

# IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

July 2014

Vol.29, No.7 ISSN 0790-7672

and **Northern Star** incorporating **Workers' Weekly** Vol.28 No.7 ISSN 954-5891

## D-isinformation Day

Martin Wolf of the *Financial Times* wrote in the *Irish Times* on the anniversary of D-Day:

"One hundred years ago Europe's fragile order fell apart. Seventy years ago the democracies launched an assault on totalitarian Europe. Twenty-five years ago Europe became whole and free".

Or, to put it another way: A hundred years ago Britain wrecked a pretty stable European order for the purpose of destroying Germany, which had developed too successfully on a line pioneered by England; seventy years ago Britain clambered back on the Continent, lest Nazi Germany should be destroyed without it by its totalitarian Russian enemy; twenty-five years ago Europe reverted to national warfare within, accompanied by destructive military adventures abroad.

What Britain did a hundred years ago was written about a hundred years ago by two Irish writers who played a critical part in establishing a national state in Ireland. Connolly described the British intervention in the European War as *The War Upon The German Nation*, and Casement as *The Crime Against Europe*. Their arguments have not been refuted in this era of mass higher education which trains people to think that they think for themselves. Mention Connolly and the War to a properly educated intellectual of our time and the response is not reasoned disagreement but physical recoil from thought. Connolly plus The Great War trigger a conditioned reflex. The Murder Machine didn't leave with the British administration.

The World War—Britain's enhancement of the European War—was destructive, but a viable order of things might have survived it, if it had been ended by a Peace Conference worthy of the name. It was the Versailles Peace that was deadly.

The multi-national Hapsburg state did not collapse. The various nationalities in it fought for it in the Great War. There was no nationalist insurrection in it, as there was

*continued on page 2*

## The EU:

### *Interesting Times Ahead*

The selection of Juncker for EU Commission President could be a defining moment for the EU. The campaign for and against him has laid bare the realities of the current relationships among Member States individually and together as the Council of Ministers, the Parliament and the Commission. The most glaring reality is that the UK is not playing by the Community rules and has no intention of doing so. Its opposition to Juncker is not based on policy or principle apart from its principle of disrupting the EU.

The question is how long is the rest of the EU going to put up with this and which part of the trinity of powers of the EU will play the most effective role in countering this negative role, to the extent of forcing a UK exit. This will also define which of the trinity will be the central force in the EU and shape its future or its demise—and it is one or the other.

The fact that Juncker will get the job is not the end of the matter. Another ex-Luxembourg PM had the job before—

*continued on page 2*

## D-Day:

### *how cracks just keep appearing in a Big Lie*

The "D-Day" ceremonies in Normandy (France) on 6th June 2014 were as absurd as only the celebration of a Big Lie can be. British war-pipers—a sop to the Scots perhaps, to discourage them in their slow process of detachment from the UK—accompanied post-modern depictions of ballet dancing "Allied" troops heroically scaling the beaches and defences of Fortress

Europe. The lie is of course that D-Day brought about the liberation of Europe from the fiendish Nazis, restoring it to Freedom and Democracy.

In fact, across Europe, most people have only the vaguest idea of the 1944 "Battle of Normandy" and were quite bemused by the antics of the Leaders of the West this June on the beaches. The abiding fact for most Europeans of what brought about the end of Nazi rule in Europe is, and always will be, that the Red Army was rolling up the German armies on the Eastern Front and approaching the

borders of Germany itself at the very time that the secondary operation in Normandy—where at most about an eighth of the armies Germany had in the East were engaged—finally began. For them, the "Battle of Stalingrad" is both the actual and iconic pivotal event and turning point of the War. Even in France itself, this is widely understood to be the case, expressed in the extraordinary prestige enjoyed by the French Communist Party at the end of the War and for several decades thereafter. That D-Day was driven

*continued on page 2*

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>D-isinformation Day.</b> Editorial	1
<b>The EU: interesting times ahead.</b> Jack Lane	1
<b>D-Day: how cracks keep appearing in a Big Lie.</b> Philip O'Connor	1
<b>Readers' Letters: Western Front Association.</b> Donal Kennedy	3
<b>Lord Bew's Personal Peace Process.</b> Pat Walsh	4
<b>LA Samuel Beckett.</b> Wilson John Haire (Poem)	5
<b>Shorts from the Long Fellow</b> (Morgan Kelly On Piketty; Piketty On Property Tax; Troika; Quinn Family)	6
<b>Grannies Rule, OK!</b> John Morgan	7
<b>Royal Prefix Undermines State's Ethos.</b> TomCooper (Report)	9
<b>Massacre In West Cork.</b> Barry Keane (Comments and Clarifications in response to Brendan Clifford)	9
<b>A Professor And An Archbishop On Dunmanway.</b> Brendan Clifford	10
<b>Beached.</b> Wilson John Haire (Poem)	13
<b>Could A Belatedly Democratised Fascist Protector Of A Vicious Sectarian Murderer Ever Be Acceptable As Taoiseach?</b> Manus O'Riordan (Some Collinses And Somervilles, Part 6)	15
<b>Biteback: Request To Correct A Grotesque Historical Untruth In RTE News.</b> Philip O'Connor (Letter to RTE)	
<b>Brian Walker &amp; Dunmanway.</b> Niall Meehan (Full text of <i>Irish Independent</i> letter)	21
<b>Does It Stack Up?</b> Michael Stack (John Mandeville; Roy Foster)	22
<b>Extreme Care Needed By Senior Law Officers In The Use Of Language</b> Patrick Fahy (Report)	23
<p><i>Labour Comment</i>, edited by <b>Pat Maloney:</b>  <u>Guilds: Opinions And Comments</u>                      Mondragon, Part 31                      (back page)</p>	
<b>Doctors Differ! And Administrators?</b> Seán O Riain	24

tells it like it was: "*the Allied D-Day landings... ensured victory in Europe would not lie solely with one of the totalitarian powers*".

To sum up: the Democracies built up Nazi Germany in the 1930s as a force against Communism. Then they made war on Nazi Germany but conducted it in such a way that they ended up in alliance with Communism against it. And they had D-Day in 1944 in order to save part of Europe from Communism and resume conflict with it.

That is how the Victors in the Great War, who had no enemy of any consequence in 1919, conducted the affairs of the world under British leadership.

## D-Day

continued

as much by a US/UK intention to 'get into Europe' before the great Soviet ally had advanced too far westwards as by the concern to defeat Nazi Germany, is one of those things that Europeans know in their bones, despite the relentless myth-making aimed at convincing them otherwise.

The lie was given fulsome expression in the speeches of Obama, Hollande and Cameron at the absurd 6th June ceremonies. But no one is really fooled, despite Obama's plea—which is effectively an order—for UNESCO to declare the Beaches a "*World Heritage Site*", and Hollande's pathetic call for the Western Allies, having landed in Normandy in 1944 and restored Freedom and Democracy, never to leave Europe again. In an aside, Putin poured some sardonic cold water on proceedings by saying he had always been a great admirer of the *independent* French foreign policy pursued by the great Charles de Gaulle (the insinuation being of course that this has been abandoned by the more recent leaders of *la grande nation*).

As is the nature of Big Lies, the cracks in the D-Day story just keep appearing. The usually very anodyne and mindlessly globalist all-day French TV news channel, France24 ([www.france24.com](http://www.france24.com)), provided surprisingly good coverage of events throughout 6th June, including the Western Allied ceremony in Normandy. But the main event at the ceremonies even on the French news that day was not the ballet dancing of the British actor-soldiers, but the breakthrough meeting on the crisis in the Ukraine at the ceremonies themselves

in the United Kingdom. It was pulled to pieces by the victorious Empires at Versailles and unviable national states were set up in its place, making Eastern Europe a hotbed of nationalist passion and anti-Semitism. And the existing German state was not allowed to continue. The Germany Monarchy, which was at least as democratic as the British, was destroyed to order, and a chaotic form of ultra-democracy was put in its place. And the British Naval blockade of Germany was intensified at the end of the War and continued into the Summer of 1919, causing hundreds of thousands of death by starvation, in order to compel the new German Government to sign a confession of guilt for the War.

Germany was humiliated and plundered. Having done that, France wanted to disable it by extending its own borders and establishing a Protectorate over the Rhineland. But Britain would not allow that, as it would have made France too strong. So, having brutalised post-War Germany, Britain then encouraged its revival as a counter to France. And, in the 1930s, it collaborated actively with Hitler in breaking the Versailles conditions. It

was with British help that Nazi Germany became a major Power in the late 1930s.

Then Britain made war on Germany again, messed up the War, kept it going after the 1940 defeat, hoping for German/Russian War. When that happened, it resisted American pressure for a Second Front in 1942 and 1943, hoping that Germany and Russia would exhaust each other. It did not allow D-Day until 1944. It was clear by then that Germany and Russia would not exhaust each other, but that Russia would win conclusively, and would possibly appear at Calais if there was any further delay.

So we had D-Day in June 1944, when "*the democracies launched an assault on totalitarian Europe*". The landings were successful because nine-tenths of German military power was engaged in trying to slow down the irresistible Russian advance in the East. (Allied forces faced just 11 German Divisions. The Soviet Union had 228 Divisions facing it, as it commenced Operation Bagration.)

And when the Russians met the armies of the Johnny-come-lately democracies in Germany, the Cold War started.

In a later paragraph Martin Wolf almost

between Russian President Vladimir Putin and Ukrainian coup leader Petro Poroshenko, facilitated by—of all people—the German Chancellor. Given the day that was in it, these were all the wrong people to be hogging the headlines!

One of the simmering French resentments about the nature of the liberation in 1944 is the rarely mentioned slaughter of French civilians that occurred in the course of their liberation. Apparently on D-Day and in the course of the Battle of Normandy, 25,000 French civilians were killed by Allied carpet bombing, the main weapon in the Western arsenal. Much of this was superfluous: of no military significance. Hollande, to carry off his Freedom and Democracy thesis with any credibility with his domestic audience, and to the obvious embarrassment of British commentators, felt he had to refer to this "tragedy" at some length. (By the way, it was bombing, rather than battlefield brilliance, which finally beat the German Army there.)

This crack in the liberation story also set the tone for a remarkable panel discussion on France24. A very smart young Russian lady and an unusually bright British commentator turned the discussion around to the stark realities of the Soviet role in the war, and tossed in asides on the British contribution to those 25,000 French civilian deaths and the questionable military need for the wholesale "levelling" of German cities too. An American pressman on the panel was appalled at the direction the discussion was taking, and was reduced to trying to warn viewers of the dark forces at work in Russia, and how important D-Day had been in preventing those dark forces reaching the West! The cat just kept getting out of the bag.

Angela Merkel kept a low profile at the ceremonies, making no speeches and making a quiet and dignified visit to a cemetery that contained both Allied and German war dead. But she stole the headline with her Putin-Poroshenko meeting. Her whole bearing during the ceremonies—as indeed that of Vladimir Putin—was ambiguous. There has been intense irritation in Britain at the paltry €3m invested by the German Government in commemorations of World War One, compared to the over €19m being lavished by France and Britain on them. Merkel has dismissed these criticisms, saying what was more important was reconciliation between Europeans.

While Britain cannot contemplate 1914

## Western Front Association

I see the WFA was established by John Terraine, hagiographer of Douglas Haig and by Correlli Barnett.

I'm sure the latter's history of the British Army states that it was set up in the 17th Century to suppress the Irish Catholics.

Though claiming to be a non-political charity its leading lights were clearly right-wing Blimps. Farrar-Hockley, no less, ex GOC Northern Ireland.

It beggars belief that a citizen of Ireland would want to join it much less serving soldiers in the Irish Army or that Irish Army premises should host it.

There was a time when the only ones to march with the British Legion on Remembrance Day in Ireland were Irish branches of the British Union of Fascists, though the British Legion marched in Kevin O'Higgins's funeral.

I had the satisfaction to dine once, in FCA uniform in Collins Barracks, Cork (1958). My father spent one night there as a prisoner in May 1921. He was a good Irishman, and didn't play a treacherous role either.

**Donal Kennedy**

**Editorial Note:** It may interest readers that Michael Carragher, who featured in this magazine in the December 2013, and in the February and March issues, is said to be a member of the Western Front Association. The Dublin Branch of the WFA meets at Collins Barracks.

without ensuring that its war propaganda of that time is established to have been correct ("the Hun was to blame!"), Merkel avoids all such value judgements. The current exhibition in the German Historical Museum in Berlin on WW1 is a model of balance and anti-war remorse—indeed to an irritating extent—with anything like it unimaginable at the Imperial War Museum.

Merkel's politics on War Remembrance are much more of a kind with the powerful and simple symbolism of that judgement-free meeting of Francois Mitterand and Helmut Kohl, bowing in silence and hand in hand at the battlefield of Verdun in 1984. Compared to the simple truth of that meeting, that laid the foundations for an extraordinary decade of European integration largely driven by Mitterand, the antics at the Normandy beaches this 6th June were divisive, sad and undermined by the Big Lie they are meant to promote.

**Philip O'Connor**

## EU

**continued**

Santer—and a determined effort by Pat Cox and the European Parliament destroyed him and the moral authority of the Commission on a ridiculous corruption charge. The UK's opposition is likely to go on in the hope that another opportunity might arise to destabilise him and the Commission and cause further disruption as part of its on-going campaign against

the EU.

This UK campaign and its purpose must now be obvious even to the dogs in the street. It is to be hoped that the Parliament has learned some lessons from the Santer episode and remembers who helped to stoke it up within the EU.

The question now is who will galvanise and give consistent leadership to the opposition to the UK strategy, countering which will remain the main issue facing the EU. The Commission has not so far regained its authority from the Santer debacle to be in a position to do this. This could change if Juncker focuses, in effect, on the UK issue and counters it in his programme and his choice of portfolios. If he tries to buy off the UK with an important portfolio it will show he has learned nothing. Such an offer would be accepted with contempt and would only be putting off the inevitable. It would only be used as another UK disruption platform.

At present the Council of Ministers in effect means Angela Merkel. She has wavered over the Juncker appointment and says she cannot personally envisage the EU without the UK. When it comes to the UK she continues to live in the fantasy world that believes the UK 'saved' Europe from fascism. That it saved Europe from itself. And moreover that it did so out of the goodness of its ever caring heart. Europe can't therefore be trusted to look after itself.

However, she has been pushed by German public opinion and the European Parliament to maintain her support for Juncker. But she has made radical political decisions before and maybe she could do so again if and when she comes to the end of her tether with the UK. It would be the most important decision she could ever make, personally and politically, and her caution is therefore understandable. She has taken a first step in making it clear to Cameron at his mini-summit in Sweden on 11th June that getting your way with threats is not her understanding of how the Community works. In the context of diplomacy that is as good as saying that he should consider some sex and travel. That was a very good omen.

The Parliament must have had its eyes opened wide by UKIP's success in the UK and, as it has had to listen to its members

for years, it knows exactly what that means as there is no mistaking UKIP's message—least of all in the EP which it treats with contempt.

UKIP's success shows that, given an opportunity, popular feeling in the UK is increasingly anti-EU and this cannot now be lost on the EP. The Parliament has acquired more and more negative power *vis a vis* the Commission and it remains to be seen how it will use this with a Juncker Commission and whether it can turn it to positive power. If the Parliament acts as suggested above and uses the role allowed to the UK as its criteria for judging a Juncker Presidency—and the Council—it could help transform the situation for the better.

The EU could be in for interesting times.

**Jack Lane**

## Lord Bew's 'personal peace process'

Lord Bew defended himself in the *Sunday Independent* after the political policing arrest and detention of Gerry Adams by what the Professor would have called the Repressive State Apparatus.

Prof. Bew came into focus for his pivotal role in the Boston College Tapes which, according to the Ideological State Apparatus, had fingered the Sinn Fein leader for the Repressive State Apparatus to detain him for the killing of Jean McConville. The Sinn Fein leader then made a point of bringing attention to the role of the Lord Bew in all of this in his rather impressive post-release press conference.

Lord Bew penned an article for the *Sunday Independent* clarifying his position in relation to Boston College, Ed Moloney, Anthony McIntyre and the tapes (11.5.14). Here he said, as a—

"visiting scholar I did not appoint Ed Moloney, Anthony McIntyre... However, I was an admirer of Moloney's detailed knowledge of republicanism... He also had the advantage of having produced a work of contemporary history on Ian Paisley (much disliked understandably by Ian Paisley)..."

Why the completion of a hatchet job on Paisley would have commended Moloney to Prof. Bew is only explicable from the understanding that the Professor was an advisor to the Unionist Party and desired a similar job on Adams, which he knew Moloney was capable of writing.

Lord Bew regretted the decommissioning of the Boston Tapes after their surren-

der to the Repressive State Apparatus:

"It is clear... that... McIntyre believed that the Burns Library in Boston College would always be a safe place for these papers. For almost a decade that belief was vindicated and the archive was quietly built up. The recent PSNI interest in the tapes came late in the day. Both Moloney and McIntyre were disturbed at the turn of events and fought a legal battle to prevent premature disclosure. McIntyre said on the BBC programme *Spotlight* last week that, in hindsight, it was a mistake to publish Brendan Hughes tape following his death. At any rate, the police interest in the archive has ended up destroying the project."

