

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

April 2019

Vol.34, No.4 ISSN 0790-7672

and *Northern Star* incorporating *Workers' Weekly* Vol.33 No.4 ISSN 954-5891

Parliament Rebels Against The People

The British Parliament is refusing to enact the decision taken by the British Electorate to withdraw from the European Union. Parliament put the matter to the electorate for decision but then refused to enact the decision that the electorate made. No conditions were put by the Parliament on what the electorate might decide. The choice was *Leave* or *Remain*, to be decided by a simple majority.

This was done on the assumption that the electorate, when freed from the constraints of party-politics and given a fundamental matter of state to decide—not just choosing a domestic Government from two parties which are 99% identical—would know what was expected of it and toe the line. It didn't.

When it didn't, Parliament went behind the vote, speculating on what the electorate *really* wanted and discounting what it said it wanted, for the purpose of setting aside the Referendum result and restoring the representative system.

The minority group in Parliament, chiefly Tory, which had, for about 25 years, been advocating British withdrawal from the EU, and which now urged that, in accordance with the Referendum result, there should be a simple Brexit, were denounced by the majority as "Extremists".

Party-politics then came into play. The Labour Party became entirely obstructive of the attempt of the Government to negotiate terms with the EU, which would bring about something less than a simple Brexit. While declaring that Brexit without a deal would be absolutely catastrophic, and having no agreed policy of its own that did not mean in substance staying in the EU, it voted against the terms negotiated between the EU and the Government, declaring those terms to be catastrophic too.

The term "*vassal state*" was coined by the Tory minority that supported the Referendum result to describe the condition that Britain would be in under the Deal

continued on page 2

Another Foster Inaugural!

Roy Foster delivered his Inaugural Lecture at the Queen Mary University of London entitled: *The Buried Tombstone, The Melting Iceberg, And The Random Bullet: memory and forgetting in modern Irish history* (14 March 2019). He was introduced by Ian McBride, his successor at Oxford, who described him fulsomely as, *inter alia*, "*the most accomplished historian of the era*".

He is now the Professor of Irish History and *Literature* at the University. The *Literature* element is the key—as his History is strictly something to be dabbled in as a crutch to display his literary pretensions. And the latter essentially means talking and talking about *Yeats*—a recurring theme throughout this lecture as is the case in most of them. It was his third Inaugural Address and was a vintage performance. *Performance* being the operative word.

The Professor had to explain the titillating title to his tittering audience. The

continued on page 4

A GAA Debate In The Shadow Of Brexit

A debate in the GAA (Gaelic Athletic Association) flared up and spilled over onto the national airwaves in early March. The prospect of a Hard Border as a result of Brexit was its backdrop but as arguments have flown from both sides the discussion has prompted deeper questions pertaining to national identity and the isolated position of Northern nationalists.

The exchanges started when former Armagh captain and current Armagh delegate to the Association's Ulster Council, Jarlath Burns, was interviewed by Justin McCarthy on *This Week* on RTE radio. Burns expressed a private opinion that, in the event of a Border Poll, his hope would be that the GAA nationally would not be neutral but would support a United

Ireland. On the following day, in the course of a lively interview on Sean O'Rourke's RTE radio show, GAA pundit and Derry all-Ireland medallist Joe Brolly upped the ante by vigorously endorsing the stance taken by Burns.

The case against has so far come mainly from sports columnists and GAA specialists in the Southern newspapers. Of particular note was a piece by Declan Bogue in the *Irish Independent* (Bogue normally writes in the *Belfast Telegraph*)

continued on page 12

CONTENTS

Page

Parliament Rebels Against The People. Soloheadbeg. "England Out Of Ireland". Editorial	1
Another Foster Inaugural! Jack Lane	1
A GAA Debate In The Shadow Of Brexit. Dave Alvey	1
Readers' Letters: Balancing Guilt With The Gingerbread. Donal Kennedy (The Welfare State And Britain's Emergencies)	3
A Professor's Slur. Jack Lane (Letter sent by the Aubane Historical Society to R.F. Foster)	5
LEST WE FORGET (4). Extracts from <i>Irish Bulletin</i> . This issue lists British Acts Of Aggression, 2nd May - 7 June 1919 (ed. Jack Lane)	6
Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (Clair Wills and the Story She Tells (Part 10)	9
The Centenary Of Dail Eireann. Brian P. Murphy osb (Definitions of English rule in Ireland as 'usurpation' with some reference to Brexit)	11
Corrections To March Irish Political Review	14
Money Creation. John Martin (The debate continues . . .)	15
The Treaty War And Two Treatyite FF-ers. Manus O'Riordan	17
The Russian Revolution. Brendan Clifford (Part 15)	20
Mindless Liberalism. Pat Walsh	25
Israel And The 'Song Of Bernadotte' . Donal Kennedy	27
An Open letter to Simon Kingston, West Cork History Festival. Jack Lane	28
Biteback: Boycott Eurovision In Israel. Zoe Lawlor, Betty Purcell on behalf of <i>Ireland-Palestine Solidarity Campaign</i>	28
Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (British Parliament in Action)	29
Two Poems. Wilson John Haire (LibFib, Left Bereft. Drill Music)	29

Labour Comment, edited by **Pat Maloney:**
Democratic Programme of Dail Eireann

(back page)

agreed between the EU and the Government. There was some exaggeration in that description, but the term can be applied squarely to the policy of the Labour Party as far as we can find a policy in its various utterances. It is that Britain should remain in substance within the Customs Union and the Single Market, while complying with the Referendum result by withdrawing from the decision-making bodies of the EU. Britain would then be under the EU, not in it.

Wages and working conditions are the legitimate concerns of the working class, and therefore of the Labour Party. Beyond that it is out of its depth. National concerns are the business of the other party. The problem is that the other party is in two minds about itself, and that the working class did not appreciate in the Referendum that it is not its business to interfere in higher politics. That is the mindset of Labourist politics.

Europe in the post-post-War generation is now confronted with naked British democracy for the first time and is astonished. The founders of the EU—having lived through the British collaboration with Hitler in the 1930s, the sudden *volt face* of August 1939, the demonisation of France

for trying to make terms for ending the War into which it had been led by Britain after it was defeated, etc —knew about British democracy and excluded it from European affairs for a generation. The following generation, lacking direct experience, and with the actual history of the preceding generation having been made unthinkable, lived in what can only be described as a toytown democracy when it is compared with the British version that is the real thing. But it is also an exclusively British thing. It is a development in the home base of a World Empire. It might be dated in substance from the 1880s. It has stood firm ever since, creating mayhem all around it.

If the EU is to have the future it hopes for, it must stand firm against British democracy, and disillusion itself about British democracy.

Soloheadbeg

History Ireland, a magazine sponsored by the academic Establishment, has a picture of Sean Treacy by Sean Keating on the front cover of its March/April issue, along with the title, "*Soloheadbeg*". But inside all that is to be found is a brief comment by Martin Mansergh. It is

possibly a very daring article, given that Mansergh is a member of Micheal Martin's Fianna Fail, and Fianna Fail in Martin's hands has become the *anti-History party*.

The title of the article is *Physical Force Or Passive Resistance?* The sub-title is a statement: *Soloheadbeg—vindicating a democratic mandate for independence*. It is illustrated with a photograph of Nicholas Mansergh, a British Imperial civil servant and academic who owned property in Co. Tipperary close to Soloheadbeg. The caption on the photo reads "*Nicholas Mansergh—'History was forged in sudden death on a Tipperary by-road'.*"

There is also a photo of a 'Wanted' poster, offering a thousand pounds reward for information leading to the capture of Dan Breen, who had a "*sulky bulldog appearance*" and "*looks rather like a blacksmith coming from work*".

The article opens with a quotation from Nicholas Mansergh for which no reference is given:

"History was forged in sudden death on a Tipperary by-road as surely as it ever was in meetings at Downing Street or for that matter at the Mansion House in Dublin, where the Dail met coincidentally but fortuitously that same day, 21 January 1919."

It is not explained either by the Editor or the author of the article what Nicholas Mansergh was, except that he was the father of the author. It seems that saying what he was is too delicate a matter to be attempted. And it is not explained what it was that happened at Soloheadbeg that put it on a par in the forging of history with decisions taken by the Government of the British Empire or by the Dail at the Mansion House.

History has been described as just one damn thing happening after another. And so it is. Roy Foster set out to change that, as not being the best way of seeing things from his viewpoint. He set out to abolish "*narrative*" and replace it with "*themes*". But abolishing sequence in time proved to be beyond him.

Einstein may have said that all time exists together, but not many people are capable of living in the timelessness of mathematics. In the temporal world it is a case of one damn thing after another, and by reason of the other, today, just as it was in 1919. And what happened by reason of Soloheadbeg that was on a par with what happened by reason of what was done in Whitehall and Westminster, or in the Mansion House?

The current position, set by the Anglo-*Irish Times*, is that Soloheadbeg—an armed robbery of a delivery of industrial dynamite—pre-empted a Constitutional development that was on the cards, which would have got national independence without the use of force against Britain, and started a war instead—which, of course, made it more difficult to confer independence on nationalist Ireland, because, as everybody knows, Britain does not give way to terrorism.

The quotation from Mansergh senior does not actually say that Soloheadbeg started an unnecessary war, but it does not contradict the view that it did.

The comment by Mansergh junior is:

"To accept that the Soloheadbeg ambush represented the start of the War of Independence is not quite the same thing as saying that it started it. While Dan Breen claimed that Sean Treacy and he wanted to start a war by killing as many policemen as possible, other participants in the ambush did not accept that the killings were deliberate."

We consider ourselves to be reasonably literate, but we must admit that the statement that the robbery "*represented*" the start of the War, though it may not have quite started it, conveys no definite idea to us. It strikes us as being a slippery formulation, without meaning, which enables the author to keep in with the *Irish Times* fashion without being accountable for it.

An armed robbery is different in kind from a war, even if the robbers had it in mind to use the gelignite in war if there was a war. And this was what they had in mind, because what they did with the gelignite was bury it deep out of harm's way.

Mansergh jnr. comments that the ambush "*seemed an isolated incident*" until one of the robbers fell into the hands of the British law four months later and was rescued by his colleagues. If a robber is rescued by his colleagues, is that so unusual that it constituted war?

Soloheadbeg was entirely an IRB affair. The Irish Republican Brotherhood was a Republican conspiracy, always at war with Britain if one considers that kind of thing to be war. It never recognised the Dail as the sovereign authority. When the Dail set up a Government—and Local Government bodies around the country transferred allegiance from Dublin Castle to it, and war began—the IRB ran in parallel with it, never declaring allegiance to it. And, in December 1921, Michael Collins cleared his agreement with Lloyd George with the

Balancing Guilt With The Gingerbread: *The Welfare State And Britain's Emergencies*

The late Flann O'Brien, a.k.a. "Myles na gCopaleen", was a Divil for strong Beverages. But he had no stomach at all for Sir William Beveridge, the British Civil Servant whose 1942 Report largely inspired Britain's Welfare State. In one of his less funny *Irish Times* columns he attacked it. I don't know whether O'Brien's reactionary stance arose from his schooling in Blackrock, alma-mater both of Ragged-Trousered Philanthropist Sir Bob Geldof and the former Education Minister Ruairi "Ho Chi" Quinn. One of Beveridge's aims was the elimination of ignorance. Geldof and Quinn are woefully ignorant of history and Quinn peddles the discredited canard that the Second World War was described in Ireland as 'The Emergency'.

The report that a London schoolgirl who went to Syria to fight against its Government (like many British and US Servicemen) where she had seen an adult human head in a bucket, reminded me of seeing a press photo of a British soldier holding the severed head of an alleged "terrorist" in Malaya during the "EMERGENCY" which lasted from 1948 until 1960.

Had the British described their bloody campaign there as a War, they would have had to pretend to abide by the Geneva Convention. But they had free rein and they employed chemical warfare to defoliate the jungle, created concentration camps described as protected villages, practised starvation, torture, aerial bombing, and invented the "*body-count*" as the measure of success of winning hearts and minds. Military units competed at head-hunting and showing their trophies.

Malaya is very rich in resources, expropriated by the British. It is particularly rich in rubber and tin, acknowledged by the Attlee Government as vital for Britain. Calling their War a *War* would have sent Insurance Premiums through the Roof, discomfiting to a Nation of Shopkeepers.

Calling it an *Emergency* soothed their material concerns, let them get away with Murder most Foul.

Britain's Welfare State would not have been possible without the continued robbery of the lesser breeds.

The robbery of Iranian Oil, for instance and the installation of the corrupt and tyrannous Shah.

Most Britons never saw the Guilt for the Gingerbread or how they might be balanced

Seventy-seven years since Sir William Beveridge's Report, Official Britain and her Irish Sycophants have made little progress in combatting Historical Ignorance—a lethal enemy.

Donal Kennedy

IRB before breaking up the Dail with it.

The authority for the Soloheadbeg Ambush was the IRB, not the Dail. And the possibility of waging a war in defence of Irish independence lay entirely with the Dail.

On the other hand, armed robberies carried out in harassment of British rule in Ireland are nothing to get excited about. And, going on Redmondite precedent, IRB conspirators had good reason to be sceptical about Constitutional initiatives until the Dail met, appointed a Government, and showed itself to be in earnest about defending itself.

Mansergh jnr., who locates the origin

of the Irish state in the IRB deal with Lloyd George in 1921-2, is disparaging about the Dail:

"The Declaration of Independence passed at the Dail's first meeting was more polemical and less high-minded than the 1916 Proclamation.

The Dail's 'Message to the Free Nations...' spoke of 'the existing state of war between Ireland and England'. Whether this referred back to the conscription crisis, the last few years since the Rising, the last few centuries or to everything since 1171 is unclear. The 1918 Sinn Fein election manifesto, echoing the Ulster Covenant, pledged 'making use of any and every means available to render impotent the power of keeping Ireland in subjection by military

force or otherwise'. It is very difficult to argue that the ambush or its outcome was in contradiction with the position of Sinn Fein or the Dail at the level of principle, as opposed to the opportuneness of its timing and tactics..."

The Ulster Covenant, and everything connected with it, was an event within British politics, supported by half of the British membership of the House of Commons. The Unionist half of the Commons stood squarely and openly in support of the arming of 'Ulster' and the Curragh Mutiny.

Ireland outside of the Unionist part of Ulster was being governed by a predominantly Unionist Government as a conquered country in 1918. For a generation under Redmond it had the appearance of having submitted to conquest. That submissiveness was disturbed by immersion in the World War as an obligation to a dead-letter Home Rule Act that was certain never to be implemented. This led to the 1916 Insurrection and to a re-conquest that only stimulated the independence movement.

In 1918 Ireland was governed as a conquered country in a way that it had not been for a considerable period before 1914. It was so governed in the aftermath of the Insurrection, which was an act of war. It voted itself independent and an elected Government was established. And there was no support at all within British politics for that Government. The comparison with the Ulster Covenant affair is indecently absurd.

The statement that—

"It is very difficult to argue that the ambush or its outcome was in contradiction with the position of Sinn Fein or the Dail at the level of principle, as opposed to the opportuneness of its timing and tactics"

is bewildering—but revelatory. The Dail was an elected body mandated to establish a Government: the IRB was a conspiracy. Is there no difference in principle between defensive military actions authorised by the elected Government and an armed robbery committed by a conspiracy?

You disappoint us, Mr. Mansergh.

"England Out Of Ireland"

Simon Coveney, the 26 County Minister for Foreign Affairs, complained about the Sinn Fein Leader, Mary Lou Macdonald, appearing at a St. Patrick's Day event in New York, standing before a banner saying *England: Get Out Of Ireland!* Did it not

occur to him that he says the same thing in effect, and more forcefully, with the Backstop to the Backstop?

His complaint was taken up by BBC's *Radio Ulster*, i.e., *Radio Six Counties*, whose Holier-than-Thou commentator, Stephen Nolan, began ranting—under a flimsy camouflage of impartial interviewing—about Republican "*murder gangs*".

The next day the furore was repeated over boxer Michael Conlon, who entered the ring in a New York fight to the accompaniment of the the singing of a traditional Wolfe Tones song, which included the line, *Ooh ah up the 'RA*. This set Stephen Nolan off on another rant about Republican murder gangs.

The British Army, after about ten years of "*the Troubles*", announced with astonishment its realisation that what it was doing in 'Ulster' was fighting a war with an organised and disciplined military force with competent Intelligence and Counter-Intelligence services.

Such a condition of things could not have come about without sufficient reason. And the fact that there was sufficient reason for the War in the way Northern Ireland was governed was tacitly admitted by the Blair Government in 1998, when it changed the Six County system and encouraged the murder gangs to take part in the new system of government that their murder campaign over 28 years had brought about.

A further measure required by the 1998 settlement was an *Act of Oblivion* for all that had been done in the course of the War (which had occurred in some previous British conflicts). The indications were that Blair would have done this if the 'Constitutional Nationalist' SDLP and the Constitutional Nationalist Dublin Government had not been utterly opposed.

