

Table of Contents

About the Journal

Dr. J. David Smith, "The History of the Gold Star Journal"  
by Ashun Johnson

The Journal's Winter Tradition

by J. P. Smith

The Journal's History in the 1990s: The Journal's History in the 1990s  
by J. P. Smith

The Journal's History in the 1990s

by J. P. Smith

The Journal's History in the 1990s

by J. P. Smith

# Gold Star Journal 1999 Edition

Edited by:  
R. Sellors Meador  
W. Eric Zink

## Table of Contents:

About the Journal .....	4
Drugs Used to Treat AIDS: Mechanisms, Uses and Resistance by Joshua Hermsen .....	5
The Roman Warrior Tradition by C. L. Paige .....	9
A Study of Trends in Smokeless Tobacco Usage Among The College Aged Population by Matthew Coggins, Brian Murphy, Rasheem Neloms .....	12
The Promulgation of Pantheism by Sellors Meador .....	17
At Critical Analysis of the British Counterinsurgency in Northern Ireland: Early phases, 1968-1970 by Gabriel Conlon .....	19

## **About the journal:**

*The Gold Star Journal* is the scholarly Journal of The Citadel, Military College of South Carolina. Papers written by students of various disciplines are voluntarily submitted and reviewed by the journal staff. Dr. Suzanne Mabrouk, Department of Chemistry, founded *The Gold Star Journal* to encourage the importance of good writing and academic excellence, as well as recognizing the hard work of students in their academic pursuits at the college.

## **The Editors:**

### **Sellers Meador**

Sellers Meador is a senior from Mobile, AL, and a Biology major here at The Citadel. Upon graduation in the spring of 2000, he plans to pursue a career in medicine.

### **W. Eric Zink**

Eric Zink is a junior from Newark Valley, NY. He is a Computer Science major, with a minor in Applied Physics. Having been published in the 1998 edition of Gold Star Journal, he was asked by Dr. Mabrouk to work on it this year. Graduating in the spring of 2000 he plans on entering the software development field and attending graduate school.

### **Acknowledgments;**

The staff of The Gold Star Journal would like to extend a very special thanks to Dr. Suzanne Mabrouk for her continued support of the journal over the past three years. The journal would also like to thank Brig. Gen. Clifton R. Poole for his support of the journal and for his work in making this publication possible. Also, the journal extends its gratitude to Lt. Col. Suzanne Ozment, Dean of Undergraduate Studies and Women, for her support of the journal, and her assistance in the publication. Thanks as well to Maj. Angela Williams for offering the continued assistance of the Citadel Writing center and its resources. Without the continued faithful support of all of these dedicated people The Gold Star Journal would be impossible.

## Drugs Used to Treat AIDS: Mechanisms, Uses and Resistance

Written by Joshua Hermsen

AIDS, Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome, is the expression of symptoms due to infection by the HIV-1 virus. This virus acts to compromise the immune system, which allows the most minor of pathogens to cause extreme damage to the body. While there is currently no cure or vaccine for this virus, there are drugs used to combat it. These drugs fall into one of four categories: nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTI's), non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTI's), protease inhibitors (PI's) and Hydroxyureans (HU). The basic, life sustaining processes of HIV-1 function, are the primary targets for the drugs used in treatment of infection. Each of the different types of drugs attempt to prevent, at different stages, production of new virulent particles. The drugs are complex in their mechanisms, have a unique way of being used clinically, and are resisted fairly easily.

The HIV virus is an RNA retrovirus. It consists of a lipid bilayer outer membrane, glycoproteins associated with the lipid membrane, several types of proteins that compose membrane like structures of their own, and the nucleic acid RNA (1). The virus works by a cycle similar to the lysogenic cycle exhibited by bacteriophage viruses. The virus enters the T4 cells of the immune system through the CD4 receptors of the T4 cell membrane. It is brought into the cell through endocytotic action and subsequently undergoes the process of uncoating. Through uncoating, the lipid bilayer and protein membranes of the virus are dissociated and the viral genomic RNA is exposed to the host cell's cytoplasm. Through the action of reverse transcriptase, the single stranded viral genomic RNA is made into double stranded complementary DNA (cDNA). This DNA is then incorporated into the host cell's genome. Through transcription, viral mRNA is made from the viral DNA in the host's genome. This viral mRNA can then be used in translation to produce the protein products that will constitute new viruses (1). The process of the viral genomic RNA being converted into cDNA via reverse transcriptase is targeted by three of the types of drugs used to fight HIV, the NRTI's, NNRTI's and HU. The other class of drugs; the protease inhibitors, work to prevent the viral protein products produced from the translation of viral mRNA, from being activated to form new virus particles (2).

If reverse transcriptase is effectively blocked, the virus is not able to replicate and damage to the host can be minimized. The process that transforms the RNA into DNA is called reverse transcription. The enzyme that catalyzes this reaction is called reverse transcriptase. Reverse transcriptase binds to the RNA and synthesizes a new strand of cDNA by adding triphosphate nucleotides together. The reaction is: RNA + deoxyribose-triphosphate nucleotides -----  
--- cDNA. The DNA will be composed of four different nucleotides. All of the nucleotides contain a deoxyribose sugar/phosphate backbone. As free molecules in the cell solution, each nucleotide has a triphosphate group attached to the 5' ribose carbon. Attached to the 1' carbon of each ribose is either a single ringed or double ringed structure. This ringed structure, a nitrogen base, is what differentiates the nucleotides. The purines, adenine (A) and guanine (G), are double ringed in structure. The pyrimidines, cytosine (C), thymine (T), and uracil (U, RNA only) are single ringed. The nucleotides are linked by 5'-3' phosphodiester linkage (backbone) and hydrogen bonding (between the ringed structures). Each nucleotide has an -OH group attached to the 3' carbon of the ribose or deoxyribose sugar. This 3' -OH group is hydrolyzed in a reaction catalyzed by reverse transcriptase and used to form the phosphodiester bond with the alpha phosphate attached to the 5' carbon of the ribose of another nucleotide.

### The Drugs

The NRTI's (nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors) are designed to block the formation of the cDNA strand. The NRTI's are nitrogenous base analogs. The drugs are very similar in structure to DNA nucleotides. So similar that the viral enzyme, reverse transcriptase will use them as nucleotides in synthesizing the cDNA chain if they are present in the system. The effectiveness of the drug results from a simple difference in structure. Instead of having an -OH group at the 3' position of ribose they have some other group. Zidovudine (better known as AZT), one of the most widely used NRTI's, has an N3 group in the 3' deoxyribose position (1). This difference in structure prevents the NRTI analog from forming the phosphodiester linkage with other nucleotides. The NRTI's are effectively DNA chain terminators. If these bonds cannot be formed; nucleotides cannot be added; the DNA cannot be synthesized and the virus cannot replicate (1).

The NNRTI's also target the reverse transcription process but in a slightly different way. NNRTI's target the viral enzyme reverse transcriptase itself, specifically its p66 subunit (1). Nevirapine, one of the most frequently used NNRTI's, binds to the p66 subunit near tyrosine 181 and tyrosine 188 (1). The active site of this subunit is not specifically known, but it is known that these tyrosine residues are near the site of catalytic activity. By binding to the p66 subunit, the function of the reverse transcriptase is inhibited. The enzyme is no longer able to link nucleotides together and form the cDNA. This prevents the virus from replicating.

Hydroxyurea is another drug that combats the RNA to DNA information flow. This drug combats the ability of the host cell to form deoxyribonucleotides. The exact mechanism of the drug's inhibitory action is not known (3). It is known however, that Hydroxyurea inhibits the host cell's ribonucleotide reductase enzyme. This is the enzyme that prepares nucleotides into their usable form by converting ribonucleotides into deoxyribonucleotides. The difference between these

two is the group attached to the 2' carbon of the ribose. In ribonucleotides there is an -OH attached to the 2' carbon, whereas in deoxyribonucleotides there is an -H attached to the 2' carbon. These deoxyribonucleotides are the building blocks of DNA; if they are not synthesized the DNA cannot be formed, and HIV-1 cannot replicate. Realistically, the Hydroxyurea does not totally inhibit the synthesis of DNA. DNA is produced, but the transcripts are incomplete and not viable. Hydroxyurea is unique among the HIV drugs, effecting only machinery of the host cell (3).

Protease inhibitors are targeted against a much different portion of the virus life cycle than the drugs discussed so far. Protease inhibitors target the conversion of polyproteins into active virus proteins (2). Polyproteins (pre-proteins) are the proteins formed from the translation of the viral mRNA. Protease is a viral enzyme coded for in the pol section of the viral genome (2,4). It is a dimer composed of two symmetrical peptide chains, each ninety-nine amino acids long (5). Protease is a member of the aspartyl protein group (3,4). This group also includes pepsin and renin (4). Protease is designed to cut itself out of the polyprotein, and then activate the polyprotein through proteolytic cleavage at phenylalanine-proline peptide bond sites (4). Protease inhibitors competitively bind to the protease active site and inhibit its functionality (2). Indinavir is one of the most effective protease inhibitors currently in use. The protease inhibitors are the newest class of HIV drugs.

### Clinical Use of HIV Drugs

It has been found that the most effective treatment for patients infected with HIV is a three drug cocktail. There are two important entities that are assayed to determine the state of a person's infection. The amount of T4 cells per millimeters cubed of blood and the viral load (number of copies of viral RNA per milliliter in the plasma). The goal of treatment is to maintain the highest possible level of T4 cells and an undetectable viral load. T4 level is actually assayed by measuring the amount of CD4 receptors present. A patient with a CD4 count below 500 is generally considered to have AIDS. It is important to remember that a person can be infected with the HIV virus and not have AIDS for a period of greater than ten years.

Initial infection with the HIV virus causes a large immune response. CD4 counts plummet while viral load rises. During this time the virus begins seeding itself in the lymph nodes. Usually within a period of three months the viral load has diminished to undetectable levels and CD4 counts are close to normal. There are physical symptoms associated with this period such as fever, lymphadenopathy, rash, diarrhea and headache (5). Many people attribute these symptoms to something else, such as a cold or allergies, and therefore do not get tested and diagnosed. There is debate whether to begin treatment as soon as a person is infected (if it is known) or to wait until problems begin to arise later. Most studies have shown that immediate therapy augments the immune system's initial response and results in maintaining higher CD4 counts and lower viral loads (1,2).

The use of HIV drugs in treatment is a major topic of clinical study. The current consensus is that a combination of two NRTI's and one protease inhibitor yields the best overall results. One study has shown that a three-drug regimen is more effective than two drug, or mono-therapy drug regimens utilizing the same drugs (4,6). In a study published a little over a year ago, a combination of Zidovudine (AZT), Lamivudine (3TC), and Indinavir was tested against Zidovudine + lamivudine and Indinavir alone. This is only one study, but the results are indicative of others. Patients in the three-drug treatment group (AZT+3TC+Ind) were 50% less likely to deteriorate further or die during the thirteen-month test period than patients in the two drug or mono-therapy groups. CD4 counts remained higher in the three-drug group and viral loads remained lower throughout the term of study (7). The average CD4 count was raised (from counts at start of test) and maintained by one hundred cells per cubic millimeter. The average decrease in viral load (from levels at the start of the test) was  $-2 \text{ LOG}_{10}$  (7). This study is exciting because it shows an actual improvement in patient condition, not just stabilization or decreased rate of decline.

Studies involving Hydroxyurea have also involved using drug combinations. In a study involving Hydroxyurea and an NRTI, viral load levels were reduced by a factor of  $-1.3 \text{ LOG}_{10}$  from the patient's levels before treatment, which was an increase of  $-.5 \text{ LOG}_{10}$  over treatment with the NRTI alone (3,8). Another study used a three-drug regimen consisting of Hydroxyurea, an NRTI and a Protease inhibitor. During this study replication competent virus could not be found in 2/3 of the patients (3). These results are encouraging and make sense. With this drug combination, the host cell's ribonucleotide reductase is inhibited and the cell has difficulty in making nucleotides; the viral enzyme that transcribes DNA is inhibited, and the viral enzyme that activates viral proteins, protease, is inhibited. It makes sense that combating the viral cycle from 3 differing angles would yield positive results.

The molecular mechanisms of a drug make it specific for treatment of a condition or ailment. The way that drugs interact and the effects of drugs being used together dictate the combinations that are used. There are other factors that affect the use of drugs such as bioavailability and half-life. Bioavailability measures the amount of active drug left in the body after absorption is taken into account. A high percent bioavailability is good and means that only a small amount of drug is lost through absorption. Half-life of a drug also affects its use. The half-life is a measure of the amount of time it takes for  $\frac{1}{2}$  mass of the drug to be metabolized or otherwise rendered ineffective. One of the most prescribed NNRTI's, Nevirapine, has an oral bioavailability of greater than 90% and a serum  $\frac{1}{2}$  life of 25-30 hours (5). This long  $\frac{1}{2}$  life and high bioavailability account for the smaller doses of NNRTI's that are needed in treatment. Zidovudine, a common NRTI, has an

oral bioavailability of 60% (5). This is a relatively low bioavailability, and is the reason that large doses must be given daily. Doses are given more than once daily because of the short intracellular  $\frac{1}{2}$  life (3 hours) of Zidovudine (5). The level of drugs must be kept at a constant high rate to combat the level of new virus produced daily. Estimates of viral production are around  $10^{10}$  new viruses daily (6). The protease inhibitors have an oral bioavailability of 65% and a  $\frac{1}{2}$  life of 1.5-2 hours. These factors make it necessary for protease inhibitors to be taken in larger doses and more frequently. The amount of drugs necessary to effectively fight HIV infection lead to more problems. Patient adherence or compliance to the treatment program often suffers because of the sheer amount of drugs that have to be taken. One of the protease inhibitors, Saquinavir, must be taken three times daily. Each dose is 1200 mg, which is in the form of six 200-mg pills. Eighteen pills daily, plus the pills for the other drugs used in combination. It can be confusing if not kept under strict watch. This problem will be minimized as drug companies develop combination formulas. Merck has already done this with two NRTI's, Zidovudine and Lamivudine, in a combination treatment called Combivir (9). Also, the cost of this treatment is enormous. For a combination therapy consisting of AZT, 3TC and a protease inhibitor, the cost is over ten thousand dollars per year. When considering the socio-economic status of some infected people this is overwhelming and impossible.

