

# IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

February 2012

Vol.27, No.2 ISSN 0790-7672

and **Northern Star** incorporating **Workers' Weekly** Vol.26 No.2 ISSN 954-5891

## The Right To Desert

"Minister for Defence, Alan Shatter, has said that serious examination is taking place into the possible pardoning of Irish soldiers who deserted from the Defence forces to fight for the Allies in World War 2. Speaking on Morning Ireland Minister Shatter said these soldiers had fought against fascism and contributed to the future of freedom and democracy in Europe. He said they were penalised by a regulation barring them from being employed in any public service job. He welcomed the passing of a motion in the Stormont Assembly earlier this week calling for a pardon for the soldiers. Minister Shatter said he believes that it is right that the Republic of Ireland now revisit how this issue was dealt with historically" (RTE Online, 25 January).

The motion at Stormont not only demanded that the deserters to the enemy should be pardoned, but that there should be an official Apology because their right of desertion was not recognised.

Sinn Fein supported the Stormont motion, which was proposed by the DUP. But, of course, Sinn Fein in the 1940s did not recognise the 26 County regime as a legitimately-constituted State. Nor did it do so for half a century after the end of the World War. And it is still, on occasion, accused of not recognising it in earnest by the governing party which is seriously considering honouring the deserters from the Irish Army to join the British Army—at a moment when the British Prime Minister was reasserting a right of military intervention in the Irish state.

If the Dail complies with the DUP/Sinn Fein motion, it will substantiate Sinn Fein scepticism about its legitimacy. States assert a monopoly right on the use of force. The converse of this is that, in democratic states, the apparatus of force of the State must be unconditionally obedient to the elected Government of the state. A State which accords a right to its soldiers in time of war, not only to desert but to join the Army of a hostile State is, to put it at its mildest, an inadequate state, doubtful of its right to independent existence.

The Irish Army was not a conscript army: soldiers were all volunteers—and it had been open to the men in question to go and volunteer in the UK. Many did so and did

*continued on page 2*

## The Euro

## Realities And Abstractions

Recent developments to secure the Euro, and the new inter-Governmental arrangements to do so, have left our EUophiles talking and writing the most awful rubbish. The EU has had to be cast aside as ineffective and now the EU structure is being used by the British Government as the best way to prevent the Euro being a success. The choice is plain—the EU or the Euro! But that is the last thing that any EUophile will say. He/she will try to have it every which way. The Commission's top civil servant, Catherine Day, was at it in Dublin last month.

"Ms Day, the Irish woman who has been secretary general of the commission since 2005, told the Institute of International European Affairs in Dublin yesterday the future shape of the EU was currently being determined. The traditional "community method" of doing business was being challenged by an inter-governmental approach dominated by the larger states" (The Irish Times, January 6, 2012).

It is not "*being challenged*"—the Community method *was* challenged, lost and

*continued on page 6*

## Deserters: Ireland A Fascist State?

The *Irish Times* published the following letter from a lady who had clearly been traumatised in its issue of 27th January

"Pardon on way for Irish who fought, according to Minister for Defence, Alan Shatter...

That is good news. But now let him take a good look at what happened to soldiers' children, charged and taken to court by the NSPCC and the ISPCC, to be criminally charged and sentenced to an industrial school for up to 16 years or life. Yes, I mean life, because the nuns could have you sent to a Magdalene Laundry or a mental institution just because your father

was in the British forces, and then have it put on your records (like it stated on my records that went in with me to the industrial school at the age of three years old). Letters that were sent to the industrial school from the parents were sent on to the Department of Education. So the children never got to see their parents; the Department of Education and the nuns made us orphans. When we were released from the industrial schools there was no family to turn to.

We also were to be given the worst treatment possible, because as you know Ireland did not like the British. The Irish government gave the British government the bill for the children and the British government paid.

The Irish people who did join the British forces must have been the bravest people going, knowing that they were very likely to face death; to find that if they made it back home to Ireland, their own government and people rejected them: and this is supposed to be a good Christian country.

Ireland did not just incarcerate its own children; it also incarcerated a lot of foreign children in the industrial schools as well.

*continued on page 7*

## CONTENTS

Page

<b>The Right To Desert.</b> Editorial	1
<b>The Euro: Realities And Abstractions.</b> Jack Lane	1
<b>Deserters: Ireland A Fascist State?</b> Report	1
<b>Readers' Letters: Views Of Sinn Fein.</b> Stephen Richards	3
<b>Iran Not Trying To Develop A Nuclear Weapon</b> — <i>US Defence Secretary Panetta.</i> David Morrison	8
<b>Not Sufficient To Be Sour.</b> Jack Lane responds to Desmond Fennell	9
<b>Shorts</b> from <i>the Long Fellow</i> (Pensioners; Failed States; When Was Independence?; The Media And Change; Mary Raftery; 'Unexpected' Death)	11
<b>Raymond Crotty's Appeal To England:</b>	
<i>Introduction.</i> Brendan Clifford	12
<i>Eire: A Land Where Emigrants Are Born.</i> Raymond Crotty	12
<i>Some Comments On Raymond Crotty's Article.</i> John Martin	13
<b>Es Ahora.</b> Julianne Herlihy (Elizabeth Bowen, Lies, Spies & Academics — <i>Qui Bono?</i> ; CUP & Einbhear Walshe)	15
<b>Deserters And Their Champions Equally Unworthy Of Trust.</b> Donal Kennedy (Unpublished Letter)	16
<b>'The Further One Gets From Belfast'.</b> Niall Meehan replies to Jeff Dudgeon	17
<b>The 1934 Larkin Affidavit: A Comment.</b> Jeff Dudgeon replies to Manus O'Riordan	21
<b>Crozier Antidotes For Hart Maladies.</b> Manus O'Riordan	23
<b>Items From The Irish Bulletin, 1919.</b> Number 7	27
<b>Does It Stack Up?</b> Michael Stack (Inside Job; Corporation Tax; Fee-Paying And Public Schools; Ultra-Privileged Schools)	28
<b>Needs Sectioned?</b> Wilson John Haire (Poem)	29

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

The Guilds And Capitalism

*Mondragon*, Part 4

(back page)

**Due to pressure of space, it has been necessary to hold over a number of items,  
including *Naval Warfare, Part 18* by *Pat Walsh***

not suffer adverse consequences.

The *Irish Times*—the newspaper that Britain left behind it in Ireland when it had to leave—did some stirring on this issue over a year ago. It complained that:

"Soldiers who deserted but did not join the British army were treated differently: Some were not even arrested, and their names were left off the list" (8 Nov. 2010).

The list in question was a blacklist, which barred those concerned from public employment for seven years.

Is there not, then, a substantial difference between soldiers who just desert and those who go into the service of a potential enemy?

The Irish Government asserted neutrality against Britain in 1939 and sustained it until 1945 with the support of the Opposition parties, including the party for which Mr. Shatter now speaks. That the declaration of neutrality was made against Britain was not in doubt at the time. Germany made no claims on Ireland. Its concern with Ireland was entirely in the context of

the War declared on it by Britain. Britain held a quarter of the island and was exerting pressure on the other three-quarters to facilitate its war effort.

The possibility of Irish neutrality had come about only a year before Britain launched the War on Germany. It was the Appeasers who brought it about by vacating the three Ports which they held under the terms of the dictated 'Treaty' of 1921 and transferring them to Irish sovereignty. The great Anti-Appeaser, Churchill, denounced the action at the time, when he was the "*voice in the wilderness*". He was brought back into the British Cabinet when war was declared a year later, and he urged that the Irish declaration of neutrality should be treated as nonsense. But the Arch-Appeaser, Chamberlain, who had given the Irish back the Ports, remained Prime Minister for nine months after he declared war and he would not revoke his agreement with the Irish.

When Churchill eventually became Prime Minister in May 1940, the British war offensive (for which no serious

preparation had been made) was in collapse. The issue for the British Government then was whether to limit the War in the light of the military fiasco in France, and make a settlement as France did, or to use British naval dominance to keep the War going and try to embroil the world in it.

There was argument within the British Cabinet on the issue. Churchill, despite his notorious reputation as a warmonger, had his way. He kept the War going with very little British fighting, spreading it piecemeal for a year, until he gained Stalin as an ally and the catastrophic phase of the War began.

That Britain might have adopted a different course of action, either in 1939 or in June 1940, is not allowed by the Churchillian mythology of the War. And, though Ireland maintained its neutrality in the face of Churchill's threats, it failed to produce a history of the War from its own viewpoint subsequently and therefore fell under the spell of the mesmeric myth cast by Churchill.

The object of almost all British history-writing is to make the possibility of a different course of action from the course chosen by Britain unthinkable. What Britain did was the only thing to do and anybody who does not agree is a scoundrel.

But the revisionists who dominate Irish academic history in the British interest argue the exact opposite case with regard to Irish history. They charge nationalists with the fallacy of holding that there was an inevitable, predestined course of events leading to the formation of an independent Irish state. They assert that history happens through a series of complicated conjunctures, and that in each conjuncture something different might have been done. But, when it comes to consideration of British history, they comply happily with the orthodoxy of the Churchillian myth. There were no reasonable alternatives to what Churchill did!

Churchill did not occupy Southern Ireland, though he asserted the right to do so. Occupation was not expedient. His spies reported to him that occupation would be met by all-out resistance by all political tendencies, so on balance he did not do it. But he did not make a virtue of expediency. At the end of the War he reasserted the right to occupy Southern Ireland that he had asserted at the outset.

It was through determination in all quarters to resist British occupation that the Free State Army took on the character of a national army. It was in origin a mercenary force recruited by Collins, and

armed and paid for by Britain, to impose the Treaty and break the Republican Army that had fought Britain to the negotiating table after it had treated the electoral process with contempt. Collins might have remained the militarist icon, but the character of the force was changed, and the rupture of the Treaty War was overcome to a considerable extent—by the collaboration of all parties, except the Sinn Fein holdouts, in serious preparation for resistance to another British occupation.

If that is now to be trivialised by honouring deserters to the British Army, it should at least be admitted that Sinn Fein scepticism was well-founded.

Mr. Shatter—who is Minister for Justice and Equality, as well as for Defence—said in another statement that the neutrality of the State, in which he is a Government Minister, in Britain's Second World War "was a principle of moral bankruptcy", and he described the deserters from the Irish Army to the Army of the British Empire as "members of our Defence Forces who left this island during that time to fight for freedom".

A word needs to be said about this legendary "fight for freedom", and how it was that the Irish State which Mr. Shatter serves had to fight Britain for its freedom after voting for it; and how the British Empire, which had denied Irish freedom until Ireland made itself too hot to handle, suddenly became the belligerent champion of general freedom; and how the Irish State failed to see that the Empire, from which it had escaped so recently and with such pain, made itself morally bankrupt by failing to recognise the obvious fact that that Empire had been transformed, "in the twinkling of an eye", into the champion of general freedom, and to make itself available for the Empire's war effort.

Minister Shatter did not support his anathema against his own state with a word of explanation. It appears self-evident to him that the Empire had undergone a marvellous transformation during the brief interval since its war against Irish freedom. But, since it isn't everybody who is capable of seeing visions like that, we must try to puzzle it out.

In the "war that brought freedom to Europe" there were at least two, fundamentally -antagonistic, conceptions of Freedom on the winning side: and those two Freedoms would probably have produced another world war after the defeat of Germany, but for the deterrent effect of nuclear weapons.

It was Russia that broke the military

continued on page 4

## Views Of Sinn Fein

I was interested in the responses, editorial and from Wilson John Haire, that appeared in December and January *Irish Political Review* to my letter of November [*The Presidency And Sinn Fein*, November *Irish Political Review*]. What interested me was the failure to engage substantively with the points I was making, the good points and, no doubt, the less good. As Philip Larkin's tutor said of him, I can understand a point when it's explained to me. To that extent therefore, the lack of explanation tends to make my points for me.

To be cited as an example of communal antagonism in action is certainly vexing, when I had made clear that I felt a degree of contempt for both the DUP and Sinn Fein, who have both traded their way to fortune on the back of communal antagonism. Wilson John Haire then weighed in with talk of the ferocity of my outburst. Well, I suppose I'm guilty of ferocious outbursts from time to time, but usually only when there's no milk for my porridge, or when some of the cats get at the butter.

I have to assure Wilson John Haire that any notions I might once have had about my intellectual ability have long since been knocked out of me, but I do have some intellectual curiosity, which is why for the last thirty three years I've been devouring everything that has come out of Athol Street. Maybe I haven't profited as I should, maybe I was too influenced by Brendan Clifford before he slowly turned round, or maybe I'm just a "thran" Unionist. But what I sense is the absence of any appetite to analyse the very strange development of Sinn Fein from the early 1990s on. So, not much intellectual curiosity in the pages of *Irish Political Review* in that regard these days.

I also find it peculiar that Brendan and others in their anxiety to demonstrate that the IRA of 1919 to 1921 was not engaged in sectarian murder fail to consider the evidence that the Provisional IRA (like its "Loyalist" counterparts) was so engaged. Unlike Wilson John Haire, I don't believe that Northern Ireland is a better place for that Provisional campaign. On the basis of the *volte face* that Sinn Fein not so elegantly executed we now know that the deaths were needless deaths.

Brendan Clifford has argued powerfully for the potency of the 1918 election result in Ireland as a validation of the war that followed. That there was a sizeable minority in the whole island which was stubbornly opposed to Sinn Fein shouldn't stand in the way of the march of a nation. Very well then. The Provisional campaign was conducted on behalf of a minority of a minority and in the face of not just one but a whole series of election results, which the obnoxious method of government set up in 1921 doesn't cancel out. Northern Ireland was reduced to a human and economic wasteland on foot of a dogged denial of the national rights of a majority. The democratic rationale of the IRA campaign was therefore more akin to that of the Black and Tans, as was the method of warfare. It's a strange liberation movement that ends up killing many of the "fellow-Irishmen and women" that are meant to be the beneficiaries of the liberation. It's like the villages in Viet Nam that had to be destroyed in order to be saved.

And at the end of this 25 year long bloody campaign its leaders, who had sent many idealistic young volunteers to their deaths, and had raised communal tensions to an unprecedented pitch, decided to embark on a process that would end up with them becoming ministers of the Crown in a partitionist assembly. The "war" was bad enough; the hypocrisy of the peace process was astonishing. The deaths were consigned to a cloud of unmeaning. The last chapter of *Animal Farm* comes to mind.

As Brendan Clifford writes of Cromwell, at the end of all this the Provos "had achieved precisely nothing", in terms of their stated ideology. The present Sinn Fein critique of the dissidents is therefore incoherent. The conduct of the dissidents is deplorable, but I don't see how it can possibly be so from a Sinn Fein perspective. The dissident campaign may be equally devoid of democratic legitimacy but it is perhaps slightly less dishonourable than that of the Provos. At least the dissidents don't engage in wanton sectarian murder.

I'm sorry to have to labour these points, which I wouldn't do but for the studied refusal of *Irish Political Review* to engage in lively debate about them. No doubt there are counter-arguments to blow me out of the water; it's just that so far I haven't heard them. I don't expect to hear them from Sinn Fein whose approach is like that of the Duke of Wellington—"never apologise, never explain"—but I would have liked to come across some half-decent explanation in the pages of *Irish Political Review*, instead of *ad hominem* type rebuttals.

**Stephen Richards**

power of Germany. Britain scrambled back onto the Continent four years after deserting France. Facing a German Army that had been gutted by the Red Army and that had most of its remaining power deployed in the East, it took the British and Americans most of a year to get into the heart of Germany and meet the Russians there. The long delay about opening the Second Front, and then the long delay about pressing on into Germany were caused by Britain. But the Western Allies did eventually get there.

After Germany had surrendered, two nuclear bombs were dropped on Japanese civilians, even though the excuse the Western scientists gave themselves for concentrating on the production of weapons that they knew to be horrendous was that they had to make them before the Germans did.

Europe was freed from Nazism by the antagonistic freedoms of Communism and Imperialism, with their antagonist notions of democracy. Each denied that what the other brought to Europe was Freedom. And in post-Nazi, anti-Nazi Germany the force that broke the power of Nazism was banned. (We refer to the Communist movement.)

Britain collaborated with Nazi Germany for five years. It then decided to make war on it, but everything it did in that War led to an increase in the power of Nazi Germany. The British policy of spreading the war, after its abandonment of France, led to the extension of Nazi power by effective defensive actions.

The USA used nuclear weapons against Japanese civilians three months after Germany surrendered. Churchill wanted the Soviet Union nuclear-bombed. But he was voted out of Office, the Labour Government was slow to shrug off the wartime propaganda about the Soviet friend and ally, and Britain did not have its own nuclear bomb anyway for a few years more.

After the surrender of Germany, the US had to give priority to its war—the war with Japan which it had deliberately provoked. And by the time it might have turned its mind to destroying its Soviet ally in Minister Shatter's universal war for Freedom, it was too late. Against all expectations, Russia had made its own nuclear bomb by 1948.

How was it that an unquestionable war for Freedom, which Ireland branded itself as a moral bankrupt by refusing to participate in it, ended like that?

RTE a couple of years ago broadcast a couple of programmes about Ireland's complicity in Evil, because of its neutrality. The late Cathal O'Shannon, son of the Connolly socialist of that name, was a central figure in them. He explained how he went off to fight Fascism (though not as a deserter) and his act was not properly appreciated when he came back. But it turned out that where he had fought Fascism, in an RAF uniform, was in Burma/Myanmar. This was problematical, since Burma had been a country conquered by the British Empire and subject to Imperialist oppression until it was liberated by Japan, after Japan was given an ultimatum effectively demanding its surrender and it decided to fight instead.

Japan had been the protector of the British Empire in Asia during the 1914 War. It was humiliated at the post-War Congress at Versailles, at which the League of Nations was founded, when its proposal for a declaration of racial equality was rejected. Then Britain, acting under American pressure, refused to renew its Alliance with Japan. In the practice of international affairs, that meant that Britain marked it down as an enemy. And then Britain in 1941 seconded an American ultimatum with which Japan could not comply without ruining its economy. Japan responded by bombing an American naval base in the middle of the Pacific and by running through the British Empire in Asia.

It was then defeated by America, but the British Empire never recovered, though not through want of trying. Burmese Independence was proclaimed under Japanese auspices. When Cathal O'Shannon and the British Army tried to force Burma back under Imperial rule, the Burmese wouldn't have it. Whatever O'Shannon did in Burma, he did as an Imperialist oppressor putting down Freedom at the drag end of Empire.

Britain had to give up Burma to a Burmese independence movement inspired by Sinn Fein and made effective by Japan. Churchill was outraged. He said that the Burmese leader, Aung San, should be prosecuted as a war criminal and collaborator. But that was crying for the moon. Aung San became Prime Minister of his country, which Japan had inspired to assert its independence—but he was blown up with his Ministers at their first Cabinet meeting. The British Foreign Office decided to reveal a couple of years ago that the assassination was the work of the British security service. The person chosen to make that revelation was the BBC's secular saint, Fergal Kane, so it can hardly be doubted.

If Minister Shatter is allowed to proceed with his intention to overrule the decision taken by the Government of the day about deserters from the Irish Army to the British, on the basis that the deserters contributed to war against Fascism and therefore placed themselves above national law while the Government of the day was morally bankrupt, it should at least be done on a case by case basis, taking account of the fact that Britain was an Imperialist Power in this war, and that it waged war against other things than Fascism. At the very least, participation in the British Imperialist attempt to undo the Japanese liberation of Burma should not be counted as anti-fascist action.

If Fascism is to be the justification of desertion to the enemy, Minister should say something about the fact that his own party, Fine Gael, was a fascist party during the fascist era of the 1930s. He should also mention that the reason Ireland did not become fascist was that Fianna Fail (now described as the *morally bankrupt* party) held the ring for Parliamentary democracy throughout the 1930s.

Shatter's remarks on *moral bankruptcy* were made at the opening of an exhibition on the *Shoah* (Jewish Holocaust) in his Department. They were accompanied by a statement that "*the doors of the Irish state were firmly closed to Jewish families fleeing from persecution*". (It has become necessary to specify 'Jewish' Holocaust because there is now to be another official Holocaust. The French Parliament is to decree that the Turkish treatment of the Armenians who were roused to rebellion by Tsarist Russian propaganda in the Great War was genocide and that it is a crime to question this. No notice is taken of the many peoples who were literally exterminated during the expansion of Anglo-Saxon power in the world.)

A supporter of Shatter's project has commented that General Franco kept an open door in Spain for Jewish refugees, unlike De Valera. And it was the case that many more Jews found refuge in fascist Spain than in democratic Ireland. Fine Gael might cite that fact in defence of its own fascist phase, if it had not chosen to pretend that it was never fascist. It campaigned vigorously for the recognition of Franco's insurrection as the legitimate Government of Spain, as against the elected Republic, from 1936 onwards. De Valera refused to recognise Franco's Government until it had made itself the *de facto* Spanish State in 1938.

There were two significant differences

between Spain and Ireland (besides the obvious difference in size). Spain had a land border across which Jews could flee. And Spain had fought an authentic Civil War, unlike the Irish one—which was a conflict manipulated by Britain between two bodies of people with the same aim. Authentic civil wars are capable of producing a strong regime (e.g. England, America). The victor is militarily triumphant, self-confident, and in command of a unified regime. The spurious Irish 'civil war' was debilitating. The victor won with British guns, British money, and British propaganda backing, spurred on by British threats. He was not driven by a fundamental disagreement with those against whom he fought about the kind of State there should be. Therefore, when he won, he could not command the situation morally. There was a rupture between material and moral force. The party defeated in war retained the moral force and became dominant within ten years of defeat, but could not restore the situation as it had been in 1921.

Britain had an entirely reasonable purpose in making the Irish fight each other in 1922. It was to ensure that the Army that had fought it to the negotiating table in 1919-21 would not be the Army of the State which it was obliged to recognise in Ireland. The Irish State, which declared neutrality in 1939, was essentially unarmed. Its achievement was to convince Churchill that he would nevertheless meet with strong national resistance if he acted on what he took to be his right to occupy Ireland. Franco's neutrality was the armed neutrality of a state made strong by victory in an authentic civil war.

Franco might have given victory to Hitler by joining him in the War and closing the Mediterranean to the Royal Navy by taking Gibraltar. Instead of doing that, he made it clear to Hitler that he would have to fight his way through Spain to get to Gibraltar.

The crucial part played by Spain in the War as declared and fought by Britain makes its characterisation as a war against Fascism ridiculous. The Anti-Fascist War was the Soviet war of defence, in which German power was broken. But the victory of the Anti-Fascist Power would probably have led to war with Britain, if Britain had still been capable of a major war effort at that point.

It might be added that Britain and France (with their Imperial hinterlands) were the only Allied countries which were involved in a war of choice. Every other country maintained a neutral position until attack-

ed, or the threats of the great Western democracy forced them to end their neutrality (i.e. the Latin American states). If de Valera's Ireland was *morally bankrupt*, it was in good company!

It is absurd that the deceptive shibboleths of the war propaganda of what was a very confused War with regard to principles should be bandied about in Irish politics almost 70 years later by a Government Minister for the purpose of making nonsense of Irish history.