Admission of the reality that what had been going on for 28 years was not a murder campaign but a war, would have devalued the futile, self-righteous constitutionalism of the SDLP and Dublin.

The constitutionalist self-righteousness was spurious. The Six Counties was not governed constitutionally. Northern Ireland, at the outset, was placed outside the political system of the state, which is the only British Constitution. And neither the SDLP nor the Dublin Government recognised the Northern Ireland Government as legitimate.

The 26 Counties had a Constitution and it claimed sovereignty over the Six Counties, thus delegitimising the system against

which the IRA made war. (And now the 26 Counties is committed to holding the Six Counties within the EU when Britain leaves.)

Because of the Constitutional Nationalist humbug that prevented what was obviously a War from being officially recognised as a War, the War has been followed by thirty years of civil feuding. But one would have thought Simon Coveney had more useful things to do at this juncture than poke his finger into it.

Another Foster Inaugural!

continued

buried tombstone referred to a '98 rebel who was buried with his tombstone in his coffin. This was very Irish and a symbol of how the Irish buried their memory. Memory is a big problem for the Irish. Geddit?

The *melting iceberg* was prompted by a project in which a lady was bringing an iceberg from the Arctic to Belfast, home of the Titanic: it was to be allowed to melt near the Harland & Wolf site, to symbolise the melting of the hatred and antagonisms in N. Ireland—which, like icebergs, could take a long time. *Hatred* is another problem for the Irish. Geddit?

The audience did and applauded. The *random bullet* was to be the finale. So please wait.

His main theme was Irish hatred, memory of wrongs done to Ireland, and forgetting/not forgetting them. And these tropes still exist, as evidenced by the "*vehemence of animosity*" and "*violent antipathy*" he had experienced in recent times when the narrative of Irish history and its memory was '*complicated*' by people like himself. Whatever did he mean?

And of course he had to confirm the existence of this Irish hatred by quoting that most clichéd of remarks by Dr. Johnson about the Irish never speaking well of each other. It seemed to be news to the audience and they laughed.

Of course the Irish might have a reason for some hatred, he admitted. The Penal Laws were mentioned but then the newly-discovered *nuances* of these laws should be taken into account and "*were now being appreciated*". He mentioned that an authority on these nuances, Marianne Elliot, was in the audience. There may have been something also in the land

confiscations to annoy people and North Cork was mentioned in this regard. How and why that place was singled out from any other place in regard to confiscations was curious. The reason for this hatred usually given was to blame the "evil Saxon". How quaint these Irish are!

But the hatred was there in any case and was always ready to burst forth. The Civil War was the ultimate proof of this. He said very explicitly about that war—"How it came about is a mystery to me". But, really, it was no mystery to him! He went on to explain: it was just another opportunity for this Irish hatred, almost satanic, always lurking, always ready to display itself. Maud Gonne's declared hatred of the British Empire was another proof of this inexplicable Irish propensity. And of course Pearse was quoted, though he had made the very valid point that great love was inseparable from great hatred.

A new revelation was that the hatred and violence of the War of Independence was a *generation* issue. Around 1918 a new generation had arisen that was more violent and hate-filled than the previous generation. And, for good measure anti-Semitism was mentioned but not elaborated on.

The previous generation had been a fun generation but the fun had gone out with the arrival of fundamentalism around 1918—and that was the explanation for the violence of the War of Independence. And this is called history by a professional historian!

It was conceded that the new state was stable, cohesive and avoided fascism: and the homogeneity that the Catholic Church helped create might help to explain this. And then a large photo of De Valera kissing the Papal Nuncio's ring was displayed on the screen to show, I assume, the price that was paid to avoid fascism! Of course, Mr. Yeats' flirtation with, and songwriting for, the Irish fascists was not mentioned or illustrated.

Then there was the triumphalism of the 50th anniversary of the Rising and Foster suggested that whether it "*galvanised hatred in the North*" is a "*vexed question*". But it had to be asked. By contrast, the 75th anniversary was low key and a photograph of Haughey was displayed—and he was described as "*a gunrunner to the Provos*"—the usual slur!

Finally, as regards the *random bullet* in the title of the Address: this was an IRA bullet that accidentally killed his kindly, very convivial, RIC grandfather in Wicklow. The IRA had apologised for it. The

bullet took a long time to reach his heart—a couple of years! His grandmother picked herself up and established a boarding house and successfully reared her large family. He learned later in life that the bullet story was all a yarn. Granddad was so convivial that he died of cirrhosis of the liver and Grandma, being the resourceful woman she was, got the more dramatic story accepted and benefited greatly from it in more ways than one.

And that was why we should all be wary of memory in Ireland. Geddit?

The audience agreed and were in raptures. I had expected to hear shouts of "*Encore!*" No questions or discussion were allowed as that might spoil the love-in atmosphere.

Jack Lane

We reproduce below a letter sent by the Aubane Historical Society to R. F. Foster, MA (MA, PhD, Hon Litt D Dub, Hon D Litt Aberdeen, Belfast, D Laws Hon Queen's, Ontario), FBA, FRSL, FRHistS, Carroll Professor of Irish History, etc., etc.

A Professor's Slur!

"Dear Professor Foster

We have been informed that at the recent 6 March 2019 RIA launch of a new collection, edited by Ian d'Alton and Ida Milne, *Protestant and Irish*, in your introduction you said that the Aubane Historical Society (AHS) once called your wife a "Castle Catholic".

You gave no source for your claim. Feel free to propose one as we can't find it. Please rest assured that we are indifferent to your wife's personal beliefs, religious or otherwise, and do not know if she lived, or lives, in a hut, a house or, indeed, a castle.

On looking through files, we find that in two publications we reviewed and also referred to your wife Aisling's novel, *Safe in the Kitchen*, in *Aubane versus Oxford* (2002) and in *Taking Leave of Roy Foster* (2006). Neither of these contained a gratuitous reference to either your wife's religion or to her normal place of residence. The publications did cite Aisling Foster's published comments on her Roman Catholic education, on how the two of you met and on your decision to marry. This was in the context of your and her well-known, somewhat crusading dislike of the work of Frank McCourt, author of *Angela's Ashes*, and of Alice Taylor, author of *At Home through the Fields*, which we thought odd.

I draw your attention, also, to a contemporary review by Maggie Traugott of

Aisling Foster's novel in the London *Independent* (14 November 1993). It described the heroine of the novel as "*a Dublin Castle Catholic*". You should examine too, a profile of Aisling Foster in the 14 October 1993 *Irish Times*. The "*post modernist convent girl*" reportedly stated, "*My grandmother was a 'Castle Catholic'*".

It seems you may have equated your wife with one of her characters and/or her description of her own grandmother. In your confusion, you appear to have intertwined our critique of historical revisionism and ascribed the false attribution to us.

This is very post-modern of you and may align with your belief in post-nationalism and in multiple allegiances. It may also relate to an alternate reality. As Eoghan Harris, one of your supporters, remarked in 2017, "*facts are not fixed*" (<https://www.academia.edu/34399025/>, p19). It is not a belief system we share and ask you in future not to confusingly associate us in your memory bank with fiction, with members of your wife's family and/or with fictitious events (bit of an oxymoron that, but, possibly, you know what I mean).

Your comment may have been motivated by an attempt, clumsy in its execution, to draw a line between those who attended the book launch and the AHS, which you once termed '*shadowy*' (though you published our address). With that in mind, we will attempt to contact as many who attended the launch as possible, with a copy of this letter plus a free copy of *Aubane versus Oxford*. We will also give them a link to one of our later publications, *The Embers of Revisionism* (2017), <https://www.academia.edu/34075119/>. It features on its cover your picture alongside that of Ken Loach, Tom Barry's and one of the actors Cillian Murphy (from Loach's *The Wind that Shakes the Barley*, a film you did not appreciate a whole lot).

Those in attendance at the launch may then measure the reality of our position against your imagined view of it.

As in *Aubane versus Oxford*, we would like to thank you for bringing our society to the attention of a wider audience, even though your references are jaundiced and frequently, as here, are incorrect.

We would be happy to accept your apology, if and when you may consider that appropriate. In the meantime I do hope that we continue talking about, if not to, each other, even if it is occasionally from across a crowded room.

Jack Lane

(on behalf of the AHS)

Aubane Historical Society, Aubane, Millstreet, Co. Cork.

8/3/2019

jacklaneaubane@hotmail.com

LEST WE FORGET (4)

**The following are the Acts of Aggression committed in Ireland
by the Military and Police of the Usurping English Government,
during the week ending
July 12th, 1919.**

SUMMARY

Date July	Arrests	Raids	Sentences	Months	Armed Assaults	Suppressions & Proclamations	Courts Martial	Daily Total. (Exclusive of terms of imprisonment.)
7th	-	About 500	-	-	-	1	-	About 501 Approx.
8th	11	-	-	-	2	12	-	25
9th	1	3	-	-	1	-	2	7
10th	7	2	7	-	-	2	-	18
11th	-	4	1	21	-	-	-	5
12th	1	2	1	-	1	-	-	5
Total	20	511	9	21	4	15	2	561

[Figures as in original.]

ATROCITIES.

Monday, 7th July, 1919.

Discharged without trial:- Mr. Patrick O'Brien, one of the three brothers arrested on suspicion in connection with the Silvermines shooting, was released after being 18 months in custody. Raids. Extensive house-to-house searches were made over large areas to the North and West of Newmarket, Co. Cork, by fully equipped British military and police. The raiders were accompanied by military wagons, armoured cars, and Red Cross cars, filled with armed soldiers. Two old disused shot-guns – the sole result of the raid – were found and commandeered.

Proclaimed: The annual Tipperary Feis (Gaelic League Festival) to be held in Thurles on Sunday last, was proclaimed by the British authorities on Friday. Large forces of military and police, with full war equipment, were drafted into the town on Sunday. The promoters decided not to hold the Feis, although such a course resulted in heavy financial loss to them.

Tuesday, 8th July, 1919.

Arrests:- Austin Geraghty and Peter J. Loughlon, Doolin District, Co. Clare, were arrested by British military and police in connection with the shooting of two R.I.C men near Kilfenora, Co. Clare. Michael Byrne, Camlough; Patrick Osborne, Gib Street, Belfast; Owen MacCroosh, Eshavany, and Patrick McShane, Cross, were arrested in connection with an alleged assault on two R.I.C. men at Camlough, Co. Armagh on Sunday last. They were brought before a Special Court at Camlough Barracks and remanded to Forkhill Petty Sessions on the 12th August. John Mahon, Gurteen, Newtownbarry, Co. Wexford, was arrested for failing to pay a fine imposed on him for collecting funds for Dail Eireann without a Permit from the British authorities. He has been "wanted" for some time on this charge. Robert Hegarty, 3 Kimmage Road, Dublin, was arrested on a charge of illegal drilling, and remanded in custody until Friday next.

Proclamation:- Sinn Fein, Sinn Fein Clubs, Cumann na mBan, the Irish Volunteers, and the Gaelic League in the County Tipperary were "prohibited and suppressed" by Proclamation published to-day. Two Proclamations were issued by the British Authorities, the first to cover the suppression in the North Riding area of Co. Tipperary, the second to cover the suppression of the South Riding area. An Aeridheacht announced for Castlepollard on Sunday last was proclaimed and large forces of British military and police were drafted into town to enforce the proclamation. Military guards were placed on all the approaches to the town. A meeting was held at the Market Square and was addressed by Mrs. Sheehy-Skeffington.

Armed Assault:- A District Inspector with a force of fully armed police came on the scene and ordered the dispersion of the meeting. On being asked for his authority the D.I. ordered a baton charge. Several people were injured in the charge, and the crowd retaliated with stones. The D.I. then ordered the police to fire, and for a time matters looked very serious. For some reason the police failed to obey the order, and after a time the people dispersed quietly in spite of the great provocation. After the arrest of John Mahon at Newtownbarry (vide above) a crowd numbering about 300, collected and booed and hissed the police. Four or five police rushed out of the barracks and attacked the crowd with batons. A small number of the crowd were dispersed, but the large majority held their ground, with the result that a regular melee ensued. In the meantime a military wagon of British soldiers arrived on the scene. They fixed bayonets and charged the crowd, with the result that a large number of people were wounded.

Wednesday, July 9th, 1919.

Armed Assault:- While standing at the corner of the village street in Athea singing the "Soldiers' Song" and "Wrap the Green Flag round me", a group of boys were attacked by two R.I.C. men. The police gave no warning of their attack. One boy was badly wounded under the right eye, and his face bruised and battered. Several other boys received nasty wounds. The two who received the most severe injuries did not belong to the group of vocalists.

Courtmartials:- Patrick O'Halloran, Scalahan, Tipperary, was tried by courtmartial at Cork for possession of "a seditious document". The document in question was a copy of the official organ of the Irish Volunteers. The decision of the court was not published. James, Barry, Gevagh, Co. Cork, was arrested, tried by courtmartial and sentenced to seven days imprisonment for possessing a shot gun. The accused admitted possession but said he thought he could have a gun for use on his farm. The sentence was remitted and the accused released.

Raids:- The house of Mr. John Noonan, Creamery Manager, Freemount, was searched by British military and police. Nothing incriminating was found. The house of Mr. Patrick Murphy, Freemount, was also searched, with a similar result. Mr. Daniel Mooney 's house at Avoca was searched by soldiers and police, who failed to discover anything.

Arrests:- John O'Connor, Farmer, Barnlough, was charged at Bansha Petty Sessions, with having a quantity of explosives in his possession without a permit from the "authorities". O'Connor stated he had got the explosives (about a pound weight of blasting powder) for blasting timber about four years ago, and had forgotten it was there. Defendant was let off with a fine of 10/- and costs, but was warned that in future the penalty would be heavier.

Thursday, 10th July, 1919.

Suppression:- The following letter from Mr. John O'Sheehan, Dublin, to the Editor, Irish Independent, was suppressed by British Censor in Ireland.

"Sir,

Your account of the Castlepollard Aeridheacht is not quite correct. The police charged and batoned the crowd on Saturday night without any preliminary warning.

The police fired several shots, fortunately without injuring anyone, although several people in the crowd stated they heard the D.I. order the R.I.C. to "shoot to kill".

I do not know the D.I., but a very excited individual, in civilian clothes, came up to the car on which the ladies and I were seated, and told us "to get to hell out of that". And on my enquiring who he was and what was his authority he shouted, "find out, I'll soon show you."

The full programme was carried out on Sunday. It took over three hours and was attended by over 1,000 people. It was quaint to stand in the crowd on top of the hill and watch motor lorries of soldiers and police and armed detachments of police cyclists, looking for us in the roadway below.

(Signed) JOHN O'SHEEHAN. Dublin".

Raids:- Police made a search early last Monday morning of Beech Lawn Rathgar, the residence of Mr. John McLoughlin. They stated that a stranger was staying there, but on searching could find no trace of him. The residence of Mr. Furlay, Upper Rathmines Road, was raided yesterday by a force of detectives.

Sentences:- At a Crimes Court in Galway 7 men were ordered to be imprisoned until the rising of the Court, and ordered to find bail on a charge of unlawful assembly, and for groaning a man whose cattle were recently driven.

Suppression:- Following the Proclamation of County Tipperary, there were scenes of great military and police activity in all parts of the County. Press reports of these activities were censored by the British 'authorities'. In Thurles military engineers were engaged in putting up means of communicate with centres in the County, such as Fethard and Templemore. Big establishments of armed men exist in all these centres. The streets are patrolled night and day by armed police from Belfast, 50 of whom have arrived there.

Friday, 11th July, 1919.

Sentences:- James O'Keeffe, Caretaker of Avondale House, Rathdrum, Co. Wicklow, tried by courtmartial at Ship Street Barracks, was sentenced to one year and nine months imprisonment with hard labour, for being in possession of a shotgun, ammunition, and some blasting powder, without the necessary permit from the British "authorities". The articles mentioned were found during the police raid on Avondale House.

Raids:- British Military and police raided the houses of the late Mr. James Ennis (uncle of Mr. F. Lawless, M.P.), Messrs. James Rooney, Chris. Nulty, and Michael Roche, all in the village of Naul, Balbriggan, Co. Dublin. Nothing incriminating was found.

Saturday, 12th July, 1919.

Arrests:- During the attacks by police on the people of Castlepollard, Westmeath, last Sunday, a constable saw John Sweeney, 15 years of age, pick up something from the ground. The boy was arrested and in his pocket was found a military cartridge. At the subsequent trial the father stated that the boy had been given the cartridge by one of his brothers, all of whom were serving in the army. Sweeney was allowed out on bail.

Sentence:- Mr. James O'Dogherty, 38 Connaught St. Dublin, tried by courtmartial at Ship Street Barracks, on July 1st, on a charge of possessing firearms and ammunition was found guilty and sentenced to two years hard labour. One year was remitted by G.O.C.

Raids:- The house of Mr. M. Dennehy, Rathmore, Co. Kerry, was raided by British Military and police. An exhaustive but fruitless search was made. The house of Mr. C. P. Fitzpatrick, Ballinagh, Co. Cavan, was searched by police, who took away with them a copy of "The Soldiers' Song".

