see the transformation from the despair of 1925.

**Pat Walsh**

## EU Election

continued

The method chosen was that of the European Commission working with the Council (the Governments of the Member States); and the creative tension between the two created the impetus for the project to develop. The Commission was given the right to initiate legislation and policies that would make sense across Member States and add value to people's lives in matters that could not be done by individual states alone but which they all had to implement. A new political reality would thereby be created that would create horizontal perspectives and political entities across Europe. CAP, Europe of the Regions, and other such overarching Programmes were typical of this approach but these were only a beginning. This was obviously a long-term project and there was no way it could be short-circuited—but the creation of the Parliament was an attempt to do just this.

The creation of the Parliament was artificial. It did not arise on the basis of the successful completion of a new European reality. It was just an ornament.

Parliaments can be painted as the essence of democracy but, if they are artificial creations, they are essentially demagogic rather than democratic. And if they do not have the responsibility of creating governments, they are irresponsible. That is to say, they do not have to deal with the consequences of their own actions. Such is the case with the European Parliament.

Its demagoguery reached its climax when, under Pat Cox as its Chairman, it carried into effect its one real achievement. The Parliament destroyed the authority of the one institution on which the European project was realisable—the Commission. Allegations of corruption and cronyism won the day against the Commission, though there was evidently more of this in the current Limerick City of Culture project than there ever was in the Commission. As Cox himself might be able to confirm. The furore raised by the Parliament fatally undermined the standing of the Commission. And it has never recovered from this blow.

With the Commission sidelined by Cox and company, "*the centre cannot hold*" as regards the European project. That was proved absolutely when the Banking crisis arose—and the Eurozone members had to ignore the Commission to save the day.

The Commission is now reduced to observer status at the table, when it comes to the Euro, the most crucial issue for Europe. The Parliament is not even in the room.

But the Parliament has found new things to do. It really came to life over the Ukraine, when its leaders decided to go extra-parliamentary on the streets of Kiev. They felt more seized and passionate about the Ukraine than they ever did about any issue that would have consolidated Europe on an internal basis. They were much more certain and agreed about what was good for the Ukraine than they were about Europe. The natural inclination of these types of parliamentarians for demagoguery was given full ventilation. There will be more of the same as opportunities arise.

This Parliament is one big illusion in the context of the European Project. Far from contributing to the European project, it cut across the development of the EU and should therefore be ignored and left die a decent death.

The old anarchist slogan on elections "*Don't vote, it only encourages them*", like all slogans can be correct sometimes as a stopped clock is inevitably correct sometimes. The slogan is appropriate for the forthcoming European elections. It's time has come—don't vote!

**Jack Lane**

## The War

continued

about the half-centenary of 1916, nothing was being planned for the Election on which the state was based. She asked Jack Lynch (that good man) why not? Against his own better judgment, Lynch organised a Mansion House Commemoration of the meeting of the First Dail in January 1919. The occasion was spoiled by Dennis Dennehy's hunger strike in Mountjoy on the issue of homelessness, which brought central Dublin to a standstill, struck fear into the hearts of the Establishment, convincing them that Bolshevik revolution was at hand, and making them mentally unfit to cope with the Northern situation when it erupted six months later.

But rest easy. We see no plans to hold a great commemoration of that unfortunate Election. We are only asked to celebrate the Great War unquestioningly and the Rebellion problematically.

An *Irish Times* editorial on the Great War is titled *Dulce et decorum est*. . . It is delightful and becoming. The conclusion of the Latin tag which was used as the title of a poem by Wilfred Owen is *pro patria mori*—to die for your country.

The theme of the editorial is that there should be no disagreement over what the War was for—and, for that matter, no agreement either. The event should be commemorated piously and mindlessly.

It takes British Minister Michael Gove to task for arguing with some Godforsaken remnant of the British Left over what it was about, and being "*bullishly patriotic*".

How right it is! If it is possible for us—

"to embrace in our collective remembering... the ideas of Carson and Redmond and Pearse, the Covenant, as well as the Home Rule, the campaigns for women's suffrage and for the rights of workers. And that most seminal of events the 1916 Rising",

—then of course we cannot do it patriotically, there being no *patria* which would bind all of these things together. So "*our consensus on the need for a common understanding of commemoration as a shared remembering*" must not be tainted by patriotism—or by remembering either!

Could it be that the *Irish Times*, that was once given style at least by the likes of Robert Smyllie has sunk so low that its editorials are now being penned by that unequalled writer of goo, Stephen Collins?

The editorial has a puzzling motto, "*I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him*". That was Mark Anthony's opening gambit in his slippery speech in praise of Caesar. So we can take it that the *Irish Times* is only holding the line with this gibberish until it is safe to get back to saying what it thinks. ■

# Shorts

from  
*the Long Fellow*

## BOOM AND BUST

It is in the nature of capitalism that there is boom and bust. The pendulum swings from one end of the business cycle to the other, but with each oscillation the economy changes. There is never a return to the *status quo*. Emile Zola described this vividly in his novels of nineteenth century mining towns in France. In *Germinal* the leader of the miners' strike is driven to despair:

"It filled him with fresh discouragement at the invincible power of big capital, which was so strong in battle that, even in defeat, it could still grow fat on the bodies of the less important casualties lying around it" (cited in *Das Kapital Reviewed* by John Martin, page 65).

Small capital is eliminated and big capital is consolidated. In the era of abundant credit many people were enticed into speculative investments in property and other assets. It is not that the big capitalists don't make mistakes, but they are more capable of absorbing losses when the pendulum swings to bust. They are also in a position to feed on the scraps left by those who cannot. The drying up of credit means that only those with access to cash can purchase assets that have fallen below their real economic value.

Conditions of bust induce panic in those least able to absorb losses and bad decisions are made. In the case of the Euro-zone crisis, objective conditions were exacerbated by elements within the media with an ideological interest in the collapse of the Euro. But it seems those that bet against its survival have lost heavily. It has been reported that the price of gold has dropped by 40% from its September 2011 peak against the Euro (*Irish Independent*, 10.1.14).

## J. B. SAY

The famous French economist J.B. Say (1767 – 1832) has been enjoying something of a revival in France and is quoted approvingly by the President. Say is famous for the statement *L'offre crée meme la demand* (Supply creates its own demand). A contributor to *irishconomy.ie* finds this development "extraordinary". Indeed it is so "extraordinary" that an explanation as to why would be superfluous.

The Long Fellow doesn't find the statement in the least "extraordinary". On the contrary, there is more truth in it than the alternative: "demand creates supply".

About twenty years ago the Long Fellow could live quite happily without the internet, emails and mobile phones. He never demanded them. But when they arrived it soon became inconceivable to live without them.

The idea that supply creates demand does not just apply to innovative products. A society must produce if it is to consume. The existence of credit enables the separation in time of the acts of production and consumption, but that separation cannot be suspended indefinitely.

## PAUL KRUGMAN

The greatest supply side economist was, of course, Karl Marx. But the Left has abandoned him and lost all interest in supply or production. The guru of the Left in Anglophone countries is now the Nobel Prize winning economist Paul Krugman, who focuses on demand.

Krugman was given an opportunity to explain himself on *Morning Ireland* (RTE Radio 1, 14.1.14). He was surprisingly defensive.

When pressed by the interviewer he admitted that Ireland might have needed a little austerity, but it has been given too much of the medicine.

A little austerity! If demand determines supply, there should be no austerity. Has Krugman lost the courage of his convictions? Later in the interview he conceded that Ireland had very little room for manoeuvre, but maybe she should start yelling at the Germans. Oh dear!

A child of five knows—even if a Nobel prize winning economist doesn't—that modern production is sophisticated. We do not live in a Jeffersonian utopia of small producers so beloved of economists. Even if there is the required technological know-how in a specific country, demand does not automatically call forth supply in that country. In a small open economy like Ireland's, the supply will be already available from abroad. A stimulus to demand will only worsen the balance of payments deficit and drive the country deeper in debt.

## FINTAN O'TOOLE

Has Krugman been influenced by Fintan O'Toole? That is the incredible thought that arises from his *Morning Ireland* interview. When questioned about the Irish recovery he remarked dismissively that "not dead" hardly counts as success.

O'Toole had an article four days earlier in the *New York Times* (10.1.14) with the

headline "*Ireland's Rebound is European Blarney*". He claimed that Ireland was only "still standing". Every silver lining must have a cloud! He mentioned the unemployment rate of 12.8% (it's actually 12.4%) without noting that this is a fall from a peak of about 15%. He focuses on the level of emigration ("almost 90,000" in the year to April 2013) without mentioning the number of immigrants (56,000) and the fact that the population of the country continues to grow.

A perceptive reader might look askance at O'Toole lamenting economic growth at a respectable 2% between 2011 and 2013, but even this is bad news according to O'Toole because the IMF said we would grow by 5.25%!

We are used to O'Toole's thrashing the Irish State for a largely Dublin audience in his *Irish Times* column. This is very much in the Protestant Ascendancy tradition of that newspaper whose policy was to denigrate the State after independence. But what is the purpose of doing the same for a foreign audience at a time when the Irish State is seeking funds on the international markets?

Now that he is based in Princeton, can we expect O'Toole to turn his jaundiced eye on the United States; or does he dare bite the hand that feeds?

## MORE ON THE ECONOMY

Fortunately, nobody (except perhaps Krugman) takes O'Toole seriously. About a week after his NYT article *Moody's* upgraded Ireland's credit rating from junk to investment grade. This had the effect of reducing the interest rate on Government Bonds to about 3.25%, still above the German rate of 1.75%, but the gap is closing.

Ireland recorded a 13.2% increase in industrial production in the twelve months to November 2013 (*The Irish Times*, 14.1.14). This was the highest in the EU. Most of the increase seems to have occurred in the latter months of the period, which is an encouraging sign.

The national debt peaked at just over 125% of GDP at the end of the second quarter of 2013. It looks like it will fall to 120% when figures are compiled for the end of 2013. The budget deficit is likely to come in at about 6.8% (less than the target of 7.5%) in 2013. It should be borne in mind that the state has substantial cash holding, which if netted off against liabilities would reduce our national debt. The precautionary need for these cash holdings will diminish as funding becomes more readily available: a benefit of regaining control of the public finances. The Minister

for Finance, Michael Noonan, thinks that running down these cash balances could reduce our debt quite quickly to 113% of GDP.

*Eurostat* (15.1.14) indicates that we continue to have a large balance of payments surplus of +31.3 billion euro for the first ten months of 2013. Germany has the highest surplus at +166.3 billion. Interestingly, the country with the largest balance of payments deficit in the EU is the UK with -66.5 billion, followed by France (-63.5 billion), Greece (-16.2 billion) and Spain (-12.8 billion).

The balance of payments figure is a measure of a country's ability to pay its way in the world (exports less imports). In retrospect, our large balance of payment deficits in the years before the bubble burst should have indicated to us that the economy was not on a sustainable footing. The fact that the Public finances were sound allowed our politicians to neglect the problem of private debt. In an era of free movement of capital (especially applying to Ireland), the balance of payments figure is not an infallible guide. Nevertheless, the surpluses in recent years are a good sign. It might also be said that Greece and Spain are not out of the woods yet; and the UK and France may have a few difficult years ahead.

A dark cloud on the horizon for Ireland has been the possibility of the State being required to re-capitalise the banks again. However, the danger of this appears to be receding. The credit rating agency *Fitch* thinks that the number of homeowners with mortgage repayments greater than three months in arrears is likely to peak this year and then fall. Also, the value of the State's holdings in AIB and Bank of Ireland increased by 34% last year giving a combined value of 13.1 billion euro (*The Irish Times*, 10.1.14).

#### NAMA

The *Sunday Independent*, the newspaper of the lumpen bourgeoisie, continues its campaign against NAMA. Its front page non story (12.1.14) claimed a developer (not named) was offered insider information by a former NAMA employee (also not named). The story was confirmed by three—yes you've guessed it—unnamed sources. The unnamed developer, apparently did not make any formal complaint but the newspaper claimed that the non story "*opens up the possibility*" of NAMA referring the matter to the Gardaí.

The *Sunday Independent* media campaign is just one element of the attack. There has been a plethora of legal cases involving NAMA (*The Irish Times*,

16.1.14). It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that most of these have been vexatious or delaying tactics by the counter party.

90 cases have been completed. NAMA has been successful in 89 of these; it was only "*partially unsuccessful*" in the case that it didn't win against the developer Paddy McKillen.

Of the 90 cases, 60 were initiated by NAMA; it won all these. The remaining 30 completed cases consisted of 15 cases brought against NAMA (one of which was "*partially unsuccessful*"); 13 appeal cases which it won; and 2 cases which it inherited from IBRC, which it also won.

Since its inception in 2009 it has spent 18 million euro in legal fees to law firms and for legal counsel (some of this may be recouped). 14 million euro has been paid in legal 'due diligence' in acquiring its loan portfolio. It has spent 36 million in borrower recoverable costs.

Finally, it spent 34 billion to acquire loans with a face value of 72 billion. The other costs pale into insignificance when compared to this. This enormous purchase was financed by issuing bonds to the banks, which in turn used them as collateral to obtain loans from the European Central Bank: a very ingenious and cost effective way of taking these loans off the balance sheets of the banks.

#### FRANCOIS HOLLANDE

The private life of President Hollande is descending into a very un-French like farce. In Catholic societies sin is accepted as part of life. Public figures don't normally have to explain their private arrangements. In Britain and America, by contrast, sin must be uncovered, rooted out and exposed to the public.

In the past all that was required of a French public figure was that he make a decent effort at discretion and not cause a scandal. Perhaps France has changed. Nevertheless, it is inconceivable, even with a magazine like *Closer*, that other French Presidents would have found themselves in the difficulties of the current incumbent. There was never any doubt that Bernadette and Danielle were the first ladies of Chirac and Mitterand.

Hollande's indecisiveness in this matter does not augur well for other more important aspects of his Presidency.

*Das Kapital Reviewed,*  
A Modern Business Approach To  
Marxism  
by John Martin.  
€12, £10  
from Athol Books:  
postfree in Ireland and Britain

## 'Disappearing' The UVF

Pat Walsh's *Return of the Double Act* (IPR Oct. 2013) on Prof. Henry Patterson and the Lord Bew was a very useful corrective to the revisionist baloney of the *Irish Times*, and nearly all the (other) British media. The concocted history is that the Provisional IRA (which didn't exist before September 1969) is responsible for every act of terror in Northern Ireland—ever—apparently.

I don't imagine Sinn Féin is particularly worried about this, it's quite useful for the other actors in the current political farce (really) to recall that SF has a fairly big stick it can retrieve from under the stairs. But the Bew/Patterson twaddle takes the heat off former members of the 'Official' IRA in academia, the Dáil—and the House of Lords. And masks the fact that there was an armed terrorist organisation active before 1969.

That was the UVF (Ulster Volunteer Force) re-founded in 1966, by (according to Gusty Spence, its most famous / notorious member) a 'Stormont' Cabinet Minister. The original 1912 UVF was a mass movement of quite plebeian character. The nobs were kicked upstairs to the officer corps (though there was some election of officers). But the impetus for resistance to Westminster came up from the skilled workers in Belfast and the small farmers, who had joined in the 'land agitation', run and successfully concluded, by William O'Brien.

The 1966 mobilisation was largely a lumpen phenomenon of people who were barely proletarian. Much less people who could be characterised as 'labour aristocracy', a favourite with (entirely bourgeois in origin) intellectuals on the British Left discussing 1912 and all that. It would be interesting to deal with similarities and differences between the 1912 and 1966 mobilisations—but the point is not to allow the UVF to be 'disappeared'.

**Seán McGouran**

## Paisley In The Spotlight

The *Irish Times* chose not to comment editorially on Ian Paisley's television interview in which he told a number of home truths. Its former columnist Fionnuala O'Connor did so in an article with a banal moralistic title, *Paisley's Eye On The Sins Of Others Rather Than His Own* (Saturday, 25.1.14).

His own great sin was, of course, that as a Biblical Protestant he made a political deal which made the Good Friday Agreement functional, and thus brought an end to Protestant supremacy in the Northern Ireland operation of the British State. But Fionnuala does not mention this. She concentrates on trivia.

In politics it is often necessary to know who is speaking in order to know what is being said. The political order is different in kind from the eternal order of the Good Book. It is the medium of circumstances in the process of change. Paisley stepped out of the eternal order, which he had guarded for half a century, in order to enact a necessary deal in the political order when none of the sophisticated believers were able to do it. That was his great sin in the realm where sin is taken in earnest.

He gave great offence. And it was those who had looked down on him from their superior postures, while depending on him at the same time to defend the gap, who were most offended. He carried the bulk of his own unsophisticated Biblicalist followers with him at the critical moment.

A mixture of political ambition and fundamentalist resentment led to his being ousted from the leadership of his Party and his Church a few years later. Peter Robinson took over and tried to re-take some of the ground Paisley had given away. He was forced back into line by a combination of Paisley's influence, the scandal of his wife's affair with the young Fenian chef, and the humane astuteness of Martin McGuinness in his hour of trial. But now he is trying to backtrack again, under pressure from Jim Allister's fundamentalist *Traditional Unionist Voice* (with which the resentful SDLP has been flirting under the effective leadership of has-been Seamus Mallon, who failed entirely to make a functional arrangement with Lord Trimble and his Official Unionists).

Fionnuala O'Connor is blandly

described as "a writer, commentator and journalist". She was a socialist revolutionary, under another surname, in the People's Democracy movement which in 1969 drove the Civil Rights movement out of its careful middle-class limits, confronted Protestant/Unionist strongholds in the name of British rights which could not exist in the absence of British politics, and prepared the way for the *Explosion In Ulster* of August 1969, and the War that resulted from the explosion. Then, like many revolutionaries of the time, she was picked up by the *Irish Times*, given bourgeois status, and deployed in the West British war of attrition against Fianna Fail who were the Southern "Tories" of the "Tories Out, North And South" PD slogan of 1968-9.

A highlighted extract in her *Irish Times* article refers to Paisley's "diatribes against Catholicism, drawn from the nightmarish visions of Satan's court in the *Book of Revelations* [sic]".

What is this weird *Book of Revelations* that Paisley is addicted to? Why, it's the culminating book of the Christian Gospel!

But surely Fionnuala is Oecumenical? She certainly did not support our attempt to get the Six Counties into British politics. In British politics there is no need in politics for Christian Oecumenism, because actual politics is far removed from religion, though the state remains ceremoniously sectarian. The mutual antagonism of the Christian sects can operate freely without disturbing the life of the state. But, when the British thinned their state in the Six Counties down to the Northern Ireland structure, religion was made the bearer of politics. And, when nice people tried to soften the communal antagonism without dealing with the matter of exclusion from the political life of the state, Oecumenism became the order of the day. And that means you can't be snooty about the *Book Of Revelation*.

Daniel O'Connell could. He had parted company with the Protestant radicals in the North, saying that they had led the Catholics up the garden path in 1798 and left them stranded. And he said it was a good thing that Rome interposed itself between the Bible and the people because the Bible on its own was likely to encourage strange notions.

Fionnuala can hardly be an Oecumenist, when she sneers at something that is sacred to Protestants. And she rejected the possibility of the British political system. And she doesn't support the Provos—in her *Irish Times* column she said they did the Northern Bank job and it would be the end of them. So what vantage point is it that she sees Paisley from?

Eilis O'Hanlon, in the *Sunday Independent* (Jan 12), says *Paisley Is A Sickening And Hateful Bigot. What's New?* But Eilis hates a lot of people—or finds them hateful. What particularly got her goat was his remark about the South asking for it, in the matter of the Dublin/Monaghan Bombings. She doesn't explain. She just says the remark was "nauseating".

But what were Conor Cruise O'Brien and Garret FitzGerald doing with their chicanery over the Sunningdale Agreement? and what was Cosgrave doing when he arranged the SDLP Ministers to sit with his Ministers for a Cabinet photo-shoot? and what was the SDLP doing when it said that it would *trundle* the Unionists into a United Ireland? and what were they all doing when they denounced the Ulster Workers' Council Strike against the Council of Ireland chicanery as Fascist and called for the British Army to break it? They were deliberately antagonising the Ulster Protestants on an issue which the Protestants felt was a danger to them. And, despite all their denunciation of Ulster Unionism for its recourse to violence, no defensive measures were taken against the probability of Unionist retaliation in that very excited, unstable and dangerous situation.