Fascism was not an internationalist system that threatened civilisation. It was a means by which various capitalist countries, thrown into disorder by the Great War and the disruptive peace that followed it, preserved Capitalism against the force of international Communism, which had also been generated out of the chaos of the Great War. Churchill, the mythical leader of the "*Anti-Fascist War*", was an ardent supporter of Fascism as the only effective defender of capitalist civilisation in post-Great War Europe.

Countries that were reduced to an antagonism of their social elements by the recklessness with which the British Empire brought about world war, conducted the war, and re-made the world according to its whims at the end of it, were forcefully drawn back into functional capitalist nation states. Fascism did for capitalism, by drastic means in a situation of dire emergency, what we call Democracy does by routine in normal situations.

The main fascist country that ran its full course (i.e., that was not broken by external intervention) was Spain. Fascist order was imposed on a chaos within which Communism was seen to be developing, was preserved by force for about forty years, and was then modified into the representative system that we call Democracy. Representative government was restored on the understanding that the Fascist era would be treated as a necessary development out of chaos which made orderly representative government possible. In recent years a Spanish judge was overcome by a feeling that this was an outrage on justice, and he began to issue indictments which treated the fascist era a criminal outbreak. This struck at the authoritarian roots of the democratic state (all states have authoritarian roots), and endangered the system. Spanish democracy has now acted to protect itself by prosecuting that judge for treason.

In recent times there has been a democratic mania for knocking down functional authoritarian states, rather like

Franco Spain, because they are authoritarian, and replacing them with make-believe democracies. This was done in Iraq with Irish approval and marginal Irish participation on the grounds that it must always be a good thing to destroy 'tyrannies'. Today Iraq is free. It was not free under Saddam. Under Saddam very few people were killed by the political process. A great noise was made by Amnesty International about those who were killed — but the figures for political killing under the tyranny were so small, compared with today's figures, that it is too embarrassing to mention them. And the allied countries in the 'Coalition of the Willing' that brought down Saddam did not collect figures for civilian casualties consequent upon their invasion.

When the media tell us of improvements in the Iraqi situation the base year that they use is not 2001, when the tyranny was operative, but 2006, when the 'freedom' introduced by the 'liberation' had brought about general mayhem. Details of life under the tyranny cannot be mentioned, because they would make it appear as a Golden Age. The humanitarian ideology, so much in evidence when the invasion was being prepared, is now strictly subordinate to the requirements of Utopian capitalist democratic ideology.

Democracy is nationalist in tendency, no less than Fascism was. And, when it becomes "*international*", i.e. Imperialist, it does so on the basis of its nationalist core.

Conor Cruise O'Brien saw that Democracy was nationalist in tendency. He saw it in the course of his brooding over the French Revolution in learned mode, but he lacked the moral courage to follow through this insight in his political mode. He also saw that Democracy, constituted into a general ideology, is capable of being immensely destructive. This is not something that his leading apostle, Eoghan Harris, learned from him. Harris, as publicist for the fantasist Ahmad Chalabi in the invasion of Iraq, gave free expression to the democratic utopianism that revolted O'Brien in his learned musings on the French Revolution. And then he went quiet.

The nationalist character of Democracy is plainly evident in the most influential democracy in this region of the world. The British State was a kind of oligarchic tyranny for about a century and half following the establishment of a stable regime around 1715. Then it gradually phased the populace into the electoral system of the state until it became a

democracy in the militarist Imperialist atmosphere of 1918. Imperialist militarism does not survive in it today in connection with some remnant of the old ruling class. It is carried by the democracy proper.

The stable transition from Oligarchy to Democracy was seen as a possible development by the ruling class in the late 19th century in the context of militarism and Imperialism. It was democratic Britain that ignored the Irish Election of 1918, fought the Black-and-Tan War, and lost Ireland. It is democratic Britain that is now seeking to clean up that piece of history and to erode the national morale of the country which it lost so disgracefully—by rewriting its history and ridiculing its culture.

And this is the project that the present Government proposes to carry forward.

\*

The BBC, an agency of the nationalistic, democratic, imperialistic British state, was doing its proper job when it made the running on the issue of the outrageous refusal of the Irish State to recognise a right of desertion to its Army. On 4th January it carried a very misleading and impressionistic programme on Radio 4, in which a number of people were given free rein to make wild assertions. One of these was that orphans of soldiers who had died for Britain were put into Industrial Schools with a code attached to their names "SS", to mark them out for harsher treatment. There were complaints too about the deserters being ostracised by their neighbours. But Radio 4 had shown considerable disregard for factual reporting on 3rd August 2011 (at 7.40 am) on its prestigious *Today* programme when it conducted an interview with Robert Widders, the author of a book on these Irish deserters. That interview had been flagged as follows: "*Also on today's programme, the story of the thousands of Irish soldiers punished for choosing to fight Fascism*". Here is a transcript of the interview which followed.

#### RADIO 4 INTERVIEW

**RW** Good Morning

**BBC** Just tell us the typical story of what happened to any one of these 5,000 or so who deserted.

**RW** Yes, what happened is that these men deserted from around 1940-41 onwards when the threat of invasion had disappeared. and they made their way across to England, joined the British Army or the Navy or the Air Force and served throughout the 2nd World war fighting against Fascism. In many cases the Irish State at the time imprisoned their children, either during the War or post-War, where they were singled out for special treatment, which meant increased abuse. Some of

these men died, in many cases during the liberation of Europe, some of them on the beaches of Normandy on the 6th of June. And, after the War, they were all court-martialled, the dead and the live men. And they were also banned from employment for seven years. This was known informally in Parliament as the *Starvation Order*, and the implications are obvious. And these men were treated very badly and their treatment compares very badly, compared to men who deserted and who didn't fight with the Allies, for instance men who became criminals or even the handful of men who fought with the Waffen SS. They were not treated in the same manner.

**BBC** It is a very, very interesting tale. You know, what was going on? Was it just because they were fighting with the hated English? I mean, what was the— Why do you think they were treated so harshly?

**RW** Well I think it was—the Government had to do something. In fairness the Irish Government had to make some sort of a response and can't be blamed for that. But it's the nature of the response that's at fault. Because it was unconstitutional and it was illegal by Irish law, and there was an element of vindictiveness in this legislation.

**BBC** And we should say there's something of a campaign now, isn't there? I don't know whether that's as a result of your book, but a campaign to essentially to get those verdicts overturned?

**RW** Yes, there is a campaign. And it is as a result of the book. Because of course this had been hidden away for half a century and the book brought this into the public domain. And a guy called Peter Mulvaney in Ireland, another ex-soldier like myself, he took the issue up and started a campaign and I'm working with him on this. And we're calling upon the Irish Government to show some humanity and compassion and pardon the handful of very old men now and allow them to die with dignity and honour.

**BBC** But what's so significant—I mean some of the children who were, I mean rather few of the men themselves are around, but some of the children who were punished on behalf of their father's activity must still be around.

**RW** Oh, there are a lot of them around, and I've spoken to many of them. And in fact one lady showed me a School Register only a few weeks ago. And on this register it's marked, some of the names are marked "S S", which stands for Special Treatment for the children of British soldiers. And when I say schools, it was really more like a prison, because there were given routinely, routinely they were physically and sexually abused. They were denied medical treatment and they were rented out as slave labourers to work in the fields for farmers.

**BBC** What an extraordinary tale, Robert Widders. As I say the book is called *Spitting On A Soldier's Grave*. Thank you very much."

## Realities

continued

is now dead. The fight is over. It was one or the other and it is obvious which has won out. There is no point in flogging a dead horse. But Ms Day kept saying that this was yet to be decided.

"She said the current treaty would be outside EU treaties but would hopefully be compatible with them. "Outside France and Germany, most of the other member states are not particularly happy with the clear leadership role they have taken." She said there had been a lot of grumbling on the margins and calls on the commission to speak up for the community method, but the economic crisis had made it much more difficult for the commission to play its traditional role."

So one Treaty could be as good as another—but if so why have two? The only alternative she seems to have is for people to be hoping and grumbling and—what else—pray? That hardly constitutes a policy. It is dog in the manger politics.

"I would like to see a revival of strong support from the smaller member states for the commission. As a body it most closely reflects their interests. I think there has been a bit of a falling off of that in recent years" (ibid).

It is a bit late in the day for this and it was one small country (guess who?) which led the charge, along with Pat Cox and the European Liberals, to successfully destroy the authority of the Commission over a decade ago. Of course Day, and the Institute of International European Affairs, never mention this as Mr. Cox is one of their great heroes and inspirers and he is on its *Comité d'Honneur*. Are they all blind, deaf and dumb?

The phrase 'falling off' brings to mind the similar fate of Humpty Dumpty. He also had a 'falling off' but Humpty simply fell—he was not pushed. But our Irish EUophile heroes pushed and praised the pusher of the Commission off the wall and now all they can do is look at the wreckage and hope it gets itself together again. And grumble and hope.

The unreality goes on:

"If Britain chooses to stay and make it work we can keep the EU as we know it today, but if they pursue the role of being a Switzerland or a Hong Kong that some on the Tory backbenches and in the City favour, then we can easily move to having a loose outer circle and an inner circle."

Does she not know that Britain HAS chosen? It was in all the papers. It happened about 2am on 9th December 2011 if she

needs to check the record. Britain has chosen to be a defender of the EU as the most effective way to oppose the arrangements to secure the Euro. And Ms Day does not seem to see this!

But hey, despite all this:

"She said under current plans the commission would be given huge new powers and responsibilities, but few people realised what this was going to mean. "We are talking about a future in which national budgets are synchronised; in which the commission has oversight over national budgets; the power to intervene and call for change in national budgets" ... (ibid).

Yes, the Commission will probably be used to do the donkey work of the new inter-Governmental arrangement but even that is not certain. That is the biggest role the Commission will have, but that has nothing to do with what the Commission was set up to do. It will get some crumbs from the table of the new inter-Governmental arrangement.

The Commission was the central and unique instrument set up to create a European polity, by initiating legislation and crucial decisions across the Community and thereby building up the necessary moral and political power to integrate the nation states. At best its role will now be reduced to a bureaucracy pure and simple for the inter-Governmental arrangements and will do as it told. The substance has gone and that means the EU is gone. But Ms Day speaks as if nothing had really changed for the Commission—that it goes on as before with a bit of tweaking here and another bit there but oblivious to the fact that its essential role is dead and gone. She is a true bureaucrat.

The approach of Ms Day is typical and, if the Government approaches a referendum with such an eclectic approach, it will convince nobody. There is one task and one task only—to secure the Euro via the inter-Governmental plans. If that is confused with anything else under the guises of supporting 'Europe', the 'EU', 'Brussels', the 'Union' or whatever, it will give such mixed messages that voters will be turned off. These concepts are now abstractions and electorates as a whole do not relate to abstractions—they only exercise the ideologues.

It was ironic to read Brendan Halligan's paean of praise to Lemass's efforts in having his application to join the EEC accepted, delivered on the 50th anniversary of the formal application to do so. In outlining the hurdles Lemass had to overcome, he might have mentioned that presented by himself and the Irish labour Party. Both were then mindless and unconvincing in their opposition to entry

into the EEC and they remain in that state—except that they have since changed their stance. But their new commitment is as mindless as their opposition was. Halligan's concluding remarks illustrated the waffle that passes for thought in those circles about the current situation: "*The Lemass legacy suggests the need for a clear understanding of where the national interest lies today. He would, for sure, be opting for involvement rather than isolation*" (18 Jan.). That's a great help. What does it mean? "*Involvement rather than isolation*" is a meaningless and useless counterposing in today's context.

The EEC of the Lemass era is gone and the EU is now being bypassed.

Promoting the EU is in effect a weapon that can now be used against the only form of integration that's vital and feasible—the Fiscal Compact.

Halligan does not address that, he is evading the issue. But we know which he supports—easy—whichever one is successful. If the EU survives without the Compact, he will be in a position to waffle on forever about an ever receding 'Europe' that would not have any political reality. If the Compact succeeds he will also be a supporter but its success will owe nothing to him and his poor imitation of Chatham House, as the this recent contribution by Catherine Day shows.

Declan Ganley has joined in with another abstraction about a United States of Europe. A great idea—a 'bold idea' according to the *Irish Times* (10 Jan.)—and a total red herring in not concentrating on the task in hand. If the Fiscal Compact fails, all such grand ideas will be so much fantasising. The creators of the European project started with the mundane task of the coordinating work of the Coal and Steel Community, without which all the rest would have been so much hot air. The same applies, ten times over, with the absolute need to make the Compact work.

Jack Lane

## Deserters continued

Proud to be a British soldier's child...  
Prisoner 893 (Industrial school),

Kathy Ferguson,  
Jacox Crescent,  
Kenilworth, England."

**Could it be that the self-proclaimed 'paper of record' has been publishing some 'false consciousness'? It seems that any old rubbish is grist to the mill of doing down the Irish State. The same lady appears to have had a different story about her childhood in the *Sunday World* of 28th January 2007. The story below has nothing about Soldiers or Desertion or being singled out for bad treatment**

"... "Have two different birth certificates, but I still haven't a notion about my real identity."

A middle-aged woman spoke yesterday of the heartbreaking trauma she is enduring in her ongoing battle to discover who she really is. Kathy Ferguson is a woman with no name. She does not know her real identity. She does not know her precise age, exactly where she was born or who her parents were. She does not know if she has any brothers, sisters, cousins or other relatives. She is convinced, however, that she was born in Ireland. But despite a painstaking and exhaustive search into her background here, she has still failed to discover her true origins. Kathy maintains that a birth certificate issued to her by authorities here is not really hers and is simply a "near match" to that of a person that could pass as being her.

"People have positively no idea of the trauma I am going through because of my situation... The fact that I don't know who I am plays on mind all the time. It's like having to endure slow torture. There is no escaping the desperate agony it causes. I find I am continually wondering about my origins and background..."

"Having to go through life like this not knowing the truth of my situation is pure hell."

Kathy is now threatening to take legal action against Government bureaucrats who she maintains have provided her with two different identities, each of which is incorrect.

"According to the Irish Government I was born in Ireland on November 26th, 1947. According to the British Government I was born in England on March 2nd, 1945..."

"Both of these obviously cannot be right. As far as I am concerned each of them is most certainly wrong."

Kathy, who spent her childhood in a number of different children's homes and institutions in both Ireland and England, is determined to discover the truth of her origins.

She has contacted anyone who might help her find out more about her fractured life and has written to countless people, including church bosses and political leaders like Bertie Ahern and Tony Blair.

Two Government departments that have replied to Kathy's enquiries have recorded her separately as Kathleen Marie O'Brien and Kathleen Power. According to the birth certificates record office in Dublin she was born in Holles Street Hospital on November 26, 1947, and her real name is Kathleen Marie O'Brien. But documents she has obtained from the births office in England state she was born on March 2, 1945, in Coventry, and her real name is Kathleen Power. "*One minute I am Irish-born Kathleen O'Brien and I am now 59 years old*", Kathy said yesterday. "*The next minute I am English-born Kathleen Power and I am 61 years old. The truth of the matter and from my own extensive research neither identity is correct. All I want to know is who I really am, but no one seems capable of telling me.*"

Kathy is a mother of four, has spent most of her life living in England where she still resides today. But much of her

time in recent years has been spent in this country where she has been desperately trying to discover her real identity. Speaking at her home in Kenilworth, Warwickshire, yesterday, she explained that her own intensive investigations had helped her piece together some of her lost childhood. She endured a brutal, tragic and disruptive background and upbringing, most of it spent in the care of social services...

The earliest records reveal she was sent to an industrial school run by the Sisters of Mercy in Ennis, County Clare, in December 1948 after being found "destitute" on the streets of Killaloe. A court document, associated with her detention there, read in part: "It is hereby ordered that the said child shall be sent to the Certified Industrial School at Convent of Mercy, Ennis, being a school conducted in accordance with the doctrines of the Catholic Church" and where the managers were willing to receive her.

It added that Kathy was to be detained there until 1961, a period of 13 years, when it was believed she would be 16 years of age.

But only... a few years after her detention at the Ennis industrial school, she was transferred to England where she was placed in the care of a couple living in a caravan in Coventry.

Kathy believes the woman in whose care she was placed was fraudulently claiming to be her real mother in order to obtain maintenance payments.

"It beggars belief that the Sisters of Mercy handed me into the care of someone claiming to be my mother who was not really my mother at all," she complained yesterday.

"It seems to me there was absolutely no proper checking done on anyone."

Further court records Kathy has obtained show she was eventually taken from the couple in the caravan after it was found she was being abused by them...

She was then taken into the Care of the social services in England, where she stayed until her teens.

"There has not been a door that I have not knocked on or a politician that I have not written to in my search for my true identity. But no one seems to be able to help me", Kathy told *Sunday World* yesterday. She said that when she received records from the Sisters of Mercy about her time in their care, they advised her that she might be disappointed when she went looking for her birth certificate as it might not be accurate.

"I have trawled Ireland looking for details of who my mother might be and of any relatives I might have and have found nothing and nobody..."

"It seems I am a non-person. I have two birth certificates, but neither is mine. I have a UK passport that states that I am a subject of the United Kingdom, but was born in the West of Ireland. "I have an Irish birth certificate that says I was born in Dublin and a British birth certificate that says I was born in England.

"But I can find positively no records of who my parents are in either jurisdiction. It's as though, I like me, they really do not exist".

[Cathal.oshea@sundayworld.com]

## Iran Not Trying To Develop A Nuclear Weapon

—US Defence Secretary, Leon Panetta

Asked about Iran's nuclear programme on *Face The Nation* (CBS, 8 Jan. 2012), US Defence Secretary, Leon Panetta, replied:

"Are they {the Iranians} trying to develop a nuclear weapon? No." {1}

Viewers whose opinions on Iran's nuclear activities have been formed by mainstream media in the West must have been amazed by this statement. There, the impression is constantly given Iran definitely has an active programme to develop nuclear weapons, which will yield results in a year or two. And that has been the impression for the last six or eight years.

One would never guess that it has been the considered view of the US Intelligence services since November 2007 that Iran hasn't got an active nuclear weapons programme. This assessment was contained in a National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) entitled *Iran: Nuclear Intentions And Capabilities*, key judgments of which were made public. These stated *inter alia*:

"We judge with high confidence that in fall 2003, Tehran halted its nuclear weapons program... We assess with moderate confidence Tehran had not restarted its nuclear weapons program as of mid-2007..." {2}

The UN's International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) statement on 4th December 2007 in response to the National Intelligence Estimate said:

"IAEA Director General Mohamed ElBaradei received with great interest the new U.S. National Intelligence Estimate about Iran's nuclear program which concludes that there has been no on-going nuclear weapons program in Iran since the fall of 2003. He notes in particular that the Estimate tallies with the Agency's consistent statements over the last few years that, although Iran still needs to clarify some important aspects of its past and present nuclear activities, the Agency has no concrete evidence of an ongoing nuclear weapons program or undeclared nuclear facilities in Iran." {3}

The NIE's conclusions were a disappointment rather than a relief to President George W Bush, who complained in his memoir, *Decision Points*, that the news "tied my hands on the military side", saying:

"But after the NIE, how could I possibly explain using the military to destroy the nuclear facilities of a country the intelligence community said had no active nuclear weapons program?" (Quoted in *Urging Obama to Stop Rush to Iran War* by ex-CIA analysts Ray Mc Govern & Elizabeth Murray, published by Consortium news.com on 30 December 2011 {4})

Subsequent annual threat assessments of the US Intelligence community given to the US Congress were not materially different from the conclusions of the NIE. For example, the February 2011 assessment to the House of Representatives Intelligence Committee by the Director of National Intelligence, James R. Clapper stated:

"We continue to assess {that} Iran is keeping open the option to develop nuclear weapons in part by developing various nuclear capabilities that better position it to produce such weapons, should it choose to do so. We do not know, however, if Iran will eventually decide to build nuclear weapons." {5}

So, when he expressed the opinion on 8th January 2012 that Iran hadn't got a nuclear weapons programme, Defence Secretary Panetta was merely repeating the considered view of the US Intelligence services for the past four or five years.

### Israel

Do the Israeli Intelligence services disagree with this assessment? Not significantly, judging by quotations from key Israeli Intelligence service personnel published in the Israeli media.

*Iran still mulling whether to build nuclear bomb* was the headline on an article by Amos Harel in *Haaretz* on 18th January 2012, just before a recent visit to Israel by the head of the US military. The article said:

"Iran has not yet decided whether to make a nuclear bomb, according to the intelligence assessment Israeli officials will present later this week to General Martin Dempsey, chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"The Israeli view is that while Iran continues to improve its nuclear capabilities, it has not yet decided whether to translate these capabilities into a nuclear weapon—or, more specifically, a nuclear warhead mounted atop a missile. Nor is it clear when Iran might make such a decision." {6}

This concurs with the view expressed in January 2011 by the head of Israeli Military Intelligence, Brigadier General Aviv Kochavi, just after his appointment to the post.

According to an Agence France Presse report, he told the Knesset Foreign Affairs And Defence Committee on 25th January 2011 that "*Iran is not currently working on producing a nuclear weapon but could make one within 'a year or two' of taking such a decision*" {7}. He added that Iran "would then need more time to develop an effective missile delivery system for it".

He also said it was unlikely that Iran which currently enriches uranium to 20



percent, would start enriching to the 90 percent level needed for a bomb, because it would be in open breach of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty exposing it to harsher sanctions or even a US or Israeli military strike", adding that "at the moment, it's not in Iran's interest to move their programme ahead".

Earlier in January 2011, Meir Dagan, who had just retired as head of Mossad, told the same Committee that he did not believe that Iran would be able to produce a nuclear weapon until 2015 (see *Haaretz*, 7 January 2011, {8}). According to *Haaretz*, he said that "Iran was a long way from being able to produce nuclear weapons, following a series of failures that had set its program back by several years".

So, whereas Israeli political leaders often assert that Iran's acquisition of nuclear weapons is imminent, Israel's Intelligence services question whether Iran

has made a decision to develop nuclear weapons. In that, they appear to be at one with the US Intelligence services.

**David Morrison**

23 January 2012

References:

- {1} [www.cbsnews.com/8301-3460\\_162-57354647/face-the-nation-transcript-january-8-2012/](http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-3460_162-57354647/face-the-nation-transcript-january-8-2012/)
- {2} [www.dni.gov/press\\_releases/20071203\\_release.pdf](http://www.dni.gov/press_releases/20071203_release.pdf)
- {3} [www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/PressReleases/2007/prn200722.html](http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/PressReleases/2007/prn200722.html)
- {4} [consortiumnews.com/2011/12/30/urging-obama-to-stop-rush-to-iran-war/](http://consortiumnews.com/2011/12/30/urging-obama-to-stop-rush-to-iran-war/)
- {5} [www.dni.gov/testimonies/20110210\\_testimony\\_clapper.pdf](http://www.dni.gov/testimonies/20110210_testimony_clapper.pdf)
- {6} [www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/israel-iran-still-mulling-whether-to-build-nuclear-bomb-1.407866](http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/israel-iran-still-mulling-whether-to-build-nuclear-bomb-1.407866)
- {7} [www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5gShKfmWcoQIABBQ\\_DodMUUh6lckA](http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5gShKfmWcoQIABBQ_DodMUUh6lckA)
- {8} [www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/outgoing-mossad-chief-iran-won-t-have-nuclear-capability-before-2015-1.335656](http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/outgoing-mossad-chief-iran-won-t-have-nuclear-capability-before-2015-1.335656)

late 19th century? The tenant farmers of Ireland were engaged in a decades-long land war using every means possible, from moonlighting and boycotting to putting their case at Westminster and in the Royal Courts of Justice. They ignored Catholic advice from the Vatican on the matter. In other words it was not a society of some kind of passive peasantry with a benign aristocracy as tended to be the case in Europe. Desmond's simple description of 'rural' is just not adequate and he is again missing the actual social dynamic of the society. Also, it is worth mentioning that after the success of the tenant farmers, the urban tenants took up their own cause and followed the example set by the countryside and achieved their property rights. Where rural Ireland led, urban Ireland followed.