Armed Assault:- Mr. J. J. Brady, Gaique Cross, Longford, when returning from Longford in his motor, was stopped by police at Drumlish. After being ordered out of his car, he was searched, but with no result.

The following are the Acts of Aggression committed in Ireland by the Military and Police of the Usurping English Government, during the week ending July 19th, 1919.

SUMMARY

Date July	Arrests	Raids	Sentences	Months	Armed Assaults	Suppressions & Proclamations	Courts Martial	Daily Total. (Exclusive of terms of imprisonment.)
14	7	-	-	-	-	1	9	17
15	7	1	-	-	1	1	-	10
16	1	1	2	3	-	-	1	3
17	-	1	1	6	2	1	1	6
19	1	3	1	9	-	-	1	6
Total	16	5	4	18	3	3	11	42

[Figures as in original.]

Monday, 14th July, 1919.

Arrests:- Charles Donnelly, Rathmines, Dublin, was arrested on Saturday by members of the R.I.C., and D.M.P., and brought to the local Police Station. The charge against him has not been disclosed.

Trials:- Michael Maunsell, Martin Griffin, John Farrell, Tom Crean, Denis Sugrue and Michael Griffin, all of the Camp District, Tralee, Co. Kerry, were arrested on Friday last in connection with the shooting at Sergeant Oates and Constable Connell on the 24th June, and with Michael Spillane, John Butler and Michael Flynn, already in custody, were brought before a special court at Tralee R.I.C. Barracks on a charge of attempted murder. Spillane, Flynn, Maunsell and Griffin were identified by the two R.I.C. men and remanded in custody. The others were released.

Proclamation:- A Proclamation, issued by the British Military, was posted in Derry last Friday night prohibiting a hurling tournament, arranged by Nationalists, to be held on Saturday, 12th July. The "authorities" arranged to afford protection to an Orange Demonstration in the same vicinity, but the Proclamation suppressing the Tournament stated "grave disorders are likely to follow the holding of the Tournament". The military who were confined to Barracks were held in readiness to suppress the gathering if necessary.

Tuesday, 15th July, 1919.

Arrest:- Mr. Hugh Kennedy, Mountain View, Bansha, Co. Tipperary, was arrested and removed to Cork jail on a charge of having firearms in his possession.

Raids:- A motor cycle owned by Mr. T. Kelleher, Main Street, Youghal, Co. Cork, was seized by a force of police in a Garage in Devonshire Square.

Trials:- The Misses M. E. Harris, The Mall; M. Owens, do; Norah Fitzgibbon, North Main St; Annie Donald, Do; Johanna O'Brien, Church St; and Eileen Coleman, Cork Hill, Youghal, Co. Cork, all members of the Youghal Cumann na mBan, were summoned to the Petty Sessions on a charge of making a collection without Permit from the British "authorities".

Proclamation:- A Lecture to be delivered in the Mansion House, Dublin, and last night by Mr. Arthur Griffith, member of the Irish Parliament for East Cavan, and N.W. Tyrone replying to Sir Edward Carson's speech at Belfast, was proclaimed by the "authorities". The Lord Mayor and Mr. Griffith were served with notices, signed by the Chief Commissioner of Police, prohibiting the Lecture which notices were ignored by both, the Lord Mayor stating that "he would never be a party to closing the Mansion House to the citizens". The meeting was announced for 8.15 p.m., but long before that hour large forces of fully-armed police had taken possession of the neighbourhood of the Mansion House.

Armed Assault:- As Mr. Griffith approached the Mansion House he was held up by three armed policemen, and the police superintendent informed him that he could not proceed. Mr. Griffith then asked the Superintendent if the authority under which he acted against the will of the Lord Mayor was not the batons and revolvers of the policemen. He received no reply. The Lecture was held elsewhere.

Wednesday, 16th July, 1919.

Arrests:- Mr. Paul Galligan, member of the Irish Parliament for West Cavan, was arrested at Cavan and conveyed to Belfast on Tuesday. The charge against him has not transpired.

Sentence:- Mr. James O'Meara, Connaught Street, Dublin, was sentenced to two months' imprisonment, with hard labour, and one month in default of bail, at a Crimes Court in Athlone, on a charge of unlawful assembly and drilling at a reception of the

Irish American Delegates. Accused refused to recognise the Court's jurisdiction. Mrs. Mary McElroy, 5 Tyrconnell Terrace, Inchicore, Dublin, was tried on a charge of possessing a 5-chambered revolver, and 33 ball-cartridges, without a Permit. A fine of £5 was imposed, and an order to find bail in £10, in default of which one month's imprisonment.

Thursday, 17th. July, 1919.

Armed Assault:- In proclaimed Co. Tipperary, armed police patrol the streets of the town, and British military, with full war equipment, scour the country in military motor wagons. A number of boys playing cards by the roadside in Thurles vicinity were dispersed by armed police. Those anxious for games of any sort find it difficult to elude the vigilance of the forces. On Sunday evening some parties who were attending a hurling match at Delvin, Co. Westmeath, were met and scattered by the police with batons.

Proclamation:- An Aeridheacht announced for Drumcree, Delvin, Co. Westmeath, on Sunday, was proclaimed on Friday. The ground on which the Aeridheacht was to have been held, and all the roads in the vicinity, were occupied by armed police and military. The Aeridheacht was held in a field a short distance away, and proved a great success.

Raids:- The instruments of the Killallon Fife and Drum Band were seized by British military and taken away in a motor lorry.

Sentence:- Patrick O'Halloran, Scalahean, Co. Tipperary, was tried by courtmartial at Cork on July 8th, and sentenced to 6 months' imprisonment with hard labour. He was charged with having in his possession a copy of the official organ of the Irish Volunteers.

Saturday, 19th July, 1919.

Arrest:- James Cullen, Ballynanny, Mayobridge, Newry, was arrested yesterday. The charge against him has not transpired.

Sentence:- Michael O'Connell, Thurles, Co. Tipperary, tried by courtmartial at Cork, on June 30th, was sentenced to 9 months' imprisonment on a charge of being in possession of a revolver and ammunition without a permit.

Raids:- On Tuesday last, 16 R.I.C. men and 13 British Military raided the houses of Mr. John Cawley and Mr. J. P. Flood, Granard, Co. Longford. Thorough searches were made in both houses. In Mr. Cawley's they found various numbers of "Nationality". "The Irishman" and other Irish-Ireland papers, which they tied together with the intention of taking away. Apparently they changed their minds, as they eventually left without taking them. In Mr. Flood's house they found and commandeered two bundles of Election literature; two private letters from an absent member of the family, various other letters personal and otherwise, information re Co-operative Societies, Sinn Fein Cumann, &c., and a copy of the Mansion House protest against the treatment of the prisoners in Belfast Jail. The residence of Mr. H. Cecil Watson of Islington, Terenure Road, Dublin, was raided by police officers, but nothing was found.

Irish Bulletin

A full reprint of newspaper of Dáil Éireann giving war reports.

Published so far:

Volume 1, 12th July 1919 to 1st May 1920. 514pp.

Volume 2, 3rd May 1920 to 31st August 1920. 540pp.

Volume 3, 1st September 1920 to 1st January 1921. 695pp

□ 36, £30 paperback, per volume

□ 55, £45 hardback

POSTFREE in Ireland and Britain

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

Clair Wills and the Story She Tells (Part 10)

"We Irish Protestants have always had a reputation for appreciating the minutiae of social distinction. Often invisible to the outsider, this extended to such as our dogs, our yachts, and, of course, our newspapers. My paternal grandmother was no exception. Her take on the relative pecking order of the Irish dailies was that one got one's views from the *Irish Times*, one lit the fire with the *Irish Independent*, and as for the *Irish Press*—ah! Delicacy forbids me to go into details, but suffice it to say that it involved cutting it into appropriate squares, and hanging these in the smallest room of the house!"

Ian d'Alton. 'A Protestant Paper For A Protestant People: *The Irish Times and the southern Irish minority*'.

"Irish Protestants and Irish Catholics alike have suffered death for Irish liberty. The struggle for the Republic was initiated by Protestants, and in the past century and a half the foremost Irish leaders have been Protestants—Wolfe Tone, Russell, McCracken, Orr, Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Robert Emmet, John Mitchel, Thomas Davis, Smith O'Brien, down to Butt and Parnell. It is obvious that, if the Irish cause had been a religious cause, the majority would not have chosen their leaders from the creed they were supposed to be opposing. This alone disproves the pretence that the Irish struggle against England is founded in a rivalry of religious beliefs."

Eamon de Valera's message to President Wilson of the United States, 27th October 1920.

"War is not an accident: it is an outcome. One cannot look too far back to ask, of what?"

Elizabeth Bowen, *Bowen's Court: The story of an Anglo-Irish family from the time of Cromwell to the present day*, Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd. London. 1942. HB.

At the beginning of this series of articles, I suggested that Clair Wills was very fortunate in how she progressed her career, especially with the subjects she choose to address. And by far the most important of these was—as it turns out—none other than Paul Muldoon. The latter in turn was hugely lucky to befriend Leonard L. Milberg when he emigrated to America in 1987 and went to Princeton University where he became the Howard G. B. Clark '21 Professor in the Humanities and Founding Chair of the Lewis Center for the Arts.

Leonard L. Milberg graduated from Princeton and joined his father, Benjamin Milberg's investment fund—Milberg Factors—which has a huge presence in New York's elite financial companies. Being so successful in his career, Leonard L. Milberg has given hugely important endowments to his old *alma mater*: from rare Jewish American literature in 1999 to Poetry, and in 2006 after he became friendly with Muldoon, Milberg donated a very important Irish theatre collection to Princeton "to honour Poet and Professor Paul Muldoon".

So Clair Wills in 2015 was appointed, not only the Leonard L. Milberg Professor

of Irish Letters in Princeton, but also the Princeton Chair for the Fund for Irish Studies series of events and seminars. All of this makes her a very important player in academic circles and it will be interesting to see who benefits from her nod.

And only last January it was reported in the *Irish Daily Mail*, 8th January 2018 that "Pulitzer Prize winning poet Paul Muldoon has been appointed as one of Ireland's 'Cultural Ambassadors' by the Minister for Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, Josepha Madigan, *Fine Gael T.D.*" The other four nominated were: "Trinity educated Ethiopian-Irish actress Ruth Negga... master musician Martin Hayes and leading architects Shelley McNamara and Yvonne Farrell of Grafton Architects". They have all been nominated for a period of three years. Their brief, according to the paper, will be to:

"Promote Ireland globally and provide advice and input on strategic cultural initiatives and take part in key events and projects."

The Minister did not reveal how much money those chosen would be paid, if at all.

I wrote in my March *Irish Political Review* article that I had finally found a book which purported to be the history of 'The Bell' magazine. The title was *The*

Bell Magazine: And the Representation of Irish Identity, Four Courts Press, Dublin, 2012. The author was Kelly Matthews and her title was 'Assistant Professor of English' at Framingham State University, Massachusetts. The most important information about any venture like this would have to be: who put up the money? Matthews didn't even bother with this most serious question and naturally I was really disappointed. Because Clair Wills referred to 'The Bell' as one of her most serious sources and time and again she referred to its backers, but never once revealed who they were in her book 'That Neutral Island', I was driven quite to distraction. I looked up lots of other sources myself and came away empty-handed and just as I was about to quit, I hit the jackpot!

Finally in 'Seán O'Faolain, A Life', by Maurice Harmon, Constable, London, 1994, there is an account of who up to now seemed to be the secretive backers of 'The Bell'. The main one was Joseph McGrath,

"a former Republican and Government Minister who founded the Irish Hospital Sweepstakes and became wealthy. Eamon Martin, the brains behind the Sweepstakes, was McGrath's appointee on the Editorial Board."

I then looked up this most mysterious person and found out via Wikipedia the following paragraph. The rest of the information was given to me by himself.

Joseph McGrath was on the Treatyite side of the Civil War and was a Cumann na nGaedheal Minister for Labour before resigning from that party because of the way the party treated former IRA fighters, by not allowing them into the new army of the State. But, as he was a trained accountant, he became a businessman and builder and went on to great success in this field.

In 1930, McGrath founded the *Irish Hospital Sweepstake* and its success made him one of the wealthiest men in Ireland. It was the world's first lottery and its success was such that it prompted suspicions about its business model. There is little doubt that McGrath used his wide IRA connections, especially in America, for which he was criticised—and also for what some would call "*his dubious business practices*", but then that was easy for his critics to say. Such success always brings out the naysayers and in certain sectors of the community this is almost a default setting. Nevertheless the Sweepstakes were hugely popular and there is an advertisement in a small

pamphlet 'Glendalough' in 1968 under the banner headline:

"The World's Greatest Sweepstakes: The Irish Hospital' Sweepstakes Have Paid over Two Hundred and Five Million Pounds with Three Sweeps Annually. The Prize Fund Divided into Units of £120,000 with the first prize being £50,000"

— which at that time was a massive amount of money.

Patrick McGrath was an affable and very likable man. He also had a great ability as a businessman. In Ireland, and pretty much elsewhere throughout the world wherever there was an Irish community, there was set up a truly enormous network of sellers and buyers of Sweepstakes tickets. Mothers throughout Ireland were encouraged to send books of tickets to their relatives and there was a sellers' commission to encourage sales. The Draws were publicised in the media. The result was a huge hospital building programme throughout Ireland. Special hospitals were needed to support the TB eradication programme. They were built by means of the Sweepstakes funding. The Irish Hospitals Sweepstakes were a win-win situation for everyone involved and indeed for the whole nation.

McGrath was also involved in the setting up of *The Irish Glass Bottle Company Ltd.* (Everybody used glass bottles and imports from Britain were limited due to the Economic War perpetrated illegally on Ireland by the UK.) So again this was a most propitious business move, favourable to the Irish economy. He was also involved in setting up Waterford Glass, which he developed into a top global brand before that notion was even thought about previously by any company.

Joseph McGrath died in 1966 at Cabinteely House, Dublin, which was donated to the State in 1986 and the land was developed into a public park. I still think it interesting that *'The Bell'*, today lauded by many as a liberal magazine helmed by Seán O'Faoláin and later by Peadar O'Donnell, should shroud in secrecy its chief founding patron. But then Clair Wills has as *'The Bell'*'s purpose, no less than:

"It was in the service of creating a modern Irish identity."

But *still* she is not shy about acknowledging that, for all of O'Faoláin's European posturing, he was "*in desperate need of*

English approval".

In our book room over the past few months it has been my duty to look at some of O'Faoláin's books and truly I stand by my former assertion that they are heavy going and stodgy beyond belief. But what really took my attention was the back cover of *'The Irish'*, Penguin Books, Middlesex, 1947, PB. In a profile of *'The Author'* there is a small biography where it is stated that O'Faoláin, amongst other things,

"taught for four years at Strawberry Hill Training College for Teachers, after which he turned to writing and went back to his native Ireland".

Reading Harmon's biography of O'Faoláin, and indeed the latter's own autobiography *'Vive Moi! An Autobiography'*, Sinclair-Stevenson, London, 1993, HB, Edited and with an *Afterword* by Julia O'Faolain' (O'Faolain died in 1991 - JH), what comes across constantly is his precarious finances. There are constant attempts to extract money from publishers upfront and looking for various travelling lecturing tours, especially in the USA, not unlike Elizabeth Bowen herself in the latter part of her life.

And Wills also acknowledges the very precarious finances of another Irish writer — Kate O'Brien. Though she accepts O'Brien came from a wealthy Limerick family, it seems that money slipped through her fingers. In a letter quoted in Wills's book, O'Brien writes to her neighbours in London, John and Barbara Gawsworth, on 6th September 1939:

"I feel terribly nostalgic at not being in my right and customary place just now..."

Wills finds this talk —

"of nostalgia, to describe her longing for an adopted home, odd and striking. Ethical and political commitment, she seems to be saying, can and perhaps should exert a stronger emotional tug than origins. But O'Brien was a chronic debtor and she also admitted to more mercenary motives:

"I am going to damn well get a well-paid (if possible) war job. I simply must get solvent and earn a living. What jobs will there be do you think? I'll be looking for something writer-ish, if you know what I mean. I mean, I'm not going to be a Police Canteen Woman or a sergeant of the Waa(f)..." (Underlining -JH).

Wills shrewdly reads O'Brien's novel, *'The Last of the Summer'* —

"published in 1943 saying much of it

was written during the summer of 1942, at the height of the dudgeon over Ireland's decision to remain neutral... It is possible, in fact, that the novel was a deliberate piece of propaganda designed to prick the conscience of the Irish nation. Was this O'Brien's war work? In later years she claimed to have carried out wartime work for the British Ministry of Information, but this may have been wishful thinking. (She suggested she had given 'pep talks' on the BBC for the home front. Her biographer describes this claim as 'almost certainly not true'. She was never, at any rate, to land the 'well-paid war job' she craved.)" (The italics and brackets are by Clair Wills.)