### Resistance

Perhaps the largest problem facing the fight against HIV is resistance. This resistance results from genetic alterations. Mutations in the cDNA transcribed from the viral RNA are much more prevalent than in the body's normal genetic processes because, unlike DNA polymerase III, reverse transcriptase has no proofreading mechanism. This allows for any and all mistakes made during transcription to be expressed phenotypically.

The rate of mutation for HIV is approximately 1 in ten thousand cells (2). If viral replication is occurring at  $10^{10}$  new viruses per day, there are one million mutated viruses produced each day. Reports of resistance are staggering. In the above mentioned study involving AZT, 3TC and Indinavir 83% of the patients in the two NRTI treatment group had resistance to 3TC after six months. One hundred percent of the patients in the three-drug treatment group (that had amplifiable viral loads) had this same resistance (7).

Possibly the best news about resistance concerns the Hydroxyurea drugs. These drugs are unique in that they combat the machinery of the host cell, not the virus. It is hypothesized that viral resistance against Hydroxyurea will be less likely to form as a result of this. For resistance to form against Hydroxyurea, the host cell DNA would have to be mutated. The chance of this is less likely because of the proofreading and repair mechanisms possessed by human DNA (3).

Resistance to protease inhibitors is a big concern. While these drugs are very potent the development of resistance poses a threat to their overall effectiveness. Protease inhibitors select for mutations within the pol section of the HIV genome. These mutations lead to structural changes in the protease that make it resistant to inhibition (6). There are specific codons within the protease sequence that confer resistance. For Indinavir, codons 32, 46, 71, 82, and 84 are significant and codons 46 and 82 are most important. Resistance requires multiple mutations and more mutations confer higher levels of resistance. Resistance to protease inhibitors occurs more rapidly when lower doses are administered. This effect is increased when a protease inhibitor monotherapy is used (6). Resistance to protease inhibitors is decreased when used in combination with other drugs. The protease inhibitors are similar enough in structure that resistance to one usually confers resistance to others. The prospect of a transmittable HIV strain that is resistant to all protease inhibitors has already been realized. A case involving a patient in San Francisco gave epidemiologic and genetic proof of a transmittable HIV virus that is resistant to all protease inhibitors (8).

Great strides have been made in the fight against the HIV virus since it was first seen eighteen years ago. The life expectancy and quality of life for people infected with HIV is steadily on the rise. HIV is a debilitating and elusive virus that is constantly one step ahead of the scientific efforts made against it. The virus has reached pandemic proportions and will continue to flourish until still better treatments are developed and greater attempts are made to halt transmission.

## References

- Mandell G.L., Atlas of Infectious Diseases, 2nd edition:2.x, 19.x, 20.x,1997.
- Simmons C.M., Protease Inhibitors: Understanding Their Role in HIV/AIDS Treatment, Physician Assistant, 49-54, 1997.
- Schochetman Y.C. et al, Hydroxyurea in the Treatment of HIV Disease: Targeting Cellular Enzymes in Antiretroviral Therapy, 2-1, 1998.
- McDonald C.K. et al, Human Immunodeficiency Virus Type 1 Protease Inhibitors, Archives of Internal Medicine, 157, 951-959, 1997.
- Feinberg M.B. et al, Report of the NIH Panel to Define Principles of Therapy of HIV Infection and Guidelines for the Use of Antiretroviral Agents on HIV Infected Adults and Adolescents, Annals of Internal Medicine, 128, 1058-1098,1998.
- Deeks S.G. et al, HIV-1 Protease Inhibitors, Journal of American Medical Association,277, 145-151, 1997.
- Hammer S.M. et al, A Controlled Trial of Two Nucleoside Analogues Plus Indinavir in Persons with Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infection and CD4 Cell Counts of 200 per Cubic Millimeter of Less, The New England Journal of Medicine, 337, 725-739, 1997.
- Sherer R., Optimizing Antiretroviral therapy, Update for the 12th World AIDS Conference, 2-5, 1998.
- Carpenter C.C.J. et al, Antiretroviral Therapy for HIV Infection in 1998, Journal of the American Medical Association, 280, 78-82, 1998.

## The Roman Warrior Tradition

Written by C. L. Paige

The Romans have always had a long history of warrior traditions and values. This tradition was evident in every aspect of their culture. Whether found in sculptures, frescoes, poems, plays, songs, or politics, the Romans had a strong warrior element in their lives. The Roman soldier, however, changed over time. From the time of Cincinnatus to the time of Caesar, the Roman warrior changed his values. To illustrate this clearly, one must review the works of the Roman people to learn their philosophy on what the perfect soldier should be.

The history of the strong Roman warrior culture begins with the myth of Romulus and Remus, who later become the legendary founders of Rome. As the story goes in Livy's A History of Rome, Romulus and Remus's great uncle, Amulius, was the twin brother of Numitor, their grandfather. In order to usurp the throne from the rightful heir, Numitor, Amulius banished him from the kingdom, destroyed his genitals and appointed his daughter, Rhea Silvia, a Vestal Virgin (this meant that she had to take an oath of perpetual virginity). This was to ensure his unchallenged reign as king. As luck would have it, while a Vestal Virgin, Rhea Silvia encountered the Roman god of war, Mars. They had an intimate affair, which resulted in the birth of the twins Romulus and Remus (Livy, 21). Here we see already that the legendary founder of Rome was the son of the god of war. The strong warrior tradition already was coming alive in this classical myth.

The Romans also associated themselves closely with the myth of Hercules. Hercules was the greatest mythological hero at the time and Romans strived to be like him. The Romans felt that they were the supreme warrior race and wanted to have a warrior role model. Hercules comprised all the virtues of a warrior. His strength and might was surpassed by none. His redemption of his crimes of passion showed his developing discipline. The Romans felt that Hercules, as the son of Jupiter, was the epitome of the virtuous warrior.

Roman history is split into two periods. The first is the Roman Republic (which comes from the Latin words "res" and "publica" meaning the "public thing"). The Republic lasted from 509 B. C. E. to 31 B. C. E. and consisted of two periods: the early Republic and the late Republic (Kagan, 117, 147). The early Republic ran from 509 B. C. E. to 133 B. C. E. and the late Republic from 133 B. C. E. to 31 B. C. E. (Kagan 117, 147). This is important to know for one will see a change in the way the Romans viewed their soldiers and what motivated men to serve in the army of the Republic.

The early Republic was a time when the Roman soldier valued loyalty to his family, his country, and the gods of Rome. This made the Romans value the citizen-soldier as being the ideal warrior of the times. The legend of Lucius Quinctius Cincinnatus describes the Roman ideal of the citizen-soldier. Cincinnatus was a Roman farmer who was appointed dictator by the Senate to take charge of the Roman army when the Aequi besieged Rome. When appointed dictator, he ordered all business to be suspended and all men of military age to report for duty. Eager to please their dictator, all the men able to fight reported willing and ready. Being trained beforehand and having the rations and equipment needed for battle, they marched to the city where the Aequi were and besieged them, making the besiegers the besieged (Livy, 98-100). After this victory, Cincinnatus returned to his farm where he spent the remainder of his life. The battle that Cincinnatus fought was relatively unimportant in Roman times, but the moral of the story is legendary. Everything that Cincinnatus stood for was what the Romans viewed as a true warrior. He served his country, led in battle, then turned his back on personal honor and glory and returned to his farm. The citizen-soldier, as represented by Cincinnatus, was the true Roman soldier of the early Republic.

In the early Republic, the consuls were expected to fight for Rome when attacked by her enemies. This was what motivated Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus to fight for Rome during the outbreak of the Second Punic War (218-202 B. C. E.). At the time of the outbreak of the war, Scipio Africanus was a twenty-five-old citizen who had never held high office but had amazing capabilities as a general (Kagan, 124). This meant that he was obligated to lead the Roman army into war. After several decisive battles with the Carthaginians under Hannibal Barca, the war seemed hopeless for the Romans. Scipio Africanus managed to rally the support of the Roman allies in southern Italy and defeated the Carthaginians at the battle of Zama (202 B. C. E.) winning the war for Rome (Livy, 340). Again, we see the citizen-soldier come to life in the Republic. Here a man achieved honor and glory by serving his country to the best of his abilities as both a citizen and a soldier.

By the end of the Punic Wars, the Republic started to weaken. After many years of fighting, Rome was at peace with the world. Already having conquered the Mediterranean and the Italian Peninsula, the Roman soldiers had nowhere to fight and returned to be rewarded for their hard work. But after they fought many battles on their own soil, the Senate had nothing to offer the troops and many of them became landless laborers. This created resentment and anger among the men who had fought valiantly for Rome and now were being ignored by society. One attempt to rectify this situation was the redistribution of all the land. The Gracchi, two brothers who became tribunes, promulgated this idea (Kagan, 133). This attempt to give land to the landless resulted in the beginning of the end of the Roman Constitution.

The end of the Republic also signified the end of the citizen-soldier in Rome. With landless soldiers in abundance, generals could now recruit from the ranks of the poor for political purposes only. The first to do this was Cornelius Marius (Livy, 502). In order to defeat two barbaric tribes threatening the Roman Republic from the north, Marius recruited from the landless soldiers and promised them land and protection while they served for him, and all they had to do was swear



allegiance to him (Livy, 503). This changed the Roman warrior, for now he was fighting for a general rather than Rome itself. In addition, this made the soldier a mercenary rather than a patriot. All that the Roman soldiers were fighting for now was land and money rather than the values of their forefathers. The only thing that connected them to the virtues of Cincinnatus and Scipio Africanus was that they were Roman citizens but even this would change.

After Marius' reforms and strategic successes, other generals started to follow suit and before anything could be done, the generals now held more power and influence than the Senate, allowing them to dictate laws in Rome. This was apparent by the middle of the last century B. C. E. when Gaius Iulius Caesar went on his *cursus honorum*. Gaius Iulius Caesar was the epitome of the virtuous Roman Warrior in the *late* Republic. Caesar was a man of noble birth whose family had lost its wealth. He then ran for consul by throwing elaborate and ostentatious parades (Kagan, 140). This made him strongly indebted to the banks. When Caesar was elected consul, he used funds from the Roman Treasury to pay off his debts. When word of this got to his enemies, he was scheduled to go on trial after his consulship. Caesar, being a wily politician, ensured his position as proconsul of Cisalpine Gaul after his consulship of Rome, exempting him from trial (Kagan, 141). From there, Caesar conscripted men from the local region to carry out his plan of the conquest of Gaul (Caesar, 40). Caesar had already distinguished himself as an able military leader with his exploits in Aisa Minor and Hispana (Kagan, 140). This was to ensure his greatest ambition of being the first sole ruler of Rome in nearly five hundred years. When the Helvetii went on the move, he quickly went to Lake Geneva to fortify the Danube River and conscripted two legions of men (Caesar, 137). This was a pivotal moment in the Roman Warrior tradition. Throughout the history of Rome, no foreigner had ever fought for the glory and expansion of Rome, but by drafting non-Roman citizens to fight for Rome, Caesar destroyed the tradition and glory of Rome. It was Cicero who said "O tempora, O mores" meaning "Oh the times, Oh the customs" showing how the Roman people were being destroyed by generals' lust for power. Caesar went on to win Gaul for Rome and destroy the Republic forever.

Caesar's total defiance to the Senate when asked not to bring his army into the Gates of Rome was an essential turning point. Caesar's audacity destroyed the power of the Senate and reinstated one man rule in Rome. Pompey was the last hope of the Republic. Pompey's firm belief in the Senate and antagonistic attitude towards Caesar made a rivalry unseen since the days of Sparta and Athens. The two great generals met at Pharsalus. Caesar had war ready troops and the high ground. Pompey had war weary veterans and the low ground. After his obvious defeat by Caesar, Pompey fell upon his sword and died (Kagan, 141).

Upon his victory, Caesar went back to Rome. He was elected dictator for life and was offered the crown of Rome but refused it. Feeling threatened by the enormous popularity of Caesar, and in one last attempt to save the Republic, a group of senators lead by Marcus Iunius Brutus and Gaius Cassius Longinus assassinated Gaius Iulius Caesar on the Ides of March at the base of a sculpture of Caesar's arch enemy, Pompey (Kagan, 143). This might have saved the Republic had the trend of generals fighting for power instead of Rome had not been so entrenched that the Republic was beyond hope of returning to the traditions of Cincinnatus. Caesar's close friend, Marc Anthony, and adopted nephew, Octavian Caesar, formed an alliance and hunted down the conspirators of Caesar's murder (Kagan, 145).

At this point, it was inevitable that the Republic was doomed and that someone would soon fill the void of leadership. The internal strife and ambitions of Roman soldiers destroyed the Roman warrior tradition. The only element to remain from the old Roman Republican Warrior tradition was the Praetorian Guard. These were the 9000 best-trained men in the Roman army (Andrew, lecture). They were the guardians of the imperator and of Rome herself. These were the last of the traditional Roman warriors.

The status of the Praetorian Guards was probably helped by Ocatvian Caesar (nicknamed Augustus) who wanted to return Rome to its traditional heritage. Augustus summoned the great Roman poet, Virgil, to write an epic poem to show the heritage of the Roman people comparable to the Greek verses of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Virgil presented Augustus with the epic poem, the Aeneid. This was a story about a Trojan warrior named Aeneas, who went on a destined mission to become the legendary founder of the Roman people. Aeneas traveled the Mediterranean and the Underworld to find a place for his people. Once settled, Aeneas married the daughter of King Latinus, Lavania, and founded the city of Lavinium (Virgil, 278). Virgil also "proved" that Augustus was a direct descendent of Aeneas (Virgil, 290). Virgil hoped this would bring back the traditional Roman Warrior to the army. It was written to make the citizen-soldier come alive and to make men fight for pride and love of their country rather than the money and greed of power hungry generals.