When Tony Blair told Paisley he was going to become a Roman Catholic, Paisley told him he was a fool. That was taken in good part in the camaraderie of British politics, since the matter referred to the doubtful hereafter. The most charitable thing one can say about the actions of O'Brien and FitzGerald in 1974 is that they were the actions of fools, and people suffered for them in the here-and-now.

Look Up the  
*Athol Books*  
archive on the Internet  
[www.atholbooks.org](http://www.atholbooks.org)

es ahora \*

## The Raj in the Rain

Part III

"The whole property of this country has been conferred by successive monarchs of England upon an English colony composed of three sets of English adventurers who poured into this country at the termination of three successive rebellions. Confiscations is their common title, and from their first settlement they have been hemmed in on every side by the old inhabitants of Ireland, brooding over their discontents in sullen indignation."

Lord Chancellor Clare's famous words in his Union speech of 1800.

*Vanishing Country Houses of Ireland.*

By the Knight of Glen, David J. Griffin and Nicholas K. Robinson. Published by The Irish Architectural Archive and The Irish Georgian Society. 1988. Dublin.

In the Preface of this *Vanishing Country Houses*, which was published with the financial sponsorship from Christie's Auction House and The Rohan Group plc, by Noel Grove Annesley, whose brother Patrick "lives in Anne's Grove in North Cork", a Big House that with the help of the State opens its gardens every year to a paying public. Grove Annesley, Desmond Guinness (President of The Irish Georgian Society), and Nicholas K. Robinson (husband of former President of Ireland Mary Robinson) founder of The Irish Architectural Archive, all bemoan in this book the lack of the Irish State and its people to be more pro-active in keeping up the 'Big Houses', rather than allowing them to fall into disrepair or, in so many cases, complete dissolution. I find this charge against us—the Irish people—to be absolutely outrageous and in very poor taste. The Big House owners were the ones who were profligate and spent their days hunting/shooting and drinking and running up bills that were left unpaid, as the local Irish could bitterly attest to and indeed did.

"The Big House as presented by Edgeworth, Lever, Somerville and Keane, for example, is grounded in the minutiae of daily life; decay or decline is inherent in the small cracks of the plaster, the leaking roof, and the endless stratagems by which a society wards off unpleasant truths. The hypocrisy, self-delusion, or drunken improvidence of Edgeworth's Rackrents, Lever's Martins, Somerville's Prende-

viles, and Keane's Swifts are presented to the reader in detailed account books, as it were, of physical decay and social irresponsibility. These novelists accumulate evidence against their own culture... Seeing Anglo-Ireland's failures with a lacerating clarity, they invoke a vision of a lost ideal and a failed cultural purpose—of social responsibility, enlightened landlordism, or personal dignity—that their historical role as conquerors and exploiters of a native population has denied them" (*The Anglo-Irish Novel and the Big House* by Vera Kreilkamp. Syracuse University Press. New York. 1998. p. 268).

In the *Irish Political Review*, August edition 2003, I wrote an article under the title 'Vera Kreilkamp and Hubert Butler' because this American scholar wrote a review in *The Irish Times* (5 July 2003) of a book 'Unfinished Ireland: Essays on Hubert Butler' edited by Chris Agee and which came from a series of talks given in Kilkenny titled 'The Hubert Butler Centenary Celebrations', 20th - 22nd October 2000. In that review Kreilkamp is alive to what the Irish Georgian Society is about. As I wrote:

"She incisively acknowledges that, for the likes of 'The Irish Georgian Society', the preservation of these big houses are encoded with the idea of "aesthetic rescue with a significant degree of historical nostalgia". The former inhabitants are now presented as either fellow victims or again in the mocking words of Séamus Deane, "The Big House surrounded by an unruly tenantry, Culture besieged by barbarity, a refined aristocracy beset by a vulgar middle class—all of these are recurrent images in twentieth-century Irish fiction which draws heavily on Yeats's poetry for them" ('Celtic Revivals' by Seamus Deane. Boston. Faber and Faber. p 31.)"

Deane in the latter book outs Yeats as a significant begetter of myths.

"Yeats's account of the Anglo-Irish tradition blurs an important distinction between the terms 'aristocracy' and 'Ascendancy'. Had he known a little more about the eighteenth century, he would have recognised that the Protestant Ascendancy was, then and since, a predominantly bourgeois social formation. The Anglo-Irish were held in contempt by the Irish-speaking masses as people of no blood, without lineage and with nothing to recommend them other than the success of their Hanoverian cause over that of the Jacobites. This is evident in the poetry of men such as Daithi O'Bruadair and Aodagain O'Rathaille who lived through the first and most painful phase of the Whig Settlement in Ireland. But much later in the century Burke also went to great lengths to distinguish what Yeats ignored in Ireland.

Burke claimed in his *Letter to a Peer of Ireland on the Penal Laws against Irish Catholics* (1782) "Ireland had an oligarchy without an aristocracy. The Protestants in Ireland are", he claims, "plebeian".

And:

"A plebeian oligarchy is a monster: and no people, not absolutely domestic or predial slaves, will long endure it. The Protestants of Ireland are not *alone* sufficiently the people to form a democracy and they are *too numerous* to answer the ends and purposes of an aristocracy. Admiration, the first source of obedience, can only be the claim or the imposture of the few..."

Deane goes on to further elucidate:

"Nevertheless, it is this group which Yeats refers to as an aristocracy and it is to Burke and others he looks for an intellectual justification for this description ... Yeats had demonstrated throughout his long career that the conversion of politics and history into aesthetics carries with it the obligation to despise the modern world and to seek rescue from it. His sympathy for fascism is consistent with his other opinions, although he is, in the end, loyal to his early conception of an aristocratic society dominated by "some company of governing men" (Ibid pp 31-33—italics are the authors—not mine JH)

Yet Desmond FitzGerald, the Knight of Glen had no trouble with ending his article in *Vanishing Country Houses of Ireland* with a quotation from the English poet laureate and acknowledged astute social climber Sir John Betjeman:

"But where is his lordship who once in a phaeton  
Drove out twixt his lodges and into the town?  
Oh his tragic misfortune I will not dilate on;  
His mansions a ruin, his woods are cut down.  
His impoverished descendent is dwelling in Ealing,  
His daughters must type for their bread and their board,  
O'er the graves of his forbears the nettle is stealing  
And few will remember the sad Irish Lord."

And with that the Knight of Glen admonishes us with this statement: "Should we not remember and preserve some of this important aspect of our national inheritance?" Indeed!

A friend of mine once told me that his father, who was starting out his life as a young professional, had to go out into the

fields in the morning to bring in the family's 5 milking cows. Shoeless as he steered together the cattle—a young woman from the local 'Big House' out riding deliberately scattered the cows and triumphantly rode off. Finally his father got them into the outhouse and then put on his shoes and rough worsted wool suit for the train up to Cork to the office where he worked. After building up his firm with a lot of hard work, he eventually bought a bigger house in a better part of town and sent his son—my friend—to get a private education and then university.

But one day his father met the woman from the 'Big House' and she was now working as a receptionist and, as she was a spinster (all her 'equals' having died in the wars), she was living in a frugal bedsitter. But she still refused to acknowledge him as a former neighbour from a small town, though he was quite willing to let bygones be bygones. And the question that has to be asked is: should we as taxpayers once again be asked—and not only asked but be expected to keep up these 'Big Houses' as shrines to a brutal colonial past?

Vera Kreilkamp is "explicit in denouncing the preservation of the 'Big House' as a *"cultural shrine"*, if the focus doesn't foreground imperial conquest. She accepts this is done with great taste at Strokestown Park House in County Roscommon, where "visionary" local man Jim Callery bought and restored the Palladian mansion and sited beside it the Famine Museum. Roy Foster not only condemned this but laughed at it, as did Fintan O'Toole and others and yet my visit there had such a profound effect on me that I cannot wait to go back and learn more about *"our past"*, denied as it is by the two foregoing *oinseachs*.

When I wrote about Jim Callery away back in 2003—it took the Irish media and in this case *The Daily Mail* on 24th June 2013 to acknowledge Callery as a "visionary" and the work of the Irish National Famine Museum as an important tool for the many visitors and school tours to understand the relationship between landlord and tenant and what eventually led to the Famine Holocaust. At Strokestown, Kreilkamp—

"was able to see the 'space of the other', "gloomy underground passages for the servants, and "lofty barrel-vaulted stables" for the horses which "graphically indicates the relative care lavished on horses and native Irish servants."

It had the double effect of dispelling the Yeatsian myth of "aristocratic ascend-

*ancy culture"* and restoring "a disturbing narrative of undercapitalized and exploitive Anglo-Irish land policy and local governance" (Kreilkamp op-cit p263).

And indeed Kreilkamp has an answer for the Knight of Glen.

"Because the strongest voices of these houses, an element of self-interest in a rapidly expanding heritage industry is perhaps inevitable. But to separate the gentry estate as agent of imperial domination of the countryside from its status as aesthetic object worth preserving is to dehistoricize and misread it".

And here Kreilkamp quotes from the English historian David Cannadine regarding the English heritage industry. He says:

"The committees of the great preservationist societies were—and still are—groaning beneath the weight of great grandees. The idea of a 'national' heritage which is somehow 'threatened' and must be 'saved' is sometimes little more than a means of preserving an essentially elite culture by claiming—quite implausibly—that it is really everybody's. The claim is usually accompanied by a highly value-laden version of the past, not so much history as myth" (ibid p. 262).

The two other people interviewed for Paddy Cooney's documentary *'The Raj in the Rain'* were Sir John Leslie of Castle Leslie, Co. Monaghan and the self-styled historian of the Ascendancy—Mark Bence Jones. The more eccentric Leslie caught my attention. He was showing people rather shyly around his home but it is his formidable niece Sammy who has made a great success of the Castle as a hotel and upper-class venue for weddings, in a field where the competition is fierce. As Sir Paul McCartney—of the Beatles—had his second wedding there to Heather Mills (short-lived as it was), it garnered huge media attention and as a result it is now apparently sought after as a wedding venue.

Leslie admitted that back in the days when he was young, the outlets for him and those like him were the British Imperial armed forces—army, navy, air-force—the diplomatic corps or you could be an artist and looked upon rather strangely; but he fastened upon architecture. However, it wasn't to be, as he had to go into the army and joined the Irish Guards because they had a lovely uniform and the officers had a man who polished their shoes/boots and their buttons. Initially he had a great life in London, attending all the grand balls. After all—his father Sir Shane Leslie was the first cousin of Winston Churchill, because both their mothers were

American sisters, the daughters of an American entrepreneur Leonard Jerome.

Shane Leslie—he changed his name from John Randolph on becoming a Roman Catholic and also renounced his considerable estates, some 50,000 acres at the time, across Monaghan and Donegal in favour of his second brother Norman who died in the First World War. But the agreement stood so that, when he succeeded his father as third baronet in 1944, the family property passed direct to his eldest son John who at 97 is still *in situ*.

In the *'Raj in the Rain'*, Sir John Leslie showed the same eccentricities of clothes style that saw Shane wearing a kilt for his life. The former wore wool suits with violently clashing colours and he always wore a beret with a cockade. When he hesitantly pointed at a picture and asked if we wanted more history, he told us that it was a portrait of Mrs. Fitzherbert (1756-1837) who married the Prince of Wales secretly as it was strictly forbidden for the Heir to the Throne of England to marry a Catholic. His father had written a biography of her where he proved that she had indeed married King George IV.

John Leslie came into his own recounting the debutante balls in London and all the young girls going up to Buckingham Palace and the weekends at the great houses and what parties they had. He showed numerous photos.

The best balls were in the great House of Lord Londonderry where Lady Londonderry definitely had more jewellery than any Queen I have ever seen in *Hello* magazine. There was one photo of both the host and hostess—the Londonderrys—and Winston Churchill, Neville Chamberlain and there in the background a very young John Leslie.

He also said his father Shane went to all the activities of the Catholic Poetry Society and knew all the literary and political people of London but the one who was not liked was Sir Alfred Douglas (lover of Oscar Wilde) who eventually went to gaol for slander. The last ball that he remembers was in the loveliest house of them all—Norfolk House—and this must be in 1935. If your invitation said "*decorations*" at the bottom—it meant you had to wear all your decorations (medals etc) because Royalty would be there—Queen Mary and King George V. He recalled dancing the foxtrot with the Mitford sisters and listening to jazz in the Café de Paris.

Then one day, as the officers were walking back from Mass, a soldier came out and said "*Germany has invaded Poland—we are at war*". They were all shocked but knew they had to do something

and he remembered Winston Churchill saying "*Be prepared, be prepared*" and he was the person to take over. He hated war, was horrified by war, hated human suffering but he loved organising, which is something quite different. And here he showed us a photo of Winston Churchill in typical bellicose mood in front of a BBC microphone. (I had doubts if John was indeed talking about Churchill at this point until the photo.) But there was a certain naiveté about Sir John Leslie that came across on screen extremely well

Then before he knew it—they were taken down on buses to Dover and embarked on steamers and when they woke on the morning they were in Boulogne Harbour and saw sunken ships all around them with masts sticking up out of the water and they were told—rather needlessly I thought—that the Germans were very near. However they dug in quickly and German tanks were coming over the hill, bullets flying all around but rifles against tanks were never going to be the smart option and a German stood over them with a stick bomb (?) and they all surrendered.

The same debacle at Calais, Dunkirk and the English Expeditionary Forces were imprisoned or else on their way back in *ignoble retreat* to England. (The italics in this case are mine JH.) John Leslie stated that the Germans treated the English wounded exactly like their own. And then they were on the road and by rail to Munich and the Red Cross gave them water and biscuits and 1,500 officers ended up in this huge barracks, where they were to stay for the next five years. The ordinary soldiers had a better time of it because they were able to work in farms, which was especially nice for extra food benefits, but also in the coal and salt mines. The Geneva Convention prevented the officers from working and this was respected by the Germans according to the account given by Sir John Leslie who never breathed a word about his close family ties to Churchill.

After the War Leslie went to Rome for the next forty years, where he led a riotous party life again in all the best palazzos and he returned home in 1994 when Sammy, his niece, urged him to come back and report for some duties like showing people around, planting trees, tidying things up, and attending discos which he loved.

He showed us his grave and said, as the Leslies were Catholic, they were buried within the Castle walls. His father Shane had given the old pilgrimage islands of Lough Derg, Co. Donegal to the Bishop of Clogher (they had long been a penitential

place for the old Irish so this was only right and fitting in my book). For this, Sir Shane, despite his widespread philandering—his first wife Marjorie, the daughter of Henry Clay Ide, United States Ambassador to Spain and mother of his three children Anita, John and Desmond (d. 2001), used to refer to his ladies as "*Shane's band of alley-cats*"—received in 1960 from the Pope the honour of Knight Commander of St. Gregory. He married his second wife Iris in 1958, seven years after the death of his first wife.

Throughout his life Shane suffered from nervous breakdowns and he was quite indifferent to his children. His daughter Anita wrote:

"It was not that he disliked us, he would just have preferred if we had not existed."

Her brother John showed some of that sympathy which hugely endeared him to me because from what I have read I thought Shane Leslie to be a right scoundrel.

Mark Bence Jones was filmed after one of his strokes and so that alone made understanding him quite difficult as his speech had been affected. But he—with wasps literally crawling over his face sat in the garden of his home Glenville Park spoke to camera about what he termed in a Yeatsian phrase—the Ascendancy. Indeed we were interrupted when a man with a bull-horn shouted out that Bence Jones's book *Twilight of the Ascendancy*, Constable and Co. London. 1987 was for sale and that he had written on every big house in the country.

Bence Jones was married to Gillian—a large landowner from Suffolk who once brought out a collection of poems—and they had a son and two daughters. There was one scene in the film where Gillian was reading—dreadfully—presumably from her awful 'poems' and there, caught in the camera's glare, was a somewhat mortified-looking (to this viewer anyway) Tom McCarthy, who in real life works in the Cork Library and is quite an accomplished poet himself.

Bence Jones too was a Catholic and was one time Chancellor of the Irish Association of the Knights of Malta. He left Glenville to his daughter Silvia who showed us the log-book for those who stayed in Glenville. There was the signature of the Bishop of Lahore, Dorothy Bell of Fota House, and Elizabeth Bowen of Bowen's Court.

We went off on a drive and found the signage for Farahy and there over a gate Mark Bence Jones told us the familiar

story of Elizabeth Bowen selling her house to a local man who in no time at all demolished it. The outrage is always reserved for this local man and not for the woman who *spent* her way into a situation that demanded as a solution for her problems—the immediate and quiet sale of her 'Big House'.

But Glenville too had pots collecting rainwater, and no proper ESB wiring only what the grandfather, who had been an engineer in Lahore, had mocked up. The trailing wires would be enough for any sane person to run for their life. But the lack of light according to Silvia had a good point and that was that one could never see what one was eating for the dinner. As the camera panned over this dismal setting, the clever song sung on the sound-track was that old classic, '*The party is over*' as the camera lens lingered over the dust and mould and dank decay.

Silvia thought she would get a Leader grant to keep Glenville going, maybe for an artist's recording studio—it was after all only twenty miles away from Cork city and airport. She also thought she could get the ESB in to wire the whole house and she was thinking of other options that would enable her to keep the house going.

At Kinsale, when Patrick Cooney asked us to give a clap for someone who represented the 'Big House', I know now that the youngish shy woman who stood up was Silvia Bence Jones and I wish her all the best for the future. But for the political context of these 'Big Houses' I go again to none other than Edmund Burke who wrote to his son Richard, who was agent for the Catholic Committee in Dublin. The Protestant Ascendancy were "*an Ascendancy of Hucksters*", a "*Jobb-Ascendancy*", "*a junto of Robbers*". In 1792 Burke wrote also:

"This protestant ascendancy means nothing like an influence obtained by virtue, by love, or even by artifice and seduction... It is neither more nor less than the resolution of one set of people in Ireland to consider themselves as the sole citizens in the commonwealth; and to keep a dominion over the rest by reducing them to absolute slavery under a military power; and thus fortified in their power, to divide the publick estate, which is the result of general contribution, as a military booty solely amongst themselves" (Deane, op-cit p.23)

**Julianne Herlihy ©**

On-line sales of books, pamphlets  
and magazines:  
<https://www.atholbooks-sales.org>

# Irish Times Demands A New German Imperialism

Paul Gillespie expounds on the world in an authoritative tone for *The Irish Times* which—since the start of the end of the crisis and the Irish change of government which was obviously much to its taste—has been pursuing a 'realist' view of the crisis, supporting the Noonan Government in securing debt relief 'deals' from the Eurozone, which its editorials repeatedly equate with Germany.

Gillespie has travelled far since his espousal of "*permanent revolution*" but in this and other views appears to have retained some of the grim reductionist assumptions that underlay that once fashionable view of human affairs. In a recent commentary he lamented the reluctance of Germany to act as the "*regional hegemon*" of Europe and outlined German short-comings which prevent it from fulfilling this rightful imperial role:

"Germany... lacks some of the key attributes of regional economic and political leadership, such as the willingness to supply counter-cyclical credit, fund debt write-downs, provide a market of last resort or co-ordinate macro-economic policy. It is... reluctant to provide the political and military security normally supplied by regional hegemons" (*Germany may have to choose between 'sound money' and the euro's survival, 12 January*).

Leaving aside the accuracy of Gillespie's remarkably benevolent view of "*regional hegemons*", this statement involves a breathtaking set of assumptions. He argues that, instead of acting robustly in the role of benevolent imperial protector and imposing the "*radical solutions*" needed—to which its economic power apparently entitles it—Germany has remained wedded to "*minimalist {solutions} based on the available consensus*" leading to a "*perpetual struggle between sub-optimal outcomes and the consequent problems thrown up by such incomplete designs*". The only meaning this can have is that Germany should stop acting in accordance with the majority will of the Eurozone states and instead use its "*hegemonic*" power to impose the type of monetarist money-printing solutions long advocated by the cynical mouthpieces of the European currency's chief competitors, the *Financial Times* and *New York Times*.