We can conclude from this that the Boston College project and other oral histories were destroyed by firstly Ed Moloney's decision to publish *Voices from the Grave* for commercial or publicity purposes and by the actions of the British State in wishing to utilise Moloney's and McIntyre's work to do down Gerry Adams.

On Radio Ulster (6.5.14) Jack Dunn of Boston College revealed that Moloney and McIntyre neglected to know about the MLAT Treaty between US and Britain—which Maloney as a journalist should have made his business to know about. That was even though it pre-dated the Boston College Project by a number of years, going back to the time of the IRA ceasefire. Dunn also said that Moloney and McIntyre did not make it their business to check the contracts given to contributors that stated

the protection of their testimonies was subject to existing US Law.

In other words, Moloney and McIntyre placed their faith in British 'goodwill' after 1998 and then a US University to defend the project against the US judiciary!

The interviews on the tapes were sponsored by what is called the '*Boston College Center for Irish Programs IRA/UVF Project*'. The Boston College Editors of the Project explained in a Preface to the Moloney's book that exposed the tapes to the scrutiny of the Repressive State Apparatus:

"The transcripts of interviews... are subject to prescriptive limitations governing access. Boston College is contractually compelled to sequestering the taped transcriptions unless otherwise given full release, in writing, by the interviewees, or until the demise of the latter..."

That meant, in effect, that the interviewees were encouraged to speak freely about what they had done in the War, and who they had done it with, and to whom, on a guarantee of impunity. The guarantee came from the assurance that it would remain secret until they died, unless they chose to make it public, and would only be made public when they died. This arrangement meant that the interviewee might give evidence against others, and also against himself to lend it plausibility, without leaving himself open to prosecution, and without being present to defend any allegations against cross-examination with regard to the implication of others.

The effect of this has been that Brendan Hughes, who was disgruntled at how the Republican Leadership ended the War, was able to make accusations about Adams without challenge that have been used by the British and their media to re-open the War politically, presumably in an attempt to undermine Sinn Fein, culminating in the arrest and detention of the Sinn Fein leader.

The British Government, through its police service in 'Northern Ireland' demanded to have the tapes and the American Courts upheld the demand under a Treaty Moloney and McIntyre failed to notice.

The whole business is at the very least symptomatic of a tremendously naïve understanding of how the British State has operated historically—surprising in Irish Republicans but perhaps less so after they have come under academic tutelage and become prone to fancy ideas about press freedom and the like. What is undeniable is that it has been seized upon by the British State in its efforts to wear away at the movement that facilitated the rise of

the Catholic community out of the predicament they found themselves in from 1921.

In the *Sunday Independent* article Prof. Bew defended his relationship with Anthony McIntyre revealing that he had first come across the IRA man when "*he opened a dialogue from prison with me on the subject of my recent book and a Thomas Davis lecture given on RTE*".

"Strangely, McIntyre became my own personal peace process with the provisional republican movement, which he left only in 1998. McIntyre got a first class degree at the Open University in prison and then a PhD when he got out. He had also published in academically respectable places. It is not obvious to me that there are many people with that background and experience together with academic credibility."

Anthony McIntyre's argument is that the British state moulded a compromising Republican leadership (or was it the despicable Mr. Adams?) over time to secure its defeat. But it seems that Prof. Bew also had in mind some moulding of Dr. McIntyre through academia—with perhaps more success than in the former case.

One can sympathise with Dr. McIntyre's predicament. Earning an honest living is difficult after serving such a long time in prison. He became mixed up with some property developers in Dublin and was employed as a kind of intermediary for them to deal with angry property owners/investors which left a bad taste for a republican socialist. Clearly he was not suited to the role of enforcer for gombeen capitalism.

But the last place an honest living can be earned is in academia. To enter the hallowed halls there is a price to pay which is far dearer than the price Sinn Fein paid in 1998. It involves a surrendering of mind.

It should be noted that Prof. Bew's "*personal peace process*" as advisor to David Trimble was very different in its objectives than that of Sinn Fein. It actually paralleled McIntyre's view of it more so. Prof. Bew wished to see the political defeat of Sinn Fein in the peace process and Dr. McIntyre predicted it.

Prof. Bew noted in relation to criticism of the Boston College project that it was "*imbalanced*":

"I have to say it never occurred to me that Ed Moloney and Anthony McIntyre were 'enemies of the peace process' though they were obviously critics of Gerry Adams. One of the most eloquent denunciations of the Omagh bomb was

written by Anthony McIntyre..."

Dr. McIntyre's denunciation of the Omagh bomb was from a seemingly pacifist perspective and he soon began to adopt the position that the IRA campaign had not been worth the taking of life. Of course, implicit in this position is the rather disturbing caveat that a successful Republican campaign might have been worth it. But that is just a logical extrapolation of this line of criticism and does not necessarily represent Dr. McIntyre's position which may perhaps be thoroughly pacifist now.

Gerry Adams also denounced the Omagh bomb. He said after the bomb: "*the violence we have seen must be for all of us a thing of the past, over, done with and gone*" (Irish News, 02.08.98). This statement prompted Trimble to agree to meet Adams for the first time.

Perhaps his words were not as effective in comparison to Dr. McIntyre's, as he was already being seen by dissidents on the lines of a traitor. But, presuming he had influence within Republicanism, and the IRA hadn't as yet gone away or decommissioned its arms, the practical effect on those wishing to carry on the armed campaign would have been much more powerful. The Republican Army was a much more powerful instrument of peace than the keyboard.

The statement that Ed Maloney and Dr. McIntyre are not "*enemies of the peace process*" is rather inconsequential in relation to the fact that they "*were obviously critics of Gerry Adams*". Being enemies of Gerry Adams made them enemies of the Republican peace process and led them to being utilized by those who were really "*enemies of the peace process*" within the British State. That is an incontrovertible fact.

Prof. Bew also related the value Dr. McIntyre had for David Trimble:

"In the mid-Nineties young republicans of my acquaintance all appeared to believe, on the basis of the testimony of Joe Cahill, that the ceasefire had been called because the British had given the 10-year signal for withdrawal. McIntyre never believed that and it is obviously true today that he was right. But the fact that he was prepared to write and say it openly paradoxically strengthened the ability of unionists to make the necessary compromises embodied in the Agreement."

McIntyre projected the idea that Republican willingness to work within the 1998 Constitution amounted to surrender. Bew and Trimble attempted to impress this view on the Unionist Party, supported by Eoghan Harris and Sean O'Callaghan.

But Geoffrey Donaldson was not convinced by this ideological simplicity. He contested Trimble's view and had at least half the Unionist Party with him. He later joined the DUP, who prospered electorally when they rejected this view and fought a rear-guard action against the Agreement, which they saw as a Republican/Catholic victory.

Perception in these things usually equates to reality and if it is ignored so is reality.

The agreement was dysfunctional under those who accepted the Bew/McIntyre view of things and it was made functional—for a while, at least—under those who rejected it.

Pat Walsh

### LA SAMUEL BECKETT

What are you waiting for? I ask as your captain -  
Waiting for Godot?  
Life? to live it you have to be a cretin,  
Eh Joe?  
This ship talks like Krapp's Tape.  
The joys of life are gone and Malone Dies.  
Intercept! a foreign trawler sows the ocean  
with bait  
in Irish waters. They are taking our fish.  
Not I,  
they Come and Go, that's our fate.  
Move now or for you it's Rockaby bye bye.  
What is life but the sound of distant Footfalls.  
Molloy knew all about the Endgame.  
What a ship of sighs!  
Look, that foreign boat still trawls  
while you philosophise about life.  
It's More Pricks than Kicks,  
though It's not tragedy, boredom is the midwife.  
See! they're hauling-in, again up to their  
old tricks  
and you're the all-new Lé Samuel Beckett.  
Didn't he also write Happy Days?  
But it didn't bring me much joy- Feck it!  
that day the sun lost its rays.  
If I were you I'd scuttle myself.  
And who thought of my name,  
something taken off-the-shelf?  
Now I'm made to also suffer for France. I  
blame  
the owl that eats its own farrow.  
No, Joyce said that during colonial Ireland.  
He's a bridge now, the bridge of sorrow?  
Move! or you'll get your arse tanned.  
Ah well, maybe I'll bump into him one day.  
They're steaming off with our fish!  
Houl yer horses! it's Worstward Ho without  
delay,  
as I Dream of Fair to Middling Women  
and wish,

Wilson John Haire

18 June, 2014

# Shorts

from  
*the Long Fellow*

## MORGAN KELLY ON PIKETTY

Morgan Kelly's review of *Capital in the Twenty First Century* by Thomas Piketty revealed some interesting statistics (*The Irish Times*, 10.5.14). In 1980 the top 1% of American citizens were receiving 10% of national income, whereas in 2007 their national income share had risen to a quarter. A similar trend is evident in Canada and the UK, but in Ireland the trend is more stable. Referring to research from his UCD colleague Brian Nolan, Kelly says that the national income share of the top 1% in Ireland was 12% before the Second World War. It dropped to 6% in the 1970s and rose to 8% from the 1990s. Kelly concludes:

"We resemble the European pattern more than the Anglo-Saxon one".

Surprisingly, Kelly thinks:

"...income distribution was the major preoccupation of the early economists Adam Smith, David Ricardo and Karl Marx".

Whatever about Smith and Ricardo, it is not true to say that Marx was preoccupied with income distribution. The subject hardly appears at all in *Das Kapital*. The major preoccupation of Marx was the ownership of the means of production.

The review gives the impression that Piketty is an economic determinist. His thesis appears to be that low growth leads inevitably to greater inequality since it is more likely that the rate of return on capital will exceed a lower rate of increase in national income. If this is so, the Long Fellow can only agree with Kelly when he criticises Piketty for neglecting the political changes that occurred in Reagan's America and Thatcher's Britain. Politics always precedes economics.

## PIKETTY ON PROPERTY TAX

In an interview in *The Irish Times* Piketty suggested that taxes on property were inequitable. For example, why should a householder with a house worth 300,000 euro with no mortgage be taxed on the same basis as someone with a house with the same value, but with a mortgage of, say, 280,000?

Why not?! Both households have the same imputed income or non cash benefit from living in the house. If they did not

own their own houses they would have to pay rent. The tax system does not take into account liabilities for other forms of income. If someone earns 100,000 in a year, it is irrelevant for tax purposes whether he owes the bank money or not.

In the case of our Property Taxes the rate is well below that which would apply if the real imputed income were calculated.

Piketty seems to think that taxes should be only re-distributive. But there are numerous other justifications for the imposition of taxes. Taxes on property are an attempt to reflect the social cost of a dwelling. Each dwelling has to be serviced by (for the most part) the State. Water has to go into it. Waste material exits it. Roads have to be maintained to give access to it. The dwelling occupies land, which is a scarce resource (The Green Party, for this reason, advocates a site valuation tax rather than a property tax).

The absence of property taxes has had social consequences for Ireland. Berlin has about the same area as Dublin but has more than three times its population. We have a longer road and water network per capita than anywhere else in Europe. This makes public transport and decent water provision prohibitively expensive. This is because, in the absence of property taxes, the real economic cost of private housing is not imposed on house purchasers.

In the midst of a homelessness crisis we have vacant residential properties and occupied properties with surplus space (e.g. large family homes occupied by only the ageing parents). Up until now no cost was imposed on this wasteful use of scarce residential resources.

The absence of property taxes encourages speculative bubbles in residential property: one of the main causes of our financial crisis. In the boom time the prices paid for residential property were based on the hope of capital appreciation. Property taxes would have imposed a cost on such speculative activity.

## TROIKA

One of the good things about the economic crisis was that very necessary policy reform was implemented. It is doubtful that any political party would have had the courage to introduce property taxes if there had been no external pressure. The recent behaviour of the Government parties makes the Long Fellow regret the Troika's departure.

The Troika has called for an increase in the property tax and its extension to unused development land. Also at present the tax does not apply to land surrounding a residential property over an acre. Why should this portion of land be exempt

from property taxes?

The economy has begun to recover, which is largely due to a sense of confidence that the public finances are being put on a sustainable footing. But Noonan and the Labour Party are in danger of dissipating that momentum by suggesting that the 2 billion recommended budgetary adjustment for 2015 may not be necessary.

## QUINN FAMILY

It is difficult to take the Quinn Family's legal action seeking compensation from the State for 4.5 billion euro seriously.

The Quinns are accusing the State of encouraging Anglo-Irish Bank to make illegal loans to the Quinn group in order to support the bank's share price. The Minister for Finance and other state institutions are also accused of having acted:

"...in the knowledge and/or reckless disregard that their activities would probably injure the family (*The Irish Times*, 19.6.14).

As has been commented on by this magazine, many of these issues have already been ventilated in the trial of Sean FitzPatrick, Willie McAteer and Pat Whelan. The decisions of the jury must have been a bitter blow to the Quinn family. It found that these loans were not illegal because they were in the normal course of business.

If anything, the actions of the State had the effect of reducing the losses that Sean Quinn incurred in gambling on Anglo-Irish Bank's shares. He had invested in the bank by means of Contracts for Difference (CFDs). CFDs are a means of hiding an investor's ownership of shares. His effective shareholding in the bank amounted to almost 30%. The Bank and the State only knew about this after the event.

When the Directors of the Bank and the State found about this they wanted Quinn to sell his shares. In order to do this the bank had to lend to him in order that he could obtain legal title to the shares before the shares could be sold. The evidence at the trial suggested that he was extremely reluctant to sell his shares because he hoped that the share price would recover.

In the event, the "Maple 10" group of investors were lent a total of 490 million Euros to buy about 40% of Quinn's shares. Since these shares ended up being worthless it could be said that the Bank helped to reduce Quinn's losses.

Quinn Insurance gave a guarantee to Anglo-Irish Bank to underwrite Sean Quinn's gambling debts. The Financial Regulator put pressure on the bank to release this guarantee because the auditors were having difficulty signing off on Quinn

Insurance's accounts. So, it could be said that the State did everything in its power to ensure the survival of the Quinn Group

A weak case could be made that the State and Anglo-Irish Bank exceeded their

powers (i.e. acted illegally) in their actions. But to argue that the Quinn family should therefore be compensated for this would be, to say the least, a bizarre interpretation of the law.

## Grannies Rule OK!

I've never really understood the Granny Rule. Its complexities elude me. Not that I would have made the team. Well . . . maybe. It used to be "*Does your mother come from Ireland?*" Now it seems to be the Granny. It means more of us are qualified. Fat lot of good that does. "*Does your Granny come from Ireland?*" Not a word about Grand-das. Down in Cork, it's different. They say: Toscanini for music; Kathy Barry for crubeens; and Ringey boy for the points. But, Cork is the Rebel County. So what about Roylaty? Strong bed-fellows, Rebels and Roylaty.

It's hard to whack a bit of Roylat. Where would you get the likes. Now the British Royals are coming to the Rising celebrations. Seems they might have shot more. (Them, or us?) Dublin was always full of Royals. Bursting at the seams. Still is. The Royal Dublin Society, Ballsbridge. The Royal Institute of this. The Royal Institute of that. And don't forget the Royal Legion (Irish). They won't let you forget. All those poppies. Posies of Poppies. They don't smell, though. Much.

At the time of the Rising, Dublin was choking with Royals. Especially the Royal Dublin Fusiliers (RDFs). All over the place. Firing at everything. KIA [killed in action] by RDF. It was harder to be shot by a Royal Brit Something or Other. Usually you were shot by Royal Irish this or Royal Irish that. Or, of course, RDF. All those War Office cheques winging their way to Loyal Subjects. Poor postmen, with big bags bursting open. Red pillar-boxes. Crowns everywhere. Those pillar-boxes. Ugh! Like Ole Traffa.

Now they're coming back. Again. The Royals. Must have been properly riled, the last time. Can't get enough. Remember it was the Queen of Famine who put this country on the map, potato-fields or not, when she visited Killarney: "*I thought Scotland was the most beautiful part of my Empire, until I saw Kerry.*" Kerry haven't won a match since. And you can't get a decent bag of chips there.

*"Aroo from Kerry? I am too."*

*"How are the spuds? Big and small."*

*"Would they choke you?"*

*"Not at all."*

*"Did you ever ate British Queens?"*

*"Only when peeled."*

Now General Maxwell never seemed to be suffering from a lack of spuds. Yet death stalked him. Where he went, it went. Like the omen of death, he sometimes had no shadow. When he appeared, army bands played funeral marches. Everything in slow time. Gun-carriages were made ready. The sickly smell of cut-flowers assaulted nostrils. A big-drum would pound out the beat. Boom, boom, boom. Bearer-party files would march in counter-step. Horses' hooves would beat out a clippity-clappety tattoo. Brave men would wilt before his gaze.