The Roman Warrior went through an amazing transformation from the time of Cincinnatus to the time of Caesar. From the citizen-soldier to the general-dictator, the Roman Warrior had evolved into a different figure. To say that the Romans of the late Republic had the same virtues and love for Rome as the Romans of the early Republic is ludicrous. The Romans of the early Republic had an intense and devoted love for their country. They had a sense of pride and loyalty in their country unsurpassed by any other in history. The Romans of the early Republic had expelled their tyrannical kings so that the Roman people could rule their country in a "republic". The Romans of the late Republic had a love for Rome as well, but was blinded by the power of dictatorship and did little to help the welfare of Rome. The Romans of the early Empire did try to make a return to the traditions of the early Republic, but this attempt was unsuccessful, for the Romans of the late Republic had changed things so drastically that not even Augustus could change the values of the Romans. In all, the Romans remained a fierce warlike people to the end of the Empire, but the citizen-soldier tradition had been destroyed.

#### Bibliography

- 1). Gaius, Iulius Caesar Commentari de Bello Gallico.
- 2). Virgil The Aeneid, trans. by Frank O. Copley Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill 1975.
- 3). Livy A History of Rome, trans. by Hadas and Poe New York: Modern Library.
- 4). Kagan, Donald etc. The Western Heritage: sixth ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall 1998.

## A Study of Trends in Smokeless Tobacco Usage Among The College Aged Population

Written by Matthew Coggins, Brian Murphy, Rasheem Neloms

### *Abstract*

*The purpose of this study was to determine the common factors that lead to the use of smokeless tobacco in the college-aged population. The sample was comprised of a small number of students (N=60) at the Military College of South Carolina. The subjects were selected from three different companies from the Corps of cadets. From the companies, five subjects were taken from each of the four classes. The factors were investigated through a questionnaire. The characteristics that were investigated were age of initial use; cause of initial use; continuance; times of use; attempts to quit; use by other family members; and the subjects activities at school. Results of the study were similar to the findings of previous studies.*

Recently there has been a national concern about the increase in smokeless tobacco use among the school-aged population. There is a great concern for this because of the possible threat of future health problems to the youth. Although the risk is known, youth still often proceed to participate in this hazardous habit. When this topic is discussed there are many questions that arise related to the reasoning behind the youth's actions. There have been several articles found that have researched possible answers to these questions.

Smith and Jones (1997) looked for independent variables that were associated with the use of smokeless tobacco. The rationale of the research was to find if the use of smokeless tobacco leads to other substance abuse. They found that the age group of 14 and above used tobacco more than that of the 11 to 13 year olds. They also found that white subjects, students living in homes other than that of two-parent, those subjects with below average academic grades, and subjects who reported to have used or were using other "gateway" drugs were more likely to use tobacco. The research also found that males involved in athletics had a higher use rate, even though otherwise participation in sports was associated with increased positive behavior. The researchers found that the subject's age of initial use of the smokeless tobacco was younger than the initial age use of cigarettes.

Another article examined the trends of tobacco use by teenagers in a five-year long longitudinal study (Akers, Skinner, Krohn, and Lauer, 1987). The study examined students in both junior-high and senior-high schools. Using a six-point scale, the subjects were categorized into groups determined by the severity of tobacco use. The main observation made by the researchers was that there was a definite upswing in the use of smokeless tobacco in comparison to the use of cigarettes. The researchers also found that 70-80 % of all smokeless tobacco users also smoked cigarettes.

Marty (1986) also researched the pattern of smokeless tobacco use among high school students. The purpose of this research was to find the commonness of tobacco use among high school aged students. The subjects were students picked from two Arkansas communities. These students' chosen participated in a survey. This study lacked randomization, so the results should be viewed with caution. The results showed that of the 901 subjects, 36.7 % (161) of the males and 2.2 % (10) of the females did use smokeless tobacco. The survey also addressed the topics of duration of use, frequency of use, and number of times used per day. It also questioned causes of primary initiation and reason for continued use, the user's smoking and alcohol use, and also the subjects desire to stop. Overall this was a valid study. It could have a small threat to internal validity because the subjects were taken from two different communities, and because the groups may not have been similar. It also could have limited external validity because the subjects were taken just from the two Arkansas communities and not from other areas.

These articles researched the trends of tobacco use among teenage youth. The research indicated that common factors related to the use of smokeless tobacco included: peer-pressure, comfort, and the frequency of use. The subject's primary reason for initiation was related to a friend's influence. Their primary reason for continuing use was for relaxation, and a large percentage (71.8 %) of the subjects had no desire to quit. The majority of the users had been using the product for one to two years. They used the product six to seven days out of the week and they have between two to three dips or chews per day.

The purpose of the present research was to find out if there were any common factors in the population of the students at The Citadel that participate in this habit of smokeless tobacco use. The use of tobacco at The Citadel seems to be very high. We wanted to target some of the users and find out if there may be any different factors related to use that might arise due to the unique military environment.

## METHOD

### Design & Measure

The research was gathered by a survey research design study. The questionnaire was comprised of 14 questions. The questions were in a 'fill-in-the-blank' format (See Appendix A). The questions were designed to find common factors in college-aged tobacco users.

### Subjects

Sixty undergraduate students from the Military College of South Carolina participated in the survey. Subjects were chosen three companies (two from one battalion (#2 barracks) and one from the other (#1 barracks)). Five subjects from each of the four classes within the three companies were chosen. See Table I for a description of the subjects.

## PROCEDURE

The surveys were administered to five subjects from each class in each company. Researchers went door to door and asked if the cadet had ever tried tobacco. If the cadet reported that he or she had used smokeless tobacco, they were requested to fill out the questionnaire. The cadets were told that the information would be kept confidential and that the survey was for a classroom project.

## RESULTS

This study provided information about college aged smokeless tobacco users. The users were in a unique environment compared to that of normal college aged students. In the study, most of the characteristics found were very similar to those found in the previously written articles, but there also were some differences.

The age of initial use was investigated first. Most of the subjects reported initiating use at the age of 15 and the next most common age was 18. The youngest reported age of initiation was 6. Reported age of initial use ranged from 6-22 years (see Table II).

Reasons for initial use were also examined. Peer pressure was the most common factor (35 %) with curiosity being second (25 %). Other reasons given for initial use were the smell, family influence, and sports (see Table VIII).

The subjects were also asked if they continued use after their initiation. Seventy-nine percent reported that they did continue use. Only 21 % of the subjects did not continue to use the product after initiation. After the subjects said that they continued use, they were asked why. There were two major reasons for continuance. One of the reasons was because they liked the product and the feeling that it gave them and also they liked the taste of the product. Other reasons included relaxation, addiction and also enjoyment and because everyone else was doing it (see table III). These subjects who continued use were also asked if they had ever tried to quit. The majority answered yes, 61 % of the subjects had tried to quit at least once during their use. The majority said that the reason was because of health reasons (58 %). Other reasons included high expense, self-gratification, and teeth discoloration (see Table IV).

The fourth area researched was factors related to when the product was used. The subjects were asked where and/or when did they use the most. The time period of highest use was while studying (43 %). Other peak times of use were any time at school, while participating in outdoor activities, driving, and during a stressful situation (see Table V).

Two other trend factors found among the subjects were related to participation in activities at school and use among other family members. The majority of the subjects participated in at least one type of student activity. Most of the activities of the subjects were athletically oriented. Thirty-three percent played either a varsity or club sport and 22 % played intramural sports (see Table VI). As for the use of tobacco among family members, 60 % of the subjects had at least one family member who used some form of tobacco product although, only 28 % percent of the subjects had a family member who used smokeless tobacco (see Table VII).

## DISCUSSION

After reviewing the results, it is clear that factors do exist relating to the use of smokeless tobacco among college aged subjects. In comparison to other studies along the same line, our study is consistent with identifying trends among tobacco users.

The first conclusion was the response to why the product was used initially. As similar to other drugs, the highest response for initiation was peer-pressure. Students reported that a friend introduced them to smokeless tobacco use. Most of the subjects also reported that they have friends who also use smokeless tobacco.

One of the positive results of our data deals with why one would want to cease the use of smokeless tobacco after being addicted. The majority of the subjects answered that they wanted to quit because of the health risks that are associated with use. This showed that there is at least some concern among the majority of users with the regard to their health. This could also be a reflection of the anti-tobacco health campaigns held through out the nation.

This study sets up possible future research of the subject. This information can be used to conduct a study to see if the use factors change over time. This information could be used to see if there are any different types of students attending the Citadel as the years go by. This study could also be expanded to determine if there might be other characteristics such as disciplinary problems and other substance abuse with the users. Characteristics of academic performance could be tested.

Because the subjects were not randomly selected, we cannot assume that the findings are representative of the Corps of Cadets. It would be interesting to see if the characteristics found were similar throughout the whole Corps of Cadets. If the characteristics were similar throughout the Corps, it would also be interesting to see if the same characteristics were present in users of others colleges across the state such as Clemson University or the University of South Carolina. Also, an interest may be if the characteristics were the same at a small college compared to that of a large university. If the similar studies were carried to other universities, the characteristics in use of smokeless tobacco could be investigated to the point to see if the unique atmosphere of The Citadel might lead an often-vulnerable freshman to use.

Finally, the information gathered in this study shows that there is a possibility of a large number of use of smokeless tobacco through out the Corps of Cadets. This information could provide a basis for the initiation of a tobacco awareness education program for the Corps of Cadets to inform them of the possible dangers of tobacco use.

#### REFERENCES

Akers, R.L. (1987). Recent Trends in Teenage Tobacco Use: Findings from a Five-Year Longitudinal Study. Sociology and Social Research, 71, 110-14.

Jones, R.B. (1988). Correlates of Smokeless Tobacco Use in a Male Population. American Journal of Public Health, 78, 61-3.

Marty, P.J. (1986). Patterns of Smokeless Tobacco Use in a Population of High School Students. American Journal of Public Health, 76, 910-2.

#### Psychology Questionnaire Trends in Smokeless Tobacco

Your race?  
Your sex?  
Your age?  
What year are you in school?  
Age when you first used the product?  
What made you first decide to try the product?  
Did you continue use after you first tried it?  
If so, that was your reason?  
Do you still use the product?  
Do any of your family members use any tobacco product?  
If so which one (smoking or smokeless)?  
Approximately how many of your friends use smokeless tobacco?  
Have you ever tried to quit using the product?  
If so, why did you try?  
When do you use smokeless tobacco?  
What activities do you participate in at The Citadel (clubs, sports, etc.)?

List of Tables and Table Captions

Table 1: General Information: Descriptive information about the subjects.

Table 2: Age of Initial Use. The subject's reported age at which they began to use smokeless tobacco.

Table 3: Reasons for Initial Use: The different reasons reported by the subjects that resulted in use.

Table 4: Reasons for Continuance: The number of subjects that continued use after their initial use and the reason provided by them for the continuance.

Table 5: Attempt to Cease Use: The number of subjects that have tried to quit and the reasons reported for the attempt.

Table 6: Time and Place of Use: The time period and location of use reported by the subjects.

Table 7: Activities Held by the Subjects: The student activities reported by the subjects

Table 8: History of Use by Family Members: The reported number of subjects who had family members that used either smoking or smokeless tobacco.

Variable:		
AGE	18 to 26	
Gender	Male	59
	Female	1
Race	White	57
	Balck	1
	Hispanic	2

Variable:	Frequency	Percent
6	1	1.67%
7	2	3.33%
8	1	1.67%
9	1	1.67%
10	5	8.33%
11	2	3.33%
12	4	6.67%
13	5	8.33%
14	1	1.67%
15	12	20.00%
16	8	13.33%
17	2	3.33%
18	9	15.00%
19	2	3.33%
20	3	5.00%
21	1	1.67%
22	1	1.67%

Variable:	Frequency	Percent
Curiosity	16	26.67%
Peer Presssure	23	38.33%
Family Member Influence	4	6.67%
Smell	1	1.67%
Quit Smoking	6	10.00%
Something to do	3	5.00%
Other Adult Influence	2	3.33%
Sporting Eventd (coaches/teammates)	5	8.33%
Total	60	

Variable:	Frequency	Percent
YES	47	78.33%
NO	13	21.67%
Reason for continuance		
Variable:	Frequency	Percent
Something to Do	1	2.13%
Addiction	7	14.89%
Enjoyment	6	12.77%
Taste	9	19.15%
Relaxation	7	14.89%
Peer Pressure	5	10.64%
Like it	9	19.15%
To Quit Smoking	2	4.26%
Sporting Events	2	4.26%
Feels Good	4	8.51%

Table 5: Trying to Quit		
Variable:	Frequency	Percent
Have Tried to Quit	34	72.34%
Have not Tried to Quit	13	27.66%
Reason for attempt		
Variable:	Frequency	Percent
Health	27	79.41%
Expense	3	8.82%
Bet	1	2.94%
Self-gratification	2	5.88%
Teeth Discoloration	1	2.94%
Grossness of Habit	1	2.94%

Table 6: Time and Place of Use		
Variable:	Frequency	Percent
Driving	8	17.02%
Studying	26	55.32%
At Night	5	10.64%
At School	11	23.40%
Boredom	1	2.13%
After Meals	2	4.26%
Outdoor Activities	9	19.15%
Stress	3	6.38%
Whenever Possible	1	2.13%
Working	2	4.26%

Table 7: Student Activities		
Variable:	Frequency	Percent
Sports	20	33.33%
Clubs	18	30.00%
Intramural	13	21.67%
Military	12	20.00%

Table 8: Family Use		
Variable:	Frequency	Percent
Yes	36	60.00%
No	24	40.00%
Variable:	Frequency	Percent
Smoking	28	77.78%
Smokeless	17	47.22%

## The Promulgation of Pantheism Written by Sellors Meador

The introduction to the Romantic Movement of literature is conspicuously earmarked by the publication of a single work in the late eighteenth century, Lyrical Ballads. This masterful work by William Wordsworth and Samuel Coleridge was first printed in 1798 and revised in 1800 and is considered by many to be the defining work of romanticism. One of the central tenets of the poems contained in Lyrical Ballads is the philosophy of pantheism. This philosophy holds that God, man, and nature are not separate entities but are in fact intertwined in a unifying singularity. These poets taught that all creation is one and that in order to partake of paradise one need only find communion with the whole. Wordsworth powerfully expressed these sentiments in both "Tintern Abbey" and "Intimations of Immortality" while Coleridge professed the holiness of life in "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner." These three works serve to define the religion that these poets so virtuously upheld.