O'Brien's biographer was Vivian Mercier, as quoted by Wills from *'Irish Writing'* 1 (1946) and listed in Wills's massive 'Bibliographical Essay'. But in today's academic community, O'Brien is heroised. Certainly Dr. Eibhear Walshe, UCC, has written about her but it is her "*queering*" that is central to her now especially in Ireland. The Special Issue Spring/Summer 2018 of *'Irish University Review: A Journal of Irish Studies'* from Edinburgh University Press featured only Kate O'Brien. Amongst the many essays about her, the one that most amused me was this one by Anthony Roche (who he?) titled: *'The Devil Era': The Presence of Eamon de Valera in Three Novels by Kate O'Brien.*'

Roche is listed in the Contributors as:

"Professor Emeritus in the School of English, Drama, Film and Creative Writing at UCD... From 1997-2002, he was editor of the Irish University Review and is currently Chair of the journal's Management Board."

And what person turns up as the Editor of this Journal — well none other than Emile Pine, whose scholarship was so comprehensively derided by me in one of my previous articles on this series. She wrote a review of Clair Wills's *'That Neutral Island: A Cultural History of Ireland During the Second World War'* that was in the end just pure nonsense. It was an easy piece to demolish and took little really in the way of knowledge about the Second World War but apparently that has not stopped Pine from becoming a name in Irish academic circles. I just googled her and my jaw dropped. Honestly!

Julianne Herlihy. ©

To be continued.

The Centenary Of Dail Eireann, 21 January 2019, and the definition of English rule in Ireland as 'usurpation' with some reference to Brexit.

While listening to the four proclamations that were read in the Mansion House on Monday, 21st January 2019, to mark the centenary of the first meeting of Dail Eireann, I was struck by the use, on two occasions, of the word 'usurpation' to describe the character of British rule in Ireland. Reflection on the significance of this word provides not only an unexpected connection between the ideals of Patrick Pearse and John Redmond but also a particular insight into the legitimacy of Brexit.

Usurpation was the word that Bishop O'Dwyer of Limerick had used in September 1916 to justify the actions of those who had planned and participated in the Easter Rising. Earlier, on 17th May 1916, following the execution of 15 men and the deportation of many others without civil process, he had written a public letter to General Maxwell stating that "*your regime has been one of the worst and blackest chapters in the history of the misgovernment of this country*".

The Bishop refused to correct two of his priests, as requested by Maxwell but his sympathy and support for the participants in the Rising was not endorsed by any other bishop. In Bishop O'Dwyer's speech of 14th September 1916, which he made after he had received the Freedom of the City of Limerick, he declared that—

"these Irish Volunteers imagined that Ireland had an inalienable right to govern herself: that the deprivation of it was worse for every interest of their country ... that it was an usurpation and that resistance to it was a duty."

Bishop O'Dwyer made this point more succinctly in a private letter of 14th December 1916 to Bishop Foley of Kildare and Leighlin. He stated that—

"the English Parliament in Ireland is a usurpation and, having regard to the modern development of the idea of nationality and its rights, I would hold that, *positisponendis*, (taking everything into account) it would justify revolt".

The three traditional reasons given for a just rebellion—namely a tyrannical ruler; no chance of constitutional reform; and a

rebellion offering a reasonable chance of success—simply did not apply in Ireland's case.

Surprisingly Bishop O'Dwyer did not advert to the fact that the very word 'usurpation', so central to his argument, had been used in the Proclamation of the Republic that was read by Pearse on the steps of the General Post Office on 23rd April 1916. Part of the Proclamation read:

"we declare the right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland, and to the unfettered control of Irish destinies, to be sovereign and indefeasible. The long usurpation of that right by a foreign people and government has not extinguished the right, nor can it ever be extinguished except by the destruction of the Irish people."

The Proclamation, which had been drafted with particular concern for principles of morality, was a clear expression of both national and social ideals: the Irish Republic was to be "*a sovereign independent state*", but one which cherished "*all of the nation equally, and oblivious of the differences carefully fostered by an alien government, which have divided a minority from a majority in the past.*"

It was the same word, 'usurpation', which was used to significant effect in the Proclamations of the First Dail on 21st January 1919. The *Declaration of Independence* declared that the Irish people is by right a free people and "*for seven hundred years the Irish people has never ceased to repudiate and has repeatedly protested in arms against foreign usurpation*". As with the 1916 Proclamation, there was an association of a foreign power with the usurpation, and this led the *Declaration of Independence* to state that we now—

"in the name of the Irish nation, ratify the establishment of the Irish Republic... we solemnly declare foreign government in Ireland to be an invasion of our national right which we will never tolerate, and we demand the evacuation of our country by the English Garrison."

The carefully chosen words served as a forcible reminder that Lord French, since his appointment as a Military Governor, on 6th May 1918, had brought an even more military-style rule to Ireland and that he had used the existing emergency legislation, which had been introduced in August 1914, to greater effect. This legislation included the *Defence of the Realm Act*, the *Defence of the Realm Regulations* and the appointment, when deemed necessary, of a *Competent Military Authority*. All of these regulations made the normal civil legislative system subordinate to the military and members of the Royal Irish Constabulary participated in this military regime.

It was by the use of these powers that Lord French, signing himself Governor General, had issued a Proclamation, on 16th May 1918, which led to the arrest and imprisonment without trial of hundreds of Sinn Fein members.

In that context it was with supreme irony that the next declaration of Dail Eireann, the *Message to the Free Nations of the World*, should be read in English by Robert Barton, who had served as a British military officer in Dublin during the Easter Rising. He had left the army at the end of the War; returned to his landed estate in Wicklow; and had not only joined the Sinn Fein movement but also had been elected for the party in the 1918 election.

The words spoken by Barton contained the term *usurpation*. He declared that Ireland—

"has never relinquished her national rights, and throughout the long era of English usurpation she has in every generation defiantly proclaimed her inalienable right of nationhood down to her last glorious resort to arms in 1916."

The theme of foreign military occupation led to the statement that Ireland—

"calls upon every free nation to uphold her national claim to complete independence as an Irish Republic against the arrogant pretensions of England founded in fraud and sustained only by an overwhelming military occupation and demands to be confronted publicly with England at the Congress of Nations, in order that the civilised world having judged between English wrong and Irish right may guarantee to Ireland its permanent support for the maintenance of her national independence."

The political power of England, especially the carefully conducted campaign that had won over President Wilson of America to its side, prevented the

presentation of Ireland's case to the Versailles Conference. The case, however, had been carefully constructed and clearly formulated; and central to that case was the word, *usurpation*, with all the political implications associated with it.

There was clear continuity between the *1916 Proclamation* and the *Declarations of Dail Eireann* in 1919 but, significantly, the continuity did not end there: John Redmond had used the same word, with similar intent, as far back as 1902.

Redmond made his statement in a speech on 9th August 1902 in the City Hall, Dublin, which was timed to coincide with the coronation of King Edward VII in London. Redmond, speaking as leader of the Irish Party, affirmed that—

"this Party, as a body, has formally withdrawn from all participation in the Coronation celebrations, and we are assembled here to-day to place once more upon record the protest of our people against the usurpation of the government of Ireland against the English Parliament."

These words were uttered at the start of his speech. Having described the Act of Union as "*a crime of the deepest turpitude*", using the words of W.H. Lecky, Redmond maintained that "*from that day Ireland has never ceased to protest against the usurpation of the government of Ireland by the English Parliament*"; and then, in words reminiscent of Pearse, he declared that Ireland "*has protested by means of armed insurrection and generation after generation has witnessed brave and gallant men sacrificing their lives in prison cell or on the scaffold in defence of Irish freedom*." He then condemned the English imposition of martial law in Ireland and affirmed that "*fraud, robbery and murder have characterised the English usurpation of the government of our country*". Redmond concluded:

"we submit to the English usurpation of the government of Ireland, but we do so because we have no adequate means of successful resistance; but we do loathe English rule, and we will take no part in the jubilation of the Coronation."

The word '*usurpation*' appeared four times in his speech, which was endorsed by John Dillon and William O'Brien, and a resolution embodying his views was passed unanimously. As an aside it may be noted that, somewhat cynically, an extract from this speech was used in de Valera's election campaign in 1917 under the heading, '*What John Redmond said when he was an Irishman*'.

The authenticity of Redmond's political

aspirations, however, should not be tarnished: not only did he make a clear statement of his aims in 1902 but also he was proud to unveil the Parnell monument in Dublin, on 1st October 1911, with the inscription, taken from a speech by Parnell, that "*no man has a right to fix the boundary to the march of a nation*".

Patrick Pearse, himself, was happy to take part with Redmond in a rally for Home Rule on 31st March 1912 at which the main platform was under the statue of Parnell. Then political events in England and the start of the First World War led Redmond and Pearse to take radically different steps.

However, after the Easter Rising, it should be recorded that Redmond's critique of British rule in Ireland was remarkably similar to his analysis in 1902. Speaking in the House of Commons on 11th July 1916 he declared that British policy as expressed by Lord Lansdowne "*amounts to a declaration of war on the Irish people*"; and, on 18th October 1916, he asserted that "*the system of government at present maintained in Ireland is inconsistent with the principles for which the allies are fighting in Europe*".

After the death of Redmond, on 6th March 1918, his ideals were given formal expression by all Irish political parties on 18 April 1918, when the English Government planned to enforce Conscription on Ireland. A statement issued by the leaders of Sinn Fein, the Irish Party and the Labour Party declared that English policy "*must be regarded as a declaration of war on the Irish nation...it is in direct violation of the rights of small nationalities to self-determination*".

The word '*usurpation*' was not used in this declaration but the resolution looked back to the statement of Redmond in 1902 and to the *Proclamation* of Easter 1916; and it looked forward to the *Declarations* of Dail Eireann of January 1919. The message was clear and convincing: an Imperial power, using military force, has no legal right to claim legitimate title over an independent nation state; nor, with even greater reason, does it have legal right to draw boundaries on the territory of that state.

In this context it would seem fitting, during the present crisis over Brexit, to commemorate the centenary of Dail Eireann by implementing one of the fundamental principles of the *Message to the Free Nations of the World*: namely, to repeat the words read by Robert Barton, the Irish Republic—

"demands to be confronted publicly

with England at the Congress of Nations, in order that the civilised world having judged between English wrong and Irish right may guarantee to Ireland its permanent support for the maintenance of her national independence."

In short, Brexit, in its Irish context, should be suspended until the legality of the Irish border is adjudicated on at the United Nations. Spain may also wish to bring the case of Gibraltar to the same forum.

Brian P. Murphy ORB

GAA Debate

continued

Brolly: The GAA has a state of the art outreach programme for non-members and successfully opposes sectarianism.

"*O'Rourke*: Should you not just leave politics to the politicians?

Brolly: There are times when it is necessary to take a stance. Spiritual support from the rest of the Association is what the Northern Gaels are asking for. Parties like Sinn Fein have their own agendas. Many in the Northern GAA take a different position. Northern nationalists are feeling isolated as a result of Brexit. It is all very well for people in the liberal pluralist South to proclaim such values but they don't have to contend with scorn on a daily basis from a political party that is homophobic and anti-science, a party that habitually makes a laughing stock of the Irish language. We are not prepared to be cut adrift.'

From reading the above it may seem that Sean O'Rourke showed bias but, given the force of the case being made, O'Rourke's questioning was standard journalistic practice.

Key points made by Brolly were: the concept of a pluralist Northern Ireland has evaporated as a result of Brexit; the GAA constitutes a basic defence against the isolation of the nationalist community; the Church has collapsed as a focal point for the community; many in the Ulster GAA take a different view to that of Sinn Fein while holding a commitment to a United Ireland; he is an active defender of the across-the-communal-divide GAA outreach programme and of welcoming members of the PSNI.

CRITICISM FROM BOGUE AND MACKENNA

Before examining the substance of the criticisms made by Declan Bogue and Ewan MacKenna it should be noted that

many of their points are representative of current strands of opinion in the South. Account should also be taken that, as sports writers, they are at something of a disadvantage in commenting on political and historical matters.

Bogue begins his article by asserting that Jarlath Burns has dramatically scaled back his GAA involvement and is "*miles away from inhabiting the present inner sanctum*" of the Association. He then tackles Burns on the question of ethos which he describes as a "*tricky thing*". Referring to point 1.2 he states:

"Now 99% of those involved in the GAA would be largely unaware of such a mission statement."

Bogue clearly admires the leadership style of former GAA President Aogan O'Fearghail and approvingly cites O'Fearghail's belief in an "*agreed Ireland*". The present writer had occasion to dispute the ethos of the GAA with O'Fearghail in 2016. Having attended with family and extended family a fixture in Croke Park, followed by a commemorative pageant to mark the 1916 centenary, I was disappointed to see John Redmond's contribution highlighted on a giant screen. I complained to GAA headquarters and O'Fearghail replied defending the presentation on the grounds that, by including Redmond and Carson, the Association was acknowledging the unionist perspective. In the context of that exchange I would consider Joe Brolly's question—*who are we pleasing?*—to be well chosen.

Bogue concludes by asking: *what is the GAA?* He answers that there are thousands of different versions of what it is perceived to be. Accepting that there are 2,200 clubs in Ireland and 400 more in different parts of the world, encompassing various religions, beliefs, prejudices and sexual orientations, his final question is: "*How can any one man speak for all of that?*"

Ewan MacKenna approaches the debate from an openly partitionist angle and is less than sympathetic to the Northern viewpoint. He says:

"If those north of the border think those south of it have a view that it's a place of illogical hate and fringe lunacy dominating their society, they'd be right."

Lest there be any doubt on the role he sees Northern GAA members playing he states:

"Those in the north must realise there are large numbers in the Republic that don't see it the way they do, and therefore the tail cannot wag the dog."

In subsequent paragraphs acknowledging that Brexit has revived hopes of a United Ireland, MacKenna cuts his Northern antagonists some slack. The experience of Northern members, he says, "*was never close to experienced by the rest*" and should not be dismissed. Then he gets to another punch line. He bluntly questions the relevance of the GAA's history in the light of its present existence as—

"a multi-million pound organisation that has had the airlines of gulf states, French beer companies, and German supermarkets pump money into it, that sell their big events to a British satellite TV company that lies behind a paywall, and that rents out their world-class arena for everything from country-and-western concerts, to American college football, to those very same "foreign and fantastic games"?"

In the context of what Burns and Brolly are arguing, he sees references to history as an unjustifiable throwback to aspects of the GAA's legacy that are gone, never to return. As he puts it:

"To use the past for present means is cheaply opportunistic. It's true that for major tracts of its existence and growth, the GAA has been quite naked about being intertwined with Irish nationalism and that made sense. To everything there is a season and a time to every purpose, under heaven. But now it's largely a sporting business, with proceeds helping it fund the positives like togetherness and activity in community life. It now must stay that way."

THE WIDER POLITICAL CONTEXT

The issues raised in this debate are clearly important and weighty, for observers of the evolving Irish discourse on Brexit as much as for members of the GAA. I will comment on the issues under two headings: Changing views of Irish history; and National sentiment and tolerance.

Changing views of Irish history:

It is not surprising that the legacies of history are no longer taken seriously in Irish popular discourse. For over forty years clear signals have issued from the highest level of State indicating that the nationalist historical narrative needs to be abandoned. Elaborate alternative narratives, often focussed on social history, have been concocted; historical truth has been declared to be impossible to establish; and, as a school subject, history has been made optional on the second level curriculum.

While all of this has borne fruit in certain quarters of the academic and media worlds, a counter movement has also

appeared. In the public mind that alternative movement has become associated with President Michael D Higgins.

In a speech given shortly before the main centenary commemorations in Easter 2016 the President commented on the revisionist practice of questioning everything in the nationalist tradition. His main point was that such questioning had not been matched by a similar questioning of the triumphalism of the British Imperial tradition.

The speech was publicly criticised by DUP Leader Arlene Foster. To avoid political controversy, the President cancelled his participation in a planned commemorative event in Belfast. Higgins's very public dissenting from the official narrative in matters historical did him no harm in the Presidential Election in November 2018 which he won with the largest majority in Irish electoral history.

As described in a recent book by Kevin O'Rourke, the 2016 centenary did not go to plan for the Government. Referring to the 75th commemoration of the 1916 Rising in 1991, O'Rourke describes how very few people turned up because of fears that the event might be seen as an endorsement of the Republican War. But the 2016 centenary was different.

"Peace changed all that. To be sure the government announced rather solemnly that the centenary of the Rising would be commemorated rather than celebrated, but many Irish people decided that they would go ahead and celebrate it anyway. Hundreds of thousands of spectators crowded Dublin city centre to watch the largest military parade in the country's history, and many others watched on TV" (*A Short History of Brexit*, p. 150).

O'Rourke concludes by pointing out that neither the American nor French revolutions were non-violent and that the 1916 Rising was an event that eventually led to the establishment of an independent Irish Republic. In other words it is something to be proud of. These points are relevant to the GAA debate because they indicate how, even before Brexit, Irish public opinion was starting to swing away from the anti-nationalist agenda promoted so assiduously in previous decades.

