

# IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

January 2016

Vol.31, No.1 ISSN 0790-7672

and *Northern Star* incorporating *Workers' Weekly* Vol.30 No.1 ISSN 954-5891

## Holier Than Thou Politics

Elaine Byrne is an expert on corruption. She has a degree in it. She used to be the *Irish Times* expert on corruption in Ireland—her and Fintan O'Toole communicated to the world the essential fact about Ireland: that it is corrupt. A few years ago Denis O'Brien, the millionaire—who is a bad millionaire because he is an Irish one—offered to take issue with her at law over what she was saying about him. She emigrated to Australia for a while. But now she's back. And she has extended her range—or maybe just shifted it towards larger but safer targets:

"Enforced power-sharing has had the unintended consequence of corrupting the very notion of democracy. Under the D'Hondt model the Northern Ireland Assembly have become a permanent grand coalition government. Everybody is in government."

That's the opening statement of her article in the *Sunday Business Post* on November 15th: *North Needs To Move Beyond Enforced Power-Sharing*.

She continues:

"If the same principle were applied in the Republic... Fine Gael, Labour, Fianna Fail, Sinn Fein and the smaller parties would share out the ministerial posts between them. Irish politics would be even more insufferable... Normal democratic rules do not apply when there is no opposition... Only government scrutinises government policy. Power has a vested interest not to oppose itself..."

Elaine is a very slow learner indeed! What she describes is not the "*unintended consequences*" of the Good Friday Agreement, but its intended purpose.

The rules governing the functional Agreement system were hammered out on the understanding that the Northern Ireland region of the British state is not a suitable case for democracy.

"*Seventeen years after the signing of the Agreement... are these structures preventing 'normal' politics?*" she asks, as if the Agreement had pretended that its purpose was to foster what is considered "*normal politics*".

*continued on page 2*

Brexit?

## Time For The EU To Grow Up

If the European Union survives, it will be because it has factual existence. It will not be because it has purposeful existence.

It exists because a purposeful generation of European statesmen constructed it.

It has lost the sense of purpose that produced it. And it has even forgotten what that purpose was. But it exists. And, because it has forgotten why it exists, its existence is a problem to it.

It exists in the form of structures that were purposefully created. But it no longer has a collective will corresponding to those structures.

For lack of a collective will that directs it, its component states are driven back on their own national interests and initiatives. But the national interests of the component states are obscured or stunted by the existence of the international structures which envelop them.

Ireland joined the EU—the Common Market as it was then—as part of a package with the UK. It profited handsomely

*continued on page 5*

## Brexit and the Polish Question

On the face of it there was never any chance that David Cameron's attempt to overturn the principle of free movement of labour within the EU would succeed and he was firmly rebuffed on the issue at the European Council meeting in December. The rest of Europe seems to be amenable to finding a form of words that will allow him to claim 'progress' on his other issues however and in doing so

continues to signal its lack of real purpose in the face of British imposed Stockholm Syndrome.

As Wolfgang Munchau put it in the *Financial Times/Irish Times*:

"The influx of refugees into Germany and the terrorist attacks in France have put a de facto end to Schengen. National border controls have been reinstated in many places.

It is also clearer now than even 12 months ago that the eurozone will not turn itself into a federal union. It will reach the climax of its political and economic integration at a point that is not far from where it is today."

And on banking union:

"Supervision and resolution procedures for banks have been tightened but there will be no banking union and no fiscal union. The euro in effect has degenerated into a fixed exchange rate system. UK

*continued on page 10*

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>Holier Than Thou Politics.</b> Editorial	1
<b>Brexit? Time For The EU To Grow Up.</b> Editorial	1
<b>Brexit and the Polish Question.</b> Sean Owens	1
<b>Kenny wrong to align with Cameron on EU reform</b> . Irish Political Review Group (Press Statement)	8
<b>Shorts</b> from <i>the Long Fellow</i> (Irish Water; State Vandalism; Health Insurance; General Insurance; Rule by Lawyers; IMF Loans)	9
<b>Tom Barry and the Importance of History.</b> Brian Murphy osb	12
<b>Colum What You Like—But Not Pro-German!.</b> Manus O'Riordan	16
<b>The Wars In Kerry.</b> John Morgan (Lt. Col. Retd.) (Book Review: <i>Dying For The Cause, Kerry's Republican Dead</i> , Part 2)	18
<b>Launch Of Irish Bulletin.</b> Éamon Ó Cuív	20
<b>The Black Panthers: Vanguard of The Revolution.</b> Seán McGouran (Film Review)	21
<b>Biteback: Poppy Politics.</b> Dave Alvey	22
<b>Going West.</b> Wilson John Haire (Poem)	22
<b>Does It Stack Up?</b> Michael Stack (General Tom Barry National Commemoration 2015)	23

*Labour Comment*, edited by **Pat Maloney**:  
Programme Of The Irish Democratic Labour Federation  
About Michael Davitt  
(back page)

influence, writes that Hume got an assurance from British Labour that it would not content Northern Ireland seats in the British Parliament—a thing it had never done in the preceding 50 years and was never likely to do. And, when West Belfast in the 1940s elected Jack Beattie to Westminster with a mandate to join the Parliamentary Labour Party, the Party refused to admit him.

"Hume reached an informal understanding with Jack Lynch that Fianna Fail would not organise or run candidates, an important arrangement at a time when there was a minority element within the party anxious to establish an assertive Northern Ireland profile', Mr. Donlon added".

Fianna Fail continued to deny the legitimacy of Britain's rule in the North, and to assert *de jure* Irish sovereignty over it, while refusing to contest elections in it. Fine Gael and Irish Labour agreed with it on both counts.

We have not seen the book, but we assume on the basis of Donlon's conduct when he was diplomatically active that he still agrees that the exclusion of the North from the democracy of both of the states which asserted sovereignty over it was a good thing—and that this exclusion had nothing to do with the War that took off in the absence of any semblance of normal political opportunities.

A "*Fianna Fail source*" is quoted: "*I think it could have seriously damaged the SDLP at a time when it was only finding its feet and I think the party got a lucky break when they had no nationalist or republican competition from Fianna Fail*", he said"—and of course no socialist competition either. It could be the Nationalist, Republican, Socialist, Constitutional Party—whichever of these it chose to be at any particular moment—but a Constitutional Party that was detached from any particular Constitution: an irresponsible Constitutionalist Party.

It took the Oath Of Loyalty at Westminster—though it is said that Seamus Mallon *affirmed* Loyalty, rather than *swore* it. But it continued the Redmondite practice of refusing Government Office under the Constitution to which it was Loyal. The high point of its Constitutional activity at Westminster was when it withdrew its backbench support of Callaghan's Labour Government, brought it down, and opened the way for Thatcher.

The SDLP was founded in 1970 on two incompatible policies: *British Rights for*

She refers to "the failure of power-sharing to deliver effective governance". In fact, since Sinn Fein and the DUP made their deal under the Agreement, the North has had the best government it ever had since 1922.

If she acknowledged this fact, and asked how it could be the case, she might have been able to grow out of middle class Dublin adolescence on the subject of the North. But, then again, if she did that, her future in Dublin journalism would be dim.

The British State, when retaining the Six Counties as part of itself, decided to govern them undemocratically. It did this by excluding them from the democracy of the state, and confining them within a subordinate communal/religious system, in which "*normal politics*" was an impossibility.

When the system of majority communal rule, outside the democracy of the state, led to a War which the State was unable to win, the State, in order to end the War, altered the structures of the undemocratically-governed region in order to provide a

place in the subordinate system for the community which had been excluded from that, as well as from the democracy of the state, for three-quarters of a century.

Britain is to blame. There's no doubt about it. There's no Northern Ireland state. There never was. There is only a region of the British state that Britain decided should be governed undemocratically.

The ethos of Dublin journalism does not allow that to be said. Or to be denied—because it would be necessary to say it in order to deny it. The very thought must be suppressed because it is a subversive justification of the Provos. And the Provos must not be thought about. They must only be condemned.

*Hume Asked FF To Not Run Candidates In The North.* That's the headline on a report in the *Irish Daily Mail* on an article by Sean Donlon in a book entitled, *John Hume—Irish Peacemaker* published recently. Donlon, who was Irish Ambassador at Washington in the 70s and 80s, and who did his best to restrict Provo

*British Citizens*, and the ending of Partition, with the establishment of all-Ireland Government. It failed to understand that British citizenship rights were the outcome of British politics, not the product of British law.

We pointed this out at the time, and suggested that practical politics required it to choose between its two contradictory objects. It refused to do this. And it was therefore essentially incapable of generating a momentum of its own.

It was regarded by the State for a while as the *de facto* political wing of the IRA, in the sense that concessions made to it might influence the IRA to end the war. But it was unable to play that part thoroughly because it always had to pretend that it was something entirely different as well.

It was said by Gerry Fitt and Paddy Devlin, on private occasions, that it was John Hume and "*the countrymen*" who prevented them from being the different thing in earnest—from being British Socialists. That was a libel. We know from close experience of them that the two contradictory impulses lay entirely within themselves and got in the way of each other.

The Nationalist community in the North was, by agreement between Dublin and London, isolated from the party-life of both states. Twenty years later, around 1990, when a movement developed in the North which pressed for inclusion in British political structures, the SDLP made representations to Dublin against it, and Dublin made representations to London.

Then in 1998 the State—Britain—despairing of winning the War which it had provoked, brought it to an end by making a drastic alteration to the undemocratic form of government which it had imposed on the Six Counties in 1921. The alteration was not a democratisation as that word is generally understood. It was what Elaine Byrne can only see as a corruption of the very notion of democracy.

The system established in 19231 by Britain was Apartheid of the South African kind, though without the formal rules. The 1998 alteration was a formalising of apartheid with enforceable rules that made it a two-sided affair. The word means "*separate development*". The South African version was *de facto* white supremacy. The Northern Ireland version actually does provide for the separate development of each. That was the declared purpose. (Elaine Byrne must not have bothered to read the Agreement

documents if she thinks it had the purpose of fostering "*normal politics*".) And the declared purpose is being put into effect.

The Irish Government is a joint guarantor with the British in overseeing the implementation of the Agreement. But it is not because of the conscientiousness of the Guarantors that the implementation of the Good Friday Agreement has been kept more or less in line with the wording of the Agreement and the *realpolitik* understanding on which it was signed. It is because the Agreement was, essentially, a deal made between two parties to a war, neither of which could win it—and neither of which could, in the nature of things, be expected to cease to exist before the deal on which the War was ended was put into effect.

There have in recent years been empty gestures of "*reconciliation*" between the Irish and British Governments—the Queen's visit to the Free State and the President's visit to Whitehall—as if they had been the parties to the recent War. But the Irish Government was not a party to the War—not even though the Constitution of the Irish State denied the legitimacy of British government in the Six County region of the British state, and asserted *de jure* sovereignty over it until 1998.

The Dublin Government made an inflammatory verbal intervention in the Northern Ireland civil rights agitation in August 1969 and it made military arrangements for intervention in the North during the following Autumn and Winter, and also established liaison with leaders of the nationalist community in the North. Then, in April-May 1970 it suddenly washed its hands of responsibility for the consequences of its intervention during the preceding nine months. It did this in the spectacular form of arresting its liaison with the Northern insurrection, John Kelly, and putting him on trial on a charge of treasonable conspiracy—and also bringing conspiracy charges against a Free State Army officer, Capt. James Kelly, for carrying out the orders of his military superior, Col. Hefferon, who himself acted on the instruction of the Defence Minister Jim Gibbons, who was acting on behalf of Taoiseach Jack Lynch and the Cabinet.

Jack Lynch's Fianna Fail Government, under pressure from the Fine Gael Opposition which was briefed by the British Ambassador, put itself in the right with Britain by denying its own Northern policy since the previous Autumn, prosecuting it as treason on the part of subordinates, and washing its hands of the North.

Well, not quite. The assertion of *de jure* Irish sovereignty over that troublesome region of the British state was not repealed. It was left in place. And, since it remained part of a binding written Constitution, the Courts had to take account of it, and refuse extradition demands from the North because of it.

The assertion of Irish sovereignty over the Six County region of the UK remained in place until the IRA made its deal with the British State for a rearrangement of the internal structure of the North on lines that can only be regarded as transitional.

The present governing parties in Dublin, and the Fianna Fail party which has fallen into third (or fourth?) place under the leadership of Micheal Martin, all seem to treat the War in the North that led to the 1998 Agreement as having been nothing but a campaign of murder and mayhem aimed at the destruction of lawful authority. But why did they all wait until the 'murderers' had fought the 'legitimate' authority to the conference table, and made a far-reaching deal with it, before they recognised that lawful authority as lawful?

The time for Dublin recognition of the British system in the North as legitimate, if that was to be done to any useful effect, was August 1969, at a moment when it was obvious that nationalist discontent was approaching the point of insurrection. But that was when Taoiseach Lynch said he would *not stand idly by* as the lawful authority asserted itself.

The next time for Fianna Fail to have taken the stance that it now takes was in conjunction with the Treason Trials that it launched in 1970.

And the last time when the sovereignty claim might have been repealed to any useful effect was May 1974, when it might have saved the voluntary Power-Sharing system in the North.

But Fianna Fail, Fine Gael and Labour all stood by the sovereignty claim for a quarter of a century while the War ran its course, and they only proposed its repeal when the IRA said it was OK.

The *Irish Times* published a whole page interview with Seamus Mallon on September 9th. Mallon became leader of the SDLP when John Hume retired in 1998. Hume, acting independently of the party of which he was the leader, had worked with Gerry Adams in bringing about the *realpolitik* accommodation between the IRA and the British State in 1998, being under hostile pressure from the Dublin media and people of Mallon's disposition in the SDLP as he did so. He retired when the Agreement was signed,

leaving it to Mallon to come to a workable arrangement with Lord Trimble's Ulster Unionist Party (advised by Lord Bew).

Mallon has latterly been expressing some discontent with the Agreement straitjacket, and favouring voluntary Coalition with Unionists. He had his opportunity to do this after 1998, but he took no decisive action, Lord Trimble did not reach out to him or accept his offer to drop Sinn Fein in the absence of decommissioning, and he just let things drift.

Drift was not feasible in a situation brought about by almost thirty years of sustained warfare. Mallon, like it or not, held the position of deputy to Lord Trimble in a devolved administration in which the Unionist majority could no longer rule, only because of the War. He had either to realise in practice the possibility which the Agreement provided for, or it would be realised by somebody else. The SDLP withered in his hands.

We are told by the interviewer that he "was always a constitutional nationalist to the core". But it was not by constitutional nationalism that the Agreement had been gained. Not for the first time in human history, thoroughly unconstitutional action had brought about a new constitutional framework of things. But Mallon could not accept that state of affairs. He had to continue after 1998 a kind of hostility to the IRA that since 1998 had only a nostalgic basis. He could not act effectively within the new Constitution because he was stuck in the mindset of the futile constitutional nationalism of the old Constitution.

He now blames his failure on London and Dublin. They should have been tougher in the negotiations leading up to the GFA:

"I very firmly believe that if the two governments had taken the view that, 'right, we can't as governments, as sovereign governments, we can't do anything but demand their illegal guns'. If that had been in the script they would have gone for less."

"Instead, seven years of stop-start politics passed before the IRA did disarm, or mostly disarm, in 2005—a period when a lot of the inspirational marrow was sucked out of the agreement'..."

"He concedes that the SDLP has taken 'battering'. But he is still baffled by how voters turned away from the SDLP and Ulster Unionists..."

What this amounts to is a condemnation of the British State for not winning the

War in Northern Ireland—a War which he thinks it could have won with a bit more "pressure".

But, if the State had beaten down the insurrection against it, and disarmed it, why should it have made the radical restructuring of the Northern Ireland system which gave Mallon a degree of power, as leader of the Nationalist minority, which was independent of the will of the Unionist majority?

Anyhow, Mallon could not act, as leader of the SDLP, so as to consolidate in politics the potential advance for the Nationalist community that the new Constitution achieved by the IRA had made possible. The electorate therefore turned away from the SDLP.

And how about the "two sovereign governments"? Only one of them actually governed the Six Counties.. The other one asserted *de jure* sovereignty in one article of the Constitution, but suspended its enactment indefinitely in the next article. And it was only the Governments of Haughey and Reynolds that played any part in bringing about the 1998 settlement of which Mallon is so critical. All other Dublin Governments have refused to acknowledge that what happened in the North was a long War that was ended by a new constitutional arrangement that satisfied the Nationalist discontent that had made the War possible. Like Mallon, they rake over particular incidents in the War which they think ought to have an emotional charge that will enable them to damage Sinn Fein.

"Mallon will not allow Sinn Fein... to gain kudos for the IRA ceasefires. 'I couldn't and wouldn't, given what they were responsible for. When I think of Jean McConville...' How do you suspend that?'..."

Nobody could have lived in West Belfast in 1972 and not have known there was a war on—a war between the state and the populace.

Brendan Hughes, an able IRA commander at the time, but a diehard opponent of the Peace Process twenty years later, achieved sanctity by giving recorded evidence against Gerry Adams on Ed Maloney and Lord Bew's Boston Tapes. He says he discovered that Jean McConville was acting as a spy for the British Army at the heart of West Belfast and gave her a warning that she must stop it. But she continued, and was dealt with. Nuala O'Loan, the former Police Ombudsman, says she investigated the matter and found no evidence that Jean McConville

was a British spy—which means that the police didn't give her evidence that she was. Opinion in the locality was that Jean McConville acted very rashly, and that she was a casualty of war.