"Lines Composed a Few Miles above Tintern Abbey, on Revisiting the Banks of the Wye During a Tour, July 13, 1798" is a powerful profession of faith for Wordsworth, a self proclaimed worshipper of nature. This poem is a collection of emotions evoked by the beauty of the Wye valley and is written as a recollection of these scenes of natural tranquillity. The placid scenery of the river valley causes the poet to speak of "passing even into my purer mind, with tranquil restoration" (lines 29-30) which puts forth the idea that the beauty of nature can put one's soul at ease. The poet speaks of the passion which engulfed him five years before on his first trip through the valley with lines 40 through 50 as the most prophetic lines of the work (Adams, et al 1337).

Contained within these lines are Wordsworth's revelations of the nature of pantheism and of the experience of becoming one with the whole. Here the poet describes a "serene and blessed mood" (line 41) which causes him to transcend his "corporeal frame" (line 43) and "become a living soul." (line 46) Wordsworth then describes being able to see into life itself as if his perception had been cleansed and he could view reality as it truly exists. The images of nature presented are confusing because they encompass several roles in the life of the young poet, however, if one ignores the rationality which presupposes a duality one is able to see the all entwining nature of the universe (Adams, et al 1337).

These ideas are furthered by the masterful poet in his mournful "Ode: Intimations of Immortality" which serves as a doctrinal statement of both pantheism and of the English Romantic movement. It is in this work that Wordsworth proposes that as children we are inseparable from God or from our surroundings. The poem deals with the fact that as we mature we separate ourselves from this union by the exertion of reason.

The fifth, sixth, and seventh stanzas delve into the realm of platonic consciousness in which images of reality are conceived through our union with the whole and are missed if we try to reconcile our reality with reason. The poet speaks of "trailing clouds of glory" as "we come from God, who is our home." (lines 63-64) Wordsworth believes that children are in communion with nature and God and are therefore the most perfect "philosophers" (line 110) of the word. The child understands immortality unquestioningly whereas the adult cannot grasp eternity through reason. These lines are a promulgation of the central theme of Romantic poetry (Adams, et al 1385).

The tenth stanza deals with the responsibility of adults to try to regain our childhood innocence in order to rediscover paradise and find immortality. Wordsworth preaches that we must not grieve for our loss even though "nothing can bring back the hour" (line 177) of our childhood in which men reveled in the fresh spring grass and danced in the May and the souls of men sang a "joyous song." (line 167) The poet is trying to bring across the idea that even though we can never regain the innocence lost to experience, we can recognize a faith in nature and a divinity in the world which brings us to a perfect union with the universe (Adams, et al 1388).

Samuel Coleridge collaborated with Wordsworth on Lyrical Ballads, and his "Rime of the Ancient Mariner" is a haunting account of the need for man come into the fold of pantheism and recognize the universality of inclusive love rather than exclusive love.

The pivotal point of the ballad is contained in Part 4 wherein the Mariner realizes the union of nature and becomes aware of the sin he has committed against the whole. Lines 271 through 290 describe the conversion of the Mariner as he watched the sea serpents swim and realized the perfect beauty of their existence (Adams, et al 1495). It is at this moment that the mariner removes himself from the human concept of exclusive love and becomes part of the inclusive love that binds all creation together. As soon as this happens the albatross falls from his neck and he is free to do as he sees fit (McDaniel).

Much like the conversion of St. Paul, the Mariner becomes the apostle of pantheism as a penance which is to serve as an atonement for his sins. Coleridge calls us all to do likewise and to follow a path similar to that of the Mariner. Man must recognize that beauty in nature is an expression of divinity and only through this can man find spirituality and eternity (McDaniel).



The romantic poets at the turn of the nineteenth century were greatly influenced by these powerful works of William Wordsworth and Samuel Coleridge. The promulgation of pantheism was a controversial subject at the time and drew much criticism from the public while it was celebrated by these poets. Their firm belief in the divinity of the universe set them apart from previous poets and defined them as leading figures in the English Romantic movement.

#### Works Cited

1. McDaniel, Dr. Gerald. Dr. Mac's Study. [Online] Available : <http://www.nortexinfo.net/McDaniel>
2. Wordsworth, William. "Lines Composed a Few Miles Above Tintern Abbey, on Revisiting the Banks of the Wye During a Tour, July 13, 1798." *Norton Anthology of English Literature, Sixth, ed.* Ed. Robert Adams, et al. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1996, 1336-1339
- 3.. Wordsworth, William. "Ode: Intimations of Immortality." *Norton Anthology of English Literature, Sixth, ed.* Ed. Robert Adams, et al. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1996, 1384-1388
4. Coleridge, Samuel. "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner." *Norton Anthology of English Literature, Sixth, ed.* Ed. Robert Adams, et al. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1996, 1487-1504.

# At Critical Analysis of the British Counterinsurgency in Northern Ireland: Early phases, 1968-1970

Written by, Gabriel Conlon

## *Introduction* *Terrorism and Insurgency*

The history of the British involvement in Northern Ireland is a long one, full of bitter hatreds and deep resentments. The purpose of this thesis, however, is not to dig up old hatreds and try to justify either side. Everyone already has their own opinions about Northern Ireland, and there is very little way to change that now. The purpose of this is to examine the British counterterrorist effort, and to attempt to see what was done, what was done *right*, what was done *wrong*, and where things could have been done *better*. The author does not intend to nor desire to lay blame on either Nationalist or Loyalist forces.

Labeling of terrorism or insurgency is a very difficult topic. Terrorism is defined commonly as unlawful violence used to coerce a government or a population. One of the most crucial issues of terrorism is who decides what violence is unlawful. Looking from one perspective, a group of men who decide not to pay their taxes and rebelled against the government, and in the end secede and establish their own country used unlawful violence against their government, but from another perspective one might call Thomas Jefferson, Samuel Adams, and George Washington heroes and founding fathers. It is for certain that King George III thought that their violence was unlawful, but the key is that they were successful. When an insurgency fails, the perpetrators are called terrorists. When they are successful, they are called heroes, statesmen even.

One of the keys to fighting against an insurgency is indeed labeling it as terrorism. Manipulation of public perception is the key to labeling – if the people will call them terrorists, and fear them, hate them even, then it is possible to prevent the public from rallying around their cause.

## *Chapter 1* *Brief historical overview* *1171-1967*

British involvement in Northern Ireland dates back to the twelfth century: Henry II Plantagenet's Norman knights crossed the Irish sea into the north of "Hibernia" in the closing decades of the 1100's, in the first wave of British colonizers. These knights were mostly assimilated, and traces of them are prevalent today – many of the most traditional Irish names are derived from these Normans. Names like Fitzgerald, Fitzwilliam, and Fitzhugh are all French names- *fitz* being derived from *filis*, meaning "son" in French: these names are the equivalent of "Mc" names. For the next four hundred years, the efforts of the British to strengthen their hold on Ireland were, for the most part, unsuccessful, until the year 1601, when a rebellion against the small British presence in Ulster was crushed, and the Irish chieftains fled for Europe, leaving their homeland wide open for the Plantation.

This Plantation was the touchstone for the concept of religious strife, and since then, sectarian conflict has been an unmistakable part of the struggle for Northern Ireland. The larger context of the world at this time was that of the Counter-Reformation, with those Scots deported to Ulster being of the most rabid manner of Protestants. To them, their religion was directly linked with their land, quite literally the land was a divine grant, direct from the hands of the almighty. Indigenous landowners were stripped of land and titles, and replaced in their homes by Scots and English.

When the revolution came, it was not in the form of direct uprising against the crown, though: it came in the form of *support* of the crown. The Catholic Irish landowners, hoping to regain some of their lost territories, backed the Cavaliers in the English Civil War, and of course were defeated roundly. Again in 1689 the Irish took the wrong side, supporting James II in his struggle against William of Orange. James' lure was his promise of religious tolerance – something severely lacking in Ireland at the time – and with his defeat, the situation in Ireland worsened for the Irish.

During Oliver Cromwell's Republic, the Plantation had been expanded dramatically. The indigenous Irish people were sent to the west of Ireland, into the most impoverished of the four historical kingdoms of Ireland: Connaught. Ulster, comprising the most fertile lands of the island, was reserved exclusively for the British overlords. It was made illegal for anyone of Irish blood and Catholic faith to be found in any part of the island other than Connaught. On the leeward side of Ireland, Connaught is subjected to the harsh North Atlantic winds, and is rocky and bitter. In the decade of the 1640's, one third of the indigenous population of Ireland was killed by the British in the effort to move them into Connaught.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Toolis, 16. The Cromwellian Army's Physician-General noted that out of a total population of one and a half million, one third were killed between 1641 and 1652, during the process of transplantation, due to starvation, illness, and the sword.

The ultimate defeat of Cromwell's Lord Protectorate after his death in 1658, and the restoration of Charles II Stuart brought with it some slight amelioration: while the Cromwellian conquests were allowed to stand, land was restored to 'innocent papists,' and in 1665 this was modified further- the "Act of Explanation" required receivers of Cromwellian grants to give up one third of their land to 'innocents.'<sup>2</sup>

From 1689 through 1691, Catholic forces under James II Stuart used Ireland as a base for operations to revolt against William of Orange, a Dutchman who was king of England, and a Protestant. Events surrounding this revolt are to this day celebrated in Ireland, particularly 12 July, 1690: the Battle of the Boyne, where 'King Billy' finally handed a decisive defeat to the House of Stuart. Since 1690, Protestant groups have held marches to commemorate these events.

The 18<sup>th</sup> century appears, compared to the 17<sup>th</sup>, a quiet century for Irish history, but very much the opposite is true. Several very major events occurred here that would set the stage for much of later Irish history. First, in 1707 came the Act of Union, creating a "United Kingdom" of England, Scotland, and Wales. The Irish were not given this equality until somewhat later, but there was rather a lot of agitation to be so blessed.

The government of Ireland was completely in the hands of the descendants of the Protestant planters of the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, and a series of Penal Laws enacted by these masters forbade practitioners of the Catholic faith from ever holding public office. British use of Poyning's Law of 1494 gave the British government permission to override and amend any legislation which might come from the Irish parliament. Although the Act of Union did not apply to Ireland, the Declaratory Act of 1719 made the House of Lords the final legal appeal for Irish law and gave the British parliament the right to make law over Ireland.

Ireland was treated, during this century, essentially as a colony, and indeed it was to other British colonies that the Protestant masters of Ireland looked for inspiration. Agitators among the elite coagulated around William Molyneux' pamphlet "The Case of Ireland's being Bound by *Acts of Parliament in England*", published in the closing years of the 17<sup>th</sup> century<sup>3</sup>, gave a *raison d'etre* to Irish Protestant Patriots: equality and union with the other nations that made up Britain. In 1779 and 1780, many of the laws concerning taxes and the restriction of trade were repealed in response to the revolt in the American colonies. While London feared a possible colonial revolt so close to their own shores, the Irish had no such intentions: in 1800 the Irish Parliament voted itself out of existence, the majority of Irish Protestants preferring a much closer relationship with Britain, and enjoying the security resulting from such a relationship.

The closing of the 18th century brought the rebellion of Thomas Wolfe Tone. Even though he was a Protestant, Tone believed that the cause of Irish independence was more important than any religious or ethnic differences, and he was able to put together quite a following. He was executed in 1798.

The Catholics, as well, were largely in favor of this relationship. It was hoped that through union with Britain, and the abolition of the Irish Parliament, that the strict laws banning Catholic Irish from holding public office might be repealed or at least relaxed, and that Catholics might be allowed to send representatives to Westminster. In 1800, the union occurred. The Irish Parliament voted itself out of existence, and the Westminster Parliament began direct rule of Ireland from Whitehall.

The situation during the 18th century was essentially this: the ethnic background and religion of the majority of the population was different from the ethnic background and religion of the ruling elite. In order to prop up their status as the ruling elite, the Penal Laws came into being. These laws secured them against the Catholic majority of Irish citizenry in terms of economics and politics. These rules, while hardly pleasant for the majority of the population, seem on the face of things to have been just the ticket- once a period of epidemic disease (1725-45) ended, economic growth was unparalleled.

From 1750, the population was in a state of intense growth, more than doubling in size in the next four decades.<sup>4</sup> There was a surge in the linen industry, among other areas of urban industry, and the rapid improvement of roads made internal trade a viable and practical venture. Not everyone was best pleased with the situation, though, and from the 1760's there was a movement of unrest in the agricultural areas, and in the 1770's and 1780's this current was strengthened, on the heels of the American and French revolutions. In 1798, revolution arose again, and this time, Britain was not willing to allow a colony to break away. This was the situation in 1800, when Ireland was finally added to the Union. The population continued to increase, reaching nearly 7 million people by 1820, and this set the stage for the next major phase of Irish history: the famine.

The potato crop failed in 1845. This was the kiss of death to most of the lower class, and in the following years there was a twenty-five percent drop in the population of Ireland, due mostly to deaths from the famine, although many were from immigration to the United States as well. The Protestant land owners were not deterred from making money, however –

---

<sup>2</sup> Duffy, 133

<sup>3</sup> *ibid*, 72

<sup>4</sup> *ibid*, 74. 2 million in 1750 to 4.5 million in 1790

they were still able to sell large quantities of agricultural products. Soup kitchens were begun, government funded, in 1847, but 1848 and 1849 brought the worst years yet of the Famine.

In 1858 the lineal precursor of the Irish Republican Army was founded: James Stephens returned from exile in France to found the Irish Republican Brotherhood. At about the same time, the Fenian Brotherhood was founded in the United States. Following the end of the American Civil War, many veterans of Irish Catholic descent flooded back to Ireland, teeming to the standards of the Irish Republican Brotherhood. 1867 brought an attempted uprising by the Brotherhood, but it was neither successful nor significant.

The balance of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was occupied with political maneuvering. W. E. Gladstone, Prime Minister of Britain, pushed the first Land Act through Parliament, beginning the process of allowing tenants to own their own land, in August of 1870. In 1869, Gladstone had disestablished the Church of Ireland – there was no more official state sponsored religion for Ireland. In 1875, Charles Stewart Parnell was elected as MP for County Meath, and was a force for right and justice, but scandals over his involvement with Katherine “Kitty” O’Shea drove him to an early grave. He died in 1891, having done much for the Irish in the political realm, but having failed in his ultimate objective: independence. It is widely thought that had he lived, a single state might occupy Ireland today, rather than the fragmented state of affairs which today holds sway.