Desmond argues that, when the characteristics he describes became less dominant decades after Independence, the nation "*dissolved*". That follows logically from his assumptions and definition of what the nation consisted of and therefore there is a sort of inevitability and 'end of history' feeling about his thesis. Desmond is mixing up *changes* with *dissolution* in this instance. Some elements changed and declined in later decades but the Republican ethos of the nation went from strength to strength. It was this Republicanism that made Ireland whatever it was on the world stage for most of the 20th century. And Republicanism and anti-Imperialism became the *zeitgeist* of world politics for most of the century. Republicanism and all it meant put Ireland in a very recognisable and respected place 'among the nations of the earth' and it grew in influence as the 20th century progressed. Dev was a colossus at the League of Nations in the 30s. Aiken followed in his footsteps at the UN decades later and their reputations were based on their Republicanism and certainly not on their being Catholic, Gaelic or rural.

The rural composition changed, the economic policies changed and were adapted, the Catholicity changed but these changes did not and need not necessarily have changed the substance of the nation and an independent Republic. Change for a nation is as inevitable as change is for any individual and life without change is death. The ability to change is the nearest definition there is to life itself.

I can't see the *dissolving* he describes, at the time he describes it, in a nation state that joined the EEC as an accepted equal, expanded economically, broke the link with sterling, created the Celtic Tiger era

## Not Sufficient To Be Sour

### a response

I think Desmond Fennel's position in January's *Irish Political Review* can be summarized in the following extracts:

"In the late nineteenth century the Irish nation performed this seminal intellectual act of defining its distinguishing characteristics and values. It came to see itself, and to present itself, as an ancient, essentially Gaelic, Catholic and rural nation, which had fought a long freedom struggle, was opposed to all imperialism, and adhered to liberal democracy as the method of acquiring and exercising political power... Equipped with that defining view of itself, the Irish nation fought its Revolution... In the four decades from the 40s onwards, the nation's ability to realise itself durably in the terms in which had defined itself crumbled piecemeal and ultimately dissolved."

I think there are several flaws, or rather inadequacies, in this analysis. What he describes is a cultural/sociological fact of the late 19th century but one which by itself did not and would never necessarily have led to political independence. The dynamic of the nation is missing, the political dynamic. If the nation was defined by its rural, Catholic and Gaelic elements, there would have been no political revolution but a kind of Gaelic-speaking, Catholic, Home Rule Wales—at best.

The crucial element that made independence possible is missing. This was the Irish Republican Brotherhood, the Fenian movement. That movement was not part of Desmond's consensus of the time—it was not necessarily rural-based, being equally at home in urban Ireland at

home and abroad; it was not inspired by Gaelic Ireland; and it most certainly was not Catholic-inspired. It was inspired by, and was a direct development of, the Young Ireland movement—which was most certainly not defined by these elements of the society.

Combined with that, the IRB was also foreign-inspired, by French and America Republicanism which was its model polity. The IRB and Fenianism generally was impressed by, and in turn impressed, all sorts of anarchists and communist groups internationally. It was therefore alien to all Desmond's definition of the nation. And yet it was the element that enabled political independence to become a reality and thereby gave the other elements an opportunity to flourish and become a really significant element in the life of the nation which they would not have done otherwise.

How, for example, would Connolly, together with the people and beliefs he stood for, be fitted into the above definition? I doubt if he had a word of Irish, was Scottish-born, would have got lost in an average-sized field, was a Marxist, supported Germany in WWI and only became a Catholic on his deathbed—and for his family's sake rather than any God! The same goes for 'Pagan' O'Leary, Roger Casement in the British Foreign Service, John O'Leary in Paris, Devoy in America, Tom Clarke selling *Titbits* in Dublin, etc. etc.

And what did '*rural*' actually mean in

and is adjusting better and quicker than others to the post-Celtic Tiger era. And doing so in alliance with 'our gallant allies in Europe'. And also doing so in a situation where even the *Irish Times* itself has to break the habit of its lifetime and has had to choose to go with the 'gallant allies' rather than with Whitehall. This is not dissolution in my book—fundamental changes, yes; difficult problems, yes; mistakes, yes; austerity yes: but not dissolution. It is also worth mentioning that the rural element is the booming element at the moment and has never had it so good.

Desmond refers to "*our disintegrated nation*". And for such a serious situation he blames American influence: "*we were subjected to a foreign ideological invasion that valued nothing of what Ireland stood for and that had the power of the post-war American empire behind it*". I think that is purely ideological and totally misplaced. A "*disintegrated nation*" must have suffered a clear and obvious crisis, or crises, to have reached such a state of affairs. American influence caused no such crisis in Ireland. American cultural influences were absorbed, as they had been for over a century before, and there was as much ignored as was accepted. People picked and choose what they wanted.

The greatest crisis the Southern State faced was the Northern crisis. Of that Desmond says that:

"The Irish liberal Correctorate (every West European country had one) made clear its aversion to treating the historic freedom struggle as a national value. Accordingly, it was strongly hostile to the ongoing armed struggle of the Northern nationalists."

I think this is fundamentally wrong because it is chronologically wrong. All of liberal Ireland, as well as reactionary Ireland and indifferent Ireland, were effectively supportive of the armed struggle of the Northern nationalists *when it began*. Guns and ammunition flooded into the North from the south. I know because I was a recipient of some of it. If I was entrepreneurial I and others could have become arms dealers with the supplies available. All revolutionary elements joined in, and I recall being praised by old Blueshirt farmers for any contribution made. It was seen by them as involving '*one last push*' and the Unionists would soon have to start swimming. The '*prawn cocktail Provo*' was a reality in Dublin 4 just as much as he was in another form among those "*who ate their dinner in the middle of the day*".

The "aversion" came later. *Why* that happened is the real question.

There was one element that did not join in and kept its head. The effective owner of the *Irish Times*, Major Tom McDowell, immediately put his paper at the service of the British State and castigated his Editor who had shown signs of going native in the crisis! The paper had always served British interests, but the strength of Ireland's enduring independence had caused a flutter of second thoughts among the minions, such as the then Editor. Major Tom reversed all that. (See John Martin's *The Irish Times—past and present* for a very comprehensive analysis of all this.)

After desperate requests from the elected representatives of the nationalist minority for defensive help St. Jack Lynch and his Government raised their expectations by considering armed intervention in the North in certain circumstances and planned the acquiring of the necessary arms—to support the minority in a '*doomsday*' scenario. Lynch said he would not '*stand idly by*' in such circumstances. I took his advice. The British made it plain that Southern intervention was not on in any circumstances. The Lynch Government was humiliated at the UN and, under other more 'intimate' pressures from Britain, it backed down and abandoned its promise of *any* help to the nationalists. It lost its bearings and went to the other extreme of abandoning the nationalist minority completely. This was made plain when Lynch initiated the débâcle of the arms trial that discredited and demoralized the State. History then had to be rewritten to justify the fiasco and that State-sponsored revision is the source of the disorientation that persists. Being true to their nature, liberals and intellectuals generally joined in as they all follow power like, as the song says, "*all flowers in time bend towards the sun*".

Desmond says:

"It is not sufficient to be sour about the anti-national ideology that is now in the ascendant in Dublin or about the actions or inactions of the Irish State that is inspired by it; or about *The Irish Times*, historical revisionism and so on."

This is a plea not to shoot the messenger, which is generally very fair but if the Irish State is culpable I cannot see why we are not quite entitled to blame the Irish State insofar as it culpable. Why not? If the State causes a problem it is our democratic obligation as citizens to say so as it is the only body that can rectify its own mistakes.

As regards the *Irish Times*, it is hardly

a case of blaming the messenger, as the messenger and the message are inseparable in its case. To paraphrase Marshall McLuhan, the messenger is very much the message. The *Irish Times* is much more than a newspaper. If it was simply a newspaper depending on normal market forces it would have disappeared long ago. It has made itself immune to the market in an age when we are told that market forces are the be-all and end-all. It is an organization oath-bound to secrecy—when we are supposed to be in an age of transparency. But all that hypocrisy is the privilege of the power it has acquired at the expense of the State's lack of respect for itself. This is the legacy of Major McDowell who made the *Irish Times* what it is today in the course of his specific and expressed aim to make it serve the British State at a crucial moment. He ensured it would continue to do what it has historically always done and he saved it from a possible deviation from that *raison d'être*. This is not being '*sour*'—this is simply stating the facts of the matter. And without stating the facts I cannot see how anything can be done about the condition.

States exist to deal with problems and there is no reason to believe that the Irish State cannot deal with a problem it created and regain its historical self-respect. It has little choice but to do so in any case. The post-Cold War world is a world of nation states which have to look after themselves—and some who cannot do so become 'failed states', i.e., they are destroyed.

It is back to the future for nation states and relations between them are now as they were before the Cold War. There is one consolation—we are not the only nation state with serious problems and some are much more serious than ours.

**Jack Lane**

***Irish Times: Past And Present***, a record of the journal since 1859, by *John Martin*. Index. 264 pp. ISBN 978-1-872078-13-7. BHES 2008. €20, £15.

***The Arms Conspiracy Trial***. Ireland 1970: the Prosecution of Charles Haughey, Capt. Kelly and Others. 720pp. Index. ISBN 978-1-874157-20-8. A Belfast Magazine No. 33, 2009. €30, £25.

You can buy books and pamphlets from the address on the back page by cheque or credit/debit card from:

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

# Shorts

from  
*the Long Fellow*

## PENSIONERS

The recent controversy over pensions shows that there is nothing quite like the wrath of the middle class: and it *is* only middle and high income earners that will be affected.

Firstly, all individuals over 65 are exempt from tax for income under 18,000 euro. For married couples the exemption is 36,000. Marginal relief applies at 40% for each euro above these amounts until the overall tax reaches 20% of income, less tax credits.

Secondly, the 41% higher rate of tax only applies for income above 32,800 for single people, and at 41,800 for married couples where one of the partners has no income.

The argument of these middle class pensioners is that they should not have had to declare their State Pension of about 10,700 euro (21,400 for married couples). The tax authorities should have known about it.

This would be a reasonable point except for the fact that the Long Fellow couldn't help noticing that the day before the issue emerged some lawyers were on RTE's *Morning Ireland* denouncing the possibility of the Tax authorities obtaining ESB records for the new Property Tax. Apparently one arm of the State talking to another arm of the State is an infringement of our civil liberties!

Hopefully the economic crisis will dump these spurious ideas.

## FAILED STATES

A rather uncouth individual muttering obsessively the name "Kevin Myers" has just handed the Long Fellow a copy of the *Irish Independent* dated 3rd January 2012. The Long Fellow likes to keep in touch with what the lower orders read but there are limits. Why should he be subjected to the following rant from the obscure columnist:

"Freed from the shackles of this perverse and dysfunctional domestic ethos, the Irish are probably the most successful ethnic group in the US. Yet 20th Century independent Ireland has historically been the least successful state in Western Europe. All other countries, including the North, increased their populations by 40pc between 1920 and 2000: ours, though boosted by an atypical decade of the

Celtic Tiger, increased by just 20pc. But demographic growth up to 1980 was actually half that".

Why select the year 2000 for comparison? Are there not more up to date figures? The population of Ireland (or to be more precise the 26 County State) at Independence was about 2.9million. It's now about 4.5million. That represents a 55% increase in the population. Comparisons before Independence are difficult since the island of Ireland was not partitioned. Also population statistics were not as reliable, since the State was an alien force. But, under the paradise of British rule, the population went from 8 million (or 12 or 15) pre-Famine to about 4 million in the island of Ireland. If the Irish State was a failure, how would Mr. Myers describe rule under Britain?

## WHEN WAS INDEPENDENCE?

Kevin Myers's article begs the question of when we actually achieved Independence. Michael Noonan in his budget speech says that we achieved it 90 years ago. The Treaty "*restored our sovereignty*" and, according to Noonan, we lost it again at the end of 2010. This view of history puts Noonan at variance with that of Michael Collins, who defended the Treaty on the basis that it gave us "*the freedom to achieve freedom*" and not that we had already achieved freedom. But it is firmly within the tradition of Cumann na nGaedheal who adhered rigidly to the Treaty's terms.

The Long Fellow agrees with the Americans. The question of when Independence was actually realised is less significant than when it was declared. Our Declaration of Independence took place on 24th April 1916.

## THE MEDIA AND CHANGE

Not for the first time the Long Fellow notes that the media is kind to itself. On its 50th anniversary RTE portrayed itself as dragging Ireland into the modern world. In the past we were deferential and narrow-minded. Thanks to RTE we are now liberated and open. There is a very small grain of truth in this narrative. Most of our social institutions have taken a battering (the GAA is the exception). But what has been the consequence? the adoption of values that are external to the society and the denigration of internal national developments. If this is 'maturity', it has not brought self confidence, but the opposite: self doubt and even self loathing.

RTE was a catalyst rather than an agent of change. Events were played out on the national airwaves and were reflected on and discussed. One of the most significant

was the Bishop Casey scandal in 1992. RTE showed an extract of Gay Byrne's famous interview with Annie Murphy in 1992. Gay Byrne was anything but the agent of change. *Au contraire!* The *Late Late Show* interviewer presented a narrative of a good man who had been brought low by an "*experienced*" Irish American woman. Byrne ended the interview by saying that, if her son were half the man of his father, he would be a great man. To which Murphy replied with impressive American self confidence: his mother is not too bad either.

It could not have been lost on RTE that the Prince of the Church was in hiding and his lover had possession of the national stage. For whatever reason, the tide had turned and RTE would have to adapt.

## MARY RAFTERY

It is difficult to assess the legacy of Mary Raftery (54) who died recently after an eighteen-month battle with cancer. If she was a courageous journalist, she certainly was not swimming against the tide. Her *States of Fear* documentary was 7 years after the Bishop Casey scandal.

The Long Fellow found her column in *The Irish Times* almost unreadable. Apart from the relentless negativity, it tended to be replete with clichés and mixed metaphors. Sometimes her articles were so bad; they were good. For example here are the opening lines of a 2005 article:

"With the Government flailing about on the nursing homes debacle, Charlie McCreevy must be thanking his lucky stars that he got out when he did. It was, after all, his imperious edict that medical cards be granted as of right to all over-70s that opened up this particular can of worms like a knife through butter" (*The Irish Times*, 3.3.05).

Opening a can of worms like a knife through butter!?! Pure genius!

## "UNEXPECTED" DEATH

It used to be said that no native Irish person ever died in *The Irish Times*. Its obituary columns were restricted to the Anglo-Irish or British dignitaries. If the mortality of the Irish has now been accepted, the cause of death remains fraught for the newspaper.

And so we learn that the newspaper's Literary Editor, Caroline Walsh, died "*unexpectedly*" (*The Irish Times*, 23.12.11). Over a number of days there followed lavish coverage of the 59 year old's wonderful career which was supplemented by eulogies in the Letters column. But *The Irish Times* reader received no inkling of how this admirer of Hubert Butler and Elizabeth Bowen could have

been cut down in her prime.

It was left to a rival newspaper to explain:

"Gardai believe the Irish Times literary editor, Caroline Walsh, walked into the sea between Seapoint and the West Pier in Dun Laoghaire, south Dublin, late on Wednesday night after driving there from her home. She had been suffering from depression. Emergency services were alerted shortly after midnight and both the Coastguard and garda helicopters attended the scene. Her body was recovered shortly before 2am on Thursday. She was declared dead later at St Vincent's Hospital" (*Sun. Ind.* 25.12.11).

How can this lacuna in the *Irish Times's* coverage of a story about one of its own be explained? Its editor, Kevin O'Sullivan,

had defended its fearless coverage of the suicide of Kate FitzGerald only a week before:

"Mr O'Sullivan said the newspaper had a long-standing policy of encouraging a more open approach within society to the reality of suicide and hoped the story of Kate's life and premature death would highlight the need for people to discuss mental health issues and to seek support" (*Irish Times* 16.12.11).

And all of that is true. *The Irish Times* does believe in openness and transparency; but only for other people; never for itself.

The Long Fellow could say more on this subject, but, at this point, he would prefer that the current month's column expire ... "unexpectedly".

Twenty years later, when I re-connected with developments in the South, I found that Crotty had founded an Irish Sovereignty Movement along with Anthony Coughlan (who had hovered around the Connolly Association, a front organisation of the Communist Party of Great Britain in the 1960s and the Official Republicans—who had been shaped by the Connolly Association in the early 1970s).

The main business of the ISM seemed to be campaigning against Irish participation in the European Union. I know nothing of how the phases of this evolution on Crotty's part came about.

In 1972 he appealed to England to take Ireland in hand again as far as possible, just about drawing the line at forcible reconquest. And Britain heeded the call to "apply its own scholarship to researching and studying the subject". Oxford University undertook a comprehensive *Re-Writing Of Irish History*. And the Irish Sovereignty Movement, as far as I noticed it, seemed to be only an echo of English Anti-Europeanism. Was the ISM set up as an act of gratitude to England for responding to the call to do Ireland's thinking for it?

**Last month Desmond Fennell mentioned Raymond Crotty in his *It's Not Sufficient To Be Sour*. Readers may not be familiar with Crotty's 1972 appeal to England to pick up its historic burden in Ireland once more. His rationale was that Ireland was in a mess, beyond its own capacity to sort out. We reproduce his article below, along with an Introduction by Brendan Clifford. Some comments by John Martin follow the Crotty piece, showing the stunning rise in national fortunes in subsequent years and indicating how wrong Crotty was to write off Ireland as an economic basket case. As John Martin demonstrates, even in the present economic crisis, Ireland is still well ahead of the situation it was in in 1972.**

## Raymond Crotty's Appeal To England

The events of 1969 in the North made two things very clear: the Irish Six Counties of the British State were systematically misgoverned; and the Protestant community in the North was not, in any practical and useful sense, part of a general Irish nation.

I argued that nationalist Ireland should acknowledge that its propaganda and its culture could not reach into Protestant Ulster and attract it because of the lack of any ground of common sentiment, and that Anti-Partitionist agitation could only deepen the chasm of alienation. I suggested that the Ulster Protestant community should be recognised as a distinct nationality as a necessary first step towards engaging it in discussion. That 'two nations' proposal was instantly condemned by the Taoiseach of the time, Jack Lynch, and by every political tendency in the Republic.

(The claim to the North was asserted on the ground of existing nationality and was therefore groundless. If it had been expressed as a historic claim, and actually existing nationality declared to be immaterial, it would have been more soundly based. The irredentist Jewish nationalist claim to Palestine was purely historical, and as such it was recognised and backed by the League of Nations and the United Nations, and could not be refuted by the will of the actual inhabitants of Palestine, as the Irish

claim on the 6 Counties was by its majority population.)

I took the refusal to acknowledge a pressing reality of national antagonism in the North to be a sign of brittleness in the national culture of the Republic. I suggested that its frenzied assertion of Anti-Partitionism in that period had the function of concealing its own internal unsoundness from itself.

Nevertheless I was surprised to see in the London *Times* (which was still worth reading in those days) an article by the foremost economic historian in the Republic, Raymond Crotty—whose history of *Irish Agricultural Production* (1966) I had quoted in *The Economics Of Partition*—a formal confession of moral, cultural, political and economic bankruptcy on behalf of the bourgeoisie. It is not often that such frank, circumstantial confessions are made by eminent people. That was in 1972. I noted it in passing, but I was immersed in Northern politics then and for a further 20 years, and I did not keep track of the process of disintegration of the nationalist political culture of the South which had denounced me for blurring out the truth. It was only what I expected. But I remembered that article because I regarded Crotty as the only substantial intellectual in the public life of the South.

[The following article by Raymond Crotty appeared in *The Times* of 3rd July 1972]

**"An Irish economist's view of his country's malaise**

## Eire: a land where emigrants are born

The traveller from Dublin to Donegal can easily tell, apart from customs' formalities, when he is leaving and reentering the Republic. The Northern Ireland countryside is markedly more prosperous. Average incomes in Northern Ireland are one-quarter as high again as those in the Republic. Educational and welfare services are better. Prices are lower.

The superior conditions in Northern Ireland are reflected best by population changes. The table below shows the changes in the Republic and in Northern Ireland in the last 50 years before 1961, the last census year in which particulars of religious denominations were collected in both parts of Ireland.

There are, of course, abuses in Northern Ireland. But they have not forced half of those born there to emigrate, as has been the case in the Republic during the past 150 years.

Emigration on this scale, over such a protracted period, is without precedent. It has corrupted and deformed Irish society. It has affected every aspect of life in the Republic in ways that are inconceivable to those who have never lived in Ireland and in ways that are rarely conceived by those who have never lived elsewhere.

The loss through emigration of one-half of its oncoming population stream—and, *a priori*, the more ambitious, less contented half—which has gone on for 150 years, has drained Irish society economically and politically to the point of collapse. The Republic's human exports, for which it receives a pittance in emigrants' remittances cost the country as much as its total physical capital formation. Emigration keeps the Republic's isolated market tiny, incapable of achieving economics of scale. Industries can only exist within this tiny, inefficient market behind tariffs which are several times higher than those of Britain and continental countries, or with export subsidies equivalent to half the market value.

The emigration of half of its youth over 150 years has made the Republic into a country where young people are reared and old people die. For 1,000 people in the productive age group 20-65 years, Britain has 770 people in the unproductive age groups, under 20 and over 65 years; the Republic has 1,070. Britain's population is expanding although (it rears only 550 people aged 20 years per 1,000 people aged 20-65 years; the Republic is contracting, although it has 880 aged under 20 for every 1,000 people aged 20-65 years. And the position is worsening: in the 50 years before the establishment of the Irish State, the number of people aged 20-45 declined by 20 per cent, but it has declined by a further 25 per cent in the 50 years since the State was established. Because of the resulting crushing burden of dependency, taxes are high and public services are poor. Educational services are particularly poor, and this further reduces the efficiency and competitiveness of the economy.

The establishment of an independent Irish State put a political boundary through

the British Isles resource market. The political boundary in no way disrupted the flow of labour and capital from the Irish periphery to the English centre, but it did cut off the backward flow of government funds from the centre to the periphery, which elsewhere in the British Isles has grown to enormous proportions during the past 50 years. Had the Republic remained part of the United Kingdom and had the level of income redistribution from the English centre to the Celtic peripheries remained unchanged, the Republic today would be receiving, in income transfers from Britain, between £300 and £500 millions annually, which would raise its national income by between 25 per cent and 40 per cent.