Britain has fought wars all over the world. It has now gone to war against Syria, not quite knowing whether its target is the Syrian Government or the main Syrian Opposition. In all wars there are unintended casualties, and casualties whose orientation is doubtful. They are all expected to understand that such things happen in war, to relative themselves, to see themselves in perspective, to fit themselves into "the bigger picture". Why does that principle not apply in Northern Ireland? The signing of the 1998 Agreement was a *de facto* admission that what had been going on since 1970 was a war, not a series of individual murders.

The British State holds by that admission, more or less. The Irish State, though a signatory of the Agreement, never admitted that that was its meaning. Most of its politicians and its media have been in denial about the fact that a war was fought in the North, and ended with a new Constitutional settlement which legitimised it. They reduce those thirty years to a series of individual crimes, and urge that they be prosecuted.

This denial complex is probably a cultural/political heritage from what is called the 'Irish Civil War'. A section of 1918 Sinn Fein agreed in 1922 to form a Government under the Crown in place of the elected Republic of 1919, and was manipulated by Whitehall into making war on those who stood by the Republic even in the face of the threat of an all-out Imperial war of reconquest. It won the war with very substantial British support, and in victory it refused to make a peace settlement. The Free State leader, W.T. Cosgrave, expressed his willingness to execute 10,000 Republicans rather than negotiate peace with them.

The Republicans dumped arms, turned to electoral politics, and in a few years approached equality with the Treaty Party. Cosgrave tried to exclude them from the Free State Dail by insisting that they take the Treaty Oath, even though the British threat of reconquest, which had backed the Treaty Oath in 1920, had lost its force—and even though the Treaty leader in 1922, Michael Collins, had said he signed the Treaty only for the purpose of gathering the strength to break it.

By the mid-1920s there was the prospect of a majority of elected representatives

being excluded from the Dail by the Treaty Oath. A sensible Speaker prevented that absurdity by admitting Republicans to the Dail by means of a fudge.

There was no settlement of the 'Civil War'. The Treatyites refused to consider any terms but unconditional surrender. They won the military aspect of the conflict but failed to achieve a surrender, and they went on to lose the political aspect to the Republicans in the form of Fianna Fail.

One would expect the Fianna Fail party to be able to recognise that what happened in the North was a war legitimised by a settlement and to act the part of Guarantor of that Settlement in the event of British backsliding.

It would undoubtedly have done so under Haughey's leadership, and it did so briefly under Reynolds' leadership. In the hands of Micheal Martin it puts one in mind of the Treaty party as power leaked away from it to Fianna Fail.

Instead of acting as Nationalist guarantor of the Agreement in the event of British backsliding, it has been encouraging the British to backslide.

And the SDLP has been more than satisfied with that state of affairs.

\*

As we go to print the 'Slab\ Murphy case has become an issue. The Dublin media has for years been demonising Murphy and demanding that he be prosecuted as a crook.

The Murphy family owns a farm on the Border in South Armagh. It was chiefly the South Armagh region of the IRA that caused the State to acknowledge that it was beyond its power to crush the Northern insurrection, and that it was necessary to make a deal with it. And it was chiefly by Murphy's influence that South Armagh was persuaded to take part in the deal negotiated by Adams and Hume.

The British State, dealing with the reality of things, took no heed of the demonising of Murphy by the 'Constitutional nationalist' media—if that is the right way of describing it. But the Southern State prosecuted him for tax evasion in his Southern dimension, and tried the case in the Special Court set up for dealing with terrorist cases!

There can be little doubt that the money on which no tax was paid was raised to finance the Provo campaign. It is ludicrous to charge an individual for tax evasion on such monies. It is because of the origin and purpose of those funds that the case is prosecuted by the non-jury court—but the

authorities cannot admit that that is the case. The insistence is that Murphy is a dangerous criminal who would subvert a jury.

The lie is given to that accusation by the fact that Murphy brought a libel case in Dublin against various papers accusing him of IRA activity—and lost! If this man intimidated juries, how come he lost a libel case?

It is therefore clear that the reason for prosecuting Murphy in the Special Criminal Court is that the tax charges are spurious and that an Irish jury would throw them out.

There is another issue: none of the offences with which Murphy is charged occurred after 2005, when the Good Friday Agreement finally became functional. The Border fund-raising activities clearly ceased at that point. To prosecute them now is a clear breach of the Agreement.

The point of the Agreement was to end hostilities on both sides. Prisoners were released. Letters of comfort were given by the British Government to those

republicans who had evaded arrest for particular incidents.

Republicans in South Armagh, who accepted the Agreement, are rightly enraged at the breach of its spirit by the criminal prosecution of wartime fund-raising activities.

There is talk of a Sinn Fein/Republican Army split—a division which could feed into military activity against the Northern Ireland settlement.

That settlement may be transitional in nature, but it is a requirement of present conditions.

This split may be averted by the defence of 'Slab' Murphy being put up by Gerry Adams and other leading Provos—a defence which is the occasion for further irresponsible mud-slinging by forces in Irish public life, acting as elements in the British administration would like to act but are restrained from doing so.

Once again, it is the Republicans who are acting as the responsible element in the Irish interest, with the Establishment acting otherwise.

## Time For The EU To Grow Up

continued

from the economics of membership, but it contributed nothing politically to Europe. It was a burden—a second vote for Britain in everything that did not concern economic subsidies.

There was an interlude, however, in which Governments led by Charles Haughey embraced the European ideal and left aside the traditional British orientation. Haughey has been discredited in Ireland—and there can be little doubt that behind-the-scenes British influence has been instrumental. The same fate awaits politicians and businessmen who stray from the British orientation.

As the motivating ideal of the founders lost its substance, Ireland helped Britain to re-shape it into vacuousness.

The liberated market was to determine policy and direction.

Official Ireland was in flight from itself when it joined the Common Market. Membership of the Common Market relieved it of an existence which had become burdensome to it. It found in Europe an alternative to itself.

The absurd State Trials of 1970 signified a collapse of national will with regard to

'the North'—not a change of policy, because policy did not change, but a collapse into floundering verbiage.

The Trials—effectively for Treasonable Conspiracy—were absurd because no evidence relevant to the charge was produced. And then the Court record of the proceedings disappeared. Angela Clifford reconstructed the Trials, as far as that was possible, by correlating newspaper reports, and nothing resembling evidence of guilt could be found. The jury brought in the only verdicts that were compatible with the reported evidence, but all three parties in the Dail agreed to treat the charges as having been proved, and the verdicts as being perverse.

Those Trials were seen by the Nationalist minority in the North as betrayal by what they regarded as their national Government. The Dail had always encouraged them to look on it as their national Government, but it betrayed them under slight pressure from the British Ambassador.

The Northern Nationalist minority had no choice but to be a Nationalist minority. It was excluded from the effective democratic institutions of the UK state. When betrayed by the Dail, it took its affairs into

its own hands and made war on the UK State.

The Dail was astonished and bewildered, lost in mixed feelings of fear and admiration. And then Britain relieved it by taking it into Europe, where it could fantasise about Partition being made irrelevant by "*Europe of the Regions*".

Ireland has been a useless member of the European Union—useless to the Union, but helpful to Britain in its project of preventing the development of the Union in line with the purpose for which it was established.

(Britain gained admission to the Union because it had one Prime Minister who was seriously intent on a post-Imperial reshaping of England into one of the states of Europe, Ted Heath. Once Heath had got Britain in, he was immediately replaced by Thatcher who reasserted England's uniqueness. And Ireland gained credibility among Europeans because it had one Taoiseach who was authentically European in outlook and who understood what England was—two things that are intimately related.)

'The War' is a great problem for Europe—that is, the War which Tim Pat Coogan, and many others, tell us was called "*the Emergency*" by the Irish when it was happening; the World War brought about by England in 1939, to be fought largely by others.

Because of that War, Europe is incapable of thinking about itself. Ten or fifteen years ago it announced officially that it was preparing a history of itself. It was a rash announcement. A History of Europe is something that Europe cannot write because the War is central to it, and because England has asserted ownership of the War.

It might have been Ireland's contribution to the European post-War development to write the history of it. It had stood apart from the War and was free of disabling partisanship. It had resisted attempts to force it into the War by England, which had ensured that it did not have its own Army to fight with, by depriving it of serious weaponry.

At the time Ireland reported the course of the War dispassionately, and it did not kow-tow to the victors at the end of it.

Who were the victors? What was the War for? These are the questions that prevent Europe from having a coherent historical idea of itself.

If it was a War to free Europe, and indeed the world, from the imminent

danger to civilization posed by Nazi Germany—and that's how the British war propaganda described it—then it was indisputably Communist Russia that won the War and saved civilization.

But, no sooner had Communist Russia saved civilization, than those who had played a merely auxiliary part in the destruction of the German State declared that Communist Russia was the most dangerous enemy that civilization had faced.

Countries in Eastern Europe which had apparently been willing to settle down within the system of Nazi Evil, but were liberated from it by the Red Army, were soon to be declared to have been conquered and subjugated by the Red Army, which was the instrument of an even greater Evil than the Nazi system which it had destroyed. And, before very long, the only non-Communist state which had played a substantial part in defeating Nazi Germany, the USA, was telling us that it would be better if the human race was exterminated in a nuclear war with the state that had played the dominant part in destroying Nazism than that it should survive in a world hegemonised by the Kremlin—"*Better Dead Than Red!*"

When the EU recently engineered the anti-Russian *coup d'état* in Kiev, it unleashed Ukrainian nationalist forces which openly described the liberation from Nazism as a subjugating conquest. The EU hushed them, as far as possible, and by means of control of the news made it appear that they had not said it.

But those Ukrainians only gave blunt expression to what was the predominant West European view of Eastern Europe for two generations after the death of Hitler.

A book recently published in Germany has as its title the date of Hitler's death, and a sub-title that tells us that that was the day on which Germany joined the West.

But what was "*the West*" in April 1945? It was that part of Europe that had settled down within the Nazi system for four years while Nazi power was being destroyed in vast battlefields in Russia, and which the Western Allies managed to reach before the Red Army. Russian military superiority over the German armies was established in 1943 enabling the Western Allies to get back onto the Continent in 1944. The parts that the Western allies then managed to reach before the Red Army—that was 'the West'.

Britain had resisted American pressure

to re-engage with the War in Europe by opening a Second Front in 1942 and 1943, waiting to see what would happen on the Eastern Front—which was actually the only Front from 1941 to 1944. If it had insisted on delaying for a further year, there would probably have been no 'West'..

The West in 1945 was a nationalist mythology of resistance, plus American finance. It was a denial of the historical reality from which it emerged—or, from which it was shaken out by external forces. It denied both its own history since Britain brought about a state of war in the world in 1939, and the history of the actual course of that war.

Ideological mythology—fantasy—was judged to be the only treatment by which political health could be restored.

West Germany is the goody-goody state of the second half of the 20th century. It thinks nothing but right ideas. It is too good to be true.

Germany established Nazi dominance over all its neighbours, and the great bulk of Germans lived as loyal Nazis right up to the moment when Hitler decided they were no longer worthy of him and took himself away.

Then it came about very quickly that not a good word could be said in Germany for the system in which it had lived satisfactorily from 1933 to 1945. At the same time, the force which had liberated it from Nazism—or deprived it of Nazism—was politically criminalized. Communists were "*berufverbot*"—not allowed to have a job in many spheres.

Germany became two states after 1945. East Germany was constructed within the area reached—to use a neutral verb and avoid having to choose between *liberated* and *subjugated*—by the Red Army, and West Germany in the area the Western Allies managed to reach before the Red Army, after the Red Army had enabled them to join the ground war—or re-join it in the case of Britain and France.

East Germany paid War Reparations to Russia for the whole of Germany, absorbed millions of German refugees from Eastern Europe, and constructed its own economy out of the ruins of the War—which were much more severe in the East than the West.

West Germany was financed by the USA, which was restoring Capitalism in Europe, where it had failed, so that there would be markets for its industries which had expanded greatly during the War.

The West German State did not recognize the East German State as

legitimate;. It was constructed under the auspices of the State which had defeated Nazism, therefore it was not legitimate.

The West German State, on Adenauer's insistence, refused to recognise the East German state as legitimate. But, in the 1980s, after Adenauer, it recognised it and established diplomatic relations with it, in the name of *Ostpolitik*. Then a few years later the Cold War ended suddenly with the collapse of the Soviet Union, and East Germany was hustled into the Federal Republic, but was not treated as a new component of the Federation. It was treated as conquered territory that had been saved from a criminal gang, which could not be admitted to have any rights. Personnel of the regime were prosecuted as criminals and received lower pensions. That would have been in accordance with Adenauer's policy. But Adenauer's policy had been given up. The GDR had been recognised as a legitimate state. But 'the West' promptly forgot about that when the change in power-relationships enabled it to implement Adenauer's policy.

That instant reversion to "*realpolitik*", when the opportunity presented itself, showed how slight the West German commitment to 'international law' was, and how superficial the European Settlement of 1945, about which there has been much propaganda recently, actually was.

\*

The West German State was financed by the USA and was largely staffed by personnel of the Nazi State.

The carry-over of Nazi personnel was a sensible practical measure. Germany had quickly settled down within the Nazi system in 1933, only the Communist Party holding out. The construction of a new German State after 1945, with people untainted by Nazism (to put it that way), was not a practical possibility. The only substantial body of untainted people were the diehard Communists, and they were regarded as worse than the Nazis. (The Nazi service that specialized in the war on Russia was drafted into Cold War service against Russia by the USA in 1945 and then by West Germany.)

Suppose the Ludendorff offensive of 1918 had succeeded and Britain had surrendered and Germany had undertaken to supervise the formation of a new British State free of the taint of Imperialism—it would not have been possible. Imperialism was ingrained in British society. (Some would say it still is.) Robert Blatchford had carried the idealistic Socialists into support of Empire, and the Fabians had carried the pedestrian Labourites into it.

In Germany, however, there was a social body with no equivalent in England—the Catholics had conducted a kind of passive resistance during the Nazi period. After 1945, led by Adenauer, they formed the Christian Democracy (including Protestants who had been thoroughly disoriented by the Nazi development), and constructed the Federal Republic, easing and camouflaging the Nazi transition to democracy.

A generation later, some young Germans, living in the goody-goody culture of the Federal Republic, wondered what their nice parents and nice neighbours had done in the demonized Nazi era. They were shocked to find that they had been good Nazis. This discovery sent some of them berserk in the 'Baader-Meinhof Gang'.

The writing of German history for the first half of the 20th century is not allowed. Britain does not allow it. Britain collaborated with Hitler for five years in building up the power of Nazi Germany before suddenly deciding to make war on Germany and demonise it. The sudden switch in British policy in 1939 possibly had to do with a realization that Nazi Germany would not act simply as an anti-Communist instrument, but had a satisfied sense of itself which might cause it to settle down as a major European Power.

Dispassionate investigation of the actual course of that history would not be of ideological service to the British sense of itself as a benevolent force of destiny, therefore such investigation must not be undertaken. The British role in the affair must be swept under the carpet, as mere "*appeasement*", and the fact of mass German involvement in the Nazi system for matter-of-fact reasons of social life must be mystified into an inexplicable onset of mass hysteria.

It is understandable that the Germans, given a thorough hiding by carpet bombing of civilian life, and under Allied occupation after the War, complied with Allied ideology. But Ireland was a free agent. It had combated fascism in the League of Nations and had refused to subscribe to the British war propaganda, asserting its independence in earnest for the first time, and daring Britain to re-occupy it. If it had undertaken in the 1950s to write the history of the War as it appeared to an independent observer, it would have performed the kind of service to European culture that none of the countries occupied by the victors—which was almost all of

Europe—could perform.

Post-War Ireland did not collapse morally because it had not backed the winner in the War—even though in this kind of thing morality and triumphant force are intimately related. But neither did it develop its wartime stance into a history of the War. And, when it joined the Common Market, the revisionist collapse into Churchillian mythology was taking over.

What has been said here about post-War Germany is almost equally true of post-War France.

Britain led it into declaring war on Germany in September 1939, and when Germany responded in May 1940 to the declaration of war on it, Britain quickly withdrew its Army from the battlefield, leaving France to fight alone (just as it had left the Poles to fight alone in September 1939). And, when betrayed France made a settlement after their Armies were broken, they were branded as traitors. France, it was declared in London, was riddled with Fascist Fifth Columns. It had not the will to fight. It had not been defeated, but had opened the Front to the enemy.

Europe, then, has no history. Things have happened in it, but it has no coherent history of them. It has no presentable history of itself since 1919, when Britain vetoed the French policy for a settlement with Germany that would have given it a secure frontier, and would have ensured that the deliberate humiliations that were piled on Germany could not lead to a war of revenge.

Britain does not want Europe to have a history. It has itself a gigantic History Industry, whose purpose is to serve its own sense of destiny and prevent others from having a sense of destiny.

The Irish conceived a strong sense of destiny in the late 19th century, despite British policing. A book on this subject published by the Manchester University Press some time ago explained the effective emergence of Irish nationalism as the result of a cut in the policing fund around 1880. That is very much in accordance with the general British understanding of such things.