In 1913, the Irish were promised their independence, but World War I broke out soon afterwards, and it was deemed impolitic to grant independence to Ireland at this point. The British feared that eight centuries of pent-up hatreds might invite Germans into Ireland, to be used as a jumping-off point for an invasion, and the British stonewalled on the matter, leading to a revolt in April of 1916: the Easter Rising.

Easter of 1916 is perhaps the most significant time in modern Irish history. Although it was ultimately a failure – the British moved artillery to surround Dublin and reduced most of the city to rubble and ash – it has a peculiarly inspirational light cast upon it, in a very Irish way. It is, to the Catholic Irish, revered in much the same way as 1789 is by the French and 1776 by Americans, in spite of the failure. It was, perhaps, the fact of failure that caused the furor – the British acted drastically, with severely overbearing measures, to quell the rebellion, and made a massive show of executing the leaders. It was the massive overreaction that really brought the cause of Irish Republicanism to the forefront of the Irish consciousness, a place that it had never occupied in previous years, and within a few more years, the Irish had their republic: twenty-six counties in the south and southwest of Ireland, while the six in the northern corner remained part of the United Kingdom. The Irish Free State was the result of a compromise, but it was the best compromise that was available at the time.

Another significant development at this time was the change in name of the Irish Republican Brotherhood: Patrick Pearse, in his proclamations surrounding the Rising, signed his name as, “Commanding General, Irish Republican Army.”

The British government enacted a variety of social programs throughout Northern Ireland that have remained in force up to this day. Health care is brought into line with Britain, welfare as well. Legal systems are *not* brought to the same standards, and elections are run differently too – they are on a ratepayer basis, where elections in the rest of the United Kingdom are on a proportional basis.

## World War II.

The Republic remained technically neutral through the war, but British and American ships and aircraft used the Republic as a base of operations for hunting submarines and escorting convoys. In return, the Germans left severe bombings on Belfast, which was still, of course, part of Britain, and Dublin as well, which was the capital of the Republic.

Throughout the 1950’s and 1960’s, the IRA continued to mount attacks and small rebellions along the border between the Republic and Northern Ireland. The Republic maintained in its Constitution a territorial claim over Northern Ireland, but they never pressed the issue. In the north, voting rights have become a major issue. Gerrymandering has divided the districts up in such a way that Catholics are blocked out of power quite effectively, having no voice in government whatsoever. Abuse of power by the almost exclusively Protestant government in Stormont is rampant. Discrimination for jobs, schooling, and even housing is out of control. Into this void stepped the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association.

### *Chapter 2*

#### *Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association 1968-9*

Marching was not a new idea in Northern Ireland – the Orangemen had been marching for centuries to commemorate the victory of King William at the Battle of the Boyne. Through the 1950’s and 1960’s, marches had been held to commemorate the “twelfth” of July, 1690, through staunchly Republican areas of Northern Ireland. Locals responded with a variety of tactics, including cratering planned march routes with explosives, but to no avail – one particularly notable march, held in 1955 and led by Brian Faulkner, was held in spite of badly damaged roads, with approximately 600 fully armed policemen. This force of police was backed up by dogs and armored vehicles. This was called “The Long Stone Road Affair,” after the “Long Stone Road,” where it occurred, in southern Co. Down. This sort of Nationalist / Republican

resistance to the fiercely Protestant Orange marches was common, and so was the attempt to force marches through Catholic districts.

The sectarian nature of the power that backed up these marches was apparent – a frequent march leader was Reverend John Brown, who in addition to being a religious leader of one of the more rabid Protestant organizations, was also a commandant of the B-Special reserve police force. Speaking of one of the marches of the Orange Order, he said that there was “no such thing as a Nationalist district . . . Dungiven has been restored to the Queen’s Dominions.”<sup>5</sup> Brian Faulkner, who had since become Minister for Home Affairs, had sanctioned a significant march through Dungiven, in Co. Derry, helping to organize numerous lodges from a variety of parts of Northern Ireland. His predecessor as Minister for Home Affairs had repeatedly refused to allow marches in Dungiven, because of the strong Nationalist tendencies, and to avoid violence and unrest.

Then the nationalists caught on to the idea of marching. The first of the civil rights marches occurred on 24 August, 1968. The idea of a march had come from the civil rights movements under way at that time in the United States, and it was from these same movements that the anthem “We Shall Overcome” was drawn as well. That first march was rather a bust – Rev. Ian Paisley’s “Free Presbyterians” had organized a counterdemonstration in the same area, and the police prevented the two factions from violent confrontation, but this was not to become the trend: Only a few days later, a march planned for 5 October took on a far more unpleasant aspect.

At this point, the situation in Northern Ireland was in many ways better than it had been under the penal codes, but there were still plenty of things to be upset about – a perfect example is Londonderry in the late 1960’s. Electoral representation was far from proportionate, although it was certainly better than under the penal codes – at least Catholics were allowed to hold public office, even though due to gerrymandering they were rarely elected. In 1966, the population of Londonderry was a total of 30,826, approximately two thirds of whom were Catholic, leaving the remaining third Protestant. Londonderry had at that time twenty councillors: twelve of them were Unionist, eight Nationalist. Elsewhere the situation was similar. Eighty-two percent of the 1048 public housing units built in Co. Fermanagh had gone to Protestants, between 1945 and 1967, but at the same time the ratio of Catholic unemployment to Protestant unemployment was 2.62 to 1.<sup>6</sup> A planned new university was to have been built in Derry in 1967, but the decision to not build it there was re-enforced by Harry Midgley, former Minister of Education (and a prominent Unionist) who said, “All the minority are traitors and have always been traitors to the Government of Northern Ireland.”<sup>7</sup> In 1972, the Scarman Report finally admitted to a pattern of organized discrimination, and some steps were taken to correct the problem but far too little, and far too late.

It is very significant to note that the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association was not a Nationalist organization. There were many things that they were protesting, but British rule was not one of them. They were attempting to work within the system, to change the system. They were not yet trying to break the system apart. Their agenda was very similar to that of the American civil rights movement: fair housing, equal opportunities for employment and education, and proportional representation through revamping of electoral districts were at the top of their list of demands, and right with it was repeal of the Emergency Powers Act (1922).

The Emergency Powers Act and its companion, the Special Powers Act, were two of the most powerful legislative tools in the history of any democratic society. Of the Special Powers Act it was said by Mr. Vorster, former South African Minister for Justice, that he “would be willing to exchange all the [South African] legislation of that sort for one clause of the Northern Ireland Special Powers Act.”<sup>8</sup> The Special Powers Act was eventually repealed, but the Emergency Powers act was augmented, and a new piece of legislation, the Prevention of Terrorism Act, more than amply filled the gap left by the Special Powers Act.

5 October, 1968.

Tensions in Londonderry were riding at a very high level, the highest in years. A march planned back in July, commemorating one of the heroes of the 1916 Easter Rising had been banned, although another rally had drawn a medium-sized crowd. The NICRA was invited by Catholic leaders to hold a march in Londonderry, and without knowing fully the situation they were getting into, the Civil Rights Association agreed. Eamon McCann, a Nationalist leader in Londonderry, planned a route for the march, through some of the most staunchly Unionist parts of the city: Tim Pat Coogan describes it: “In Derry terms, it was if Hamas had paraded through Jerusalem’s Holy Places and concluded with a rally at the Wailing

---

<sup>5</sup> Coogan, *Troubles*, 61

<sup>6</sup> Mockaitis, 97

<sup>7</sup> *Portadown Times*, 15 February 1957, cited in Bell, 62

<sup>8</sup> “Freedom,” 7

Wall.”<sup>9</sup> Up until that time, no Nationalist organization had dared to set foot on that route. NICRA, primarily a Belfast organization, agreed to the route without knowing anything about it, and in doing so sealed the fate of the day.

Permission was requested, under the Public Order Act, and was duly denied: John Hume, still today a significant Nationalist leader, was one of those that felt that the route was far too controversial, and far too likely to result in violence.<sup>10</sup> The stated government reason for prohibiting the march was that the Apprentice Boys had a march scheduled for the same route on the same day, and moderate opinion both in NICRA and in the city’s Nationalist population, suggested either that the ban be obeyed or that the march be delayed, but hotter heads prevailed and it went forward.

This march was designed to be a confrontation from the start. Nationalist leaders manipulated the situation to create the maximum abrasion between the Civil Rights Association and the government, and this aspect of the march was certainly a success: two groups of police forces gathered on opposite sides of the square where the march was being held, and after a brief set of speeches, both wings of police attacked with batons. The most important aspect of this march was not that civil rights were being demanded, and certainly not that the police attacked, clubbing everyone in sight: the important aspect of the march was the publicity victory that it represented for the Nationalists. This march, and its associated police assault, had been broadcast on international television.

This was one of the first and largest publicity coups scored by the Nationalists. It had been designed as an ambush from the first, and the government had walked right into it. In the words of Eamon McCann: “... a howl of elemental rage was unleashed across Northern Ireland, and it was clear that things were going to be the same again. We had indeed set out to make the police overreact. But we hadn’t expected the animal brutality of the RUC.”<sup>11</sup> Altnagelvin Hospital reported to the Irish Times that ninety-six people appeared for treatment, Cameron’s report claimed seventy-seven marchers plus eleven police.<sup>12</sup>

The following day, McCann and his followers were arrested for breach of the Public Order Act, and upon their release, they and more than a hundred citizens of Londonderry met to discuss the plans for the next Sunday’s march. The people of Derry who came to this meeting formed an organization called the Citizen’s Action Committee, and truly were a nonpartisan organization – clergymen, Nationalists, Unionists, tradesmen, and other sorts. The CAC was an attempt to bring all the protest groups in Derry under one umbrella organization to help organize things. The character of this organization may be divined from the identities of its leadership: the chairman was a prominent member of the Labour party, a Protestant. The press officer was a Unionist and owner of (at the time) the largest department store in Derry. McCann’s faction walked out of the meeting, disgusted with the lack of a Nationalist goal, and moved on to other tasks.

The NICRA was the centerpiece of the early violence, but it was not the instigator. It was a pawn, a popular cause subverted by a hard core of insurgents who had been unable to directly stir support of their goals. The song of the Civil Rights Association was “We Shall Overcome,” rather than “A Nation Once Again,” although the former song was often overwhelmed by choruses of the latter from Nationalists and Republicans within the crowd. The subversion of NICRA by the IRA led to even further difficulties with the government, however, and both the government and the Unionists as a community insisted upon seeing the civil rights movement as a front for the Nationalists, which it was, to the degree that it was used by the Nationalists as a venue for reaching people already dissatisfied with the status quo. It was fortuitous for the Nationalists that so many civil rights marchers were beaten. J. Bowyer Bell said: “Police brutality on the printed page from a small provincial city might have passed unnoticed in Great Britain, had passed unnoticed in the past; but film, action film, was gobbled up not just in Britain by worldwide by television producers eager for hard news violence – and Derry offered hard news violence where the good guys and the bad were easy to recognize.”<sup>13</sup> The standard uniforms of the good guys were the scruffy unemployed-working-class, and the bad guys wore tailored politician’s suits, or police uniforms. These ideas were reinforced by the images of the police beating the working-class, and by the politicians who appeared “not to apologize, but to explain why whacking Catholics was necessary.”<sup>14</sup>

The government at this time did not realize the power of television. In the past, it had always worked to have a short but brutal repression of civil disorder, arresting the dissenters, and then sit back and wait for the outcry to die down. Television added an entirely new dimension, however. The Irish had grasped the concept right away, and took full advantage of it. Following the Londonderry riots, the world press descended upon Northern Ireland, making it one more stop on the world

---

<sup>9</sup> Coogan, *Troubles*, 61

<sup>10</sup> *ibid*

<sup>11</sup> McCann, 106

<sup>12</sup> Bell, 65

<sup>13</sup> Bell, 65

<sup>14</sup> *ibid*, 65

circuit of unrest. From the civil rights movement in America to France's Paris riots in May, to Derry and Belfast in the autumn. From the late 1960's violence appeared on television, real-time violence, and it made the ratings. It cannot be denied that seeing genuine, true violence, whether it is shown live or recorded, has a far greater impact than simply a conceptual knowledge of the violence.

London had some very interesting things to say about NICRA.

The Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association is at first a genuinely broad-based organization. It includes all shades of anti-Unionist opinion, from those on the extreme left such as the revolutionary People's Democracy – to Republicans of all varieties. This is the principal organization involved. The IRA – the military arm of the Republican Movement – is not organized or equipped to play a significant independent role within this body. However, members are encouraged to join and take an active role as individuals. Indeed, a member of the IRA council is on the Executive of the Civil Rights Association and many others have taken part in demonstrations without identifying themselves by tricolors and banners.<sup>15</sup>

It was recognized by London that NICRA was not directly part of the agitation. The Stormont government was not nearly so sure. David Trimble, later to become the party spokesman on justice for the Official Unionists, spoke out on his reaction to the emergence of the civil rights movement. His answer:

Puzzled, I must admit. One appreciated after a little thought that yes there were some things. I mean we had the local government franchise on a ratepayer basis, they'd abolished that in England in '48. One could see that that [sic] was a hangover. But the behavior and tactics, of civil rights, the civil rights movement, soon clarified the matter and one felt after seeing the way that they actually behaved on the streets that this was really just the Republican movement in another guise.<sup>16</sup>

These words were written nearly a quarter of a century later. At the time, Captain the Right Honorable Terence Marne O'Neill, then Prime Minister of Northern Ireland, wrote, "the activities of the Civil Rights movement appeared to the party to be nearly treasonable."<sup>17</sup> In spite of O'Neill's perception of the movement, however, he went to London. His ministers were uncooperative, and the reforms that he had attempted to push through were unsuccessful.