But Brexit has been a game changer in terms of the Irish relationship with history. The anti-nationalist case was often presented as a growing up process in which the nation was shedding childish notions of its own '*exceptionalism*', but in practice it was a movement towards a closer relationship with Britain, towards making Ireland a region of the UK in all but name. The

thinkers leading anti-nationalism were unashamedly Anglophile to a man and woman. We were being asked to break the connection with our actual history in favour of a contrived British-Irish identity.

As the Brexit negotiations have progressed and previously hidden depths of the English commitment to its Imperial tradition have come to the surface, the mat has been pulled from under the Irish Anglophile position. In small ways we are being reminded in the daily unfolding of the Brexit story why Ireland separated from Britain in the first place.

Critics of Irish nationalism, inside the GAA and elsewhere, argue that the unionist viewpoint needs to be accommodated and that one way of doing that is to re-discover aspects of Irish history where Irish and British interests were united: for that purpose John Redmond's mobilisation of Irish nationalists behind the British war effort in 1914 is highlighted. But what effect does such spinning have on unionist opinion? Will it undermine unionist opposition to a United Ireland? In modern life a community is what it says it is. The Ulster unionist community describes itself as having a British culture, and so it does. No amount of clever reconfiguring of the facts of history will alter that reality.

Another purpose behind the attempted revival of Redmondism is to make out that 1916 was an aberration and that the underlying wish of the Irish people was to remain within the British orbit. The problem there is that too much distortion of the historical record is required. The alternative tactic (still Government policy) of downgrading the study of history and de-politicising the story of the State's foundation creates problems in other areas. If history is rendered incoherent, incoherence can infect the national mind in all sorts of unintended ways. Ultimately, commemorating 1916 by including positive references to Redmond's leadership is akin to celebrating the Resistance to Nazi rule by lauding Hitler; it discredits the very idea of belief in a political cause.

It would be unfortunate if the GAA were to jettison its historical legacy at exactly the time when informed opinion in Ireland is rapidly moving towards a new appreciation of the importance of historical continuity and of *ethos*, in the philosophical sense that Aristotle used the word—a sense of security, of understanding where we have come from.

National sentiment and tolerance:

a common misconception is that nationalism and tolerance occupy opposite ends of the ideological spectrum. Historically that is not true in Ireland.

Looking at the development of the national movement in the nineteenth and early twentieth century it can be seen that it was marked by important divisions at different times. One such was a fierce and prolonged dispute in the years between the passing of the Act of Union in 1800 and Catholic Emancipation in 1829 regarding the manner by which Catholic bishops should be appointed. On one side were liberal Catholics like the Rev Charles O'Connor and the poet and song writer, Thomas Moore, and on the other were polemicists like James Bernard Clinch and Dr. Dromgoole who wanted the Irish bishops to be appointed directly by Rome. Without siding with either camp it can be said that the liberals in that instance had a more national orientation.

This identification between liberalism and nationalism was even more pronounced in the dispute between Daniel O'Connell and the Young Ireland movement in the 1840s. For Thomas Davis and Charles Gavan Duffy the important principle was that a national movement needed to be developed having as its overriding characteristic a bridging of the divide between Catholics and Protestants. For O'Connell the main aim was to defend Catholic interests in the most pragmatic and effective way possible.

A similar division is to be found in the electoral conflicts between the supporters of William O'Brien and Redmond's Home Rule party in the two General Elections of 1910. In the first instance the O'Brienites stood as independents and in the second as a political party, the *All-for-Ireland League* (AFIL); in both contests they defeated the Home Rule Party in eight of the nine Parliamentary seats in Cork city and county. The AFIL was liberal in the sense that it opposed a tendency towards *Catholic ascendancy* in the Home Rule Party and advocated *Conciliation and Consent* in dealings between nationalists and diverse Protestant interests (including Northern unionists) regarding Land Purchase and various schemes for administration devolution. Through its daily newspaper, the *Cork Free Press*, it identified strongly with the Thomas Davis strand of national politics.

A striking difference between the AFIL and its Redmondite opponents was that All for Ireland representatives had greater

confidence in the national cause. Leaders like Redmond and John Dillon vehemently opposed Land Purchase and administrative devolution on the grounds that achieving such reforms would weaken the demand for national independence. But the AFIL contended that allowing the tenants to become land-owning farmers, and co-operating successfully in a conciliatory manner with the diverse elements of all-Ireland society, would build confidence in the national ideal. Subsequent history showed this to have been a correct judgement. The Counties where the AFIL had influence—Cork, Kerry, Tipperary, Limerick and Waterford—were all areas where the ethos of Irish nationality has deep roots, areas which are to this day strongholds of the GAA.

The opinion expressed here is biased in the sense that it is based on the writings of Brendan Clifford (of whom I am a long term associate) in books like *The Veto Controversy* (Athol Books 1985), the *Cork Free Press in the Context of the Parnell Split* (Aubane Historical Society, 1997) and *Spotlights on Irish History* (Aubane Historical Society, 1997).

My thesis is that in Ireland a tendency to greater tolerance and generosity of spirit goes hand in hand with a secure sense of national identity. I am confident that it would withstand rigorous scholarly assessment.

But to return to the matter in hand, I don't find it surprising that the individuals currently defending the national ethos of the GAA have both, in different circumstances, risked their reputations in pursuit of greater social tolerance. Despite the confusion of recent decades when everything traditional has been subjected to relentless questioning and criticism, I believe that Irish society continues to have a core. What is at issue in the debate started by Burns and Brolly is whether the GAA knows itself well enough to remain part of that core.

Dave Alvey

Corrections to March *Irish Political Review*

The name **Shamima** is mis-spelt in some instances in the *Editorial*. Also, for **Begin** read **Bevin**.

In *The Russian Revolution*, page 28, first paragraph, the first new sentence should read:

"The individual capitalist could sell his surplus at the expense of a rival capitalist"

[leaving out a superfluous not]

Money Creation

In his article in the March issue of the *Irish Political Review*, Martin Dolphin gives a very brief view of the money multiplier which he attributes to me. He says:

"... if the reserve ratio is 10% and £1,000 is deposited, then the bank will be able to create additional credit to the value of £9,000."

But in my opinion that statement is at best very misleading, if not just plain wrong. If £1,000 is deposited, the bank can only lend £900. The bank may be able to lend more ***if and only if the £900 that is lent out is then deposited in the same bank***. There is no reason to believe that this will be the case. As I've said before, the multiplier works only if you look at the banking system as a whole or there is only one bank in the system so that money lent out can be deposited again in the banking system.

I was a little bemused at the examples Martin gives in his article. He says bank BA lends 100 million to CA (as in Customer A). CA spends the money and the recipient of CA's spending lodges the money with bank BB. Martin is rather coy about naming this depositor, but I will call him CZ. So where does bank BA find the money?

At this point it seems that Martin is acknowledging a problem. Someone has to fund the 100 million credit bank BA has given CA. So it appears even in Martin's example that commercial banks can't create credit out of thin air.

Let us examine what has happened in minute detail. When CA spends the money, he gives a cheque to CZ, the vendor of the goods bought by CA and the person that Martin is too embarrassed to mention! At this point, person CZ has given credit to CA. CZ has a piece of paper which gives him a right to funds but he has not exercised that right. It is only when he lodges the cheque at bank BB that he receives the funds. Bank BB will then credit CZ with the 100 million.

At this stage in the analysis I would like to pause in order to take a closer look at CZ. Martin assumes that CZ begins with a zero balance and that, as a result of CA

buying goods, CZ has now 100 million in his account. But what if CZ started this series of transactions by owing bank BB 100 million? When he lodges CA's 100 million, he has reduced his debt to zero. In this scenario the overall debt (and therefore credit) in the economy has not changed. The debt incurred by CA has been used to reduce the pre-existing debt of CZ to zero.

But let us indulge Martin! Let us assume that CZ starts with a balance of zero and ends up with 100 million in his bank. We can conclude that CZ has a surplus over and above his day to day spending. The point I am making is that, for credit to be created, someone in the economy must have a surplus. We can also conclude that CZ trusts the banking system with his money!

Now let us resume our analysis. CZ has lodged his cheque with bank BB. At this stage bank BB is funding the original loan taken out by CA. However the good news is that bank BB has in its possession the cheque lodged by CZ and originally written by CA. When BB lodges the cheque with the Central Bank 100 million is transferred from bank BA to bank BB.

It's only when the Central Bank, acting as the clearing house, does this transfer that the funding requirement falls on bank BA. Of course, all the various stages in this process are almost instantaneous in the case of electronic transfers of funds.

Martin then asks very reasonably: what if bank BA hasn't the funds in the Central Bank to pay bank BB? Surprisingly, Martin says that in that case the Central Bank can step in! But, if the Central Bank is providing an overdraft facility to bank BA, then credit or money has indeed been created out of thin air. But it has not been created by bank BA, it has been done by the Central Bank!

Martin, perhaps sensing his *faux pas*, suggests another scenario. Suppose bank BB lends 100 million to a new person called CB and CB for reasons best known to himself lodges the 100 million cheque into an account in bank BA. All bank BA's problems are solved! The Central Bank will make the accounting entry to transfer funds from bank BB to bank BA.

But why would CB borrow 100 million

from BB in order to lodge it with the hapless bank BA?

Perhaps bank BA is so desperate to find funds that it is willing to pay a higher interest to CB than he would have to pay bank BB in borrowing costs (apparently nobody has told bank BA about creating credit out of thin air!). But why wouldn't bank BB lend directly to bank BA? Perhaps it is worried about the solvency of bank BA, but is more confident that it will be repaid by CB.

Of course, it is also possible that the transactions are fraudulent. During the Irish financial crisis Irish Permanent lent billions of euro to one of its subsidiaries — Irish Life. Irish Life was deemed not to be a banking institution. When the latter lent the money to Anglo Irish Bank this bank could account for the liability as a "customer deposit" rather than a loan from another Irish Bank. The idea was to pretend that there were people outside the Irish banking system that were only too willing to finance such a fine institution as Anglo Irish Bank. Unfortunately, the Irish courts decided to convict the Chief Executive of Irish Permanent of the crime of conspiring to mislead the world about the true state of Anglo's finances. The fact that he was wearing a green jersey at the time was not considered grounds for his defence.

Having presented these rather dubious transactions Martin claims that "200 million in credit has been created". Interestingly he doesn't say it was created out of thin air.

But it is very arguable that 200 million in credit has been created. The loan of 100 million by bank BB to CB looks like a piece of window dressing to get bank BA out of a hole. CB owes 100 million to bank BB and CB in turn is owed 100 million by bank BA. CB's net balance is zero. This 100 million doesn't have any effect on the real economy.

The transactions of substance are the 100 million loan from the banking system to CA which is ultimately financed by the loan to the banking system from CZ.

Commercial banks are mere intermediaries between lenders and borrowers. While such banks can lend and borrow with each other, ultimately the finance for bank lending to the wider economy must come from outside the banking system.

The banking system can recycle a given amount of money numerous times, but each time it lends it must be able to finance the lending by borrowing. For credit to exist there must be a class of people who

have surplus funds over and above what they need for day to day spending. The banks must also find a class of people who do not have enough funds for their spending or investment needs but whom the banks believe are capable of repaying loans they have received at some future date.

Now let us apply these principles to a real world example. In an earlier article in this series Angela Clifford suggested that there was a rapid expansion in credit during the 1970s. There were two reasons for this. We agree, I think, that one reason was that the American Central Bank (the Fed) broke the dollar's link with gold and in effect printed money. But it appears we disagree on the second reason.

Angela thinks that there was a change in the intellectual climate. The influence of Keynes diminished and that of Milton Friedman increased. As a consequence there was a reduction in State spending and regulation by the State.

It is quite plausible that such policies would increase the amount of private credit available because there is a transfer of wealth from the State to the private sector. Therefore there is more money to lend. Also deregulation can reduce the barriers to capital flows across national boundaries. But a change in an intellectual fashion cannot change the basic principles of banking. Commercial banks cannot create credit out of thin air.

There was a highly significant event in the economic history of the twentieth century that occurred in the 1970s. The Middle East by means of the OPEC cartel was able to raise oil prices. As a result there was a massive transfer of wealth from the West to the Middle East. The new found wealth of the Middle East was not dispersed among the mass of people in the oil-producing countries. Instead a relatively small group of people accumulated the vast bulk of the wealth. Given that there is a limit to the consumption of even the most Hedonistic of people the vast bulk of the new found wealth was available to supply as credit. But where did it go? Almost all of it returned to the western banking system.

In this period the western banking system was overloaded with Middle Eastern money. The West was in recession, so the banks were not confident that the credit that they could now supply would be repaid. Famously the Chairman of *Citibank*, Walter Wriston, said that people and companies can go bankrupt, but not countries. *Citibank* proceeded to lend

billions to countries such as Mexico and Brazil. We now know that it didn't end well!

As well as Middle Eastern oil, there are numerous other sources of global finance. A relatively new source is Russia. This has similarities with Middle Eastern money in that its source is Oil. Secondly it is restricted to a small number of people. But the wealth accumulated by the oligarchs was not as a result of a transfer of wealth from the West; but a transfer of Russian State assets (causing the impoverishment of the Russian people) to the Oligarchs.

A second relatively new source of credit was caused by the advent of the Euro and the lifting of any restrictions to capital flows across national boundaries within the EU.

The global financial crisis of over ten years ago laid bare the functioning of the banking system as well as revealing how it was financed.

When the loans that banks make go bad, the entities that finance those loans must absorb the loss because the loans are not financed out of thin air. Nor are the loans that a bank makes equal to a multiple of the banks' borrowing or customer deposits, as Martin appears to believe. The accounts always balance. The assets of a bank (consisting mostly of loans) equal the liabilities (consisting of shareholders' funds plus various creditors).

The first group to absorb the losses are the shareholders. This is relatively uncontroversial. Shareholders know that their investments carry risk.

If the losses exceed the value of shareholder funds, then we are on more difficult terrain. Most creditors of banks such as depositors and bond holders are under the impression that their money is safe in the bank. They put money in the bank precisely to avoid risk. If such creditors take the hit for banking losses, confidence in the banking system is undermined and confidence is a prerequisite for the functioning of the system. The etymology of the word credit is *credere* the Latin word to believe.

The EU was not particularly consistent in its treatment of the countries that had banking crises. It appears that a determining factor was from where the finance for the loans came.

When the Cypriot banks collapsed, it

was revealed that most of the finance was Russian money. The EU decided that, because the finance did not come from the EU, there would not be any significant adverse effect on the EU economy if the Russian creditors were obliged to absorb the losses.

The Irish banking crisis was different. The advent of the Euro enabled the various banks operating in the Euro zone to Hoover up savings from around Europe. A large proportion was funnelled through the Irish banks into the property sector. And what could be safer than houses!

If the loans had somehow been financed out of thin air, there would have been no problem. But of course they were not. It was said that Anglo Irish Bank had no systemic importance for the Irish economy but was crucial to the EU economy because of the source of the finance.

An example of the extent of the expansion of credit was revealed in an RTÉ interview with Michael Soden, a former Chief Executive of Bank of Ireland. He said that Bank of Ireland took over 100 years to grow its loan book to 100 billion euro in 2001. But it only took another 7 years for it to reach 200 billion. And Bank of Ireland was the least reckless of the Irish banks.

The EU decided that some subordinate bondholders would take a hit but the depositors and the senior bondholders were unscathed. The reasoning was that the contagion effect of European creditors being burned would cause a recession in Europe and the collapse of the banking system.

But of course someone had to finance the losses. It was decided that the Irish State would have to take the hit.

In my opinion Martin has been so dazzled by the banking system's apparent power that he has lost sight of the economic substance. Not only is the idea that commercial banks can create credit out of thin air wrong, but it leads to a distorted view of recent global economic developments.

A commercial bank cannot create money out of thin air. It is a mere financial intermediary. Ultimately, credit must be financed from outside the banking system. If there was any doubt about this it should have been eliminated following the financial collapse of 2008. Credit must be financed and, if loans go bad, either those who financed it must bear the loss or the State must step in. Someone must pay. The liability does not disappear into the "*thin air*".

John Martin

The Treaty War And Two Treatyite FF-ers from the sublime to the ridiculous

Brendan Clifford has long argued in this magazine that what is commonly referred to as the *Irish Civil War*, should be more accurately called the *Treaty War*, since there was no fundamental difference in objectives between most of those Irish Republicans who had fought shoulder to shoulder in the War of Independence, but who differed as to whether the Treaty was an unavoidable compromise — with the Free State providing a stepping stone to an eventual Republic — and those who found it unconscionable that the IRB, with Collins as President of its "virtual Republic", should set about dismantling the real Republic that had actually been brought into being in 1919 and that had functioned for the three years up till then.

Irish language terms, such as *Cogadh na mBráithre* (War of the Brothers) — and one recalls how West Cork War of Independence heroes Seán and Tom Hales now fought on opposite sides — or *Cogadh na gCarad* (War of the Friends) are far better descriptions of the actual social reality than 'Civil War'. For that war would not have ignited but for Collins bowing to Churchill's ultimatum to commence the bloodletting.