The Irish sense of destiny made possible by lax British policing compelled Britain to allow the formation of an Irish state. The state, despite the 'civil war' with which Britain managed to damage it at the

start, maintained that sense of destiny, more or less, until the Northern insurrection of 1969-70. It then collapsed in the face of Northern social realities whose existence it denied. Ireland, in damaged form, then entered damaged Europe as part of a couple with Britain. Europe, through the rise of Christian Democracy (which was strongly anti-British in sentiment, and which was beyond the reach of British understanding) was making something of itself under cover of the Cold War, without having to deal with itself as a distinct entity.

Then the Cold War ended, leaving Europe face-to-face with itself for the first time. And Britain, assisted by Ireland, made hay.

\*

Britain is now considering whether it could damage the EU better by leaving it or by remaining within it. There is no ground for complaint in that.

The EU has no foreign policy. In place of foreign policy it has vacuous ideology. It is a foreign policy instrument of the USA, and in the US interest it is damaging itself by applying sanctions on Russia, and it is committed in principle to war on Russia if Russia does not over-ride the will of the populace of the Crimea and transfer it back to the Ukraine.

EU foreign policy is waffle, but it has a domestic issue which it cannot avoid for much longer. When it replaced national money with Euro money, it agreed that Britain might maintain its own money system. Irish money was essentially Sterling until the Euro was founded. Then, partly by accident, Ireland entered the Euro system and broke with Sterling

EU agreement to British exemption from the Euro brought about the anomaly of a Single Market with two separate major money systems, one of which was an EU currency and the other a major international currency.

The rational development would have been the emergence of a proper Eurozone Single Market within the wider EU, which would be treated as a free trade area. Britain is insistent that that must not be allowed to happen. The Euro must not be allowed to be formed into an independent financial system independent of Sterling and in conflict with it.

Concession of British demands during the renegotiation of its membership currently taking place would mean that the development of a Eurozone would be subordinate to the interest of Sterling.

When the EU lost the cover of the Cold War, it sought comfort under the British

wing. Britain is now demanding that it disembowel itself, else it will leave.

These events place Ireland in a dilemma. Membership of the EU has enabled the country to develop, and to diversify its trade which was heavily dependent on the British market when it entered the EU.

Participation in the Euro currency zone has enabled it to break free of the yoke of Sterling. It is forgotten that Irish economic policy was to an extent dependent on decisions in London because the Irish pound was interchangeable with the English pound. Boom and bust cycles were exported from London to Dublin in the decades after the Second World War.

On the other hand, there is a free travel area with the UK, which mitigates the partition of the island of Ireland. And

there is a big Irish population in Britain.

An Opinion Poll published in the *Irish Times* revealed that 74% of the people of Ireland considered that, if Britain left the EU, Ireland should not follow. That is a significant figure and it shows that the Irish sense of destiny survives.

There are fears that Britain leaving will make partition of Ireland permanent. But the contrary is the case. A large segment of Northern Ireland has no wish to be cast adrift from Europe. Britain voting to leave can only hasten a decision on its future.

It is unlikely that Britain will vote in a 2016 Referendum to leave the EU. But, if it did so, that would be a fitting culmination to the centenary of 1916.

**PRESS STATEMENT from Irish Political Review Group, 20th December 2015**

## **Kenny wrong to align with Cameron on EU reform**

Enda Kenny is undermining Irish national interests by lending support to David Cameron in the negotiations over the UK proposals for reform of the EU. By describing Cameron's position as 'flexible' he is helping to give an appearance of reasonableness to the British case and by referring to the "absolute importance" to Ireland of the UK staying in the EU he is misrepresenting the facts and bolstering the UK's attempted subversion of the European project.

In joining the EU in the 1970s Ireland was able to break free from a crippling dependence on the British market (in 1974 56.3% of Irish exports went to the UK, in 2014 it had reduced to 15%). Later our status as an EU Member was instrumental in attracting large in-flows of foreign direct investment (FDI) to the economy. For some time the Continental EU has been our largest export market. The Irish state has a clear interest in the survival of the Euro and, with all its faults, in the continuance of the EU as a developing Union.

The subversive purpose of the British position can be seen in Cameron's letter to Donald Tusk, President of the European Council, on 10th November in which he states:

"First I want to end Britain's obligation to work towards an 'ever closer union' as set out in the Treaty. It is very important to make clear that this commitment will no longer apply to the United Kingdom. I want to do this in a formal, legally-binding and irreversible way."

The 'ever closer union' referred to is a key phrase from the preamble to the Treaty of Rome, reproduced in many subsequent Treaties and frequently invoked in Judgements of the European Court of Justice. It is the essential philosophical driver underpinning EU development and law. If Cameron gets his way on it he will have won the right of states to remain as Members while disavowing any commitment to the overriding purpose of the Union; he will have devalued the most fundamental principle of the EU.

The Taoiseach was wrong when he asserted at a Confederation of British Industry (CBI) conference on November 9th that a Brexit would be inimical to Irish interests. The truth is that in the event of a British exit trade relations between the UK and this state would continue as before. Norway is not a member of the EU, yet it enjoys the full benefits of EU free trade; the UK would be no different.

Since Margaret Thatcher's tenure as UK Prime Minister, British Government representatives have worked assiduously to disrupt the process of EU integration, and that policy preoccupation is likely to remain. As the executive of a Member State with a vital interest in the survival of the Euro and in the development of the EU as an "ever closer" political entity, the Irish Government should use its influence to defend the EU against the Cameron campaign.

# Shorts

from  
*the Long Fellow*

## IRISH WATER

*Publicpolicy.ie*, which is financed by Chuck Feeney's *Atlantic Philanthropies* thinks that *Irish Water* should be given a chance. There have been marked improvements in our water services since it was set up. For example, 20,000 people have been removed from "boil water" notices. The spare capacity of water supply in Dublin has been increased from a dangerously low 2% to 8%.

It makes sense for water services to be under one centralised authority rather than a patchwork of Local Authorities with all the duplication of services that that entails.

The critics of *Irish Water* imply that the service before it was set up was somehow adequate. In the Long Fellow's own experience it was not. In fact it was shambolic. While it is regrettable that households are not charged for usage, the installation of water meters has enabled *Irish Water* to locate the source of leaks more quickly. One of the first tasks of the new organisation has been to conduct an audit of the assets with a view to allocating resources to the greatest need. There appears to be some evidence of planning as distinct from the sticking plaster approach of former times.

The issue of *Irish Water* goes to the heart of the role of the State. Should the State be active in planning the infrastructure of the country or should it be passive: merely responding to needs as they arise. Incredibly, the so-called Left in this country prefer a passive State whose only role is the provision of welfare.

The same issues arose during the implementation of the Property Tax. As well as eliminating a glaring anomaly in our tax system, the implementation of the tax has enabled the State to accumulate important data on home ownership, which will facilitate planning.

The Long Fellow regards Water Charges and Property Taxes as red line issues at the next General Election.

## STATE VANDALISM

If the Long Fellow did not understand the so-called Left in this country, he would be surprised that a "social democrat" is selling State assets at a loss. He would also be surprised at the silence of the left

opposition. But, alas, he understands only too well.

In the midst of a housing crisis, the Minister for Housing Alan Kelly proposes to sell Council Houses at a loss. From January 2016 tenants will be eligible to buy the property at discounts of up to 60%. Simon Brooke—the head of policy at the social housing organisation *Clúid*—thinks the average discount will be 50% on the market value (*The Irish Times*, 25.11.15). So, for every 10 houses it sells, the State will be able to acquire 5 houses to replace them.

The so-called Left has no concept of the State's interest. Presumably, its acquiescence to the diminution of the State's housing stock is explained by the fact that the 'beneficiaries' are on low incomes. A tenant on 7.40 euro an hour (less than the minimum wage) will be entitled to a 60% discount. But, even at a discount of 60%, how is such a person expected to pay for a mortgage? it is already the case that a high proportion of Local Authority mortgages are in arrears. Also, how is such a person able to bear maintenance costs, which would no longer be the responsibility of the Council?

The Long Fellow thinks that the only people who will benefit are tenants with substantial undeclared income (e.g. criminals).

## HEALTH INSURANCE

It should be a source of embarrassment to Fine Gael that one of the pillars of its 5 point election manifesto had to be abandoned. Apparently, the much vaunted 'Dutch model' of health care, on which the Party placed its hopes, is not the panacea that it first appeared. The Government has discovered that competition in the Health Insurance market does not drive down costs, but the opposite: it escalates them.

Micheál Martin was right to wonder whether there had been any thought put in to Fine Gael's policy. It is unnecessary to go to the Netherlands: just look at the Irish experience. There has been a dramatic increase in Health Insurance costs since Brendan Howlin allowed private insurance companies to compete with VHI some years ago. All that has been achieved is duplication of administration and marketing costs.

## GENERAL INSURANCE

Ireland's recent experience of the private insurance market in general makes the Long Fellow wonder whether there should be a private insurance market at all. It is said that free market competition stimulates innovation and thereby increases the productive forces of society. But in the

case of health insurance the 'innovation' took the form of undermining the community rating system. BUPA left the Irish market when it was prevented from cherry picking low risk customers.

Irish motorists are still paying for the collapse of *Quinn insurance* and many of us were left high and dry with the collapse of *Setanta Insurance*. We are now seeing the consequences of a mindless chasing of market share.

The only small consolation from an Irish point of view is that—like the banking crisis—some of the costs have been born by British companies. The Irish subsidiary of *RSA* (formerly *Royal and Sun Alliance*) posted losses of 171 million euro in 2014. This followed a loss of 258 million in 2013. The British parent company had to make a capital injection of 399 million euro to keep its Irish subsidiary afloat.

The only sensible approach to insurance is to have either a single state owned insurance company or a single privately owned insurance company that is regulated by the State. Nothing could be worse than the expensive chaos of the existing system.

## RULE BY LAWYERS

Is there any profession in this country more arrogant than the legal profession? That is the question that arises from an interview with Edmund Honohan SC, Master of the High Court (*Sunday Independent*, 13.12.15). In his view politicians should consult more with lawyers:

"It does seem to me politicians say something must be done. Then they go into power and they go to the civil service and the civil service gives them four options and then they go to the lawyers. It should be the other way around. They should say to the lawyers: 'This is our problem. Can you lawyers come up with a solution?' We actually do have solutions".

If the profligacy of lawyers at the various interminable Tribunals is anything to go by, seeking the advice of lawyers before the civil service is a recipe for national bankruptcy.

## IMF LOANS

It is remarkable how liberal the IMF is when it comes to other people's money. For some time now Ajai Chopra, the former head of the IMF team in Dublin has been criticising the European Central Bank for not doing enough to help the Irish economy. But by the time the Troika had come to town, the ECB had already pumped 150 billion Euro into the Irish banking system, which was not far short of Ireland's national income. Should it have continued doing this indefinitely as

well as printing money for Greece and Portugal in the absence of centralised political control?

As well as undermining the currency, the continued dependence on ECB funds would have made it impossible for our banks to obtain alternative sources of funding.

It appears that the IMF is taking a

similar 'liberal' line in relation to the Ukraine's debt to Russia. The Ukraine is in default of a 3 billion loan from Russia. The rules of the IMF forbid it from lending to States which do not make a *bona fide* effort to repay their creditors, especially Sovereign Loans. But the IMF is prepared to waive this obligation. Not for the first time, politics trumps legal and economic considerations.

of the good things and opposed to all of the bad things, as might be expected.

But the clear sticking point is "*the fourth basket and the free movement of persons*". While there is no difficulty with preventing abuse and the possibility of some reform of the "*export of child benefits*" (a paltry issue involving a minimal amount of money in the context of the overall welfare budget, which is more than offset by the savings in not having to provide education and health care for the children concerned), there is "*no consensus on the request that people coming to Britain from the EU must live there and contribute for four years before they qualify for in-work benefits or social housing*".

According to Wolfgang Munchau:

"Mr Cameron wants to restrict the flow of refugees {sic} through a rule to withhold for four years in-work benefits to people newly arrived from the EU. The European institutions and a large number of member states consider this a violation of EU law.

There are fortunately various technically feasible ways around this. If Brussels is good at anything it is fixing legally intractable disputes. Member states can, for example, employ residence as a discriminating factor, link benefit payments to past insurance contributions or invoke exceptional circumstances. If you want to keep somebody out, there are ways to do it. As long as Mr Cameron wants a deal, he will secure one that is more than half-decent."

Apart from referring to EU migrants as "*refugees*", Munchau makes the mistake, as does Tusk, of referring to the Cameronian notion of 'in-work benefits', which can be withheld under certain circumstances. Some such as Housing Benefit may fall into this category, but Tax Credits, the most expensive of these 'benefits', are part of the tax system, not the benefits system, and unless Cameron has some sort of a card up his sleeve it will be impossible to include them in his scheme.

Munchau is not particularly optimistic about the chances of success of the 'In' lobby, but he does state:

"One potentially attractive argument is that a decisive vote for 'In' could allow Britain to fill a political vacuum that has been opened by a dysfunctional euro zone and the demise of Schengen.

Britain could become a leader in Europe. It could be the diplomatic opportunity of a generation."

He is not wrong. Britain has been wrecking Europe in order to be able to lead it for most of the last 500 years.

## Brexit and the Polish Question

continued

prime minister David Cameron is right to insist on the idea of a multi-currency union as an accurate description of the monetary framework of the EU. So, in an environment where the two main projects of integration are crumbling, there is no rational case for Brexit."

The Cameron 'reforms', which he wants to be "*legally binding*" and "*irreversible*", aim to formalise the current stasis and potentially reverse, through national parliamentary 'red cards', some of the integration which has already taken place.

His difficulty now though, is that having built migration up into a major policy difference with Europe he has increased the level of neuralgia on the subject, both within his own party and in the UK at large. People by and large do not care much, if at all, about the abstract issues of integration. But the refugee crisis has intensified an already high level of concern about both EU and non-EU migration and it seems to be voters' main preoccupation. Polls prior to last Summer put the 'remain' vote well ahead of 'leave', but now show the two sides as neck and neck. More ominously perhaps, the odds at Paddy Power currently show punters are betting heavily on Brexit.

There is a deep irony in the fact that the British political Establishment, having pushed relentlessly for the expansion of the EU, both to dilute or halt the progress towards "*ever closer union*" and provide itself with a cheap labour force, may now find itself hoist with this same petard. The incorporation of Poland in particular was considered a triumph, its noted Anglophile/ Atlanticist tendencies increasing the UK's leverage over the Franco--German integrationist axis. But, notwithstanding this, the Poles were wholly unable to stomach the second-class status Cameron bizarrely wanted to foist on them and seem to have carried their point with France

and Germany.

The Polish President of the European Council, Donald Tusk, an arch-Atlanticist, was obliged to reply to David Cameron's letter to him and did so in December by way of a letter to the other members of the Council.

Regarding the "*legally binding commitments*" sought by Britain in relation to the development of the Eurozone Tusk is silent, mentioning instead

"a set of principles that will ensure the possibility for the Euro area to develop further and be efficient while avoiding any kind of discrimination vis-a-vis Member States" and "a mechanism that will support these principles by allowing Member States that are not in the Euro the opportunity to raise concerns, and have them heard, if they feel that these principles are not being followed, **without this turning into a veto right**".

Cameron's letter was specific about the fact that "*there should be no discrimination and no disadvantage against any **business** on the basis of the currency of their country*" and Tusk does not directly address this. If non-eurozone businesses are not to be discriminated against, what measures towards integration could the eurozone legally take in the future? Regardless of whether or not there is an explicit veto, this amounts to a veto in practice

On "*ever closer union*" he says that there is "*wide agreement*" that there are "*various paths of integration for different countries*" and "*a shared view of the importance of national parliaments*" as well as "*a strong emphasis on the principle of subsidiarity*", but no mention of a "*legally binding*" brake on integration for the UK which Cameron demands.

On competitiveness, everyone seems to be in agreement: they are in favour of all

## IIEA vs ESRI

The Institute for International and European Affairs has published (11 December 2015) a Brexit briefing note entitled 'Brexit, Northern Ireland and the Island Economy—An Update'. It is authored by Professor John Bradley, formerly of the Economic & Social Research Institute. The note makes mention of the absurd "20% fall in trade" statistic, bandied about in political and media circles in November, which came from the ESRI report on Brexit discussed in December's *Irish Political Review*.

According to Professor Bradley:

"The recent ESRI report on the consequences of Brexit for Irish-UK trade asserts that the level of Irish exports to the UK could fall by nearly 22 per cent. But this methodology was based on an analogy with studies of the trade-boosting impacts of the removal and lowering of tariff barriers in economies in Asia where trade barriers had been very high and the structures of the economies are very different from those of the EU. The fact that Irish-UK trade has been well established since the foundation of the state, and has endured through many different trade regimes {including full-blown trade war—S.O.} and currency fluctuations that can be much larger than any likely post-Brexit tariff barriers, suggests that the ESRI negative Brexit impacts on Irish-UK economic interactions need to be interpreted with caution."

This is putting it rather kindly indeed. The ESRI report was a desperate attempt by the Trinity College economics professoriate to dramatise the consequences of Brexit in time for Enda's trip to London and nothing else.