The Republic has thus paid dearly for its political independence. But, because of the sapping of its political will by emigration, it has been incapable of using that independence to achieve a more effective allocation of its resources.

Government in the Republic, deprived of an effective opposition, has been largely a matter of expedients. Two expedients in particular have seriously exacerbated the great structural weaknesses of the economy. Rigorous protection, introduced in the 1930's, caused massive emigration in the post-war years as the Republic's consumers escaped from the poor quality, high priced goods of its protected industries.

Then, starting from scratch after the Second World War, the Republic proceeded to create a national debt which, relative to Gross Domestic Product, is now the largest in the world. It has created in 25 years a national debt on which interest payments are equivalent to 5 per cent of GDP, compared to 3 per cent in the case of Britain's debt, accumulated through three centuries, two world wars and numerous lesser wars. The Government of the Republic borrowed to create employment. Yet the Republic is the only country in the world where, during the past 25 years, the number of people at work has declined. The Republic's work force is now 1,050,000; it was 1,228,000 in 1946; and it was 1,308,000 when the State was established.

There are fewer people at work now in the Republic than at any time in the past 200 years.

The further course of the ailment affecting Irish society appears clear. Emigration was stemmed during the 1960's by a rapid expansion of national debt from a narrow base; the

benefits of this expansion are now exhausted and only the costs remain; national debt charges, soaring above the Government's capacity to borrow, will powerfully reinforce all those elements which have caused an upward trend in emigration since the establishment of the state 50 years ago. The vicious circle of emigration-poverty-emigration will be forged tighter. As disillusion with government grows and respect for it declines, more economic and political violence is to be expected.

Outside assistance comparable to that which Northern Ireland now gets from Britain might arrest the ailment which afflicts the Irish Republic. Annual subsidies of £300-£500 millions would probably halt emigration and make possible in the Republic that sort of economic and political development which has occurred in Northern Ireland during the past 25 years. Indeed, the hope of obtaining assistance of this nature was a major factor in inducing the Irish Government to seek EEC membership. However, the undeveloped state of the EEC's regional policy and the competition for the small funds available from other peripheral regions—including those of the United Kingdom—clearly indicate that only nominal assistance will be forthcoming from that quarter in the foreseeable future.

There is no prospect of the Irish situation being rectified by outside intervention. If the ailment which afflicts the Republic is to be arrested, and if the Republic's neighbours are to be spared embarrassment and worse by the progress of that ailment, this must be through the efforts of the Irish themselves.

The economic resources exist to cope with the problems affecting the Republic, critical as these are. The real problem is that emigration saps the political will to mobilize resources so as to make emigration unnecessary.

Wealth in Ireland, for 150 years, has been systematically stripped from landless, mobile, young people and given to the immobile elements who remain. A reversal of this process, which would direct as many resources and opportunities as possible towards those young, ambitious, mobile people who would otherwise emigrate would help greatly. In particular, if that estimated one-third of Ireland's national income which accrues to the ownership of land were diverted by a land-tax to supplement the inadequate returns to mobile labour and capital, emigration could be reduced drastically. By causing the old, less competent present occupants of land to be replaced by the vigorous young people who now emigrate, such a tax would also bring an immediate increase

	Northern Ireland		Republic	
	Roman Catholics	Others	Roman Catholics	Others
1911	430,161	820,370	2,812,509	327,179
1961	497,547	827,495	2,873,473	144,863
Change				
1911-61	plus	plus	minus	minus
	16 per cent	13 per cent	5 per cent	58 per cent

Source: Stationery Office, Dublin, *Statistical Abstract of Ireland, 1950*, Table XIV; *Statistical Abstract of Ireland, 1969*, Tables 43 and XV.

[Illustration of a child by a turf reek, with the caption: "In 150 years the Republic has become a place here young people are reared, and old people die."]

of more than 50 per cent in agricultural output.

There are other obvious measures to be taken, such as refinancing the Republic's crushing burden of national debt. A rational organization of the Republic's resources could probably eradicate unemployment and halt emigration overnight. It could raise living standards above those of Northern Ireland in five years and thereby reduce partition to the status of an academic issue only.

Britain cannot constructively intervene in the Republic's affairs unless it is prepared to use a degree of force which is nowadays politically unacceptable; or to incur financial obligations in the Republic twice as high as those it now bears in Northern Ireland. Nevertheless there are positive measures which Britain can take to minimize the damage, apart from the defensive one of isolating itself as far as is practical from its sick neighbour.

First, Britain should inform itself better about conditions in the Republic. It is unnecessary for the British news media to report every skull cracked in an Irish brawl—remarkably few are. But, on the other hand, more discernment is required than was shown, for example, by most of the British press when it described as “an Irish economic miracle” the expedient of rapidly expanding the national debt to generate a little unsustainable economic growth in the 1960's.

Britain, in its wisdom, questions continuously all of the premises on which its society rests. It should realize that nothing at all comparable obtains in the Republic which, as a result of emigration that drains away all constructive opposition, so far from being a society of individualistic rebels, is the most sheepishly conformist in the world. That, and the small amount of public funds spent on education, results in poor scholarship generally, but especially in relation to politics and economics, where new, critical ideas and insights tend to be as rare as they are unwelcome. If Britain, therefore, would understand its troubled and troublesome neighbour, it must apply its own scholarship to researching and studying the subject.

The British economy has gained in the past from a large inflow of industrious, adaptable and assimiable [sic] Irish labour without having had the cost of rearing, educating or training that labour. But it is now clear that continued drawing on the Irish labour pool has entailed unforeseen costs for Britain. The protracted, massive haemorrhage of people from the Republic to Britain has corrupted Irish society and now subjects Britain to the embarrass-

ments and dangers of having a seriously sick neighbour. It is not in Britain's interests to further depopulate the Republic, any more than it is to depopulate Northern Ireland, Scotland or Wales.

Restricting immigration from the Republic, though immediately painful to Britain and the Republic, would bring long term benefits to both. No other single measure would do as much to create in the Republic those conditions where a more rational, less inefficient organization of resources would become politically feasible. Given such a reorganization, the Republic would develop into a normal, healthy prosperous society, where the wild men would cause no more difficulty than elsewhere. The Republic's greatly expanded trade under those conditions would be far more beneficial to Britain than the present disastrous drainage there of half its youth.

**Raymond Crotty"**

## Some Comments On Raymond Crotty's Article

Raymond Crotty's 1972 article is similar to more recent articles by the likes of Morgan Kelly and Brian Lucey. There are differences, but the main theme is the same: the Irish State has failed. It would appear that this idea of Crotty represented and continues to represent mainstream academic thinking, which indicates a strange relationship between academic institutions in this country and the Irish State.

However, a look at the facts gives a very different picture, which shows sustained progress.

### POPULATION

After a massive reduction in the population following what is known as the Famine, the population of the Irish Free State stabilised at around 2.9 million following independence. There was a reduction in the population to 2.8 million in the 1950s, but from then on the population of the 26 Counties has been growing. By the early 1970s when Crotty's article was written the population had increased to 3.0 million. It is now about 4.5 million.

In the 1970s net immigration (immigration less emigration) amounted to 104,000; there was net emigration in the 1980s of 208,000. But in the 1990s and 2000s net immigration amounted to 37,400 and 353,200 respectively.

### GROWTH

From 1960 to 1973 Irish economic growth averaged 4.4% per annum. In the Celtic Tiger years annual growth was close to 10%. Employment in 1961 amounted

to 1.1 million; it is now over 1.8 million.

It is difficult to sustain the thesis that Ireland was an economic basket case either in 1972 or now, notwithstanding our current travails.

This is not to say that Ireland has not had economic problems since Independence. The economy had the characteristic of being a region of the UK. The industrial heartland of the UK absorbed the surplus agricultural population of Ireland. Independence involved a struggle against this by the creation of manufacturing industry in Ireland.

There is no doubt that the UK benefitted from Irish emigration both before Independence and afterwards. Ireland educated her labour force at her own expense for export to the UK. In the 1960s this trend had diminished and by the 1970s had been reversed. In the light of this, it was bizarre for an Irish academic to enlist the support of Britain at precisely the point when Ireland was least in need of it.

### BIZARRE

But even if Ireland was in need of help, what possible reason could Britain have had for helping her stem the outward flow of labour? Not only was there no reason for Britain to do so, it had an interest in the opposite. The reduction in the flow of Irish labour required Britain to look to her other ex-colonies for workers.

The plea by Crotty for Britain to take us in hand had nothing to do with objective economic circumstances. It represented the early signs of an ideological collapse among the national intelligentsia. Britain was only too willing to exploit this weakness.

John Martin

### APPENDIX

The following statistics come from an article written by Paul Sweeney of the ICTU for a Conference in Canada in May 2004.

#### Net Emigration from Ireland from 1850 to 2010

1850s	800,000
1860s	697,000
1870s	502,000
1880s	597,000
1890s	396,000
1900s	262,000
1910s	116,000
1920s	136,000
1930s	101,000
1940s	250,000
1950s	409,000
1960s	135,000
1970s	minus 104,000 (net immigration)
1980s	208,000
1990s	minus 37,400 (net immigration)
2000s	minus 353,200 (net immigration)

*To page 15, column 3*

## es ahora \*

ELIZABETH BOWEN, LIES, SPIES, & ACADEMICS  
—QUI BONO?

In the January edition of the *Irish Political Review*, Brendan Clifford wrote about attending a meeting of the Old Athlone Society where a number of historians gave lectures. What caught my eye, besides Clifford's brilliant critique of William Sheehan's thesis in his book *A Hard Local War: The British Army and the Guerrilla War in Cork 1919-21* was the crawshawling of the academic Dr. Margaret O'Callaghan who stated that she and her friends felt "policed" by the Aubane Historical Society. Of course Clifford eviscerates her assertion and I howled with laughter at the wit with which he did so. But actually I too have been told that many historians of the revisionist cadre will do anything *not* to lecture in places that they think might be attended by the little Aubane grouping. I was amazed to hear that poor Roy Foster is still traumatised by "being attacked" by Aubane in Co. Sligo at the Yeats Summer School in July of 2002! He has bitched about being *ambushed* by a whole group of the Aubane Society—it appears the number grows with each telling of it. So I had to go back to look up what had actually transpired. Under the title of 'Fostering Illusions' in the 2002 September issue of the *Irish Political Review*, the only person present was the irrepressible Séan McGouran who sold pamphlets outside the venue at Hawks Well Theatre. Anyone who knows Séan can attest that he is simply too nice for the "bully role" that Foster has consigned for him and that is probably why Foster claims that there were so many of the Aubane contingent present. What I think that Foster found unforgivable was Séan's unflattering portrait of him in that article for the *Irish Political Review* when he wrote of the Yeats biographer:

"He is a thin lanky man with such impressively brown hair that I thought of Fintan O'Toole's jibe that Gerry Adams seemed to have "dyed for Ireland". He has the attributes of a slightly over-the-hill juvenile lead in a jaded West End play."

Oooch!

### CUP & EIBHEAR WALSH

The school of English in University College Cork is wedded to the notion that Elizabeth Bowen has to be completely established as a novelist and short story writer of the first order and her Irishness has to be embraced if we are to be a people of forward-looking cosmopolitan taste.

## It Is Time

None of your nasty Irish nationalism please seems to be their *leitmotiv*. But a peculiar thing seems to be happening—the more we are woven into the European community, the more that it genuinely seems to *constrict* and what instead seems to happen is that the Anglo pull is ever more embraced—especially amongst those academics/writers and journalists.

Eibhear Walshe, who produced *Elizabeth Bowen's Selected Irish Writings* in September 2011, is a Senior Lecturer in English and earns somewhat in the region of €130,000 per year. Yet in his Acknowledgements he accepts that he received additional financial help by way of "The College of Arts, Celtic Studies and Social Science UCC Publication Fund and the National University of Ireland Publication Fund gave me much appreciated grants towards the cost of the volume." Also he thanks "The UCC Arts Faculty Research Fund to visit London and from the Royal Irish Academy Mobility Grant to work on the Bowen archives ... at the University of Texas at Austin".

For some reason Walshe feels indebted to Dermot Keogh and states: "I have dedicated this study to Dermot Keogh in gratitude and recognition of his support, outstanding scholarship, encouragement and invaluable friendship". I would like to ask Eibhear where Keogh's "outstanding scholarship" is evidenced? But this is academia we are speaking about, so such mortifying mulch must be over-stated—I suppose.

In 2008, Alan Hepburn, Associate Professor of English at McGill University of Montreal, published *two books*—the result of five years of travelling research—on everything that Elizabeth Bowen ever really wrote, whether it was published or never published. The books were published by Edinburgh University Press and really are an impressive exploration of Bowen's work. He does not reproduce the Bowen War Reports, presumably because the Aubane Historical Society had already completed that work on the proviso that should future reports be released then they would make them available to the public. But, quoting Professor Hermione Lee's book on Bowen, Hepburn states: "Bowen's political position vis-à-vis Ireland falls within the Burkean tradition of "enlightened imperialism" ...". But full quotation from Lee shows how much Bowen "disliked Gladstone's policies of disestablishment and Home Rule" and how she favoured "the gradual handover of power with England in a "senior, advisory, kindly role" ...".

While Eibhear Walshe does reproduce six of Bowen's Wartime Reports to the Ministry of Information—all funnily enough in 1942, though she was well established in her role in 1940, he thanks the National

Archives of the UK for "reports FO800/310". Alan Hepburn though has no quibble about thanking Jack Lane for his seminal "Notes on Eire" *Espionage Reports to Winston Churchill, 1940-'42*, Aubane Historical Society, 1999. Moreover in cleaving to the evidence, Hepburn stated that, when writing about Joyce for "Séan O'Faoláin's Dublin-based magazine 'The Bell'", and therefore addressing an Irish audience, "Bowen rhetorically *positions herself as Irish* in this summing up of James Joyce's career".

Writing about Bowen and Ireland, Walshe underscores the nature of the violent Cromwellian colonisation of Ireland, which gave Bowen's ancestors the land of the dispossessed Irish, by reproducing Bowen's remarks in an *Afterword to Bowen's Court* in 1963 to the effect that: "My family got their position and drew their power from a situation that shows an inherent wrong."

In his opening *Introductory Essay* Walshe acknowledges that his intention is this:

"In putting together this representative collection of her views on Ireland, my purpose is to provide a context for Bowen's place in Irish literary culture and also for the place of Ireland within her own imagination".

He then allows Maud Ellmann's suggestion (in *Elizabeth Bowen, The Shadow Across the Page*, Edinburgh University Press, 2003-JH) that "Bowen's background gave her ample cause for scepticism about national identity", but Eibhear Walshe would argue that, at the same time, "Bowen had an underlying conviction that she occupied some sort of enabling ideological middle-ground between the British and the Irish". I know Eibhear is no historian but still that comment makes my jaw drop. How can anyone who has actually seen and read her *Reports* not accept that Bowen was ideologically committed to Britain's War but definitely not to Ireland's Neutrality? She

## Crotty concluded

The figures are determined not only by the condition of the Irish economy but other factors such as the condition of the rest of the world. It is interesting to note that in the 1930s net emigration at 101,000 was quite low in historical terms.

The figures do not tell the reasons for emigration or the quality of work Irish emigrants obtained abroad. It is likely, for example, that the expectations of those Irish who emigrated in the 1980s were far greater than those who emigrated in the 1950s.

*Note 1:* The figures from 1850 to 1924 reflect emigration from the island of Ireland. From 1924 onwards the figures relate to the 26 Counties.

*Note 2:* The figures for the 2000s come from the Central Statistics Office.

John Martin

certainly obtained enough information to allow her to assess that Dev and his people were *serious* about their stand and she quite rightly conveyed this information to Britain's governing elite all the way up to Lord Cranbourne and even Churchill himself. But she never identified with the Irish policy of neutrality, very much like today's Irish elite historians, writers—and even some politicians, though the latter are still coy about it.

Though Bowen, according to Eibhear's reading of her fiction, especially her short stories where—

"her Anglo-Irish characters are presented as both heroic in terms of courage and endurance, but on the other hand, wilfully blind to the *lurking menace in the fields* and to the inexorable rise of the New Ireland" (All italics are mine).

Where Eibhear Walshe goes completely awry is when he stated:

"Bowen's desire to *mediate* is seen most dramatically during the Second World War when she volunteered to write reports for the Ministry of Information. It was a well-intentioned but ultimately naïve undertaking that clouded her reputation in Ireland and exposed her lack of insight into Irish antipathy towards Britain. Born and raised at a time of imperial decline, she was unable to understand the resentful attitude towards Britain then held by the Catholic majority of the Irish state and the keen antipathy towards any perceived allegiance to the British crown by the Anglo-Irish."

Bowen herself held it was her finest hour and that she had a "*good war*", and she was not ashamed for saying so.

I also contend that Bowen's *Reports* were central to policy in the UK and elsewhere and there was no rush to whip back our ports because the British accepted that we would defend them and they just could not afford to kick Ireland, whatever anyone else thought or recommended. Gray of the US legation could let off all the steam he wanted, but both the USUK could not afford to be belligerent towards Ireland in reality. And Bowen knew that and she put aside her own feelings and reported the truth of the situation which James Dillon, for all his brilliant rhetoric and drama, couldn't see.

If Walshe thinks Bowen was "*naïve*"—he couldn't be more wrong. In fact, he is the one who is naïve—certainly he is giving a good example of being so in this book. He goes into some horrible guff about Bowen and "*her marriage*" to Séan O'Faoláin. Bowen wed Alan Cameron in 1923 at the age of twenty four and in many ways he made her the sophisticate that she became. She had many love affairs and her one with O'Faoláin was brief but developed into a kind of friendship. But, as Victoria Glendinning said, she always came back to Alan and she missed him terribly after his death in 1952. He had always drunk considerably—indeed they all did and smoked too—but, when he got pensioned off and retired to Bowen's Court, his drinking became legendary.

Walshe makes so many errors that it just really made me question how he can say that he is a Bowen enthusiast if not a scholar! Bowen, according to Walshe "*had a flat in Regent's Park*" when she actually lived in a house—2, Clarence Terence—and she was not interviewed by O'Faoláin for *The Bell*—in fact it was Larry Morrow, alias *The Bellman*, etc. etc. But one observation made by Eibhear Walshe stood out for me—and those of my readers in the *Irish Political Review* might find it amusing also:

"In all of these Irish writings, Bowen looked homewards to North Cork.... However, unease continues to *lurk out* in the North Cork terrain. The tensions of being Anglo-Irish at a time when Britain was at war while Ireland remained neutral accentuated Bowen's ambivalent attitude towards Ireland."

What or who can be *lurking out in the North Cork terrain*? Almost conspiratorially Walshe has decided to include—

"her controversial reports to the Ministry of Information. War brought out a new aspect in Bowen's relationship with Ireland, one which was to damage her reputation: her fact-finding activities to provide secret reports on Ireland and Irish neutrality for the British Ministry of Information. Bowen was paid for this work but kept it secret from her Irish connections and friends and this was retrospectively, seen in some quarters in Ireland as spying."

Then Walshe uses various academics—such as Eunan O'Halpin, Clair Wills and Robert Fisk—to talk about the reports, therefore buying himself coverage in case whatever is lurking out in the fields of North Cork should go after him. He flounders on with his flawed analysis, saying Bowen said that James Dillon was "*a Fascist sympathiser*", which she never ever did. He then states:

"Her reports show Bowen at her critical best in that she adapts and shapes her view of Ireland to accommodate this new Irish crisis of identity."

What is the latter about I find myself thinking? Because Walshe has written a biography of Kate O'Brien, he tells us rather extraordinarily that Bowen met with the former in London but I have never found the evidence for that. Bowen sometimes worked with people that she never met—such is the life of a busy writer and critic. And so on Walshe goes and even I eventually lost heart. He says this and that and then admits: "*However, Bowen's own place in Irish literary culture was ambiguous.*" And finally we come to the end with this rather unexpected notification:

"For Bowen, Ireland drew out essential contradictions within her imagination, and the critical works in this collection will, I hope, illuminate this most important source for her imagination, her own hyphenated identity."

In the next issue of the *Irish Political Review*, I will dwell on the launch of the book by Mary Leland and other Bowen related trivia.

Julianne Herlihy ©

Readers may be interested in the letter below, sent to Gerald Nash, the Labour TD for Louth East Meath, on 30th December 2011

## Deserters And Their Champions Equally Unworthy Of Trust

I heard you on BBC Radio 4 today.

I had 6 uncles and one aunt in the British Forces and a First Cousin in the Merchant Marine between the Second Boer and Second World Wars. All were Irish.

One Uncle, Warrant Officer Leo Burke, was killed at Singapore, aged 38 in February 1942 when I myself was 6 weeks old. He had joined between the wars. He was once punished for punching a superior who made a disparaging remark about the Irish.

So he once struck a blow for Ireland, for which I salute him. By no stretch of the imagination did die for democracy or the self-determination of any nation and you should not delude yourself that he did.

Irish anti-fascists from the Republican and Labour movements joined the International Brigade to defend democracy in Spain, and some of them later joined the British forces because they were against Fascism. I don't think anyone deserted *Oglaigh na hEireann* (Parkgate Street) to defend democracy and oppose Fascism in Spain. I find your contention that those who deserted the Irish Army to drop bombs on German civilians, or otherwise serve the British forces, were motivated by a commitment to democracy, unconvincing.

I can believe that some, when it looked like they'd kill nobody while the rest of the world was mutually murdering each other, joined the Brits to be in the fashion. I believe many Norwegians joined with the Germans to fight the Russians, it was more fashionable than being in the Resistance.

Ireland declared an Emergency in 1939, allowing the State to suspend Constitutional rights, as allowed for by the Constitution in an Emergency. The term did not apply to the European war then started nor the World War heralded by Pearl Harbour. It is ignorant and dishonest to pretend otherwise. I doubt history is your forte.

You are in coalition with a Party which admired and aped the Blackshirts and Brownshirts and sent its dupes to Spain in support of the mutinous, murderous Fascist Franco.

Those who deserted the Irish Forces ratted on Ireland, broke their solemn oaths and could hardly expect to rejoin the Irish public service without some act of expiation.

Britain still had an Empire after the Second World War. The deserters had no valid claims on Ireland. As Irish citizens they were bound by their fellow citizens to render fidelity to the nation. They were unfaithful, and their champions today are equally unworthy of trust.

Donal Kennedy



## 'The further one gets from Belfast...'

### A second reply to Jeffrey Dudgeon

I am grateful to Jeffrey Dudgeon for replying on the contentious subject of the killing of thirteen civilians and four British Army personnel in West Cork in late April 1922. I am grateful also to *Irish Political Review* for facilitating the discussion.

Dudgeon ignored my remarks (*Irish Political Review*, November 2011) on Peter Hart's errors and misrepresentations concerning the 28th November 1920 Kilmichael Ambush. I do not know if that means he now accepts my argument. Dudgeon concentrates instead on vindicating Hart's view of the "April killings" in West Cork in 1922, seen as "emblematic" of IRA attacks on Protestants during the War of Independence period.