In his call for Germany also to "*provide... the military security normally supplied by regional hegemons*", Gillespie is echoing another complaint regularly heard in the Anglosphere about Germany—its "*failure*" to take on more of the Western military "*burden*" in the world, most recently by remaining outside the Western Imperial military projects in Libya and Syria (before the latter was halted in its tracks by the intervention of Russia). In this anniversary year of 1914, with the credibility of the traditional British 'thesis' on the responsibility for that War *lying squarely with 'German militarism'* in tatters, the cry of the Anglosphere is that now Germany is not militarist enough! Gillespie has aligned himself with this pathetic war cry too.

Gillespie accuses Germany of what in modern 'political economy' (the tautological creed of today's power politics) is regarded as the greatest reprimand for a state: acting as a mercantilist power. Not only are German actions those of a mere "*geo-economic and commercial power, increasingly aware of its own interests*", but it is also allowing its state policies to be "*heavily constrained ... by its domestic politics*", i.e. by the German democracy. Even worse—and against the logic of current economic need—it has maintained its partnership with France, based on Jean Monnet's principle that "*Europe will be forged in crises and will be the sum of the solutions adopted from these crises*". The *Irish Political Review*, however, can report reliably that Germany will not be taking Paul's advice to destroy this historically revolutionary approach to consensual European decision making.

## "SOUND MONEY"

Gillespie castigates Germany's insistence on the principles of "*sound money*" and claims that "*The creditor states led by Germany have refused to fund... a 'transfer union', demanding debts be paid, albeit over a prolonged period.*" But there are few today who would seriously deny that a loosening of European purse strings at any time up to 2012—while bank regulation and monetary controls at national level remained in chaos—was a serious proposition or was supported by any state in the Eurozone, with the exception of Greece. It is equally

undeniable—as has been consistently reported (almost uniquely) in this journal—that there have been many statements from leading German and Eurozone leaders that issues such as legacy debt could be revisited once the banking and monetary union was actually and firmly in place.

The notion advanced by Paul Gillespie—that Germany faces a choice between its sound money policy and "*saving the euro*"—is truly bizarre. In fact it is the non-choice that was repeatedly put forward by the *Financial Times* over 2010-12 when its entire agitation could be interpreted as aimed at collapsing the currency (as recently stated by Michael Noonan himself). The end of the euro crisis appears in fact to most Germans (and Europeans) as final proof of the success of a sound money policy in actually saving the currency.

Germany will never abandon 'sound money' as Gillespie advocates. If there is one constant and absolutely fundamental principle of German economic policy since the last World War, it is that it will never again involve itself in funny money, which it sees as having precipitated the last catastrophic world economic crisis. In the German system it can be said that money is quarantined with a remit to serve real economic production and is prevented from becoming a determining productive force itself. Every stage in the history of the European Monetary Union has consisted of Germany accommodating French "*growth policy*", on condition of a "*sound money*" system with "*Bundesbank type rules*". This formula has been maintained since such a union was first mooted in the 1969 Werner Report of the Commission, which at the time had become the driver of a deepening European integration.

Gillespie raises another red herring (also a favourite of *Financial Times* commentators)—the alleged threat of Germany leaving the euro. This is a left-wing and/or eurosceptic fantasy which has no basis in reality. The only force in Germany to even lamely question current German commitment to the euro—the much hyped economist-inspired "Alternative for Germany"—achieved less than 3% of the vote in the recent federal election despite considerable media hype and the support of countless 'important people' for its propositions.

## THE ELEPHANT IN THE ROOM

Gillespie is on new ground in that at least he appears to be discussing the health and prospects of the Eurozone. But halfway through his article he goes and loses all

coherence by introducing a Power which is not even a member of the currency he seemed to have been discussing, and writing as if the EU and Eurozone are a *continuum* and the same thing. He says: "The UK's gradual withdrawal from deep engagement in the EU plays into this picture of a system unbalanced between its major powers". The fact, however, is that British antics in Europe are aimed purely and simply at minimising the integration of the Eurozone. Its leaders have been quite forthright in stating that the British national purpose in remaining within the EU is to prevent it becoming anything, and in the process retaining a veto over the development of the Euro. The British press have been weaving a tale as to how this card has been repeatedly played with great success since at least Thatcher's time, and how Britain successfully disrupted the deepening of European integration and replacing it with a policy of mindless 'expansion' instead. How does Gillespie retain his blind spot and fail again to mention this elephant in the room?

The absence of European coherent policy, which would clearly differentiate the serious business of the Eurozone from the more marginal system of bureaucratic arrangements to which the edifice of the EU has been reduced, is hopelessly missed in Gillespie's commentary. If he would step back from his trees (and windmills) to see the wood, he would rapidly realise that Pat Cox's stoking of civil war in the Ukraine is only the latest manifestation of this destructive British-inspired policy direction, a trajectory only conceivable while the coherence of the Eurozone remains incomplete. An integrated Eurozone would rapidly return to restoring a balance with Russia.

#### THE "PERIPHERY"

Gillespie laments the failure of a French-led "*southern alliance*" to counter German money policy. But France has never gone in for such a destructive approach and remains wedded to its core 'critical' alliance with Germany. At no time during the recent crisis did France ever advocate a monetary policy other than that of 'sound money', whatever 'growth' elements it has sought to bolt onto it. The very notion of "*periphery*" economies is also debatable. How "*peripheral*" is Spain, Italy or, indeed, Ireland? It is a notion that can only have meaning in a world seen as one defined by competing "*major powers*" and geopolitical "*hegemons*" as Gillespie clearly does.

Gillespie's view of a prolonged 'peri-

phery' country deflation trap makes little sense in the cases of Ireland or Spain. In what way can these (re-)growing economies be described as caught in a deflationary spiral? Is he seriously advocating expanding borrowing—i.e. growing the national debt—of countries where it already tops 120%, in order to end the non-problem of "*deflation*"? Keynes must surely be turning in his grave. Gillespie says Ireland has been left with no choice but to follow a tight system of monetary rules. This is true, but it is a system that was decisively and overwhelmingly accepted by the electorate in a referendum which endorsed the new euro system and the monetary and banking union now being put in place.

THE OTHER WING OF *THE IRISH TIMES*

## "Come all ye ultramontane anti-revisionists...."

Eunan O'Halpin, Bank of Ireland Professor of Contemporary Irish History at TCD, has a chapter in a recent book called *Death And Dying In Ireland, Britain, And Europe: Historical Perspectives*, edited by James Kelly; Mary Ann Lyons, published by IAP. O'Halpin's contribution is called: *Problematic Killing During The War Of Independence And Its Aftermath; civilian spies and informers*.

This issue is his preoccupation at the moment. He introduces his topic in a way that makes all the killings in the War and the War itself automatically 'problematic':

"The IRA's treatment of alleged spies must be considered in terms of the fact that republicans saw the War of independence as one where British forces engaged in a campaign of systematic terror, murder and despoliation" (p.318).

The assumption here is that this 'fact' was just a republican 'fact'. Doubt is cast on the objective fact that the British forces engaged in these actions to nullify the effort to establish a legitimate Irish state based on the overwhelming election result of 1918. If that elemental fact is problematic, then it was a war of choice by the Republican forces. And therefore all killings were indeed problematic at best and murderous at worst. All spies and informers become 'alleged' spies, except of course those supporting the British forces where they would be doing their moral duty in so spying and informing.

If the Professor thinks that the War was a republican war of choice he should read the London *Times* of the period, which could hardly be disturbed as a Republican mouthpiece. Ireland chose to vote and

If the proposal of *The Irish Times* is for Ireland to follow a singular policy of seeking 'legacy debt' compensation, perhaps this should be made more widely known to its own other 'leading commentators'. If there was ever an argument that Ireland is a dysfunctional state, dominated by corrupt 'elites', and undeserving of any such compensation, it is the case relentlessly put forward by another IT staffer—Fintan O'Toole—which was given extensive coverage in the influential German *Sueddeutsche Zeitung* just as coalition negotiations began last Summer and again last month in the *New York Times*. Perhaps with the appearance of Gillespie's piece we should be thankful for small mercies.

Philip O'Connor

Britain chose to go to war. Then Ireland chose to defend itself in that war. It was a people's war attested by Local Elections results, along with another General Election in the midst of the War in 1920 which produced more overwhelming results in favour of Sinn Fein than the 1918 Election. No mention is made of these elemental facts in O'Halpin's piece. War was optional for Britain—not for Ireland unless it had lost all self-respect. This is the irrefutable ABC of modern Irish history.

The Professor has a fixation on Cork as more civilians were killed there than in other counties. He seems to assume that such things must form some definite numerical pattern per county. But all wars vary in intensity at different times and in different places.

"County Cork therefore stands out... not only for being the most violent overall, but for having by far the largest absolute proportion of civilian spies killed by the IRA, but also for having the largest proportion of civilian spies in the overall total of deaths" (p.327).

But O'Halpin is not satisfied with simply recording what happened. He poses the question—why such killings in Cork?: "*The answer surely lies in the frame of mind of the local IRA leadership, particularly the Cork No. 1 Brigade*" (p.330).

And what is likely to have created their frame of mind? I would suggest it was their own history which was the primary factor that shaped their minds. History does that sort of thing, as any Professor of

the subject might accept. Cork and Munster generally had its own historical characteristics. It was there that the Whiteboy movement was strongest, as was the Fenians, the Land League, and the All for Ireland League—that overthrew Redmondism there 8 years before the rest of the country did so in 1918.

It also had many groups of very loyalist supporters and was dotted with garrison towns and was put under martial law from an early date. And it made the last stand for the independent Republic. In the tradition of O'Sullivan Beare, many people there never willingly bent the knee to illegitimate power. So the War had, like every other conflict in Cork and Munster, almost inevitably a certain piquancy to it—shall we say.

But, in relation to the specific question of identifying spies in this area, the IRA had a top class Intelligence source, Josephine Marchmont, head clerk at General Strickland's 6th Division Headquarters at Victoria Barracks, who became the fiancé and later the wife of Cork's IRA Intelligence Chief, Florence O'Donoghue. It is story worthy of the Hollywood treatment. O'Halpin is surprised at the lack of conscience by Cork Republicans of their actions on spies. Their main intelligence source helped give them that clear conscience.

O'Halpin mentions none of this and one is left wondering instead whether there was some sort of blood lust in the Cork No. 1 Brigade despite the fact that the leaders were determinedly neutral in the War over the Treaty which could have been a great opportunity for such lusts if they were that way inclined. Such behaviour was the prerogative of the Republicans' enemy, the Free State, who 'disappeared' people at will.

He is an avid supporter of the 'disappeared' thesis of Gerard Murphy, who claims many unidentified people were shot there for sectarian reasons. Murphy's allegations, O'Halpin says, are a "necessarily speculative attempt to address the question of who might have been abducted and killed by the IRA's Cork No. 1 Brigade" (p.342), but "It is very likely that material in crucial sources such as the *Military Service Pensions* .... Will bear out the thrust of Murphy's research as regards the scale of the secret killing" (ibid).

So the Professor is happily promoting Murphy's thesis before the evidence is available. This must be a new and unique approach by a Professor of history to his subject.

Murphy's thesis on the basis of 'what

might have been' should follow the advice O'Halpin gives in another context, the killing of the 'Cairo Gang':

"Dead men leave behind them traumatised families, unpaid bills, unanswered letters, and their futures. Blood, brain matter, torn flesh, remorse or lack of it is everywhere. The killers are marked forever, whether they realise it or not by the horror of what they wrought." (p.319).

Exactly. In other words, people very rarely disappear without trace. But Murphy does not provide this type of evidence for the numerous 'disappeared' or for the killings he alleges, nor does our Professor expect it. Perhaps he—and O'Halpin—should visit any Garda Station and witness how the rawest recruit to the force would approach the report of a disappeared person and apply it to their thesis. "Who are you talking about, Sir?" would be the first, obvious question and if that could not be answered satisfactorily there and then there could be a charge made against the complainant of wasting police time.

Towards the end of his piece O'Halpin lashes out at those who will not be satisfied by the evidence yet to come to support

Murphy's thesis. He predicts both what the evidence will be and what the reaction to it will be: "...be they ultramontane anti-revisionists, fastidious academics, or hybrids with a foot in both camps" (p.343). A Professor of history lambasts 'fastidious academics'! This says a lot more about him than it does about the 'fastidious academics'. He clearly prefers another type. I suspect it is those who are 'necessarily speculative' in their history writing, which is a much easier type of history to write. What a joker!

Many readers may be mystified by this unusual description of some anti-revisionists as *ultramontane*. Infallibility should follow next. There is a logic to this, as Cork city has its very own version of ultramontaniam. His reference to it must originate from his fixation with Cork and his absorption of an aspect of Cork city's culture that regards people "from the back of Musherah", County Cork's highest mountain, as being beyond its comprehension and something of a law unto themselves. It's a Cork version of 'beyond the Pale'—and it is precisely where the unmentionable Aubane is located. But a rose by any other name .....

Jack Lane

## Book Review

### Lethal Allies!

Colonel Morgan reviewed the aptly-titled *Lethal Allies* by Ann Cadwallader (Mercier Press) in the December issue of *Irish Political Review*. His concern was with the way the book dealt with the Dublin/Monaghan Bombings of 1974, which he had researched for many years prior to publication of his *Dublin/Monaghan Bombings 1974, A Military Analysis*. He did not feel qualified to comment on other aspects of Ann Cadwallader's book.

Ann Cadwallader herself is a journalist of many years' standing. She started out with the BBC in Yorkshire, moving on to Belfast and Dublin. Eventually she became a producer for RTE. I remember her writing in the *Irish Press* and that her articles were factual and to the point. She was Northern Editor for the Group. She is currently a case worker for the Pat Finucane Centre. (She is married to Gerry O'Hare, perhaps best-known for being the former husband of Rita). I understand that he was originally in People's Democracy and then drifted towards the Republicans, for whom he edited the *United Irishman*.)

With the abysmal state of Irish academia

on national issues, the Derry-based Pat Finucane Centre (PFC) has become a beacon for serious research and an alternative repository of knowledge and documentation—albeit in the narrow field of 'Troubles'-related history. It has many researchers and volunteers, trawls the archives in Kew and elsewhere—and makes its findings available to all.

The PFC has also provided a haven for Justice For The Forgotten (JFF), which investigates and comments on the 1974 Dublin/Monaghan Bombings, after it lost its funding from the Irish State. Margaret Urwin, Secretary to JFF, is now associated with the PFC.

#### 'MURDER TRIANGLE'

While there is a Chapter on the Dublin/Monaghan Bombings in *Lethal Allies*, the bulk of the book is concerned with the killings of Catholics in what Frs. Raymond Murray and Denis Faul dubbed the "Murder Triangle", which is located to the South of Belfast. Ann Cadwallader defines its extent as follows:

"The range of the 'Triangle' stretches beyond Counties Tyrone and Armagh, to Dundalk and Monaghan in the south and

down to Dublin. The most northerly attack was in Ahoghill, Co. Armagh, and the most southerly (within Northern Ireland) in Crossmaglen, Co. Armagh" (p15-16).

The book relates the stories of 120 Catholics killed in this 'triangle' between 1972 and 1978. Most of these were not involved in politics, and just one was a Republican. Many of these killings were the work of a grouping based in Portadown, though others were also involved. The book found that members of the Ulster Volunteer Force collaborated with individuals in State forces—RUC, RUC Reserve, and the Ulster Defence Regiment. British Intelligence does not feature in this section.

An important source for the research are the reports produced by HET—the Historical Enquiries Team, a police unit established to re-examine selected conflict-related deaths and which is answerable to the Chief Constable of Northern Ireland. Members of the team have some access to old police records and apply police methods to the information contained in them. HET Reports have sometimes yielded damning results where the original investigation was often minimal.

The Pat Finucane Centre assists families to apply for HET investigations and in return they make the private Reports available to the Centre, where they become part of its Archive.

The HET reports are of variable quality. However they have been the only avenue (apart from mounting onerous court cases) into police records by bereaved families seeking answers. As Cadwallader says, "*Many families have been bitterly disappointed by HET Reports. In some cases, while collusive actions appear to be evident, HET Reports fail to draw the obvious conclusions*" (p17). Moreover Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, a UK body, found in July 2013 that HET investigations showed bias when investigating killings by British armed forces while on duty. The future of HET is currently in doubt.

Sinn Féin has proposed that some kind of Truth and Reconciliation Commission would take evidence about all conflict-related deaths, but this has found little favour with others. It was one of the proposals considered by Richard Haass.

In her Acknowledgements, Ann Cadwallader pays particular tribute to Alan Brecknell, whose father Trevor was killed along with two others in Donnelly's Bar near Newry on 19th December 1974, while celebrating the birth of his first daughter with friends and with workmates from the

nearby engineering plant. Searching for answers as to how RUC and UDR men could have been involved in the killing of his father, he found a lot of information. He then helped others in a similar situation. From that grew the association with the PFC and the database which forms the basis of *Lethal Allies*—a book which is very much the result of a collaboration by a tightly-knit group which has analysed and cross-referenced its HET Reports along with other materials, particularly documents from the British State Archive at Kew.

Ann Cadwallader has presented the information garnered in a coherent and readable manner and the text has photographs and brief profiles of the victims by family members interspersed.

The account given of the Donnelly's Bar killings gives a flavour of the substance of the book:

"Ann Brecknell was in Daisy Hill Hospital in Newry, recovering from giving birth two days earlier to her first daughter, Róisín. At Donnelly's Bar, not far away in the village of Silverbridge, her husband, Trevor, aged thirty-two, was planning to 'wet the child's head' in celebration. Friends and work colleagues from a small engineering plant nearby had joined him in the small bar, attached to a filling station and a house owned by a local couple, Gerard and Marie Donnelly. The atmosphere was typical of any Friday night in thousands of bars up and down the country. People were looking forward to the weekend ahead, and to Christmas, which was less than a week away.

"Patsy Donnelly (no relation to the bar owner), aged twenty-four, was filling his car up with petrol on his way to see his girlfriend. Michael Donnelly, Gerard and Marie's son, still just fourteen, was helping out at the petrol pumps. People were just beginning to hear news of the carnage in Kay's Tavern across the border when a car drew up to the pumps and a man opened fire with an SMG {Sub-Machine Gun}, hitting Patsy Donnelly in the head. He fell dead, face-down, near the pumps. Another man, John Taylor (Ann Brecknell's brother-in-law) was hit in the shoulder and jaw and collapsed. From where he lay on the ground, he could see the blurred figure of a gunman, laughing.

"Young Michael Donnelly ran into his dad's bar, where about twenty-six people were enjoying their evening. The gunman followed him. Inside, Margaret Taylor (Ann Brecknell's sister and John Taylor's wife) was talking to Trevor, who was about to raise his glass. Margaret saw Michael running into the bar, immediately followed by a gunman who opened fire, hitting her in the head. Another man, Brendan McConville, was also hit, taking cover under a pool table. He later des-

cribed the gunman as having a 'Mexican-style moustache'. Another customer, Jimmy McCreesh, remembers standing near Trevor and seeing the gunman push his weapon through a small glass pane in the inner door. As he turned away, Jimmy was hit twice in the back.

"Other customers had already dived for cover. Five people were immediately hit with bullets, including Trevor Brecknell. Jimmy says Trevor was dead before he hit the ground.

"A second man then ran into the bar, throwing in a bomb. It exploded with a blue flash as the gunmen ran out and the bar was plunged into darkness.. Customers were buried under rubble. Fourteen-year-old Michael Donnelly was hit on the head by fragments of rubble and killed. His father, Gerard, heard the shots and was caught in the rush of his fleeing customers when the bomb went off. He returned in the darkness and, using a flash lamp, found the body of his son in the debris.

"Ambulances began taking the dead and injured to the nearest hospital, Daisy Hill, in Newry. Ann Brecknell saw them arriving, little realising how her life was about to change. Pathology reports show all three of the dead had died instantaneously from head wounds.

"The RUC did not move in to examine the scene until the following day (the Royal Scots Dragoon Guards, who had been on the scene just after the bombing, had withdrawn after heavy stoning from an angry crowd). As the HET puts it, "There was significant hostility towards the security forces particularly the Army in the area, with considerable suspicion locally that the security forces were colluding with loyalist paramilitaries. The Red Hand Commando group admitted responsibility for both the Kay's Tavern bombing and the killings at Donnelly's Bar.