In relation to Northern Ireland he notes:

"Even if the UK electorate vote to remain in the EU, under acceptable modified terms that are unlikely to differ very dramatically from the present terms, the long-term lukewarm participation of the UK in a range of important EU activities and their refusal to join in others have already had negative economic consequences for Northern Ireland and the inter-relationship of the Northern and Southern economies. North-South trade and disruptive cross-border shopping activities have been affected by large fluctuations in the euro-sterling exchange rate, where this aspect tends to be highly visible and attracts immediate attention. However, more importantly it has also made it more difficult to build longer-term and deeper North-South economic and business engagement within the island than it might have been if the UK were a fully participating member that shared the objective of closer business and economic integration within the EU and if this logic was also applied to the

island economy."

And:

"This sub-optimal situation within Northern Ireland has been exacerbated by the unwillingness of the UK government to participate in a series of European post-Single Market initiatives designed to move further ahead with the creation of a more deeply integrated European market place. The most important of these initiatives concerns the fact that the UK remains outside the Eurozone, and that economic impacts on UK-Irish and North-South trade of fluctuations in the euro-sterling rate have been far greater than any consequences of fluctuations in the rate against the Danish and Swedish currencies (the only other 'old' EU Member States outside the euro zone). Movements of the currencies of the newer Member States that have not yet joined, but are obliged to do so eventually, have been generally very small or non-existent."

"The island of Ireland is unfortunate in that the scope of its economic activities is divided by an international land border between a small state and a region of a larger state that have tax systems that are not very harmonised and currencies that can fluctuate rapidly and through large margins. It is well known that price deviations induced by exchange rate fluctuations can often take a long time to work through the economy. On the island as a whole, this can appear as a kind of disruptive negative-sum process where both sides eventually lose."

The ESRI report completely ignored the issue of currency differences and their impact on North-South trade, even though it found the relative lack of trade between the two parts of the island overall "surprising". There is some good news of sorts though:

"The consolidation of the Northern peace process, combined with the reality of the Single European Market, are longer-term factors that have served in the past to offset the short-term price fluctuations caused by exchange rates. However undesirable such uncertainty may be, at least it has prepared Irish and Northern Irish businesses for dealing with the possibility of additional disruptive influences on trade and other economic processes that a Brexit might bring."

In concluding Professor Bradley refers to the conclusions of the book published by the IIEA in Feb 2015, *'Britain and Europe: The Endgame'* which he summarises as:

"1] **The economic consequences of Brexit will be difficult, but not catastrophic**

The economic and business consequences of a Brexit for Ireland are

likely to be awkward, at worst, perhaps strategically challenging, but not catastrophic. Indeed, it may offer prospects of some benefits for Ireland in areas such as increased inward investment in areas of Irish specialisation. Of course, any such benefits would be partially offset by the imminent implementation of a new, low rate of corporation tax in Northern Ireland. Research carried out earlier in 2015 by Open Europe in the UK asserted that the overall impact of Brexit on the UK economy is likely to be confined to a band between minus and plus 2 per cent of GDP, presumably with negative/positive knock-on consequences for the Northern Ireland and Irish economies. In layman's language, this is merely a formal way of *admitting that we cannot presently evaluate the consequences!*

There is no compelling reason why a Brexit would make such North-South co-operation dramatically more difficult than it already is unless the breakup takes place in an adversarial and acrimonious atmosphere between the EU and the UK. Then we enter a perilous and unknown world of disrupted trading relations, queues at restored border check-points, and the inevitable consequences for Ireland: a slow and highly costly disengagement with our largest trading partner, Britain, and the same and possibly worse with Northern Ireland. In the words of Lord Denning, this would be 'an appalling vista'

There may be:

"[2] A threat to social protection and employment rights?

From a Trades Union perspective, Brexit pulls Ireland in the wrong direction, as social protection and work-place rights are diluted in the name of international competitiveness. Of course, such concerns are also relevant to the UK Trade Union movement and are likely to play a role in the internal UK debate on Brexit."

But finally:

"[3] The nature of a post-Brexit UK is difficult to quantify

The situation facing Northern Ireland is particularly challenging in the light of its tight inter-relationships with both the British and the Irish economies, the common land border, and the general lack of much by way of political articulation of EU preferences along the lines of Scotland during the recent referendum. But the actual process of Brexit, and the nature of the post-Brexit world, are too fraught with uncertainty to be amenable to any precise quantification."

The IIEA note is a welcome antidote to the histrionics of the ESRI and can be read in full at: [http://www.iiea.com/ftp/Publications/Brexit\\_Northern\\_Ireland\\_and\\_the\\_island\\_economy\\_an\\_update.pdf](http://www.iiea.com/ftp/Publications/Brexit_Northern_Ireland_and_the_island_economy_an_update.pdf)

Sean Owens

The annual Tom Barry Commemoration was held in Fitzgerald Park, Cork, on Saturday 28th November. Cork Lord Mayor Chris O'Leary, who is the first Sinn Fein Lord Mayor of Cork since Thomas McCurtain, gave the opening remarks. Cllr. O'Leary was also the first Cork Mayor to attend this annual event: Fianna Fail and Fine Gael Mayors declined invitations. The Boys Of Kilmichael was sung by Sean Kelleher, Chairman of the Kilmichael Commemoration Committee, and pipers were in attendance. The event, which was organised by the Tom Barry Memorial Committee, concluded with a Decade of the Rosary led by Mons. O'Callaghan of Mallow. Below is the Oration, which was delivered by Brian Murphy osb.

## Tom Barry and the Importance of History

### INTRODUCTION AND THANKS

Before my talk, I would like to express my thanks to Seamus Lantry and the Tom Barry Memorial Committee for their invitation to talk at this ceremony of commemoration. I would like to thank also Cristoir de Baroid and the Dun Laoi association for their assistance in historical projects in the past. I also thank you all for being here to-day, despite the threatening weather; and a special thank you to the Lord Mayor for honouring this event with his presence. I am especially happy to be here to-day, on the precise day of the 95th Commemoration of the Kilmichael Ambush, as my family, on my father's side, came from very near Kilmichael. My mother's side of the family was O'Brien from Ringmoylan, Pallaskenry, County Limerick. My grand-father, Patrick Murphy, was from Inchigeela and then farmed at Rusnakilla, Tarelton, where my father was born. At the time of the Kilmichael Ambush, my father was studying at Christians in Cork and he then went on to study medicine at UCC. He practised as a doctor in London and was buried in Leytonstone Cemetery. His brother, William, my uncle Bill, was buried in the same cemetery in February 1976 and so strong were his feelings for Kilmichael that, on his grave stone, are the words, 'Originally from Kilmichael'. With thoughts of Kilmichael, we are now focussed to talk of Tom Barry.

### 1 Tom Barry and his view of History

"I knew no Irish history and had no national consciousness", Tom Barry (1 July 1897-2 July 1980) wrote in the early pages of 'Guerilla Days in Ireland' (1949) "and for that reason I went to fight for England in the first World War". His words remind us of the importance of history; both for him, personally, making the choices that shaped his life; and for us, as one attempts to discern the past that has shaped, and is shaping, our lives at this very moment. Barry wrote the words in 1949 in order to explain why he, as a youth of 16, enlisted in the British Army (Royal Field Artillery) on 30th June 1915. "I wanted to see what war was like", said Barry. He was not, he said, concerned

with Redmond, Home Rule or the plight of Belgium.

It would appear wrong to blame his lack of knowledge of Irish history on his schooling: in National School at Rosscarbery. His teacher, John McCarthy, taught him a knowledge of the Gaelic past and also instructed him on how to use a rifle; he only attended secondary school at Mungret College for one year, August 1911–September 1912, before the register curtly recorded of him: "*Went Home (ran away) without knowledge of superiors—no vocation*". Moreover, the Mungret College annuals for that time record prize essays on Irish themes, even one on the history of Cork City, and include the results of the hurling team, including a visit by the team to Belgium. Despite these influences, the 16 year old Tom Barry joined the British Army and began a period of training at Athlone and Woolwich which culminated with his posting to Mesopotamia (modern Iraq) on 21st January 1916. One can only speculate as to whether news of Patrick Pearse's oration at O'Donovan Rossa's funeral, on 1st August 1915, or Bishop O'Dwyer of Limerick's statement against recruitment for the British Army, on 10th November 1915, was ever heard inside Tom Barry's training camps.

Tom Barry changed his view of Irish history on hearing of the events of the Easter Rising, which occurred shortly after he had arrived in Mesopotamia in January 1916. Barry wrote: "thus through the blood sacrifice of the men of 1916, had one Irish youth of 18 years been awakened to Irish nationality". Barry experienced a further awareness of Irish nationality, when he returned to Cork after the War, in February 1919; and, on reading the Proclamation of the Irish Republic, he affirmed that, "*the beauty of those words enthralled me*".

It should be noted that his wife, Leslie Mary Price (1893-1984), whom he married on 22nd August 1921, was an active member of Cumann na mBan in the years before the Rising. She also acted as a messenger inside the GPO during the Rising and she showed exceptional bravery

when bringing a priest, Fr. Flanagan, into the Post Office on the instructions of Tom Clarke. Tom Barry praised the contribution of Cumann na mBan during his military actions; and the British Intelligence *Black Book*, on republican suspects, listed c.60 women in County Cork as members of the organisation. Sometimes personal details were given of the women and they were identified as despatch riders and messengers for the IRA. They are all remembered to-day.

Barry regularly stressed the importance of history while writing *Guerilla Days in Ireland*: it was as if he was trying to make sure that no young Irish person would be as ignorant of Irish history as he had been. He discerned three distinct phases in the struggle for Irish independence, 1916–1921: firstly, the Easter Rising; secondly, the election of Dail Eireann; and, thirdly, the creation of an Army (the IRA) which had taken an oath to Dail Eireann and could defend it with a moral mandate. Barry wrote of the third phase in which, as is well known, he acted as Commandant General of the Third West Cork Brigade and was Commander of the Kilmichael, Crossbarry, and other ambushes.

Barry's concern for accurate history was again manifested when, in May 1970, he wrote the Foreword for Ewan Butler's account of Cork's number 3 Brigade and, most especially, when, in 1974, he published a pamphlet, *The Reality of the Anglo-Irish War*, in order to refute some of the claims of Liam Deasy in his book, *Towards Ireland Free* (1973). The sub-title of Barry's pamphlet, in a manner typical of Barry, says it all: "*refutations, corrections and comments*"; and, as for Deasy's book, he concluded that it was "*a mere travesty of the real history of what occurred in the 3rd West Cork Brigade in 1920-1921*".

Another manifestation of Barry's concern for sound history was his opposition to the Bureau of Military History's plans for Witness Statements, to be submitted by all participants in the War of Independence years. He wanted all Statements to be checked by the Commanding Officer of the person concerned and added that, if that was not

done, "then God help Irish history". Fortunately, his fears have proved unfounded. His wife, Leslie, however, did submit a Witness Statement but it is not known, if she consulted her husband about it. Barry's concerns underline the fact that he placed a high priority upon a sound historical narrative. In particular, in all his writings, he was concerned to make two points: firstly, that the actions of the troops under his command (and other IRA units) acted bravely and within the rules of war; and, secondly, that in West Cork the families of Protestants were not attacked, unless they were Loyalists who were co-operating with the Crown Forces.

## 2 Contemporary Protestant opinion supported Barry's version of history as against that of modern revisionist historians

The aims and concerns of Barry have an immediate relevance to the writing of history at the present time, when some historians, notably from Trinity College, Dublin, have attempted to show that Barry's two fundamental concerns were not sustainable, i.e. they claim, firstly, that the IRA did engage in a campaign of terror; and, secondly, that the IRA did target Protestants on account of their religion. Faced by these claims, it is proposed, and I think illuminating, to let Protestant voices speak for themselves.

The voice of Erskine Childers, a person of Protestant background, who like Barry, had fought in the First World War and then committed himself to the cause of the Irish Republic is of special importance. In his own unpublished account of 'The Irish Revolution', located in Trinity Manuscript Room, Childers wrote:

"it is worth noting once more that the violence evoked in this year (1919) was slight. Nor was it indiscriminate or undisciplined. At no time, neither then nor subsequently, have civilians—Protestant Unionists living scattered and isolated in the South and West, been victimised by the republicans on account of their religious opinions or religion."

The words of Childers merit great attention: the late Peter Hart cited from the same manuscript but chose not to use these words in his book on the IRA and Cork in 1998; and, since I published them in a review of Hart's book in that year, they have been greeted with silence by Hart and his colleagues.

Silence, also, has been the response to the presentation of the fact that, not only was Childers a member of the National Land Bank of Dail Eireann, but also that

he was working on that Board with two others of the Protestant faith, Lionel Smith Gordon and Robert Barton, Director of Agriculture and a former British Army Officer in charge of prisoners in 1916. Far from driving Protestants from the land, Dail Eireann actually appointed Protestants to conduct a land reform programme; and far from indicating sectarianism, these appointments indicate clearly that Dail Eireann was trying to act in the ecumenical national spirit advocated by Wolfe Tone.

Childers also expressed his opinions in the pages of the *Irish Bulletin* (November 1919– July 1921), the newsletter of Dail Eireann, which attempted to convey a factual record of the events of the period, despite the challenge of press censorship, police raids and the activities of British propaganda. Here one must acknowledge the fine achievement of the *Aubane Historical Society* for, not only publishing three volumes of the *Bulletin* (up to the date of 1st January 1921), but also for providing an index to persons and places. That a work, which should have been carried out by one of our national institutions, has been performed by a group of private citizens is greatly to their credit.

The *Bulletin* was attacked by British propaganda agents at the time, such as Major C.J. Street and Captain H.B.C. Pollard, who called it "a malignant and lying sheet"; and their views have been echoed in our own time by Roy Foster who asserted that the *Bulletin* was "brilliant at scaling up any (British) military activity into a 'notorious' looting or sacking". In opting for the British propaganda narrative of the War of Independence, Foster marked out a path which many revisionist historians have followed.

The narrative, as told by the *Irish Bulletin* tells a far different story. Significantly, it is not to be found in the index of Peter Hart's book nor is it referenced in Eve Morrison's article on 'Kilmichael Revisited' in the book by Trinity History Workshop, edited by David Fitzpatrick, and titled, *Terror in Ireland, 1916-1923*, (2012).

On this, the 95th anniversary day of the Kilmichael ambush, it is appropriate to reflect upon it in the context of the writing of history. The failure of Hart, Morrison and others to advert to the *Irish Bulletin* in regard to the Kilmichael Ambush has led them to attach too much credence to the views of British propaganda. This version was first publicised by Sir Hamar Greenwood, in the House of Commons, on the evening of 29th November. His

statement was based on police reports: one by General Tudor, Chief of Police, which asserted that "the ambush consisted of about 80 to 100 men. All the men were in khaki and wore steel helmets... and by force of numbers some of my poor fellows were disarmed and then brutally murdered." A British Military Court of Inquiry into the ambush took place on 30th November and this was used by the two leading British propaganda agents in Dublin, Basil Clarke and Hugh Pollard, to send an 'official' report to the press. This resulted in a headline in *The Times* of 1st December 1920: 'Mutilated Bodies' and the statement that "inspection has revealed that the bodies have nearly all six bullet wounds and have suffered terrible mutilation, as though they have been hacked with axes". This story was embellished by the police journal, the *Weekly Summary*, on 10th December, under the heading of 'Murder and Mutilation', and, in various forms, appeared in the *Irish Times* and other papers.

The *Irish Bulletin* attempted to reply to these charges, on 23rd December 1920, under the heading, 'Converting acts of Warfare into Atrocities'. It claimed that the English authorities—

"prevented the examination of the bodies by any independent witnesses and spread broadcast the reports that hatchets had been used to mutilate them".

It then made the general comment that "the majority of the official reports issued by the English authorities in Ireland during the last twelve months have been false". The suspicions of the *Irish Bulletin* were, in fact, justified. The findings of Dr Jeremiah Kelleher, who, as coroner, conducted a medical inspection of the Auxiliary dead on the afternoon of 29th November, did not justify the 'official report' on the Ambush. The doctor did state that one wound was "inflicted after death by an axe or some similar weapon", but that was the only mention of an axe. Far from all the bodies having six or more bullet wounds, the doctor stated that only one Auxiliary had six bullet wounds and four others had three or four. Later, at a court hearing in regard to compensation claims, in January 1921, Dr. Kelleher did state that "some of these injuries were inflicted after death", but there was no mention of "mutilation" either at the court hearing or in his formal doctor's report at the Court of Inquiry on 29th November.

It should be noted, moreover, that Dr. Kelleher had every reason to blacken the reputation of Barry's men: his son, Captain Philip Kelleher, who had recently joined

the Royal Irish Constabulary, had been shot dead by an IRA unit, at Granard, County Longford, barely a month earlier, on 31st October 1920.

The words "mutilated" and "butchered" were, in fact, those of an Auxiliary cadet, Lt. H.G. Hampshire, who had visited the site at "Kilpatrick", yes, that was how he described the location! It was his words that were selected for the 'official report' and, after they had been repeated in the published books of Street and Pollard, his words soon became the British version of the Ambush. Clearly the *Irish Bulletin* was right to question the integrity of each and every British official report but, incredibly, Peter Hart, even after reading Dr. Kelleher's findings, stated that "the British report should not be so completely dismissed".

Eve Morrison, while mentioning Dr. Kelleher's medical report, has not let its measured findings affect her critical views of Barry and the Ambush. Her account of the Ambush, moreover, is influenced by her reliance on a map of the site which she claims to be "an invaluable record, annotated and signed by Tom Barry himself" and which "hangs of the wall of Barrett's pub in Coppeen, West Cork".