In the course of his reply, Dudgeon attempted to demonstrate that Irish Republicanism is anti-Protestant, even though republican ideology and action "*claim[s] to be non-sectarian*".

During the late 18th Century some Irish Protestants founded *The Society of United Irishmen* and a significant number, mainly Presbyterian, broke from an assumed allegiance to the colonial system of Protestant supremacy. This tradition of Irish Republican separatism was led by Theobald Wolfe Tone. It was influenced by the American and French Revolutions, the first uprisings in human history to be influenced by secular as distinct from religious ideology. The subsequent 1798 *United Irishmen*-inspired rebellion failed and was brutally suppressed.

These Protestant republicans were considered caste traitors. The best-known modern example is the last Protestant Editor of the *Irish Times*, Douglas Gageby, who considered himself a republican in the Wolfe Tone tradition. According to Major Thomas McDowell, the newspaper's then Managing Editor and a fellow Belfast born Protestant, Gageby was (as reported in 1969 to the British Ambassador to Dublin), "*a renegade or white nigger*".

According to Dudgeon, republicans practise "*(fake) non-sectarian[ism]*". It is in essence devious, a kind of Roman Catholicism of the fundamentalist Protestant imagination. This view requires empirical proof. Depicting most of the late April 1922 West Cork killings as sectarian and as part of a pattern is therefore important to Dudgeon, who is an Ulster Unionist. Since the Ulster Unionist Party cannot easily shake off accusations of

consistent sectarian practice in Northern Ireland (because it is a fact), events like the April killings are a basis for suggesting that the competing Irish ideologies cancel each other out, while confirming a need for ethnic separation. It is a rationale for partition on the basis of sectarian equivalence, a familiarity that breeds contempt.

I will look at this question of IRA sectarianism in two parts, first in terms of the April killings themselves, second with regard to whether they were "*emblematic*" (Dudgeon's term) of a consistent practice.

### PART ONE – APRIL 1922

Three Protestant men disappeared in the early morning of 26th April 1922 in Ballygroman, that lay south of the Macroom-Ballincollig road, after one of the group shot dead an IRA officer. That seems to be cause and effect. However, three more were shot dead early on the 27th in Dunmanway, six were killed over 27th-28th April (five around Ballineen-Enniskeane and one in Clonakilty). One more, the last, was shot dead early on the 29th. On the 28th the nearby Murragh Rectory was fired on and Rev'd. Ralph Harbord was wounded. Other premises were fired on. Hotelier Richard Helen claimed he escaped his captors in Clonakilty. A Farmer, Richard Perrot, claimed he was not home when visited. Most of those affected were Protestant. The premises of a Catholic bar owner were fired on and a Catholic former RIC member claimed he escaped the attackers.

Simultaneously, on 26th April at 1pm, after the initial Ballygroman event, three leading British Intelligence Officers and their driver were arrested nearby in Macroom. They were then executed and buried secretly.

The seventeen killings took place in a short space of time within a confined area of West Cork. The perpetrators were never identified (see Meehan, 2011: references at end of article).

Dudgeon's question as to whether ten of the thirteen civilian killings were sectarian is legitimate. However, his deductive reasoning is weak. On the basis that "*evidence is slim so supposition is king*", he observed, "*I guess the murder of {Roman Catholic priest} Canon Magner*" in December 1920 by a British Auxiliary (named Harte not "Hart") "*remained a hurt in the area*". Consequently, speculates

Dudgeon, this "*hurt*" was a factor in the late April 1922 killings. Maybe, maybe not. Not much to go on there.

Undoubtedly, sectarianism was a feature of Irish society at that time. The new state of Northern Ireland emerged on the basis of mass expulsions of thousands of Roman Catholics from their houses and places of work (plus "*rotten prods*", aka socialists who opposed the expulsions), and large-scale killing directed by unionist forces. These actions were motivated in large part by anti-Catholicism, otherwise known as sectarianism (see Kenna). The state of Northern Ireland, in which unionists outnumbered nationalists by two to one, settled down to sectarian rule by one community over another (see Higgins and Brewer). The state collapsed in turmoil during the late 1960s. It lasted long enough to entrench resistance to reform within unionism and to engender an eventual point blank refusal by nationalists to again tolerate second-class status. A violent conflict developed, whose sectarian features British and unionist counter insurgency measures exacerbated (since that suited their political interests).

In early 1922 Michael Collins was faced as head of the new Provisional Government (set up under the Treaty with Britain) with a reinvigoration of sectarian attacks on Catholics in the emerging state of Northern Ireland; with belligerence from Westminster over failure to fulfil Treaty commitments; and with erosion of republican unity as a result of the Treaty. He didn't want to re-fight the British, was prepared to confront unionism and hoped but failed to prevent internecine southern conflict over Treaty provisions. Collins, who was killed in a civil war ambush in August 1922, despised sectarianism. His death during the southern civil war, and that war itself, probably prevented one between north and south (see Macardle, p704, 731-2).

It is reasonable therefore to explore whether a complementary or responsive savage sectarianism occurred down south, where Roman Catholics were in an initial majority of 94% to 6%. If we look at the question from the vantage point of the 1968-1994 Northern Ireland conflict, and also reliance by post-Independence southern Governments on Roman Catholic ideology, it seems plausible to suggest that such might have occurred. In West Cork the Protestant population, mostly Church of Ireland, was larger than average. That is where the "*April killings*" occurred, during a period of turmoil after the January 1922 Treaty split, prior to the June onset of civil war.

In these highly volatile circumstances with no established legitimate authority, in early April 1922 the British War Office decided in its wisdom to "*re-establish[...] intelligence services in Southern Ireland*" (in McMahon, p67). This was in violation of agreements between the two sides. British Army headquarters asked that field Intelligence Officers "*step up unobtrusive intelligence gathering*" that, "*if it could be combined with a visit to friends or a fishing trip, so much the better*". Intelligence gathering had ceased once official hostilities ended in July 1921. It had been based on a network of agents and paid informers within the civilian population.

#### FISHING FOR INTELLIGENCE

The War Office decision sowed the seeds of an Intelligence catastrophe that temporarily suspended British evacuation from Southern Ireland (Hamilton, p162).

On 26th April the southern-based Sixth Division Brigade Intelligence Officer Lieutenant R.A. Hendy, acting on orders, "*wished to see the state of affairs at Macroom, ...making the excuse of lunching with a mutual friend along the way*" (in McMahon, p67). Two battalion officers, G.R. Dove and K.L. Henderson, plus Private R.A. Brooks, their driver, accompanied Hendy. All were in civilian attire. The IRA in Macroom became suspicious and arrested them. The officers explained, as advised, that they were on a fishing trip, but without rods or other necessary accoutrements. The Intelligence Officers had lunched *en route* with their "*mutual friend*" in Farran that was near Ballygroman (Regan, 2012 a, p79). As we know, early that morning at Ballygroman an IRA officer was shot dead, followed by the disappearance of those held responsible, Protestant loyalist Thomas Hornbrook, his son, Samuel, and a former British officer, Captain Herbert Woods.

There was something unique about Intelligence gathering in that particular area. It had been based on systematic informing by Protestant loyalists. We know this because the British Army's restricted circulation, *A Record of the Rebellion in Ireland in 1921 and the part played by the Army in Dealing with it (Intelligence)*, said so. The *Record* stated that Southern Protestants generally did not inform because "*except by chance, they had not got {information} to give*". Though this rationale for Intelligence failure is self-serving, the analysis continued,

"An exception to this rule was in the Bandon area where there were many Protestant farmers who gave information.

Although the Intelligence Officer of the area was exceptionally experienced and although the troops were most active it proved almost impossible to protect those brave men, many of whom were murdered while almost all the remainder suffered grave material loss" (in Murphy, 1998).

In other words, this exceptional group suffered as British allies from accurate IRA targeting (see Borgonovo, 2007, on IRA Intelligence capacity). We may ask whether, in these circumstances after the Treaty-split, just before the civil war, information extracted from the British officers, or merely knowledge of their intent, placed this group in mortal danger?

This line of enquiry could not have emerged from Peter Hart's 1998 book, *The IRA And Its Enemies*, because he suppressed it at source.

First, Hart cited the *Record* suggesting that Protestants did not have information, in order to reinforce his view that the April killings were sectarian. He suppressed the following sentence about the Bandon Valley exception, which eviscerated the point. Dudgeon consistently fails to address this unethical presentation of evidence by Hart.

Second, Hart suppressed information contained in his 1992 PhD thesis that IRA officer Frank Busted claimed he "*killed five to six loyalists, Protestant farmers*" at that time (p377). Hart's 1992 thesis (p117-8) also stated that Busted,

"was involved in {killing}... three British officers in Macroom **and a massacre of Protestants in the early months of 1922**" (emph. added, NM).

Those last eleven words are omitted from the same sentence in Hart's book (p100).

Third, the actual killing of the officers and their driver is almost a non-event in Hart's narrative. Hart erroneously reported (combined with a mistaken reference) that three more officers were "*released*" (1998, p280, n49) and also placed the doomed officers' status as spies within inverted commas, in a generalised commentary on "*conspiracy theories*" (*ibid*).

Though raised a Catholic, Busted, whose father was Protestant, later became "*an outspoken atheist*" (Hart, 1998, p248, n149). Censoring Busted's involvement in both sets of *April Killings* suppressed a connection with the execution of the officers and stymied the presentation of a non-sectarian explanation for the killings. A historian intent on proving sectarian intent would, naturally, find the Busted evidence an inconvenience. It is difficult to see Hart's excisions and failures as simply the product of misjudgement.

#### NEW EVIDENCE

I originally drew attention to a possible connection between the civilian and military killings and Hart's suppression of the Busted evidence (Meehan, 2008a, 2008b). John Regan from Dundee University has produced new evidence on the connection. Regan critiqued Hart in a talk in Trinity College Dublin in October 2011 that Dudgeon attended. Regan's findings are published in *The 'Bandon Valley Massacre' as a Historical Problem* (2012b) and in summary in *History Ireland* (Jan-Feb 2012a).

The IRA captured the officers, apparently held them in Macroom Castle, before execution and secret burial in Kilgobnet. Free State authorities recovered and repatriated the bodies in September 1923 (*Sth. Star*, 15 Dec 1923, *Ir. Ind.*, 13, 14 Dec 1923). In his attempt to save the officers, Sixth Division Brigade Major (the later famous) Bernard Law Montgomery, "*was evidently in a savage mood*". He met with IRA Commandant Dan Donovan, who was of no help despite intense British military pressure that led to an eyeball to eyeball confrontation with the IRA (Borgonovo, 2011, pp38-9; Hamilton, p163; see, "Alarm in Macroom, British Military Display Follows Kidnapping", *Freeman's Journal*, 1 May 1922).

Donovan eventually conceded to Montgomery, "*it was done by some of the IRA at Macroom who had temporarily seceded from control*" (Hamilton, p163). That seems improbable. According to Twohig (p337-8), the order for the arrest and execution of the officers came from IRA Brigade HQ in Cork, after telephone contact from Macroom second in command, Adjutant Charlie Brown. One of the officers was identified by Browne as having been involved in torture and killing of prisoners in Cork's Victoria Barracks during 1921 (*ibid*; Browne, *The Story of the 7th*, 2007, 82). In addition, Frank Busted claimed that during a raid on his house two of the officers killed his mother by throwing her down stairs (O'Callaghan, p190). A significant memoir by A.J.S. (Stephen) Brady, son of the Rector of Macroom, reinforces this perception. He observed that one of the officers had previously,

"trussed an IRA {prisoner} like a fowl, had a rope tied to his ankles, was thrown on the road and dragged behind an army vehicle at high speed to his death" (p196).

In addition, in a recently published volume on the Civil War, John Borgonovo noted that "*two of the officers, Lt R.A. Hendy and Lt G.R.A. Dove had been implicated in the torture and unauthorised*

*killing of IRA prisoners"* (2011, p38).

As applied to the civilian killings, however, Donovan's comment appears plausible. Possibly, an out of control IRA party used Intelligence information obtained during the missing officers episode (or earlier) to target those assumed to be in league with British Intelligence. In other words, the exceptional group identified later by *The Record*. Consecutive killings over three evenings on 27th-29th April, moving from Dunmanway towards Bandon, with a short detour to Clonakilty, suggests a small organised group.

#### IRA LEADERSHIP ACTION

A horrified local IRA leadership immediately set out to halt the civilian killings by putting guards on the houses of those thought vulnerable. Stephen Brady's memoir details Charlie Browne visiting his father to assure him,

"nobody here would hurt you or anyone belonging to you. In case strangers may trouble you though, I'm going to put a guard on the Rectory" (p194).

The Rector thanked Browne and shook his hand. At a University College Cork seminar on *"Irish Protestant Identities"* in honour of Joe Ruane (26 May 2011) the historian John A. Murphy stated that his father was the IRA guard in question. On 28th April IRA Brigade Commandant Tom Hales distributed a *"military order"* to battalion commandants threatening *"capital punishment if found necessary"* to *"any soldier in the area"* who *"interfere[s] with or insults[s] any person"* or who did *"not... uphold{...} the rigid discipline of a military force"*.

The welcome of the local Protestant population for this initiative is confirmed by Brady's memoir and also by Church of Ireland clergyman, Rev'd. J.L.B. Deane (*Ir. Times* 10 Nov 1994). Deane noted that West Cork Protestants later voted for Fianna Fail TD Sean Buckley *"as a mark of gratitude and respect for what he had done {as an IRA officer} in 1922"* to stop the killings. Deane supported previous correspondent Christoir de Baroid's assertion (3 Nov) that a *"maverick IRA group in south-west Cork"* was responsible for the killings, that were *"stamped out immediately by the local IRA leadership"*. Deane asserted, contrary to Dudgeon's view of a downtrodden population, that *"the community affected... had long since drawn a line under {the killings} and is living in harmony with its neighbours"*.

We can't be sure that this is what happened. Those who killed the military personnel and the civilians did not advertise their responsibility, apart from Frank

Busteed. He told Ernie O'Malley about killing *"loyalists, Protestant farmers"* (at that time) in the 1950s and the author of *Execution* (1974) about killing the officers and their driver during the early 1970s. Twohig (p343) records that in 1959 Tom Crofts, former Brigade Adjutant, and Browne, former Battalion Adjutant, asked him not to record the story of the killing of the officers, despite the passage of time. He complied until 1994. Other than that it was seen as a Truce violation (though if that were the case the British officers were in violation also), he gives no reason.

Peter Hart's alternative narrative suppressed evidence in order to feed a story of sectarian republican practice that culminated in an apparently random civilian sectarian massacre. Some of Hart's PhD evidence did not support his IRA sectarianism conclusion and he left it out of his book. Other evidence was misrepresented. Dudgeon objects to my view that Hart wrote a sectarian history. The alternative is to term it fiction.

Another view put forward, due to the exceptional nature of the event, is that the civilian killings may have been the action of *agent provocateurs*, guided by an increasingly hysterical Sir Henry Wilson. No evidence has been put forward in support of mainly English killers (presumably) who, in the course of their grisly Machiavellian endeavours, managed convincingly to mimic local accents.

#### PART TWO – A PATTERN?

Dudgeon observed, *"My interest is in assessing whether the Cork killings were part of a pattern of anti-Protestant attacks"*. Indeed, Peter Hart portrayed them as the culmination of activity that began *"from the summer of 1920 onwards"* (2002, p25). The April killings are, therefore according to Dudgeon, *"emblematic"*. That can only be so, however, if similar killings occurred. Otherwise, even if sectarian, they are exceptional.

Here, Dudgeon faces a significant obstacle, the testimony of southern Protestants. They refuted allegations of republican attacks on Protestants. The pages of the then Protestant *Irish Times* were littered with letters from Protestants rejecting northern unionist propaganda to this effect.

Southern unionists joined in the attack. It is not difficult to source the basis of southern unionist pique. They felt betrayed by Ulster unionists and their support for Partition under the 1920 Government of Ireland Act. The southern unionist leader, Earl Middleton, was expelled from the Irish Unionist Alliance for proposing limited

Dominion Home Rule in November 1917 and promptly set up the Unionist Anti Partition League (see Jackson, 1999, p233; 2003, p161, 181-5).

As the Anglo-Irish conflict developed, there were more immediate concerns. In December 1920, when K Company of the Auxiliaries (it appears a significant number of whom were from northern Ireland) burned Cork, they burned Protestant-owned property. Similarly when Fermoy and Middleton were sacked and many Creameries burned, Protestant-owned property was often the target. A southern unionist from Bantry, Mr G.W. Biggs, wrote in response to Ulster Unionist leader, Edward Carson:

"I feel it my duty to protest very strongly against this unfounded slander {of intolerance on the part} of our Catholic neighbours ... I have been resident in Bantry for 43 years, during 33 of which I have been engaged in business, and I have received the greatest kindness, courtesy, and support from all classes and creeds in the country" (*Ir. Times*, 24 Jul 1920).

Biggs's substantial business was then burned down, by the police. His house was commandeered by the military, Biggs was forced to send his family to Dublin and went himself to live in a hotel. Previously-mentioned Sixth Division Brigade Major Bernard Montgomery afterwards remarked, *"it never bothered me a bit how many houses we burned"* and *"I regarded all civilians as **"shiners"**"* (Hamilton, pp158, 160). Including, it seems, Mr Biggs.

A letter in the *Times* of London (30 Sep 1920) from John Annan Bryce, younger brother of a former Chief Secretary for Ireland, described what happened to Biggs and his business. Annan Bryce complained of a military threat to burn republican-owned property if that of loyalists were targeted. He went on, *"there is no justification for the issue of such a notice in this district, where the only damage to loyalists' premises has been done by the police"*. In further highly significant correspondence Annan Bryce also told of the arrest and deportation back to Ireland of his wife Violet for attempting to speak in Wales on British reprisal burnings and other atrocities (see correspondence in *Church & State* 86, Autumn 2006).

#### STRICTLY STRICKLAND

Dudgeon observed that *"pretty well every Protestant on the island was guilty of {the type of} helpfulness"* provided by Bandon Valley loyalists. Self-evidently, that is not the case. A more typical attitude is perhaps illustrated by this Cork episode:

"One day {Cork Divisional Com-

mander General Strickland } stamped into my father's office and in his extremely rude, brusque manner said, "Look here Clarke, you are trusted by both sides: it's your duty to give me information". Father, looking him in the eye, calmly said, "I will *not* inform against my own countrymen. It is your duty to control the rabble your government has let loose on Ireland. Good morning". Going purple in the face, the General stormed out, crossed the Mall to Grandfather's office, and received virtually the same reply". (Pyne Clarke, 1985, p.52-3).

According to another *Times* (London) correspondent (27 Jan. 1921) Strickland's proclamation threatening to prosecute those who withheld information "*aroused protests from loyalists in the South*", as "*it is [now] an offence to remain neutral*". This letter mentioned the fate of West Cork loyalist John Bradfield who was shot, having been "*found guilty of having attempted to inform the enemy of the presence and movements of Republican troops*". A cousin of Bradfield's was shot soon afterwards in similar circumstances. The final April killings victim fourteen months later on 29th April 1922 was a third Bradfield cousin (see Meehan, 2011).

The post-Truce killing of Bradfield was regarded differently from that of his relations. Protestants protested the April killings, contrary to Dudgeon's inane belief that they "*kept their heads down*" on the subject. A Protestant Convention was held on 11th May 1922, two weeks after the April killings, that packed out Dublin's Mansion House. It resolved—

"We place on record that, until the recent tragedies in the County Cork, hostility to Protestants by reason of their religion has been almost, if not wholly, unknown in the Twenty six counties in which Protestants are in a minority."

The participants, in condemning the April killings, were not prepared to make concessions to Ulster Unionist propaganda that set out to muddy the waters of responsibility for aggravated sectarianism in the new state of Northern Ireland. The Rector of Macroom told a British officer investigating the disappearance of the Intelligence Officers, that "*he personally had nothing to complain of as regards the way [the IRA] were treating him*" (Brady, p195).

#### PROTESTANT MEMOIR

Memoirs and biographies by or about Protestants in West Cork are to hand. None mention a sectarian campaign against Protestants. The biography, by his grandson, of Jasper Wolfe, Crown Solicitor during the conflict (who represented the RIC at the inquest into their killing

Cork Lord Mayor Tomás McCurtain), cites Wolfe on rejecting the notion emphatically (Ungoed-Thomas). Wolfe insisted afterwards that, though he was subject to attack, this was not because of his religious beliefs, but rather due to his leading position within the British administration during a period of armed conflict. His grandson biographer recently expressed "*surprise*" at allegations of republican or nationalist sectarianism. Jasper Wolfe had never raised them in often-told tales of being,

"kidnapped by the IRA, or attempts to shoot him, or of his house on the outskirts of Skibbereen being occupied by Republicans or Free Staters in turn. But I never heard any suggestion of sectarian hostility towards the Wolfes, whether from the I.R.A., from their Catholic neighbours, or indeed from any Catholics at all" (2010).

Had sectarian attacks on Protestants been a feature of the their experience, the former Crown Solicitor, who also coordinated local loyalist compensation claims during the later 1920s, would have said so, surely.

If Dudgeon wishes to reject the testimony of fellow unionists, albeit southern ones, so be it. Dudgeon could take his cue from a loyalist Roman Catholic, John M. Regan, who transferred from the RIC to the RUC. His memoir observed, "*the further one gets from Belfast the less sectarianism there is generally*" (in Augustejn, ed, p78). Regan did not mention sectarianism as a factor while stationed in the south, but experienced it personally after transferring to what is now Northern Ireland.

Southern unionists were alienated from northern counterparts and increasingly estranged from the British Government and its forces. British policy, not the IRA, attacked the material interests of Protestants. That, in the main, is what concerned them.

That is not to suggest that all Protestants were unionists (never mind active loyalists of the type the Bandon Valley appears to have produced). A significant number had, like Douglas Gageby and African National Congress counterparts later in South Africa, the status of "*white niggers*". Dr. Dorothy Stopford, a Protestant who went on to pioneer TB inoculation in southern Ireland, ministered to the injuries of IRA Volunteers in West Cork and gave lectures on first aid to Cumann na mBan (the women's IRA auxiliary, see O'Broin, pp167-72, 220-73). Could she have given her allegiance to such a force, were it engaged in a pattern of attacks on co-religionists? Could her Aunt, the historian

Alice Stopford Green, have provided a safe house for Eamon deValera and Michael Collins, and for meetings of Dáil Ministers, if the Dáil was directing attacks on fellow Protestants? (*ibid*, pp157,167-8) Could Erskine Childers, Robert Barton and Ernest Blythe have led republican resistance to British rule if such were the case?

Thus, there is no evidential support for a "*pattern*" of sectarian attacks in the south against Protestants, as occurred in the north against Roman Catholics.

#### SOUTHERN COCOON

After Independence, southern Protestants were concerned that their relative socio-economic advantage be maintained. It was, so much so that twenty-five percent of senior Executives in banking and industry in southern Ireland in the early 1970s were Protestant. In the 2006 Census, Protestants generally were in possession of larger farms and disproportionately occupied higher status managerial, technical and professional categories (Meehan, 2010).