The RTÉ drama series about the War of Independence, "*Resistance*", concluded on the eve of that bloodletting. But it realistically portrayed the Treaty arguments on both sides that had preceded it. The fictional character Jimmy, a member of Collins's War of Independence assassination Squad, initially holds to the perspective of "*What's good enough for Mick Collins, is good enough for me*", and argues with his anti-Treaty girlfriend: "*It's this (the Treaty), or all-out war, and we can't wage all-out war against the entire British Army*". But, later, Jimmy reflects on what is at stake in going down the Collins road, and chooses to follow Liam Mellows instead. The "*Resistance*" script also presented the respective arguments between Collins and Mellows as follows:

Collins: "Sometimes we must balance abstract principles against the real human cost... You're head of Army Ordinance. You know what we have and don't have. You of all people know we do not have the guns to wage a protracted war against them... Don't go with de Valera. He wants to divide us."

Mellows: "If I go with the President it's

because our conscience leads us in the same direction. It's your Treaty that divides us."

Mellows later comments to a Republican colleague:

"I never wanted to see Irish men fighting against Irish men... But that's the great crime... They're forcing us into this position. Nobody wanted this, but that's what we've got. They've made this mess. Let them pay the price for it."

And the series concludes with Mellows declaring:

"We shall not fire, unless fired upon. We shall not kill, unless they come to murder us. If they do come for us, we will defend the Republic with our last drop of blood. Long live the Republic!"

Collins did come for Mellows and the Four Courts Garrison when he launched the Free State's Treaty War in June 1922. But it was not he who would murder Mellows six months later. Collins himself was already dead since August — neither "murdered" nor "assassinated" — but killed in action, as, on the Republican side, Cathal Brugha had been in June.

It would be Collins's successors, the Cumann na nGaedheal Government, who would murder Mellows, Barrett, McKelvey and O'Connor, executed without trial in December, as Cosgrave's Government had already judicially murdered Childers in November. But, if he did not murder Mellows, it was Collins himself who had come after, and must be held responsible for, the fatal and murderous shooting, on July 31st, of his one-time closest comrade, but now his Republican opponent, Harry Boland, condemning him to a slow, excruciatingly painful, death over the next couple of days.

See www.historyireland.com/20th-century-contemporary-history/harry-bolands-irish-revolution/ and www.historyireland.com/revolutionary-period-1912-23/harry-boland-2/ for my 2004 'History Ireland' dispute with the revisionist author of '*Harry Boland's Irish Revolution*', the recently deceased Professor David Fitzpatrick, RIP.

Desmond FitzGerald, later a Fine Gael Fascist ideologue, had been a member of the Cumann na nGaedheal Government that carried out the aforementioned executions. His son, Garret FitzGerald, would

become a Fine Gael Taoiseach, and in retirement would reflect in 2005:

"After the rejection by republicans in mid-October (1922) of an amnesty, the first four executions of arms-carrying republicans occurred; these were followed shortly afterwards by that of Erskine Childers, publicist for the anti-Treaty movement... Childers was found guilty of what had been made a capital offence — being in possession of a small revolver that had been given to him by Collins long before this. It is difficult to acquit the government of prejudice against Childers, an Englishman who had, absurdly, been suspected by Griffith of being a British agent, engaged in fomenting a civil war in order to give the British a chance to bring their troops back to Ireland to restore peace in the country! ...With the killing of (Cumann na nGaedheal) Deputy Sean Hales, the government, under pressure from the army, ordered the execution without trial of four IRA prisoners (incl. Mellows). It is very hard for us today to accept or justify these acts..." (*Further Reflections*, p 95).

In Dáil Éireann on 24th November 2011, the current Fine Gael Taoiseach, Leo Varadkar, who was Minister for Transport at the time, would put it more bluntly:

"Deputy Ferris raised the issue of Ballyseedy, for example, and I have been there. I can say, in clear conscience and without any doubt in my mind, that the events of Ballyseedy constituted an atrocity. I can also say that people who were murdered, or executed, without trial by the Cumann na nGaedheal government were murdered. It was an atrocity and those people killed without a trial by the first government were murdered. That is my view."

This in no way led either FitzGerald or Varadkar to question the Treaty itself. Quite the contrary.

An early and principled champion of the Treaty had been Frank Carney, who died of a heart attack in October 1932, at the early age of 36, having served as Fianna Fáil TD for Donegal for the previous five years, after being elected in his first contest in 1927. Yes, for Fianna Fáil! In a Derry City *Cemeteries Series* this past February 21st, Eamon Sweeney wrote of this Treatyite:

"The future TD for Donegal, was born in Enniskillen, County Fermanagh, on April 25, 1896, and fought for the British Army in World War I as part of the Royal Inniskilling Fusilliers. Frank Carney would go on to join the IRA and fight in both the Irish War of Independence and the Irish Civil War... There is nothing in itself overly remarkable in the fact that Carney won an election. However, prior to the summer of 1922 Frank Carney was

a pro-Treaty advocate and a trusted aide of Michael Collins. Yet, as his remains were lifted into a Dublin church in 1932 it was Eamon de Valera who helped carry his coffin..."

"It was British Prime Minister Lloyd George who brought new impetus to the Irish Volunteers in early 1918. His proposal to introduce conscription to Ireland to help the British war effort was ratified at Westminster in the April of the last year of WWI. The reaction in Ireland was immediate. Protests against the idea sprang up across the island and membership of the Irish Volunteers increased almost everywhere. In Fermanagh, Frank Carney trained the new recruits using what he'd learned in the Inniskillings. And, it was these efforts that brought Carney to the attention of Michael Collins. Collins from mid-1917 was Director of Organisation for the Irish Volunteers and his plan was to take the network of local groups and transform them into a national force. The 'Big Fellow' as he was known, insisted on weapons and tactical training, the sourcing of arms and full-scale administration.

Collins compiled lists of officers and weapons available to him and carefully drew up a detailed picture of the set-up across the entire country. Michael Collins also insisted on working personally with each of his commanders, especially through the Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB). The leadership of the secret, oath-bound body met at conventions in Dublin where all the leaders came together after meeting Collins face-to-face.

It was through these meetings that Collins would have learned of the capabilities of the young Frank Carney and it was to Michael Collins that Commandant Carney would have answered directly in terms of both the Irish Volunteers and the IRB. It was a relationship however that would eventually fracture in the heat of the Irish Civil War... (after) Carney had been appointed as one of the chief supplies officers for the Irish (Free State) Army."

"So, where and when did the switch to support for Eamon de Valera's anti-Treaty political party happen? The answer is this. During the Civil War on June 28, 1922, at Portobello Barracks in Dublin, Michael Collins was busy in the process of gathering troops and armaments for an assault on the city's Four Courts that had been taken over by the anti-Treaty IRA. As supplies officer Frank Carney was ordered to hand over weapons and other materials to be used in the upcoming attack. About to obey the order, Carney realised that the man getting ready to take the supplies away was a British Army officer at the Phoenix Park Depot.

It was then that it became clear that Collins' assault on the Four Courts was part of an alliance with British forces. Carney promptly refused to comply with the order and resigned from his job. Several more men under Carney's command also quit and all of them were

placed under arrest.

It was an action that his former comrades in the anti-treaty republican forces did not forget a decade later when Carney died suddenly of a heart attack in Dublin. The day after Frank Carney's death on October 20, 1932, Eamon de Valera and other members of the Executive Council of Dail Eireann carried his tricolour-draped coffin into St Andrew's Church... The church was crammed with dignitaries that included every member of the Irish Government benches and many members of the opposition as well. Representatives of Fianna Fail and the IRA from all over Ireland were also present in the church, with Dublin IRA providing a guard of honour who duly stood to attention around the coffin...

The Dublin newspapers reported that an 'immense concourse' took part in the cortege that went with the horse-drawn carriage, led by pipe bands, to Amiens Street Station. From there, a train packed with floral tributes carried Frank Carney's remains to Derry, stopping along the route to pick up more wreaths at Omagh and Strabane. At Derry the train was met by thousands of people who formed a cortege, which was again headed by pipe bands. A hundred of Frank Carney's old IRA comrades marched behind the hearse and took turns carrying the coffin for a few yards each.

The bitterness of the Civil War in Ireland was still very much in evidence, but personalities from each side set aside their differences, at least for a few hours, to accompany one of their former leaders to his (Derry City) home... At Derry City Cemetery, the lengthy graveside oration was delivered by Sean T O'Kelly—a future President of Ireland."

O'Kelly, one of de Valera's principal lieutenants, pronounced:

"If we would honour a man worthy of honour, let those of us who cherish true Irish ideals and honour patriots of our nation, best do so by trying to emulate men like Frank Carney, his courage and sacrifice."

Carney was a Treatyite Ffer who had backed Collins on the Treaty, but who then rebelled on realising the character of the war that Collins was about to unleash in order to enforce it. "*The Donegal TD who disobeyed a direct order from Michael Collins*" was the heading given by Sweeney to his account. Undoubtedly, in the history of Fianna Fáil TDs down through the decades, Frank Carney must be ranked among the noblest.

But now, from the sublime to the ridiculous—a present day Treatyite Fianna Fáiler. This past December 29th, under the heading of "*Brexit and the echoes of history*", a letter was published by the '*Irish Times*' which stated, *inter alia*:

"Brexit has surfaced a number of historical analogies of varying utility... For the season that's in it, I thought of one more that might provide some comfort for those who are anxious to see the withdrawal agreement get through Westminster on the week of January 14th, 2019. On December 6th, 1921, the Anglo-Irish Treaty was signed in London. This was followed by the famous Treaty debates in the Second Dáil. The debate was adjourned on December 22nd and resumed on January 3rd, 1922. On January 7th, the Treaty was ratified by the Dáil with 64 votes in favour, 57 against and three abstentions."

"Many historians have suggested that there was a notable change in approach after Christmas as citizens had pressed their TDs to avoid a resumption of war at all costs. One member of the Dáil resigned his seat rather than comply with the pressure being put on him by his constituents, and two more admitted that 'if the vote had been taken before Christmas, they would have voted against the Treaty, but they had decided, because of local pressure over the recess, to vote in favour'. A large section of the public viewed Éamon de Valera's document number 2 (a sort of Canada-plus) as not sufficiently different from the agreed terms to justify rejection."

"In effect, getting out of the 'bubble' of the Treaty debates in Dublin and being confronted with a widespread public anxiety to get on with their lives, the recess had had sufficient effect to ensure a narrow margin of victory for the pro-Treaty side... Theresa May clearly hopes that the 'immediate and terrible' consequences of no-deal will bear heavily enough on the British people and their representatives to get the agreement through Westminster..."

The letter was signed by Barry Andrews, in his capacity as Director General of the Institute of International and European Affairs. That letter struck me as odd and inappropriate, at the very least. The IIEA has hitherto not campaigned as to the internal affairs of another EU Member State. The IIEA is, instead, a serious source of research and analysis, as exemplified by its Brexit series. The IIEA Chief Economist, Dan O'Brien, is also an '*Irish Independent*' columnist, and one does not need to be in agreement with his conclusions in order to appreciate how his commentaries are both thoughtful and thought provoking. But this *ex cathedra* pronouncement from the IIEA Director General trivialised the issue, with its flippant and false historical parallels. And it was all the more inappropriate since he already knew that barely three days following its publication, he would be formally on leave of absence from the IIEA, as and from January 1st.

As for the flippant "*analogy*" in the Andrews letter: British Prime Minister Lloyd George's threat of "*immediate and terrible war*" if the Treaty was not signed in December 1921, had been all too real. But there was no threat of "*immediate and terrible war*" from the EU to the UK. Indeed, in a case of history mimicking a repetition of itself, not as tragedy but as farce, it was May's Government itself that, on March 13th, would now threaten "*Economic War*" on Irish agriculture, North as well as South.

During the Treaty debates in Dáil Éireann, Liam Mellows argued that, as the Republic already existed, it could not subsequently be set aside, Treaty or no Treaty. A fact was a fact, and "*we are not afraid of the facts. The facts are that the Irish Republic exists. People are talking today of the will of the people when the people themselves have been stamped*". Those advocating the Treaty were not doing so on account of its merits. Instead, they "*are in favour of the Treaty because they fear what is to happen if it be rejected. That is not the will of the people—that is the fear of the people.*"

It was not unreasonable of the people to fear "*immediate and terrible war*", and to vote accordingly. The problem is that war was precisely what the Treaty gave them. For what could have been a more terrible war than the *Cogadh na gCarad* unleashed by Collins, with his attack on the Four Courts? In the *Notes* that he penned justifying that commencement of battle, Collins sought to deny that it was war at all, attempting to fool the reader, and perhaps also himself to a greater or lesser degree, that it was not war at all, but was just some sort of limited police action:

"Met by this reckless and wrecking opposition, and yet unwilling to use force against our own countrymen, we made attempt after attempt at conciliation... The Irregular Forces in the Four Courts continued in their mutinous attitude... Having given them one last opportunity to accept the situation, to obey the people's will, when the offer was rejected the Government took the necessary measures to protect the rights and property of the people and to disperse the armed bands which had outlawed themselves and were preying upon the nation."

This Note was published posthumously in August 1922 as the opening chapter of Collins's '*Path To Freedom*'. As for the Treaty itself, Collins maintained:

"I did not sign the Treaty under duress, except in the sense that the position as between Ireland and England, historically, and because of superior forces on

the part of England, has always been one of duress. The element of duress was present when we agreed to the Truce, because our simple right would have been to beat the English out of Ireland. There was an element of duress in going to London to negotiate. But there was not, and could not have been, any personal duress. The threat of 'immediate and terrible war' did not matter overmuch to me... The British would not, I think, have declared terrible and immediate war upon us... I am not impressed by the talk of duress, nor by threats of a declaration of immediate and terrible war. Britain has not made a declaration of war upon Egypt, neither has she made a declaration of war upon India. But is the conflict less terrible because of the absence of such declaration? We must not be misled by words and phrases. Unquestionably the alternative to the Treaty, sooner or later, was war, and if the Irish Nation had accepted that, I should have gladly accepted it. The opponents of the Treaty have declared over and over again that the alternative to the Treaty was not war."

But if we accept Collins's assertion that he accepted the Treaty as a good deal, and not through any fear of "*immediate and terrible war*" from Britain, he certainly worked up such a fear in order to bully Robert Childers Barton, a cousin of Erskine Childers, into signing the Treaty.

I do not need to repeat here all the distortions of West Cork Republican history on the part of the late Peter Hart—and which have been so thoroughly exposed by the Aubane Historical Society—as any qualification before giving credit where credit is due. Of all the Collins biographers, it was Hart, in his 2004 biography '*Mick—The Real Michael Collins*', who provided the clearest narrative of how Collins himself would deploy Lloyd George's "*immediate and terrible war*" threat to secure Barton's signature:

"After more toing and froing, the Prime Minister, eager to close the deal, resorted once again to bogus yet mesmerising stagecraft. With a letter in each hand, he announced that one contained articles of agreement, the other a declaration of failure. The former meant peace, the other war—and 'war within three days'... Which was it to be? Griffith replied that he would sign, even if he did so alone. That was not good enough, Lloyd George declared—all would have to sign to avert a war... Barton, the most honest and reliable observer, has provided his own account: 'First of all, Collins and Griffith and Duggan were going to sign whether Gavan Duffy or I did, or not, and Lloyd George had said all five must sign, or war would follow... For three hours we had a most frightful battle in the delegation among ourselves, at which the most

terrific things were said to Gavan Duffy and to me by Collins and Griffith and Duggan. They called us murderers, stated that we would be hanged from lamp-posts, that we would destroy all they had fought for. The most terrible prospect was held out by Collins and Griffith to us.' ... Collins made the pessimist's case about their prospects in a second war: 'He stated that only 2,000 active Volunteers were operating and asked me (Barton) whether I wanted to send them back to be slaughtered'... Collins and the other two willing signatories got up to leave several times, but returned to the fray until, according to Barton, 'our opposition was finally broken down'...' (pp 316-9).

At the Cabinet meeting back in Dublin on December 8th:

"Griffith said he stuck by it all, and then the issue of duress emerged. Barton declared he would not go back on his signature, but said he had been 'intimidated' by the threat that he would be responsible for war otherwise. Childers (secretary to the plenipotentiaries, noted in his diary that he) was then astonished to hear Collins say 'he did the same (!)' (Hart's italics). In fact what he said was that 'if there was duress, it was only the 'duress of the facts'! ... What Collins meant was that he did not feel compelled to sign by Lloyd George's three-day warning, but he had to acknowledge the situation as it was: war and defeat would be the inevitable, unacceptable, alternative. He would return to this fine but (to him) vital distinction again and again in the following months... He would continue ... with a full defence of the Treaty as not just the best terms possible but a good deal in itself." (pp 325-6).

Lloyd George had threatened "*immediate and terrible war*" if the Irish delegation did not sign the Treaty on the final night of the negotiations, and Colonial Secretary Winston Churchill warned in writing, on 12th April 1922, that Collins had to choose between "*the threat of civil war, or of a republic followed by a state of war with the British Empire*". The former war was the one that Collins chose to fight. Hart related how the British Cabinet minutes of 16th May 1922, reveal that Collins had told Churchill "*he intended to fight and asked for 10,000 more rifles for pro-Treaty forces*" (p 386).