In fact, there is another copy of the map in the Bodleian Library, Oxford University, in the papers of A.F. Hemming, Principal Private Secretary to Sir Hamar Greenwood, Chief Secretary for Ireland. I obtained a coloured copy of the map, many years ago, having read of it in Charles Townshend's still valuable book on *The British Campaign in Ireland* (1975). While correctly stating that the copy in Cork derives from a Macroom law firm, Morrison does not advert either to the very detailed account of the origins of the map provided by A.S. Brady in his personal memoir, *The Briar of Life* (2010) or to the account that he gave to Meda Ryan, in 1980, for her book on *Tom Barry: IRA Freedom Fighter* (2003).

Brady, a son of a Protestant clergyman, lived in Macroom; was on speaking terms with the Auxiliaries; and was in his early twenties at the time of the Kilmichael Ambush. Coming from that background, his views are especially valuable. He states clearly that the law firm of T.P. Grainger was provided with a copy of the map to deal with the compensation claims of Lt. Frederick Forde, the only Auxiliary to survive the Ambush, and the other Auxiliaries who had been killed. However, Brady raised the important caveat that the location of the dead bodies of the Auxiliaries, as shown on the map, "is based on the assumption that the corpses

had been left lying where the men had fallen".

Moreover, the written details on the map state that it shows the "position of cars and bodies as found by search party on 29 November 1920". The delay in the drawing of the map enforces Brady's warning of making false assumptions about the positions of the bodies. Further credence is given to this warning by Tom Barry's affirmation that the bodies of the dead Auxiliaries were removed from the lorries before they were burnt. As a result, the body of Commander Francis Crake, who was in the first lorry, appears with a cluster of other bodies in a field near a laneway marked, on the map, as 'Farm Road'.

There is also a question about the time that the map was actually drawn: the Bodleian copy was signed by E. Fleming, Lieut. D.I.3. "C" Company Auxiliary Division RIC and dated 21st January 1921; the copy that was used at the Macroom Courthouse was presented at a hearing which lasted from 11-15 January 1921. While the maps are identical, the written notes below the maps have certain differences. John F. Bourke, counsel for the claimants, stated that, with the help of a map, they could reconstruct the ambush scene "with tolerable accuracy". He did not claim absolute accuracy. As a result of that hearing, with Judge Hynes KC presiding, the families of the dead Auxiliaries received compensation sums ranging from £500 to £5,000. The compensation claim for £15,000 by Lt. Forde was heard, on 18th January 1921, at Bandon Courthouse and he was awarded £10,000. According to A.J. Brady, Forde was not happy that Grainger had deducted £100 for his solicitor's fee. With Forde's settlement, the compensation claims concluded.

However, doubts about the reliability of the maps as an historical record of the Ambush remain: doubts not only for Eve Morrison but also for Sean Murphy in his book, *Kilmichael: A Battlefield Study* (2014).

Speaking in Cork, it is instructive to reflect on the circumstances in which Arthur Hemming succeeded Cornelius Gregg, as Private Secretary to Greenwood, in the last weeks of November 1920 and came into possession of the map. The private diaries of Mark Sturgis, an Under-Secretary at Dublin Castle, now published by Michael Hopkinson as *The Last Days of Dublin Castle* (1999) reveal much about the implementation of British policy in Ireland. Gregg, a career civil servant,

born in Kilkenny, had been acting as Secretary to Greenwood since March 1920. During that time, he was in regular contact with Joseph Brennan, who was born in Bandon, and who worked in the financial department at Dublin Castle. On 24th October 1920 Brennan sent a cable to Gregg informing him that "the town of Bandon, County Cork, has been subjected to outrage, arson and general terrorism by forces of the Crown". Brennan then stated that a gang of soldiers had ransacked his father's residence at Kilbrogan House and forced all the occupants onto the streets at night.

Among those forced out of the house were Brennan's elderly father and brother, who had fought in the British Army in Mesopotamia. Another brother, he added, had been killed in the war in France. Brennan then stated that the Crown forces had also damaged some of the family's business concerns, including the Bandon Milling Company. He concluded by asking Gregg to inform Sir Hamar Greenwood of this state of affairs. Gregg replied immediately stating that "I am getting daily sicker and sicker of the news from Ireland and sorrier that I ever came to my present job". The full account of the incident is to be found in the book by Leon O'Broin, *No Man's Man* (1982). Within a month, Gregg had resigned his position and it was in these circumstances that Hemming succeeded him and that the official map of the Kilmichael ambush site is to be found in his papers.

This incident at Bandon provides an unusual insight, coming as it does from those Irishmen working inside the British administration, into the character of British military rule in Ireland. It is fitting to return to the *Irish Bulletin* and the writings of Erskine Childers for further insights into the role of the Crown Forces. Erskine Childers gave his verdict on the matter in the *Irish Bulletin* and the *Daily News*, the English daily paper, in the months of March and May 1920. Published later in the year in pamphlet form, the French title, "La Terreur Militaire en Irlande", might well have been chosen to refute revisionist contentions that the IRA was engaged in a campaign of terror. Childers attempted to put the armed struggle into context and he wrote:

"I want to insist on this general statement that an attempt is being made to break up a whole national organisation, a living, vital, magnificent thing, normally and democratically evolved from the intense desire of a fettered and repressed people."

This, he concluded, "*is the great crime, the fundamental crime*".

Tom Barry would have been happy with these sentiments. In his own way, he had attempted to show that his troops were acting under a democratic mandate with particular reference to the success of the Sinn Fein Courts. Childers and the *Irish Bulletin* went a step further. They constantly stressed the democratic credentials of the IRA and emphasised not only the General Election of 1918 but also the overwhelming success of Sinn Fein in the Local Elections of January and June 1920. This was contrasted with England's denial to Ireland of a place at the Paris Peace Conference in January 1919; and the ever increasing imposition of British rule of Ireland by martial law—starting with the *Defence of the Realm Act* of August 1914 and culminating in the *Restoration of Order in Ireland Act* of August 1920.

Protestant voices were also heard in several organisations and, in these forums, they expressed the same sentiments as Erskine Childers. Among these bodies were the Irish Co-operative Society of Sir Horace Plunkett and George Russell, which was particularly critical of military attacks on the Creameries; the Irish White Cross Society (founded 1st February 1921) with James Douglas, a Quaker, at its head and two Church of Ireland bishops, along with many other Protestants, serving as trustees; the *American Commission on Conditions in Ireland* (first meeting 18 November 1920) at which several Protestants spoke critically of the Crown Forces in Ireland; and the *Peace with Ireland Council* (founded 29 October 1920) which provided an English forum to highlight the failure of British policy in Ireland. Among the members of this Council, were Lord Henry Bentinck, Basil Williams, and John Annan Bryce. The titles of the pamphlets published by this society tell their own story of the conduct of British troops in Ireland: '*The Terror in Action*' by J.L. Hammond; '*Frightfulness in Ireland*' by Sir John Simon' were but two of many such publications. Roy Foster dismisses these particular voices as those of "*engagé British liberals*" and the manner in which some participants in the Trinity History Workshops have, over the years, neglected these distinguished voices, and the Societies to which they belonged, suggests that they have adopted the same disparaging mindset as Foster.

Many voices could be chosen in order to examine their view of the War of

Independence with that of Tom Barry: three will suffice.

Firstly, on the matter of sectarianism, the voice of Lionel Curtis provides an informed English view. He visited Ireland, in the first months of 1921, on behalf of the *Round Table Society*. His views were published in a paper, with the simple title of '*Ireland*', in June of that year. Curtis declared that

"Protestants in the South do not complain of persecution on sectarian grounds. If Protestant farmers are murdered, it is not by reason of their religion, but rather because they are under suspicion as Loyalists. The distinction is a fine, but a real one."

It is, in fact, the same distinction made by Tom Barry. In the course of his visit to Ireland, Curtis and his fact-finding companion, John Dove, met Childers, on 23rd March 1921, and many other Irish people. His views, however, were distinctly of his own making: he associated the Sinn Fein movement with "*terror*"; he followed the British propaganda view on the Kilmichael Ambush, claiming that "*bodies were shamefully mutilated*"; and he adopted the official British Army view of the Irish people by asserting that the Irish mind had "*an ingrained belief in the virtue of violence*". In that context, his comments on the absence of sectarianism are all the more remarkable.

Secondly, again on the matter of sectarianism, some Protestant voices from Limerick are relevant: partly because they have been largely ignored; and partly because they afford another insight into Peter Hart's use of source material. Faced by allegations made in the *Galloway Gazette*, of March 1914, that "*in Limerick the Protestant part of the population seemed to be living in terror*", there was an appeal by Catholics to Protestants that these claims should be rejected. The claims were made in the context of the advancement of the *Home Rule Bill* as part of Government policy and the resultant fears of Irish Unionists. On 2nd March, W. Holliday, a member of the Harbour Board asserted: "*all of these stories that had been circulated through the country for political objects by political tricksters were false and untrue*"; and, on 14th March, a group of leading Protestant Unionists declared publicly, in the *Limerick Chronicle*, that

"we wish to say that we saw some of these visitors, and that no such statement was made by us or in our hearing. Further, if any such statements

were made we believe them to be untrue."

When Peter Hart dealt with a similar matter in his book, *The IRA and its Enemies*, he made much of the threat that Catholics had made against Protestants in Limerick in January 1914, under the index heading of '*Limerick County Council, sectarian violence*'; but he made no reference to the amicable resolution of the matter in March 1914.

Nor does he refer to a large gathering of Unionists in Limerick on 21st August 1920 when, in the midst of several resolutions against Home Rule, a motion was proposed by Sir Alexander Shaw that—

"we here present take this opportunity of stating that we have never experienced any religious intolerance in the past, and we do not anticipate any in the future, and we strongly deprecate it as being against the best interests of our country and of all religion."

His resolution was passed unanimously. The same sentiments were expressed by Sir Charles Barrington at a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce on 4th April 1922 when he stated that "*in year gone by and at the present time the question of religion never arose in Limerick or the South; they all, Catholic and Protestant alike, lived in the best of harmony and good fellowship*".

These sentiments accord with the many statements mentioned by Protestants above and are manifestly at variance with the sectarian view of Limerick as projected by Peter Hart.

Thirdly, on the alleged terror tactics of the IRA, the voice of Alice Stopford Green, the distinguished historian, who was living in Dublin at that time, is revealing. She affirmed at the end of 1920, in a short pamphlet on '*The Irish Republican Army*', that

"it would be hard to find in any country a body of men equal to the Irish Volunteers. Sober, self-respecting, upright, they give the unique spectacle of an army of revolutionaries protecting life and property, maintaining the only law and order that now exists in Ireland, suppressing burglary and crime, doing equal justice in their courts to Protestant and Catholic, landowner, policemen, Republican and Unionists."

Tom Barry would have been extremely happy with her opinion, especially as Dorothy Stopford, the niece of Alice, acted as a medical doctor in Kilbrittain, West Cork, from May 1921, and was on good terms with the local IRA units.

The words of Alice Stopford Green may serve as a concluding tribute to Tom

Barry and all the men and women who engaged in the War of Independence. Her views, and those of many others of the Protestant faith, notably Erskine Childers, show conclusively that recent revisionist claims that the republican movement was sectarian are fundamentally flawed at source.

### Reflection on the coming Centenary of the Easter Rising

Some reflection on Tom Barry and the coming celebration of the centenary of the Easter Rising may be fitting. Many of you who knew Tom Barry, and those of you who have read the invaluable book by Meda Ryan, will know that he did not attend commemorations of the Rising, even that of 1966; he felt unworthy, as he was a British soldier at that time. His wife, Leslie, did, however, participate in the commemorations in Dublin and Limerick. The words of Roger Casement provide guidance in striking a balance between commemorating those who fought in the First World War and those who took part in the Rising. Writing in his prison cell, shortly before his execution by hanging in August 1916, he wrote:

"Irishmen, live unselfishly and die faithfully and fearlessly for Ireland as the men of 1916 have done and no power of man or Empire of Gold can withhold freedom from men so vowed. What was attempted so valiantly this year by a handful of young men is the only episode of this war that should survive in history ... The rest is either mistaken slaughter of brave men or plotting to destroy an enemy by hate for motives of greed and domination. I cast no stone at the millions of brave dead men throughout Europe—God rest their souls in Peace—but the cause of all the great combatants is essentially selfish and greedy."

Tom Barry may have drawn some consolation, or guidance, from these words: his actions and those of his comrades who had participated in the war were not derided by Casement; they were described as "*brave*"; but priority was given to the Easter Rising "*the only episode of this war that should survive in history*". Barry would have been happy to accept such an order of priorities.

It is also significant that Casement's view was essentially that of a member of the Protestant tradition; he only became a Catholic in the days before he died. Recently, while restoring an old walled garden at Glenstal Abbey where I live, I attempted to give a practical expression to these sentiments. Working in the early months of 2009, the 90th anniversary of

Dail Eireann, I became aware that, in August 1919, the Dail had suggested that individuals and groups would commemorate the Rising by planting 16 trees in memory of those executed. The Director of Agriculture at that time, as mentioned above, was Robert Barton, of the Protestant faith and a British Army Officer in charge of prisoners after the Rising. That a person of his background could make such a recommendation was a clear sign of recognition, respect and reconciliation.

In order to reflect these qualities of commemoration, I planted sixteen trees, with a small memorial stone providing basic details of those who had been executed, and I added one more tree for Winnie Barrington, the only daughter of

the Barrington family, who was the accidental victim of an IRA Ambush in May 1921. The Ambush took place at Newport, County Tipperary, about seven miles from Glenstal Castle, now Glenstal Abbey, in which her family lived. The words on her grave stone in the local cemetery at Abington offer a final reflection on our commemoration of 1916. The words read: "*here lies (buried) all that could die of Winnie Barrington*". Words reminiscent of those of the Scottish poet, Thomas Campbell, "*to live in hearts we leave behind is not to die*". Something of the spirit lives on and, by cherishing that spirit, our commemoration becomes not only a remembrance of the dead but also a celebration of the lives of those whom we think of to-day.

**Brian Murphy OSB**

## Colum What You Like—But Not Pro-German!

In the *Irish Times* on October 27th last, under the heading of "*An Irishwoman's Diary: The New York life of Mary Maguire Colum*", Madeleine Humphreys opened:

"In the Family Immigration Centre on Ellis Island I trawled through the manifest of the *SS Celtic*. It had sailed from Liverpool to the Port of New York in September 1914. I was looking for an entry for Mary Maguire Colum, and there it was. Squashed in under the name of her husband, Pdraic, it noted 'Mary Colum, wife'. Mollie, as she was known, would have been delighted. She was very much in love with her new husband, but I felt cheated. This was a meagre entry for a woman who was WB Yeats's 'ideal of a youthful nihilist'... Mollie was also a teacher in Patrick Pearse's progressive school in Rathfarnham and she had a lot to offer a land of conquering physical adventure."

Humphreys went on to pay due tribute to Mary Colum in her own right—as a widely syndicated literary critic, a Professor of Poetry in New York's Columbia University, a Pulitzer Prize judge for Drama, and one of the founders of the USA's National Book Award. But Humphreys seemed to have had problems with one particular associate of the Colums in New York:

"They rented a walk-up apartment on the fifth floor of Beekman Tower, looking down on the East River. Not far away, in a boarding house on West 29th street, John Butler Yeats, father of the poet, was enjoying an Indian summer of the mind. Writing to his daughter Lily, who was

back in Dundrum in Dublin, he declared 'I do love the Colums' and he was just getting into the habit of having afternoon tea with them at Beekman Tower when Kuno Meyer, the Celtic scholar, began to show up. Meyer was an Irish nationalist, born in Hamburg and believed, by many, to be working in the German cause in New York in 1915. Yeats didn't like him. The Colums were also radical nationalists, but the old man continued to love them. Nevertheless, he stopped going to tea at their apartment for fear of who he might meet. This fear did not extend to Nora Connolly who came to stay with the Colums in 1915 while on a secret mission for the Irish Volunteers."

Humphreys was pussyfooting around Kuno Meyer. At a special meeting of Dublin City Council on 18th July 1911 a motion to confer the Freedom on the City to Kuno Meyer was tabled by two Sinn Féin Councillors: it was proposed by Seán T. O'Kelly, a future President of Ireland, and seconded by William T. Cosgrave, a future President of the Executive Council of the Irish Free State. The ceremony took place on 23rd April 1912, when the honour was also conferred on Canon Peadar Ó Laoghaire of Carraig an Ime, Co. Cork, the greatest modern Irish writer of his day. And Ó Laoghaire's own speech went on to express his appreciation of Meyer and his indebtedness to him for his translations from Old Irish, which had unlocked for him for the treasures of the early language. Cork followed suit with a ceremony that also conferred the Freedom of that City on both men, the ceremony taking place on

25th September 1912. The *Cork Examiner* had editorialised on the previous day:

"Dr. Kuno Meyer is now Professor of Celtic in Berlin, but before his appointment he had for many years sojourned in Ireland, and his reputation as an authority on the early Irish language and literature is universally acknowledged. He has made this department of study his own, and with the thoroughness and determination of his race he has explored, investigated, elucidated, until he had ennobled the character of the early Irish nation as a people possessing a refined and expressive language, a copious and heroic literature, of high proficiency in the arts, in music and in the higher forms of craftsmanship ... For his labours and his services in collecting and expounding those widely scattered vestiges of the early culture and refinement of our people. Dr. Kuno Meyer has imposed a heavy obligation of gratitude on Irishmen and women of the present day".