Protestant population decline in the South began in the 19th Century, as Protestant privilege was eroded, penal laws were abolished and the British Government attempted to ally with an emerging conservative Roman Catholicism. This occurred during a period of catastrophic overall population decline that began during and after the Famine of 1845-48. Relative Protestant population decline intensified in the period 1911-26, during the period of the First World War, War of Independence and Civil War, and its aftermath. Economic factors, combined with the decline of imperial economic and social privileges, the attraction of Empire and of the 'Mother country' itself, alongside some antipathy toward Irish nationalism and the sad state of the Irish economy during the 1920s, all probably played their part. UCC historian Professor John A. Murphy, whose republican family roots are in West Cork, referred to the notion of Protestants being driven from their land and occupations in the 1920s as "*Paisleyite myth mongering*" (*Sun. Ind.*, 4 Oct 2004; on this, generally, Meehan, 2010).

Far from being attacked, post-Independence southern Protestants existed within a self-administered and largely beneficial cocoon. Conservative Irish Governments got on with socially controlling the Roman Catholic majority, particularly its working class members and some occasionally bothersome artists and intellectuals, through the welfare agencies and ideological pronouncements of the Roman Catholic Church. The same type of people

affronted the rulers of Northern Ireland, where physical substituted for social control.

In the South religious affiliation does not generally affect everyday social intercourse. In February 2006 Kevin Myers, a supporter of Peter Hart's work, commented on a spontaneous and generally opportunist riot directed at police in Dublin's city centre. A loyalist 'Love Ulster' band parade for loyalist victims (some of whom served in the official security forces) was abandoned before it started and provided the catalyst. Myers wrote,

"the rioters know that the RTÉ journalist Charlie Bird was a Protestant, and accordingly beat the bejasus out of him?"

A response from *Times* journalist Eugene McEldowney appeared,

"I am indebted to Kevin Myers for the information that my friend and colleague, Charlie Bird of RTÉ, is a Protestant (Irish Times, February 28th). I have known Charlie for 34 years and until now this information had escaped me, largely because I never thought to enquire. Kevin obviously pays closer attention to such fine details than I do. But how fiendishly clever of the Dublin lumpenproletariat to have uncovered this same information. Now that he has raised the issue of a sectarian headcount, perhaps Kevin would use his investigative skills to give us a religious breakdown of the injured gardai?" (Ir. Times, 3 Mar 2006).

Before accusations of sectarian activity are made, either in newspapers or in history books, great care should be taken in the presentation of evidence.

Anti-sectarianism is in the objective interests of all Irish people. Understanding its political and social roots is an important part of recognising how to get rid of it. In the War of Independence and its aftermath Irish republicans were not involved in perpetuating sectarian politics in Ireland. Ulster Unionists sowed those seeds and eventually reaped a whirlwind.

#### BOOKS CITED

Augusteijn, Joost (ed.), *Memoirs of John M. Regan, a Catholic Officer in the RIC and RUC 1909-48*, 2007  
Borogonovo, John, *Spies, Informers and the 'Anti-Sinn Fein Society': the Intelligence War in Cork City, 1919-1921*, 2007  
- *The Battle for Cork: July-August 1922*, 2011  
Brady, AJS (Stephen), *The Briar of Life*, 2010  
Browne, Charlie, *The Story of the 7th*, 2007  
Hamilton, Nigel, *Monty, the Making of a General 1887-1942*, 1981  
Hart, Peter (PhD Thesis), *The Irish Republican Army and its Enemies, Violence and Community in Cork, 1916-23*, 1992  
- *The IRA and its Enemies, Violence and Community in Cork, 1916-23*, 1998  
- 'Definition, Defining the Irish Revolution', in Joost Augusteijn, ed., *The Irish Revolution, 1919-23*  
Higgins, Gareth I, and John D Brewer, *Anti-*

*Catholicism in Northern Ireland, 1600-1998: the Mote and the Beam*, 1998

Jackson, Alvin, *Ireland, 1798-1998*, 1999

- *Home Rule, An Irish History 1800-2000*, 2003

Kenna, G.B. (pseud., Fr John Hassan), *Facts and Figures, the Belfast Pogroms, 1920-22*, 1997 (orig. publ. 1922)

Macardle, Dorothy, *The Irish Republic, a Documented Chronicle of the Anglo-Irish Conflict and the Partition of Ireland, with a Detailed Account of the period, 1916-23*, 3rd ed., 1999 (orig. publ., 1937)

McMahon, Paul, *British Spies and Irish Rebels*, 2009

Meehan, Niall, 'After the War of Independence, some further questions about West Cork, April 27-29 1922', IPR, v. 23, n. 3, March 2008a

- 'Troubles in Irish History', in Brian Murphy, Niall Meehan, *Troubled History*, 2008b

- "'Protestants were left as orphans'", Church & State 102, 4th qtr, 2010

- 'Distorting Irish History Two, the road from Dunmanway: Peter Hart's treatment of the 1922 'April killings' in West Cork', Spinwatch.Org, 24 May 2011

Murphy, Brian, 'The IRA and its Enemies' (review), *The Month*, Sept-Oct 1998

O'Brien, Mark, *The Irish Times, a History*, 2008

O'Broin, Leon, *Protestant Nationalists in Revolutionary Ireland, the Stopford Connection*, Gill & Macmillan, 1985

O'Callaghan, Sean, *Execution*, 1974

Pyne Clarke, Olga, *She Came of Decent People*, 1985

Regan, John M, 'The 'Bandon Valley Massacre' as a Historical Problem', *History*, v. 97, n. 325, Jan 2012a

- 'Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde, the Two Histories', *History Ireland*, v. 20, n. 1, Jan-Feb 2012b

Twohig, Patrick, *Green Tears for Hecuba, Ireland's Fight for Freedom*, 1994

Ungoed-Thomas, Jasper, *Jasper Wolfe of Skibbereen*, 2008

- 'IRA Sectarism in Skibbereen?' *Skibbereen and District Historical Society Journal*, Vol. 6, 2010

Niall Meehan

### This correspondence is now closed. Editor

Reply by Jeff Dudgeon To Manus O' Riordan's Articles On James Larkin In *Irish Political Review* (October, December 2011)

## The 1934 Larkin Affidavit: A Comment

Manus O'Riordan, in his *Irish Political Review* article, 'The 1934 Larkin Affidavit' (Part I, October, pp. 21-25), attacks James Larkin at length for an affidavit he made to American commercial lawyers in 1934. This named many of those involved, including Irish socialists, in German sabotage operations in the US and Canada in 1915-17. This collaboration is described as unconscionable, indeed reprehensible, something never before noticed.

I was then criticised, in passing, for having suggested in my Casement book that it was Casement's contribution to this sabotage (it comprised some one hundred

bombings and arson attacks), more than his diaries, that ensured no intervention by President Woodrow Wilson to save him from execution.

Manus asserted (p21) "*there is not the slightest evidence that Wilson had any awareness in 1916 of Casement's name cropping up in association with German sabotage operations*" so doubting my "flamboyant claim... that Wilson's refusal to intervene on behalf of Casement's life... was primarily due to knowledge of the contents of intercepts that had yet to be decoded". It is thus Manus's case that Wilson's only reason for silence was homophobia—not American interests.

After a compliment to me, Manus indicated surprise that I should "*attempt to minimise President Woodrow Wilson's wholehearted embrace of the Ulster Presbyterian prejudice to 'Save Ulster (and the World) from Sodomy!'*". This "*embrace*" is the reason invoked for the President declining to seek clemency for Casement from the British Government. He later states it was obvious that "*President Wilson's raw-nerve of pure-and-simple Ulster Presbyterian homophobia had been touched in July 1916*".

It is anachronistic and itself religiously prejudiced to suggest President Wilson and Ulster Presbyterians were suffused with a peculiar homophobia at the time, one it is implied which lingered on until my Strasbourg case 60 years later—and Dr. Ian Paisley's and Peter Robinson's unsuccessful "*Save Ulster from Sodomy*" campaign in the 1970s.

The prejudice against homosexuals was in Casement's time universal. Next to nobody, except some advanced Liberals were other than utterly condemnatory. It is plain too that the longstanding campaign by Catholic nationalists and Republicans to deny the authenticity of Casement's Black Diaries was entirely motivated by a horror of the hero patriot being revealed as a homosexual and as engaging in sodomitical practices.

The attitude of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Randall Davidson, is a rare example in 1916 of at least a compassionate attitude to gays. The Archbishop, like others, first tried to promote the insanity argument in order to bring about a reprieve. He wrote,

"If Casement is now guilty in the vicious way alleged it may be taken as further evidence of his having become mentally unhinged. I have to do pretty frequently with problems of vice of that sort, and I suppose it is indisputable that sometimes a mental upset takes the shape of vicious behaviour, especially of an unnatural kind."

As I wrote, "Dr Davidson being an Anglican would have, as he said, more experience of the subject", while he exhibited due Christian charity saying, "One feels that an incident such as this sends us all to our knees and that is really all we can say, but it is the best".

He was to make a final plea to the Lord Chancellor two days before the execution, and in a last artful throw tried to turn the circulation of the diaries to Casement's advantage. He adduced the fear that people in America and Ireland would make mischievous capital of the execution

"far more so if they could (as they would) spin a tale to the effect... that the authorities had been privy to the trumping up of an infamous story about the man's immorality, an accusation with which he had never been confronted."

In contrast, it is worth noting that sixty years later, during my Strasbourg case, the Cardinal Archbishop of Armagh, Tomás Ó Fiaich, endorsed the British Government's attempt to maintain the criminalisation of homosexual men in Northern Ireland. One could be permitted to ask Manus if Irish Catholicism is also homophobic or simply paedophilic?

The British Ambassador in Washington, Sir Cecil Spring Rice, sympathetic to clemency for Casement but stymied by London, perhaps started this prejudice against President Wilson. Brian Inglis in his biography quotes him saying, "The President is by descent an Orangeman and by education a Presbyterian", adding his own view that "Wilson's sympathies were with the allies, and with Ulster" (p357).

The Ambassador's opinion carried no accusation of homophobia (although the word had not then been coined nor when Inglis wrote). Spring-Rice was from a Limerick background and had a cousin, Mary Spring Rice, involved with Casement in the 1914 Howth gunrunning. She was famously photographed beside ammunition boxes and rifles on the Asgard with Mrs. Erskine Childers. The Ambassador probably retained a certain sympathy for Home Rule and a concomitant antagonism to Ulster.

Manus's view however probably says more about his own prejudices regarding Ulster Presbyterians than about homophobia.

On the main topic, attributing Larkin's behaviour (and his lapse from socialist virtue) in providing this affidavit to a prolonged nervous breakdown and "severe depression" is unconvincing and evidentially lacking.

I would argue the view, one Manus discounts, that it is much more likely it was the involvement of Franz von Papen in the Hitler government that prompted Larkin's statement, particularly as it was not then a police matter but a commercial compensation claim.

Manus writes that von Papen, the Ger-

man military attaché in Washington "had no hand in the July 1916 explosion on 'Black Tom' Island in New York Harbour" nor was he ever "accused of complicity in that act" (Part II, December 2011, *From Sing Sing to Sing and Sing*, pp19-23).

This is Republican-lawyer argumentation not an historian's assessment. It is unworldly not to assume von Papen was involved in long-planned acts of sabotage since he was expelled six months earlier, being properly "accused by the US government of complicity in a plan to blow up US railroad lines".

It is most likely that Larkin was of the view that the German National Socialist Government was a great threat to socialism and that his affidavit was given in "an anti-Nazi context". The affidavit came in 1934, a year after von Papen became Hitler's deputy and Vice-Chancellor of Nazi Germany.

Although he left government after the 1934 executions during and around the *Night of the Long Knives* and the extinction of German democracy, von Papen did not leave power. He became Ambassador in Vienna until the 1938 *Anschluss* with Austria, and was then posted to Ankara to the key post of Ambassador to Turkey.

Franz von Papen was therefore at the centre of the Nazi operation for more than a decade. He was far from uncomplacent in the events of that period, especially in the 1930s. Larkin could have done no other than assume he was part of Hitler's system, indeed an enthusiastic supporter. He was certainly privy to most of its crimes, endorsing the regime with his presence until he left office in 1944 – despite acquittal at Nuremberg of the specific charge of "crimes against peace".

Manus writes, "Nor can any amount of either foresight or hindsight justify Larkin 'fingering' von Papen in 1934 for conspiracy to commit murder in the USA" (Part II, p. 20). I hope if I was in Larkin's position I would have fingered von Papen. Present sight of him as Hitler's deputy would have been sufficient justification. Frank Ryan is excused for vastly more collaboration with the Nazi regime than Larkin is for an affidavit over events nearly twenty years earlier.

I didn't intend to take up a defence of Larkin until I realised the two articles had charged and convicted him in an unfair and unbalanced way. It is not as if the US authorities acted against any of the people he named. There was no felon setting involved.

Manus seems desperate to convict and then excuse him although I cannot see why. He is however guilty of writing history backwards, with England, as usual, being defined as a criminal nation for acting in its own interests. For some reason this does not apply to other countries as if none, particularly Ireland, acts on self-interest.

In tangential musings, he deals at length with the role of American statesman John McCloy who in 1934 was the lawyer who persuaded Larkin to prepare the affidavit. Oddly he does not speculate over the proba-

bility that McCloy, like Woodrow Wilson, was another American of Ulster Presbyterian stock.

He also asserts, as stated earlier "there is not the slightest evidence that Wilson had any awareness in 1916 of Casement's name cropping up in association with German sabotage operations", partly, as the intercepts which I quoted "had yet to be decoded" (Part I, October, p22).

I am afraid this will not do. It is accepted that British Intelligence decoded the cables going to and from Germany's Washington embassy, for one, and in sufficient time to act on them. Why they often failed to act is another question.

When I mentioned that it is unclear "when these messages were decrypted", I was not suggesting it happened long after the event, rather that it was unclear which day they were decrypted and indeed who was told, when, of their contents. I did point out that London, through decrypts, knew about the Easter Rising a month before it happened.

It is absurd to suggest that President Wilson was unaware of Casement's name cropping up before the execution. As he had gone over to the Germans after his stay in America and his 1914 contacts with von Papen, it was hardly remarkable to assume he had conspiratorial connections with both German diplomats and Irish revolutionaries. British decrypts naming Casement however were not even necessary for a case as the US had a sufficiency of knowledge tying both him and von Papen to sabotage.

The reality is that on Tuesday 18 April 1916 the Americans raided the offices of Wolf von Igel, a German diplomat masquerading as an advertising executive in New York, and gathered up a cache of documents left lying out on sabotage operations in the US, on Casement and on von Papen amongst many others. (See the *New York Times* news article of 23 September 1917 <http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9502E6D9103AE433A25750C2A96F9C946696D6CF>)

The seized documents were erroneously thought by John Devoy to be the reason for Casement's capture on Good Friday in Kerry. In fact his arrest was a matter of luck as the British had not warned the RIC in Tralee of his imminent arrival. Whether decrypts of Berlin's January 1915 message to von Papen in Washington specifically naming Casement as someone suggesting people "suitable for sabotage in the United States" reached Wilson matters not. He knew enough by April 1916 to be assured Casement = von Papen = US sabotage and thus was someone he was not going to be seeking a reprieve for.

Manus admits to being wrong about Larkin (plus neglecting the 1934 affidavit) and will have to again over President Wilson's supposed lack of awareness of Casement's link to German sabotage.

28 December 2011

## Crozier Antidotes For Hart Maladies

Last October 16th, the Irish edition of the *Sunday Times* carried a letter from Pierce Martin denouncing columnist Justine McCarthy for not bowing down before the myths created by a certain academic historian whom he lauded as "*the courageous and woefully denigrated Peter Hart, who cannot defend himself from a cold grave*". I find Martin's special pleading that Hart should be allowed to escape from critical analysis particularly hard to stomach, having spoken by the side of Frank Ryan's cold grave in defence of his reputation (see <http://irelandscw.com/org—RyanComm.htm> for that October 2005 commemorative oration) a week after the *Irish Times* had facilitated a very much alive Peter Hart in publishing his character assassination and sneering reference to "*Frank Ryan, the Republican saint / Nazi collaborator*". Character assassination of those lying in cold graves was very much part of Hart's stock-in-trade and became the means by which he established his academic notoriety. Hart even claimed to have conducted a "*live*" interview with some already in their graves!

Here I am concerned with Hart's character assassination of an Englishman, Brigadier-General F.P. (Frank Percy) Crozier, whose 1931 book—*A Word To Gandhi*—I discussed when refuting Fintan O'Toole's attempt to suggest a Widgery-style "*mitigating factor*" in his account of the 1920 Bloody Sunday massacre. (*Irish Political Review*, January 2012). Crozier's dedication reads as follows:

"To the experience and prophetic insight of my Grandfathers, F H Crozier, Esq, Honourable East India Company's Service and Madras Civil Service, sometimes Special Agent at the Court of His Highness the Maharaja of Vizeanagram, and Major W F Percy, for many years a Resident Magistrate in the West of Ireland, this volume is due."

Crozier was of the opinion that he possessed more than enough British Imperialist experience in his pedigree to write authoritatively on both Ireland and India. And this was only the icing on his own personal experience. Here is how Crozier recounted his resignation from the command of Britain's RIC Auxiliaries:

"When the British Government ordered me, in my 'patriotic' position of 'loyal' police officer, to condone crimes of violence committed by its patriotic, loyal, armed and uniformed servants, against defenceless and 'loyal' women in Ireland,

and I refused, telling the 'disloyal' elements to search for 'Patriotism' and come and tell me when they had found it, as I threw my letters of appointment into a dustbin, it was that British Government which was 'disloyal'—not I" (pp12-13).

"In February 1921 ... defenceless Protestant women of the shopkeeper class were looted by armed policemen near Trim. The officer in chief command of the Auxiliaries proceeded to the scene of the disreputable armed robbery, in order to administer justice. Some thieves he handed over to the *military* for trial. These were subsequently tried and sent to prison. Other men he sent back to England for Ireland's good. The Government sent the latter back to Ireland to duty because they knew too much and threatened to expose in the Press the truth about the burning of Cork! Later, certain of the men submitted to mock trial and were acquitted! England's honour was saved and, what was much more important, Cabinet jobs as well! Meanwhile the chief officer who went to Trim to enquire into the facts resigned in disgust on account of the condonation of police crime by the Government. During debates in the House of Commons and in answer to questions about the chief officer concerned and the Irish Chaos, many different stories were told in order to bolster up the Government and discredit Ireland. The writer was the chief officer! *He knows!* These things can happen more easily in India than in England. *The writer knows!* The ten commandments are inoperative in India in certain quarters. The eleventh—thou shalt not be found out—rules the day. The eleventh commandment ruled the day in the times of the 'Black-and-Tan' Coalition till they *were* found out, when the Coalition died" (pp95-96).

I am not here going to repeat the detailed refutations of Hart's character assassination of Tom Barry in respect of the Auxies' false surrender during the November 1920 Kilmichael Ambush, the most comprehensive being that by Meda Ryan. (See [www.indymedia.ie/article/69172?&condense\\_comments=false#comment104437](http://www.indymedia.ie/article/69172?&condense_comments=false#comment104437) for my review of Meda's 2003 biography, *Tom Barry—Irish Freedom Fighter*.) My concern here is with Hart's character assassination of Crozier on this issue, on pages 36 to 37 of his now long-discredited 1998 tome, *The IRA & Its Enemies*. Hart wrote:

"Barry's 'history' of Kilmichael ... is riddled with lies and evasions. There was no false surrender as he described it. The surviving Auxiliaries were simply 'exterminated'... General Crozier, after resigning and becoming a vocal critic of the Auxiliary Division and British policy in

Ireland, asserted that: *'It was perfectly true that the wounded had been put to death after the ambush, but the reason for this barbarous inhumanity became understandable although inexcusable ... Arms were supposed to have been surrendered, but a wounded Auxiliary whipped out a revolver while lying on the ground and shot a 'Shinner' with the result that all his comrades were put to death with him, the rebels 'seeing red', a condition akin to going mad'* (Crozier, *Ireland For Ever*, 1932, p 128). Crozier stated that *'I journeyed to Cork to find out the truth about this carnage, and as I was in mufti and unknown, learned a great deal, not only about the ambush.'* That a senior British police officer could have infiltrated the West Cork IRA to such an extent is simply incredible. It is clear that Crozier picked up this information—which certainly does have an authentic ring about it—after he had resigned and after he had become *persona grata* with Michael Collins. Much of the material in his book clearly came from this source."

Hart was calling Crozier a liar. But it would be wrong to consider this a case of the pot calling the kettle black, for there is no evidence to suggest that Crozier was lying and much convincing evidence pointing to the exact opposite. Contrary to another whopper of a lie on Hart's part, Crozier **never** claimed he had "*infiltrated the West Cork IRA*". Hart seems to have gone out of his way—whether through malice or ignorance or both—to obscure the fact that Crozier undertook not one but **two** investigations of Kilmichael. Crozier's conclusions from his **second** investigation were related as follows by Meda Ryan (my emphasis):

"Of significant importance is the testimony of Brigadier General Crozier, commander of the Auxiliaries from 1919 to 1920. He came to Ireland (**having resigned**) {in February 1921, MOR} '*as a civilian, at the request of Sir Hamar Greenwood to give evidence*' on the Kilmichael ambush. In his 'Unpublished Memoirs' (published posthumously by *The Kerryman* in March 1938) he wrote: *'I took particular care to enquire into this story of mutilation, as it appeared to me to be quite unlike the normal or abnormal act of Irishmen. The correct story I found to be as follows: The lorries were held up by land mines and the leading lorry was partly destroyed. The men were called upon to surrender and did so throwing up their hands and grounding their rifles. Each policeman carried a revolver in addition to a rifle. One policeman shot a Sinn Féiner at close quarters with his revolver after he had grounded his rifle and put his hands up. A hand-to-hand combat of the fiercest kind ensued, the butts of rifles, revolvers, crowbars being used, hence the battered condition of the police. When it is intended to kill a man*

with a butt—end there is no hitting him on the legs.”

Ryan commented: "This account clarifies that the 'false surrender' story was in circulation in the area shortly after the ambush, and was not fabricated by Tom Barry or anybody else later" (Tom Barry, p81). Indeed, Crozier had previously made clear that the 'false surrender' story was already in circulation no later than two months after the Ambush, on the occasion of his **first investigation, undertaken a month before his resignation**:

"During the last month of 1920 the English people were horrified to read in their newspapers that a party of Auxiliary 'Black-and-Tans', about eighteen strong, had been ambushed by Sinn Feiners in County Cork and that all, save one man who had a miraculous escape, had been butchered to death, while lying wounded on the ground. The evidence against the Irish assassins and mutilators seemed complete. Corpses were found bearing many terrible wounds. The one survivor could not explain anything, as he was completely inarticulate from shock and wounds."