Witches require new brooms. They help them fly. He was a new broom. A kind of high-flyer. He didn't take prisoners. His reputation preceded him. Face just-shaved, he stared back at the world, defiantly. His fingers ran along his chin. Considering things. In his quarters, he gazed at himself in the mirror. He had the look of a pugilist who'd had one fight too many. A real gilie file, he could pass for a sergeant-major with chronic dyspepsia. A glass of Scotch was clutched by his big hand. You could see him pouring more gravy over his plate of roast beef. Merry England. Reaching for the salt-cellars. Getting down to it. Putting it away. "*When I was a Second Lieutenant! Those were the days.*"

His quarters were spartan. Masculine. It's the way he liked it. Parkgate was his new posting. He'd replaced the inaply named General Friend, who'd been a near AWOL. He would not stand such nonsense. Birrell had bitten the dust too. Never leave your post. In the distance, he could hear a volley. His body went rigid. He grimaced, as if in pain. His fists went into a ball. He looked towards the window. Sighed. "*Ragged*", he thought. "*Must have a word with that Commandant.*" In his mind he could hear *The Dead March*. Boom, boom, boom. Those rebels would go to their graves in silence. Next for a volley. Wait for it.

Arbour Hill, must stay hidden. He'd have to take another look. He detested the Irish longing for martyrs. He just might sate it. He'd give them martyrs. His thoughts strayed to his own departure. Full military honours. The whole shebang. Flag draped on coffin. Sword and cap

bedecking. Firing party for him. Firing Squad for rebels. A flurry of doves, as his spirit departs. Those politicians. Always looking for a fall-guy. A soldier. Not to be trusted, those politicos. Tripping over words. Here am I, a full General. Should be in France.

Rebels must be scattered, organisation broken, spirits lowered. Must check that list of British prisoners. Too good for them. Saxon preparation will win the day. Nothing slip-shod. He bends and ties the laces in his leggings. He dons his tunic. Adjusts his Sam Browne belt. Ensures the buckle rests squarely between his third and fourth buttons. He tightens his tie. Ready for duty. Things to be done. Consults his watch. *Tempus fugit*. Another volley is due. It's all in the timing. That damn Commandant. Must give him a right-good rollicking. "*Orderly!*" he barks. "*Orderly! Fetch my crop.*"

The Orderly comes scurrying.

At Richmond Barracks things were in train. Order was being achieved. Prisoners were breakfasting early on stale bread and cold tea. Dark-suited and bedraggled, clothes creased. In need of a good wash. Being got ready for deportation. They, too, can hear the volley. They know what it means. For whom they do not know. They speculate. Someone cries. Outside the wall, a soprano, with a voice like cut-crystal, sings, *Mavourneen*. Silence descends. The soprano finishes. To each his own thoughts. Embarrassed eyes look elsewhere. The dawn had broken. Outside were hostile crowds. They'd have to run the gauntlet, before reaching the cattle-boat at the docks.

When young, I was told little. Reverential mentions of Pearse. Respectful references to de Valera. (A relation had written *An Bhunreacht* and the speech chastising Churchill.)\* I was let know as

\* Maurice Moynihan was appointed Secretary to the Government by de Valera in 1932, taking over, I believe, from his brother Seán. de Valera was very dependent on Maurice. He was put in charge of the new Constitution Committee (1937) which became a product of his and de Valera's views and values. Maurice could express things of a complex nature, in Irish or English, in simple language. He helped de Valera in his speeches, especially the exchange with Churchill at end of WWII.

He was my mother's first cousin. His mother was Mary Power, my grand-aunt. They came from Rock St., Tralee. I don't know the Moynihans personally. Maurice became Governor of the Central Bank. He shunned publicity. He died in his nineties, circa 1993. Power (de Paor) is a Norman name. Tralee was a Norman town, circa 1260. Many of the local surnames are Norman.

to which side my bread was buttered. I would know when cloaked figure [de Valera] would arrive. The torches would be lit. Crowds would gather at 'The Pike Man'. Everyone shouting "Up Dev". 1916 would get a mention. That was up in Dublin. This was Tralee. "*The pale moon was rising*".

The winds blew me their way. I learnt more. I got to know an aunt above in Dublin. She'd been in Kilmainham Goal during the Civil War. Six female relatives of mine had been held there—three from the one house. Some of them had been involved in the Republican news-sheet, *The Invincible*. My widowed grandmother, along with this aunt, had tried to join the Marrowbone Lane Garrison during the Rising, to no avail. (My father and an uncle-in-law were already there.)\*\*

James Connolly had rejected several who'd sought to join the GPO Garrison when 'under the influence'. I'd thought my grannie was the only reject. A sort of *primus inter pares*. But not so. (Nor are grannies mentioned in *The Proclamation*.) Anyway, I am conscious that many people have much bigger claims to participation in the Rising. Nor do I make any great claim now, except that I was entrapped by the Editor. So be it. I'd walked into it.

Annie Morgan told me that Marrowbone Garrison was under command of Capt. Séamus Ó Murchadha (Murphy). The Watkins Garrison was under command of Capt. Con Colbert. For tactical reasons, the Watkins Garrison joined Marrowbone on the Tuesday. This was authorised. Capt. Ó Murchadha stayed in command, I believe. On the Saturday, Annie told me she was making up beds and doing chores, in Marrowbone, when Colbert addressed Ó Murchadha—"I am young, with no responsibilities. You are married with duties. Le me hand over to the British at the surrender." This was

---

\*\* All the info regarding 1916 Rising comes from an aunt of mine, Annie Morgan. She was the only one to speak to me of surrounding events.

On Easter Monday she, with her mother—my grandmother, Bridget Morgan, a widow of 10 Gray St. D8, went in search of my father, who'd left home at above address, to participate in the Rising.

Somewhere in Parliament St. they met Barney Mellows (Liam's brother). He directed them to Marrowbone Lane where they might meet my father. They tried to join the Garrison there. My grandmother, an ageing widow, was refused. The following days were spent by my aunt doing messages and carrying out allotted tasks by the garrison. (She was not in any organisation, I believe.)

agreed Colbert handed over the Marrowbone Garrison (including the Watkins' Garrison) to the British. This led on to Colbert's court-martial and execution.

(Annie is not included in any records, I believe. There is a risk someone might contradict her. I have no proof, except for what she told me. I never met my grandmother.)

Con Colbert might have been selected for execution anyway. 'G' Branch, Dublin Metropolitan Police, was picking out leaders of the Rising.

Several years ago I was given copies of letters written by my father in 1916, from Knutsford Goal, Cheshire, England and Frongoch Internment Camp in Wales. (He'd been deported after the Rising.) He'd written these letters to a close friend who had also been in the Marrowbone Lane Garrison. The originals had been given to Army Archives, quite properly. All of this was a complete surprise to me. I'd never been aware of any letter written by him, though I recognised his writing immediately. It was hand-writing of the time. Up and down, rhythmic, without embellishment.

The letters were written with an eye out for the censor. They gave away nothing compromising. Nothing was written that would put anyone on the inside—or the outside—at any risk. Military information, or political views were not exchanged. The letters were penned not long after the leadership had been court-martialled by British military and many executed. They were written, it appears, in the knowledge that the recipient would not alarm any next-of-kin. Rather, it seemed that the writer was anxious to allay any fears and dampen down feelings. The writer was an ordinary volunteer. He'd finished his schooling at fourteen years of age. He'd probably not been away from home before. Apparently very politicised.

The local inspiration was Emmet in particular. O'Connell was the *bete noir*. There was no sectarianism. The first letter is dated "*Monday, 12th June 16, Knutsford*". It goes on: "*Remember me to Billy King and all the remaining blues*". (The 'blues' refers to the Gaelic Football team—Bulfin's—called after William Bulfin, the writer.) The letter acknowledges receipt of a parcel. It expects they will be interned—

"In Colwyn Bay or... north Wales... plenty of freedom then, football, swimming in the sea... we will have to work also... we seem to be able to get the papers up to date... I received a letter from Joe ----. You should see Paddy McGrath with his moustache off\*\*\*.

O'Toole, O'Connell and all the boys are in the pink... Tell Tommy Delaney that Paddy McGrath and all of us want him to keep the Bulfins together... keep the old colours flying... do you ever pay a visit to Mooney's?"

The second letter is dated 2.7.16, *Frongoch Camp (Upper) 1007, Near Bala, Nth. Wales*:

"...you have heard of our change from Knutsford... surrounded by mountains... we have every arrangement... we are to have a concert on this evening... the past few days were... raining the whole time... there are two camps... Toole, P.D., J. McG. are in one... P. McG, J.H., J. O'C and myself are in the other... We are housed in huts of 30 each... our own officers run the camp."

The third letter is dated "*14 Aug. 16, Frongoch*":

"...We are having a fine time, sports, football.. I have turned to running now, 440yds. champion of Frongoch... Toole, McGrath {Joe McGrath} and the boys must feel very queer with city life {he is being ironic, JM}... there are 569 interned here now—it seems we are in for a winter campaign... we... are quite prepared to meet anything that comes... it seems a bit lonely without all the Bulfins gone {They'd been released. JM} ...I suppose the boys are preparing for the football season again... we are bound to miss poor Cromien {He'd been killed in the Rising, JM}... tell Jack, Joe McGrath {who was to become a Free State Minister}, Toole, and all the boys I was asking for them... will see you next St. Patrick's Day."

These letters are now nearly one hundred years old. Now they appear to be sad. So much has happened in the meantime. The British persist in putting in their oar. Not to mention those Royals. And where is the lark who rose when the first execution occurred? Or was it my imagination.

The USA has 'Independence Day'. France has 'Bastille Day'. Ireland should have its day, "*Lá na Saoirse*". To fall 3 May each year, to co-incide with the first execution at 0330 hours.

Each year, on 3 May, at 0330 hours, a lark should be released from the Stonebreakers' Year, Kilmainham Goal,

---

\*\*\* Paddy McGrath went on hunger-strike, under Fianna Fail, during the forties, while still in the IRA. De Valera released him. Later he was involved in a shoot-out in Rathgar with Gardai. Two Gardai were killed. He was subsequently tried and executed by firing-squad.



with due ceremony, to celebrate "*Lá na Saoirse*" (The Day of Freedom).

Institutions could conduct their own commemorations on 3rd May, in like vein, each adapting to particular needs or

conditions.

Meanwhile the net spreads. Pedigrees are examined. More and more are being unearthed. Grannies Rule OK!

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

Report

## "Royal prefix undermines State's separatist ethos"

A conference on the disastrous effects which the Curragh Mutiny, or 'incident' as it became known, of 1914 had on British army discipline was held recently at the Curragh army camp, which is today the headquarters of the Irish Defence Forces.

The conference was attended by Irish and British historians and it emerged that 58 British Army officers threatening to mutiny, might be given the option of resigning their commissions or even accept dismissal rather than be sent north to coerce Ulster to accept Home Rule.

A century later a second Curragh 'incident' occurred and again the government, albeit an Irish government, failed to defend the ethos and values of the state.

I refer to the decision taken by members of the Curragh Golf Club at their last annual general meeting to restore the 'royal' prefix to their title. Records show that the club was granted the title 'Royal' in September 1910 by King George V. The 'Royal' Curragh golf course is adjacent to the military barracks, and the captaincy of the club has been shared bi-annually between civilian and Irish military members since 1922.

Despite our rejection of monarchism and the establishment of the Republic in 1949, we still have a number of Irish-based institutions whose names include a "royal" prefix like the Royal National Lifeboat Institute, and the Royal Dublin Society. However, I respect these organisations and recognise the valuable contribution they make to Irish national life. The fact that they have a "royal" prefix is merely a residue of our colonial past. However, this is not the case with the Curragh Golf Club. The self-conferring of this 'royal' title is an attack on the republican and egalitarian ethos of this state.

The fact that the Irish Defence Forces were party to the re-introduction of this royal prefix further undermines and devalues the separatist ethos of the Irish State."

Tom Cooper

*Irish Examiner* 31.3.2014

## Massacre in West Cork

### *Comments and clarifications in response to Brendan Clifford*

1. Having read back over the Brendan Clifford's initial review and both responses (IPR April, May, June 2014) I think we may be talking at cross-purposes. In the introduction I discuss the problems of nomenclature in general and in particular to naming the IRA (Massacre, p 13). My solution was that "Up to the vote on the Treaty in January 1922, the term 'IRA' referred to the military arm of the independence movement. After this, in most documents, it referred to the part of the IRA that was against the Treaty ('the anti-Treaty IRA'), which is how it is used in this book." When I refer to the 'Anti-Treaty' Bandon IRA this is simply a name to distinguish them from the local pro-treaty IRA under the other Hales brother, Sean. In my mind it carries no more significance than that.

2. But there is no doubt that the Anti-treaty IRA, under Charlie O'Donoghue arrested the Hornibrooks. However, it is a very large step from this to actually naming names when I do not have specific individual evidence about who did what. Should I accept Alice Hodder's letter that Michael O'Neill's brothers gouged out Herbert Woods eyes? Should I accept the recently discovered evidence of the Free State Director of Intelligence, Michael Costello, (1925) that Michael O'Neill's brother Daniel was one of those responsible for the Hornibrook deaths? Should I dismiss the evidence of (Anti-treaty) Michael O'Donoghue that he knew who did it and why it was done? Many of these men were heroes of the revolution. I owe them a duty not to go farther than the evidence allows. Eve Morrison is entitled to conclude what she likes in her review of *Massacre* and required to stand over it but that does not mean she is correct. If that is literary coquetting on my part, then so be it.

3. In my response to Brendan's review of *Massacre* I referenced the 'helpful citizens' list in *Tom Barry: Freedom Fighter* (2005). The reference I gave (p.

450, Fn.72) was wrong. As a result I mislead Brendan into discussing the Chinnery shooting instead of the 'Dunmanway Diary'. My apologies for this error. The correct reference should have been p. 448 Fn. 18. In the first edition of *Tom Barry: IRA Freedom Fighter* (2003, p. 329 Fn. 18). "Dan Cahalane, Author Interview 25/2/1981. He had the diary and documents and studied them carefully. Flor Crowley studied and worked on this {Dunmanway} 'find'. Though many of the names are in the Tom Barry private papers in letters, arising out of his investigation, there is not an exact copy of lists." I am certain the documents examined by Flor Crowley in *The Southern Star* in 1971 are the same as those photographed and lodged by Flor Begley in the Bureau of Military History because I compared his articles with the photographed version in the Military archives. Therefore I can only conclude that the 'helpful citizen' list must still be in the possession of Dan Cahalane's family. I hope this clarifies the position.

4. Brendan also stated that Michael O'Donoghue had used the phrase "unfettered military power" to describe the West Cork massacre. This is not the case. This phrase is mine and it describes only the people who carried out the murders. It could not describe the leadership of the local IRA as most of these were away in Dublin at the time.

5. Brendan believes that my book is treatyite but my point that the treaty caused a split in the IRA and this resulted in less discipline within the rank and file. Of course, the treaty was a diktat imposed by the British and Collins may well have believed that he could force it through the Dáil, but this was not a major reason for the West Cork shooting as far as I can see.

Thank you in advance for the opportunity to reply and I presume we can end this correspondence amicably.

**Barry Keane**

## A Professor And An Archbishop On Dunmanway

Barry Keane is quite right—the phrase “*unfettered military power*” is his, not Michael O’Donoghue’s. But it captured the spirit of O’Donoghue’s complaint about the treatment of his British policeman brother by the Republican police—not the Dunmanway killings—so that I wrongly supposed that Barry was echoing it. I wasn’t trying to deprive Barry of credit. I imagine I was subconsciously distancing him from a phrase that I do not think at all realist or creditable.

In Paragraph 1 Barry Keane seems to say that Sean Hales organised a separate Anti-Treaty Army in West Cork. I had thought that Sean Hales had continued in the command of a united Army, even after he changed his mind and declared for the Treaty. That shows how little I know about it. But it makes me wonder why Anti-Treatyites should, as a blow against the Treaty, kill some middle class Protestants who had no connection with the Republican movement, instead of the leader of the Treatyite Army in their midst. (He was TD for the area, and was killed in Dublin seven months later, after the Treaty Dail had conferred on the Free State Army a right of summary execution of prisoners-of-war.)

Barry Keane’s amendment of his reference in support of his statement that Meda Ryan now acknowledges that there is no list of informers does not really clarify anything. What Meda says in that Endnote, which he quotes, is that there are lists, but “*not an exact copy*” of them in Barry’s private papers.

Barry says he did not, or that it was not his intention to attribute the killings to an Anti-Treaty group. But there are many passages in his book which it is very difficult to reconcile with this, and those passages have led to it being appropriated by the revisionist Establishment, which has *a priori* certainty in this matter.

If it is the case that Barry knew that he didn’t know, why did he speculate so freely about names?

I’m afraid that, if he does not produce another book, or a heavily-amended version of this, preserving what is factually established, but showing that neither he nor anybody else knows who did the

killings or why, I can’t say that the revisionists have acted unreasonably in taking it that he supports their case.

The latest revisionist review appeared in the *Irish Independent* on 31st May.

It is strange, but indisputable that the only position from which the whole of Ireland is visible is the two-nationist position, from which in 1969 a case was made for Partition. The anti-Partitionist mainstream of Southern politics is blind to the existence of social realities which conflict with the doctrine that society in Ireland is a national unity.