But this Cork organ of Redmondism changed its tune when Britain declared war on Germany and Redmond followed suit. Anti-German hysteria was rife. In February 1915, when extolling the killing score of the British Army's Michael O'Leary, which included the killing of a German soldier who had surrendered, not falsely but truly, the *Cork Examiner* published the following piece of sneering doggerel:

*"When the Gaelic League in Dublin  
resolved Kuno Meyer  
It was Private Michael O'Leary who  
took the Mauser fire".*

The Redmondite anti-German racism that engulfed both Dublin and Cork on the outbreak of the First World War was to result in both City Councils striking out the honour they had given to Meyer such a short time previously. In vain had W.T. Cosgrave protested on March 1, 1915:

"The proposal now before the Council is to remove the name of this eminent Celtic scholar from the roll of honorary freemen. To negate a life work of Celtic erudition. No Continental upheaval can affect the everlasting debt of gratitude owed to German Celtic scholars. Zeiss, Windisch, Thurneyson, Zimmer and Kuno Meyer have laboured in the vineyard of Celtic study, and the labourers are worthy of their hire".

"No exponent of jurisprudence, however profound, can alter the truth of this scholarly industry, and generations yet unborn shall benefit by their work. No denunciatory sophistry can affect what they have accomplished, and every honest-minded citizen shall applaud the effort to prevent the stain upon the fair fame of Ireland's municipality".

To no avail. The expunction of Meyer's name was carried out in Dublin on 15th March 1915, and Cork later followed suit. When the War of Independence had at last effected a sea-change in Irish public opinion away from such *shoneenism*, Dublin City Council voted once more on 19th April 1920—this time to rescind the infamous resolution of March 1915, and Cork also followed suit. But it was too late for Meyer. He had died on 11th October 1919.

Humphreys was also pussyfooting around the position of the Colums themselves. She seemed to share the reservations and fears of Yeats the Elder regarding Meyer, and to regret that the Colums did not likewise share them. But how could they? Humphreys neglected to inform her *Irish Times* readers that when Britain waged a World War against Germany, the poet Padraic Colum, along with his literary critic wife Mary, openly and explicitly supported the Central Powers of Germany and Austria. On the outbreak in August 1914 of what James Connolly called "The War on the German nation", Redmondite mobs also waged war on German nationals in Ireland by sacking any German shops that could be found. On 18th August 1914, in a letter in the *Irish Independent*, Padraic Colum protested:

"Sir, I hope there are a few Irish men or women who have read without deep indignation the account of unprovoked attacks upon German shops in our capital and in other towns in Ireland. What have these defenceless traders done to the citizens of Dublin that their means and subsistence should be destroyed? What has Germany done to Ireland that she should be insulted by mean attacks? Have we not sufficient sense of national calamity that we can watch with mere spite the spectacle of a great nation being beset by Russia, France and Great Britain, being resisted by Belgium and looted by Japan? If that nation was as remote from us as the kingdom of Prester John, we should have some sympathy for its struggle. But the nation is Germany, the motherland of Zimmer, Windisch and Kuno Meyer. I remember when the Anglo-Irish and the English universities mocked Irish civilisation, saying there was nothing in our literature that was not silly or indecent, it was from the German universities that the word went forth that made our culture respected. I remember a time when a speech by Dr. Julius Pokorny was of more account than a message from the *Times* correspondent in America ..."

The Colums did not subsequently revise their views on the First World War. It was on the basis of recognising where they continued to stand, that James Joyce, who

had lived within the Austrian Empire in Trieste, could later write to Mary Colum, expressing utter contempt for British anti-Austrian propaganda: "*They called the Austrian Empire a ramshackle empire ... I wish to God there were more such empires*". Joyce would elaborate: "*I cannot begin to give you the flavour of the old Austrian Empire. It was a ramshackle affair but it was charming, gay, and I experienced more kindnesses in Trieste than ever before or since in my life.*"

Neither Joyce nor the Colums would ever revise that perspective. On 2nd February 1931, Padraic Colum attended Joyce's 78th birthday party in Paris, and reported on it in the New York journal *The New Republic* on 13th May 1931. It contained the following restatement:

"The state for which he has the highest esteem was the old Hapsburg Empire. '*They called it a ramshackle empire*', he says, '*I wish there were more such ramshackle empires in the world.*' What he liked about old Austria was not only the mellowness of life there, but the fact that the state tried to impose so little upon its own or upon other people. It was not warlike, it was not efficient, and its bureaucracy was not strict; it was the country for a peaceful man."

Madeleine Humphreys told her *Irish Times* readers nothing of the pro-German and pro-Austrian sympathies of the Colums. And if, as she wrote, Yeats the Elder had no fear of meeting Nora Connolly when she was staying with the Colums, comparable to his fear of meeting Kuno Meyer, well, according to his prejudices, he should have had. Robert Briscoe—the War of Independence IRA gun-runner, Fianna Fáil TD and the first Jewish Lord Mayor of Dublin—might have understandably revised his own views of Germany and the First World War, as a reaction to the outcome of the Second World War, when he could number and name hundreds of relatives who had lost their lives as victims of the Nazi German Holocaust. But he did not. His actual experience of living and working in Germany from 1912 to 1914 would not allow him to do so, as he well recalled in his 1958 memoirs, *For the Life of Me*:

"Berlin was a city of gaiety in 1912; not the frenetic, die-tomorrow gaiety I knew there in the twenties, nor the terrible strength-through-joy of Hitler's capital, but genuine lightness of heart. There were wonderful concerts and operas to which one could go very cheaply since they were subsidised by the Kaiser's paternalistic state... There was also boating on the lakes, or long walks in the

storybook German countryside; and hospitable cottagers who invited you in for milk and coffee cake when you got tired. It was all so serene and happy that one felt it would go on forever. I am sure the Germans did... I remember the night, almost the minute, that everything changed. It was toward midnight on August 4, 1914, when England declared war on Germany."

Briscoe's father sent him to the USA:

"So in December, 1914, I sailed for America ... But I enjoyed myself... Her name was Norah Connolly, daughter of the Irish patriot who was later killed in the Easter Rising of 1916, which was the beginning of our fight for freedom... One night ... she gave me a sealed envelope with a simple trust, 'Please take care of this for me. I'm so scatter-brained I'm fearful of losing it'. Highly flattered by her confidence I put it in my breast pocket and thought of it no more. On the windy dock in New York, when we had passed the immigration officials, she was met by

James Larkin, whom I recognised as one of the great leaders of the Irish workers seething beneath the crust of British rule. She asked me, then, for the envelope, and handed it to him. I realised that I had been her courier, but did not mind the risk she had put on me. Much later I learned that the papers I had carried into America were dispatches from James Connolly to German Ambassador Count von Bernstorff. They were the beginning of what was known as the 'German Plot', the attempt of Irish patriots to enlist German aid and German arms for Ireland's fight for liberation... But had I known what it was, I would still have done it gladly."

But perhaps it is beyond the comprehension of an *Irish Times* columnist to acknowledge that, during Britain's and Redmond's Great War, radical Irish nationalists, whether Jew or Gael, truly believed in working with the 1916 Proclamation's "*gallant allies in Europe*".

**Manus O'Riordan**

## **Book Review: Dying For The Cause, Kerry's Republican Dead PART TWO**

### **The Wars In Kerry**

The Litany of villains is an extensive one. Who deserves to play the part of Quasimodo? Or Dracula? Many would plump for Neligan. Others might go for Daly. Or they might go for an outsider. A Sixty-six to one shot. Me! I go for Hancock. Col. James Hancock, Dublin Guards, Ballymullen Barracks. He had served in the Australian Army in WW One. After War's end, it seems he remained with the Brits. Mystery surrounds this individual. He wound up in the Dublin Guard. Then he's off to Kerry, where he left his footprints and deadly handprints all over the place. Hancock's half-crazy.

A feature of Ballymullen Barracks, especially during the Civil War, was torture. Beatings were regularly administered to prisoners. Broken limbs often resulted. It seems such cruelty gave some pleasure to its perpetrators.

Sometimes victims would have to place their hands upon tables. Their interrogators would tap their fingers with hammers, breaking them, and making the prisoners jump and roar. This was quite a feature of the Free State questioning technique. Legs and knees, too, became targets. Prisoners were hobbling about a lot. Others were trying to hold broken arms and hands as comfortably as possible. Such prisoners, oftentimes, were useless when required to

perform some manual duty. It is said that one prisoner, through injury now incapable, had been deemed unfit to be one of the Ballyseedy Massacre victims. In the event, the one in the adjoining cell was out of luck. He was plucked out, on the spur of the moment, to make up the numbers. Sometimes you're out of luck. Othertimes you're just lucky. But no one in Ballymullen, in or out of uniform, could be considered in any regard to be connected with luck. Behind those walls, killers lurked and sulked. (*When I strayed with my love to the pure crystal fountain!*)

In any conflict, it would be difficult to surpass the cruelty involved in the 'Civil War' in Kerry as employed by the Free State. It was deliberate and it was employed for a purpose. It had high level sanction and was without restraint. It was often personalised and had intimations of the particulars of the victims being part of the awfulness involved. Autonomy lay with levels usually below any that military employ. It seems that in Ballymullen people, in large numbers, were going about with the power of life or death in their hands. *Carte Blanche*, it seems, was given out like bottles of stout at an American wake. There were few, if any, with clean hands. Faces were distorted with cruelty, or, were so because of its infliction. Foul

deeds occurred in that awful place. The whole truth will never be known. Those grey walls have cast a long shadow in Ballymullen, that place of ghosts.

Perhaps the Civil War was particularly disfigured by the three abominations perpetuated by the Free State in March 1923. The GOC, Kerry, was General Patrick Daly, as we have already seen:

1. The Ballyseedy Massacre, 7 March 1923: Eight Republican prisoners bombed to death, with one escapee, Stephen Fuller. Their bodies were further grenaded and bullet-riddled. The surrounding trees were spattered with human flesh. The sole survivor crawled to safety.

2. Countess Bridge Massacre, Killarney, 7th March 1923: Four Republican prisoners bombed to death, with one escapee, Tadgh Coffey. The bodies were further grenaded and bullet-splayed. (*"How can you buy it? he asked with a smile!"*) The sole survivor chanced upon a friendly house.

3. Behags, Cahirciveen, Massacre, 12 March 1923: Five Republican prisoners bombed to death, with no escapee, though, subsequently, the truth emerged as an officer spoke out.

These were three big hits. Stephen Fuller was blown clear, miraculously, at Ballyseedy. He managed to escape and lived to tell the tale. At Countess Bridge, Tadgh Coffey, was also miraculously blown clear, and lived to tell the tale. At Behags, no one survived. However, a Free State officer, ashamed, spoke out. These three atrocities were obviously part of a policy decision, taken by, or condoned by, a high-level authority within the Free State system. I am unaware, anywhere, of any Republican action in any way comparable. In regard to the atrociousness of deeds, the Free State wins, hands down. Shame, endemic to those of the Free State persuasion, was the underlying cause, I believe.

After Ballyseedy, nine coffins were handed by the Free State authority in Ballymullen, Tralee, to the crowd, mostly women, who were gathered. One of the coffins bore the name of Stephen Fuller. The coffins all contained body bits and pieces. As the women took off the lids in order to identify, an Army Band from the Barracks played Dixie music. It must have been a macabre scene. Dixie music from the band and the wails from the women. No Tarrantino movie could capture it.

One wonder if Daly was looking out a window. Or Nelligan. What were they

thinking? Were they moved, at all? Did they have any feelings? Could they feel? I think not. Someone had authorised that band to play. Meanwhile the people had procured proper coffins and were trying to re-arrange the contents as best they could. Stephen Fuller's coffin would stay empty for many a year, as he lived on and on. These three atrocities could be covered, maybe, by one word: Animals! Though this does not do justice to animals. And animals do not suffer shame or feel its effects.

In his book, *Dying For The Cause*, Tim Horgan speculates that Neligan selected those to be bombed and shot to death at Ballyseedy, to accord with their home localities and their prominence in the Republican struggle. A strange sort of selectivity. Perhaps Neligan had started a new system of condemnation: Sentence determined by address. A type of contorted snobbery. The Traell prisoners were said to be a sorry-looking lot. They had been beaten and ill-treated. They looked like the halt and the lame, Barely holding things together. The night was closing in. It was cold but dry. They boarded a lorry. The little convoy took off for Ballyseedy. Ostensibly to remove imaginary Republican mines. To be, in fact, mined by the Free State, and blown to smithereens. Cpts. Flood and Clarke, of the Dublin Guard, had constructed the mine. Off they went, this sorry lot. Into the night. Sick and sore, maybe no longer caring. Then, at Ballyseedy, tied to the gate, and, boom, up it went. Capt. Ned Breslin detonated the mine. But Stephen Fuller was crawling away.

Back in Ballymullen, what was Neligan thinking? How was he feeling? He was to have five pensions eventually. One was a British one. It appears he drew it until the day he died. The one and only Colonel David Neligan. People like that never cease to amaze. They play for high stakes.

The Free State's Intelligence Chief in Tralee was like the Hand of Death. When he pointed that finger, that was the end. But would he be waiting? He had to be somewhere. Obviously, in that place of horrors, in Ballymullen. Would he be looking out, awaiting the convoy's return? Would his heart give a little jump? Maybe. Might he secretly be hoping for some sort of miracle? No, not Neligan. Not likely. He'd want to hear of success. All gone up in smoke, those Republicans. And The Republic with them. From whence do these people come?

It is unlikely that Daly held his hand.

He didn't need Daly's hand and Daly didn't need his. They were birds of a feather. Two vultures hovering over the bodies they'd already butchered. Who would swoop first? Who was the hungriest? Two sad men. Gazing out their windows. Awaiting the Hand of Death. Neligan with his glory days in the Castle, betraying each and everybody; Daly recalling his days with the Squad, getting up close and letting him have it between the eyes. Oh, Cathleen ní Uallacháin, you were rearing them still!

Undoubtedly Neligan and Daly were Free State All-Stars. Player of the Year? I'm not sure. Take your pick. Neligan had become the more obvious, I think. Strange for one who'd been immersed in Intelligence matters for so long. Daly had been a silent killer while a member of the Assassination Squad in Dublin. Now he was GOC (Kerry), Free State Forces, his headquarters in Tralee. He had a big say regarding who would die. Or who might be permitted to live. Death, it appears, took wings out of his office, more silently than it winged it from Neligan's. Once a priest had pleaded with Daly to save his brother who'd been sentenced to death. Daly told him, any more and he (the priest) would go to his death too. Daly was one of the real hard men. His shadow meant death.

But I think that Hancock was the best—rather, the worst—of all. Neligan had been witnessed as he struck someone. He was seen to shoot and kill publicly. But, somehow, Hancock has more menace. It is something to say that someone had more menace than Neligan or Daly, but I feel Hancock had. He appears to have been more likely to be 'on the spot, Johnny'. Where danger threatened, Hancock turns up. At Clasméalcon he came on the scene, after the surrender. He personalized matters. He removed Rudge Hathaway and took him to the nearby cliff-top and beat him. There were troops about. There may have been other witnesses too. It appears this beating was a bad one. Then he had him brought to Tralee, to face a firing squad in the days that followed along with his two surviving comrades. Hancock was nobody's baby, though he must have had a mother too. Sometime.

Hancock popped up too at Frenit, the outer port of Tralee. Here in early August 1922 he inspected the pier. Republicans had mined it, anticipating a Free State landing, but commercially-interested groups had snipped the wires. Hancock was on the ball. The Free State landing took place. Some 450 Free State troops

were landed and made for Tralee, seven miles away. Republican forces were depleted: many fighters had gone to West Limerick and West Cork to help the Republican defensive line. Though they fought a delaying action from the high ground at Sammy's Rock, they could not fend off the superior force. They retreated to Tralee. Around Pembroke St. and Rock St. street-fighting ensued. But the town fell. The Free State force took Ballymullen Barracks. From the Limerick direction further Free State incursions took place. Kerry Republicans were back to the Flying Column again. They'd taken to the hills. Soldiers of the Rearguard.

But the end was coming. The Free State had won. The new satellite state had formed. Developments occurred. The huge Free State Army took on a life of its own. The Army was no longer there, allegedly, to serve the people. Rather, it was the people who were there to serve the Army. The Cumann na nGael Government began to reduce army numbers and introduce new measures. This brought some dissatisfaction. There was an Army Mutiny. There came a split. Resignations followed, together with some rationalisation. Old comrades had parted. Somewhat.

Hancock and his likes, it appears, vanished. No doubt, monetarily, well-rewarded. Gone, I presume, to pastures new. He and the others. People like Capt. Wilson, who'd left his mark on the Kingdom too. They were a strange lot, those Dublin Guard. Many had come from the British Army. They came from different national backgrounds. They were from different parts of the country too. Some were from Dublin. And they came from Kerry, strange though it may appear. But they owed much to their blood-stained main origins: *The Assassination Squad* and the Active Service Unit, Dublin. Remembered forever. Never to be forgotten. Neligan, Daly, Hancock, Clarke, Breslin, Wilson. On and on it goes. The Litany of the Disreputable.