The O'Neill reform package would have very probably appeased the Derry protesters, had it appeared in time. It contained five major points. First, the abolition of the Derry Corporation, followed the appointment of an ombudsman. On the heels of this was a new system for housing allocation and a promise that the Special Powers Act would be repealed in time. The final part of the plan was to end Corporate voting. London took a 'hands off' policy at the time, and O'Neill was unable to convince his cabinet at Stormont to go along with him, and the reforms brought about his downfall as an effective political force. His own cabinet ministers vilified him as being nothing more than a "creature of the IRA and the Trotskyites."<sup>18</sup> The Unionists wanted his removal, and in the end they got it. Before his downfall, however, O'Neill made significant attempts to rectify the situation. In an historic televised speech on 9 December, 1968:

Ulster stands at the crossroads . . . our conduct over the coming days will decide our future . . . These issues are far too serious to be determined behind closed doors or left to noisy minorities . . . For more than five years now I have tried to heal some of the deep divisions in our community. I did so because I could not see how an Ulster divided against itself could hope to stand. . . .

There are, I know, today some so-called loyalists who talk of independence from Britain – who seem to want a kind of Protestant Sinn Fein. These people will not listen when they are told that Ulster's income is 200 million [pounds] a year, but that we can spend 3000 million [pounds] a year only because Britain pays the balance . . . Rhodesia, in defying Britain from thousands of miles away, at least has an air force and an army of her own. Where are the Ulster armored divisions and the Ulster jet planes?

. . . Unionism armed with justice will be a stronger cause than Unionism armed merely with strength. What kind of Ulster do you want? A happy and respected province in good standing with the rest of the United Kingdom? Or a place continually torn apart by riots and demonstrations and regarded by the rest of Britain as an outcast?<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Confidential Scotland Yard memo, quoted in Hamill, 20.

<sup>16</sup> Coogan, *Troubles*, 63

<sup>17</sup> *ibid*, 63

<sup>18</sup> *ibid*, 65

<sup>19</sup> *Belfast Telegraph*, 10 December, 1968

O'Neill resigned on 28 April, 1969, replaced by his sometime Minister of Agriculture, Major James Chichester-Clark. Of O'Neill's time in office, David Bleakley wrote:

... he was in many ways a prisoner of the aristocratic remoteness associated with the O'Neill line.<sup>20</sup> It was at once his greatest asset and his heaviest liability – good for foreign consumption but difficult to retail at home. . . . It was right for O'Neill to make the attempt and a great pity that more of his party had not made the move earlier . . . . But O'Neill labored under the difficulty of his clan: he moved among the Roman Catholic population like some ancient lord, anxious to do the decent thing by his tenants, but he could not really make contact . . .<sup>21</sup>

And the situation continued to deteriorate until August.

### Chapter 3 Enter the Army 1969-1971

The army was brought into the equation in August. The Apprentice Boys march had degenerated into chaos when it reached the Catholic Bogside district, at the edge of Derry's medieval walls. The Bogsiders had learned their lesson about how to build barricades, when in April their barricades had been smashed by the RUC, and this time they were more than ready. As the Apprentice Boys march moved closer to their district, police massed between the two factions, and were showered with a barrage of stones, bricks, bottles, furniture, and anything else portable or uprootable. To create some more space in between the factions, the police charged, rattling riot shields against batons. One of their armored cars was set on fire. From the top of a tall building, Bogsiders launched Molotov cocktails down on the policemen. Loudspeakers blared Republican music and exhortations. Bernadette Devlin, Westminster MP for Mid-Ulster, roamed the barricades, urging her constituents to greater rage. The military was watching the situation closely, and the commanding officer of the Prince of Wales Own Regiment was on the scene in civilian clothes.

In Belfast, similar events were under way. As word reached Belfast of events in Derry, a surge of violence broke out there as well. Protestant mobs roamed the streets, looting and burning out Catholic homes and driving newly homeless Catholic families out of Protestant districts. The Finucane family lived near the Falls Road, in Belfast, on Percy Street. Their home was confiscated by the Protestant mob, and was spared from burning- it was used as a headquarters. Dermot Finucane said:

I was just a kid watching the adults talk about life and death saying: 'The Loyalists have broken into such-and-such an area and they are burning everyone's homes out.' And you would be sitting there terrified, not making a sound; you were like a mouse, just listening. I had these visions that the Loyalists were going to overcome the barricades and I knew from the way that the adults were talking that we didn't have enough to defend ourselves. I didn't really have a sense of who 'they' were. I just thought of them as crazy people, angry people, who would just come up and stab you to death, shoot you.<sup>22</sup>

The rampage continued for two more days, in both Belfast and Derry. Police forces were utterly unable to control the rioting and burning, but they were unable to obtain the support that they needed from the military. Riots broke out throughout Northern Ireland – barricades in the Falls Road, and firebombs at police stations in Coalisland, Armagh, and Dungiven, violence in Strabane and Lurgan. The prime minister of Northern Ireland, Chichester-Clark, announced that the B-Special force of part-time reserve policemen would be mobilized and used "to the full, not for riot or crowd control but to relieve the regular police."<sup>23</sup>

Eight thousand five hundred B-Specials flooded the streets, but to no avail. Although they had some initial gains in territory, the rioters quickly drove them back and were able to retake their positions. There is some evidence that suggests that B-Specials were engaged in the rioting themselves, both as protection *and* as participants. The same sources claim that some members of this reserve force also engaged in the burning and looting.<sup>24</sup> Anthony Peacocke, Inspector General of the RUC, was examining the situation carefully, trying to figure out a way to work things out to restore order. The Government of Ireland Act allowed the Westminster government to aid the Stormont regime once a certain criteria had been met: all the civil power's resources must have been exhausted before the military could be used. Two weeks before that, the

---

<sup>20</sup> The O'Neill family was historically the clan of the High King of Ireland.

<sup>21</sup> Coogan, *Troubles* 72

<sup>22</sup> Toolis, 98

<sup>23</sup> Hamill, 5

<sup>24</sup> Dewar, 33



Commissioner of the Royal Ulster Constabulary had asked for military help, but to no avail – the Unionist Party was not interested. Westminster had given them quite clearly the message that should they request the assistance of the army, the validity of the Stormont government would be called into question, and that was something to be avoided at all costs.

The Republic threw a firebomb into the situation as well: Jack Lynch, Prime Minister of the Republic, announced that the Irish Government was to position field hospital units along the border for the treatment of those that did not feel it advisable to go to Northern hospitals. He said:

It is evident that the Stormont Government is no longer in control of the situation. Indeed, the present situation is the inevitable outcome of the policies pursued for decades by successive Stormont Governments. It is clear also that the Irish Government can no longer stand by and see innocent people injured and perhaps worse.<sup>25</sup> Further statements from the same address included a declaration that it would be ‘unacceptable’ for the British to deploy troops, and that London was being asked to request a UN force. Lynch intended to ask London to re-negotiate Northern Ireland’s constitutional position, as well – a United Ireland was the only permanent solution, after all. Further, he stated that the RUC could no longer be accepted as an impartial force.

At midday on 14 August, however, political concerns went out the window. Peacocke called a meeting of the Security Council, and at 4:45 an official request was signed for assistance from the Army, and troops were introduced to Northern Ireland to assist the civil power. The government in Stormont was effectively broken, as the opposition party walked out. Gerry Fitt, a Republican Labor MP in both Stormont and Westminster, told the House that the Government of Northern Ireland held no further relevance to the affairs of the Irish people. Following the walkout, the Home Affairs Minister, Robert Porter, made the announcement that troops had been deployed in Londonderry. It was announced in Westminster by the Home Secretary, James Callaghan, at approximately the same time:

The General Officer Commanding Northern Ireland [the GOC] has been instructed to take all necessary steps, acting impartially between citizen and citizen, to restore law and order. Troops will be withdrawn as soon as this is accomplished. This is a limited operation and during it the troops will remain in direct and exclusive control of the GOC, who will continue to be responsible to the United Kingdom Government . . . The Ireland Act of 1949 affirms that neither Northern Ireland nor any part of it will in any event cease to be part of the United Kingdom without the consent of the Parliament of Northern Ireland, and the United Kingdom reaffirms the pledges previously given that this will remain the position so long as the people of Northern Ireland wish.<sup>26</sup> At 5 o’clock PM on 14 August, the first members of the 1<sup>st</sup> Battalion, the Prince of Wales Own Regiment of Yorkshire (1 PWO) was inserted into Londonderry, to regulate the Bogside. In Belfast, rioting continued through the night, and on the morning of 15 August, LTGEN Sir Ian Freeland, the GOC, reviewed his situation. 1 PWO was committed to Derry, reinforced by a company from the 1<sup>st</sup> Battalion, The Royal Regiment of Wales (1 RRW). All that was available to send to Belfast was three companies from 2<sup>nd</sup> Battalion, The Queen’s Regiment (2 QUEEN’S) and the remaining two companies of 1 RRW. Brigadier Peter Hudson, commanding officer of 39 Brigade, visited the trouble spots during 14 August, and determined rapidly that more troops were needed. Stormont duly requested more troops, and within hours lead elements of 3<sup>rd</sup> Battalion, The Light Infantry (3 LI) were landing. Within two weeks, Army manpower on the ground had risen to approximately 6000 men, and a few days after that it was decided to begin clearing some of the barricades.

General Freeland convinced Westminster and the Cabinet that the only practical way to clear the barriers was through negotiation, and for a while there was a constructive relationship between the Army and the Catholic community. That this relationship survived as long as it did was remarkable – it was almost eighteen months until the first casualties were inflicted upon the army.

One of the most important first steps in this relationship was the disbanding of the B-Specials, which occurred on 16 October, 1969. The Ulster Defense Regiment (UDR) was formed to replace it. The UDR was to be a regiment of the Army, under Army command, to be recruited exclusively from the population of Northern Ireland. Although this regiment was under the command of the Army, it was really more of an ancillary police force, augmenting the discredited RUC with a new force under new controls.

It appeared initially that the Army had arrived in order to defend the Catholics from their Protestant neighbors, but on 15 August some doubt was raised, as it seemed to many that the Army stood by and watched the rampaging mobs pillage and burn Catholic districts. Fact, however, was that the Army did not have enough forces on the ground yet to do anything effectively, and they also didn’t really have an idea of how to handle any situations into which they could be thrown. A snatch of song, written by Protestant extremists, and sung to the tune of Johnny Horton’s “The Battle of New Orleans,” sums up well:

On the 15<sup>th</sup> of August we took a little trip,  
Up along Bombay street and burned out all the shit,

---

<sup>25</sup> Coogan, *Troubles* 76

<sup>26</sup> Hamill, 7

We took a little petrol and we took a little gun  
And we fought the bloody Fenians till we had them on the run.<sup>27</sup>

The infantry was not able to maintain an effective presence in Belfast for several days yet. Eventually, enough troops of 3 LI arrived on the streets, and there was some measure of control, but now the Protestants began to bristle. The soldiers were met at their first introduction to Protestant society by Ian Paisley, leader of one of the more virulent strains of Protestantism, who welcomed them as saviors from the Catholics. Troops noted that Paisley's barricades were just as well stocked with Molotov Cocktails as were the Catholic barricades. British commanders had been warned that factions were likely to expect that the Army was there to be its personal protector, but this was a faulty assumption: the Army was to be an impartial force for order. As enough troops arrived to begin operations, many amazing and shocking things were discovered, not least of which was that behind many of the Protestant barricades were uniformed members of the police force.<sup>28</sup> The weekend was full of confusion. Ten people had died, and more than sixteen hundred were injured. Hundreds of homes had been destroyed, and numerous factories as well. Stormont felt that the army had been, on the whole, badly briefed when it was thrown into the situation, and that it had entirely no idea of what was going on. The police had not been in the best shape to give information about the situation, and accepting their directions had at times caused troops to be poorly deployed. One anonymous civil servant wrote: "You won't believe this, but in fact Westminster made it quite clear to us that not only did we have to commit the whole of the RUC and find ourselves failing, but we had to commit the B-Specials as well and find ourselves failing. Can you imagine! The most discredited force in the whole of our modern history and we had to commit them before Westminster would agree to commit the Army."<sup>29</sup>

This climate of fear and distrust fed the paramilitary organizations that were growing in importance at the time. The Irish Republican Army came to the forefront for the Catholic side. They were widely perceived to be defenders, protecting the Catholic population from the wickedness of a Protestant government. At the same time, however, the Protestants were becoming angry with the Army. The decision to dissolve the B-Specials had enraged the Protestants, who felt that the B-Specials were truly their protectors, rather than the Army. Serious riots in the Shankhill that followed the announcement led to Army intervention. The Army held its ground and its fire for over an hour. More than a thousand rounds were fired at them by the Protestant rebels, and twenty-two soldiers were wounded. After a considerable wait, the soldiers were authorized to fire in self defense, and sixty-six Army rounds killed a pair of Protestant gunmen and wounded a number of others.<sup>30</sup>

During this time, the IRA escalated its campaign to crush Stormont. The effort at this time was to convince the people that the Army was their real enemy, because that was what they saw propping up the Stormont government. By this time, the NICRA had been thoroughly infiltrated by the IRA's operatives, and the Association's newspaper, *Citizen Press*, was caustic in its condemnation of the Army's actions:

On Thursday, the homes of two Catholic British Army ex-servicemen in Derry were raided . . . the raid was certainly the precursor of more to follow and it has also been confirmed what many of us thought all along – that the peace-keeping role of the military is a political disguise to enable the unionist clique to round up and terrorize its political opponents and those who bravely defended their homes and their lives from the attacks of the RUC and the B-Specials.<sup>31</sup>

Other broadsheets proclaimed similar messages. A student group's paper, *Free Citizen*, had this to say:

Army justice on the Shankhill Road appears to have been decidedly rough and ready. Proceedings in the magistrates court are described as 'hilariously irregular' by at least one lawyer involved. Major Hitchcock has a rough and ready guide for justice. 'Anyone smelling of CS gas is being arrested because he has no business to be in the area where it was fired.'<sup>32</sup>

It is interesting to note that this paper, while being the instrument of a group that was essentially anti-government, was criticizing the way the Army was too rough in a Protestant neighborhood.

The attempt made by the Army to step softly and not make the situation any worse did, in fact complicate things. Brian Faulkner – formerly an organizer and leader for Orange Order marches, and now Minister for Home Affairs – said:

---

<sup>27</sup> Hamill, 18.

<sup>28</sup> Hamill, 19.

<sup>29</sup> Hamill 21.

<sup>30</sup> Dewar, 39.

<sup>31</sup> Hamill, 23.