On 22nd June 1922, Churchill sent Collins a telegram demanding that he attack the Four Courts, and then went on publicly to declare that Britain would regard the Treaty as broken if this was not done. Collins duly obliged on June 28th. After four days of shelling, the Four Courts surrendered, but not before the shelling resulted in the destruction of the Public Records Office. "*If I refrain from*

congratulations it is only because I do not wish to embarrass you", Churchill wrote to Collins. "The archives of the Four Courts may be scattered but the title deeds of Ireland are safe."

The Free State War to disestablish the Republic having commenced, both Barton and de Valera rallied to the fight in its defence, under Cathal Brugha's command at O'Connell Street. Brugha finally ordered his Republican Volunteers to disperse, before fighting on himself, being fatally wounded on July 5th, and bleeding to death on July 7th. Peter Hart wrote of Collins's own death in action on 22nd August 1922:

"The guerrillas were not trying to kill Collins in particular, and many of those involved were sorry to have done so. Except for the outcome, it was just another ambush of opportunity in a war that would last another eight months, and consume the lives of Sean Hales, Rory O'Connor, Liam Lynch, Liam Mellows, Erskine Childers and hundreds of others. In personal terms, there is no reason to see Collins's death as any more tragic than any of the others that took place during the Civil War. If anything, as Collins was one of those responsible for starting the war and ordering men into combat, his killing was more justified than most, according to his own understanding of violence. Collins's death was a lot cleaner and made a lot more sense than many of those that followed. Among the first killed were four young republicans...picked up by gunmen four days after Beal na Blath, and driven to the suburbs, and murdered. A drunken revenge for Collins by former Squad men out on a Saturday night? It was as much part of his legacy as the Irish Free State that came into being two months later" (p 412).

This then was "*the immediate and terrible war*" trivialised by Barry Andrews, a onetime Fianna Fáil Minister. The *'Irish Independent'* of 15th October 2015 carried a photo of Andrews himself in turn holding up a photo of his War of Independence and anti-Treaty combatant grandfather Todd Andrews, alongside his Chief, de Valera. It reported:

"The former Fianna Fáil TD Barry Andrews, is captivated by 1916 and the role Todd Andrews, his grandfather, played in the early years of the State. 'He was a dyed-in-the-wool Republican, right up until the day he died', he recalls. 'I had begun my first year at UCD when he died, but I remember him well. Once, as for a laugh, when I was in London, I sent him a postcard with a photo of the Queen on it.' Andrews studied history at college and went on to be a history teacher before entering public life (he is now the chief executive of the GOAL charity). 'The beauty of history is that it's never black

and white and 1916, in particular, is rich with complexity. For a long time, the history taught in schools didn't look at all sides but it does now and today's students are fortunate for that."

Now, there is no particular reason why anybody should not be in political disagreement with either their grandfather or father. And I should be the last person to suggest so! Nor was there any obligation for Andrews to elaborate further in that interview, being out of politics at the time, as the then chief executive of GOAL. But that has now changed. The *'Irish Times'* reported this February 18th:

"Barry Andrews, confirmed as Fianna Fáil's European Parliament candidate for the Dublin constituency, hails from party royalty. His father, David Andrews, was TD for Dún Laoghaire between 1965 and 2002 and minister for foreign affairs on two separate occasions, including when the Belfast Agreement was signed in 1998... In his own political career, Barry Andrews (51), a barrister, served on Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council

between 1999 and 2003 and won a Dáil seat in Dún Laoghaire in 2002, when his father retired. He served as minister of state for children in his second Dáil term but lost the seat at the 2011 general election, which saw Fianna Fáil reduced to 20 TDs in the wake of the economic crash and EU-IMF bailout. After losing his Dáil seat, Mr Andrews worked as head of Goal, but resigned in the wake of a US investigation into the charity's multimillion-euro Syria operation. He subsequently took up the position of director general of the Institute of International and European Affairs."

That the purpose of his leave of absence since January 1st was to emerge once again as a Fianna Fáil public representative, and that it was preceded three days earlier by his letter expressing delight in the defeat of de Valera by the Treatyites, and that this questioning of that party's very *raison d'être* does not appear to have raised a single eyebrow in its ranks, does indeed say quite a lot about the Fianna Fáil of today.

Manus O'Riordan

100th Anniversary Part 15

The Russian Revolution

The Soviet State, when Lenin died in 1924, was irrevocably committed to building an industrial economy by socialist methods in a society in which ninety percent of the population lived in privately owned farms. It had been obliged, at the end of the Civil War and the Wars of Intervention, to establish a market for the farmers to trade in, and to allow some private capital to become active. This arrangement, the *New Economic Policy*, was a holding operation designed to buy time until the State could take things in hand and establish a collective socialist alternative to a multitude of private capitalists.

Seventy years later, when the State fell apart, General Volkogonov, the first historian who had access to the State Archives, said, in his biography of Lenin, that they had not understood that the NEP was only a holding operation, a "*tactic*", as he put it, to enable things to function until the State was ready to put things on a collective basis. It seems that this was something he came to realise from documents in the State Archive. But it was all there, as plain as daylight, in Lenin's speeches and pamphlets, that were published in vast quantities both singly and in the *Collected Works*.

The *Collected Works* had gone through five editions, and a sixth was in preparation

in the 1980s to consist of 70 volumes. The only explanation of why Volkogonov did not understand that the NEP was a "*tactic*" is that he couldn't read. It is not unusual to come across intellectuals with complicated modes of understanding and "*heuristic*" methods who do not take in the plain meaning of things that they pass their eyes over because that would be commonplace.

Lenin said clearly and repeatedly, with regard to the NEP, that the petty bourgeoisie tended to generate capitalism, daily and hourly, and that the State must be continuously active, nipping rising capitalists in the bud with the support of the less enterprising petty-bourgeoisie.

Russia under the NEP was a vast seedbed of capitalism. The State had to live with it, and make concessions to it, while preparing to over-ride it.

Bukharin had been the Left Opposition against Lenin in the critical matter of the Treaty with Germany. And then he held out for the continuation of War Communism, until Lenin decided that the peasantry which he had made owners of the land must be provided with a market. He then became a theorist of the NEP. He formed the governing bloc of the Central Committee, along with Stalin, while Left Opposition formed around Trotsky, which

Trotsky did not always acknowledge.

The Left Opposition held very faithfully, and very publicly, to Lenin's view of the NEP as a temporary tactic. It criticised the Bukharin/Stalin Government for becoming an agency of the NEP in its proclivity to generate capitalism. It condemned the "bureaucracy" developed by Stalin as General Secretary of the Party as a *de facto* instrument of capitalist restoration. There was talk of the revolution being overturned by a Russian Thermidor — Thermidor being the French Revolutionary month in which Robespierre was overthrown and the *Jeunesse Doree*, the gilded youth of the nobility, appeared.

Undoubtedly a fair degree of bourgeois life did emerge under the NEP. There was corruption, of course. There were millionaires. And no doubt there was a social life for the spoilt brats of the millionaires. But it seemed to me, as we were thrashing things out at King's Cross in the early sixties, that Lenin — who had given a lot of attention to the Robespierre affair — had accomplished his own Thermidor with a swing to the Right, by means of which he kept his State in being.

Trotsky conceded the necessity of the NEP to the State. But the attitude of the Left Opposition was, roughly, that even though it must be tolerated it should be harassed. But what Bukharin said to the peasants was: *Enrich yourselves*. The Left Opposition, which could not enter into the spirit of the 'tactic' was scandalised. But harassing the NEP while it was delivering the necessary goods made no sense to Bukharin and Stalin.

The Left Opposition, though it was within the leadership of the Party that ran the State, demanded a kind of right of organised faction. Trotsky would not tolerate the idea of forming a rival Party. But it was said that Lenin had tolerated Oppositions in the Party. Bukharin gave further scandal by the way he mocked this notion. He had gained the majority in the Central Committee on the issue of the Treaty with Germany but nevertheless Lenin had treated him as the Opposition. Lenin, he said, was tolerant of Opposition when he was in the minority against it.

During these years of the NEP Stalin, the bureaucrat who ran the Party, was "*the gravedigger of the Revolution*", restoring Capitalism under a flimsy guise.

Then, suddenly, at the end of the 1920s, Stalin committed the Party to abolishing the NEP. The reason for this was disputed. Was it because Left Opposition pressure within the Party became irresistible? Or was it because the tendency towards

capitalist development inherent in the NEP became so strong that it had to be dealt with sharply? Most of the Left Opposition did not quibble but became active against the kulaks who, realising their power, had tried to starve the cities. The Left Opposition programme was being implemented by Stalin, and what else mattered?

Stalin kept the State functional during the period when the NEP was feeding the cities and supplying raw materials for State industries, while at the same time retaining the capacity for arbitrary actions against the NEP when it appeared to be getting beyond control. The entrepreneurs had to be provided with a stable framework for their activities if they were to be capitalist suppliers of the goods which the Socialist State was not yet capable of producing. And Bukharin encouraged industrious peasants to enrich themselves while the cities could only be fed from the private market.

The Left Opposition case was that, in the hands of Bukharin and Stalin, the State apparatus had been absorbed into the functioning of the NEP. It had ceased to be an independent force which allowed capitalist development under close supervision for the time being, and had become an agency of capitalist development. It had forgotten that the NEP was a 'tactic' and had made it the future. And it was Stalin, the Chief Bureaucrat, who had done this.

If that was what was done, it would have been Stalin who did it. Bukharin did not do things: he thought about them. The Party was in Stalin's hands. It had come into his hands in Lenin's time. There is no doubt that he had a considerable aptitude for 'bureaucracy'. He had been Lenin's bureaucrat. At the end, Lenin tried to get it taken out of his hands. But nobody would try to take it. Certainly not Trotsky, who had scourged Leninism before 1917 as bureaucratism, and who did not see himself in the position of Chief Bureaucrat. But bureaucracy is a necessary function of state, and especially so in a revolutionary state in the process of being constructed.

Some of the reasons given by Lenin were trivial in the circumstances. One was that Stalin was rude to his wife.

When we were discussing these things, it was generally accepted that Stalin threatened Krupskaya that he would appoint somebody else to be Lenin's wife if she did not stop pestering him. The somebody else was Inessa Armand. At a certain point it seems that the transparently stoical life in Chernyshevsky's *Crystal Palace* ceased to be satisfying to Lenin

and he acquired a mistress who was kept secret.

Since the opening of the Russian archives in the 1990s it has been suggested that Lenin's last letters, dictated because he could no longer write, were forgeries produced by the personal group around him.

Whatever about all of this, nobody would undertake to remove Stalin from the General Secretaryship of the Party when it seemed that Lenin wanted him to be removed.

They could not do without the Chief Bureaucrat who made things work. And he was a very political bureaucrat — comparable in many ways to Britain's First Prime Minister, Walpole, who took over the '*Glorious Revolution*' and made it work as a State. And he was able to defend himself within the Revolution.

It was, however, not unreasonable on the part of the Left Opposition to suspect that the administrative ability that was applied to making the NEP functional, when maintained year after year, would become an administrative apparatus of the NEP. Bureaucracy tends to become addicted to routine, and would therefore be inclined to preserve the NEP. But the NEP could not be remade systematically into something else without the purposeful activity of the bureaucracy that had maintained it for five years. It could not be done by rebellion.

Only the organised civil power of the State, "*the bureaucracy*", backed by the police power, the KGB (founded by Felix Dzerzhinsky who came to Bolshevism from Rosa Luxemburg's party), with both acting under the direction of the Central Committee of the Party, could have done what was done in a few years at the end of the twenties and the beginning of the thirties.

"*Stalinism*", as we encountered it in usage in those discussions, was one thing in 1923-28, was a quite different thing in 1928-1933, and was a third thing after 1933.

If Stalin had made the NEP the permanent form of Soviet economy, and capitalism had become dominant, then Stalinism could have been reasonably summed up as *The Revolution Betrayed*.

But what title could one give Stalinism in the second period except *The Revolution Enacted*? It carried out the programme of the Left Opposition. And Trotsky, though he had distanced himself to some extent from the Left Opposition, had never disowned its programme. Its programme was his programme.

Then in 1933 we get Stalinism as Socialist—or at least Anti-Capitalist—industrial economy, comprehensively out of joint with the capitalist world economy. And it was this that Trotsky characterised as *The Revolution Betrayed*.

The implication of this characterisation is that the Revolution should not have been attempted. Socialism could only be built on a foundation of advanced capitalism, but Stalin's socialist revolution of 1928-32 undertook to do, by socialist methods, what capitalism had failed to do in Russia. And Socialism which undertook to build an industrial economy in a peasant society would be very different from a socialism whose starting point is advanced industrial capitalism. Socialism doing what capitalism should have done would necessarily have some similarity to capitalist industrialisation.

It could not be done piecemeal over many generations, as Capitalism had developed in its country of origin, England. It had to be done fast. Capitalism was world capitalism and was bearing down on it. Capitalist military assault had been warded off for the time being. But Trotsky insisted that capitalism had established the International Division of Labour in dominance in the world. It was relentless, and was resistible only by international socialist revolution. But international socialist revolution was not happening at all in the places where it counted: Britain, France, Germany, Italy. Capitalism had been stabilised by Fascism—a fact celebrated by Winston Churchill.

Capitalist pressure on Soviet Russia could only increase. Therefore socialist industrialisation was undertaken by rough and ready methods that were very different from the projected socialist ideals that had been spun within advanced capitalism.

Socialist industrialisation had to be undertaken amidst "*the bulks of actual things*" as they were in Russia. The case of "*revolution betrayed*" rested on its being undertaken on those terms, as far as I could grasp it. And what seemed to me to be a case against it having been undertaken at all.

The only book about Communism that I had read at the start of these King's Cross discussions was Saint Thomas More's, which I read in Slieve Luacra in my mid-teens. But I had some grasp of economics beyond Marx's *Capital*. I had been drawn into the subject through Archbishop Whateley's games with logic, which led me to the multitude of Anglo-Irish economists who speculated on the matter disinterestedly because England had not

let them have an economy of their own.

I had some sense of how things could be done and how they could not be done. And it was obvious that the development which was forged through basic industrialisation under external pressure would be very different from socialist ideals formulated within advanced capitalism. If that difference meant that Socialism was betrayed, then the betrayal lay in the fact that it was undertaken. And the best known Trotskyist intellectual of the time, Tony Cliff, who published a magazine called *International Socialism*, seemed to be saying, in some talks of his that I heard, that it should not have been undertaken. He held back from stating that as a conclusion, but it was implicit in the substance of his description of Russia in 1928.

Now, whatever it was that was constructed in Russia through the Five Year Plans and the Collectivisation, it was something that the capitalist world, in either its Parliamentary or its Fascist forms, was not willing to live with.

I should explain how it happened that Pat Murphy and myself became involved, as impartial outsiders, in a series of meetings whose purpose was to see if a common ground of indisputable fact could be established which would enable the Marxists of various hues that had been gathered together by Liam Daltun to act together politically.

This came about because of a magazine published by Pat in the Working Men's College in Camden Town. The WMC was an institution that ran evening classes on a wide range of subjects. Pat went to it to get some basic academic qualifications that he needed for an office job. He could not do labouring because of a physical disability, and that disability had resulted in him being almost as uneducated, though a Dubliner, as I was through sheer wilfulness in the backwater of Slieve Luacra. I went to the WMC because I passed it daily on a bus in which I was the conductor, was curious about it, found that it had Russian classes, and joined in order to get the hang of Russian pronunciation—my interest in Russian having to do with Pushkin etc., and not at all with Lenin.

Pat got the certificates he needed from the WMC, but its purpose was not basic education. It was founded, in the 1840s I think, to draw the working class, which was then on the rise, into the liberal culture of the bourgeoisie who had risen.

The founders were "Christian Socialists". Christian Socialism was a development within the Protestant revival that

was sparked off by the 1832 Reform that admitted the Puritan middle class to the corridors of power. The gentry undertook to civilise the Puritan middle classes into the gentry culture and the WMC aspired to extend this to the working classes, which were coming along behind the middle classes, and were held by Puritan culture for the time being, but were likely to break off and become a raw class force on their own.

Amongst the founders was the Rev. Charles Kingsley, author of *Westward Ho!*, who provoked one of the classics of English literature into existence with his assault on Henry Newman, who carried the revival of Christian culture through to the extent of becoming a Roman Catholic.

It was amongst the liberals of the Christian Socialist variety that the propaganda for war on Germany began. In 1870 France, with its superior forces and its history of military conquest, made war on Prussia for the purpose of stopping the unification of Germany, and was defeated by Prussia, with the result that the unification of Germany was speeded up. France was no longer the top-dog in Europe and therefore was no longer Britain's No. 1 enemy. Germany, by failing to be defeated by France, became Britain's potential No. 1 enemy.

It took about 30 years for the ruling class to reorientate itself and begin to make military preparations for war on Germany. The Christian Socialists led the way from the mid-1870s.