"Detective Sergeant Gerry McCann, one of relatively few Catholic detectives at the time, headed the RUC investigation. From eyewitness accounts, the gunman armed with the SMG appeared to be a known loyalist from Portadown. Hoping for an early arrest, McCann circulated a photofit picture to Special Branch in Portadown and waited to hear back. And waited. But with no response. Finally, knowing his suspect would be at the unemployment office in Portadown at a specific time, McCann went there himself and brought along an eyewitness. The suspect duly put in an appearance, but to McCann's surprise had substantially changed his appearance. McCann found this highly suspicious. Had the suspect been tipped-off about the photofit circulating within Special Branch in Portadown? Since then, however, the HET has established that the suspect was named within Special Branch databases as having been involved in the Donnelly's Bar attack.. McCann was never told this, but his hunch had been correct all along.

The individual was never arrested for questioning about the Donnelly's Bar attack.

"There is more evidence of collusion. The bar's owner, Gerard Donnelly, told McCann about a rare police raid on his premises six days before the attack. The officers had insisted on visiting his own residential quarters, and opening all its doors. It had seemed like a genuine raid at the time. The RUC had warned him against serving drink after hours and to under-age customers. Now he wondered if they had been scouting the premises. McCann searched the police attendance record at Forkhill police station, but there was no record of the raid. The HET also comments on the 'highly unusual' absence of this record. South Armagh was at that time a dangerous environment for police, so such a check would routinely have required pre-planned British Army back-up. The HET concludes that the police 'check' was in fact 'pre-attack reconnaissance', in which case it was carried out entirely by RUC members..." (pp135-138; *Lethal Allies* mentions such spurious 'checks' in other instances, and also that a Loyalist was discovered to have a batch of pub-layouts based on such checks).

Cadwallader then considers the failure to follow up leads about the car, the explosives, and the timing, which was such that the same personnel could have been involved as in the Kay's Tavern explosion. Ballistics evidence is then reviewed. A connection with Mitchell's Farm (Glennane) later emerged. This was a meeting place for security personnel and loyalists (and was a staging post in the Dublin/Monaghan Bombings). All these add up to a damning catalogue of an investigation into the Donnelly's Bar attack that was in reality a cover-up.

Alan Brecknell has not left the matter there. Following on from a case in the Strasbourg Court, *Brecknell v. the United Kingdom*, the family is taking a case to the NI Police Ombudsman. The HET "is referring its concerns to the same office" (p142).

All this information is well-supplied with end-notes, and there are some footnotes as well.

#### HIDDEN HAND?

It can be seen that the core of *Lethal Allies* is evidence-based. Collusion—cooperation—between members of the overt security forces and paramilitaries is documented.

What does not appear along with these stories is the role of the British security apparatus. The emphasis is on the cooperation between elements of the police and UDR with paramilitaries. But that is not really the most important part of the

story.

In a way, the *continuum* within Unionism is natural. The armed forces of Unionism preceded the establishment of the devolved administration, and they protected it from overthrow. Unionist civil society was a single entity of which paramilitary policing was an integral part. It seems artificial to make a distinction between the police and civil society for this period. The Catholics were not part of civil society at that stage. It is the Provo war that has won them that place.

Of course there had to be a pretence that policing was objective, but in case after case recounted by *Lethal Allies*, investigation of killings of Catholics was cursory, to say the least.

But there was much more to the killings recounted in this book than Protestant policing of Catholics. Anne Cadwallader and the PFC are aware of that. In the Introduction she says "I... contend that Britain, like other colonial powers in dozens of conflicts, used what amounted to 'surrogates' to prosecute its battle against insurgents" (p16). She also has an add-on to the story part of the book, a Chapter entitled *From Dhofar To Armagh*, dealing with counter-insurgency, as used by the British from the Irish War of Independence onwards. The Chapter starts with a quotation from Thomas Mockaitis (a prominent American academic specialising in strategic studies and liaises with the military):

"The British have succeeded in counter-insurgency where others have failed because history has given them the kind of military establishment and colonial administrative experience necessary to defeat revolutionary movements" (*British Counter-Insurgency 1919-1960*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1995, p180).

In this Chapter, Cadwallader deals with London use of "surrogates to carry out duties with which it would rather not sully its hands publicly" (p341). She points out that between 1945 and 2013 the British Army says it has been engaged with 17 rebellions. It claims victory in seven of these: Malaya, Kenya, Brunei, Malaysia, Radfan, Dhofar and Northern Ireland. (Anne Cadwallader makes no comment on the claim of Northern Ireland as a British victory.) One of the encounters is described as a draw: Cyprus. Five interventions are said to be failures: Palestine, Egypt and Aden (three times).

(Incidentally, the Palestine failure seems to have been because Britain did not train and use the Arabs against the Jewish rebels when it was fighting to retain control. In other words, it did not

use a classic anti-insurgency tactic. But that is not surprising since the Jewish nationalist 'enemy' had recently been planted in Palestine by Britain itself to be a "little loyal Jewish Ulster" (as Ronald Storrs put it) for use against the Arab Middle East.)

Other British military involvements are described as ongoing or "unquantifiable". The source for these facts is the *Counter-Revolutionary Warfare Handbook*, produced by the Army Staff College, Camberley, Royal Military Academy, Sandhurst, 1988, as cited in Col. I.A. Rigden, *The British Approach To Counter-Insurgency* (Army War College, Pennsylvania 1988).

*Lethal Allies* goes on to deal with the work of Frank Kitson and others on Counter-Insurgency, who advocate the use of "counter gangs" as surrogate or proxy forces (p349). Kitson also noted the need to tie in "the legal services into the war effort in as discreet a way as possible" (*Gangs And Counter-Gangs* p46).

Cadwallader goes on to say:

"Collusion, likewise, between state forces, the British Army and locally recruited paramilitaries, was not unthinkable in past and parallel colonial-style conflicts. Why should it be different in Ireland?" (p354).

Cadwallader suggests in an earlier Chapter, *Her Majesty's Murderers*, that it would be wrong to view "the loyalist gunmen and bombers who killed so many decent people" as "the real villains in this book". These were to be found—

"on the British honours lists of the past few decades, and old gentlemen living comfortably on civil service and political pensions in the English shires".

While there can be no argument with this, the Chapter goes on :to look at the calibre of the individual loyalist paramilitaries they exploited" (p320). Here are to be found profiles of some of the major Loyalist figures named in the text. Similarly, an Appendix to the book lists local security force personnel "involved in murder and other serious criminal offences—Mid-Ulster 1970s". The British Intelligence apparatus in the area is not referred to.

In fact the major British players are notably lacking in the story. There is no account of the various British Intelligence and Military groupings set up on foot of the strategy set out by Kitson and others mentioned. There have been a number of books on these themes and it would have been good to see a correlation made

between the local perpetrators and the British string-pullers.

There is a divide in the book between the detailed and meticulous description of the assassination strategy as it was put into effect by British local surrogates and the proper attribution of responsibility for what happened. If someone stopped reading at page 319, the impression would be left of Loyalists on the rampage with helpers in three arms of the local security services. They would not carry away any idea of British culpability.

The vivid story form of the incidents described is what leaves the impression on the reader: the somewhat theoretical and abstract suggestion later on that these were merely the henchmen of the British would not have the same impact on the reader. This dichotomy would tend to set off Hibernian reflexes amongst some readers. (That is to say, they would blame 'black' Protestants for what was happening, rather than the governing power.)

That impression would be reinforced by the lack of context: there is no mention of the way Britain in 1920 established one community in power over an aggrieved population, balked of its place in an Irish polity. And then refused to intervene until after its policy had caused a defensive insurrection.

#### STRATEGIES

The incidents described by Cadwallader are part of a worked-out strategy to break the will of the Catholic community and make it turn on the warriors who had brought this terrible retribution upon them. But the Catholic community did not wish for peace on the terms available in the 1970s: back to Unionist rule and second-class status in housing, jobs, community life and above all politics. That is why it held firm behind the IRA.

One would have imagined that the book would have been sympathetic to the Provos, even if not overtly so. But there are very few references to the Republicans and most of them are hostile. For instance, an attack on Tullyvallen Orange Hall (1.9.1976) was "*an indiscriminate, sectarian attack*" (p124-5); in mounting the Kingsmill Ambush, in which 10 Protestant workmen were killed, "*IRA retaliation for the killings of the Reaveys and O'Dowds was immediate, terrible and inexcusable*" (p158); and, after the killing of Jim McLoughlin, there was "*what looks very like a retaliatory action on sectarian grounds, the IRA killed the Dobson brothers*" (p183).

Also, in the Chronology of the attacks covered in the book: 1972 to 1977, it appears out of place to see listed *Bloody*

*Friday—21st July 1972*. Surely this was a Belfast event, while the other entries in the Chronology relate to the 'Triangle' killings which are the subject of the book. (There is one other Belfast entry—a shooting in 1980 which is connected to the subject matter of the book.)

In the *Conclusion*:

"In the 1970s, even as the events in this book were unfolding, senior IRA leaders were unperturbed by the random sectarian assassination of their co-religionists. Dáithí Ó Conaill (1938-1991), a prominent republican and long-standing member of the IRA 'army council', told journalist Kevin Myers that, on the contrary, such murders could even be beneficial for the IRA. First, said Ó Conaill, because hardly any IRA men were ever killed; second, because they acted as a recruiting sergeant; and third, because they added to the general sense of anarchy that was 'vital... to the IRA campaign'..." (p361; the Myers reference is to *An Irishman's Diary*, Irish Times 23.4.2003).

I do not know if these were Ó Conaill's views or not. Ó Conaill was not around in 2003 to contest the words attributed to him by Myers: he died in 1991. It seems odd to take these remarks from a tainted source as a description of Republican views.

This approach is reminiscent of SDLP-type griping at the Republicans. It fits in with the idea that everything that has been achieved for the Catholic community in the last four decades could all have been got peacefully by street agitations, rent boycotts and the like. That one-dimensional view overlooks the British Government's intransigent determination to avoid taking direct responsibility for the way the Six County region of its state was governed; Unionist stubbornness in defending existing political structures and the discriminatory social system as a bulwark against Catholics outbreeding them, out-voting them and destroying the Union; and finally—and perhaps, the most important of all—the change the Catholic community itself underwent during its baptism of fire—a change which transformed it from a disgruntled and devious minority to a self-confident community capable of statesmanship.

There was always the danger that the Republican War in Northern Ireland would reduce itself to an inter-communal one. After the failure of Sunningdale, British policy was to reduce the conflict in the North to civil war: that was the meaning of Merlin Rees's *Ulsterisation* strategy. He took up that position after failing to save Power-Sharing by forcing the SDLP and the Irish Government to accept deferment of the Council of Ireland in the interests of saving the Executive.

The killings described in this book are mostly a result of the *Ulsterisation* of Britain's war. However, the Republican leadership was aware of that danger and took steps to curb retaliatory violence on Protestant civilians.

I was surprised to see Seamus Mallon of all people promoting *Lethal Allies*. He semi-retired from political prominence after becoming the first Deputy First Minister—and then allowing David Trimble to make a monkey out of him by refusing to work the Good Friday Agree—ment (which Tony Blair had forced him to endorse). Mallon, an ardent advocate of the power of non-violent tactics, could find no way to hold Unionism to the deal it had accepted. A statesman he is not.

He recently re-emerged from semi-retirement to pressure SDLP leader Alasdair McDonnell and the party to give credibility to Jim Allister's Traditional Unionist Voice—and to give Unionism its first victory in recent times. Mallon did that by overturning the SDLP leader's intention to oppose Allister's Bill banning Special Advisers from holding Office in the Northern administration if they had served more than five years in jail. This proposal was undoubtedly against the spirit of the Good Friday Agreement.

Sinn Fein was one vote short of a 'Petition of Concern', which would have triggered community voting and defeated Allister. Mallon had the SDLP abstain on the vote to make the proposal a community issue, which meant that Unionism had the simple majority needed to pass Allister's Bill. As a consequence, the centre of gravity in Unionism has shifted in Allister's direction, which leaves the majority Unionist party looking weak—and thereby threatens Power-Sharing.

Allister's victory in breaking the nationalist front is bound to translate to votes in the forthcoming election. But Mallon will not be too concerned about that. The current preference of leading SDLP members is for an end to Power-Sharing and a transition to some kind of weighted majority rule arrangement, which would enable the Party to hold power as the junior partner in a coalition with Unionists. At the moment it has been reduced to having just a single Minister in the Executive.

Despite these disruptive tactics, Mallon appears several times in *Lethal Allies*, where the SDLP is given a good press.

#### POWER-SHARING EXECUTIVE

And that brings us to Sunningdale. *Lethal Allies* has to mention the abortive 1974 Power-Sharing Agreement because

of the 1974 Dublin/Monaghan Bombings. No blame is laid at the door of the SDLP for insisting on immediate implementation of the grandiose Council of Ireland element of the Agreement, even at the cost of losing Power-Sharing.

The Ulster Workers' Council was formed as a result of the Sunningdale arrangements. But unfortunately *Lethal Allies* does not understand what the UWC was, nor how it differed from other Loyalist and Unionist groupings. On page 9, the UWC is defined as:

"an ad-hoc group of loyalist paramilitaries and unionist politicians which organised strikes and roadblocks to defeat (successfully) the 1974 Sunningdale Agreement on power-sharing and the Council of Ireland".

But that misses the point about the *Ulster Workers Council*: It was very much a group of Trade Unionists, the industrial working class of Belfast. Their Strike was a stoppage for political purposes. It was different in kind from previous 'Strikes' in Northern Ireland, such as those mounted by Bill Craig's middle class United Loyalist Council (see page 30: Craig's lieutenant, Trimble, is not mentioned).

There is also a serious misrepresentation of the object of the Strike" *"An all-out strike by the UWC against the power-sharing Executive seemed inevitable... the UWC declared the anticipated strike that would bring down power-sharing"* (p69). In fact, the Strike was declared on the specific issue of the setting up of a full Council of Ireland with a legislature and an executive to administer the whole island in areas which the two Governments might transfer to it. The stoppage was called after the Dublin Government which signed the Sunningdale Agreement declared in the High Court, in response to a legal challenge brought by Kevin Boland, that its signature did not imply any recognition of the legitimacy of Northern Ireland's position within the UK, and that the sovereignty claim of the Republic over the North still stood. This came as a shock to Unionists who thought the Southern sovereignty claim had been repealed by the Agreement.

The UWC group of Trade Union shop stewards then called a strike against the setting up of the Council until the issue was clarified, or until an election to Stormont was held in the light of the Dublin Government's statement in Court. If that election returned a majority for the Agreement, the Council could go ahead. The ending of the Power-Sharing Executive itself was not at issue.

A couple of months' notice was given

of the decision to call a Strike on these terms. Neither of the terms was met. It was declared that an Election could not be held for four years and that the setting up of the Council would go ahead on schedule. A third way of averting the Strike was a referendum in the South to repeal the sovereignty claim, but that was rejected by Dublin.

The Strike went ahead. It was effective because it was run by the shop stewards of the well-organised industrial working class, which of course was Protestant. The SDLP declared the Strike to be a Fascist rebellion and demanded that the British Government should smash it. The only way it could have been smashed was by the Army taking over the function of the skilled workers and trying to run electricity, water, industry etc. That was considered and not thought to be feasible.

The SDLP was encouraged in its intransigence over the Council by the Dublin Government, in which Conor Cruise O'Brien and Garret FitzGerald determined Northern policy. The partner of the SDLP in the Power-Sharing Government, Brian Faulkner's Unionist Party, found its position untenable after standing by the SDLP for two weeks, during which virtually the entire Protestant community declared support for the Strike, and it resigned. The SDLP said he was ready to form a government without Unionists. But the Secretary of State scrapped the Agreement instead. So Power-Sharing ended because of the refusal of the SDLP to negotiate on the Council.

There have been suggestions that elements of British Intelligence opposed to Prime Minister Harold Wilson and abhorred the Sunningdale Agreement were behind the UWC Strike. They may have hated the Agreement, but it is extremely improbable that they could have conducted a Strike in the Trade Union way that this one was conducted.

The Strike was effective because it was conducted by authentic Trade Unionists, in a methodical way, and was called on a specific point that appeared reasonable to many Unionists who were not opposed to power-sharing.

Ann Cadwallader describes this complex situation as follows:

"Concerned about a Dublin High Court ruling that the reunification of Ireland did not require the consent of a majority in Northern Ireland, the UUP leader, Brian Faulkner, travelled South to meet the Taoiseach Liam Cosgrave. The following day, an SDLP member, Hugh Logue,

called the Council of Ireland 'the vehicle that would trundle unionists into a united Ireland'. That day (17 January) at 7.40 pm loyalists went to Boyle's Bar... in the village of Cappagh, Co. Tyrone, and opened fire at random..." (p52).

And that's it.

#### DUBLIN/MONAGHAN BOMBING

Nor are there any remarks about the Irish failure to mount extra Border security in the crisis situation brought about by the UWC Strike.

In the context of previous experience in the 26 Counties, the Dublin/Monaghan Bombings were a foreseeable consequence of Irish policy, yet no extra defensive measures were put in place at this time of crisis. Colonel Morgan, in his book on the Bombings, sets out some of the defensive measures which he, as a military man, would have mounted—but nothing of the kind was done. He sees this as a deliberate omission by senior Garda officers colluding with British Intelligence.

It is hard to quarrel with Paisley's remark about *Dublin/Monaghan* in a BBC Northern Interview that political leaders in Dublin had "*brought that on themselves*" (see Dan Keenan, *Robinson Denounces Paisley Remarks On Bomb Attacks*" (IT 11.1.14).

It might be remarked that Dublin/Monaghan is so much forgotten that Dan Keenan, who is a Northern Correspondent of the *Irish Times*, was able to write in the same report:

"UVF attacks, two of them in central Dublin and the third in Monaghan town in May 1974, killed 33 people."

One would have thought that the Sub-Editor at least would have known that there were four bombs, three of which were in Central Dublin.

Then there is the matter of the Barron Report into the Dublin/Monaghan Bombings. Colonel Morgan also argues that Loyalists did not have the capacity to mount the sophisticated synchronised treble bombing in Dublin, with its diversionary follow-up in Monaghan: that professionals had organised the operation. In the Chapter *Bombs Know No Borders*, *Lethal Allies* gives consideration to a possible British Intelligence involvement in mounting the Bombings. It asks: "*Were the bombs solely the responsibility of loyalist paramilitaries? Or were British security services involved?*" (p214). However it is not pointed out that Justice Barron rejected this contention.

Instead of describing the Barron Report for what it was—a whitewash of Britain's

role, and of collusion by senior Garda officers—*Lethal Allies* says "It was not all the families wanted, but it was a huge step forward" (p227). Elsewhere there is a reference to its "damning findings" (p69).

Even the way *Lethal Allies* usually describes the Bombings as the "Dublin and Monaghan Bombings" is misleading. Col. Morgan—who is not mentioned in the book—has argued cogently that the way the operation was mounted showed a professionalism not evident in other Loyalist bombings. Apart from the nature, the siting, size and sophistication of the bombs, there was the timing of the Monaghan Bomb which indicated it was a diversionary operation, designed to facilitate the escape of the Bombers across the Border. Dublin and Monaghan were one operation. That is why he puts a slash between Dublin and Monaghan: *Dublin/Monaghan Bombings*. Justice Barron rejected this analysis, saying there was nothing to indicate the bombings were connected.

However, that said, Ann Cadwallader does provide the new information that "senior RUC officers... had even known of plans to bomb Dublin and Monaghan in May 1974" (p275).

#### CONCLUDING

*Lethal Allies* says that the UVF was founded in 1912 (p322; on p9 the date of formation is given as 1st January 1913). There is no reference to Gusty Spence's memoirs, in which he describes what is in effect the founding of the modern UVF by senior figures in Unionism in the 1960s, politicians disgusted at Terence O'Neill's limited *rapprochement* with Sean Lemass.

On another minor point, the Orange Order is said to have been "formed in 1876" (p8). My understanding is that it was founded in the 1790s.