<sup>32</sup> *ibid*

Instead of moving in to support the civil power they dug in as a sort of peace-keeping force on the fringe of the barricaded areas and tacitly accepted the right of various Republicans and known IRA men to rule and speak for these areas. . . . The desire to approach this situation cautiously can be fully appreciated, but it was a grave misjudgement of the kind of men with whom the Army was dealing.<sup>33</sup>

While this statement is obviously colored by Faulkner's past actions as a Unionist agitator, he does have a good concept in mind, one that cannot be ignored. The Army, after the first "hammering" of the Shankhill, did not venture much into the central strongholds of either the Protestant or Catholic communities. Their training had been desperately inadequate, and even that was in the wrong areas.

Having just come from a counterinsurgency campaign in the deserts of Aden, the British Army was in no shape for this sort of counterinsurgency. The training they'd received for Aden was refreshed in preparation for their deployment, but was not build upon. Desmond Hamill describes the process in his invaluable book.

Some young soldiers arrived to be confused by their training. What they had actually been trained in was the formal drill of the 'box formation' – to receive bricks and stones. Trained in the 'shoot one round at the big black bugger in the red turban' style and they had all practiced it on the Long Kesh airfield. All the old drill. Dannert wire . . . unfold the banners . . . bring out the camera . . . get the magistrate to read the Riot Act and say 'move now!' Then the cameraman and baton men would go forward and lay a line of white tape across the road and unfurl the banner which read 'HALT OR WE WILL OPEN FIRE.' 'Very impressive!' recalled a young officer disarmingly. 'The first time we did it the order was written in Arabic.' But when they first arrived in Ulster they were confused by having to blacken their faces and crawl around with weapons, against an enemy they could not identify.<sup>34</sup>

The Army went into the situation vastly unprepared, and the GOC dealt with things as best he could under the circumstances. With conflicting signals coming from all sides of the situation, he took his own initiative and constructed the "Peace Line." This tall barbed-wire barriers ran through Belfast, dividing the Catholic Falls from the Protestant Shankhill. In places, dividing the districts evenly meant running the barrier down the center of a street, but General Freeland did it, anyway.

The Peace Line was a stop-gap measure, but it held. After the initial rush of violence, 1969 closed on a relatively peaceful note. The IRA had not gathered enough strength yet to take an openly belligerent role, and the reactionary Protestant groups had nothing at the moment to react to. Small violent acts continued, of course, and the pressure continued to build. Each community solidified into their own areas of control, and 'No-Go' areas were established: parts of Northern Ireland that soldiers and police patrols simply did not visit. These areas were governed for the most part solely by their residents. The Stormont Government was infuriated by the fact that large chunks of their territory were consistently outside of their control, but rage could do nothing to solve the problem, and so they waited. The waiting period did nothing for the morale of the Army, either, and their frustration at not being able to solve the problem was hardly conducive to improving the situation. The Christmas season and early 1970 brought a respite from the violence, though, as all three sides involved pulled back some.

Lieutenant Colonel Michael Dewar, who commanded First Battalion, Royal Green Jackets (1 RGJ), views early 1970 as the last reasonable opportunity for a protracted war and occupation to have been averted. "Until the spring of 1970, most Catholics regarded the troops as their protectors. The Lower Falls operation changed everything, though the Army was merely doing its job and reacting to events."<sup>35</sup> The Great Falls Road Curfew, together with the Ballymurphy affair caused great disruption and were the point of no turning back.

The first use of CS tear gas in Belfast came on 31 March, 1970. Small riots had been under way since Easter Sunday, a few days before, although no huge trouble came up until Tuesday, the thirty-first. Approximately 70 soldiers of the First Battalion, Royal Scots (1 RS) stood between an agitated Protestant crowd and approximately four hundred angry Catholics, at the edge of the Ballymurphy housing development. During the night of 31 March and into 1 April, a large quantity of tear gas was fired into the crowds to keep them separated. The tear gas drifted on air currents through the narrow streets of the development, though, and by morning had affected far more than just the rioters: many innocent families also came under the cloud of gas. The net effect of this was to strengthen the support base of the opposition.

The Great Falls Curfew, which occurred shortly after this, and put the final cap on the belief of the Catholic population that the Army was there for no other purpose than to prop up what they viewed as a morally and ethically bankrupt government. The attempt by the Government to re-route the Orange marches was immensely unpopular with Protestants, and it was judged by the Government that in order to keep them appeased, the marches would continue as scheduled, along

---

<sup>33</sup> *ibid*

<sup>34</sup> *ibid*, 23-4

<sup>35</sup> Dewar, 39-40

the scheduled routes, after an attempt to re-route a march on 3 June met with riots by the Protestants. Later on that month, the final straw was dropped at a place called Crumlin Road. A Protestant Orange march consisting of the members of eight Orange Lodges each with their own band, and a mass of more than two thousand other Protestants in train, met with trouble. A small number of Royal Marines from 45 Commando attempted to block off the Catholic youths that were throwing stones and sheets of broken glass, but they were able to do little with simply their four-ton truck as a roadblock against the advancing mob of nearly a thousand. From a further position down the road, another small group of Marines and a contingent of the RUC held further mobs at bay, but the next day the march was allowed to continue as originally planned. The Marines area of responsibility was ominously calm during 27 June, but in other areas nearly three hundred people were treated for injuries. The remainder of 45 Commando was deployed throughout 27 June, and by the afternoon it was believed that the situation had been adequately placed under control, and indeed it was until approximately 9 o'clock PM, when a drunk driver made his grand entrance to a pub at the helm of a stolen bus. Through the night, violence flared even higher, and the current state of troops in West Belfast was not nearly enough to keep things under control. Sunday morning's light showed the wreckage that was left of Crumlin Road, and that night the Protestants had another shot at a police station, but for a few further days the situation was quiet.

During the months prior to this, the IRA had been quietly building up its membership. From January, when the Provisional IRA (PIRA or Provos) had split from the Official IRA (OIRA), the Provos had more than octupled their strength. The OIRA felt that it was slipping, and as the Provos had managed to take hold tightly of the unpleasantness at Crumlin Road to look like the defenders of the Catholics, the OIRA took the opportunity to strike at the Army as well, before the dust had really even settled at Crumlin Road. A further three days of rioting ensued, this time on the urging of the OIRA, and at the end of this time, at the urging of the Home Secretary, Reggie Maudling, the Army imposed a curfew. One senior minister described Mr. Maudling:

Reggie was running it. Not a good way of doing things. The Home Secretary has quite enough to do without running Northern Ireland in that sort of situation. And he wasn't the most . . . uh . . . dynamic of people. Nicest of men but not the most dynamic. I think we felt this [rioting] would die down . . . that if we showed enough resolution and force they would pack up. Shows how wrong you can be!

A cynic might comment that more than simply the Home Secretary were lacking slightly in 'dynamic' nature. At this time, it had been nearly a full year since the introduction of the Army, and there were still no clear ideas of who was to do what. Through all the colonial insurgencies of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Army had, through close cooperation with the civil power, managed to prevail over and even crush rural guerilla forces. When those forces moved into the cities and mastered the art of urban warfare the situation invariably became more difficult, and required much more cooperation between the civil power and the Army, and in Northern Ireland there was no such cooperation. The objective of the Stormont Government was to defeat the terrorists. The objective of the Catholics was to change the government into a format and structure that would be acceptable to the population as a whole. The objective of the Protestants was to remain British at all costs. The Army was left with no clear objective, other than self-preservation. The GOC, General Sir Ian Freeland, did not really want to have the Army involved in Northern Ireland in the first place, and it was impossible to blindly do everything that the civil power wanted, because the civil power was without question dominated by the Protestants, and did not adequately represent all sides of the dispute.

Stormont was very unhappy about the existence of the 'No-Go' areas. These were areas that were not safe for officials or agents of the Government. Police patrols could go there only with extraordinarily heavy military escort, and even that was rarely if ever done. One observer in Stormont recalled:

Freeland was pressed very hard by the Cabinet to occupy the Bogside. Now he sat there with that Death's Head smile of his and said to them 'Look! If you ask me whether I can take the Bogside as a military exercise – yes I can. In three hours. I can take it over and totally command it.' Now, I always thought of Freeland as one of the least mentally-agile soldiers I had ever met but at that point he added, 'Three hours to take over and about three years to get out again. Is that what you want?' And the whole Cabinet sat back in stunned silence.<sup>36</sup>

Stormont was attempting to bring some reforms into action, but they were neither quick-acting enough, nor were they accepted by the Catholics. The Army continued its efforts to win over the hearts and minds of the people, with varying degrees of success. Unfortunately, the degree of success depended on the local regiment. The Royal Anglians, in Belfast, were one of the less successful in this task: multiple accusations of rape were leveled against the regiment, based on events at a discotheque and a movie theatre set up by soldiers. A local priest recalls:

Unfortunately, while some regiments behaved excellently, others didn't. There was a fair amount of . . . not brutality, but extreme inconvenience . . . unnecessary obstruction. At some houses I went to the man would say, 'The military were very efficient, proper gentlemen, they didn't even wake the baby and I offered them a cup of tea.' Others would say, 'They were real bastards. One put his foot through the television and smashed

---

<sup>36</sup> Hamill, 24

it.' This was in the autumn when the Provos were regrouping and getting ready and it all stemmed from that Lower Falls curfew.

September of 1970 brought one major change: Brigadier Frank Kitson. Brigadier Kitson was to command 39 Brigade, responsible for the city of Belfast. Kitson, the *bête-noire* of the Left, had recently completed writing *Low Intensity Operations*, still the classic text on the subject of fighting a counterinsurgency campaign. The main idea that made him the target of hatred from the Left was a simple one: Brigadier Kitson wanted the Army to be ready beforehand to deal sharply with popular uprisings before they had a chance to become uprisings, thereby preventing any form of revolt from getting very far past the planning stages.

The press was far from kind to Kitson, particularly those of a Leftward bent. The French daily paper *Libération* had this to say: "A man has declared war on Europe; a free Europe; a special war. A man distinguished by his rich military experience; his political outlook on warfare, and his militaristic conception of politics." Roger Faligot, the author, is described as

"France's leading specialist on modern Irish history" by his publisher.<sup>37</sup> It was claimed by many that Kitson had been given Belfast as a testing ground for his ideas and concepts. It is for certain, however, that Kitson was qualified for the job – he had experience in Kenya, Cyprus, Malaysia, and Oman, with all their associated revolts and campaigns.

Kitson was convinced that to be successful, a campaign of this nature needed close cooperation between the civil and military coordination. His constant request and plan was to incorporate more civil administrators into the Army of occupation in order to smooth relations between the Army and the civil government. The lack of coordination between Stormont, Westminster, the Army, and the local governments caused more problems than anything else, and through a long, drawn-out process, Kitson was eventually granted an opportunity to exercise his theories. Brigadier Kitson wrote, "There are other potential trouble spots within the United Kingdom which might involve the Army in operations of a sort against political extremists who are prepared to resort to a considerable degree of violence to achieve their political ends. "

If a genuine and serious grievance arose, such as might result from a significant drop in the standard of living, all those who now dissipate their protest over a wide variety of causes might concentrate their effort and produce a situation which was beyond the power of the police to handle. Should this happen the Army would be required to restore the position rapidly. Fumbling at this juncture might have grave consequences even to the extent of undermining confidence in the whole system of government.<sup>38</sup>

While many of his enemies in the Republican movement view him as a deadly adversary and indeed as the *deus ex machina*<sup>39</sup> of the British Army (Sean McStiofain referred to him numerous times in his memoirs), many British and American writers view him as being insignificant in the long run. J. Bowyer Bell claims that "his views were not significant within the British Army."<sup>40</sup>

General Sir Ian Freeland had been replaced already by a new GOC: General Sir Anthony Farrar-Hockley. On the evening of 3 February, 1971, General Sir Farrar-Hockley went on television in an address in which he named leaders that he claimed as the most significant adversaries of the Government. Since that night, his name in Republican circles has been changed: he has been nicknamed Sir Horror-Fuckley. The same day, the Home Affairs minister, John Taylor, told the *London Times*: "We are going to shoot it out with them, it is as simple as that."<sup>41</sup> Firefights increased, and within two days, the first British Army casualty in Northern Ireland in nearly half a century was taken: Ensign Robert Curtis of the Royal Artillery Regiment was killed. Some of the worst rioting in the eighteen months of Army involvement occurred on that night. The next day, Prime Minister Chichester-Clark declared that "Northern Ireland is at war with the Irish Republican Army Provisionals."

#### Chapter 4

##### *Legal Aspects of Fighting a Counterinsurgency*

##### Usage of Regular Military Forces in the United Kingdom to Suppress Civil Disorder

*"If it should be found that the civil power is insufficient, the military may be called upon by the magistrates to act."*

*-Stone's Justice Manual, 1973*

---

<sup>37</sup> Hamill, 43

<sup>38</sup> Coogan, *IRA*, 112

<sup>39</sup> *ibid*, 112

<sup>40</sup> Bell, 186

<sup>41</sup> Coogan, *IRA*, 112

Robert Taber said that "Constitutional democracies ... are particularly exposed to the subversion that is the basic weapon of revolutionary warfare. ... Constitutional law is a further embarrassment, and sometimes may be a fatal impediment."<sup>42</sup> The set of laws that govern how the government may use military force to interact with its people in such a system is without doubt one of the most Gordian of all knots. The United Kingdom is no exception. Between the *Manual of Military Law*, the Army Act of 1955, and a variety of rulings from the House of Lords, as well as the body of common law, it is sometimes nearly impossible to determine how and in what manner a soldier may take action. According to British law, there is a certain duty placed upon soldiers to act as *de facto* law enforcement officers as needed, even when there are no specific orders as such.