"I knew the Irish well; I had spent most of my schoolboy holidays not very far from the spot where this dreadful massacre took place. I could hardly believe my ears when I was told the tale in a hospital in which I was incarcerated while suffering from serious injuries {from a road accident—MO'R}. Meanwhile, Parliament gloated and revolted over the foul deed, the Irish and the police being whipped up to further atrocities by the lies told. Following the reception of the news about Kilmichael, four unarmed Irishmen were brutally murdered in Dublin. I determined to proceed to the scene of the atrocity, unknown, unrecognisable and alone, to learn the truth, as soon as I was well enough to travel. I went to County Cork in January, unannounced. Staying in a small hotel, alone, I made enquiries and visited the scene of the disaster. {All emphases mine—MO'R.} What did I find? There had been an ambush—an act of war—in the martial law area. Some policemen had been killed and wounded, while the remainder surrendered, when suddenly a policeman in the act of surrender whipped out a revolver and shot a Sinn Feiner dead. The Irishmen, 'seeing red', killed all the police save one whom they thought was dead. That is the true explanation of the 'butchery' at Kilmichael. What I found out, the British Government could have found out. What I wanted to know—the truth—politicians had no wish to know" (*A Word to Gandhi*, 1931, pp93-94).

What makes Crozier all the more credible and convincing is that he never pretended to have undergone a "gates of Damascus" Pauline conversion, with the

scales falling from his eyes all at once. Writing in 1931 of his **first**, January 1921, investigation of Kilmichael, he tells us exactly how he saw it at the time, concluding that there had indeed been an Auxie false surrender, while still believing that the Auxie corpses had been subjected to *post mortem* mutilation. It was only on the occasion of his **second** investigation, undertaken subsequent to his February 1921 resignation, that he concluded that allegations of mutilation also constituted a false accusation.

There is yet another issue where we might compare Hart and Crozier—how they would have responded to the following rhetorical question posed by Gerard Murphy in 2010:

"Certainly men (or women) sent in by Dublin Castle or British Military Intelligence could and should be described as spies. Similarly those members of the IRA or their families who volunteered information on their colleagues should be called informers. But should a loyalist such as Mrs Lindsay, who happened to notice IRA men preparing for an ambush and reported it to save lives (after informing the local priest to convey the message to the IRA and thus save lives on both sides) also be called a spy or informer, even though she was only being true to her own convictions?" (*The Year Of Disappearances: Political Killings in Cork 1921—1922*, pp63-64).

In 1998, in his "*Spies and Informers*" Chapter, Peter Hart did in fact write:

"Cork IRA officers routinely insisted that those executed were proven, convicted traitors. *We were careful that before a spy was shot it had to be a definite case of spying.*' (Sean Culhane). Some were indeed 'guilty', if only by IRA standards... Mary Lindsay did help give away the Dripsey ambush... The song—'Where the Dripsey River Flow'—refers to the betrayal of the Donoughmore Battalion column on 28 January 1921, which resulted in the death of one Volunteer and the execution of three others. The only '*son of Cromwell*' involved was a woman, Mrs Mary Lindsay ... Mrs Lindsay was separated from her Catholic neighbours by class, creed, loyalty, and a whole battery of myths and prejudices (including her own) which combined to form an insurmountable ethnic barrier. Frank Busted revealed some of these when he told her {and here Hart drew on the quotation attributed to Busted by Sean O'Callaghan in his 1974 book *Execution*—MO'R}: 'Listen you old bitch, you think you are dealing with a bunch of farm labourers, the men who will touch their caps to you and say 'Yes, Madam', and 'No, Madam'. Well, we're no bunch of down-trodden tame Catholics'..." (pp300 and 308-9).

They certainly weren't. And—despite Hart's suggestion through the manner of his characterisation in this Chapter—neither was Busted a Catholic bigot of any sort. Indeed, being gender- as well as ethnically-precise, it was none other than that same Frank Busted who was the only "*son of Cromwell*" involved—the exception that proved the rule, or not? Hart seemed to have forgotten himself, for, in an earlier Chapter, entitled "Guerillas", he had written (my emphasis):

"Frank Busted, a Blarney mill worker, joined the Fianna Eireann—the republican boy scouts—in 1910, under the influence of his ultranationalist mother. *Busted's deceased father had been a Protestant although Busted himself was raised as a Catholic and later became an outspoken atheist.* He moved up to join the Volunteers in 1917 ... Busted was soon elected as captain of the Blarney company and was also invited to join the IRB but was (he says) turned down because of local prejudice over his '*Protestant*' name. This did nothing to alter his militancy, however ... In late 1919 ... (Busted) took up arms full-time in his new capacity as vice O/C of the Donoughmore Battalion. From January 1920 on, Busted took part in nearly every ambush or barracks attack between Cork and Macroom, as well as numerous operations and executions with the city gunmen. When a battalion column was formed in November 1920 he was the obvious choice as commander, and he held the post until the Truce. His mother's death after a British raid only increased his passion for revenge, which he took out on a considerable number of suspected 'spies' and 'informers'... It was he who planned the Dripsey ambush in January 1921 ('a bit of a debacle'—Busted) and the consequent kidnapping of Mrs Lindsay and her chauffeur" (p248).

And how might Crozier have responded to Murphy's question? This is what Frank Crozier had actually written in 1931, under the heading of "*The Lesson of Muddled Murdering*":

"Mr Bell was a resident magistrate who had been specially deputed to carry out an investigation into Republican bank balances. As he began to know too much, he was dragged out of a tram-car and shot dead, in crowded Dublin, the assassins escaping in confusion... *But the real cause of the assassin's escape was that the population was beginning to revolt against the blood-lust policy introduced into Ireland by the descendants of Oliver Cromwell ...*" (My emphasis—MO'R).

"Mrs Lindsay was a very gallant old British lady who died because of her patriotism to England. She was 'let down' by her Unionist friends. Hearing of an ambush of police or soldiers by Sinn Fein rebels, she hurried off to warn the nearest police station. Finding out what this grand



old lady had done, the rebels caught her and shot her as an informer. They might have respected her age and kept her as a prisoner, but they said they had no prisons. There can be no half measures in rebellion, which can only be justified by success. The usual result of rebellion is either complete victory or a string of dead bodies hanging from the lamp-posts..." (My emphasis—MOR).

"In this case the British Government was entirely to blame for Mrs Lindsay's death. Demanding and expecting loyalty from her, she was shamefully abandoned. Loyalty begets loyalty, lack of honour and protection begets disloyalty; but who understands 'loyalty'? Between the gunmen of England and the gunmen of Ireland the 'loyalists' fell and suffered. It was foolish for 'loyalists' to 'talk' in Ireland in 1920 and 1921. It was madness to 'inform'..." (pp52-53. my emphases—MOR).

Hart and Crozier can also be compared in terms of their treatment of the issue of self-determination. Hart's only 'assessment' of the significance of Sinn Féin's overwhelming 26 County victory in the December 1918 General Election was his regurgitation of police reports and Loyalist cum *Irish Times* prejudices in his "*Youth and Rebellion*" chapter:

"Many—policemen and others—thought this rebellion of 'mere boys' was directed as much against parents and elders as against British rule. This idea first became a common theme of police and press reports during the by-election campaigns of 1917, beginning with North Roscommon in February. Dubbed a 'women and childrens' election', Count Plunkett's victory as an abstentionist candidate was widely attributed to the activities of those too young to vote... Roscommon also produced the first stories that 'young members of the farmers' families used stringent intimidation on their elders'. The generational divide had apparently widened even further by May, when the next contest was held in South Longford. One local newspaper warned Irish Party voters beforehand that 'some of the young members of your household may put obstacles in your way' (quoted in *Irish Times*, 7 May 1917), while the *Irish Times* (8 May 1917) reported that: 'the enthusiasm of the young element has reached such a point as to cause family friction in many households. Some refused to help their fathers on the land unless they exacted a promise to support Mr McGuinness (the Sinn Féin candidate), while daughters declined to pursue their domestic duties without laying similar toll.' These reports of the intimidation of fathers by their children continued unabated through to the general election of December 1918. As for the latter event (when, for the first time, 'boys' could vote alongside their parents), one breathless account had it that: 'the

young people (egged on by their curates!) ran it and actually, in many cases locked the old people into their homes so that they might not be able to attend the booths.' (EH Ussher, 'True Story', Representative Church Body Library (Church of Ireland). See also *Irish Times*, 19 December 1918.) However, exaggerated, such claims reflected a widely shared perception of Sinn Féin—and especially the Volunteers—as a youth movement, and an almost equally shared apprehension of what this meant" (p166).

Hart did nothing to modify anything quoted above that might possibly have been "*exaggerated*", not to mind present the evidence that directly contradicted the profoundly prejudiced panorama which he so colourfully presented. Another example of Hart's deep-seated dishonesty. One talent that Hart undoubtedly had was to grub through the details of press reports in order to come up with juicy quotations to bolster up his own prejudiced 'thesis'. It is therefore inconceivable that, in coming across the above quotations from *Irish Times* election coverage, he failed to read that paper's actual **analysis**. The *Irish Times* could not have survived as a mere expression of crude prejudice, pure and simple. Being the self-styled 'paper of record', it was also expected to provide some thoughtful analysis. Hart's very determined decision to suppress that *Irish Times* analysis, lest it disturb the thrust of his story-telling, was the action of an academic liar. In a profoundly enlightening opinion piece, entitled "*How Count Plunkett Won North Roscommon The Inner Story Of The Contest (By One Who Was Through It)*", the *Irish Times* reported on 8th February 1917:

"The significance of the contest is to be found in the light which it throws on the mind of rural Ireland at the moment. Here is a constituency where three-fourths of the electorate are peasant proprietors under the various Land Purchase Acts. They were never getting better prices for their produce, and they were never better off. The Post Office Savings Bank deposits and the local banks are eloquent proof of this. Yet 3,023 of these men record their votes for the candidate recommended to them because he was the father of one of the leaders executed in Easter Week."

The *Irish Times* report did indeed emphasise the role of young Republican activists during that Roscommon election campaign. But its analysis had nothing in common with Hart's crude caricature of it as some sort of Maoist-style Cultural Revolution undertaken by landless Red Guard youth against their peasant proprietor fathers. *The Irish Times* correctly

saw it as an unqualified National Revolution by the peasant proprietors themselves against British rule and the Redmondite Party that had been compromised by Britain's Imperialist War. That *Irish Times* opinion piece had opened with the sentence:

"Count Plunkett won North Roscommon on the anti-conscription cry and the appeal to the people's sentiments in connection with the rebellion of Easter Week." (My emphasis.)

And it ended with a set of conclusions designed to disabuse its Loyalist readership of any illusions about what direction the march of Irish democracy was taking:

"The result of the election is a portent. It means that, if Mr. Redmond's party join the Liberal soreheads by forcing a General Election, they will be swept out of three-fourths of their seats in rural Ireland by the same forces that carried Count Plunkett to victory in a place like North Roscommon, believed to be so peaceful and so free from Sinn Féin and the rebellion taint." (My emphasis.)

And what of Crozier? He was a military man who neither cited the 1918 General Election results nor used the term "*self-determination*". But he made clear that it was an Irish **majority** he'd been sent to suppress, and the term he used was "*self-assertion*". Of the two grandfathers to whom he had dedicated his 1931 book, *A Word To Gandhi: The Lesson of Ireland*, he wrote of one, Major W.F. Percy:

"My grandfather, a retired Army officer and a resident magistrate in Ireland for years, said of Dublin Castle, the seat of Irish misgovernment and immorality, so far back as 1884, '*This place must be blown up some day. It is the only way; it's too vile!*'..." (pp86-7).

The declared purpose of the book was to appeal to British public opinion to learn the lessons of Ireland and not repeat the same misjudgements in India with even more devastating consequences:

"The lesson to be deduced for India is that Englishmen, Scotsmen and Welshmen must insist that the Lloyd George folly in Ireland, the Churchill folly about Natal and Ireland ... and the Coalition folly in Westminster in 1920-21, is not repeated in 1931-32 in India, Delhi and Westminster" (p76).

"Mr Winston Churchill, who as a member of the Government once did much to bring about and prolong the trouble in Ireland and then rectified his mistakes, is now making more mischief in India" (p85).

"The Lloyd George-Winston Churchill mentality in Ireland in 1920-21 was bad enough. Winston Churchill in India would be even worse" (p67).

"The most crying need to-day is for

men who think as Mr Churchill does about India to be kept out of Parliament and public life" (p36).

Notwithstanding his unrealistic faith in the Treaty as a final settlement, Crozier's introduction undoubtedly packed a punch:

"The 'trouble' in Ireland—brought to a conclusion in 1921 by a belated agreement with England after years of strife—and the 'trouble' in India—not yet terminated—possess a common factor. Both 'troubles' arose from a mistaken view on the part of the English of what is really true 'Patriotism'. What most of us—I am not among them—consider 'Patriotism' to be, is far from what 'Patriotism' really is. This mistaken notion has caused rebellions, revolutions, wars, massacres, slavery and misery, and incidentally, the so-called 'Irish Problem', 'Indian Problem, and long ago, 'the Problem' which lost England her North American colonies ... 'Patriotism', derived from *patria*, country, and in its turn from *pater*, father, is supposed to denote 'Love of Country'. Left alone it no doubt does, but alas, it has not been left alone, as to it has been added a vastly different ingredient, 'Loyalty'. 'Loyalty' to what?... 'My country, right or wrong'... Very nice, no doubt, but entirely immoral, for no 'Government' can be always right and no 'wrong' can be ever right... The truth is, as Washington and Collins found out, as Gandhi is finding out, by guile of Governments, 'Patriotism' (cum 'Loyalty') has become a world religion in which flags, statues, war trophies, unknown warriors, war memorials, shrines, tombs, cenotaphs, anniversaries of victories and 'great days', graves, war gratuities, promotion, profiteering and the two minutes' silence are worshipped and bowed down to as were the golden images by idolators of old. In the face of this false worship, nothing matters! Wrong is Right!" (pp11-14).

Poppycock is not without an antidote! Crozier went on to begin his first chapter thus:

"There is some similarity between the struggles of Ireland and India for self-expression. Both countries were in turn occupied by England for gain. Both became 'planted'. Both became permanently entwined in the mesh of English economics and finance... The denial of self-expression in the constitutional manner by England led both countries into the paths of resistance, Ireland eventually finding her soul at the pistol's mouth ... The pistol's mouth in Ireland in 1920 and 21 (resorted to because constitutional methods had failed for forty years) spelt unrestricted red blood on both sides" (pp17-18).

Crozier, the British Army Brigadier-General, did indeed describe assassinations carried out as part of Ireland's War of Independence as "*murder*" (while fully

acknowledging IRA ambushes as military action), but—unlike Hart—he did at least recognise it as a War of Independence, backed by the will of the majority of the Irish people:

"Michael Collins ... succeeded because, although (he) stooped to undiluted murder, they (Sinn Fein) admitted the offence as the only possible way out, while the British Government, employing the same means as its adversary, not only denied its use but endeavoured to saddle Sinn Fein with the atrocities committed by its agents! ... Ireland denied none of the murders committed her men, but still objects strongly to being saddled with the murders of such well-known Irishmen as McCurtain (Lord Mayor of Cork), O'Callaghan (Mayor of Limerick), the ex-Mayor of Limerick and Father Griffin..." (pp20-1).

Crozier noted how elected representatives had been particularly targeted:

"During the 'Terror' in Ireland, while Irishmen were at the mercy of the 'Black-and-Tans', and the 'Black-and-Tans' were being murdered by Irishmen, and martial law was in force in Munster, the Mayor and ex-Mayor of Limerick were murdered in their houses, in front of their wives, at night, during curfew hours, by policemen disguised as Sinn Feiners" (p81).

"The Lord Mayor of Cork and other public men were murdered by the British Government's police in order that the world should be made to believe that Sinn Fein was divided—which was far from being the case—the wicked and intensely stupid deeds being publicly credited in the Press to the Irish People... The victim of the RIC gunmen's bullets was Lord Mayor McCurtain, a prominent Sinn Fein volunteer, a Republican and a Member of the Imperial Parliament, who never took his seat at Westminster. This man was done to death in his house, in the presence of his wife, by a party of policemen disguised as 'Shinners', in the dead of night... A coroner's jury brought in a verdict of wilful murder against the authorities. Of course the men who made up this murder party were transferred separately to different and far-away parts of Ireland... When the English people became shocked from time to time at news of the murder of a presumably harmless Irish policeman walking on his country beat far removed from strife, they naturally did not understand. Why should they? How were they to know they were merely reading of the gradual extermination of the Cork police murderers? Every one of the murderers or accessories to the murder was eventually accounted for, including a senior officer, who, having been hidden in the Isle of Man for some months, was murdered shortly after his return to duty in another part of Ireland, on his way from church. The murder of this officer, in a Protestant quarter, caused more loss of life and

considerable destruction of property. The murder of McCurtain by the police was responsible for the murder or death of dozens, perhaps hundreds, of other people, for the gradual extermination of each policeman murderer caused a huge reprisal, and so on" (pp21-2).

This was a British war against the majority of the Irish people, as Crozier concluded (my emphasis):

"In the martial law area in Munster, warning proclamations were issued by the competent military authority ... setting forth the penalties for 'harbouring' rebels, 'carrying arms' or 'assisting the enemy'. These repressive measures were penalties for acts of rebellion. The fact was lost sight of by the military that the innocent suffered and *the majority of the population of Munster was in revolt* ... 'Harbouring' was thus universal ... After an ambush in the martial law area, the competent military authority invariably burnt the cottage or cottages of peasants nearest to the scene of the disaster, despite the fact that the occupants might have known nothing whatsoever about it ... But the trouble did not end there. After the burning of a cottage worth, say, £500, the local Sinn Fein rebels invariably took up the matter and arranged their own reprisal! As the rebellion had degenerated into a clash between upper-class misrule and the lower-class population, it was obvious that the Sinn Fein bonfires would not be kindled in the home of a mere worker, but would be set going in the £10,000 mansion of a landlord, which is exactly what happened! If the truce had not become operative in the summer of 1921, the ever-increasing vicious circle would have gone on expanding indefinitely. The burning of the £10,000 mansions and the refusal of insurance companies to pay, had a great deal to do with the advent of peace in Ireland!" (pp73-4).

For anyone who has had the stomach to read—or re-read—Peter Hart, a subsequent reading of F.P. Crozier, for all his sins, certainly comes as a welcome breath of fresh air!

**Manus O'Riordan**

General F.P. Crozier: *The Men I Killed* (1937), *Irish Memoirs and other writings*. Introduction by *Brendan Clifford*. 152 pp. Index. ISBN 0 85034 085 3. AB, 2002. **£10, £7.50**.

You can buy subscriptions, books and pamphlets online and pay by credit/debit card from:

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

**ITEMS FROM 'THE IRISH BULLETIN' – 7**

The "Irish Bulletin" (7th July 1919 – 11th Dec.1921) was the official organ of Dáil Eireann during the 1919 – 1921 period. Lawrence Ginnell, then Director of Publicity for the Dáil, first started it in mid 1919 as a "summary of acts of aggression" committed by the forces of the Crown. This newsheet came out fortnightly, later, weekly. We reprint below the summaries published for January 1920

Date:-	Dec. 29 <sup>th</sup> .	30 <sup>th</sup> .	31 <sup>st</sup> .	Jan.1 <sup>st</sup> .	2 <sup>nd</sup> .	3 <sup>rd</sup> .	Total.
Raids:-	1	25	2	-	1	5	34.
Arrests:-	3	5	2	-	3	-	13.
Sentences:-	-	-	1	6	1	1	9.
Proclamations & Suppressions:	-	-	-	-	1	4	5.
Armed Assaults:	1	-	-	1	1	-	3.
Courtmartials:-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1.
Murder:-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1.
Daily Total:-	7	30	5	7	6	10	66.
Date:-	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	Total.
Raids:-	25	4	155	3	52	31	270.
Arrests:-	-	-	6	6	1	1	14.
Sentences:-	-	2	1	4	-	-	7.
Deportations:-	-	-	4	-	-	-	4.
Armed Assaults:-	2	1	-	-	-	-	3.
Daily Total:-	27	7	166	13	53	32	298.
Date:-	12 <sup>th</sup> .	13 <sup>th</sup>	14 <sup>th</sup>	15 <sup>th</sup>	16 <sup>th</sup>	17 <sup>th</sup>	Total.
Raids:-	52	65	10	15	-	55	197.
Arrests:-	1	14	2	11	31	4	63.
Sentences:-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1.
Armed Assaults:-	1	1	-	-	1	-	3.
DAILY TOTAL:-	54	80	13	26	32	59	264.
Date:-	?	20th	21st	22nd	23 <sup>rd</sup>	24 <sup>th</sup>	Total.
Raids:-	1	100	151	26	2	1	281.
Arrests:-	4	7	7	16	-	1	35.
Sentences:-	1	2	-	11	-	1	15.
Suppressions:-	1	1	1	1	1	-	5.
Armed Assaults:-	1	-	1	1	1	-	4.
Courtmartials:	-	-	-	-	1	-	1.
Deportations:-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1.
Daily Totals:-	8	110	160	55	6	3	342.

Date:-	26th	27th	28th	29th	30th	31st	Total
Raids:-	104	70	-	10	-	12	196.
Arrests:-	5	8	3	18	-	6	40.
Sentences:-	-	-	1	-	7	-	8.
Courtmartials:	-	2	-	-	-	-	2.
Suppressions:-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2.
Murder:-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1.
Daily Total:-	111	81	4	28	7	18	249.

Does  
It  
Up

Stack  
?

#### INSIDE JOB

The documentary film by Charles Ferguson, *Inside Job* made by Sony Pictures (USA) and screened on Channel Four just before Christmas, goes a long way to explaining how and why the Recession happened. He ruthlessly interviews the top culprits who are named and shamed out of their own mouths, assisted by some tight editing. But there was no need to add anything. These US bankers, regulators, academic economists and the rating agencies seemed to be only too eager at first to boast of what they had done. Until, in interview after interview, each of them began to realise the approach of the pit they were digging for themselves and for their organisations—and their faces and their body language expressively told the rest of their sad story.

Or rather our sad story, because it became clear that the Baddies were winning here and we were on the losing side and will be for some time to come. What you are looking at in *Inside Job* is the greatest all-time raid on US and on world-wide society. The money did not go away, it may have been lost by us and by our society but it was stolen by these crooks and hoodlums and they have it and their families will have it for many generations to come. Broadly speaking, the 1873 Great Depression pauperised the middle income group and pauperised the already impoverished poor. Then the 1929 Wall Street Crash again took from the poor and from the middle-income people whatever savings they had accumulated. But this present Recession has not only plundered whatever wealth and savings we may have had but the future generations have been plundered by the way credit—bank credit, and State credit, and credit card credit—was taken and sequestered to themselves by these crooks. They are the super-rich because they bribed and corrupted their way into super-wealth and there is no indication whatsoever that they will stop bribing and corrupting.

Look at what is happening. Effectively, nothing is happening. The lid is being kept on. Some steam is escaping or being let off but essentially nothing is being allowed to happen to endanger the wealth of the super-rich. Has the *Glass-Steagall Act* been re-enacted in the USA? Has it .....? Have obviously crooked things like *short-selling* been firmly outlawed? Have credit

default swaps, securitisation, derivatives, CFDs and all the rest of the burglary tools been made illegal? No, they have not. Why not?