The book is not well indexed: the Notes are not included, which is a pity as there is useful information in them. Thus the note to a reference to "the killings of an RUC chief superintendent and a superintendent on 20 March 1989" (p159) leads to the fact that it is Chief Supt. Harry Breen and Supt. Bob Buchanan who are referred to (Notes, p385). Neither appear in the Index. As the two were the subject of the Smithwick Tribunal, this is more than a trivial detail.

Despite these flaws, I would commend this book to readers who want to know what went on in the 'murder triangle' in the 1970s. The dossier of research is presented in such a way that puts flesh on what is often presented in a dry, statistical manner.

The book confirms what Sinn Fein has said all along about security force collusion in the extra-judicial unionist offensive against nationalist civilians—something very few people believed while it was being said.

Angela Clifford

## Did Borgonovo Miss The Point About The First Dáil And War?

I have not yet read Charles Townshend's latest (2013) book, *The Republic: The Fight for Irish Independence, 1918-1923*, and would not directly comment on it without doing so. But I can comment on a somewhat bizarre review of that book in the *Sunday Times* of 29th September last, by Martin Mansergh, the one-time special political advisor on Northern Ireland to three successive Fianna Fáil Taoisigh—Haughey, Reynolds and Ahern—before becoming a Fianna Fáil TD 2007-11 and a Junior Minister 2008-11. Mansergh's review of Townshend is a prime example of the thought disorder that has overwhelmed the Soldiers of Destiny in this present century:

"The author stresses the political purpose behind all the violence of those five years. The Volunteers were trying to maximise Irish freedom, while the British were trying to suppress violence so that it led no further than 26-county Home Rule, but had to resort to copious counter-violence in the process. Townshend does not in any way minimise the degrees of darkness inherent to any conflict, or give too much credence to the claim by Richard Mulcahy, the IRA chief of staff, that theirs was 'the guerrilla war of a civilised modern people'. This was not just a physical fight. There was also a political struggle towards the establishment of an alternative state with its own parliament, police, courts and publicity machine, concomitant to the boycott of the British state in Ireland. It was a revolution carried out for the most part by young men and women. Townshend believes the level of popular support, though vital, may have been exaggerated, as was clearly shown post-treaty when most people wanted to settle for what had been won, however incomplete..."

And further on, in a rather underhand exercise in smear-by-innuendo, Mansergh writes:

"Tom Barry gave different accounts during his lifetime of the subsequent Kilmichael ambush, during which a whole contingent of Auxiliaries was wiped out, just as Dan Breen gave three different versions of the Soloheadbeg ambush in January 1919. Apart from the difficulties of precise recall and complete overview even at the time, as a former British soldier who served in Mesopotamia, Barry had something to prove."

So, according to today's Mansergh, the essential character of the War of Independence was of Britain being compelled "to resort to copious counter-violence" in

the process of "trying to suppress {Irish} violence", with a question mark being placed over whether the Irish waging such a guerrilla war should be considered "a civilised modern people". And how many different versions of Soloheadbeg / Sologheadbeg is it that Mansergh himself has given (to match his two different spellings)? A decade ago, in his 2003 volume of *Collected Writings*, under the chapter heading of "The Ambush at Sologheadbeg, Annual Commemoration, 25 January 1998", Mansergh reproduced an oration which he had delivered in that era, when he was in the business of aspiring to inherit Dan Breen's Fianna Fáil mantle and achieve election to Breen's old Dáil seat of Tipperary South. Mansergh then spoke of Breen with nothing but the utmost reverence and respect. He did not directly challenge any of Breen's accounts, or indeed the Soloheadbeg summation of his own British Government Empire Division father, Nicholas Mansergh, but he did obliquely present a rather more coherently political, alternative assessment to each of them, by drawing on the Bureau of Military History Witness Statement of the O/C of the IRA's South Tipperary Brigade, Seumas Robinson (which, in fact, is how Robinson spelt his own first name). In that oration Mansergh had both intoned and informed:

"Here on 21 January 1919, the first shots were fired in the War of Independence. A revolution had begun. My late father, Nicholas Mansergh, who heard the shots ring out as a boy of nine, from two miles away, wrote in *The Unresolved Question* published in 1991: 'History was forged in sudden death on a Tipperary by-road as surely as ever it was in meetings at Downing Street or for that matter at the Mansion House in Dublin, where the Dáil met coincidentally but fortuitously for the first time that same day, 21 January 1919.' **Nonetheless, as we know from the O/C Seamus Robinson's statement written thirty years later ... Robinson was very conscious of the meeting of the Dáil, and anxious that responsibility for the attack should not be imputed to the Dáil, or provide any excuse for its suppression before it got off the ground...** Men of resolution and ruthless courage like Dan Breen, Seán Treacy, Seán Hogan, Seamus Robinson and others present at Sologheadbeg were impatient. Much has been said and written about local Tipperary men Dan Breen and Seán Treacy in particular. I would like to focus

on another participant, Seamus Robinson ... as his perspective on both events is both interesting and not widely known. **In the December 1918 general election the Irish people had decisively spoken. The British government had failed to respond to the will of the people constitutionally spoken...**

"In 1920, Erskine Childers the elder, who did much to expose the brutalities of the Black and Tans in the British press, wrote to an English friend: *'It is all dreadfully logical, that's the trouble. Government by consent is a hard thing to compromise about.'* **After a world war fought for the rights of small nations to self-determination, which was only another word for government by consent, Britain's position in Ireland was politically untenable.** The purpose of the War of Independence was to drive that point home beyond recall... It was abundantly clear to Robinson that the Volunteers could only win, if they were a ghostly army of sharpshooters operating all over the country, to deal with small bodies of enemy forces, making Ireland too costly to hold, always choosing their own ground and their targets. The aim was to make quite literally 'the king's writ run in Ireland'. In another phrase of his, the action at Sologheadbeg was designed to set the ball rolling..."

"Seamus Robinson, who was elected to the Dáil in 1921, was strongly anti-imperialist, feeling a keen empathy with the insurgent peoples of India and Egypt. He was prepared to settle the dispute over the Treaty, provided Ireland was not required to be part of the British Empire... He later fell out with Michael Collins over the Treaty, openly challenging the commonly held belief that it was Collins who had won the war... As national revolutions go, the Irish one was relatively mild. **A revolution would not have taken place at all, if Britain had not been so reluctant and slow to accord Ireland its national rights.** I agree with Professor Joe Lee that the period 1919-21 represents a magnificent achievement by a people that had few advantages compared to Britain's might and resources... The men and women of 1919 succeeded where both the constitutionalists and the Fenians, Young Ireland and the United Irishmen had failed. As Dan Breen's party leader and Taoiseach de Valera told a Fianna Fáil Ard Fheis in 1957, there were particular conditions of success that were not replicated later... He believed that **the War of Independence was successful only because it was backed by the vast majority of the people.**" (Martin Mansergh, *The Legacy of History*, 2003, pp 257-260; all emphases mine—MO'R).

The Mansergh of 1998-2003 would have had no need for a good dose of Borgonovo, but the Mansergh of 2013 is badly in need of reading the better elements of John Borgonovo's latest (2013) book, *The Dynamics Of War And Revolution:*

*Cork City, 1916-1918.* In the December 2013 issue of *Irish Political Review* I wrote:

"Is it true, as Jack Lane charges (July 2013), that Borgonovo misses the point about the significance of both the All-For-Ireland League election defeats of the Redmondites in Cork in 1910 and the British response to the Sinn Féin victory in the 1918 General Election? I initially found abundant evidence for the former, but little for the latter charge."

My December article endorsed every criticism Jack had made of Borgonovo concerning the AFIL. But what of the second part of Jack's critique? I must say that I found myself most impressed by the weight of evidence that Borgonovo had assembled to illustrate the surge in popular support for the objective of an Irish Republic between 1916 and 1918, which gives the lie to Doubting Martin Mansergh's current acceptance of the Townshend thesis that the level of popular support for a Republic may well have been "*exaggerated*", and that the Treaty was probably what "*most people wanted to settle for*" all along. (No question, as far as Mansergh is concerned, that they had to weigh up the consequences of Britain's explicit threat of "immediate and terrible war!" Or, as Liam Mellows had put it, this was not the will of the people, but the fear of the people.)

Here are some examples of Borgonovo's findings:

"Irish Volunteers Expansion: In County Cork... companies took root in 1917, and by 1918 the Volunteers enjoyed a presence in almost every county parish. The new areas paid rich dividends during the guerrilla war of 1920-21, as locales first visited in 1917 becoming IRA strongholds, sometimes providing sanctuary to the officers who first organised them... In late 1916, new recruits flooded into the movement. By the end of the year, one officer estimated the city strength at close to 1,000, up from 300 at the time of the Easter Rising... By the end of 1917, the city boasted sixteen companies covering the breadth of the city, organised into two battalions and numbering about 2,000 men." (pp 84-85).

"(In May 1917) the British government organised the 'Irish Convention' composed of moderate-opinion leaders within Ireland's political establishment... The convention's lack of a democratic mandate also damaged its credibility, as Dublin Castle arbitrarily determined the delegation strengths. The AFIL's William O'Brien argued that selected representatives '*would quite certainly be defeated if they were obliged to face their constituents at the polls*'. (O'Brien to Lloyd George, 18 June 1917. The AFIL refused to join, despite Lloyd George's personal appeal to O'Brien.) JJ Horgan (the Cork Redmondite leader) likewise considered the Irish Convention '*utterly undemocratic and unjust*', and later wrote that

Sinn Féin, '*even at that time, probably represented the majority of the Irish electorate*'..." (p 104).

"The (Redmondite) United Irish League functioned until the 1918 general election. Police estimated the UIL shed almost half its remaining members from June 1918 and 1919. By the end of 1918, the RIC characterised the UIL in Cork city and east Cork as '*quite inactive and possess no influence*'. The party effectively ceased operating by mid-1919..." (p 115).

"Cork's Irish Party did not collapse overnight. The movement's steepest decline occurred between 1914 and 1916, prior to the Easter Rising. The party functioned in 1917 and 1918, until its meltdown following the cataclysmic general election... The party's failure was not due to its machine, but rather its message. Acquiescence with Dublin Castle, appeals to the House of Commons for Home Rule, and continued support of the war effort no longer commanded strong public support. When the Allies declared their war aims as securing democracy and self-determination for small nations, expectations for both rose in Ireland, especially after American entry into the war. Citizens who gave their political allegiance to Sinn Féin clearly expressed a desire for self-determination and opposition to the war effort. In 1918, such expressions grew in volume, popularity and intensity. They resulted in a civil uprising against conscription, and Sinn Féin's sweep of the general election" (p 119).

"The Irish Party shed support during 1918. Yet the endemic organisational atrophy attributed to the Irish Party during this period was not apparent in **Cork city**. {My emphasis; but, of course, as argued by both Jack Lane in July and myself in December, Borgonovo had comprehensively missed the point that, as far as national politics were concerned, Redmondism in **Cork county** was never to recover from the defeats it had suffered at the hands of O'Brien's AFIL in both the 1910 general elections—MO'R.} The Redmondites retained political patronage networks in the city and county government, enjoyed the support of the commercial elite, and controlled two of the city's three daily newspapers (with the other being unionist). The party possessed sufficient organisational strength to win a campaign, assuming it could find support among voters... The Irish Party failed to contest any County Cork constituencies outside the city... **The RIC county inspector believed Sinn Féin would have won any of these non-contested seats by a four to one margin**" (p 213; my emphasis—MO'R).

"The Representation of the People Act (passed earlier in the year) expanded the franchise to all males over the age of twenty-one and women over thirty... the new franchise rules tripled the Cork city electorate from 12,298 to 45,017. {That's actually closer to being quadrupled—

MOR}... The AFIL's two parliamentary incumbents, William O'Brien and Maurice Healy, stood down prior to the election... O'Brien and his fellow AFIL MPs were prepared to resign {in favour of Sinn Féin—MOR} in early 1918, but decided to wait until the franchise expansion came into effect. This maximised damage to the Irish Party since it was assumed most new voters would support the republicans. Redmondite JJ Horgan echoed this belief when he complained to Dublin: *'The Register has increased from 18,000 (sic) to 45,000, and it is full of irresponsible young males and females.'*... Recognising likely defeat and the implications of the post-war peace conference, Cork Redmondites sought an electoral pact with Sinn Féin... Cork UIL election agent Henry Donegan reported the pact enjoyed little support beyond the city's three senior party leaders, coroners JJ Horgan, William Murphy and James McCabe... Without a pact, JJ Horgan believed they had *'no earthly chance of winning in Cork'*, and he, Murphy and McCabe urged Cork's UIL Executive to withdraw from the election. When they were outvoted, the three coroners resigned from the party" (pp 214-7).

"Ultimately, Sinn Féin platform speakers explicitly called for a republic... Foreshadowing the 1921 Anglo-Irish Treaty, the Irish Party demanded Dominion Home Rule in 1918, rather than implementation of the 1914 Home Rule statute... Sinn Féin framed the election debate as a referendum on Irish independence prior to the Paris Peace Conference... The final results showed an unquestioned Sinn Féin triumph... Sinn Féin dominated the returns, with JJ Walsh securing 67 per cent of votes cast, and Liam de Róiste 66 per cent. The Irish Party's Talbot-Crosbie received 24 per cent, and Richard O'Sullivan 23 per cent, with the two unionists getting 8 per cent and 7 per cent respectively... In 1918 Cork voters ... did clearly reject both continued citizenship within the United Kingdom and Dominion Home Rule within the British Empire. By voting for Sinn Féin in such overwhelming numbers, Cork city clearly expressed a desire for full and sovereign independence, in the form of an Irish republic" (pp 220-8).

Borgonovo's impressive marshalling of such facts and figures not only gives the lie to the New Millennium neo-Treatyite thesis of Fianna Fáil's Martin Mansergh, it also demolishes a longstanding myth proclaimed by veteran Redmondite propagandists Kevin Myers and Dermot Meleady. (It was Myers who, this past November 2013, launched the second half of Meleady's voluminous biography of Redmond himself, the first half having been launched in March 2008 by ex-Taoiseach John Bruton, a self-described Redmondite.) So far so good, then? Well, not quite. In July Jack Lane had written:

"Borgonovo says nothing at all to explain the (British) reaction to the 1918 Election, and makes nothing of the rejection by Versailles either, only that Sinn Féin *'failed to explain their fallback position'* to the electorate."

Jack had provided no page reference, and I was beginning to wonder if, in our shared indignation at Borgonovo missing the point about the AFIL, Jack had gone for overkill on an additional point. After all, Borgonovo's framework was 1916-1918 and it was not necessary for him to opine at all on the War of Independence that was to take place in subsequent years. Swept along by my enthusiasm for Borgonovo's detailed exposition of the triumph of popular support for the Republic, and with only 10 pages to finish in the book's 234 pages of basic text, I was beginning to regret that Jack had not left well enough alone, by just sticking to his AFIL critique.

But then, on page 225, the bubble of my enthusiasm burst and I at last appreciated the full force of Jack's critique of Borgonovo on the War of Independence. For there was the very phrase Jack had quoted, in Borgonovo's narrative:

"Though republicans clearly emphasised their appeal to the Paris Peace Conference, they failed to explain their fallback plan. Speakers outlined tax boycotts and the establishment of Dáil Éireann, but downplayed physical-force alternatives. Election chairman Denis Tobin claimed *'they were all pacifists'*, while JJ Walsh told supporters *'Physical force had no particular fascination for him'*. Republican speakers did not advocate a violent overthrow of the British administration, or suggest armed resistance to government repression of Dáil Éireann."

And worse was to follow. For, while not required by his time framework to do so, Borgonovo **had indeed opined** as follows on the War of Independence: *"In 1918 Cork voters did not provide a mandate for the IRA's violent campaign of 1920-1"* (p 228). Here Borgonovo contradicted what he had previously written on page 119, about Sinn Féiners having reasonable expectations that the declared war aims of the Allies, in favour of both democracy and self-determination for small nations, would also apply to Ireland. As Jack wrote in July:

"Only a small minority was not surprised by the British response: their assumptions had turned out to be right. But this view was not what caused the people's war that followed. The War of Independence did not start and was not caused by the chaos of WWI, nor by incidents such as that at Soloheadbeg, despite Dan Breen's brave efforts to claim that accolade."

On the home stretch, and on the cusp of his concluding remarks, having left the neo-Treatyite and Redmondite myths of Mansergh and Meleady way behind him and gasping for breath, Borgonovo came a cropper at the final fence and allowed Meleady to pip him at the post with another Redmondite myth. But, if he so wishes, he does not have to accept just Jack Lane's criticisms in that regard. A decade ago there was also a powerful Treatyite refutation of the now shared Borgonovo-Meleady myth about a War of Independence supposedly fought without any democratic mandate.

In an *Irish Times* letter on 12 September 2003 I had written:

"Seán Russell was a man whom de Valera once considered worth making the effort to save from himself. Russell had given sterling service in the 20th century's first war for democracy—the Irish War of Independence fought to give effect to the democratic mandate of the 1918 elections. When de Valera failed to persuade Russell to accept the democratic mandate of his later Republican election victories of the 1930s, he was left with no option but to act ruthlessly and with resolve against Russell and his followers."

Dermot Meleady took umbrage at my reference to the 20th century's first war for democracy, and his letter of 24th September declared:

"Whatever the mandate of 1918 was, it was not a mandate for further violence. Those who voted were not asked for, and did not give, approval for a war. Those who started the assassinations of policemen in 1919 were a tiny self-appointed group determined to force the pace of events... Calling the struggle 'a war for democracy' seems to suggest that the fundamentals of that system were not in place in 1918. Such a simplistic formula may be all right for feeding to gullible tourists on the open-topped tour buses of Dublin, but it ignores many facts. Free and fair elections had taken place for decades and, since 1885, on a franchise as wide as could be found anywhere. Thanks to 40 years of patient and peaceful work by Parnell, Dillon and Redmond, an executive responsible to an elected native parliament was there for the taking by 1914, were it not, tragically, for the Ulster difficulty."

I responded on 29th September:

"Dermot Meleady is mistaken in asserting that there was no authorisation by the First Dáil for the War of Independence fought by the Irish Republican Army. Full and formal acceptance of such responsibility for the IRA was proclaimed by that Dáil in March 1921 and subsequently endorsed by the 26-county electorate in voting Sinn Féin back into power as the Second Dáil in the 1921 General Elections... General Frank Crozier, who founded and commanded

the British Auxiliary terrorist operations in Ireland from 1920 until his resignation in disgust in 1921 ... had no doubt that what Britain had been waging in Ireland was a war against democracy, as he would later recall in his 1932 memoirs: "The Coalition Government of 1920-21, as dictatorial, and therefore as nearly Fascist, as any British Government is ever likely to be, failed completely in its attempt on Irish democracy, because the army would not comply with the rules of this intolerable Fascism." Out of the horse's mouth."

But the truly substantial refutation of the Meleady thesis came on the next day, 30 September 2003, in a letter from Risteard Mulcahy, son of General Richard Mulcahy, IRA Chief-of-Staff in the War of Independence, Free State Chief-of-Staff in the Civil War, and subsequently leader of Fine Gael. Risteard Mulcahy wrote:

"The Irish Volunteers were initially formed in 1913 as a defence force to ensure the implementation of Home Rule. Like its predecessor, the General Headquarters Staff of the Volunteers was established in March 1918 by the Volunteer Executive as a defence force in response to Lloyd George's conscription threat and at the time of the 'German plot'. Dermot Meleady is correct when he acknowledges that the GHQ Staff was not responsible for the isolated events in 1919 nor did it approve of these events. It remained quiescent as a military force until the end of 1919 but was then obliged to take action because of the British campaign of intimidation and imprisonment of Sinn Féin speakers, the suppression of Sinn Féin, the Gaelic League and the Volunteers in June 1919, and the suppression of the Dáil later in the autumn. Military action started in January 1920, with the attacks on RIC barracks, carried out initially in association with the Cork Volunteers. There is no reason to believe that GHQ would have commenced military action without the draconian attempts adopted by the RIC to suppress the activities of the representatives elected by people. Dermot Meleady is not correct in implying that the War of Independence, extending from January 1920, to July 1921, was not based on democratic principles. The decision to commence hostilities was approved by Cathal Brugha, Minister for Defence in the first Dáil, and responsibility for the war was subsequently accepted by Dáil Éireann. One must agree with Mr Meleady that it was unfortunate that Home Rule was not established in 1914. It was equally unfortunate that the 1918 election did not evoke a conciliatory response from Lloyd George and his Cabinet."