The 1908 Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Employment of the Military in Cases of Disturbance defined the role of the Chief Constable in this process to be that of forwarding the requests of the magistrates to the military, upon which the military will take appropriate action. The Royal Commission on the Police stated in 1962:

The importance of the historical subordination of the constable to the justice is this. It was the legal form of control over the police favored by Parliament in enacting the 19<sup>th</sup> Century statutes which still govern their constitutional position; but it is a control which in this century has virtually fallen into disuse. The law and practice are consequently at odds, with the result that there is now uncertainty as to the control of the police, the Chief Constables asserting a large measure of independence and the police authorities appearing to exercise some, at least, of the powers formerly exercised by justices.<sup>43</sup>

The gulf between actual legal authority and common practice is often a large one, and is exacerbated when nobody really knows what the situation is supposed to be. It has been commonly assumed that the police are in overall charge of the situation, with the military subordinated to them, but this is not the case. Commonly held is this opinion expressed by Major P. F. Steer, at the Royal United Services Institute for Defense Studies seminar in April of 1973:

We must also remember an essential difference between soldiers and policemen and that is their command. There is no clearcut chain of command within the police forces. Station Sergeants do not 'command' the constables of that station, and Chief Constables are autocratic within their own areas of responsibility, whereas in the Army we have a clearly defined chain of command from the Army Commander who is in turn governed by directives from the political masters in an internal security situation, down to the patrol commanders. I feel that it would be wrong to turn a soldier into a sort of special constable, nor would I like to see every fourth man controlling a riot a soldier.

This is the view that has grown up in common practice, even though that is not how the law was intended to be viewed. The laws concerning use of the Army to suppress civil disorder have hardly changed since the 18<sup>th</sup> century, when police forces were not nearly efficient enough or well coordinated enough to allow coordination between efforts, and because lines of communication were not fast enough to make consultation with higher government an effective proposition. The *Manual of Military Law* states that "There is ... a duty to take action laid upon military commanders by Queen's Regulations which is not laid upon other citizens, except Magistrates and peace officers."<sup>44</sup> By way of summarizing the law concerning the military and civil disturbances, it goes on to say:

There is, however, nothing to compel a military commander to seek permission before answering a request for military support.

The common law, which governs soldiers and other citizens alike, imposes two main obligations in such cases, which are, first, that every citizen is bound to come to the aid of the civil power when the civil power requires his assistance to enforce law and order and, secondly, that to enforce law and order no one is allowed to use more force than is necessary.

When called to the aid of the civil power, soldiers in no way differ in the eyes of the law from other citizens.

...

Even though the civil authority should give directions to the contrary, the Commander of the troops, if it is really necessary, is bound to take such action as the circumstances [of the disturbance] demand.<sup>45</sup> 1831's Bristol Riots established a precedent, and for failing to suppress these riots, the Mayor of Bristol faced trial, and two Army officers were court-martialed. One was stripped of his commission, the other shot himself. In 1908, the Select Committee reported that the military "... are bound, like all citizens, to aid the Civil Authority."<sup>46</sup> It is well established,

<sup>42</sup> Taber, 28

<sup>43</sup> Report of the Royal Commission on the Police, 1962. Cmnd. 1798, paragraph 35

<sup>44</sup> QR J1164

<sup>45</sup> Queen's Regulations, cited in Eveleigh, 8

<sup>46</sup> Report of the Select Committee, 12 July 1908, paragraph 12

therefore, that it is the job of the Army to assist the civil power in suppressing disorder. In this role, the soldier is treated much the same in legal aspects as is a constable.

There are a number of differences between soldiers and constables, however. The first and most important is that the soldier is not a peace officer. He has had, in most cases, no training in law enforcement. The soldier, further, has taken no oaths to uphold the law such as the constable has. In the long run, the soldier has all the duties of the constable with respect to civil disturbances ... and none of the special responsibilities.

#### *Chapter 5 Conclusion*

The fumbling that Brigadier Kitson cautioned against had occurred early and often. The consequences were 'grave' and the extent of 'undermining' is still being felt today, close to thirty years after the fact. The British military garrison today is more powerful today than it has ever been before. The British military maintains one hundred and thirty five installations in Northern Ireland, with a total garrison (1994 levels) of approximately 22,000 troops<sup>47</sup>. Overall command is at Thiepval Barracks, Lisburn, which is also the Belfast Area Regional Command center. Housed within Thiepval Barracks are:

- Headquarters, Office of the General Officer Commanding Land Forces (GOC)
- 107 Ulster Brigade Territorial Army HQ
- Belfast Regional Command
- 39 Brigade, British Army HQ
- British Army Press Office

Also located at Thiepval is the central control for several signals commands, Special Military Intelligence Units, and those units of the SAS assigned to Northern Ireland.

The province has been divided into three commands. Belfast Regional Command is housed in Lisburn, just southwest of Belfast. North Area Regional Command is located at Ebrington Barracks, Derry, and is the headquarters of the 8 Brigade, British Army. Drumadd Barracks, Armagh, is the location for the headquarters of the 3 Brigade, British Army, and is the center of the South Area Regional Command. The Royal Irish Regiment is based in Belfast, at the Memorial Building, on Waring Street. The British Army Cadet Force is headquartered in Comber, and the Cadet Battalion of the Royal Irish Regiment is based in Derry. In addition to bases and garrisons, the British Army operates a number of surveillance sites, and several of them are on civilian property, most notably Broadway Tower, Divis Tower, Templar House, and Ward 19 of the Royal Victoria Hospital, all four in Belfast.

In 1985, the Army began to build a series of surveillance towers / bunkers in south Armagh, to control both border and several in-country locations. There are thirteen such sites. To control border crossings along the rest of the border between the Province and the Republic, the British Army has set up eighteen permanently fortified bases which serve as both checkpoints for vehicle inspections and as bases for patrols. Approximately one hundred main roads have been destroyed or blocked in order to prevent border crossings at those locations.

The Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC) is the police force for Northern Ireland. They are the only police force in the United Kingdom which carries firearms on a day to day basis, aside from tactical units. The RUC mirrors the operational structure of the British Army, to a large degree, in order to facilitate interservice cooperation. The RUC is headquartered at Knock, Belfast. Each region is divided further into divisions. The Belfast Region is headquartered at RUC headquarters, again, at Knock. Divisions include A, B, D, and E. Rural East (South) Region, comprising G, H, J, and P divisions. Rural West (North) Region includes K, L, N, and O divisions. 1994 strength of the RUC is recorded as 13,085 officers, including 1391 women. The RUC is not only a counterinsurgency force – they carry out all the duties of law enforcement in addition to their other role.

Spread throughout Northern Ireland are Scene of Crimes Offices (SOCO). The SOCO reports to crime scenes and take pictures and collect forensic evidence. The SOCO also is in control of the evidence laboratories. Within Belfast, there are SOCO personnel attached to every RUC barracks. Through the rest of the province, however, they are permanently attached only to divisional headquarters. Headquarters Mobile Support Units operate directly under the control of the Special Branch, and are assigned at the request of Divisional Commands. Primarily these units are based at Knock HQ and Lisnasharragh, although there are HMSU personnel based at three locations in Rural West (North) Region and Rural East (South) Region also. Divisional Mobile Support Units operate under the control of the twelve divisional commands. Both Divisional and Headquarters Mobile Support Units receive training from specialized military units (including the SAS<sup>48</sup>) assigned as part of the Operations Training Unit based in the Palace Barracks in Hollywood, Co. Down.

---

<sup>47</sup> Information in this chapter concerning current locations and numbers of troops and police forces is drawn from "British Military Garrison in Northern Ireland."

<sup>48</sup> Mockaitis, 124

Hopefully this past year's peace agreement will bring good results. There has indeed been a significant drop in violence, but the world is waiting to see what will happen.

### *Glossary of Terms\**

- Active Service.** Term used by the IRA to describe when its members were on an IRA operation.
- British Army.** The troops of the British Government who serve tours of duty in Northern Ireland.
- Catholic.** Adherent to the Catholic Church; Catholics comprise forty-three per cent of the Northern Irish population and total 645,000 people. Although they are the biggest single religious denomination, Catholics are a minority in the state. Across the disputed border, Catholics compose the overwhelming majority of the Irish Republic's four million population.
- Crown.** A term used to denote the British Government and all the forces, like the British Army, and institutions that compose the British State – whose constitutional head is the Queen.
- Fenian.** A term, usually pejorative, for a Catholic that implies he or she is a Republican. The original Fenians were an Irish-American revolutionary group in the 1960's.
- Fianna Fail.** A socially conservative political party in the Irish Republic with republican leanings.
- Fine Gael.** A conservative political party in the Irish Republic who are strongly opposed to the IRA and whose historical forbears fought on the pro-treaty side against the IRA in the 1922 Irish Civil War.
- IRA.** Irish Republican Army. The IRA's aim is to force the British Government to leave Ireland either by political violence or negotiation.
- Loyalist.** A Protestant strongly, often violently, opposed to a United Ireland.
- MI5.** The British domestic intelligence service that has overall control of the British Government's battle against the IRA.
- MI6.** Britain's overseas intelligence services. MI6 once fought against MI5 for control of spying operations in the Irish Republic, and has in the past run its own agents in Dublin.
- Nationalist.** A member of the Catholic population who aspires to a reunited Ireland by non-violent means.
- OC.** Officer Commanding.
- Official IRA.** Republican paramilitary faction. The Officials split from the Provisional IRA in 1969. They declared a cease-fire in 1972 and have since played an extremely limited role in the conflict in Northern Ireland. [They are Socialists, bent on world Socialist revolution.]
- Oglaigh na hEireann.** Gaelic term for the Irish Republican Army.
- Plantation.\*** The colonization of Northern Ireland by deported Scotsmen under the Stuart and Tudor dynasties, also under Cromwell's regime.
- Protestant.** Adherent to any of the different non-Catholic Christian denominations in Northern Ireland. The Protestant population stands at 855,000 and comprises fifty-seven per cent of the total population of Northern Ireland.
- Provisionals.** Another name for the modern-day IRA, which split in 1969 at the outbreak of the Troubles into two factions, the Official IRA and the Provisional IRA. The Provisionals soon eclipsed their Official rivals and the term Provisionals is now virtually synonymous with the IRA.
- Provos.** Shortened term for members or supporters of the Provisional IRA.
- Republican.** A supporter of a United Ireland. The term in Northern Ireland is usually synonymous with a supporter of the Provisional IRA.
- Republican Movement.** A term used to cover both Sinn Fein, the legal political wing of the IRA, and the IRA, the illegal military wing, of the republican organization.
- RIR.** Royal Irish Regiment. See UDR.
- RUC.** Royal Ulster Constabulary, the heavily armed police force of Northern Ireland.
- SAS.** Special Air Service, a small but elite unit of the British Army that specializes in the ambush and assassination of IRA men on active service.
- SDLP.** Social Democratic Labour Party, the main constitutional Catholic nationalist party.
- Sinn Fein.** The legal political wing of the IRA.
- SOCO.** Scene of Crimes Officers, who forensically examine murder scenes.
- Special Branch.** The RUC's powerful intelligence division which recruits and runs most of Northern Ireland's informers.
- Stiff.** To murder.
- Stormont.** The [nominal] seat of government in Northern Ireland.

---

\* Unless otherwise noted, definitions in this glossary may be considered cut from whole cloth provided in Toolis. Words or phrases in brackets are the author's additions, and definitions marked by an asterisk are the author's.

\* Author's own definition



**Taig.** A term, usually pejorative, used by Loyalists to describe Catholics.

**Volunteer.** Term used by the IRA to describe its members, in counterpoint to the salaried professionals of the RUC and the British Army.

**UDA.** Ulster Defence Association, the once legal but now banned Protestant paramilitary group which in the early Troubles was the biggest paramilitary group in Ulster.

**UDR.** Ulster Defence Regiment, a regiment of the British Army that is almost exclusively recruited from Ulster's Protestant population. UDR soldiers have borne the brunt of the IRA's assassination campaign and over two hundred individual UDR soldiers have been killed. A considerable number of UDR members have been convicted of involvement in sectarian killings of Catholics. Nationalist politicians have accused the regiment of being a sectarian force with secret links with illegal Protestant paramilitaries. In 1992 the regiment was merged with the Royal Irish Rangers to form the Royal Irish Regiment.

**UFF.** Ulster Freedom Fighters, an illegal Protestant paramilitary group whose main activities involve the sectarian killing of Catholics and the assassination of Republicans. The UFF is a cover name for the UDA.

**UVF.** Ulster Volunteer Force, an illegal Protestant paramilitary organization involved in the sectarian murders of Catholics and the assassination of Republicans associated with the IRA.

**Unionist.** A Protestant who believes in maintaining Northern Ireland's political union with Great Britain.

**Whack.** A verb meaning to murder.

#### Works Cited

1. Bell, J. Bowyer. *The Irish Troubles*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press. 1993
2. "The British Military Garrison in Ireland," *Sinn Fein Peace Action Monitor*, 1 September 1994
3. Coogan, Tim Pat. *The Troubles*, Boulder, Colorado: Roberts Rinehart Publishers, 1997
4. Coogan, Tim Pat. *The IRA: A History*, Boulder, Colorado: Roberts Rinehart Publishers, 1994
5. Dewar, LTC Michael, RGJ. *The British Army in Northern Ireland*, London, UK: Arms and Armour Press, 1985.
6. Eveleigh, Col. Robin, RGJ. *Peacekeeping in a Democratic Society: The Lessons of Northern Ireland*. London, UK, C. Hurst & Co, 1978
7. "Freedom: A Sinn Fein Education Publication," May 1991
8. Hamill, Desmond. *Pig in the Middle*. London, UK: Methuen, 1985
9. [www.army.mod.uk](http://www.army.mod.uk). Site maintained by the Ministry of Defense on behalf of the British Army
10. [www.britain-info.org](http://www.britain-info.org). Site maintained by the information department of the British Embassy in Washington, DC
11. [ruc.police.uk](http://ruc.police.uk). Site maintained by the Royal Ulster Constabulary
12. Kitson, MGEN Frank, *Low Intensity Conflict*, London, UK: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1971
13. McCann, Eamon. *War and an Irish Town*, London, UK: Pluto, 1993
14. McPhilemy, Sean. *The Committee: Political Assassinations in Northern Ireland*, Boulder, Colorado: Roberts Rinehart Publishers. 1998
15. Mockaitis, Thomas R. *British Counterinsurgency in the Post Imperial Era*, Bath, UK: Bookcraft Ltd. 1995
16. Mullan, Don. *Bloody Sunday: The Eyewitness Accounts*, Boulder, Colorado: Roberts Rinehart Publishers. 1997
17. "Shooting the Troubles." San Francisco Bay Guardian, 2 March 1983.
18. Taber, Robert. *The War of the Flea*, London, UK: St. Albans, 1970
19. Toolis, Kevin. *Rebel*