The Protestant colony in the North underwent a singular development in the course of three centuries, producing much that is interesting, but the ‘constitutional’ mainstream of nationalist Ireland has never taken any interest in it. It is only interested in the superficial, and in practice illusory, political unity of the 1790s. But the strangest thing is that denial of the distinct reality of Ulster Protestant social existence has led in the end to the denial of the reality of the national development and achievement of society in the rest of the island. The opinion-formers of Southern Ireland, who denied Northern realities then, are now busily trampling on all that they stood for then, and scourging their ancestors who dared to exist in defiance of England.

That is why a comparatively minor incident, about which little is known for certain, is inflated into “*four bloody nights that shamed and shocked a fledgling State*”—*Irish Independent* blurb on a review of Barry Keane’s book, 31 May. The *Independent* has no doubt in the matter: “*Ten West Cork Protestants were taken out and murdered by an IRA gang*”.

The reviewer says:

“Through no fault of their own, Dunmanway Protestants were targeted because of their perceived links with northern Protestants and events in the north. The stark, unquestionable reality was that all the murder victims were Protestants. Over the following 70 years, there have been other examples of such targeting...”

Seventy years brings us almost to the end of the recent war in the North—an

exercise in “*unfettered military power*” if ever there was one. The Provo “*IRA gang*”, disowned and denounced by the Dublin Governments which asserted de jure sovereignty over the North, sustained a war for more than a quarter of a century, with no authority other than what was given by the situation. Dublin Governments during all those decades had failed to establish any real contact with the recalcitrant Protestant part of the dogmatically-asserted nation, and nor had the “*constitutional nationalist*” party within the North. But the effective exercise of unfettered military power brought about an unprecedented development of political cooperation between unionists and nationalists. No amount of constitutional debating points could have done it—they only acted as irritants.

And there is not even the fig leaf that the men of violence gave up their evil ways so that this might happen. It was clearly their evil ways that made it happen. And, lest there should be any misunderstanding, when the leader of the gang went to London to give an audience to the Queen (and to the President), another leader of the gang said that, presented with the same situation again they would do the same thing again.

Unfettered military power clearly has a rightful place in the scheme of things in which we live.

The writer of the appreciative *Irish Independent* review of Barry Keane’s *Massacre In West Cork* is Brian Walker of the Irish Institute at the Queen’s University in Belfast, who is a compiler of electoral facts and author of a number of books, including *Dancing To History’s Tune*. It’s an odd idea—that history plays a tune which people dance to, as if History was a kind of God existing apart from this world and making things happen in it, rather than an account of the things that happen in it through the action of circumstances in it.

Professor Walker seemed unable to grasp that Partition and the Northern Ireland political system were two distinct things put together by Whitehall policy. Partition without the Northern Ireland political system would have left the Six Counties within the political system of the UK state, and without the local apparatus of sub-government of Catholics by Protestants organised as a distinct political body. It was the friction of communal Protestant sub-government, excluded from the normal political life of the state, that kept Protestant/Catholic antagonisms

alive—it was current reality, not History that did it.

Professor Walker, in denial of the obvious facts of the matter, asserts that Northern Ireland was a state in itself, and not an undemocratically governed region of the British state/.

Northern Ireland did not do the things that any political body that is a State must do. Those things were always done by Westminster: taxation, the Post Office, the welfare state, all the things on which ordinary life depends. Northern Ireland benefited from them but was excluded from the doing of them. Perhaps Professor Walker, habituated to the elephant in the room, was unable to see it, or perhaps there were other reasons why he said what he did. Anyhow he was in public denial about Northern Ireland realities.

And, when he turned his Ulsterish vision to West Cork, it was clear to him that Protestants were killed in Dunmanway because they were Protestants. He praises Barry Keane for going some of the way towards establishing the truth but feels he is too cautious.

He is unimpressed by IRA leader Michael O'Donoghue's account of the incident in his *Memoir* and doesn't agree with Keane when he said that O'Donoghue had no reason to make up the story of the victims being active Loyalists:

"Given that the event was so notorious, there was still very good reason for O'Donoghue to try to excuse such an atrocity".

Was it notorious? Was it "*one of the notorious events in the modern Irish revolutionary period*"?

He says elsewhere in the review:

"the perpetrators were never identified or charged, although there must have been many witnesses. The horror of these days was soon subsumed in the violence of the Civil War. Later their memory was pushed into the background among both republicans and members of the Church of Ireland".

Not so notorious then!

It seemed to me that O'Donoghue, on leave from the war in the North at the time, just wasn't much interested in the incident.

And I notice that neither Walker nor Keane shows any interest in what was preoccupying O'Donoghue at the time: Collins' invasion of the North. This absence is particularly noticeable in

Walker's *The Two Irelands* (2012). It is a history of what he sees as two states established in 1921. The first thing one of them did was make war on the other, but he doesn't even mention the fact!

Comparing the Northern and Southern minorities, Walker writes:

"unlike southern Protestants, most members of the northern Catholic and nationalist community had afforded limited or no acceptance of the northern state" (*Two Irelands*, p85).

It would have been difficult to accept what did not exist.

How does a population "*accept*" the State in which it exists? Essentially by participating in its democratic political life: not by waving Union Jacks and loving the Royal Family.

In the 1960s *The Queen* used to be played at the end of cinema performances. In London it was background music as the audience made for the Exits. In Belfast part of the audience stood upright as the music implored God to make the Queen ruler of the world, while others dashed out. That was one of the major differences between acceptance and non-acceptance of what Walker chooses to call "*the state*".

In parts of Britain large numbers of people voted for virtual Communists in the Labour Party, hoping that the Party would abolish the Monarchy and establish a strongly socialist Republic. Those non-royalists were British in practice, the Belfast Royalists were not. The Ulster Unionists who stood to attention until the last bars of *The Queen* died away had given away the essential ingredient of Britishness when they agreed to exclusion from the political life of the British state, and to exercise a squalid communal dominance over the large Catholic minority outside the political life of the state.

A West British Northern Catholic who wanted to accept the state—and there were many thousands of them—found that the state did not present itself politically for participation in it—which is the democratic mode of acceptance. All that was available to the would-be acceptor was Royalist ceremonial gestures with the Orange Order acting as cheerleader. And the Catholic whose economic position was greatly improved by the socialist reforms of 1948 felt no gratitude to the form of politics that presented itself to the voter, the Unionist Party—because he knew that he was in no way indebted to the Unionist Party for the reform. The reform

was the work of the governing part in the state, the Labour Party, which he was not allowed to join, and which did not present itself at "*British Elections*" in the Six Counties soliciting his vote. And, when he went to draw his dole, he got it from the civil service of the state, not from the civil service of the devolved Unionist apparatus.

Such was Northern Ireland—not a state, not an instrument of "*good government*", but a Westminster policy instrument whose object was to manipulate Southern Anti-Partitionism.

The Catholic minority benefitted from the legislative measures of state, was not drawn into the political life of the state because it was excluded from it, and was aggravated continuously by the local mode of politics to which it was subordinated. And in these peculiar circumstances it increased both in absolute numbers and as a proportion of the whole population.

The Southern Protestant minority was not excluded from the political life of the state but in large part chose not to participate in it. It was a rapidly declining minority when the state was formed. It had been a ruling minority for centuries and remained disproportionately wealthy through inheritance from its centuries of monopoly. There was no legislative economic decolonisation after the great land reform of 1903—and that had been enacted by Westminster under pressure from William O'Brien's vigorous but conciliatory agitation.

The decline of the Southern minority was the natural consequence of the failure of a colony of superior people—people who took themselves to be superior—to exert a hegemonic influence over the native population, and who were faced with the prospect of the withdrawal of the State which had put them in place, and of subordination to a State constructed by he natives whom they had failed to Anglicize.

That was the context of Protestant decline in the South. It was also the context of the Dunmanway and other incidents. One thing that seems certain about Dunmanway is that it was political, not criminal.

About the word "*massacre*": Barry Keane says Chambers is not the only dictionary. In Belfast shops there are three dictionaries: Collins, Chambers and Oxford. Collins seems to be the most commonly used. It says massacre is

"indiscriminate large-scale killing", agreeing with Chambers. That is the meaning I picked up from actual usage. But the Oxford—at least in the pocket edition that came to hand—says "*brutal slaughter*", omitting quantity and adding a particular quality and making it possible for the killing of one person to be described as a *massacre*. Were the Dunmanway killings done *brutally*? I had the impression they were done clinically.

If the nine killings in question, carried out ninety years ago, in a disturbed interlude between two wars, were neither indiscriminate nor brutal (if one allows the distinction between brutal and non-brutal ways of killing), why apply extremist language to them?

They were matter-of-factly forgotten, along with a great many other things, for seventy years. Protestants who remained true to their colonial mission and could not tolerate life in an Ireland governed by the Irish State followed their State home. Those that did not leave became Irish by virtue of not leaving. Some held themselves as aloof as possible, while others became part of the people. The Dunmanway killings were raked up seventy years later, in sensationalist terms, by Trinity College, as part of the attempt to clean up Britain's record in Ireland after losing the 1918 Election. The method of exonerating Britain was to depict the Irish national movement as being driven by Catholic bigotry and the urge to rob Protestants. The excuse for doing this was the suggestion that the Southern Irish, by remembering that England had oppressed them, were responsible for the war in the North, which was essentially a campaign of genocide against Protestant farmers in the Border region. That was the general thrust.

If I had seen the slightest sign of interest on the part of Trinity and other revisionists in the actuality of the Northern Ireland system, I would have credited them with sincerity if not with too much understanding. Misunderstandings are soon remedied. But they had no interest in investigating the particularity of the Northern Ireland system, which had generated war within the most advanced liberal democracy in Europe. The war in the North was, to them, no more than an opportunity for imposing a false history of itself on the South.

Barry Keane contends that what he said in his book was that he did not know who

did the Dunmanway killings or why. He might have chosen a clearer way of saying it.

Professor Walker says there must have been many witnesses but nobody was ever charged. The striking thing is that there have not even been strong local rumours, as if an external force with local knowledge had acted stealthily. So it might be that nobody knew, or that everybody knew but clammed up forever after.

There are two witnesses, and they testified at the Inquest. Alice Gray, wife of one of the victims, and Mrs. Nagle, mother of another. Attention has been drawn to this in the *Irish Political Review*, but no notice is taken of their evidence by Professor Walker, while Barry Keane only mentions the fact in passing when dismissing Owen Sheridan's argument in *Propaganda As Anti-History* (Aubane Historical Society) that the killings might have been the work of the British Secret Service. What they said certainly does not undermine Sheridan's argument, though Barry Keane seems to think it does, without saying why. It is odd that the only direct evidence should either be summarily dismissed as irrelevant, or ignored.

Mrs. Gray, whose husband was shot, gave testimony in Court that the killer said: "*Take that you Free Stater, Free Stater, Free Stater*". The implication is that it was an anti-Treaty action. But it is implausible that middle class Protestants uninvolved in Republicanism should have been killed as action against the Free State, whose birth lay far in the future, at a moment when the possibility of holding the IRA together seemed good.

And, if there was a group in the IRA that wanted to nip Free Staters in the bud, surely they had a better target in Sean Hales, who gave an undertaking that he would vote against the Treaty but then defected to the Treatyites. (Six months later, 7 December 1922, he was killed in Dublin because the Treaty Dail passed an Act giving the Free State Army the authority to kill prisoners. And in reprisal the Free State Government (installed on 6th December), in an action reminiscent of the Terror of the French Revolution, took from prison a group of prisoners, incarcerated for five months, and shot them without trial on December 8th.

Shooting Sean Hales would have made some sense as an anti-Treaty act. Shooting Mr. Gray made none in the light of his wife's testimony. What Mrs. Gray says

the killer said carries the flavour of a slogan made up by somebody with an external understanding

There was another witness, Mrs. Nagle, whose son was killed. She said that there were two intruders who asked her whether her son was going to school and where he he was employed. She testified: "*One had a mask*" and added: "*She did not know either of them and did not think they were from Clonakilty or district*" (see *The Dunmanway Killings—Curiouser And Curiouser*, AHS).

Professor Walker ignores these known witnesses, and Barry Keane makes little of them.

The existence of the many other witnesses mentioned by Professor Walker is one of Cheyney's "*unknown unknowns*".

Walker, to give him his due, says that the incident remains a complete mystery. But it is a mystery which he and others are under an obsessional obligation to speculate groundlessly about according to their prejudices.

Painting the scenery for his knowledge of the Dunmanway killings, Professor Walker writes:

"Reprisals against innocent members of the community because of the actions of others were a nasty feature of the violence of these years. For example, in December 1921, Auxiliaries burnt a large part of Cork... in response to action of the IRA.

"At the same time the IRA burnt the homes of "loyalists" in Co. Cork in response to British army actions. Tom Barry later described how "Our only fear was that there would be no more loyalist homes to burn"..."

The meaning of Barry's remark might not be entirely clear to everybody these days. It was that there were more nationalist Irish than British loyalists in Ireland, and the British therefore had more legitimate targets to hit.

Here is the passage from Barry's *Guerilla Days In Ireland* from which Walker wrenches a striking sentence:

"The Irish Republican Army's counters to the activities of British murder gangs and espionage agents were not the only ones the situation demanded. The enemy campaign included other instruments, the chief of which was that of fire terror. From the middle of 1920, fire-raising gangs accompanied raiding parties, and roved over West Cork, burning to the

ground the homes of IRA men or those suspected of actively supporting the IRA... Farmhouses, labourers' cottages and shops went up in flames as the British fire gangs passed...

"The British are, of course, a people well practised down the centuries in the use of fire as an instrument of terror. It has been said that they reached the peak of perfection in this art in Ireland after the Rising of 1798, but I do not think this is correct. Surely they excelled in the war for the conquest of South Africa, when they failed to defeat in the field a handful of Boer riflemen, but succeeded in forcing their surrender by mass burning of Boer homesteads and the imprisonment, under appalling conditions, of Boer women and children, many thousands of whom died. So in 1920 and 1921, the British would use against the Irish the instrument which was so successful against the Boers, previous generations of the Irish and other subject races. There was, however, one all important factor which the British evidently forgot to take into consideration. While the South Africans had no British Loyalists homes which could be destroyed as reprisals, Ireland was studded with castles, mansions and residences of the British Ascendancy who had made their homes here. The West Cork Brigade was slow to commence a campaign of counter-burnings, but eventually action was taken. A note was sent to the British Military Commander in West Cork, informing him that for every Republican home destroyed from that date, the homes of two British Loyalists would be burned to the ground.

"The British ignored this threat and two nights afterwards burned out a small farmhouse and a labourer's cottage. The following night the IRA burnt out four large Loyalists' residences in the same neighbourhood. The British countered this by burning four farmhouses and we promptly burned out the eight largest Loyalists homes in that vicinity. And so the British terror and the IRA counter-terror went on. Castles, mansions and residences were sent up in flames by the IRA immediately after the British fire gangs had razed the homes of Irish Republicans. Our people were suffering in this competition of terror, but the British Loyalists were paying dearly, the demesne walls were tumbling down and the British Ascendancy was being destroyed. Our only fear was that, as time went on, there would be no more Loyalists' homes to destroy, for we intended to go on to the bitter end...

"Very soon... an outcry arose from the British Loyalists themselves, demanding that the British forces should cease destroying Republican homes, as otherwise they too would be treated likewise. Those Britishers had sat for many months smugly watching their Republican neighbours' homes going up in flames, and no expression of pity or

appeal for clemency ever escaped them...

"One result of the IRA counter actions was the attempts made by the British Loyalists to sell out their Irish properties and leave West Cork for residence in Britain. Those attempts also were defeated as the IRA completely banned all sales of residences and properties unless by permit from the West Cork Brigade. All sales came to a standstill..." (*Guerilla Days In Ireland*, Chapter XVII).

Professor Walker borrows his one-sentence quote from Barry from his own book *The Two Irelands*:

"During the war of independence... and the following civil war considerable members of them [i.e. the "unionist and Protestant community in the south"] suffered political and sectarian attacks. Such incidents sometimes involved murder, but more commonly intimidation and burning of homes, which led large numbers to flee. Members of this community, often labelled as 'loyalists', were targeted for reprisal for actions of the British army, as described by Tom Barry, IRA commander in West Cork, in his later account: 'our only fear was that, as time went on, there would be no more loyalist homes to destroy'. Sometimes these attacks happened in response to events in the north. After the Dunmanway murders in late April 1922, Church of Ireland archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Jack Gregg denounced such reasoning: 'I fail to see what is the connection between these residents in the west of Cork and the troubles in the north. I cannot see any intelligible cause for this declaration of war upon a defenceless community', and called on the government to 'protect a grievously-wounded minority'. In early May 1922, Gregg recorded in his diary: 'A week of v. great anxiety as to the church's future. News of evictions, ejections and intimidations everywhere. Where is it all to end? Is it the beginning of the end, or a short storm? Prov. Govt. so far seems powerless to intervene'..." (*The Two Irelands*, p49).