If John Borgonovo was unwilling to take the point from Aubane, he might at least have considered taking that War of Independence point from a Mulcahy. Unfortunately, however, he has missed that point as well.

**Manus O'Riordan**

## A Critic Emerges From Academia, Michael Carragher

I have received some further print-outs from the ether regarding Michael Carragher, whose comments on me were published in the December *Irish Political Review*. I learn from this new material that I am the leader of BICO/Aubane Historical Society, that I engage in "demented shrieking"; that I hold that—

"Hitler was less one of the great mass-murderers of history... than the tragic victim of fiendish British contriving; the poor Nazis were only looking for a place to lay their weary heads, and if they broke some stuff while staggering to their beds all over Europe and North Africa, blame Perfidious Albion";

that my aim "is a single party state in which all opposition is outlawed and state terror it deployed to ensure that none emerges"; that once in power I will arrange that anyone "who expresses a dangerous or even politically incorrect opinion is sent off to Siberia for re-education"; that "meanwhile" {while waiting for incorrect opinions to punish?} I and my colleagues redecorate our dachas and build up our collection of Mercedes Benzes and Rolls Royces; that, since I could not string "useful fools" like Desmond Fennell and Meda Ryan along if I said this was what I was about, I dissimulate.

We—

"deploy lies, fear, envy and greed—and the attendant promise that you, and you alone, can assuage the masses' fears and sate their greed. You can always fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time, and no matter where you go, as the fellow says, you need never bring an eejit. Unionist eejits yesterday, Nationalists today, Unionists again tomorrow if that suits the revolution better."

We are engineering a situation—

"of uncertainty in which people will believe the most fantastic nonsense. The problems that this situation brings about were recognised 2,000 years ago: the opportunities were exploited by Lenin and his cronies. Just as they were by Hitler. You know the story. You're busy working when your mobile phone chimes and it's your herdsman, crying that there's a wolf in among your flocks. So you drop what you're doing, grab the shotgun... into the four by four and head for the hills... But there's ne'er a sight of Mr. Wolf when you arrive; your goats are all present... and your herdsman's crying 'But he was right there, Mr. Aesop! Honest! He nearly killed me...' Just like

the time before... But what d you do? You... need a herdsman; you'd love to sack this lying bastard... but the lying bastard's father is secretary of the Herdsmen's Union and he'll sue you for wrongful dismissal if you do..."

Of course we do sometimes—

"come up with some good stuff because having some good stuff is essential if they're to sell the rest of the stuff—like every successful propagandist, they need plausibility and verisimilitude if they're to keep the mob behind them",

the mob apparently being "useful fools" like Brian Murphy: a rigorous academic of the old school, before, in Irish Universities at least, the term came close to being synonymous with the slipshod propaganda in support of current Government policy.

Anyway, you've been warned. Read on at your own risk.

"Lenin placed great value on "useful fools". And where did they end up?

"Kamerad, do you know how to spell Siberia?"

"Jawohl, mein Fuhrer! Thy vill be done. Ve haff fays off making zem think'..." (see LivingHistory website; thread on Historical Revisionism and the Irish War of Independence, Ed.).

About five years ago I was sent a sheaf of print-outs about myself and BICO from an ethereal body called the *Cedar Lounge*. I remember commenting that it was the kind of thing that used to be published on the walls of public lavatories in the days before the Internet. Its purpose seemed to be to give wild expression to resentments that lay beyond the reach of coherent thought. But it wasn't as bizarre as this stuff.

I will agree with Michael Carragher about one thing: as between him and me, one of us is engaged in "demented shrieking".

I read in one of the new pieces (Apr 12, 2011, 7.21 am): The "democratic government" advocated by Mr. Clifford would necessitate the sort of corruption of language you'd find in *Pravda* or *Der Stürmer*".

*Der Stürmer*, as I recall, was an anti-Semitic magazine, edited by Streicher and produced by the Nazi Party, which depicted Aryan maidens being seduced or raped by wealthy but disgusting Jews.

As to *Pravda*: a few years ago I was given a print-out of a tirade against me published in an ethereal magazine: the *Dublin Review Of Books*. It must have associated me with *Pravda* because in a comment on it I drew attention to the fact that there were two Russian words for truth, *pravda* and *istina*. *Pravda* meant—at least in dissident usage in the 1920s—a kind of higher, purposeful, directive truth which is not finicky about factual detail. And *Istina* was factual truth. I have always been addicted to the latter. Eoghan Harris, who denounced me as an Orange stooge forty years ago because I said the Ulster Protestants were a solid community which would hold firm against assault and would sooner or later have to be negotiated with, specialised in the higher truth which is not bogged down by factual detail. He has copyrighted a refutation of the "factist" idea of truth.

To conclude on this matter of the rabid racism attributed to me by Carragher: I took part in a public meeting in Dublin a few years ago, at which a translation of a pioneering work of the belated German colonising movement of the late 19th century was launched. A German intellectual of the contemporary Know-nothing, kind condemned the publication. Carl Peters, the Anglophile German colonist, should be denounced rather than be known about. I did not see how it was reasonable to treat German colonial racism in Africa as being different in kind and more heinous than the effective exterminating racism of the British Empire in other places—an effectiveness which influential British writers actually boasted of during the generation leading up to the Great War: particularly since the Germans in East Africa, when isolated by the Royal Navy in 1914, trained up a native force which engaged in effective military resistance for the duration of the War, and were looked to by the Irish when Britain brushed aside the election result of 1918.

The only basis I could see for distinguishing so sharply between British and German racism, and condoning the British, was a conviction that the peoples subjected to exterminatory British racism were racially inferior while the victims of German racism were not. And that distinction would of course be racist itself.

The German intellectual, lost in the fog of German collective guilt, was unable to follow this. But a couple of 'liberal' Dublin intellectuals, one of them a publisher, the other a lecturer, said that the British exterminations of peoples were not genocides but were events that occurred in the course

of nature. The point could not be developed because the booked time ran out and the caretaker wanted to close the hall. (I did not hear that it was developed subsequently by those moderates.)

The notion that Britain only exterminated inferior peoples in the cause of Progress is, as far as I can see, the generally-received but rarely expressed position of British civilisation in the post-1945 world. The unspoken understanding is that genocide began in 1940 or 1941, and was first identified in 1945—although there was a premature outburst of it in German South West Africa in the early years of the 20th century.

I have come across a pre-1914 German account of German children playing game of Germans and Herreroes, as British and American children played Cowboys and Indians—and I've mentioned it somewhere. I'm afraid that the essential difference between the two still escapes me. I wish some clever person would explain it.

Anyhow that is, I think, the closest I have come to the viewpoint of *Der Stürmer*. And it seems to me that those whose see a fundamental difference between Cowboys and Indians and Germans and Herreroes are very much closer to the viewpoint of *Der Stürmer* than I am. Between them and *Der Stürmer* it is only a matter of a difference of opinion about which of these peoples—all of whom are capable of interbreeding with us—are inferior breeds.

Carragher contrasts me with Martin Mansergh and says that Mansergh, though not quite a historian is an honourable man. And I am a Nazi/Kremlinite Anti-Semitic shrieker. Well, Mansergh, like Carragher, threw the Nazi slander at us, in a letter published in the *Cork/Irish Examiner*, in connection with our *North Cork Anthology*. He did not provide a shred of evidence. And, because he was an influential person, adviser to Taoiseachs, the Editor would not publish a letter rebutting the allegation and demanding evidence. Bringing an action for libel against him would have required big money, which we didn't have. So we contented ourselves with dealing with the matter in our own publications. I had an open mind about Mansergh before that, but since then I could only see him as a blackguard—a pretentious rich man with the mentality of a thug.

It says something about the brittle condition of the 26 Counties, politically and academically, that it feels threatened by small groups which produce small

circulation books and magazines by self-help, groups which are never mentioned in the national media, and feels the need to squash them.

The Nazis had a word for that project: Gleichschaltung—co-ordination, harmonisation. But what the Nazis co-ordinated was major rifts in the political structures of the state. What happened in Ireland was that the *Irish Times* sniffed out dissent in a remote region of North Cork and pounced on it, and the adviser to Taoiseachs reinforced the attack. Aubane's offence was that it took Elizabeth Bowen's word for it that England was her home, even though she owned a remnant of a Cromwellian estate in North Cork. The approved line was that she was a great North Cork writer. I knew that the only Bowen who was read in North Cork, outside a little Anglo-Irish enclave that kept itself to itself, was Marjorie, who was a straight-forwardly English romantic novelist. And so, while we put an extract from Elizabeth into the *Anthology*, we did so in Deriddean form, with a stroke through her name to indicate her doubtful right to be there. And that, believe it or not, was what caused the demonisation of Aubane. We happened to cut across a project to replace the literature of the independence movement with English literature with Irish connections—a kind of head-transplant operation.

I am a product of a culture that had no problem about being Irish. It was at ease with English literature, but knew it was English. And it knew that Swift was a kind of exiled Englishman whose bitterness against the English State, which exiled him after he rendered it an invaluable service, led him to feel a kind of pity for the Irish amongst whom he was obliged to live. I know these things because they were generally known. I was entirely untouched by academia, and I haven't even the most elementary certificate to my name. I knew what was known by people around me. And I know that that was true in a merely factual sense.

Because of the position I took on the North forty-five years ago, I had to do a bit of history investigation for myself because academia supplied no relevant information. It has since been admitted by Professor Lee that Irish history in the 20th century was a taboo subject for the History Departments of Irish Universities for most of the century. And in fact much more than the 20th century seems to have been tabooed.

I gather from some of Carragher's expressions that there has been some

disagreement with him about BICO and the AHS. But anyone wanting to make an academic career in Ireland would be well-advised to heed Carragher, reckless libeller though he is. *Pravda* rules, OK?

Regimented indoctrination in the British interest under Oxbridge's hegemony is the order of the day. That is the way the future lies, insofar as the powers-that-be in Irish academic life can determine it. So I second Carragher when he says (Dec. 3 2011 5.44pm): "*Aubane's imprimatur is likely to prove an embarrassment or even an obstacle*".

Aubane has proved to be dangerous in the manner of Voltaire's definition: "*This animal is dangerous. If attacked, it defends itself*".

\*

I still don't know where Carragher belongs in the academic structure of the state. The only information I have seen about him in the material I have been sent is that he lives in Blackrock (Dublin).

He is obviously fluent with vulgar abuse. In Slieve Luacra we understood such things, and were charitably disposed towards people who were intoxicated by the exuberance of their own verbosity. (We knew our Churchill, you see.) But the *Stürmer* reference, and his summary of my view of the 2nd World War cannot be let pass.

What I have said—and repeated again and again over a period of twenty years at least—is that the British Empire greatly expanded its territory in the Great War, prevented France from disabling "*Prussia-nised*" Germany in the immediate aftermath of the War because that would have restored France to the position of the strongest Power in Europe, and therefore it made itself chiefly responsible for policing the Versailles imposition on Germany. There were democratic Governments in both Austria and Germany during the 1920s. They sought relief from the Versailles conditions, but this was refused. And democratic Austria—a small remnant of the Hapsburg Empire with a political life that was not appropriate to its new condition—sought to merge with Germany but was forbidden to.

Then along comes Hitler, and everything that was forbidden to democratic Germany was conceded to him.

The term "*appeasement*" implies conciliation of a powerful enemy with whom one is confronted. Nazi Germany was not powerful to start with. In 1933 it still had only the small cadre army allowed by Versailles. It became powerful in the course of the next five years, with active British support. Britain did not "*appease*".

It collaborated with Hitler in freeing Germany from the conditions of Versailles. It did not do this through the League of Nations. It had marginalised the League straight away in 1919, and treated the Empire as the force of order in the world.

Britain negotiated a Naval Agreement with Hitler in 1934. It allowed him to build a mass army around the Versailles cadre force, and to push it right up to the French border, in the Demilitarised Rhineland. It stood idly by when he drove across the Austrian border, brushed aside the patriotic Fascist regime in Vienna (which Mussolini supported), and established a unified Austro-German Nazi regime. Then he claimed part of the lost Habsburgh territory in Bohemia, and Britain intimidated the Czechoslovak State (an unstable structure which it had created in 1919) into handing it over to him.

It was only in 1938, with the incorporation of Austria and the Sudetenland and the acquisition of the advanced Czech arms industry, that Nazi Germany became a Great Power in Europe.

At this point something like the old system of Powers was restored. Something of the kind was bound to happen after Britain had disabled both the League and France, and had proved itself incapable of giving purposeful global leadership by means of its expanded Empire. That Great Power system was restored with active British support in 1938.

There was only one outstanding issue remaining from Versailles—the position of the German city of Danzig and the Polish Corridor which separated East Prussia from the rest of Germany. Democratic Germany (1919-33) had refused to accept the Versailles arrangement on Poland as final. But there were no such strong feelings on the Sudetenland. Yet Britain broke the will of the Czechs on the Sudetenland, but encouraged the Poles to refuse to negotiate on Danzig—which they did not actually govern, and were never likely to.

Hitler actually retreated from the democratic attitude to Poland. He made a Treaty with Poland in 1934, in which he took the Corridor off the agenda, leaving the Danzig issue for future negotiation.

In the Autumn of 1938 Poland took part along with Germany in the dismantling of Czechoslovakia. Britain tacitly accepted the position adopted by Germany as the Great Power broker in these affairs.

With Czechoslovakia (which almost everybody except the Czech minority in it seems to have hated) out of the way, Hitler

suggested to the Poles that the time had come to sort out the Danzig issue. He proposed that Danzig should become part of adjacent East Prussia, that the Corridor should remain Polish, but that there should be an extra-territorial road across it to establish land contact between the two parts of Germany.

Pilsudski (whose Polish Socialist Party was the only party praised by Connolly in both runs of the *Workers' Republic*) had died recently. He had gone to war—without an electoral mandate!—to restore the Polish state in 1914. Like Connolly he was allied with Germany, but in a later stage of the War was in conflict with it. He was recognised as the founder of the state. Later on he became the military guardian of it—Dictator if you will, and Fascist or not as you fancy. If you probe the detail of situations, you find such things are not as definite as ideological rationalisations after the event tend to suggest. For example, the patriotic Austrian Fascist, Starhemberg, who was backed by Mussolini, became a participant in the "*Anti-Fascist War*", without, as far as I could see, ceasing to be a Fascist.

Anyway, Pilsudski made the 1934 agreement with Hitler, on the understanding that the sore point of Danzig would be dealt with later. He was succeeded by Colonel Beck, who was apparently a flamboyant character with little sense of reality. He would not take the hint that the time had come to discuss Danzig. He would keep the piece of Czechoslovakia which he had taken on German authority.. (I don't recall that Britain gave it to him.) But he refused to discuss the transfer to Germany of a German city on the German border, even though it lay outside his control as an anomalous Free City under the sovereignty of the aborted League of Nations.

Britain offered him a military Guarantee—a military alliance—along with its ally France, with Beck's hand on the trigger, if there was any attempt to transfer Danzig to Germany. And I seem to recall that he said he decided to accept the Guarantee "*between two clicks of the ash from my cigarette*".

Hitler saw Polish acceptance of the Guarantee as a breach of the 1934 Treaty, and as a military encirclement of Germany. And, as far as I could see, it was both.

Martin Mansergh was indignant when I said that the Guarantee constituted a military encirclement. But the South African Government—the only Commonwealth Government made up of people who had fought a war on their own behalf—warned Whitehall at the time that it was

an encirclement and was likely to lead to war. And the Oxford War Pamphlets, which were resumed about this time, said that of course it was an encirclement, and a good thing too!

But that obvious fact was not acceptable to British ideology after it bungled the War that it had set up.

Beck had Berlin in his sights—perhaps not unreasonably so. But neither of his powerful allies did a thing to implement the Guarantee when the War came. The Polish State broke up in a few weeks. If it was hoped that the German invasion would lead to an immediate Nazi/Soviet conflict, that possibility was pre-empted by the Agreement made by the two in late August 1939, whereby the regions of Russia conquered by Poland in 1920 would revert to Russia in the event of a collapse of the Polish State.

(A Polish Government-in-exile was set up in London. Four years later the British Government remade it to suit the Soviet rearrangement of Poland.)

Britain (and France) used the Polish War as an occasion for a declaration of war on Germany on their own account. It was of no use to Poland since they did not attack Germany during the German/Polish War.

The Anglo-French declaration of war on Germany lay on the table for eight months. Mid-way through that period both States revived the League and got it to expel Russia for pushing back its border near Leningrad, and they made preparations to engage in war with Russia in Finland. When that didn't come off, Britain breached Norwegian neutrality for the purpose of stopping Swedish trade with Germany, and Germany responded with an extemporised invasion force that successfully pre-empted the British.

While the British were licking their wounds over Finland, Germany finally responded to the Anglo/French declaration of war on it. The small army which Britain contributed to the War was surrounded, and a substantial remnant of it was brought home.

France, finding itself under occupation and deserted by its Ally, made a provisional settlement with Germany. Britain denounced the settlement as betrayal and made war on France. Not being occupied, and still possessing the most powerful Navy in the world, Britain did not need to call off its declaration of war, though it had no realistic hope of carrying the war to Germany. It kept the war situation in Europe alive with pin-pricks, hoping that it would

lead to a Nazi/Soviet War, which it did in June 1941. And then it backed an American ultimatum to Japan which led to war in Asia.

I think it is reasonable to sum up this course of events by saying that Britain brought about the 2nd World War. Germany didn't do it. It only made war on Poland when placed under military encirclement. It was British conduct subsequently thought brought Germany closer to being something like a World Power than it had been in 1939, but still not very close.

For all its ideological bluster, Britain did not go to war in earnest against Nazi Germany. It gave it two practice-wars, in 1939 and 1940, as preparation for war on Russia. With the expertise developed in those two wars, Germany won some spectacular skirmishes in Russia for a couple of months in 1941, but it never broke the Russian line, and therefore it was ground down over time by superior Russian resources, superior Russian preparation for war, and a will to fight that was more in earnest than the British will.

(The main British war effort was the obliteration of the working class areas of German towns and cities by the bombing campaign for which it had prepared in the 1930s, but chose not to attempt in 1939-40.)

It was of course said in Westminster that Germany had embarked on world conquest. At its peak it mounted only a crude war of *Lebensraum*, and it was not even that in 1939. Hitler admired Britain greatly, but he learned little from it about how to set about world conquest.

As to 1914: Britain intervened in a European War (which I think, along with Casement, that it had set up diplomatically, but that is not an essential) and made it a World War; by seizing German trade and German colonies; invading the Ottoman Empire; and by encouraging the expansion of its Japanese ally in Asia.

The distinction between European War and World War seems to have become too subtle to be grasped by academic minds in Ireland under Oxbridge hegemony.

Here is how Carragher, with "*no political agenda*", and applying nothing but professional academic method, sums up what I have written about Germany in World War 2:

"the claim that Britain was responsible for, not just the First, but also the Second World War, is a measure of just how "historical" the Aubane Historical Society is. If you think their arguments on this

one "stack up" you will disappoint me deeply. {This item is addressed to "Kieran".} According to Aubane, Hitler was less one of the mass murderers of history, right up there with Stalin and Mao, than the tragic victim of fiendish British contriving: the poor Nazis were only looking for a place to lay their weary heads, and if they broke some stuff while staggering to their beds all over Europe and North Africa, blame Perfidious Albion.

"Now anyone who could be brought to believe that Britain is responsible for not just the First but also the Second World War has to be so majestically stupid that he owes it to humanity to leave his brain to science. Or, if not stupid, bigoted to the point of blindness..."

"How could any intelligent person ever trust a single word from a source that would try to peddle such transparent nonsense?"

"This is revisionism of the very worst sort: rank propaganda masquerading as history. The imprimatur of any publisher that panders to stupidity and bigotry cannot but prove to be a liability to true historians brought onto its author's list to provide the plausibility and verisimilitude that successful propagandists need..."