Because the lawmakers are still controlled by the crooks—there is no other explanation. *Inside Job* will, hopefully, open people's eyes to how we've all being done now and well into the future. The so-called Troika—the IMF, ECB, and EU—are the police acting for the super-rich and for their Private Banks. They are our enemies but you can observe the Stockholm Syndrome being catered for by the various media. We cannot stand being civil to those we know to be our enemies and so the media puts out jokes and jests about them and so we laugh in our own misfortune.

*Inside Job* itself—although it attacked bankers, credit ratings agencies and regulators—dealt only with the USA. Of course the rot started there and was worse there than elsewhere but why did it not deal with the UK? Why indeed! And why did it not deal with the Big accounting firms to which a huge amount of the blame should be attributed? The Balance Sheets of the banks were supposed to be audited by these firms and the firms certainly charged huge money for their auditing, but they did not blow a whistle even though it was patently obvious what was happening on the faces of the Balance Sheets. So *Inside Job* has censored itself but, keeping this in mind, it is still worth viewing.

A note in G2 of the Guardian newspaper, 18th February 2011 said *Inside Job* was released on that day and so it should be available. But you may have to persist in your pursuit of it. Senior Freemasons get angry at the mention of it and mutter about "*conspiracy theories*" and suchlike. To readers of the *Irish Political Review* all of the foregoing will be interesting but it is a great pity indeed that our politicians and regulators did not read John Martin's article in the June 2000 issue of the *Irish Political Review*. This article said it all under the heading of *Ireland: A Nation Running On Credit?* And that was back in 2000. Eight years before the bubble burst.

#### CORPORATION TAX

The 12.5% rate of Corporation Tax is very defensible indeed. It is a major reason for US, German, Chinese and other foreign-owned companies to be employers of large numbers of people in Ireland. It is not so high as to drive employers out of Ireland and it is not so low as to excite too much jealousy abroad. There is a good case to be made for a Nil Tax rate on limited liability companies which are employers. It costs capital to create jobs—

anywhere from €30,000 per job for retailing jobs up to €750,000 or more per job for high-tech manufacturing jobs and if a company is successful, as reflected in more profits, there will be more jobs. Personal taxation on the incomes of shareholders, managers, and workers should be enough to provide for State expenditure on security infrastructure, education, health etc etc. So there is a good case for a NIL corporation tax rate.

To a business manager what matters is not so much the rate (the nominal rate of 12.5% for example) as the effective rate. This is because in all countries the *taxable profits* are a very different amount to the actual profits calculated according to the normal accounting rules. In turn, this is because the Tax Acts specify in accordance with public policy that certain allowances or disallowances will be made as adjustments to the actual accounting profits before arriving at what is called the taxable profits and it is this latter figure of taxable profits to which the nominal tax rate is applied to find the tax payable. The tax payable as a percentage of the accounting profits gives the "*effective rate*" of tax. Every good business manager will calculate and compare the "*effective rate*" on the company profits in various countries so as to monitor which country is most advantageous for the company to be headquartered in. Germany for example has a large manufacturing sector for which there are huge tax allowances and thus a low effective rate. Ireland has not got a huge manufacturing sector and therefore would not have the huge allowances and so its effective rate is higher. It is not a simple matter to compare nominal rates of tax from one country to another.

#### FEE-PAYING AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Teacher's Union of Ireland and some of the grassroots section of the Labour Party are pushing very strongly for the fee-paying schools to receive less support from the tax-payers. Last year, the Union's President Bernie Ruane asked the Minister of Education, Ruairí Quinn to cut state support completely, which the Minister wisely refused to do. Because: the children would still need to be taught in schools, would still need teachers to be paid. And the fees presently being paid by the parents are so high that any increase in fees would be unbearable, with the likely result that children or even whole schools would go into the public non-fee-paying school system. If that were to happen the cost to the ordinary tax-payer would be a lot higher. Schools in the public system do not receive fees from parents. They do get capitation grants from the tax-payers and

## GUILDS continued

also unknown to the guild system—whose contribution to production consisted of money, enterprise and commercial ability but not of craft knowledge or skill. The structure of the guilds was too rigid, conservative and localised to be capable of rapid adjustment to these new conditions. Under the pressure of economic events it began to give way.

Another powerful cause operating against the guilds was the dominance of the economic theory of mercantilism during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. According to this the prosperity of a people was not to be judged by the prosperity of agriculture, the balance of agriculture with industry, the stability of prices and general content. It was to be judged by foreign trade, because only by foreign trade could a nation acquire a store of gold, and without gold wars could not be fought. This doctrine set a premium on colonies, wars of expansion, exploiting companies and foreign trade. Hence any influence that restricted the volume of trade and production was regarded as harmful to national prosperity.

But the most powerful influence operating against the guilds was the spirit of intense individualism and optimism which swept the eighteenth century. There was a widespread demand that individuals and society should be freed from every restriction and allowed the fullest freedom; there was further an absolute belief that by natural law this freedom would produce peace, progress and unlimited prosperity for everyone. The system of regulation of

price-conditions by State municipality or guild was scoffed at as antiquated, stupid, cumbrous and contrary to the natural laws of liberty and progress.

Hence, one of the principal acts of the French Revolution was to abolish the guilds by the *loi Chapelier* of 1791. It was believed that freedom demanded the absence of any intervening body between the individual citizen and the all-powerful State. In Great Britain and Ireland the guilds perished by inanition; their legal powers were abolished by the Corporation Acts of 1835 and 1840, but long before that date they had ceased to exercise any control of industry or trade and performed only the function of friendly societies or satisfied the demand for historical pageantry in civic affairs.

In other European countries where economic liberalism made slower progress the guilds showed great tenacity and in Germany they continued to protect craft-workers, and had nearly a million members in the year 1931.

Mr. Toulmin Smith, who looks with indulgence on the dissolution of the monasteries, is indignant at the spoliation of these *lay* institutions: "a case of pure wholesale robbery and plunder; . . . no page so black in English history" (Toulmin Smith, Editor, *English Guilds*, 1870, Preface by Dr. Luis Brentano, p.xlii).

The downfall of the guilds was not due to the fact that they were based on false or vicious principles.

"The attempt to preserve a rough equality among 'the good men of the mystery', to check economic egotism by insisting that every brother shall share his good fortune with another and stand by his neighbour in need, to resist the encroachments of a conscienceless money power, to preserve professional standards of training and craftsmanship, and to repress by a strict corporate discipline the natural appetite of each to snatch special advantages for himself to the injury of all—whether these things outweigh the evils of conservative methods and corporate exclusiveness is a question which each student will answer in accordance with his own predilections" (Tawney, *ibid*, p27-8).

The right of workers and employers to associate; the principle of the regulation of prices and conditions by a domestic authority subject to municipal and State control; the principle that the local or central authorities should regulate industry and trade for the common good; the principle that master and craftsman each has a right to the necessaries befitting his station in life; these are not false or vicious principles. The downfall of the guilds was due partly to the fact that they were not able to preserve these principles sufficiently in a time of transition and industrial revolution but mainly to the fact that these principles had been temporarily overshadowed in the public mind by contrary ideas and ambitions which glorified individual freedom, expansion of trade and colonial exploitation, and took too optimistic a view of the consequences of freedom of contract.

**(To be continued next issue)**

their teachers are paid by the tax-payers also. So in reality what the fee-paying schools do is to take over 120 million euros per year from parents who are already also contributing as tax-payers to the public school system. They are paying twice over. Who are we to stop them? Certainly, the children attending fee-paying schools are privileged but would it not be better to aim for all children to be privileged rather than attempting to pull down those who are privileged now?

### ULTRA-PRIVILEGED SCHOOLS

On 3rd January 2012, a very interesting list was shown on *The Irish Times*. It showed fifty-four names of fee-paying schools and the Capital Funding provided in the years 2007-2011. What was interest-

ing about this list was that non-Catholic schools were way out ahead when it came to drawing down Capital Grants. Way out ahead as a group. The highest was Drogheda Grammar at €1,481,493, then Dundalk Grammar at €1,160,821 and Middleton College at €1,097,582. Six non-Catholic schools got €8,259,766—an average of €1,037,353 each, whereas the other 48 schools got a total of €8,259,766—an average of €172,078 each. So, what is going on? The difference is glaring. €1,037,353 as against €172,078! It does not seem to Stack up! But perhaps there is some Departmental wisdom behind the figures? It just doesn't stack up and maybe the Teacher's Union of Ireland (TUI) would look into it?

Michael Stack. ©

### NEEDS SECTIONED?

Kim Jong-il dies, the media sickens in competition to be of mean spirit, the rhetoric of a cold war they inherit, causing their intelligence to thicken. Liberal values makes Korea conform without bombing, assassination drones, sabotage incursions and no-fly-zones? The free-world-press descends as a snowstorm. Cry democracy, those tears from war-cries can burn away the heart of a nation. A million-army, a nuclear bomb denies rape and mindless, murderous laceration. The sit in suits, bourgeois language disguises the gangster soul that craves defenestration.

Wilson John Haire  
5th January, 2012

## GUILDS continued

and apply justice in social and economic affairs. Medieval society was impregnated with the belief that ethical and moral values dominated economic activity. The notion of the community as an organic body, in which different classes perform different functions, was generally accepted. The principle that each man was entitled to the necessities benefitting his station in life was regarded as self-evident and what each station required depended on its function or contribution to the common good. "Medieval society was based on inequality between classes and equality within classes." The system secured peace, stability and justice; these were the things that the Middle Ages wanted most. It did not open up the prospect of unlimited profit and unlimited gain, but then people in the Middle Ages did not think it any advantage to a community to enable a few citizens to become millionaires.

The regulations of the craft guilds sought to eliminate unfair competition and sharp practices in order that each craftsman could secure by his industry a decent standard of living for himself and his dependents. They regulated prices, conditions of work and apprenticeship in order to safeguard the craftsman; but they also fixed standards of materials, workmanship and finished product in order to safeguard the consumer. The fixation of a just price was not then regarded as impossible; on the contrary, it was considered an elementary need of ordered life and social organization. In order that the guilds could successfully enforce their regulations two conditions had to be fulfilled: first, that all men who carried on the trade in the town should be members, and, secondly, that the town authorities should recognize the guild as the competent authority to deal with these matters. The history of the guilds up to the fourteenth century shows how this position was gradually attained.

In addition to trade regulation in the interest of justice to craftsmen and community, the guild also performed many of the functions now performed by friendly societies and the State. It looked after the member in sickness and old age; it provided for his dependents after his death; it also operated a system of insurance. Its apprenticeship system secured proper technical training for the learner and a steady supply of competent workmen for the trade.

In the period from the tenth to the

fifteenth century, industry was on a very limited scale and generally conducted in the master's home where master, journeyman and apprentice lived in personal contact. There was generally no great disparity between masters in the size of their establishments, number of workers or store of materials. Hence the craft guild, while giving a dominant position to masters, secured the interests of all members of the craft.

---

*"This sort of aggressive conformity is critical to how events unfold in the next few months. The German people value their local towns, worry about their neighbours' views, relish the rules and are rewarded accordingly by a social and economic system that really does work.*

*"A traditional explanation, with oddly persistent roots, was that the success was to do with the flourishing of a Protestant work ethic—but today some of the most productive areas of Germany, particularly the overwhelmingly prosperous Baden and Bavaria, are Catholic. And the most miserable bits of the country happen to be Protestant" (Simon Winder, *Sunday Telegraph*, 20.11.2011).*

---

It is well to guard against exaggeration as to the extent of guild organization in the Middle Ages.

"To suggest that anything like a majority of medieval workers were ever members of a craft guild is extravagant. In England, at any rate, more than nine-tenths were peasants, among whom, though friendly societies called guilds were common, there was naturally no question of craft organization. Even in the towns it is a question whether there was not a considerable population of casual workers—consider only the number of unskilled workers that must have been required as labourers by the craftsmen building a cathedral in the days before mechanical cranes—who were rarely organized in permanent societies. To invest the craft guilds with a halo of economic chivalry is not less inappropriate. They were, first and foremost, monopolists, and the cases in which their vested interests came into collision with the consumer were not a few" (Tawney, *ibid*, p26).

"There are, however, monopolists and monopolists. An age in which combinations are not tempted to pay lip-service to religion may do well to remember that the characteristic, after all, of the medieval guild was that, if it sprang from economic needs, it claimed at least to subordinate them to social interests, as conceived by men for whom the social and the spiritual were inextricably intertwined" (Tawney, *ibid*, p27).

The decay of the guilds was due to many causes and was a long process varying as to duration and intensity in different countries. Although there were complaints and abuses even before the fifteenth century the guilds continued to exist for many centuries and to fulfil at least some useful functions. As we know from modern experience, the existence of complaints is not proof that an institution is moribund or entirely useless. After the fifteenth century there was a great growth in trade and manufacture and a more intense application of finance to industry. Workshops became larger and masters now sought power to employ more journeymen. Some masters were able to employ large capital in acquiring stocks; the moral objections to usury were being disregarded in practice; in manufacture itself functions were becoming more complicated and specialized. Guilds began to divide into sections for specialized crafts and some of these crafts dominated the others by determining prices of materials or conditions of work. A new class of wealthy master began to appear who, in co-operation with the wealthy merchant, sought opportunities for bigger production and release from the restrictions of the guilds. In many cases this class gained control of the guilds, made them close family corporations and used them for narrow, selfish interests. The journeymen reacted by trying to make their own defences tighter. So we find many denunciations of the guild system for being exclusive, creating undue privilege and monopoly and acting in restraint of trade.

The monopoly, which formerly was exercised with due regard to the interest of the community in a just price and good quality, came to be exercised in a more selfish manner, with more regard to the interests of the individual and of the craft than of other crafts and the common good. With the progress of time the inability of the guild system to cope with the new circumstances in industry and commerce became apparent. Improvement in transport and commerce bought with it competition on a national scale, difficulties in controlling quality, prices and conditions of work and the rise of commercial middlemen. As towns grew, they attracted large numbers of untrained workers who remained outside the skilled crafts and were not absorbed by the guilds. The growth of capital and the development of the factory system based on machinery and power introduced the entrepreneur—

continued on page 29

## GUILDS continued

medieval period. Merchant guilds, associations of international traders, were powerful in the 12th and 13th centuries. They lost ascendancy with the rise of the craft guilds, associations of master craftsmen, journeymen, apprentices, and the various traders connected with a particular craft. Some craft guilds secured royal charters of incorporation, as did the livery companies of the city of London, the most famous survivors in England of the medieval craft guilds" (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1978).

The Commission held its first meeting on 2nd March, 1939, at which the Taoiseach, Mr. de Valera, attended and explained in some detail the task which the Government was entrusting to the Commission. He described vocational organization as an organization of society "in which people who are engaged in similar callings or professions naturally gravitate together to promote the interests of those professions or callings".

The phrase had been used in English since 1917 at least, when Sidney and Beatrice Webb published a study of vocational organization in Great Britain in which the following passage occurs:—

"But there is another form of association open to the producers, which is very widespread and which has, during the past generation, been steadily increasing in its range, namely, that of the union of those concerned in any industry or service, not in little groups to manage particular enterprises, but in an association which aims at being co-extensive with their craft or occupation. This idea of Vocational Organization, basing itself on the steady increase of Professional Associations among brainworkers on the one hand, and of Trade Unions among the manual workers on the other, has latterly become the centre of the intellectual reaction that we have described against the dominance of the Association of Consumers" (*The New Statesman*, April 21st, 1917).

The phrase 'vocational organization' passed into general usage in this country, however, mainly as a result of the strong commendation of vocational organization contained in the Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931) of Pope Pius XI on the "Reconstruction of the Social Order."

Below we reproduce an extract from the 1943 Report presented by the Commission on Vocational Organization on "*The History of Vocational Organization—The Eighth to the Eighteenth Century—The Guilds*". It starts

with a quotation from the *New Statesman*.

"Prior to the eighteenth century it is not too much to say that the framework of society in all civilized countries—with the possible exception of the pioneers of the new world of the United States—was essentially vocational. We need not refer to the widespread social organization represented by the castes of India or the guilds of China. In Europe, during the whole, of the Middle Ages, and even throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, we find it taken for granted that the King governed through vocational associations, whether the Church and the Army, the Universities and the Colleges of law and medicine, or the agricultural Manor and the Municipal Craft Guild" (*The New Statesman*, London, April 21, 1917)

This statement of authorities who cannot be charged with partiality to guilds represents the accepted verdict of history. In the long period from the eighth to the eighteenth century it was taken for granted in all parts of civilized Europe that the most natural and useful form of human association was according to a man's profession, trade or craft; such associations proved themselves a solid basis from which municipal and political institutions grew.

The spirit of the age which produced the guilds is of some importance. A modern commentator on the period writes of this spirit:

"It is to be found in the insistence of medieval thinkers that society is a spiritual organism, not an economic machine, and that economic activity, which is one subordinate element within a vast and complex unity, requires to be controlled and repressed by reference to the moral ends for which it supplies the material means." (R.H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, p61 (Murray, London, 1936). Cf also *Preliminary Essay on Guilds*, by Lujo Brentano (English Guilds, Toulmin Smith); *European Civilization, Its Origins and Development*, edited by Edward Eyre, Vols, III and V.)

The same writer explains the structure of medieval society.

"The facts of class status and inequality were rationalized in the Middle Ages by a functional theory of society, as the facts of competition were rationalized in the eighteenth {century} by the theory of economic harmonies; and the former took the same delight in contemplating the moral purpose revealed in 'social organization as the latter in proving that to the curious mechanism of human society a moral purpose was superfluous or disturbing. Society, like the human body, is an organism composed of different members. Each member has its own

function, prayer, or defence, or merchandise or tilling the soil. Each must receive the means suited to its station, and must claim no more. Within classes there must be equality; if one takes into his hand the living of two, his neighbour will go short. Between classes there must be inequality; for otherwise a class cannot perform its function, or—a strange thought to us—enjoy its rights. Peasants must not encroach on those above them. Lords must not despoil peasants. Craftsmen and merchants must receive what will maintain them in their calling and no more" (Tawney, *ibid.*, p22).

The guilds came into existence under the influence of strong religious and charitable motives which stressed the elements of brotherhood, religious duty and mutual assistance. From the fraternity concerned with religious worship to the guild which looked after social and economic interests was an easy step, and the people of the early Middle Ages were forced to take it by the imperative need for protection and justice. The feudal state was weak and ill-organized; it gave the people of the towns little or no protection of liberty, property and trade against the violence of neighbouring nobles, the arbitrary exactions of feudal lords or the bold onset of robbers. Thus there grew up Town, Frith, Merchant, Craft and Journey-men guilds to unite and protect residents of a town and the members of a trade or craft.

The growth of the guilds was not without opposition. It is interesting to note that even in the ninth century many regarded the development of such organizations with disfavour as weakening central authority. The Emperor Charlemagne issued a series of capitularies in order to suppress and annihilate them. But the movement endured and branched out, and if a section of the population felt itself oppressed or aggrieved, as at an early period the craftsmen felt towards the merchants, its remedy was to form a guild of its own.

This system of vocational organization proved itself to have extraordinary vitality and endurance. It lasted for nearly a thousand years—which is a very long period in the history of civilized Europe. Its endurance can be understood only when one understands the principles on which it was based. Originally it arose from the general desire for internal peace and justice as well as security from external danger. The guilds definitely set out to maintain justice as between members and were quite convinced that it was possible to define

continued on page 30



**LABOUR**

# Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 30 No. 2

ISSN 0790-1712

## MONDRAGON, Part 4

*"The awfulness of all this can be best appreciated by comparison with the continental development of the working class which was centred on the evolution of the Medieval Guilds. The development of a working class in this way was not a negative reactive one. It was always a positive engagement with the functioning of society as a whole and the advance of one was inseparable and incomprehensible from that of the other. They were an organic part of society that was given mystical expression via Corpus Christi.*

*"In short it was the difference between a civilized development of society and the barbarism of class war. (Jack Lane-Labour and Trade Union Review-November, 2011).*

# The Guilds and Capitalism

In 1939, the Fianna Fail Government led by Eamon de Valera set up the Commission on Vocational Organization to report on the practicability of developing vocational organization in Ireland; the means of achieving this; the rights and powers that should be conferred on vocational bodies; and the relationship between vocational bodies and the Government and Legislature. Irish interest in vocational organization was a response to the publication in 1931 of the Papal Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*, which discussed the "Reconstruction of the Social Order".

Mary E. Daly, Associate Professor of History in University College Dublin, wrote in *The Oxford Companion To Irish History* (1998):

"It was also in part a reaction against the substantial increase in the intervention by government in the economy since the Fianna Fail government had come to power in 1932. Support for the concept was much stronger within Fine Gael, the main opposition party, than in government ranks. The commission recommended the establishment of a national vocational organization, which would act as the final arbiter in disputes between various interest groups and would play a major role in negotiating collective wage and price agreements. When the report was published in 1943 it was largely ignored, though it influenced the structure of the Labour Court which was established in 1946" (p105-06).

"De Valera placated the Catholic integralist lobby by setting up the Commission on Vocational Organization on 10 January 1939. The temperamental Bishop of Galway, Michael Browne, was made

chairman. There was nothing like a group of self-declared experts getting on with the job of proposing solutions', commented {Sean} MacEntee many years later. That was one way to deal with a difficult and persistent lobby" (Dermot Keogh, Professor of History, University College, Cork, *New Gill History of Ireland, Twentieth Century Ireland*, Gill & Macmillan, 2005).

The Commission Report is a remarkable document made up of 500 pages. Chairman of the Commission was the Bishop of Galway, Michael Browne, and 24 other members, including Trade Unionists, James Larkin, Snr., Miss Louie Bennett, Senator Sean Campbell, Senator Thomas Foran and Luke J. Duffy. Professors Alfred O'Rahilly and Michael Tierney and several members of the Protestant faiths also served on the Commission.

In his Foreword, the Chairman stated that: *"The Report is a serious effort to show how abstract principles can be applied to the concrete realities of our complex social and economic life."*

Seventy years later, it is not difficult to be casual and disparaging about the aims of the Commission but in 1943, the fate of civilization was being fought out between Capitalism, Communism and Fascism and the Irish state itself had suffered a civil war at its foundation 20 years previously.

The core emphasis in this article is on the Guilds and their contribution to the rise of the Trade Union movement. As the tidal wave of Finance Capital sweeps across the world, imposing uninhibited Free Trade and the concerted destruction of Workers' Rights: it is imperative that the Labour movement begins to reassert the ethical and moral obligations of this economic activity. The Commission article printed below gives a lucid and definitive role played by the Guilds for over a thousand years in the development of civilization.

"Guilds, in medieval western Europe, associations formed for mutual aid and protection and for the furtherance of religious or professional interests. The earliest guilds seem to have been the frith or peace guilds, groups associated for mutual aid after the breakdown of the protection originally provided by the earlier institution of the kin (or group related by blood ties). Religious confraternities, for purely spiritual objects, existed throughout the

continued on page 31

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

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

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

### Subscription by Post:

**12 issues: £20, UK;  
€ 30, Ireland; € 35, Europe.**

### Electronic Subscription:

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

You can also order from:

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