The quotation from Archbishop Gregg is taken from *John Allen Fitzgerald Gregg: Archbishop* by George Seaver, published by *The Faith Press* in 1968, from which I give an extract:

"On 28 April news reached Dublin of the murder of Protestants in Dunmanway, Co. Cork. The Archbishop—after another private consultation with the Provost—said in a sermon in Dundrum the following Sunday:

"It is no matter for wonder if the members of our Church feel deep uneasiness and positive alarm in view of these horrible events. What a tale of savage blood-lust is disclosed in the murder of eight of the members of a political and religious minority,

living quietly among their neighbours. The reason for this organised massacre I cannot conceive, unless it be, indeed, as has been suggested, by way of reprisal. But I fail to see what is the connection between those residents in the west of Co. Cork and the troubles in the North. I cannot see any intelligible cause for this declaration of war on a defenceless community'..." (p121).

About a year and a half earlier, when the war described by Barry was going strong, the Archbishop, addressing the Joint Dublin Diocesan Synods, said that:

"The conflict between the two sides was not being waged in the form of reason or morals where Christian constitutionalists took their stand, but in the arena of force. Appeal had been made to the dread arbitrament of physical violence, and the verdict of superior strength was apparently the only one that would carry conviction. That was the dominant and terrible fact in their country and in that city to-day. Therefore, while denunciation could serve no good purpose, every effort of right-minded men should be bent to restoring the reign of reason and law, and the reconciliation by reasonable discussion of opposing interests..."

## BEACHED

They landed on the beaches  
clinging to Zimmer frames and sticks  
like leeches.

'They made the world safe  
for the human race.'  
says the newscaster,  
not meaning to pun.

His silent quivering lip  
wants to say Hun  
but Merkel is there  
in jacket and trousers  
and stands near he  
who represents the bear.

Further down the line is  
old gin and tonic,  
he wants peace through war  
in the style of the oxymoronic,  
this future king.

His breed met Hitler  
when his great-uncle  
was a diddler  
and his granny was  
a tippler.

But did you thank the Prussians  
for saving the day at Waterloo  
or the Americans after WW1  
or the Russians after WW2.

**Wilson John Haire**

19 June, 2014

Unfortunately the Archbishop did not explain how reason might be brought to bear on resolving the conflict between his State, which had declared itself absolutely opposed to Irish Independence, and the Irish electorate which had voted for Independence.

Seaver's narrative continues:

"But worse was to come. On 21 November—Red Sunday—fourteen British officers in Dublin were deliberately murdered in their beds...

"On 28 November Archbishop Gregg was preaching in St. Philips, Milltown, at the dedication of the War Memorial, on the heroic sacrifice of those it commemorated. Then he turned, by way of contrast, to the ghastly events of the previous Sunday:

"Ireland is writing its judgment upon its own being with its own hand. The civilised world shuddered at the story of assassination that reached it from Dublin last Monday morning. Ireland, familiar with deeds of blood, accepted it well-nigh unmoved. The greater part of the nation has taken no steps to repudiate the crime; by its silence it would seem to show that it had brought itself to hold that killing is no murder, when done for political ends... Conscience has become perverted by a false notion of patriotism... The law holds in the life of nations that 'as we sow, we reap'; and if Ireland employs terrorism it must pay the penalty. And the penalty is that the country's own moral sense becomes terrorised—terrorised into silence, if not complicity. Ireland will sink into being a country without a character. It would be a poor satisfaction to be a Free State and to have lost moral freedom"... (p112).

There was another event that happened in Dublin on 21st November 1920. A British armoured car drove into Croke Park during a football final and machine-gunned the spectators. If the Archbishop moralised about that event, Seaver did not report it.

The phrase "*killing no murder*" is one of those phrases woven into Irish history. One of the justifications of the Penal Laws designed to extirpate Catholicism (a moral or propagandist justification, take your choice) was that the Irish Catholics could be freed from the restraints of an alleged moral law because of their superstitious subordination to a foreign authority, the Pope of Rome, who could make them feel that killing Protestants was no murder.

Archbishop Gregg was the product of an upper-class Anglican military/religious family. In Anglican culture militarism and religion were intimately related, like

Siamese twins. That relationship was strongly reinforced in Ireland where Anglicanism—the Church of Ireland—was the Church of a hopeful colony that declined into a garrison. It was militarist in the strict sense of being predisposed towards war. As the official Church of an expansionist Imperial statute it could hardly have been otherwise. And, while the Irish branch of the Anglican Church was dis-Established in the late 19th century, that did not lead to it becoming pacifist, or being Irish in any but the West British sense.

The Anglican mind, which I have observed at close quarters, seems genuinely incapable of distinguishing between war and peace where Britain is concerned. The British state makes war for peace. And a famous Archbishop of Dublin three hundred years ago, William King—an enlightened Bishop of the Glorious Revolution whose medium of thought was the philosophy of John Locke—revealed that Evil was what obstructed the Will. He did not need to say the *British will*, because he was a creator of the British world, entirely immersed in its affairs.

Archbishop Gregg's biographer, Seaver, published a memoir of Apsely George Benet Cherry-Garrard (1886-1959), in which he said of Cherry-Garrard's forbear: "*As a young officer, Apsely Cherry served with gallantry in the Indian Mutiny and in the Kaffir and Zulu Wars*". All of these might be fairly described as massacres, indiscriminate slaughters. The blood-lust unleashed against the Indians led to the slaughter of hundreds of thousands, probably millions, which was covered up until India began to orientate itself after the slaughter which accompanied independence in 1945, massacres resulting from British divide-and-rule tactics during the preceding half century. As for the Kaffir Wars, sometimes called the Fuzzy-Wuzzy Wars, well—

" we had got  
The Maxim Gun and they had not."

It is entirely understandable that Archbishop Gregg and his biographer, being what they were, should have said what they did. It is a different matter when a Professor of Irish Studies uses them as authorities on the Dunmanway killing, about which he clearly has no actual evidence, and runs together different events in different time in garbled manner.

Oh, I almost forgot:

"We can speculate that if Sam Maguire, who had sworn Michael Collins into the IRB, had been at home on the family farm near Dunmanway on the night of April 26, 1922, there might be no Sam Maguire Cup today" (Walker).

Sam Maguire was a Dunmanway Protestant Republican. A Gaelic football trophy is named after him. Professor Walker is so convinced that the killings were directed against Protestants just because they were Protestants that he considers it likely that this eminent Protestant Republican would have been killed if he had been at home. And the *Independent* Editor agrees, and singles this belief out for a blurb:

"*Dunmanway was the home of Sam Maguire. If he had been home that night there may have been no Sam Maguire cup...*"

When, during the Provo war, I was making out a case, in West Belfast, for the Ulster Protestants, and for Partition, but against "the Northern Ireland state", I came to despise the Irish Institute. Was I wrong?

**Brendan Clifford**

**The Dunmanway Killings, Curiouser and Curiouser** by Jack Lane. 28pp. **€6, £5**

**Propaganda as Anti-History:** Peter Hart's 'The IRA and its enemies' examined. *Owen Sheridan*. 100pp. **€10, £8**

**The Catholic Predicament In 'Northern Ireland', Catastrophe And Resurgence,** Volume One: **Catastrophe, 1914-1968** **€24, £20**

**Northern Ireland What Is It?** Professor Mansergh Changes His Mind by *Brendan Clifford*. 278pp. **€24, £20**

**ALL POSTFREE IN  
EURO AND STERLING ZONES**

On-line sales of books,  
pamphlets and magazines:

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

## Could a Belatedly 'Democratised' Fascist Protector Of A Vicious Sectarian Murderer Ever Be Acceptable As Taoiseach?

Could a belatedly 'democratised' Fascist protector of a vicious sectarian murderer ever be acceptable as Taoiseach? History has already answered that question, on which more presently. In the meantime, let us take a brief detour into some contemporary political skulduggery. Nobody revelled more in the arrest of Sinn Féin President Gerry Adams than Ed Moloney of the infamous Boston College tapes project. In the *Irish Daily Mail* on 1st May, before Adams had been released without charge, Moloney opined:

"For the last ten years and more, Gerry Adams has struggled to remove a very large monkey from his back and a cynic could be forgiven for suspecting that by offering himself up for questioning to Police Service of Northern Ireland detectives yesterday about the 1972 IRA abduction, murder and disappearance of Jean McConville, he will be hoping that this is exactly what will happen. With Sinn Féin riding high in the opinion polls in the Republic, and Adams's own personal popularity also soaring, the republican party's leader knows that unless he can somehow separate himself from the Jean McConville 'disappearance', his rivals will continue to throw up the death of the widowed mother of ten during the next general election campaign as evidence of him being unfit for office. As the Sinn Féin president contemplates the very real possibility that his party could be part of the next coalition government in Dublin with himself as a senior figure in it, *even Tánaiste* {my emphasis, MOR}, the stakes are enormously high. His surrender at the interrogation suite at Antrim police station is a gamble which only time will prove the right or wrong move... If all goes well for the Sinn Féin leader he may be able to emerge from Antrim police station to say that he had subjected himself to lengthy questioning, had answered fully and there were no charges. The monkey will be off his back. But all that is assuming that there are no more dark stories to come out. And that may well be a big assumption."

"*This is Adams's bid for power*" was the sub-heading on Moloney's "*opinion piece*", with its suggestion that Sinn Féin's democratic electoral successes heralded something akin to an impending "Fascist"

coup. That was the cue for the editor of the *Irish Daily Mail*, Paul Drury, to write on the following day, May 2: "*There yesterday was the leader of Sinn Féin and world-renowned peace-maker, behind bars in the serious crime suite of Antrim police station, being held, after news of his 'arrest' was tweeted by the PSNI.*" And Editor Drury's own opinion piece was explicitly headlined: "*Let this be a timely wake-up call to the electorate: we don't want Gerry Adams to be next Tánaiste*". With not a shred of evidence against him, Adams was 'judged' to be congenitally unfit to be No 2 in the Government of the Republic, although the *Mail* had not the guts to also call for the removal of Martin McGuinness as Northern Ireland Deputy First Minister. But, in sinking so low, Moloney and Drury might at least have aimed higher. Gerry Adams is in fact in contention for the No 1 spot, as the next Taoiseach, according to the assessment of the European and Local Election results by Fine Gael Minister Leo Varadkar, who stated on May 24th that the next General Election would be to decide whether the Irish Government was to be led by Sinn Féin or Fine Gael.

The current Fine Gael/Labour Taoiseach Enda Kenny and the Fianna Fáil leader of the Opposition Micheál Martin outdid each other in also welcoming Adams's arrest. Martin, of course, is a Fianna Fáil leader determined to out Fine Gael the Fine Gaelers themselves, by not only openly dumping on Haughey and Ahern, but also by surreptitiously selling out the legacy of de Valera and Lemass. And, if there is one politician who, against the odds, can succeed in making Kenny look relatively good, it is surely Martin, by sinking even lower. At Leaders' Questions in the Dáil this May 13th, the Fianna Fáil leader set about felon-setting in a big way:

"Regarding the Boston College tapes of interviews relating to the McConville case, a disturbing trend is emerging whereby those with anything to do with the Boston College project are being labelled as touts, and as greedy and reckless. A hate campaign is being developed by foot soldiers within the Sinn Féin movement, as far as I can

ascertain, to target people. Regardless of whether one likes it, I believe the people involved in the Boston College project saw it as an historical project. They did not envisage the British prosecuting authorities seeking release of the tapes... Now a hate campaign has developed where those responsible for conceiving the project and doing the interviews are being targeted in language that is very dangerous. The Taoiseach might have seen recent articles in which Mr. Ivor Bell is called the 'Boston tout'. People are under pressure to come clean about the contents of the controversial Boston tapes. It is very sinister and almost sets people up for attack. It makes people very insecure and anxious. There should be no toleration of it. It is extremely important that it is nipped in the bud and that all responsible people would deal with that. I ask for the Taoiseach's comments on the implications of that."

The Fine Gael/Labour Taoiseach responded with alacrity:

"In respect of Jean McConville, I agree with Deputy Martin's sentiments here. I will not stray into the area of Deputy Adams's arrest or the questions he was asked over the number of days he was in custody... I agree with a comment made by Deputy Martin in regard to the Boston College tapes that there seems to be a sort of campaign that these are not valid, authentic or real contributions. Somebody who knows something about this said to me that some of the contributors were either dependant on alcohol or requiring of substance use all the time. I suppose the old saying *in vino veritas* is still valid."

In other words, Martin facilitated Kenny in pronouncing that alcoholic interviewees accusing Adams of "*murder*" should be regarded as telling a drunken "*truth*".

Nobody was more horrified by such political developments than the former Fianna Fáil Minister for State, Martin Mansergh. Now, Mansergh is a man who has rightly been criticised in this magazine for unbelievable statements he has made on past Irish history, not least in respect of the wartime spying mission of Elizabeth Bowen, and in last February's *Irish Political Review* I myself also criticised him for some nonsensical remarks he had written in respect of the War of Independence. But, as regards some aspects of more recent Irish history which Mansergh himself has not only lived, but in which he was an important player, Mansergh should be listened to with respect. Unlike Micheál Martin, who is a parasite on a peace process that he is all too opportunistically prepared to explode with deadly effect, Martin Mansergh played a key role in its achievement.

Mansergh has also given full credit, not only to Taoisigh Bertie Ahern and Albert Reynolds, but also to Taoiseach Charlie Haughey's own pioneering role in engaging with Father Alec Reid and paving the way for such peace negotiations. And, above all, Mansergh knows how central Adams was, not only to the achievement of that peace agreement in the first place, but in ensuring its durability. On May 8th the *Irish Times* was hardly in a position to turn down an article which Mansergh had offered under the heading of "*Adams episode sounds warning on peace process*". While political pigmies—the party 'leadership' troika of Kenny-Gilmore-Martin—revelled in the PSNI arrest of Adams, it was left to Mansergh to point out some awkward truths, even if he diplomatically pulled back from some others, allowing Lord Bew to slither off the hook:

"Most people whose concern is that peace in Northern Ireland and the institutional arrangements that underpin it should endure will have been unsettled by events of the last week. The arrest of Sinn Féin leader Gerry Adams and his interrogation for four days at Antrim police station, not only about the murder of Jean McConville 42 years ago but about his whole life in the republican movement, have no precedent since the days of Parnell... The Belfast Agreement was not just negotiated between opposing political parties. It involved the taming of dark forces, by persuading republicans and loyalists that there existed a balanced alternative democratic way that would allow the peaceful resolution of deep-seated differences peacefully in the shorter and longer term, while allowing people to get on with their lives in a more normal atmosphere... The agreement sought to draw a line under the past... It was not envisaged that anyone would be charged with prior membership of a paramilitary organisation or a directing role in the absence of new activity or offence.... It is Adams's past IRA association that enabled him to exercise the influence that brought about a ceasefire, and later disarmament and dissolution. No one foresaw that internal opponents of the peace process would become so embittered as to testify against Adams, albeit as part of a research project under supposedly guaranteed lifetime confidentiality... The Boston tapes have been a complete debacle, having been commandeered by the PSNI, prejudicing any future project. Apparently, with great foresight—or was it foreknowledge?—British law was changed 10 years ago to permit the admissibility of such statements, even where people were dead. Anthony McIntyre has engaged before, during and after the project, in repeated polemical attacks on the Sinn Féin leadership's conduct of the peace process,

suggesting a more immediate political, and not just a long-term scholarly, intention. To give just one instance, in his collected articles *Good Friday: The Death of Irish Republicanism*, he refers in April 2004 to '*the nauseating spectacle of Sinn Féin at the Republican plot*'. Ed Moloney in his foreword argues that the Adams-McGuinness leadership employed '*ambiguity, deception, dishonesty, betrayal, duplicity etc*', calls their allies '*a bunch of authoritarian Stalinist control freaks*', and expresses frustration that Adams and McGuinness have managed to escape '*Houdini-like from the straitjacket of IRA violence*'. Are these examples of the spirit of '*professionalism and detachment*', which, Moloney claims, informed conduct of the project? ... Boston College is right to question why the British government, with its huge investment in the peace process, allowed the PSNI to subpoena the tapes, when it has no difficulty 'in the public interest' in preventing the law from taking its course in relation to following up evidence which implicates members of the security forces? Did the Irish Government express any reservations about it?"

On May 20th the *Irish Times* followed through by facilitating Ed Moloney with an "opinion piece" in which Mansergh was second only to Adams as the target for his vitriol and bile:

"(In July 1981) a continuation of the hunger strike helped ensure the success of Owen Carron in that August's Westminster by-election in Fermanagh-South Tyrone caused by Bobby Sands's death... Carron's victory paved the way for Sinn Féin's electoral strategy and set in motion forces that, as I write, have placed Sinn Féin on the cusp of government on both sides of the Border. That July 1981 episode {the hunger strike negotiations spin disputed by Danny Morrison in his *Irish Times* letter on May 21—MO'R} thus assumes critical historical importance. Arguably it also explains ... why Sinn Féin, and those like Dr Martin Mansergh who recycle Sinn Féin's talking points, are so agitated about the Boston College project... This story, and the Sinn Féin-led offensive against the Boston project, is about more than the character of *the man who might be Ireland's next Tánaiste* {my emphasis – MO'R}, although it is surely that as well. It is about who controls the narrative of the IRA's part in over 30 years of violence in the North. Mansergh accuses the Boston project of hypocrisy when I wrote that it was carried out in a 'professional and detached' way... The logic of Mansergh's critique of the Boston project is unavoidable... That is the history telling of totalitarianism."