A reference is given in support of the view of Hitler attributed to me: [http://current\\_magazines.atholbooks.org](http://current_magazines.atholbooks.org). \* Unfortunately this might as well be Sanscrit as far as I'm concerned.

I do not deny the possibility that what I have written about Britain's two World Wars, when filtered through the approved academic methodology of the moment, may appear, to the trained academic mind in Oxbridge hegemonised Irish universities, to say what Carragher says it says. If so, so be it. It means that one of us lives in an Orwellian world.

My view of the World Wars would be revisionist of course in a British context. Britain does not tolerate much revisionism. It lives its national life securely within the propaganda of those Wars, which has been consolidated into mesmeric myth by an enormous history industry which weaves factual detail into an *a priori* format of transcendent morality. And any academic who tries to break free of the mesmerism is awarded a special kind of praise and discreetly marginalised. The art of government is highly developed in Britain.

But I have never pretended to be British. And my view of those Wars is not new. I heard the First discussed by people who had been alive at the time, and our postman had actually been in it. And about the Second, I remember my uncle being

---

\* This is a general reference to the area in the Athol Books site where magazines can be downloaded. Editor

responsible for taking down the local signposts and hiding them so that, when the British came back, they would get lost in the maze of Slieve Luacra roads. I read about the World War towards the end of it—even though important academics now tell us that we did not acknowledge the existence of the World War and were only allowed to talk of an Emergency. I heard it said that it would be a sacrifice to humbug if Marshal Petain was executed—which did not rule out admiration of De Gaulle. The dilemma in which the French were placed by the British was understood. And, without there being any denial that the Germans had done some dreadful things, as the British had before them, I heard it discussed whether the Nuremberg Trials had anything to do with law. And the first large-scale account of the War I read was Churchill's, in the mid-fifties—which was a good starting point because Churchill had a robust outlook on life and, while putting the line often let it slip that he knew it wasn't quite like that at all.

When I went to London I found myself among bus-drivers, who were mostly ex-Servicemen and could discuss the War easily with them because many of them were only lightly touched by the transcendent propaganda of the official view. They had few illusions about Britain's activity in the world, but it was Britain and they were British. I remember particularly the view of some of them that, if Nuremberg Law was taken in earnest, General Wingate would be regarded as a War Criminal.

So I'm not aware of having said anything basically new. I just held by an old understanding when I did not find that it was unsound.

But maybe the problem is that I became an 'Anglophobe' in Slieve Luaca? Carragher, in connection with the Athol Books reprint of Casement's *Crime Against Europe*, describes Casement as an "Anglophobe". This means he had a diseased mind: that he did not come to disagree with English policy because (as a diplomatic insider) he saw English foreign policy committed to isolating Germany for the purpose of organising war on it, but had an irrational *animus* against Britain which seized on random details and wove them into an anti-German conspiracy.

If Casement could be led by an anti-British mania to engage in many years of diplomatic activity in the interest of the British State for which he was awarded a knighthood, maybe it was also anti-British mania that led me to spend twenty years trying to get the Six Counties settled in the democratic system of the British state!

Letter sent to *The Irish Times* on 30th December which did not find publication.

## The problem with GM plans

There is an aspect to GM food technology which requires attention far beyond the blissful coyness implicit in the article from Dr David McConnell (Opinion, December 24th).

A September 2012 peer-reviewed study published in the Food and Chemical Toxicology Journal in New York demonstrated that GM corn and the world's best-selling weed-killer, Roundup, caused tumours, multiple organ damage and premature death among rats.

In an act without precedent in scientific publishing this study was later retracted by the Food and Chemical Toxicology Journals subsequent to the appointment of an ex-Monsanto employee to the newly created post of associate editor for biotechnology at the journal. Monsanto is a firm heavily invested in GM technology which wields worldwide influence. It is the manufacturer of Roundup.

It would be well to examine the interconnected structures of power linking corporate entities, governments, regulatory agencies and scientific undertakings. Science is not some pristine activity immune to corrupting influences.

**Ted O'Sullivan**

### Notes:

Cancer of Corruption – F William Engdahl - Dec 2012. <http://www.globalresearch.ca/stench-of-eu-corruption-in-monsanto-gmo-whitewash/5316294>

GMO-Rat Study Retraction - Catherine J. Frompovich - Dec 2013. <http://www.activistpost.com/2013/12/105-scientists-slam-gmo-rat-study.html>

### Comment

This letter was written in response to an article in uninhibited praise of the development and utilization of genetically modified organisms (GM), which appeared in the newspaper on 24th Dec last. Critics were described as subject to an "irrational hostility".

The author was Dr. David McConnell, Professor of Genetics at the Smurfit Institute of Genetics at Trinity College, Dublin. McConnell is a former Chairman of the Irish Times Trust. He is referred to as Chairman in the Irish Times Trust report and accounts for 2010. He is a Life Governor of the Adelaide Hospital Society, the overseeing body for the Adelaide and Meath, Hospital, Tallaght.

Dr. McConnell is very closely connected with the GM industry. He is a member of the Board of European Action on Global Life Sciences (EAGLES), which promotes GM products as contributing towards the solution of problems in developing countries. As well as Chairman, EAGLES Food Forum and Chairman, EAGLES Health Programme, he is also a Co-Vice Chairman of the organisation overall.

While a handful of letters appeared in response in the newspaper, none critical on the basis of environmental or medical concerns, were published.

**T O'S**

Well, I think I have very fairly passed on Carragher's warnings against me. But I have to report that he himself has fallen prey to my sinister influence.

As I was thinking it strange that there was no denunciation of me for the really bad things I had done by virtually general consensus (the Two Nations, and British democracy in the North), I came across his advice, to whoever it is that he is academic adviser to:

"The only people who then {at the time of the Home Rule conflict} seemed aware of the enormous challenges with which we were faced were those of the All For Ireland movement" (Dec 08, 2011, 6.59pm).

That's what I said over forty years ago and have been repeating *ad nauseam* ever

since. Professional academic historians have all rejected that view of it. Is it humane to advise aspiring academics, who are warned about other obstacles which Aubane has placed in their path, to encourage them to bash their heads against that one? The academic line is that John Redmond is the man, and Redmondism and the AFIL are incompatible.

**Brendan Clifford**

\*Roger Casement: *The Crime Against Europe. With The Crime Against Ireland Introduction by B. Clifford.* #18, £15

\*The Fighting Irish And The Great War, "Lest We Forget" by *Brendan Clifford.* #6, £5

\*Britain's Great War, Pope Benedict's Lost Peace: **How Britain Blocked The Pope's Peace Efforts Between 1915 And 1918** by *Dr. Pat Walsh.* #6, £5

Does  
It  
Up

Stack  
?

#### CHURCH OF IRELAND HISTORY

The recent publication by Booklink of *The Church of Ireland: An Illustrated History* is yet another attempt to establish the Anglican Church in Ireland as **the** church of Ireland. It is a heavy coffee-table book of four hundred glossy pages, generously illustrated with hundreds of gorgeous photographs, drawings and engravings. In the Introduction by Kenneth Milne are the sentences:

"Historians have to follow the twin paths enunciated by the Manchester Guardian's legendary editor, C.P. Scott, that though comment is free, facts are sacred, but they may well find in the course of research that the evidence on which some 'facts' are based can be flimsy in the extreme. Furthermore, there are times when soundly based facts have been misused in the interests of propaganda so that their true significance has been misread".

So far, so good. But Kenneth Milne proceeds to regurgitate many of the old propagandistic myths and to twist history to suit his purpose—which is obviously to 'legitimise' the Church of Ireland's position as the owners of vast properties and incomes since the Reformation. In order to do so, he shamelessly lays claim to the whole tradition and land and buildings going right back to Palladius and St. Patrick, forming a seamless narrative as if Catholic clergy and people had never been persecuted and evicted from their Churches and their homes and lands for refusing to acknowledge the King of England as Head of the Church and refusing to use the Book of Common Prayer.

During the reign of Henry VIII, Catholic Church property was seized and the Catholic clergy were evicted under Thomas Cromwell's administration. There is not much doubt that Henry VIII, and also possibly Thomas Cromwell, continued to be believing Catholics during the seizures, confiscations and so-called 'regranting' (to use that poisonous phrase of propaganda) of Church property to their loyal and murderous retainers.

The real persecutions of Catholics for being Catholics was when Henry VIII was succeeded by the nine year old Edward VI, when continental Protestantism took over the government of England and, by extension, the governing of Ireland. The

intense persecution of Catholics continued in the reign of Elizabeth I of England. All of this history is ignored or glossed over by Kenneth Milne in this book.

He lays claim on behalf of the Church of Ireland to Gallarus Oratory in Dingle Peninsula, to St. Columbanus who established the monastery at Bobbio in Italy, to St. Gall who established the monastery at St. Gallen in Switzerland, and to early Catholic Church sites of Clonmacnoise (St. Ciarán of the 7th century), Durrow, and to St. Colmcille who founded the monastery of Iona in Scotland. The book is attempting a complete erasure of the 1,500 years of history of the Irish Catholic Church.

Lavish photographs of the Book of Durrow AD 680, the Cross of Cong, and the Irish High Cross at Clonmacnoise, as well as references to the Book of Kells AD 790—all are *appropriated* to the Church of Ireland history. It is stated as 'fact' that King Henry II of England secured from Pope Adrian a letter—'*Laudabiliter*'—authorising that the King conquer Ireland. It is well established that there is no evidence for this supposed Papal Bull. It does not exist in the English archives, nor is there any evidence for it in the Vatican archives. The English argue that '*Laudabiliter*' is referred to in a hand-written manuscript by Giraldus Cambrensis (a known and proven liar whose sole purpose was to provide propaganda cover for his English over-masters for the conquest of Ireland). It is, but not in Giraldus's handwriting—its reference was added in another handwriting in an otherwise blank space in the manuscript. In other words—a typical forgery. Why do learned people who aspire to be reputable historians allow themselves to be used as propagandists, like Kenneth Milne does here by relying on Gerald of Wales who was a scoundrel and who has been discredited so many times that I need not repeat it further? The rather pedestrian answer seems to be that they get good academic jobs and I suppose for them the end will always justify the means!

Another propaganda item is the statement concerning St. Patrick:

*"Nonetheless it can be stated with some certainty that he was a native of Roman Britain at a time when Roman control of that province was coming to an end..."* and later on *"...his father's estate (the whereabouts of which we cannot tell)"*.

Indeed we cannot tell! Scottish tourist guide books claim St. Patrick was captured in Scotland. Wales claims him also, and there is very convincing evidence beginning to emerge to show that his

father's estate may have been on the French coast, near to where St. Malo is now. Yet none of this breaking research makes it onto the pages of this book—one doesn't have to wonder why really.

There is a good measure of English political history in this book and perhaps this is thought to be necessary in the purported history of a Church created by the English State, as the Church of Ireland was in fact. English Kings and Queens feature from Henry II down to Elizabeth II of England. The Church, like the country, was governed by the Normans wherever they established themselves by force of arms. It was decreed, as Kenneth Milne admits, that only Englishmen could be Bishops in the Norman Church. Actually, even today, the Church of Ireland is referred to by its clergy and its Protestant lay-people as of the Anglican Communion and its members call themselves Anglicans. The '*Church of Ireland*' is a misnomer—it was never the Church of Ireland—and it would help ecumenism perhaps if it called itself the Anglican Church, because that is what it is and that is what it has been since it was set up in the 16th century. The Disestablishment of the Church by the English Act of Parliament in 1869 virtually created a new Church in 1870, and the Constitution then imposed on the Church from England is still, with some minor amendments, in force today in which it is declared to be '*the Ancient Catholic and Apostolic Church of Ireland*'. It obviously is not, no matter what the English Act of 1869 says.

Kenneth Milne quotes from a 2002 leaflet published by the Association for Promoting Christian Knowledge (APCK) which states the claims of the Anglicans as:

"The Church of Ireland is Catholic because it is in possession of a continuous tradition of faith and practice, based on the Scriptures and early traditions, enshrined in the Catholic creeds and apostolic ministry."

"The Church of Ireland is Protestant or Reformed, because it affirms its constant witness against all those innovations in doctrine and worship, *whereby the Primitive faith hath been from time to time defaced or overlaid.*"

This dichotomy of being both Catholic and Protestant is emphasised as being "*at the heart of the Church of Ireland's sense of identity*".

That the assertion that the Church of Ireland is both Catholic and Protestant is a politically secular equivocation is clear from page 26 where Kenneth Milne says:

"...the country's position as a conquered (or part-conquered) land made it inevitable according to the politics of the time that her people would be expected to accept the religion of the ruler, as elsewhere in Europe."

And there you have it—"the religion of the ruler". The religion of the conqueror was sought to be imposed on Ireland "as elsewhere in Europe". But Ireland was not a signature-party to the Treaty of Utrecht. Nor to the Treaty of Westphalia, in particular. The People of Ireland, that is the vast majority of the people of Ireland, have always in the past been supporters of the Pope of Rome as Head of the Catholic Church. The majority of the people of Ireland never agreed to the English monarch being head of the Church. That the English monarch recognised the Catholic religion, as practised by the majority of the Irish people, as being a separate religion from the religion practised by Edward VI and Elizabeth I and their successors is evidenced by their persecutions of Irish Catholics. And so how can the Church of Ireland say that the religion as practised by them is the Catholic religion, as practised by those Catholics who are and have been continuously in communion with the Catholic Church which recognises the Pope of Rome as its head and the Mass as a basic part of its doctrine and beliefs? As Kenneth Milne says on

page 27:

"The Reformation, therefore, was imposed on Ireland and lacked the support that Henry VIII was given in England by sections of the people"

As if religious belief is a democratic matter!

The text does exhibit to the unbiased Irish reader how the Church of Ireland was strongly and unequivocally a part of the colonial domination of Ireland by England and on page 71 Raymond Refaussé says:

"The Church of Ireland was always a minority Church but membership of the Established Church was critical not alone to ecclesiastical advancement but also to the attainment of office and the ownership of land..."

And:

"Thus the archives of the Church of Ireland reflect a much wider spectrum of Irish life than might otherwise be supposed."

The full title of the book is *The Church of Ireland: An Illustrated History*. Certainly the illustrations are beautiful but the history is a useful but sad reminder of the exquisitely cruel and widespread persecutions imposed on the majority of Irish people by the English, now British, State for reasons of power and mercenary gain.

Michael Stack ©

## DIGGING

I went to a garden-centre the other day looking for compost and was offered sacks of sacred soil full of ghosts, bone-chippings as if someone had been flayed, dried blood now alive from fields rain-soaked, milked from those who had croaked, (imported from poor little Belgium) traces of Wild-Geese Irish as grunge, a brass button here, a corroded I.D. disk there, traces of khaki in shredded tears, a fossilised voice-box that droned, (I swear I heard a moan) a point 303 bullet stuck in a gullet. Says I: 'What does it grow - just spread it and use the hoe, to grow cabbages, potatoes and sprouts?' He laughed: 'Maybe, but don't go growing Krauts. No, feed the nation, help its incarnation, grow war, it needs human flesh this Minotaur.'

Wilson John Haire  
2nd November 2013

## Censorship British-style

BBC Radio 3 (September 2013) ran a sort-of festival of film music. ('Sort-of' because it's largely Anglo-American film music, the 'Anglo' end being incredibly militaristic.) Friday the 13th had a lot of music from horror films and other scary-stuff.

Some of this included Hitchcock material and his favourite composer Bernard Herrmann. Seán Rafferty, (who used to look genuinely upset when he announced yet another killing in BBC NI telly) presides over the daily *In Tune* programme, which was involved in this *Sound of Cinema* 'festival'. He interviewed Hermann's wife, Norma. Norma has an English accent; Bernard left the US in the late 1950s, partly for political reasons (he was a Labourite and Trade Unionist). He irritated his bosses, being a raucous New Yorker who didn't suffer fools gladly.

His bosses wanted big blowsy orchestral sounds; he produced stuff like the *Psycho* soundtrack, Hitchcock appreciated Hermann's work. The 'back office' liked to play safe. Hermann moved to the UK and (nothing if not professional) took a

job conducting the BBC's Northern (Manchester-based) Dance Band. It was in this capacity as a BBC employee that he met the boss of the British Board of Film Censorship.

This body still exists but 'Censorship' has been replaced by 'Classification'. 'The British' (including people who sat on this body) were fond of throwing their hands up in horror at the notion that Éire had a *Censorship Board*! Unionists got in on the act too, kindly don't be so tasteless as to mention 'Stormount's *Flags & Emblems* Act. (That Act was Paisley's excuse for his (1964) march—on a former funeral furnisher's shop in Belfast's Divis Street. Sinn Féin had a (very small) tricolour in the window of its election headquarters, along with a flower-urn and a number of bluebottle-corpuses; all of which could be—just about—seen through archaeological layers of dust.)

Anyway—when Hermann encountered the censor the latter told him that he had attempted to censor the *music* of *Psycho*, but was disappointed to discover that he did not have the legal authority to.

The next time Tin Tin O'Toole tries to guilt-trip you about How Awful was Éire—ere he started writing in the *West British Times*,—just keep the above in mind.

Seán McGouran

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

**Review of Irish Neutrality in World War 2** by Jack Lane and Brendan Clifford in fourth edition of **Elizabeth Bowen: "Notes On Eire"**. Espionage Reports To Winston Churchill, 1940-42. €24, £20

Carl Peters: **How German East Africa Was Founded**. Translated by Philip O'Connor (A4). €9, £7

**A North Cork Anthology**. Edited by Jack Lane and Brendan Clifford. (Bowen, Buckley, Burke, Curran, Davis, Dinneen, Eoghan Rua, etc.) €15, £12

**Second, improved edition, newly issued Eoghan Rua Ó Súilleabháin: Aislingí / Vision Poems**. With translations by Pat Muldowney, Introductory material by P. Dinneen. Includes: **Conflicting Views Of Ireland In The 18th Century: Revisionist History Under The Spotlight** by B. Clifford. €27, £23.50

All post-free in Ireland and Britain

## TU NOTES continued

figures show the number of anonymous tip-offs this year had reached 21,000 by November and may end up exceeding last year's record of 28,000.

\*\*\*\*\*

### Labour/Fianna Fail?

"Despite my high regard for Dick Spring, Labour made the drastic mistake of not going back into government in 1994 with Fianna Fáil {after Labour's coalition with the Albert Reynolds-led administration had collapsed}. I think that was probably the most serious mistake we {Labour} made since 1918, when it decided not to contest the election. Nothing we did or failed to do in the subsequent years compares in terms of the importance of failing to intervene in that election to alert people to the threat posed by the PDs. If the result had been otherwise, Eircom would not have been privatised, the sales of ACC, the ICC and TSB banks would not have occurred and the look-the-other way regulator culture would not have developed unimpeded because the Labour Party here never became a Blairite party." (*Jack O'Connor*, President SIPTU, *Irish Times*, 24.1.2014).

\*\*\*\*\*

### Shannon Dispute

"Workers at Shannon Aerospace have overwhelmingly rejected a Labour Court recommendation aimed at resolving a dispute over the management's plans to close the defined benefit pension scheme.

"The company had announced to staff that it would cease making contributions to the scheme, which is solvent, from February 3rd, 2014.

"The Labour Court recommended that both sides maintain the status quo for two months to allow for negotiations.

"Management at Shannon Aerospace had accepted the recommendation but last night 92% of staff voted to reject the recommendation. The turnout was about 88%. Siptu has not issued a formal comment on the ballot result. The company employs about 500 people" (*Irish Examiner*, 25.1.2014).

\*\*\*\*\*

### Busiest Man In Ireland!

"Broadcaster Joe Duffy was briefly speechless when he was presented with a trade union badge from 1913 to mark his contribution to the Lockout commemorations.

"SIPTU General Secretary O'Flynn said: "Joe's involvement in the commemorations of the Lockout centenary was far-reaching. He helped to remind so many people of the sacrifices made, and the courage shown, by 20,000 workers and their families during the Lockout" (*Irish Ind*, 22.1.2014).

"Salary cuts for one of RTE's top earners Joe Duffy do not appear to have hit his bank balance as his firm's cash pile last year increased 11% to €168,320.