Not to forget Major McKinnon. Or his Auxiliaries. The Tans too. And the *Times*. And our (their) own, The Munsters. Though the record shows that Kerry was slow. There are records of debates in the British House of Commons, where members claimed poor recruiting figures from the Kingdom. And that big boyo, with the moustache pointing at you, was born in Crotta. He needs you. But not any longer. Remember Ballyseedy. And, where people gave in because of human frailty, then surely they will be forgiven. But the greedy are rarely absolved.

*Dying For The Cause* is a *tour de force*. The book is deeply researched. It is finely referenced and cross-referenced. It is a credit to its author. Its pages brings things to life. It gives a sense of time and place. It allows many to thump their chests. But others can go and hide. There are those whose faces ought to be red. And red they should be. But this fine book should bring a lot of honour and pride. Its honesty and truthfulness are matched only by its obvious accuracy. It is a model for other Counties, in its methodology. It is to be hoped that it will be emulated elsewhere. But, perhaps, not with the same fondness. ("That stands in the beautiful Vale of Tralee!").

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

**Report:** Volume Three of the Irish Bulletin was launched by **Cathal Brugha and Eamon O Cuiv** at Pearse House, Dublin on Thursday, 26th November. Below is a brief Report of the speech by **Eamon O Cuiv**.

## LAUNCH OF IRISH BULLETIN

*Buíchais don chuireadh. An leabar é sea. Foinse iontach staire iad.*

The *Irish Bulletin* is the official newspaper of Dáil Éireann, giving news and war reports. Volume 3 covers the period 1st September to 1st January 1921. The Preface is by Jack Lane, and the Introduction is by Brendan Clifford. It is published by the Belfast Historical & Educational Society.

The volume records in detail the British Government's policy of unlawful reprisals, pursued by an increasingly rattled British administration in London.

The *Bulletin* was published by the Irish Government to counter misinformation by the British Government and to report what was happening. It was needed because the "*first casualty of war is the truth*".

Most of the press of the time, here and in England, were unsympathetic to the Republican cause. There was a need to put the official side of the story.

Desmond Fitzgerald was the Minister, with responsibility for propaganda, as was Erskine Childers. Erskine Childers was always highly respected by Eamon de Valera, the speaker's grandfather. Mr. O Cuiv once asked him his opinion about President Childers, who was Erskine's son. The only reply he received was that "*his father was a great man*".

The Rising, to be commemorated in 2016, was a turning point, as it gave

people a chance to dream the big dream, to aspire to that which they had been told was impossible.

The 1918 Election was the consummation of this in electing a democratic, free Government. The Election was called after the Armistice of 11th November 1918. The first Dail met on 21st January 1919. Setting up a Republican Government in that short time frame was a huge achievement. Under the Presidency of Cathal Brugha, a functioning parliament and Government was established that Éamon de Valera headed up on his release from Prison.

The difficulties were huge: most of the leaders were in gaol.

There was a verbatim report of the Dáil from the start: another fantastic achievement, given the numbers that were in jail and the bodies were operating underground.

The new institutions included a Department of Foreign Affairs, which published documents. Criminal Courts and a police force were brought into being, as were Civil Courts. Constance Markievicz took care of Industrial Disputes. Cathal Brugha and Terence McSwiney were in control of the Army.

There was a Propaganda Department, which was responsible for producing the *Irish Bulletin* and putting the case of the Irish democracy, particularly in Britain and around the world.

Credit is due to those who have come together to publish these documents, so that people can get an accurate view of what was going on and what was being said at the time.

Three volumes now available from  
Aubane Historical Society and counting!

## The Irish Bulletin

The *Irish Bulletin* was the official newspaper of the Irish Government during the War of Independence. Its aim was to provide those outside Ireland with the Government's case and the facts of the war that it had to wage. It was necessary for the Irish Government to wage war because the British Government refused to dismantle its state apparatus in Ireland after it lost the General Election in 1918.

It deserves an honoured place in Irish history yet it has never been republished and it is hardly referred to by our contemporary historians—and when it is—it is almost inevitably in disparaging terms.

## What is a Nation? By Ernest Renan and Joseph Stalin

Introduction drawing out the  
implications for the Two Nations  
Theory and other matters,

by

**Brendan Clifford.**

Athol Books 2015

A nation is a historically evolved mixture of things: race, religion, language, economic interest, geographical factors, dynastic influence. All of these things, or some of them, are blended, in various proportions, through historical events, to produce the sense of communal affinity between very large numbers of people that is called *nationality*.

The blend is the nation. Its reality is in the blend. It is not reducible to any one of its components, though one or other of the components may be particularly emphasised in particular phases of national development.

Ireland is a nation; so is Northern Ireland: when NI became systematically less British in its political life, it did not lose the collective sense of itself as a distinct social body with a will to survive, even in conflict with Britain.

This is why in 1969 Brendan Clifford described the two nations as two Irish nations. At the time he published the two nations analysis of the Northern situation, together with extracts from the two classic works on nationality from opposite sides of the European political spectrum (Renan and Stalin) to show what he meant by a nation,

This pamphlet reproduces these extracts, with a new introduction by Brendan Clifford and an epilogue discussing the relationship between class and nation, war in an imagined world, invented nations, the nation as historic territory, Charles O'Connor, and sectarianism.

€8, £6 postfree

You can buy books and pamphlets from the  
address on the back page by cheque or  
online from:

**[https://www.atholbooks-  
sales.org](https://www.atholbooks-sales.org)**

*Irish Bulletin, a full reprint of the official  
newspaper of Dáil Éireann giving news  
and war reports,  
€36, £30 paperback,  
€55, £45 hardback  
postfree in Britain and Ireland*

## Film Review

### The Black Panthers: Vanguard of The Revolution

This film, directed by Stanley Nelson Jr. is a lengthy, (nearly two hours worth), of now half-century-old cine and television coverage of a fascinating phenomenon — *the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense*. The media, and the US's law-enforcement agencies have downplayed the latter part of the group's title to the point of 'disappearing' it.

The movement was founded in Oakland, a depressed dormitory town of Los Angeles; another suburb of which is glitzy Hollywood.

A noticeable element in this film was the heavy involvement of women in the Party. They helped in cooking the free meals the party which spread all over the US mainland. The men joined in the cooking and serving, and in child-care in nurseries in places where working and sub-working class Blacks ('African American' was yet to come) were housed — stretching that word rather a long way.

J. Edgar Hoover, of the FBI, seems to have become unhinged about the Party, despite the local offices of the Bureau being unable to find much evidence of coercion or heavy armaments. One woman said that, when she joined the party, at the age of seventeen, she made it abundantly clear that she wanted to learn how to use a gun — as well as help with food distribution and welfare. The '*Self-Defense*' in the title referred to the Party's insistence that the constitutional '*Right to Bear Arms*' included all citizens. Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation that included Black Americans.

Hoover, who could smell a Red a mile off, didn't especially like all that 'socialist' welfare work.

Pressure from the State, and tensions within the Party, were the Panther's undoing. An election campaign in Oakland, which gave the 'Republicrats' a run for their money, created a situation where many tensions came to a head. Some radicals had disagreed with entry into electoral politics. They and persons on the 'welfarist' end of the movement noted that the food programs in places like New York City were run down, because as many people as possible were brought to California for the campaign. These food and other programs were difficult, even impossible, to restart. The attitudes of the

police and local authorities didn't help much either.

A number of local police and FBI personnel (with a depressingly large number of Irish surnames among them) virtually licked their lips recounting how they 'fitted-up' the Panthers, and / or forced them into shoot-outs. Not only the FBI (its strategy and tactics are personalised as Hoover's own obsession), but the police as a whole seem to have gone into action with considerable gusto. Hoover was concerned to prevent the rise of a "*messiah*". Hoover probably thought a Leader was necessary for such a movement, or possibly he just hoped it could be stopped with bullets. There was a spontaneous quality about the BPP, Fred Hampton, in Chicago, killed in what was claimed to be a 'shoot out' (he was unarmed), was twenty one years old at his death.

Hampton had practised 'outreach' to other marginalised groups like the Puerto Rican Young Lords (objects of feminist objection — did that mean the women were Young Ladies? It was a pointed question, they made the Panthers look like polygons of feminist virtue), despite the FBI and the media framing the Panthers in barely concealed racist terms as predatory (implicitly sexual, as well as socially) males, the given reason for most lynchings in the Southland. Hampton managed to include poor whites in his broad front, mostly displaced Appalachian smallholders driven off their land. 'Big Oil' thought there might be useable quantities of crude under it, there wasn't, but the 'White Trash' did not get their holding back.

Those who owned their own patch were intimidated into selling for tiny sums (was the *Beverly Hillbillies*, a very popular television comedy series of the time invented to divert attention from this injustice? Hollywood, like the Beeb, didn't have to be told what is necessary for social peace by State authority, it knows by instinct, possibly 'conditioned response' is a better phrase, what is needed.

Hoover's FBI launched 'Cointelpro' — Coordinated Intelligence Program — a gathering of any scrap of information about the Panthers. Sexual foibles were searched-out, unfortunately for the FBI, the Panthers meant business. There was rather little to work with, some of this sobriety may have had to do with the female comrades knowing how to use firearms. 'Cointelpro' is still in place, the *Guardian* review implies that it had to do with neuroses shared by President Nixon and Hoover. This was at a period when

publicity about the sheer awfulness of living in the 'Soviet Bloc' reached such a pitch of intensity that it made many young people wonder if they were being told the entire truth.

'Reds under the bed' was a jest, but 'a joke with a jag' even ordinary citizens had to look over their shoulder when expressing unorthodox political, or social, ideas. McCarthyism was not quite dead, Hollywood had been winnowed of talent, most such people leaving for England, some for France, and some writers for Mexico. From there they supplied screenplays under aliases and hyper-loyal Hollywood connived at it. Screenwriting talent is hard to come by, many big-name playwrights drafted-in to fill the gap had to be 'helped out' by Hollywood hacks.

An FBI Informant inside the Panthers said he was not guilty about what he did. He got \$300 for 'fingering' young Hampton, even for the mid- to late-'60s that doesn't seem very much for an allegedly major armed enemy of the State. Was the FBI being semi-sardonic in handing over a sum based on the Biblical thirty pieces of silver? Cointelpro has not been abolished possibly because it would cause more trouble in Congress than it is worth, possibly because liberals thought an eye was being kept on the rabid Right. That was not accurate as the flourishing of the various white supremacist militias shows that.

These militias have been exposed as 'Paper Tigers', they exist largely in cyberspace. The election of Obama drove them crazy, or crazier than they were in the first place, his introduction of mild Health Service reforms were deemed to be 'Sovietising' America. Obama was preparing a dictatorship (and was contemplating invading Texas — these patriots clearly don't grasp the notion of federal union). Obama is contemplating retirement from the Presidency, the setting up of his eponymous Library, and the veneration that seems almost automatic in regard to ex-Presidents since Franklin D Roosevelt's death.

This documentary is made up mostly rather fuzzy footage — some was 'home-made', television footage from the late black'n'white era, and early color stuff which even when filmed by professionals is often vague. A lot of the material was filmed in, effectively, riot situations, not necessarily riots provoked by the Panthers. Viewing this is a sobering experience, you will leave the cinema in pensive mode.

**Seán McGouran**

Letter send to Irish Examiner, 8th November, but not published

### Poppy Politics

Your editorial of 8 November (Recalling sacrifice has many dimensions) misrepresents the 1916 Rising and the attitude to the Great War of the nationalist elite who created this state. The immediate purpose of the Rising was to prevent Irish men and boys from being used as cannon fodder in an unjustifiable war by Britain on its main trade rival, Germany. At different times the war was characterised in those terms by nationalist leaders as diverse as Roger Casement, James Connolly, Bishop Edward O'Dwyer, Eamon de Valera and Kevin O'Higgins. It was the view of the nationalist movement as a whole following the displacement of Redmondism.

The Irish nationalist view of the Great War is neither tribal nor one dimensional as implied in your editorial: it arose out of studied observation of how the supremacy of the British Empire was defended. In the period before the Rising it was informed by Casement's inside knowledge of the British Foreign Office expressed in his pamphlet, "The Crime against Europe". Since history is written by the victors, mainstream historians of the war have shied away from a coherent narrative of its causes, yet evidence supporting the Irish nationalist view is not difficult to find.

While I would have to agree with your observation that the poppy as a symbol has been 'utterly politicised on both sides of the Irish Sea', I consider your proposal that poppy wearing be seen as an appropriate way to 'honour the hopes and ideals' of the men and women of 1916 to be both disingenuous and ahistorical.

Dave Alvey

**Roger Casement:** *The Crime Against Europe*. With *The Crime Against Ireland* Introduction by B. Clifford. €18, £15 postfree in Ireland and

## GOING WEST

You've heard of the  
Irish journalist who adored The  
Sticks  
with many wishing  
him a safe journey across that other  
Styx,  
making sure his funeral  
rites be properly performed  
with his writing arm  
in plaster  
for it seemed to be deformed.

His nation is a wistful  
dream, a romantic sort of thing,  
it had no guns or  
risings but was still able to win.  
One item in its  
armoury was someone called The  
Cruiser  
who fired fine literary  
shells but ended up a loser..

He dragged the corpse  
of Parnell into the Twentieth  
Century  
and rode it in a scene  
of political debauchery,  
he ridiculed the  
Northern victim for daring to hit back  
when some  
Nineteenth Century thinking would  
suffice as  
craic.

Alas robust  
intellectualism in Ireland seems  
dead.

When The Cruiser  
passed on a newspaper  
keep us fed,  
no sacred monument  
was too big to be demolished,  
most culture and  
religion  
was to be abolished.

Irish academics  
maliciously doctor our history.  
(a tree dying without  
its roots is shameful and derisory)

Oxbridge pays the bills  
and a professorship is the thrill,  
of being Ireland's  
hangman  
in this identity kill.

England seems proud  
of every vicious thing it ever did,  
(some hot-air  
apologies only helps to keep on the  
lid)

But sometimes you can't  
help but admire their national pride  
while we regurgitate  
our background and hope it has  
died.

Wilson John Haire.  
21 December, 2015.

## Highlights of the December issue of Irish Foreign Affairs:

\* Philip O'Connor writes a vigorous obituary of the German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt who died this year.

“The Irish aspect of Helmut Schmidt's career has attracted little attention. But it was during the European Monetary System period of the late 1970s that Schmidt became a great friend of Ireland at the European table, impressed as he was by the determination and independence of the Irish representatives on the EMS group.”

\* Popular history has caught up with the role of the Committee of Imperial Defence in WW1, and Manus O'Riordan reviews one conference on the subject.

\* Pat Walsh continues his pioneering work (Lord Esher, James Bryce).

\* A far reaching editorial throws a fresh light on the history of Europe in the twentieth century, for example, Europe after 1945:

“To the minor extent that some Power other than Russia played a significant part in defeating Germany, that Power was the United States. Its intervention in the War brought about what came to be called Free Europe. Free Europe was capitalist Europe. But Free Europe had not freed itself, and it was not capitalistically vigorous. As far as the reconstruction of Europe after 1945 had an internal source, it lay in the movement of Christian Democracy, based on Catholic social policy.”

**Irish Foreign Affairs** is produced quarterly at €5, £4. (ISSN 2009-132X).

Subscriptions: 4 issues. **Electronic €10 (£8). Postal Euro-zone and World Surface: €24; Sterling-zone: £15**

Does  
It  
Up

Stack  
?

### GENERAL TOM BARRY NATIONAL COMMEMORATION 2015

On 28th November 1920, the British Crown Forces in the form of 18 Auxiliaries in two Lorries were ambushed and successfully defeated at Kilmichael by 36 Irishmen led by Commandant General Tom Barry and supported by members of Cumann na mBan. The British soldiers were all battle-hardened, trained, former British Army officers and men who had served in World War 1. The Irishmen were volunteers who had received one week's training in soldiering from Tom Barry. Kilmichael was a remarkable victory that impacted hugely on the Anglo-Irish War.

The 95th Anniversary was commemorated at Kilmichael on Sunday 29th November 2015 in atrocious weather conditions—a rainstorm was raging throughout the commemoration—very similar weather in fact to the day of the Ambush itself in 1920. The oration was given by Diarmuid O'Tuama, a writer and historian from Belfast, before an attendance estimated at one thousand people. *'The Boys of Kilmichael'* are well remembered by the people of West Cork and some people travelled from as far as Galway, Cavan, Dublin, Waterford and Counties in-between. The ceremony was followed by a very welcome dinner in the Park Hotel, Dunmanway.

In Cork City General Tom Barry was commemorated in his beloved Fitzgerald's Park where a monument exists in his memory. The annual commemoration in Cork is organised by the General Tom Barry National Committee under the chairmanship of Séamus Lantry, and the oration this year was delivered by Rev. Dr. Brian Murphy, OSB, Historian and author of books such as *'Patrick Pearse and the Lost Republican Ideal'*, *'John Chartres: The Mystery Man of the Treaty'*, *'The Origins and Organisation of British Propaganda in Ireland 1920'* amongst other titles.

In the course of his oration on this occasion, Dr. Murphy spoke of the necessity for us all to know our history and of Tom Barry's interest in the history of Ireland.

General Tom Barry ranks as one of the most effective Generals in history. Kilmichael was a very successful military operation against well-trained, experienced, British troops who were well armed and Tom Barry displayed great courage and leadership for a man who, after all, was only 22 years old himself. At the Battle of Crossbarry Tom Barry was a superb commander. He led 104 of his men with minimal weaponry to withstand an attack by 1,250 British Army troops under Major Arthur Percival. The British troops came from Cork Barracks - 400 men; from Ballincollig Barracks - 200 men, from Kinsale Barracks - 300 men, and from Bandon Barracks - 350 men plus reinforcements.