It is quite ironic that Maloney's two poison pen 'essays' against the prospect of Adams becoming Tánaiste should have

been published in the *Daily Mail* and the *Irish Times*, since both papers are on record as having welcomed Adolf Hitler's achievement of power. The *Daily Mail* editorial on 10th July 1933, headlined "*Youth Triumphant*", argued that "*the minor misdeeds of individual Nazis would be submerged by the immense benefits the new regime is already bestowing upon Germany*". But the *Irish Times* had been well ahead of the *Mail* in that race. In his 1965 essay *Passion and Cunning*, long before he became a UK Unionist—in a period, indeed, when he might accurately have been described as a Socialist Republican—Conor Cruise O'Brien drew history's attention to "*Herr Hitler's Way*", the lead *Irish Times* editorial of 4th March 1933, which had welcomed the impending victory of Hitler's Nazi storm-troopers. O'Brien pointed out:

"Pro-Fascist opinions... were quite usual in the Irish Protestant middle-class... in the twenties and thirties. The *Irish Times*, spokesman of that class, aroused no protest from its readers when it hailed Hitler as '*Europe's standard bearer against Muscovite terrorism*' and its references to Mussolini were as consistently admiring as those to Soviet Russia were consistently damning."

That *Irish Times* Hitlerite editorial enthused:

"Events in Germany are moving towards a rapid *dénouement*. The general elections will take place tomorrow, and, although opinions vary concerning the result, there seems to be a fairly general belief that Herr Hitler will score another of his spectacular triumphs. He will conclude his election campaign tonight at Königsberg, in East Prussia, which may be said to be the cradle of Junkerdom; and he proposes to fly across the Polish 'Corridor', greatly to the annoyance of the Poles. In the meanwhile, the burning of the Reichstag, for which Communist extremists were almost certainly responsible, has caused much indignation throughout the Reich. Few believe that the official Communist Party had any part in the outrage, especially on the eve of an election; but the country is honeycombed with Communist clubs which owe no allegiance to anybody. The new Chancellor has taken the fullest advantage of the popular resentment to pursue a ferocious campaign against Communism in every shape and form. Thousands of individuals have been taken into custody. The notorious *Nordviertel* in Berlin, which is inhabited mainly by extremists, has been combed from one end to the other; and the Nazi storm troops have given short shrift to any Communists who have been foolish enough to cross their path. Omelettes cannot be prepared without the smashing



of eggs. Innocent persons have suffered, and are likely to suffer, in Germany, before Herr Hitler achieves his object; and the Jews, in particular, dread the next forty-eight hours. His insensate hatred of Jewry is the weakest plank in Herr Hitler's programme. Germany owes much to men of Jewish blood. Israel has contributed very largely to German thought and science, and the imputation that every Jew is, *ipso facto*, a menace to the State is unworthy of any national leader. The Jews are excellent citizens, and it would be a great pity if the Nazis should sully an otherwise praiseworthy scheme of national regeneration with the blot of an unreasoning anti-Semitism. In reasoned warfare against the Communists Herr Hitler will have the support of all civilised nations. At the moment he is Europe's standard-bearer against Muscovite terrorism, and, although some of his methods are certainly open to question, nobody doubts his entire sincerity. If he can stabilise Germany, he will place the whole world in his debt. At all events, he has earned his chance; we have little doubt that the German people will give it to him tomorrow."

Nobody was more enthused by Hitler's victory than John A Costello, the Fine Gaeler who would have two periods in office as Taoiseach, heading up the inter-Party Governments of 1948-51 and 1954-57. So the question posed at the outset of this article has already been answered in the affirmative. I am not, of course, suggesting that Costello was still a Fascist by the time he became Taoiseach in 1948. But since it took until 1969 before he would attempt to explain/excuse, and dishonestly so, his proud Fascist boast of 1934, it is not at all clear at what point between 1934 and 1948 he ceased to be such. *The Reluctant Taoiseach—A Biography of John A Costello* (2010), by RTÉ political correspondent David McCullagh, is regarded as the definitive work on its subject. While not a commissioned biography, it was close to being *de facto* an authorised one, with McCullagh given every assistance and encouragement by its subject's son, Declan Costello. In Chapter 5, under the heading of "*The Blueshirts will be victorious*" (p 101), McCullagh gave the impression of tackling a particular controversy head on, particularly since two quotations from Costello also featured as that chapter's sub-headings:

"The Blackshirts were victorious in Italy and ... the Hitler Shirts were victorious in Germany, as ... the Blueshirts will be victorious in the Irish Free State." —John A Costello, 1934;

"It is ridiculous to talk about Cosgrave being a Fascist or James Dillon or myself

or Tom O'Higgins or any of these people—it is absurd." —John A Costello, 1969.

McCullagh's narrative begins as follows:

"On 28 February 1934 John A Costello made his most famous speech in the Dáil—which was unfortunate, as it was probably his most ill-advised. He was responding to Fianna Fáil Justice Minister PJ Rutledge in a debate on the banning of uniforms. The ban was aimed squarely at the Blueshirts, a quasi-Fascist movement which formed part of the new Fine Gael party. Rutledge defended his legislation by outlining similar measures in other countries, to which Costello replied: *'The Minister gave extracts from various laws on the Continent, but he carefully refrained from drawing attention to the fact that the Blackshirts were victorious in Italy and that the Hitler Shirts were victorious in Germany, as assuredly, in spite of this Bill and in spite of the Public Safety Act, the Blueshirts will be victorious in the Irish Free State.'* It was deeply ironic that Costello, as wedded to democracy and the rule of law as any Irish politician, should come to make a speech comparing members of his own political party to Mussolini's Fascists and Hitler's storm-troopers. As he ruefully acknowledged 35 years later {in an RTÉ interview—MO'R}, the phrase went around his constituency at every subsequent election. But he claimed that it never affected him, because 'my own constituents and everyone in Ireland knew that it was only a phrase'. He insisted he only meant that the Blueshirts would ensure free speech, adding that 'at that time Mussolini and Hitler had not reached the bad situation that they subsequently reached, and which brought them odium of the world'. It was true that the worst excesses of Nazism and Fascism were in the future. However, while the plight of German Jews may not have received a huge amount of coverage in the Irish media of the time, the treatment of the Catholic by the Nazis did... Genocide may not have been apparent in 1934, but thuggery most certainly was. As far as Jack Costello was concerned, it was 'only a phrase'. **He did not wear a blue shirt himself** {my emphasis, but a demonstrably untrue statement—MO'R}, was not a fascist ideologue like some former Cabinet ministers, and did not subscribe to extreme views about anything. It was, as he put it, 'absurd' to talk of him or Cosgrave or Dillon or Tom O'Higgins being fascists; but his speech gave the Government the opportunity to do just that, as was shown during the Dáil debate. The controversial passage was part of a very long speech, covering more than 12 columns of the official record, most of which was devoted to a defence of civil rights, and a claim that the Bill was a menace to democracy because it

was aimed by the Government at the main Opposition party, which had been acting within the law... But Government speakers pounced on the comparison between the Blueshirts and the Nazis... Seán Lemass, the Minister for Industry and Commerce, said his speech 'brings very forcibly before the Dáil another stage in the development of militarism in politics'. Perhaps the main explanation, if not justification, for the speech was the belief on the Opposition benches that democracy was under threat from the Government, and in particular from its leader (de Valera) ... The fact that events proved these fears groundless does not mean that they were not genuinely felt" (pp 101-103).

Notwithstanding some gentle chiding of Costello, McCullagh's 'explanation' is indistinguishable from an *apologia*. And the *apologia* was sustained:

"On 9 September 1933, agreement was reached on a merger between Cumann na nGaedheal, the Centre Party and the Blueshirts, with (Eoin) O'Duffy as leader. The new party was called Fine Gael ... with Costello one of the Cumann na nGaedheal (National Executive) nominees... Meanwhile, (Fine Gael leader) O'Duffy's increasingly intemperate speeches were causing concerns in the ranks of the new party. According to Costello {35 years belatedly —MO'R}, 'he had been causing us tremendous trouble by speeches around the country, you never knew what he was going to say'. In Ballyshannon, Co Donegal, on 9 December, he gave the Government its chance with a particularly incendiary attack: *'... Whenever Mr de Valera ... arrests you Republicans, and puts you on board beds in Mountjoy, he is entitled to the fate he gave Mick Collins and Kevin O'Higgins. He does not understand the people of this country because he is a half-breed.'* ... On Sunday 17 December he was arrested... On the Monday, Costello made a late-night application ... for an order of *Habeas Corpus* to secure O'Duffy's release... Mr Justice Byrne found, in effect, that wearing a blue shirt, was not a crime {and which is why the Government now needed to introduce the Wearing of Uniforms Bill—MO'R} ... and ordered his release... It was a major propaganda victory for the Blueshirts, and a legal triumph for Costello... But the Government was determined to take action, and two days after his release, O'Duffy was arrested on five new charges... The first two charges related to membership of an unlawful association ... the National Guard... The other charges related to his speech in Ballyshannon—he was charged with sedition, incitement to murder President de Valera, and attempting to incite murder... On 21 March, the High Court ruled that O'Duffy could be tried on the

first two charges but not on the other three ..." (pp 111-114).

McCullagh apparently saw nothing incongruous in Costello's "*only a phrase*" protestations and his defence of O'Duffy for his racist incitement to murder the "*half-breed*" de Valera. He saw nothing odd in the fact that it took 35 years for Costello to attempt any explanation/excuse for his 1934 Hitlerite speech. For one who claimed a thorough reading of that day's Dáil Debates, McCullagh omitted quoting from that same speech Costello's proud boast that he **did** wear a blue shirt: "*We wear a blue shirt, or those of us who are members of the League of Youth, wear a blue shirt*". He agreed with Costello's 1969 contention that it was "*absurd*" to talk of W.T. Cosgrave, James Dillon or Tom O'Higgins—O'Duffy's predecessor as leader of the Army Comrades Association Blueshirts—ever having been Fascists. He ignored the photographic evidence of an infamous Fine Gael rally in Dublin's Mansion House, with Cosgrave flanked by O'Duffy and the veteran Redmondite Lord Mayor Alfie Byrne, and all and sundry giving the Fascist salute. He ignored the British espionage report from Elizabeth Bowen on November 9, 1940: "*I had a long and very interesting talk ... with Mr James Dillon ... (whose) religious fanaticism (is) of the purest kind I have met. This streak in Mr Dillon might be strongly felt in this country, if he ever came into full power... I have heard Mr Dillon labelled a Fascist—which is I am afraid at least partly true.*" And he ignored the recruitment letter John Betjeman had sent to the Earl of Rosse on behalf of O'Higgins on 19th April 1933:

"I have a friend ... who is one of the Big Three in the new White Army in Ireland. As you are an Irish Citizen and I expect have opinions about Dev's actions and politics at the moment, I thought that you might be interested in the enclosed pamphlets about the ACA—the White Army... All people who have property and TREES in Ireland are bound to be a bit anxious now and it looks to me as though their only hope lies in the ACA."

By quoting only half a sentence from Seán Lemass's response to Costello's Hitlerite speech on that same day, McCullagh also gave the impression that it amounted to little more than Fianna Fáil point-scoring about "*only a phrase*", whereas what Lemass had in fact delivered was a measured and thoughtful anti-Fascist analysis:

"The contention that this Bill was introduced here for no other reason except

that the political Party which supports the Government wants to spite its political opponents is a very interesting one, having regard to the information given to Deputies by the Minister for Justice concerning similar enactments in other countries. Is it suggested that the Government in Belgium, Holland, Sweden or Switzerland enacted similar legislation for the purpose of spiting its political opponents? Is it suggested that the British Government is contemplating similar legislation for that purpose? Not at all. Legislation was introduced in those other countries, and is being introduced here, because as a post-war development there has been a tendency in many countries towards the militarisation of politics, which it is very necessary to arrest if democratic institutions are going to be preserved.

"We are in the very fortunate position that we have had vivid examples given us of the dangers of such developments. It is not a matter of speculation with us. We can see in many European countries this development of militarising of politics at its various stages, its incipient stages, its half-developed stages, and its complete stage. We can see them there. First of all one Party adopts a distinctive uniform. It does so, on the pretext that it is necessary to organise some body in that way to protect the interests of its members, and they have always proclaimed that the uniformed body they organised was to be available to assist the forces of the State in the preservation of order. In making the claim that the Blueshirt organisation here had such a purpose, Deputies opposite were not original. They were merely conforming to the type of such organisations in all countries. That is the first stage. The second stage is the incitement of disorder, because the putting on of a distinctive uniform and the regimenting of the supporters of a political Party in a semi-military organisation has led to disorder in all countries. It is a fact that there is danger arising when it is possible easily to distinguish one's supporters and one's opponents. Deputies may pretend that there is no force in the argument put forward by the Attorney-General in that connection. There is very great force. Not merely does the wearing of a uniform promote in the mind of the individual wearing it a desire to support others in the same uniform in any action they take, whether that action is violent or peaceful, but the presence of such uniformed persons on the public streets seems, almost inevitably, to provoke extreme hostility among the opponents of that Party. That has been the experience not merely in this country but in Great Britain and in every European country. It is useless to pretend that only irresponsible supporters of Fianna Fáil react in that manner. The supporters of Fianna Fáil are no different in their make-up from the supporters of any other political Party in this State or in any other State. I have

traced the first and second stage in the development of militarism in politics.

"The third stage is the dangerous one when the opponents of the uniformed force decide to uniform themselves. I think that even Deputies opposite can see the danger that arises when that happens and is there any reason why it should not happen? If Deputies opposite insist that their constitutional rights entitle them to organise this semi-military and uniformed body, is there any reason why other political organisations in this State should not exercise the same rights? And once that happens, civil war becomes almost inevitable. Once that happened in other countries, civil war happened. That is the next stage and the fourth stage can be seen in to-night's issue of the *Evening Herald* in the headlines 'Critical Day for Austria. Nazi Ultimatum to the Government Expires.' That is the next stage.

"Surely Deputies, with these examples before them, with these lessons to be learned from the contemporary history of other countries, are not hoping to get away with the very foolish contention that the sole reason behind this Bill is a desire on the part of the Government to prevent its opponents developing an efficient organisation? These dangers have appeared and have caused concern to the Governments of Great Britain, of Belgium, of Holland, of Sweden, of Switzerland and of other countries, although in these countries there has been nothing approaching civil war for many centuries, although in these countries there has been stable government for many generations and although in these countries there is deep-rooted in the people a respect for the existing institutions and the existing forms. Here it is only a decade since there was a civil war that divided our people, and however great the dangers might be in Great Britain or elsewhere, the dangers here are ten times as great and that is the reason why it is all the more necessary for us to adopt here the same measures that more stable and longer established Governments have had to adopt to meet the same situation. I think it is true to say that the bitterness created by the civil war that took place here in 1922 has been more intense during the past six months than it was in 1924."

"Deputy Costello's two reasons against this Bill were, firstly, that it was, in his opinion, a Bill brought in against a political party, and the first of its kind, and, secondly, because it was an invasion of individual rights. The Constitution and the law of this State guarantee to everybody the right of free association for lawful purposes, and Deputies opposite can exercise that right. As a political party they can organise themselves to the *n*th degree. They can establish their branches in every part of this country and no one is going to interfere with them. Nobody will attempt to arrest their director of elections a week

before polling day; nobody will raid their Party offices or seize their Party literature. The only thing we ask of them is that they organise themselves as a political party for lawful purposes and not as a military organisation for some secret purpose which is occasionally revealed, but just as frequently contradicted. The only information we have about the purposes of the military organisation that these Deputies are now associated with was obtained from speeches made by the leader of that organisation. He talked of dictatorship; he talked of the reform of the parliamentary institutions of this State; he talked of abolishing democratic Government and instituting a new system upon which the people would be allowed to express an opinion after it had been in existence for five years. He talked of quite a lot of things in that strain from time to time... He has made it quite clear that Fascism of some kind is the type of political association he wants to establish in this State. Deputy Costello here to-day also made the same statement. He said the Blackshirts won in Italy; the Brownshirts won in Germany and the Blueshirts will win here in Ireland. That brings very forcibly before the Dáil another stage in the development of militarism in politics that I have not mentioned up to the present. I mentioned the first stage where political uniforms appear for the first time. The second stage where public disorder takes place; the third where an opposing uniformed force is organised and an attempt at civil war is created; the fourth, when one of these irregular private armies feels strong enough to dictate to the elected government as has taken place in Austria, and there is a fifth stage when one of these private armies succeeds in overthrowing the elected government and establishing itself in the position to dictate to the people of that country."