Last year, RTE confirmed that Duffy—who celebrates his 58th birthday on Monday—agreed to a further pay cut to bring his salary to €300,000, down from

€378,000 in 2011 when he was RTE's fourth highest paid presenter" (*Irish Independent*, 24.1.2014).

Day after day, like Sisyphus, Joe bears the woes of the nation on his back and by the looks of it, will for many a day : before he crosses "the mountain of Woes".

\*\*\*\*\*

### Fines

"The country's unions are concerned that proposals to give courts the power to deduct money from a person's wage may be used by bosses to dismiss or discriminate against employees.

"The Irish Congress of Trade Unions also wants draft laws to be changed so that people on very flexible contracts, who are expected to be available to work at short notice, do not risk losing their jobs by doing community service in lieu of not paying fines.

Raising the issue of discrimination at the Oireachtas Justice Committee, Sinn Féin TD for Donegal North-East, Pádraig MacLochlainn said that Ictu was seeking amendments to proposed laws (*Irish Examiner*, 23.1.2014).

\*\*\*\*\*

## Finian McGrath

### Press Releases

#### McGrath Warns Independents On Reform Alliance

Deputy Finian McGrath TD has strongly warned Independent TDs, Senators and Councillors to be cautious about getting involved with the newly formed group Reform Alliance. For the past few weeks they have been undermining the Independent brand and the great work that Independents do at a national and local level. People are fed up with party politics and looking to the Independents to be their voice. They know that the Independents are only answerable to the citizens of Ireland and not any political party or elite group.

The Independents have become a major new force and have huge potential to put new and radical policies forward to build a new Ireland. The Reform Alliance are nothing but a group of disillusioned Fine Gael TDs that basically support the economic policies of the Government but reject their social policies.

Deputy McGrath TD has said that he will be encouraging his Independent colleagues not to get involved in the Reform Alliance as genuine reform and change will only come with good and solid Independent voices that reflect *the true voice of the people* at a local and national level.

"We all want change. We all want reform. We all want a new Ireland but the best way forward is more Independents in the Dail fighting for our citizens", said McGrath.

For more information contact Finian McGrath mob: 087 6738041

### Damn Your Buckets And Charity.

#### *We Want Justice*

Following the recent scandal at the Central Remedial Centre charity, Finian McGrath has called for an end to the charity mentality in relation to people with a disability. Finian, who is also a parent of a daughter with a disability, has called on the Government and the wider society to respect all of our citizens and respect their rights. People with a disability and their families pay their taxes like everyone else and so should get services. You either believe in equality or you don't. We all need to end the mentality of the bucket and support the rights of the disabled.

The people suffering most in the CRC Scandal are the disabled, their families and the frontline staff. This scandal should not distract us from the cuts that have been made to these services. *Damn your charity, we want Justice.*  
6th January, 2014

### Lethal Allies

**Dáil Question** to Minister for Justice and Equality (Mr. Shatter) by Deputy Finian McGrath. 14 November 2013.

To ask the Minister for Justice and Equality if he will deal with the major justice issues in Anne Cadwallader's new book "Lethal Allies" which deals with British collusion in Ireland?

**REPLY** "...I do not think any of us can forget the many horrific acts of violence related to the conflict in Northern Ireland or, indeed, the pain that is still being felt as a result. The survivors and the relatives of those killed and injured have borne the grief of these tragic events and the memory of their loved ones lives on with them.

The atrocities perpetrated in Dublin, Monaghan, Dundalk and elsewhere in the 1970s and incidents such as the massacre of the Miami Showband stand out in the memory as particularly bloody episodes in this island's history. These incidents are among those reflected on in the book to which the Deputy refers. The Garda authorities are, of course, aware of the claims in the book. The Deputy will be aware that the author relies to some extent on material arising from the PSNI's Historical Enquiries Team. The Garda Authorities maintain a close working relationship with the PSNI and the HET.

As the Deputy is aware, the late Judge Henry Barron and Patrick McEntee SC carried out detailed and painstaking inquiries into those awful events in Dublin and Monaghan in May 1974 and, indeed, other tragic atrocities that took place between 1972 and 1976 in which so many innocent people lost their lives. The Garda authorities co-operated fully with the Barron and McEntee inquiries.

The Deputy will recall that this House and Seanad Éireann have previously and unanimously urged the British Government to allow access to documents relevant to these events. I know that many Deputies in this House have raised this issue directly with our counterparts at Westminster and that they will continue to do so.

For its part, since this Government took office, the Taoiseach has raised the issue with the British Prime Minister and the Tánaiste has also raised the matter with the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland. The Deputy will wish to note also that the Taoiseach met with Justice for the Forgotten and a group of victims and relatives in July of this year and assured them of the Government's continued support for their cause."

## GUILDS continued

Catholics have not merely the satisfaction of seeing their solutions stand the test of life, but they have the advantage of a doctrine which can save them from disastrous experiments" (Ibid, p.191)

Fr. McKeivitt reviewed The Report of the Vocational Commission in *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*-December, 1944), his final comments were:

"Whatever steps are taken, it is certain that future generations will condemn us if we miss this opportunity. Other nations are stumbling in doubt and uncertainty, and the immediate future seems dark to them in spite of the spate of planning. We are called on to show courage and adopt an organization of life that corresponds to the personal and social needs of man and that, in its essential principles, is guaranteed by its successful operation for hundreds of years."

But it was not to be. Apart from political opposition, there was substantial opposition from within his own Church.

"The Republic of Ireland was over 90% Catholic and there were few exponents of communism, liberalism or democratic socialism. A movement, which was motivated by Catholic social principles, should have met with little resistance—especially when the vocationalist principle was expressed in the 1937 constitution. Yet the resistance was overwhelming. The majority of Irish Catholic bishops and priests either opposed or failed to support the vocationalist cause. Fr. John Hayes, founder of Muintir na Tire, did more than any other vocationalist to translate theory into practice. His efforts to give practical effect to Catholic social teaching met with '...stone walls of clerical opposition ... There was a resistance to Catholic social work in Ireland by the older priests only to be compared with the resistance to Russian communism'. A minority of young priests regarded the guilds of Muintir na Tire as mere forums for discussion. Others believed 'the movement was fraught with dangers: the laity getting too much control... interference in church affairs and, worst of all, the mingling of Catholics and Protestants.' Thus, it worried Fr. Hayes that his work might be '... a labour of Sisyphus; it would be so hard to make it prevail against the spirit of the age'. Conservative bishops and priest were quite capable of suppressing vocationalist inspired schemes without any assistance from politicians and civil servants" (*Vocationalism & Social Catholicism in Twentieth-Century Ireland*, Don O'Leary, Irish Academic Press, 2000, p.164/65).

(To be continued)

## TRADE UNION NOTES

### Apprentices

The apprenticeship system should be expanded into new business and industrial sectors, according to an expert group. (*Irish Independent*, 22.1.2014)

Among the key recommendations of the independent review group were that an apprenticeship council should be established, hosted by Solas (formerly FAS).

Employers should pay apprentices in the new areas for both on and off-the-job periods.

And skills such as literacy, numeracy, maths, science and information and communications technology should be integrated into courses, the group recommended.

The group's report said that apprentice pay in Ireland was high compared with most countries, with the exception of Australia, Denmark and Sweden.

But, following the collapse in the construction sector, recruitment into apprenticeships is now at 20% of what it was at its peak, although there is recent evidence of recovery, with intake increasing by 10% in 2012, and an 18% estimated increase last year.

However, there is the world of 'Expert Groups; and the 'Real World':

"Starting this year, a student services fee of between €833 and €1,433 will be charged to apprentices who attend institutes of technology, despite many earning very low wages.

"In support of the 7,500 apprentices across the country, T.E.E.U. General Secretary Eamon Devoy said yesterday he believed it was an unfair fee.

"Everyone we've met is outraged with this and have no intention of paying it," he said. "They have little or no access to the services for which they are being charged" (*Irish Times*, 11.1.2014).

All this was made known the same week that the Government announced €12.5 billion in incentives to farmers from now to 2020. They also revealed they would give 'top-ups' of 25% to young farmers in a bid to get parents to pass the farm on.

"Ould Ireland" is far from dead and gone—they're just waiting for the price of property to rise.

\*\*\*\*\*

### Fiefdoms

My friend Mick is not impressed with the above. He claims everything these days is a scam to save money, it seems, whilst continuing to tax us royally as if Ireland Inc. was their own personal fiefdom.

"Take the new Junior Cert 'cycle' - I know many people think teachers have it easy, especially the government. So scrap end-of-year Exams and save a ton of money on setting and correcting papers, invigilators

etc. Get teachers to do it instead during their 'working hours' for free under Haddington Road, and rename it 'continuous assessment'. Then brainwash everyone, so that when they're clanking around in chains under the overseer's whips they chant the mantra "I'm lu-uu-ckky to have a job! I'm lu-uu-uukky to have a jo-o-o-b!"

\*\*\*\*\*

### PAY RISE

MANDATE wins €15 MILLION in pay rises for 40,000 workers. More than 40,000 workers in the Irish retail industry secured pay rises of an average 2.5% in 2013, cumulatively worth more than €15 million.

\*\*\*\*\*

### Liebherr

"A majority of Siptu workers at the Liebherr Ireland container plant in Killybegs last night rejected Labour Court proposals aimed at resolving a four-year pay claim dispute and the result is likely to add greatly to worries about the future of one of Kerry's biggest firms.

"A SIPTU spokesman last night confirmed the proposals had been rejected and said a statement would be issued this morning." (*Irish Times*, 15.1.2014)

The Union, which represents less than half the 670 workforce, had taken industrial action in November and December, 2013, in relation to a pay claim dating to 2009.

In early December, management accepted labour court recommendations to pay 2.5 %, back dated 18 months in return for work changes. However, the German-owned company issued stern warnings that its commitment to Killarney had been weakened as a result of actions by the Siptu workers, including staging a strike on a day when a long planned for visit by international industrialists was taking place.

"The vote took place in the plant yesterday and sources suggested that just under 270 workers voted, with 160 rejecting the recommendations" (*Irish Times*, 15.1.2014)

\*\*\*\*\*

### Informers?

"To label someone "an informer" throughout Irish history has traditionally been one of the most incendiary insults imaginable.

"Not anymore.

"If the soaring number of anonymous tip-offs over suspected social welfare fraud is anything to go by, the population is happy to embrace a new culture of grassing on their neighbours.

"While informing was once considered an act of national treason, now—the message seems to be—it's in the national interest." (*Irish Times*, 31.12.2014)

This transformation in attitudes has mirrored the country's economic collapse.

Whereas just 600 reports of suspected fraud were reported to authorities at the tail-end of the boom years in 2007, new

continued on page 29

## GUILDS continued

into a contract of employment. To go on strike or to induce other to do so was equally banned. Furthermore, no meetings might be held and no collection made to further these illegal objects. The law compelled the workers to give evidence against each other. True, the law forbade similar combinations among employers, but it was rarely enforced and it did not provide for compulsory testimony. Consequently, a worker was left without legal defence as any organised defence involved a breach of the law against meetings and financial levies. The Act was repealed in 1824" (Ibid, p.70/71).

"In spite of this repeal, the employers got an Act passed in the following year by which any action taken as a result of the deliberations of a meeting of workers was declared illegal. This meant that the workers might discuss the disabilities under which they labour, but were precluded from seeking any remedy. Yet this right of discussion was a valuable means of propaganda and enabled the oppressed to build up a class sympathy and to agitate for the reform of the electoral laws. In 1871, and more comprehensively in 1876, trade unions were declared legal" (Ibid, p.71)

### TRADE DISPUTES ACT, 1906

"The last enactment which is of interest for us is the Trade Disputes Act of 1906 which exempted from action for damages an act committed against the employer by the officials of a trade union, when that act is in furtherance of an actual or contemplated trade dispute. The act contemplated must, of course, be an act which is otherwise lawful. The consequence of this legal recognition is that the trade union enjoys a measure of legal protection though it is not a legal corporation.\* This is in some respects an advantage as it cannot be sued in a court of law. Its officials are *personally* amenable for any illegalities. To round off the legal position, peaceful picketing is now legal" (Ibid, p.71).

### PROCESSES OF PRODUCTION

"Marx combined the dialectical method of Hegel with the materialism of Feuerbach to give a method of interpreting history, which was more extreme than the previous attempts to explain historical change as the result of the interplay of economic, climatic and geographical conditions. For Marx the significant factor in social development is the processes to production. If we know the tools that men

\* The above was published in 1944 and must be modified when trade unions are recognised as Approved Societies under the National Health Insurance Act, and also by virtue of the *Trade Union Bill, 1941*.

use, then we can see that their religious, moral and legal institutions are of a kind that still correspond with the methods of production. Feudal society corresponded to the craft workers and to the water mills. The laws, forms of government and family life of the capitalist era, are the outcome of the division of labour and mass-concentration of industry, characteristic of the industrial era.

"The transition from one epoch to another comes when the discovery of new methods of production renders the social super-structure inadequate. These changes are violent as in each epoch we find a dominant class which has vested interests in the old order. For if we except the most primitive communities, we find that every social group has been organised on the basis of class-distinction" (Ibid, p.170).

"The class that holds power—patricians, feudal nobles, capitalist employers—exploits the subject masses—plebeians, serfs or wage-earners. But the exploited class tends to unite for the overthrow of its oppressors. When it gains power a new cycle begins. The feudal system was wrecked by the free townsmen organised in craft and merchant guilds. When liberated these exercised domination over the propertyless workers—the proletariat."

### CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS

"Marx believed that the use of this method of interpretation can give us the key to future social development. Capitalism develops by the ever-increasing concentration of wealth. It favours large-scale industry which can produce more cheaply and undersell competitors. By degrees the small proprietor is driven from the market and is compelled to join the mass of the proletariat—the propertyless wage-earners.

"This latter class becomes more numerous and, in time, more conscious of the identity of interest of its members. Its ranks are swollen by the accession of the dispossessed intelligentsia. It learns from the part it plays in production how to manage the machinery of production. Accordingly, when its organisation reaches the necessary degree of perfection, it steps in and expropriates the few remaining capitalists and undertakes, in its own interest, the management of the already unified scheme of production" (Ibid, p.170/71).

Rev. McKeivitt was a firm supporter of Corporatism and in 1944, when writing *The Plan for Society*, laid great store in the outcome of the *Report of the Commission on Vocational Organisation* {1939-1943} to the extent that he delayed the printing of his own publication, to include a brief Postscript on the Commission Report.

### GUILDS AND CORPORATISM

"There still remains the question as to whether the proposed reform {Corpor-

ative Organisation} is workable. That question cannot be answered by pointing to the medieval guilds which flourished for hundreds of years in different countries. The conditions under which they operated were too diverse from those of modern large scale industry to give us complete certainty that the institution can be adapted to the needs of to-day. But those guilds can prove one thing—that no obstacle to corporatism need spring from the divergent interest of workers and employers or from the desirability of maintaining a reasonable degree of competition between traders. Masters and men combined in the past and the union was fruitful until the selfishness of the masters led to the victimisation of the other members" (Ibid, p.189/90).

"Unfortunately, the guild had been weakened also by the decay of the spirit of religion and lacked the energy and prestige which might have led to its adaptation to the needs of the new industrial era. Ineffective as the guild had become in the days of its decadence, its disappearance delivered over the workers to the greed of exploiters."

### VOCATIONAL COMMISSION

"But an institution which has its origin in paganism but came to full flower only in Christian times is the expression of an idea which has lost none of its validity. The full proof of its applicability to Irish conditions must await the report of the Vocational Commission... Apart however, from a comprehensive reform of the kind, we see signs of a movement towards some institutional form of unity between capital and labour in industrialised countries, like England and the United States" (Ibid, p.190).

Here McKeivitt cites the Whitley Councils, established in 1916, which "*exercise many of the functions of the corporation*". He was encouraged also by the U. New Deal administration which he believed expressed a necessity "to find a unifying organ in industrial relations. *It is noteworthy that the imposition of these codes were more strongly favoured by the unions than by the employers*" (Ibid, p.191).

"The growing instability of industrial life presses for the creation of the corporation. The owners of property and producers seek some guarantee against chaotic conditions in which uncertain costs and prices and unfair competition, make steady progress impossible. The workers need some permanent bulwark against the continual fear of depression and unemployment. They do not favour a situation in which their livelihood is under constant threat and in which they must ever remain mobilised for a struggle. All these factors are driving even Non-Catholics toward the corporatist solution.

continued on page 30



# Guilds and Corporatism

Peter McKevitt was born in Carlingford, Co. Louth in 1900. He was ordained a priest in 1925 and was appointed to Maynooth as Professor of Catholic Sociology and Catholic Action in October 1937. From the late 1940s to the early 1950s he was Editor of the journal *Christus Rex*, an Irish quarterly journal concerned with sociology. The extracts below come from his 1944 publication *A Plan Of Society* (Catholic Truth Society of Ireland). In 1969, he wrote a 16-page pamphlet by the CTS on James Connolly.

He lectured in Maynooth for 16 years before being appointed Parish Priest of Termonfeckin, Co. Louth in 1953. He passed away in November 1976.

The first Chair in Sociology at Maynooth College was established as early as 1930, when the Trustees accepted an offer from the Knights of St Columbanus to endow a chair. However, the Chair was not filled until 1937, when Rev. McKevitt, was appointed Professor of Catholic Sociology and Catholic Action. In 1953 McKevitt was succeeded by Jeremiah Newman, who in 1968 decided to relocate the Chair of Sociology in the Arts Faculty of the NUI College. A new Department of Social Studies was established, incorporating sociology. However, it was not until 1985 that it was established as the Department of Sociology.

## GUILD COUNCILS

"Prior to the Industrial Revolution, industry and trade were in large measure self-governing. The public authority did not intervene except to protect the interests of the consumer. The regulation of the conditions of employment was, as a rule, left to the Guild Councils. There were no trade unions—unions of employees—as we understand these organisations. In fact, these sectional unions were discouraged on the ground that they tended to raise prices to consumers.

"However, as the existing system

worked harmoniously, on the whole, and the participants in each industry tended to form one class, there was no widespread demand for diverse organisations. The journeyman, at least in the earlier days of the guilds, expected to become a master himself one day, and did not regard himself as belonging to a class different from that of the master with whom he worked.

"The craft guild drew up the rules which established the conditions which must be observed by all who were permitted to ply their trade in the town in which their authority was exercised. With those regulations which protected the public against fraud and extortion, we are not concerned here. But the position of the worker was safeguarded against unfair competition. Precautions were taken so that each might get a fair share of the available trade. Care was taken that apprentices received adequate instruction. Out of the common funds or by special levies, provision was made for the widows and orphans of deceased members" (*The Plan of Society*, Rev. Peter McKevitt, Catholic Truth Society of Ireland, 1944, p.69).

## POWER OF THE MASTERS

"By the middle of the 18th century,

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>

when the modern industrial era was inaugurated, the power of the guilds had everywhere declined. This was in large measure due to selfishness of the masters who used their controlling positions to exclude journeymen from promotion. But, in any case, the mobilisation of a large number of unskilled men demanded a more extensive organisation than the guilds could have provided. New industries, for which the old rules provided no directives, sprang into existence. The prevailing sentiment of the legislative authorities was opposed to the creation of new ordinances so that the employees had no protection against the exactions of their masters" (ibid, p.69/70).

"Against the wholesale victimisation that followed it was useless to invoke old statutes such as the Statute of Apprentices, {1563}, or to recall the powers vested in the Justices of the Peace to fix wages. The new grievances could not find an adequate remedy in statutes framed to meet industrial conditions of a different character. Only a new industrial code could have checked the wholesale exploitation of the workers."

## COMBINATION ACTS

"As the employers were opposed to any public supervision of industry, the only hope for the worker lay in organisation. In England, this remedy was denied them by the prohibitions of the Combination Acts of 1799 and 1800. Ostensibly these acts sought to prevent the formation of revolutionary bodies which might follow the example set by the French Revolution. Prior to this the laws forbidding conspiracy and the laws which voided contracts made in restraint of trade had been invoked against the workers but the Combination Acts rendered any trade union organisation, criminal.

"Savage sentences were imposed for violations. It was forbidden to combine for the purpose of securing a rise in wages or an alteration of working hours or working conditions. No form of coercion might be applied to an employer or an employee to prevent them entering