The British attacked from three directions, almost surrounding Barry's men. This took place on 19th March 1921 and the British had been closing in for days beforehand and they thought they had the Irishmen cornered at Crossbarry. They were 12 to 1 against Tom Barry, but he identified an escape route to the North West of his position and he placed his men in sections facing the platoons of the approaching British. The British were trained soldiers and were better shots and so Tom Barry ordered his men not to shoot until they could see the whites of their opponent's eyes. He said afterwards:

"Nobody is a bad shot at 10 yards."

The Irish had a secret weapon which stunned the British soldiers: in a ruined castle on the low hill behind Tom Barry's men, was a Piper, Flor Begley, who was instructed to play Irish war songs as soon as the shooting started. Begley's pipe-playing greatly disturbed the British, who thought that there must have been a huge force of Irishmen ready to fight them.

When the main forces of the British attacked shortly after 8 a.m. Begley played martial airs on his pipes, as several of Barry's sections opened fire at close range on the British and, such was the ferocity of the attack, that the British broke ranks and hundreds of them ran away into the fields southwards, chased by a section of Irishmen. The British did not stop running until they reached the main road to Bandon about a mile away to the South, throwing away their guns as they ran and leaving behind a row of empty lorries. Within ten minutes the Flying Column had smashed the British encircling lines and the British arms were collected from the lorries and from the numerous dead and then the lorries were set on fire.

Then shooting began against a British

Column approaching from the South East and shortly afterwards against a British Column coming from the West and ten minutes later another British Column came from the North East. They were dealt with as they came and defeated by sections of Barry's Flying Column strategically placed and augmented by moving men quickly from point to point to counteract the pressure. After about two hours, the battle was over and won by Tom Barry and his men.

The British in this engagement were commanded by Major Arthur Percival and there is an interesting and remarkable sequel. Twenty years later Tom Barry was told that the Pathé newsreel, showing the surrender of Singapore to the Japanese, was to be shown in the Savoy Cinema in Cork City and Tom was invited to a private viewing of it one morning in 1942. He attended with some of his friends including, as it happens, my own father. When the newsreel showed General Percival surrendering his sword to the Japanese (who were a tiny force in reality—some 30,000 compared to 138,708 Allied troops), Tom Barry shouted:

"Yes!! Percival you coward and you ran away at Crossbarry too."

Percival's surrender, which was viewed by Churchill "*to be the worst disaster and largest capitulation in British history*", rather ruined his military career and he was never given a knighthood which was considered very unusual for a British General.

Percival and the notorious Essex Regiment were barbarous in their torture and killing of the Irish people. On one occasion, when he was stationed in Ireland, Percival "*personally snatched a rifle with a fixed bayonet and bayoneted one man ten times*," as reported in the book, *'The Full Monty'*, by Nigel Hamilton and the same author writes that:

"Percival is still remembered in Ireland as a vicious sadist, a man responsible for the 'Essex Battalion Torture Squad'."

Percival was not the only evil officer in the British Army in Ireland. Lord Bernard Montgomery of Alamein is reported by his biographer Nigel Hamilton as saying, after three hundred buildings in Cork were burned down by the Black and Tans, "... *it never bothered me a bit how many houses were burned .... to win a war of that sort you must be ruthless; Oliver Cromwell or the Germans would have settled it in a very short time.*"

It is noteworthy that, although details of Percival are available on the Internet, he seems to have been disowned by British printed biographical dictionaries. He is naturally enough not in the *Dictionary of Irish Biographies* (although some other British Generals are), but also he does not appear in the *British Dictionary of National Biography*, or in *The Cambridge Biographical Encyclopaedia* nor in *Webster's Biographical Dictionary*. He died in his bed aged 78 years old.

Interesting also how Keith Jeffery of Queen's University Belfast does his bit against Irish history in his edition of *'The Military Correspondence of Field Marshal Sir Henry Wilson 1918-1922'*. It is beyond belief that Henry Wilson wrote no letters or notes about Kilmichael or Crossbarry when he was Chief of the Imperial General Staff (CIGS). There are no letters in the book relating to Ireland between 6th September 1920 (a passing reference to the hunger strike of Terence MacSwiney) and 27th December 1920 (where there is a reference to Wilson sending another 10 battalions to Ireland). Similarly in Jeffery's book there are no letters nor notes about the Battle of Crossbarry, which took place on 19th April 1921. It would seem that Keith Jeffery aspires to be a propagandist rather than a historian but then that seems to be the general *grá* of nearly all our academics.

General Tom Barry explains why he won his battles. He said:

"My men are fighting for their homes, the English are fighting for their wages."

The Irish men and the women of Cuman na mBan were fighting for their economic and political liberty, fighting for their fathers and their mothers, their sisters and their brothers, fighting for their homes. Against such powerful motivations and such powerful leadership what chance had the British soldiers who were fighting for their wages and for a class-ridden State. No wonder Major Percival and his soldiers threw down their guns and ran away at Crossbarry. They had nothing worth dying for.

Michael Stack ©

**The 'Cork Free Press' In The Context Of The Parnell Split**, The Restructuring Of Ireland, 1890-1910, by Brendan Clifford. 168pp. €15, £12

**The Mondragon series will resume in February.**

## DAVITT concluded

social recognition go to the white collar and intellectual jobs—many of which have no intrinsic social value and in which far less real skill and effort is deployed.

Although there are apprenticeships in Ireland, the sought-after further development for young school-leavers remains University Education. Degrees are what win cushy jobs, high salaries, and social esteem.

Things are far otherwise in Germany and other social market countries. There the white-collar jobs are not more highly-regarded than those which rely on manual skill. There is a comprehensive apprenticeship and training system which most young people entering non-academic work undergo. Manual work there tends to have a higher skill and technical content. And there is social respect for those who have developed technical skills, which often lead to a *Meister* (Master) qualification.

And, even where youngsters go for a degree course in these social market countries, this is often done as an adjunct to work and subsidised by employers.

It is hard to see Davitt's vision of society in which manual work is respected and workers have the position which is due to them coming about until a revolution in thinking along continental lines takes place.

On the Parnell question: Parnell made his career on the back of the Land League founded by Davitt, the Fenian with a social programme. It was the combination of the Land League with Parliamentary, spiced with a dash of the Fenian spirit, that produced the powerful movement known as Parnellism for a few years. And it was Parnell who destroyed Parnellism by means of his contemptuous, "*great man*", deception of the close colleagues who had made the movement effective.

They knew well that he was engaged in a sexual liaison with Mrs. O'Shea, and that this had something to do with his imposition of Captain O'Shea on the Parliamentary Party. He assured them that he had the matter well in hand. He also assured them that, if Captain O'Shea acted against him on the issue, he would present an adequate defence.

Parnell had constructed a close alliance between the Home Rule Party and the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party was at that time going through a phase of strong Nonconformist Puritanism, and a few years before the Parnell divorce case it had ended the political career of Sir Charles Dilke, second to Gladstone in the Liberal leader-

ship, on a similar issue. When Nonconformist pressure obliged Gladstone to demand that Parnell should retire from the leadership of the Home Rule Party, or else the Home Rule alliance was off, Parnell attacked Gladstone as a humbug and demanded that the Party should back him at the cost of ending the Liberal alliance. When the Party leadership did not support him, he declared himself to be still the Party Leader anyway. He then contested by-elections against the candidates nominated by the organisation that had the support of the majority of the Party membership.

It was only when he began to act against the Party, as a Great Leader who thought he held the Irish in the palm of his hand, that the Catholic Bishops condemned him.

Davitt was both Irish and English, both peasant and industrial wage worker. He had organised the Irish tenant-farmers and then he tried to organise the English wage-workers. He knew, in his capacity as a reflective English worker, that the game was up for Parnell when he conducted no defence against the citation in O'Shea's divorce action. Parnell had made the Irish cause depend on the good will of an English Party, but he had offended the well-known sentiments of that English Party. Therefore he must go.

William O'Brien, who had continued Davitt's work with the tenant-farmers in Ireland, tried to reason with Parnell. Davitt seemed to know that Parnell, the Great Man, could not be reasoned with.

O'Brien, John Dillon and Tim Healy all supported Parnell until his conduct made it impossible. These three represented social forces in the country which had been combined while they were the actual party leaders under Parnell's nominal leadership. His actions against the Party resulted in those three elements being formed into three parties for ten years. Only John Redmond stood by Parnell. And what Redmond represented was pure Parliamentary. It was because he represented nothing in the country that the other three could unite under his nominal leadership in 1900. He remained a purely nominal leader until 4th August 1914, when his Angel of Destiny appeared beside him in his bench in the House of Commons, and told him his moment had come, and that he must commit Home Rule Ireland to English Imperial War.

Davitt's manifesto against Parnell, published in *The Labour World* on 22nd November 1891 is reprinted, along with an account of the whole episode, in *The Cork Free Press*.

## DAVITT continued

And under the third head comes the absorption by public bodies of such institutions as markets, docks, harbours, gas and water and electric lighting works, railways, tramways, omnibuses and other means of transit. The public should own these necessary monopolies, and should no longer permit private people to make rent and profits out of them. The county, or town councils, should... own and administer these and other useful and necessary institutions.

\*

The *Times* and other organs that are busily booming the Shipping Federation, but little think that the very combination which excites their enthusiasm is but a development of the capitalistic principle, which will lead us on inevitably towards a State organisation of production and exchange. This may seem a startling anticlimax to the scheme which has been outlined by... the London Chamber of Shipping. But we affirm that this will be the ultimate outcome of the capitalistic combination that is to have £100 millions at its back, and all parts of the British Empire within the scope of its operations.

The Emperor Nero is said to have once expressed the wish that Rome had but once head so that he might have the pleasure of cutting it off. Socialists may possibly harbour a kindred, though a less sanguinary, wish that the operations of capitalism or the exploitation of labour within the British Empire could be confined to one huge corporation.

\*

It would then be but a comparatively easy matter to substitute a department of State for such a corporation some fine day, and thus carry into practical operation the present aspirations of the Socialist party. As to the boast that this Shipping Federation will be able to control or manipulate the labour in the seaports of the Empire, we can treat it as an idle threat. A hundred millions of money may, it is true, represent an immense power and influence; but a counter-combination of, say, ten millions of workers would not be required to knock the power of ten times that number of sovereigns to smithereens. Sovereigns are more sensitive than men. It is far easier to damage the interests of capital than to cripple those of labour..."

[A further Editorial appeared on 19th October, 1890:]

## Labour Representation

The middle classes secured their position in the State by immense activity, by close union, by the display of signal ability, and by putting up with present small losses for the sake of future large gains. All that the middle classes gained from the aristocracy, they gained by sheer hard political fighting under leaders whom they trusted. Now, how many working men in London are there who care enough about public affairs to bestir themselves? Let the miserably small vote cast for the School Board answer.

There ought not to be a single local election in which the working-men do not give the candidates a good "heckling", and, if they can, run their own candidates—aye, and elect them. But, as a matter of fact, by their supineness, they allow middle-class men to come into the field which, naturally, they hold when once they get it...

It is true we cannot have a democratic Parliament until members are paid. But for a very small expenditure per head, the organised workmen of these countries could have at least fifty of their own men in Parliament...

[If this is not done] ...we may as well give up democracy, and fall back on class government.

## About Michael Davitt

[From *Michael Davitt, Revolutionary, Agitator And Labour Leader* by F. Sheehy Skeffington, 1908:]

### **Labour World December 1890-May 1891**

The control of the Labour World enabled Davitt, when the blow from the divorce court definitely fell on the Irish movement shortly after the paper's foundation, to give expression to his opinion promptly and in unqualified fashion. That opinion was an absolute rejection of Parnell's leadership. Its fearless utterance placed Davitt once again in a position of isolation. The followers of Parnell were, apparently, determined to be his followers still. Magnificent rhetoric about loyalty to their great leader, extravagant laudation of that leader's services and indispensability—these were the contributions of the other prominent Nationalist politicians in the first shadow of disaster. I am not concerned to discuss what grounds they believed... for such an attitude... What must be emphasised is, that of all the Irish Nationalist leaders who took the anti-Parnellite side of the Split, Davitt alone had a clear and consistent record; he alone maintained

from the first that the Parnell leadership was impossible. Once deceived in such a deadly fashion by Parnell, he could trust such a man no longer to lead a great National movement; nor could he doubt that the devices by which Parnell was capturing the temporary allegiance were but so many more tricks of the old pattern...

Neither the Catholic bishops nor Gladstone had spoken when Davitt did. Nor need one, in order to uphold Davitt's attitude, approve of the hypocritical English howl against the man who had the misfortune to be found out. That spasm of unctuous rectitude... had nothing in common with Davitt's clear-sighted and disinterested repudiation, as no longer a help but a hindrance to the cause, of a leader who had shown that his nearest followers and friends could never trust his word again.

When the Split became an accomplished fact, on the majority of Irish members finding it impossible to maintain their first attitude and go on as if nothing had happened, Davitt became a foremost protagonist in the fray, to the detriment of his paper, but to the still greater damage of the Parnellite cause. Wherever Parnell went, and particularly where he fought an election, Davitt followed him and put the issues fearlessly, without rancour but without disguise, before the electorate... [p183]..

## Some Comments

Reading over Davitt's Labour demands of the late 19th century, it is striking how many of them were to be implemented over the next 100 years. The substance of Davitt's programme was to be won—only to be undone again by the Thatcher counter-revolution. The main reason the Thatcher strand of the Conservative Party was able to start on the project of undoing the social state was that the working class had not taken ownership of the State. In a way, the people were gifted with social progress by the work of a labour elite. This meant that the Trade Unions and other working class bodies could not move from exerting negative power—which could prevent capitalists acting freely in pursuit of the profit-motive—to exerting positive power, which is to say, to take control of their conditions of life and work. Industrial democracy remained an alien concept.

Perhaps this failure to develop an alternative force is connected with the fact that Davitt's demand that manual labour be made respectable was never taken up. The intrinsic worth and value of Manual Labour in Ireland (and Britain) has never been vindicated. Monetary reward and

continued on page 24



# Programme Of The Irish Democratic Labour Federation

[The following policy statement first appeared in Michael Davitt's *The Labour World*, which was printed and published by The Labour World News Co., 263 Strand, London. It set out the direction of the Irish Democratic Labour Federation in the first issue of the paper, 21st September, 1890.

At that time there was no specific Labour organisation in either Britain or Ireland. British Labour was almost a component part of the Liberal Party very much under its influence, while Labour in Ireland had no voice of its own. This was before universal suffrage, when the property a person had determined the right to vote.

Points 1 to 9 dealt with organisational matters and are omitted here.]

## Objects

10. To obtain for Ireland the right to manage her own affairs through a Home Rule Parliament for the better development of trade and industries of our country and the general advancement of all its interests.

11. To defend the rights of the working classes of Ireland, and make manual labour respectable.

12. To improve the social condition of the workers of the country by endeavouring to procure healthy dwellings for the labouring classes in country and town, and otherwise to advocate and promote such legislation as will lighten the burdens upon the wage-earning classes, and increase their opportunities for general improvement; and by demanding that the Agricultural Labourers Act be amended, and made compulsory in its application.

13. To advocate the reduction of the labouring hours of the working classes to a reasonable limit.

14. To obtain free education for the children of the people.

15. To advocate such a settlement of the land question as will secure to the nation its supreme right to the soil, and be

best calculated to benefit directly the entirely community.

## Means

16. To influence the Legislature by organisation and the channels of public opinion to grant the reforms advocated.

17. To promote the election of working men for all positions of public trust.

18. To cordially co-operate with the working classes of England, Scotland and Wales, in defending and advancing the rights of labour in these countries, and in promoting the general social welfare of their respective wage-earning classes by means of a Federated Labour Union.

19. By demanding universal suffrage...

20. By demanding the abolition of all property qualifications in municipal and poor-law board elections.

## Rules and Regulations

...

2. No drunkard or person of known immoral character shall be admitted to membership.

## What We Work For

It is quite evident that we are on the eve

of a new departure in politics. The decisions of the Trades Union Congress, the progress of the "new unionism", the dissatisfaction which is all but universal proclaim this... Now what is it that we want? What does the new progressive labour movement demand? Its claims may perhaps be summed up under three heads.

1. It asks for the better and more democratic organisation of labour.

2. It demands that to the community, not the landlord, shall accrue that immense annual increment which is due to general industry and enterprise.

And, 3, it calls for an extension of State and municipal control, and ownership of such monopolies as can be managed by public bodies in the public interest.

Under the first head will come the adequate inspection of all factories and workshops by practical working men and women, and the reduction of the hours of labour whenever possible. These reforms do not, of course, exhaust the question of organising labour. But, taken in conjunction with the admirable work done by our Trade Unions in combining all working people in a solid phalanx of labour, they open the way to a happier and healthier state of things than has ever existed in the past...

Under the second head will come the taxation of ground values to be applied to purposes of public improvement and the absorption by the State of mineral royalties. In London alone we pay this year to ground landlords £15,000,000, merely for the permission to live here. This huge sum is not paid for any value received; it is a fine levied on labour and invention by men who have never raised a finger to earn it...

The wealth thus poured unjustly into private coffers might, if put to public purposes, render this huge London the most attractive city in the world...

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>