There was another Fianna Fáil contribution that same day which McCullagh chose to totally ignore. The Minister for Finance, Seán MacEntee, first entered this debate by way of heckling the speech of the Blueshirt Paddy Hogan, formerly Cumann na nGaedheal Minister for Agriculture. MacEntee interjected: "*Does Deputy Hogan know anything of Conroy who is a member of the Blueshirt organisation? The Deputy ought to, because his Government allowed him to go free when he should be in jail for murder. You took care that the evidence went out of the country.*" In his own speech MacEntee further elaborated:

"It is necessary that I should say, on the facts before me, of which Deputy Hogan is aware and of which every member of the Government which was charged with the administration of the law from 1923 was aware ... having heard him say that

he, when in office, stood for the principle of 'every man equal before the law and every man within the law', I do not regard Deputy Hogan as having made anything else than a hypocritical statement in using those words... Whom did his Government punish in 1923 for the (November 1923) murders of Kahn and Goldberg, for the armed raid on the offices of the London, Midland and Scottish Railway Company in May of 1923, or for the armed robbery in College Green in August of 1923? Whom did Deputy Hogan's Government punish for these crimes? Will Deputy Hogan answer me that? The man who committed these crimes, as I have already stated to-night, is a member of the Blue Shirt organisation at the present moment. He was allowed to go free even though those charged with the administration of the law at that time were well aware of the crimes he had committed, even though a member of the detective division identified him in a public court in February of 1924. That detective, when he referred to headquarters to ask whether he could arrest that man or not, was told he should not arrest him until he got further instructions. He received no instructions to apprehend that man until December, 1924, ten months afterwards... When a man was arrested in December, 1924, a brother of one of the two men implicated in the shooting not merely of the man called Kahn but also of a man named David Miller, and when that man, on 23rd December, 1924, made a voluntary statement in which he said that not he but his brother had been guilty of that dastardly crime and that with his brother there was associated another man, what action did the Government take, the Government which, according to Deputy Hogan stood always for the principle of 'every man equal before the law and every man within the law'? Remember the then Executive Council had information who these men were, and knew that on the night of the 14th November the two of them were missing from Beggars' Bush Barracks and were driving around in an Army car through the city. A member of the detective division, a detective-sergeant, identified the two of them in Green Street Courthouse on 22nd February, 1924. I have it here on record that, when he communicated this fact to his superiors, he was told not to take action and not to dare to apprehend the men until he received further instructions from headquarters. He received no instructions from headquarters..."

"If anyone read this file, as I have read it, the details of this horrible incident would never be absent from his memory; he could, if he desired, at any time recall them. They were recalled to my memory by the speech of Deputy Hogan, who said he was a member of the Government that regarded every man as equal before the law and that insisted that all men should live within the law. I said a detective

sergeant of the force recognised, within the precincts of a court, in this State, two men whose descriptions were given to the police authorities by one of the men attacked upon the occasion to which I have referred, and who, more fortunate than Kahn, escaped with his life. The detective communicated that fact to his superior officer and was told and instructed to do nothing until he received further instructions. One would think that he would receive such instructions by return with the telephone receiver still in his hands, but he was told to do nothing. Yet we are told now that all men were equal before the law. One would think that he would have been ordered to do his duty by the laws of God and the community and bring these men whose hands were red with the blood of their fellowmen to justice. He received no instructions, I repeat, until the 22nd December, more than 12 months after the date of the murder, and more than ten months after he had identified these men in court. Then he arrested one of them, the driver of the car, the brother of one of the murderers, who confessed he was there that night. I shall read the whole document if you like. There was now before them the confession of one of the gang that these two people had been implicated in this murder. Did they go then and immediately arrest these men? Not at all. They did not apply for a warrant until the 6th March, 1925. Then, when the essential witness in the case, the driver of the car, was brought up, and was acquitted of the charge of murdering Kahn, and when he had yet to stand his trial for shooting at with intent to murder Miller, instead of opposing bail and holding him in custody, as an essential witness, in the prosecution against the other men, what did the then Government that we are now told stood for equal and impartial enforcement of the law do? They allowed that man to get bail and abscond in July, 1925, so that the essential evidence in the case was wafted out of the country. Now the witnesses are gone, but the criminals came back..."

"Do not drive me too far. I could tell of another man, too, if I liked, who was guilty of a most brutal murder. I am showing these men are Blue Shirts now and if there was no other justification for banning that organisation, but enlisting these men who must be known to men in that organisation, who knew that they were enlisting men who were guilty not of one murder but of more, that was more than sufficient justification. I am sorry that I had the misfortune to be in the House when Deputy Hogan was speaking, otherwise I should not have referred to this incident at all, but I knew it was well within Deputy Hogan's knowledge. I do not want to say any more than that. I do ask what is the purpose of an organisation which would knowingly or unknowingly, wittingly or unwittingly, have men of that sort in its ranks? Let them expel

them... The Minister for Industry and Commerce has already challenged the Opposition to answer this question: If you can put yourselves into uniform for the purpose of protection, why stop at uniform? Why not revolvers and rifles and machine-guns? I would ask a further question in view of what appears in the newspapers this evening. Do your men not carry revolvers? Have they not rifles cached away and. God knows, don't we know that? Your own leader, General O'Duffy, has told us that Jerry Ryan and those others who left Templemore Barracks took a lot of military equipment with them. And if you are to wear uniforms and have rifles and revolvers are we going to put our organisation, and it is a more numerous organisation than yours, in uniform also? Are we going to give them rifles and revolvers and are we going to see the people of this country divided into two armed camps waiting for the day when one or the other, by a *coup d'état*, will overthrow the established Government of the country. And yet that is the inevitable consequence of the policy which you are pursuing to-day. Either we agree that both Parties organise upon a militaristic basis or else we agree that the Bill now before the Dáil becomes law within the shortest possible time. That is the dilemma and there is no escape from it. We are told, and none of you deny, that the outcome which you are looking for in the present situation, in the situation which you are hoping will develop, is that which developed in Italy, is that which developed in Germany, is that which apparently is on the brink of development in Austria when the Party machine will dominate, not merely the Dáil and the Oireachtas, but will dominate the whole State and the whole people. That is the philosophy which is behind your movement, that it is inspired by introverted Communism which has been responsible for the development of a situation on the Continent in which every man must surrender himself to the State. Mussolini, we are told by Deputy Costello, has won; Hitler has won, and the Blue Shirts are going to have their victory, too. What sort of a victory has been won in Germany? The most sacred rights of the individual are being made subject and inferior to the presumed advantage of the race and no man dare call his soul or body his own when the very foundations of Christianity are being assailed."

The Dáil debate on the Wearing of Uniforms Bill continued on March 1, 2, 13 and 14. Costello was present for votes on those days, but did not come back to contribute even a single word more during that Dáil debate. Why? He would not have been rattled by Lemass's anti-Fascist analysis, as he would not have accepted a word of it. But MacEntee's revelation that Costello's beloved Blueshirts had within its ranks the Jew-killer Jimmy Conroy

was a different matter, since Conroy's evasion of justice on charges of the anti-Semitic murder of Ernest Emanuel Kahn had happened on Costello's watch.

Hugh Kennedy had been Costello's mentor. In May 1922, as the Law Officer of Collins's Provisional Government, Kennedy brought in Costello as his Legal Assistant, who continued in that role when Kennedy became the Irish Free State's first Attorney General. The Irish Civil War ended in May 1923. Two months later, in July, Seán Lemass's brother Noel was brutally tortured and murdered by Free State personnel. It was not until October 1923 that Noel Lemass's severely mutilated corpse was discovered buried in the Dublin mountains. At the subsequent inquest Costello represented the Free State Government against the legal representatives of the Lemass family. When Kennedy became the Free State's first Chief Justice in June 1924, Costello carried on as Legal Assistant to the new Attorney General, and when he in turn was elevated to the bench in January 1926, Costello himself became the Free State's third Attorney General.

The one member of the Cumann na nGaedheal Government who seemed determined to see justice done in respect of the post-Civil War lawlessness of Free State Army personnel was the Minister for Justice, Kevin O'Higgins, and he was genuinely horrified by the murders by Free State soldiers of two members of the Jewish community, Barnet Goldberg and Ernest Kahn, within a fortnight of each other in November 1923, and the attempted murder of a third Jew, Kahn's companion, David Miller. Conroy had been identified by Miller as Kahn's killer, but before he could be brought to trial, Free State Army and Garda officers facilitated his flight and evasion of justice. When his whereabouts were eventually traced to Mexico, O'Higgins asked Costello if Conroy should not be extradited to face his charge of murdering Kahn, but Costello subsequently invoked a range of technical objections to avoid any effective pursuit

of the case. Then, in 1929, Conroy had a further stroke of luck. Arising from a car crash, Miller was sentenced to a year's imprisonment for manslaughter. On his release, Miller emigrated to England. He wanted nothing more to do with the Kahn case, but even if he had ever again been minded to appear in court to identify Conroy and give evidence against him, his credibility as a witness would have been called into question arising from his own manslaughter conviction. Conroy therefore felt it safe to return to Ireland in 1932. Thereafter Conroy lent his muscle to Costello's beloved Blueshirts, while simultaneously demanding of the Government he was trying to overthrow that it award him a military pension. This demand was vigorously resisted by both the Minister for Defence, Frank Aiken, and the Minister for Finance, Seán MacEntee. In July 1934, however, Costello's mentor, Chief Justice Kennedy, found against the Government and demanded that the Jew-killer be given his pension which, following his re-emigration to the USA, he continued to draw down until his death in July 1981.

But what does any of this have to do with a series on Michael Collins? Well, this much: Conroy was central to **both** of Collins's wars. A hand-picked member of Collins's "*Twelve Apostles*" assassination squad, the June issue of *Irish Political Review* has been the first publication to reveal that it was the selfsame Jimmy Conroy who was the driver of Collins's Crossley tender when the latter met his death at Béalnabláth. At which point I should now correct my typo at the end of page 22 of that issue, where I should have written '**exit**' when quoting from page 135 of Meda Ryan's account: "There is no evidence to show that a close range Mauser bullet {from his own Free State side—MOR} killed him. If he was hit by a Mauser bullet it would have created a small entry wound in his forehead and a large **exit** wound at the back of his head."

(to be continued)

**Manus O'Riordan**



**Fascist  
Fine  
Gael**



Does  
It  
Up

Stack  
?

**JOHN MANDEVILLE,  
THE SQUARE, MITCHELSTOWN**

My father taught me how to drive a car when I was twelve years old. I thought it was great fun, the potential freedom if it all! I was the proud owner of a bicycle for a few months previous to driving the car. Looking back now I realise that my father had an agenda. He was involved in Fine Gael politics, which at that time meant republican nationalist politics in Cork. He was Honorary Treasurer of Fine Gael in the Cork Constituency—Cork was all in one constituency back then—and he had started attending meetings in Dublin. Dublin then was, as it still is, 165 miles by road from Cork. (264 kms we say now but the road did not get appreciably shorter.) I mention the distance because Dublin people do not appreciate how far they are from the action on the south coast. Also Dublin people do not seem to realise that even today in 2014 Dublin is cut off all night every night from the rest of Ireland unless you have a car. Public transport does not function during the night between Dublin and the other cities of Ireland.

And so, if my father wished to attend meetings in Dublin, which were arranged to take place in the evenings to suit the Dublin people, then he had to stay in Dublin overnight to get a train home the following morning or he had to have a motor car and a driver. One person could physically drive a car to Dublin and back in one day but the 330 miles of bad and bendy roads were gruelling. And so I became the driver. My father drove to Dublin and I drove back to Cork late in the night while my father dozed. I was given history and geography lessons on the way. John Mandeville's statue on the Square in Mitchelstown was used to illustrate a lecture on the Land League nearly every time we passed through Mitchelstown. The main Cork-Dublin road did not bypass towns in those days.

John Mandeville died on Sunday afternoon, 8th July 1888 at 3 pm. He had been a man of good physique until at 38 years of age he was sentenced to prison in Tullamore Gaol for his Land League activities. He was a staunch supporter of the Kingston tenants and Bloody Balfour made him a target. John Mandeville was tortured in Tullamore. His health was

broken. He refused to wear prison clothing. The gaolers forcibly stripped him of his own clothes. He was left naked in a cell without heating—it was Winter. He insisted on Political Status in prison, he refused to engage in menial prison duties such as "*slopping out*". As a result he was repeatedly and many times punished by being put on a diet of bread and water, by being deprived of a mattress and having to sleep on a plank bed, by being put in a punishment cell with an iron door, ill-fitting door jambs and directly opening to the fresh air in isolation from other cells, and not being allowed out for exercise.

Initially in Cork Gaol, he was given back his own clothes and transferred to Tullamore Gaol by special train. Tullamore was thought by Dublin Castle, acting on Balfour's instructions, to be more remote from communications and visitors and to be under the control, Balfour was assured, of a Governor named Captain Featherston-Haugh and a doctor named Dr. James Ridley "*who were to be relied on*", according to Lord Halifax's memoirs. On 31st October 1887 John Mandeville was in Cork Gaol and on the night of 1st November 1887 until 24th December 1887 he was held in Tullamore Gaol. Repeatedly the prison doctor Dr. James Ridely certified the prisoner to be fit for punishment and repeatedly the Governor Captain Featherston-Haugh punished him on orders from the Central Prison Board in Dublin Castle, closely controlled by Balfour the Chief Secretary for Ireland under the occupying power—the British Government.

By the time John Mandeville was released on 24th December 1887, he had lost three stone in weight—42 pounds—and his health was broken. He died at home on 8th July 1888 just a few days after his 39th birthday. Evidence was given at the inquest by several expert medical practioners that it was the two months in Tullamore which caused his death, so bad was his treatment there. During the inquest, the Tullamore prison doctor Dr. James Ridley was staying in the Royal Hotel, Fermoy, which is about 10 miles from Mitchelstown. On one morning Dr. Ridley did not join the rest of his party for breakfast before going to Mitchelstown for the inquest at which he was due to give evidence. The other medical experts had already given evidence that the treatment of John Mandeville in Tullamore under Dr. Ridley's medical supervision amounted to torture. Someone went up to call him and found Dr. Ridley had cut his own throat with a razor and lay dead on his bed. Perhaps he was conscience-stricken—or did someone want him out of the way?

The inquest on John Mandeville's death went on from 17th -28th July 1888 under Coroner Rice and the jury returned a verdict of death as a result of the brutality of the prison regime. The police did not want the inquest to be held and the Crown witnesses lied and prevaricated throughout.

While over 20,000 people attended John Mandeville's funeral to Kilbehenny Churchyard, in July 1888 there was a sad sequel. John and Mary Mandeville had no children. At the inquest Mary gave evidence of his health before and after his imprisonment because she said her husband wanted the truth to be told. When asked by counsel, she said that before the imprisonment John used to carry her upstairs on one arm. After he came home from Tullamore he tried to do it on one occasion and "*he said I had got too heavy*". She had stood by her man while he was out and about in all weathers battling for the National League and organising the Plan of Campaign to protect the Kingston tenants and others throughout north Munster, Limerick and Tipperary to secure tenant's rights. She staunchly gave evidence to the inquest at a time of great personal distress for her. She had never been allowed visit her husband in prison and suffered greatly at the loss of her beloved at such a young age.

But where were they all who benefited from her husband's actions when she herself died on 22nd December 1935? It is said that there were not enough able-bodied people at her funeral in Kilbehenny and a young man had to be brought from the local pub to help carry her coffin.

**ROY FOSTER**

It seems that there is no stopping Roy Foster these days after his dinner in Windsor. On the 5th June 2014, the *London Review of Books* were able to announce the winner of 'The Elizabeth Longford Prize for Historical Biography for 2014'. It was Charles Moore (former *Telegraph* Editor) for *Margaret Thatcher: The Authorized Biography*. Vol. 1 *Not for Turning*, published by Allen Lane. The prize was £5000 which is to be presented at The Society of Authors awards party on 26th June 2014. The judges were Roy Foster, Antonia Fraser (daughter of Lady Longford) who was also at the dinner in Windsor, and Antonia's own daughter Flora Fraser. The other two other judges were David Gilmore and Munro Price.

Then Roy turns up at the Borris Festival in Borris House, Co. Carlow, now in its third year and teaming with the kind of talent one would expect to be part of

Foster's milieu. Running from June 13th - 15th 2014, John Banville is scheduled to talk with Mariella Frostrup, while the British film director Stephen Frears of *Philomena* fame talks to Philomena Lee herself about her quest to find her son. Dame Judi Dench played the mother and was Oscar nominated for her role. This is a "festival of remembering" according to the *Irish Daily Mail*, 13th June 2014. Joseph O'Connor is due to talk to Olivia O'Leary about his latest novel about a "dysfunctional family" and Damian Barr is also on the programme talking about his memoir *Maggie and Me*, which chronicled the life of a gay man growing up in Thatcherite Britain. "*Remembering is also at the core of novelist Sebastian Barry and historian Roy Foster's discussion—'A True History of Lies' in which they will examine how the Irish past is forgotten and celebrated.*"

I think that more or less tells us what it's all about really.

Micheal Stack ©

**Report: Barra McGrory Commons NI Select Committee investigation of 'Letters of Comfort' sent to the so-called On The Runs**

## "Extreme Care Needed By Senior Law Officers In Use Of Language

"I suspect I am not alone among lawyers in feeling extremely uncomfortable with some of the remarks made by Barra McGrory, DPP on June 10 to the House of Commons Select Committee investigating the OTRs. In reply to Sylvia Hermon MP he agreed that those with the letters of comfort from prosecution "should not sleep easy in their beds"—a reference no doubt intended to question the value of the letters issued by the Northern Ireland Office in that regard. While Sylvia Hermon did suggest this formula of words in her question, Mr McGrory, as an experienced lawyer, should have understood the ambiguous nature and the possibly malign interpretation which could be put on the language used—unfortunately, many people have been murdered in what they thought was the safe haven of their homes. Quite apart from that it is surely no function of a Director of Public Prosecutions to anticipate the outcome of future police investigations and the role which his office may or may not be called upon to play in relation to the result of any such investigations. During the same hearing, and prompted on this occasion by Ian Paisley jnr, who noted that he had previously acted for people who had faced criminal charges by the state, Mr McGrory suggested, somewhat flippantly it appeared, that former "poachers" can often turn out to be the best "gamekeepers".

Again, in his role as Director of Public Prosecutions Mr McGrory is in no sense a gamekeeper—that is the role of the police and the police only. Instead, the office of the DPP is charged only with the vitally important functions of deciding on the justice or equity of prosecuting alleged offenders and, where deemed appropriate, directing their trial according to law through the office of the Public Prosecution Service. Anyone who has lived in the north of Ireland over past years knows only too well the danger which is created when the roles of police, prosecutors and judges become so intertwined as to be indistinguishable..."

Patrick Fahy, Omagh, Co. Tyrone (letter, *Irish News*, 23.6.14).

## Irish Foreign Affairs

ISSN 2055-7779

June issue

Read Manus O'Riordan's report of positive developments in economic governance of the Eurozone.

Plus DeValera and WW2.

Read Philip O'Connor on the non-smoking, non-drinking German socialist sect that dictated post-war politics.

What was the Russian 'Empire' in 1945, compared to the French and English Empires? Brendan Clifford sets out the facts.

Plus more detailed exposition of events leading up to WW1 by Eamon Dyas.

And a further instalment of the Cork *Echo* Correspondence.

Also more articles, documents, a map, and editorial on Egypt.

**Irish Foreign Affairs** (Editor, Philip O'Connor) is published by *Irish Political Review Group*.

Correspondence to: **philip @ atholbooks.org**.

It appears quarterly at €5, £4.

**Subscriptions: 4 issues—**

**Electronic: €10, £8.**

**Postal: Eurozone and World Surface: €24;**

**Sterling zone: £15.**

"The most thought-provoking thing about the times we live in is that we still are not thinking." Heidegger

## The Heidegger Review

ISSN 2055-7779

Issue 1, July 2014

Editor: John Minihane  
Manager: Jack Lane

- Editorial
  - Why Heidegger is interesting.  
(This is a version of a talk on Heidegger given in Belfast on May 25, 2014.)
  - A comment on the above
  - Ireland needs an intellectual life
  - Heidegger's Philosophical Notebooks 1939-1941
  - Tom Kettle and the War against Nietzsche
  - Alexander Dugin And The Fourth Political Theory
- John Minihane  
Jack Lane  
Desmond Fennell  
John Minihane  
Brendan Clifford  
Peter Brooke

Correspondence to: **johnminahane@yahoo.ie**

Published by Athol Books, 33 Athol Street,  
Belfast BT14 4GX

**Subscriptions:  
4 issues.**

**Electronic: €10, £8.**

**Postal: Eurozone and World Surface: €24; Sterling zone: £15.**

## Doctors Differ! And Administrators?

On 25th June, CBC the United States news organisation stated that the US Food and Drug Administration had sent a warning to the company that makes most of Canada's annual flu vaccine.

The US regulator sent a letter to British drug-maker GlaxoSmithKline (GSK) about conditions at the company's manufacturing facility in Ste-Foy, Quebec in Canada.

FDA investigators "*documented deviations from current good manufacturing practice requirements*" in the manufacture of the FluLaval vaccine and its intermediates, the regulator said in a letter dated 24th June 2014.

The regulator said the company had failed to take appropriate steps to prevent microbial contamination of products. The FDA also has concerns about the company's purified water systems.

The FDA warned that the company's licence to produce vaccine for the US market could be suspended or revoked if the problems are not fixed quickly.

About 600 people work at the GSK's manufacturing site at Ste-Foy.

### CORK PLANT

The GlaxoSmithKline Cork plant at Curryabinnny came to the attention of the FDA when an inspector found paroxetine (this is an antidepressant which is sold as Paxil or Seroxat) which was contaminated with material from the plant's pharmaceutical waste tank. GSK at first allowed some batches affected to be shipped without telling their customers about the lapse. The FDA was alarmed that remedial action was not taken at the Cork plant in spite of critical failings in production being uncovered going back as far as January, 2012.

We can be grateful to the *Sunday Business Post* of March 23rd, and an article by Susan Mitchell that updated us on a number of issues. Calls have been made for more transparency in the sponsorship of Medicine. "*Glaxo SmithKline (G.S.K) recently announced that it would end the practice of sponsoring Doctors to attend medical meetings.*" Over a number of years now the industry has put out a few shows of concern for ethics fearful that we might all start asking too many questions. "*G.S.K is not the first major company to jump. In 2011 Astra-Zeneca said the company had tightened up practices in 2011 so that its actions could not be seen as an inducement for Doctors to prescribe its products.*" In

Britain Fiona Godlee of the *British Medical Journal* has been working hard to get progress on this issue. One wonders are there enough doctors who will stand up and possibly bite the bum of the Health Service Executive (H.S.E.) on the matter.

*Mind Freedom International* now has an affiliate in Ireland. *Mind Freedom Ireland* is pioneered by Cork's Mary Maddock. From small beginnings it is now reaching out to a lot of people who have suffered mental illness and their families so they can tell their stories. As well as using the tool of the internet, they organize conferences, lobby health institutions and seek to insure better rights for patients. If someone is committed in this country, it is still very difficult for a sectioning to be overturned. The first step in reform ought to be an automatic and prompt right for a patient to demand an appeal or review with independent advocacy available. There are also a disproportionate number of people with serious verifiable mental illness in the Irish prison system. Campaigners are at the start of a very long road.

### MENTAL HEALTHCARE

"*Helping ourselves*" has become a growing phenomenon with people who are survivors of poor mental healthcare even in Ireland. Overall now there are fewer and fewer examples of ECT or Electro Shock Therapy that are genuinely considered to have been of any benefit to patients. Certainly today, it would appear that ECT should never be applied without a patient's consent. Yet thousands of Irish patients were submitted to ECT over the decades, the great bulk of which should never have been administered. *Mental healthreform.ie* are campaigning on the issue and their principal spokesperson, Dr Shari McDaid, is pursuing the matter as both a health policy and as a human rights issue. Amongst recent publications that are referenced on their web site are '*Unsafe at any Dose*' by Dr Bob Johnson and Ireland's Dr Terry Lynch's '*Selfhood*'. The latter is the author of a previous work entitled '*Beyond Prozac*'. While there is some material of dubious quality on the internet, readers would do well to check out [www.criticalpsychiatry.co.uk](http://www.criticalpsychiatry.co.uk). All of us in communities have a lot to learn, including just how psychotropic drugs work.

One of the cases followed up by *Mind Freedom International* in the United States was that concerning Justina Pelletier. A fourteen-year-old girl spent ten months in a locked psychiatric ward; the reason a review team changed her diagnosis at Tufts Medical center where it had been of

mitochondrial disease and substituted for the Boston Children's hospital estimation of somatoform (mental disorder). Afterwards a Massachusetts Judge ordered her return to the custody of the state's Department of Children and families. Although the girl had been in care before : the visitation privileges of the parents were now to be far more restrictive. Many felt this was not unconnected by the parents taking legal action against the health services and then breaking a Judge's gagging order. The Department of Children and families had itself come under the spotlight of an audit showing them having a lot of shortcomings and even had been found to be neglecting some very vulnerable children. '*The Boston Globe*' also noted that the Boston Children's Hospital had strangely high statistical incidence of somatoform disorder for the size of the population serviced.

### CONSULTANTS

And so conflict has broken out between the management of St Vincent's private hospital and the HSE. Despite supposed changes to contracts, consultants want to flit at will between St Vincent's private, and public work in the hospital next door. Minister O'Reilly and the Dept. of Health are backing the HSE position that Doctors need to give their time exclusively to the public need. Of course O'Reilly had previously defended the older freer contracts and strived for the maximum possible salaries for consultants when he had the role of principal negotiator for the Irish Medical Organisation (IMO) At present experts predict the entire dispute will now move to the courts. Both sides will try to persuade their worshipful lordships of the justice of their cause. While the media might cover this on a superficial basis, there is none of the in-depth drawn-out analysis that is afforded to, for example, the Tribunals. Strange that cuts in other sectors at a less elevated level can be implemented so fully and quickly.

And on the business front there is a merger happening between two of the largest giants of the pharmaceutical industry operating in India. Sun Pharmaceutical and 'Daiichi Sankyo' have announced their delight at the new initiative. The Food and Drugs Administration (FDA-United States) previously found a plant operated by 'Daiichi' namely Ranbaxy was unfit for purpose. They then recommended that nobody should source stocks from there. Ranbaxy has a major operation in the province of Taansa in Punjab.

Seán O Riain



## GUILDS continued

realize that the old Guild System did embody a great and valuable principle which the modern world has forgotten. They are not setting out to restore the Middle Ages; but they are setting out to find a democratic form of industrial autonomy which will spring from the principle which inspired the economic system of Mediaeval Europe."

—*ibid.* pp. xi-xii.

\*\*\*\*\*

"If we would judge them and learn from them, we must study them as they were in the time of their greatest prosperity and power, before the coming of capitalistic conditions had broken their democracy in pieces and destroyed their essential character..."

"The distinction between producer and consumer was important, but it was not so much a distinction between opposing social classes as between complimentary forms of social organisation. In proportion as this was not the case, the balance on which the Guild system rested tended to break down; but the occasion of its breakdown was not the irreconcilable opposition of producer and consumer, but the struggles within the Guilds themselves between traders and craftsmen, or between exclusive and democratic tendencies."

—G. D. H. Cole, *ibid.*

**George Douglas Howard Cole** (1889–1959) was an English political theorist, economist, writer and historian. As a libertarian socialist he was a long-time member of the Fabian Society and an advocate for the Co-operative movement and Guild Socialism.

He was a conscientious objector during World War I, however, he abandoned this position around 1938, stating that "*Hitler cured me of pacifism*".

According to Wikipedia, Cole was "*Neither a Marxist nor a Social Democrat, Cole envisioned a Socialism of decentralized association and active, participatory democracy, whose basic units would be sited at the workplace and in the community rather than in any central apparatus of the State.*"

\*\*\*\*\*

"England of the 15th century... was essentially the country of free men—free producers who commanded as

individuals their own means of production and raw materials..."

—H. M. Hyndman, *The Economics of Socialism*, pp. 27-28. London. 1922.

"Never before or since had man as an individual had such a chance. Controlling his own tools and his own product, selling his labour for hire but seldom and at a good rate; in the country master of his holding and entitled to his share of the use of the common land; in the town member of his guild, secure of his privileges, safe to rise from journeyman to master craftsman and protected against competition—the advantage of such circumstances, and the real freedom and sturdy well-being they gave birth to, I have often descanted upon.

"Local markets, in which adulteration was made criminal and where profit-mongering was relentlessly put down, were supplemented to some extent by the great national and international fairs, at which goods from all parts of Europe and the East were freely offered for sale in exchange for local products. A local and national spirit of individual initiative was thus engendered, which was vivifying to all it touched then and rouses our admiration now. There was some pleasure in doing good work when the craftsman himself was in his way more than half an artist, and the artist who was not also a craftsman was unknown.

"The whole thing hung together. Individual production, individual ownership, individual exchange. From the first step to the last, the worker controlled his means of production and controlled his product. There was no probability then that the creature of his own brain, fashioned by his own hands, would turn again and rend him in the form of an over-produced commodity. The supply and demand alike of goods and of labour was strictly regulated: the object of the restrictions being almost invariably to secure good articles and good pay for producing them. When each man worked the whole or the greater part of his time on the land, or in the town, under such condition as these; when he was certain of good, if rough, food and good clothing from year's end to year's end; when education was far more general and better than has been commonly supposed; and when wage-earning was the exception rather than the rule—when all this was the birthright of the working-class, there

is little need to marvel that they did not welcome a change of system with any great alacrity, so far as they could understand what was coming about."

H. M. Hyndman, *Ibid.*, pp. 27-28.

**Henry Mayers Hyndman** (1842-1921) was an English writer and politician, and the founder of the Social Democratic Federation and the National Socialist Party.

In 1869, Hyndman toured the world, visiting the United States, Australia and several European countries. He continued to write for the *Pall Mall Gazette*, where he praised the merits of British imperialism and criticised those advocating Home Rule for Ireland. Hyndman was also very hostile to the experiments in democracy that were taking place in the United States.

During the 1880s, he was a prominent member of the Irish National Land League and the Land League of Great Britain. He was pro-Boer during the second Boer War. An entry in the *Concise Universal Biography*, London, 1935, states that he "*was bitterly opposed to the South African War, but suspected the German menace as early as 1905*".

Hyndman upset members of the British Socialist Party, which he helped establish, by supporting the United Kingdom's involvement in World War I. The party split in two with Hyndman forming a new National Socialist Party. Hyndman remained leader of this small party until his death on 20th November 1921.

\*\*\*\*\*

"At one period there existed a social order which, though by no means perfect in every respect, corresponded nevertheless in a certain measure to right reason according to the needs and conditions of the times. That this order has long since perished is not due to the fact that it was incapable of development and adaptation to changing needs and circumstances, but it is due to the fact that men were hardened in excessive self-love, and refused to extend that order, as was their duty, to the increasing numbers of the population; or else, deceived by the attractions of false liberty and other errors, they grew impatient of every authority, and endeavoured to throw off all governments."

—Pope Pius XI, *Quadragesimo Anno*, Sect. 97, p.37.

**To be continued**



## Guilds: *Opinions and Comments*

"A consideration of the scope and purposes of English mediaeval guilds cannot but raise our opinion of the wisdom of our forefathers who fostered their growth, and convince us that many and useful ends were served by these voluntary societies. This opinion we can hold, wholly apart from any views we may entertain about the religious aspect of these societies generally. Socialistic they were, but their socialism, so far from being adverse to religion, ... was transfused and directed by a deeply religious spirit, carried out into the duties of life, and manifesting itself in practical charities of every kind"

—Cardinal Francis Aidan Gasquet (1846-1929), *The Eve of the Reformation*, 1927, p.339.

"The system of these voluntary societies would be, of course, altogether impossible and out of place in this modern world of ours. They would not, and could not, meet the wants and needs of these days; and yet their working is quite worth studying by those who are interested in the social problems which nowadays are thrusting themselves upon the public notice and demanding a solution... Unlike what we find to-day in the commercial enterprises of the world, capital played but a very small part in the handicrafts of those times; skill, perseverance, and connection were more important. The Middle Ages had no knowledge of any class of what may be called permanent wage-workers. There was no working-class in our modern sense, if by that is meant a class the greater portion of which never rises. In the 14th century, a few years of steady work as a journey-

man meant, in most cases, that a workman was able to set up as a master craftsman. Every hard-working apprentice expected as a matter of course to be able to become in time a master. The collision between capital and labour to which we are so accustomed had no place in the Middle Ages. There was no such gulf between master and man as exists in our days. The master and his journeyman worked together side by side, in the same shop, at the same work, and the journeyman could earn fully half as much as his master. If we are to institute a comparison between the status of the working classes in the 14th century and to-day, the comparison must be between the workman we know and the old master craftsman... The consumer and producer stood in close relationship, and public control was exercised fully, as the craft guilds were subject to the supervision and direction of the municipal or central authorities of the cities in which they existed."

—Cardinal Francis Aidan Gasquet  
ibid, p.339-340.

*Francis Aidan Gasquet* (1846–1929) was an English Benedictine monk and historical scholar. He was created Cardinal in 1914.

In 1917, he was appointed Archivist of the Vatican Secret Archives. In 1924, he was appointed Librarian of the Vatican Library and elevated to Cardinal Priest of Santa Maria in Portico.

His historical work has been attacked by later writers. Eamon Duffy said in an interview: "*Cardinal Francis Aidan Gasquet, a great Benedictine historian, was both a bad workman and not entirely scrupulous about what he said. So you can be a churchman and a lousy historian.*" Such comment could not be held against Gasquet in relation to his understanding and explanation of the Guild Movement, he is remarkably lucid and scholarly in his analysis.

\*\*\*\*\*

"To an increasing extent in recent years men's thoughts have turned back to the Mediaeval Guilds in their search for the solutions of present-day industrial problems."

—G. D. H. Cole, Introduction to the English Edition of *Guilds in the Middle Ages*, by George Renard, p.ix. London. 1918

"National guildsmen are seeking to formulate for modern industrial society a principle of industrial self-government analogous to that which was embodied in the Mediaeval Guilds. They do not idealize the middle Ages; but they

continued on page 25

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

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

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

Subscription by Post:  
12 issues: Euro-zone & World Surface: €40;  
Sterling-zone: £25

Electronic Subscription:  
€ 15 / £12 for 12 issues  
(or € 1.30 / £1.10 per issue)

You can also order from:  
<https://www.atholbooks-sales.org>