The Christian Socialists were reformers for the purpose of bringing working class development under the influence of Liberal Imperialism. British Imperial dominance of the world was seen as being necessary to internal reform in Britain. The signs of this were all over the place in the WMC.

After I got what I needed about Russian, I stayed on because the place was convenient in other respects. It had, for instance, a good, cheap, canteen in what was called The Common Room. But, in order to stay on, I had to take some other course. I took Divinity because I saw it was where ruling class types could be studied.

The millionaire philanthropists who ran the institution as a hobby liked to pretend that it was a kind of University, and then they made some reforms, probably in imitation of Oxford or Cambridge. Provision was made for the election of part of the governing body. Pat stood for election, and got elected. I wrote some jingles for the campaign. One that I remember was directed at the authority figure, a B. Sh.

Saklatvala, who was a member of the billionaire Tata family:

"A millionaire poet from Bombay
With his hair in contrived disarray
Always wanted to shout
As he strutted about
'What a fine handsome poet from Bombay!'"

Pat got a subsidy from the College Council for the publication of a "*Student's Magazine*" in rivalry with the staid house Journal. The attitude seemed to be: "They think they've got something to say but are being prevented, so let us give them the means of finding out that they really have nothing to say:." (This was almost sixty years ago when the means of producing printed material were nothing like what they are now.)

Well, the magazine was produced. Its title was a Chinese character meaning "*Words*". (I had discovered Arthur Waley's translations of Chinese verse.) It went through many issues, which were read, before we were all expelled by Saklatvala. (The expulsion was a relief to me. Without it I would probably have been drawn into helping Pat take over the College.)

The Magazine was not political, except occasionally at a tangent. Most of those who wrote for it were Irish. Some were, or had been, in the Communist Party. Others were anarchist, but by inclination rather than doctrine.

I wrote groups of epigrams under a pseudonym. One that I recall was "*The future is the inheritance of the epicene*". An epicene is a person of uncertain gender. So I can claim to have had some insight into what was fermenting beneath the rigorously staid heterosexual surface of England around 1960.

Liam Daltun came to the WMC in 1962 or 1963 to see if there was anything there. He had come through the IRA, the Communist Party, the Connolly Association, and, I think, Gerry Healy's seriously Trotskyist Socialist Labour League. He was taken by the Magazine, got on well with Pat Murphy, and asked Pat if he would go along and see if he could make something of the miscellaneous group of Marxists that had been got together. Pat asked me to go along. And Saklatvala made a contribution very soon after by expelling us from the WMC.

And so we became involved in Daltun's attempt to enable people from four or five different Marxist tendencies to form an organisation on the basis of an understanding of the Russian revolution that was

acceptable to all. The fact that Pat and I were outsiders, in the sense that we did not come from any established tendency, facilitated the exercise.

I cannot say how long these discussions continued. It was at least a couple of years.

All concerned in the first instance were wage-workers. The first salaried person who got sort-of involved, after we had begun to produce a magazine (*An Solas* [The Light]), was a *Financial Times* journalist, John Palmer, who claimed a family connection with Sean Treacy of the South Tipperary Brigade, and was a friend of Tony Cliff, the founder of the *International Socialism* Trotskyist group. I imagine that this was one of the influences that led to the break-up of our discussion group after it began to engage in little actions.

(One of these was a demonstration against some event at the Irish Embassy. There was a heavy police presence. Liam was selected out and taken away in a Black Maria. The following morning he appeared in the Magistrate's Court in a battered condition. The policeman giving the usual evidence against him (Newman?) was also in a battered condition (Liam was a house painter with a strong arm!). A few years later Newman appeared in Northern Ireland in a senior position.

Our public meetings at Hyde Park Speaker's Corner were observed by an Embassy man that I recognised as coming from my part of Slieve Luacra, Tadhg Feehan.)

Daltun began to be taunted with having let himself fall into the clutches of the Stalinists. This began with his friend, Gery Lawless, who soon became uneasy at the way the discussions were going. Lawless was a lightweight figure compared to Daltun, but was very sociable, with a wide range of acquaintances on the London Left. He himself had come under these taunts and was upset by them, so he set about upsetting Daltun by bringing the disapproval of the Trotskyist circles from which they had come to bear on him.

Through these discussions I was discovering the history of the Revolution and, insofar as I located myself within it, I was certain, with my disposition, I would not have lasted beyond 1921 in Russia, when the Workers' Revolt was suppressed in the way that revolts are usually suppressed. But nobody was of the opinion that the revolution ended and counter-revolution set in when the Kronstadt rebellion was put down.

In 1921 a workers' revolt was crushed and capitalism was restored and Trade Union organisation independent of the Party became a negligible quantity — with Trotsky himself advocating the formal "*militarisation of labour*". If these things were a continuation and development of the Revolution, what happened in 1923-4 that marked the ending of the Revolution and its replacement by something else?

Capitalism was restored in 1921 as a "*tactic*". This did not mean that some Party members agreed to play the role of capitalists in order to create an economy. It meant that capitalism was allowed to revive because the State was confident that it could crush it at an opportune moment, after it had recreated an economy and a working class. And that presumed a pretty comprehensive power and independent freedom of action on the part of the State. It presumed that the State was the totalitarian source of everything that was going to exist.

That was the Revolution in 1921-2. What happened in 1923-4 that changed things fundamentally? I could discover nothing, except that Lenin was disabled and died. But, if that changed everything, it meant that the Revolution had become a personal dictatorship — and that a competent new dictator was needed to operate the system.

Trotsky was of the opinion that there would have been no Revolution if Lenin had not got back to Russia in time in 1917. And Lenin had certainly dominated things until 1923. Was it probable, then, that the State would change — would become a democracy while retaining its character — when Lenin was removed from it? And why did Trotsky not exert himself to take matters in hand at that critical moment? Why did he leave it to others by taking a long holiday?

Trotsky's later account was that, though everything depended on one man in 1917, individuals were of no account in 1923-4. The world revolutionary surge was in recession and brought a mediocrity like Stalin to the top in Russia as its appropriate representative. If that was the case, what grounds were for the title of his book, *The Revolution Betrayed*?

Around that time, Tony Cliff was giving public talks at a Trade Union building in Soho Square, in which he emphasised the unpreparedness of Russia for socialism in 1917 — in terms of historical development it was where England was in 1640. The implication was that it would have been better if Lenin had failed to return to

Russia and there had been no Revolution. But he did not say that. And, since a Revolution was undertaken which could not succeed, what should have been done with it in 1923? Should it have been called off? Could it have been called off? I don't know if he addressed these questions later. In the mid-1960s he posed them effectively but did not address them.

Was there something that could be called "*Leninist democracy*" that was suppressed when Lenin died? I could find no trace of it. On the only occasion when there was a majority against him on the Central Committee (which was not a democratically-representative body of society, or even of the Party), he refused to recognise its authority, and he threatened anarchy — an appeal to the mass membership — in order to get his way.

These were the kinds of things that we discussed, and I discussed them at considerable length with Daltun. During these years I got married, and for a while we lived in a room that we rented from him in his apartment in Liverpool Road. (And I might mention that at another time we lived in a house in an exclusive area of Camden Town, Gloucester Crescent, that belonged to a Yugoslav millionaire with whom Pat Murphy had struck up an acquaintance — a Mr. Pavlovitch, who spent the Winters in Yugoslavia. The next door neighbour was the composer, Vaughan Williams.)

During these discussions I got a horror of "*dialectics*". I had read Plato's *Dialogues* when I was a Creamery labourer in Slieve Luacra and I'm afraid I regarded them as part of the Sophistry against which they were directed. And the dialectics that were deployed as a way of not dealing with the issues thrown up by the Russian Revolution, seemed to be nothing but a condition of mental confusion.

Lenin undertook a socialist revolution in the expectation that there would be socialist revolutions in Germany and France very soon, which would compensate for the lack of capitalist development in Russia. When European socialist revolutions did not materialise, he kept his socialist state in being by means of a restoration of Capitalism, which was to be crushed by the all-powerful State some time later. He died. A kind of oligarchy organised by Stalin directed the NEP system set up by Lenin until 1928, when it made a practical judgment that the point of No Return had been reached. It then abolished the NEP and established socialist

industry and agriculture, in accordance with Lenin's scheme.

Until 1928 there was the maintenance of a Socialist State on an insecure economic foundation in a single country. In 1928 the Socialist State set about constructing a socialist economy and society in a single country. Nothing happened in 1923-4, apart from the death of Lenin, that warranted describing the post-1923 situation in fundamentally different terms from the 1921-23 situation. All the sharp contrasts that were made between the two seemed to depend on seeing 1921-23 through rose-tinted glasses.

That was the point I reached in discussion with Daltun. He didn't like it, but it was where dispassionate probing of facts led us.

Was it the case then that the socialist revolution undertaken by the State in 1928 — the revolution for which the State had been maintaining itself since 1921 — was the great mistake, or the great betrayal, of the vision of 1917? But that could hardly be the case, since the Left Opposition had thrown itself into the revolutionary action that abolished the NEP.

It became all too much for Daltun. He distanced himself from what he had set in motion, but I don't recall any definite point of rupture with him.

We had reached the point that the Revolution, as envisaged in 1917, found itself in a *cul de sac* in the early twenties. The State maintained itself with Right-wing makeshifts until 1928. That could not go on for ever. Its major external effect was in China. Even if it was the case that the Chinese Revolution had been mishandled on Moscow's advice, that had no bearing on the question of building Socialism in Russia because China was even more pre-capitalist than Russia.

When it seemed that it could temporise no longer, the Government undertook comprehensive industrialisation by means of its own resources, and the collectivisation of agriculture. If that was the wrong thing to do, what was the right thing? Find a way of ending the Revolution, and try to find capitalists to hand over to, so that the ideal of Socialism as imagined in the euphoria of 1917 should not be tainted?

The second volume of Isaac Deutscher's biography of Trotsky made a great impression just then. It begins with a lyrical description of the euphoria generated by 1917, which opened the prospect of absolute freedom. This absolute freedom was ruined by Stalin, the seminarian pedant who could not rise to it. And Trotsky, who

was a personification of it, had neglected to harness it, and had become *The Prophet Unarmed*.

I did not see how absolute freedom could possibly have existed. What existed was power exerted "*amidst the bulks of actual things*" by one Interest or another. And Deutscher was enough of a historian that he placed Trotsky in the actual circumstances which he had not mastered, to such an extent that Trotskyists began to see Deutscher as having reasoned himself into Stalinism. (It seemed to me that Trotsky became a character in a novel that he was writing, rather than a history.)

Industrialisation was achieved. Trotsky said it was not socialist, but was a betrayal of Socialism. He never seemed to reach a definite conclusion about what it was.

Tony Cliff said it was State Capitalism. It was capitalism without capitalists. It was capitalism without commodity exchanges. It was capitalism constructed by the working class that was being created out of the peasantry.

The working class movement was not suppressed in this development. There was no working class movement. The working class that existed in 1917 used itself up in a few years in the making of the Soviet State and the fighting of the Wars of Intervention.

The working class that carried through the industrialisation was being created as it went along out of the peasantry, and was being installed as the ruling element through the medium of the Party.

"*Capitalism is world capitalism*", as Rosa Luxemburg said, and as Bukharin repeated though disagreeing with her reasons. And Trotsky said that the International Division of Labour in World Capitalism would have its way with Russia. Maybe so. Russia is capitalist today. But it is capitalist on its own grounds, which is not something that the dominant Powers of Capitalism encourage, or even tolerate.

If Soviet industrialisation was not socialist, as imagined by idealists in advanced capitalism, it was at least a comprehensive national development carried out in defiance of Imperialist internationalism which wants markets, not rivals.

It was made possible by the fact that the Soviet State, driven back to a small area around Moscow, recaptured the entire extent of the Tsarist Empire.

It had a cost, of course. Industrialisation, however carried out, always has an enormous cost. The difference is that Soviet

industrialisation was a cost borne at home, while British capitalist industrialisation was a cost borne by the world: by destruction and plunder in India, Slave Labour Camps in the Caribbean, Balance of Power Wars in Europe to ensure British supremacy over the world it needed for its development, etc. On top of that the quiet rural economy of England was destroyed by Enclosures—with displaced agricultural workers and their children, driven to work in factory slums—and which brought early death and cultural desolation. The position of Soviet workers—with State education, social services and culture—never plumbed the depths of the British slums.

The Soviet cost was accountable because it was all born at home, under the central direction of the State. British industrialisation was carried out by hundreds of thousands of private individuals of various kinds, under the protection of the Empire, but for which the Empire took no responsibility.

I know of no book in which this very obvious difference is dealt with.

Brendan Clifford

* **Pat Murphy, Social Republican**, Tribute to his Life and Work, 1937-2009, edited by *Philip O'Connor*. 64pp, is available from:

info@howthfreepress.com. **€10, £10**

Mindless Liberalism

An article in the *NY Review of Books* of October 2018 entitled *The Suffocation of Democracy* by Christopher R. Browning states the following, in a mindless anti-Trump piece of pseudo-history:

"Today, President Trump seems intent on withdrawing the US from the entire post-World War II structure of interlocking diplomatic, military, and economic agreements and organisations that have preserved peace, stability, and prosperity since 1945. His preference for bilateral relations, conceived as zero-sum rivalries in which he is the dominant player and 'wins', overlaps with the ideological preference of Steve Bannon and the so-called alt-right for the unfettered self-assertion of autonomous, xenophobic nation-states—in short, the pre-1914 international system. That 'international anarchy' produced World War I, the Bolshevik Revolution, the Great Depression, the fascist dictatorships, World War II, and the Holocaust, precisely the sort of disasters that the post-World War II international system has for seven decades remarkably avoided."

There, have, of course, been no World Wars during the last seven decades—but there have been a plentiful supply of wars during that period which have killed tens of millions all the same. Donald Trump hasn't started a World War yet or even started any war, to the best of my knowledge. That actually sets him rather apart from his predecessors. In fact, unless I have been missing something, he has even been attempting to wind up some of the wars of his illustrious and peace-loving predecessors.

But that is not the point of the matter. Every right-thinking person feels that the

current President of the US is the worst thing that ever befell the American people and the world in general so let us not waste our time disputing the matter. Our words would be wasted anyway on those who do not *think*, but only *feel*.

What is a more serious matter is the assertion that the Public Law of Europe of the 19th Century led to the catastrophe of 1914, and then the further catastrophes following on from that.

The *Public Law of Europe*? What on earth is that, you might say?

It was the system, built by all the Treaties concluded by the Great Powers and lesser States from 1815 onwards, during the period sometimes known as the "*British Peace of a Century*" (1815-1914). Or as the author calls it "*the unfettered self-assertion of autonomous, xenophobic nation-states*".

But surely, if the Public Law of Europe was so bad, how did it lead to the "*British Peace of a Century*", pray tell?

In fact, if we look at the Public Law of Europe, and ask why it produced, in the end, the catastrophe of 1914, and the catastrophes that followed, we find something quite interesting but disturbing for our Liberal totalitarians. We find that the "*British Peace of a Century*" was undone by a "*peace-loving*" British Foreign Secretary who subverted the Public Law of Europe in the interest of the Balance of Power.

Who says so? One of the most substantial Liberals of the late 19th Century/early 20th Century, William Thomas Stead.

W.T. Stead's main political ambition was to bring about an alliance between England and Russia—which he felt was the only way of securing the future peace of Europe and Asia. For decades he called for a revolution in British Foreign Policy and campaigned for it in books, newspapers and periodicals. But, when it was achieved, he began to notice something had changed that threatened the peace, stability and security of the world—which he also campaigned for as a good Liberal! He described it, started to expose it and tried to campaign against it, without quite putting his finger on the problem. And then he went to the USA on a speaking tour—travelling on the Titanic!

In 1911 Stead published '*Tripoli and the Treaties; or Britain's duty in this war.*' This was a book protesting against Italy's invasion of Ottoman Libya and asking why Britain was not lifting a finger to protest at or to prevent it.

Stead was outraged that Britain was unprepared to defend the International Treaties it had signed up to in 1856, 1871 and 1878—part of the *Public Law of Europe*: Treaties which guaranteed the integrity of the Ottoman Empire—and failed to follow through on its pledges to go to war to defend it.

Stead was no sympathiser with the Ottomans and described himself as having written more abuse of the Ottoman Turks than any man alive. He had always seen the British defence of the Ottoman Empire as a hypocrisy founded primarily on an anti-Russian position and, as a Gladstonian Liberal, he had been in favour of a "*bag and baggage*" policy toward the Turk in Europe. But he was outraged at what the British Foreign Secretary was doing to endanger the peace and stability of the World.

Stead was, of course, aware of the other hypocrisy he was himself engaging in—as a Briton criticising other nations for seizing foreign peoples' territories. But he saw something very momentous in Edward Grey's appeasement of the Italian aggressors, when previous British Foreign Secretaries had so often threatened war with much greater Powers, such as Russia, in defence of the same principles in Foreign Affairs.

Stead smelt a rat and instinctively knew that something that really threatened the peace and stability of Europe was afoot.

The following passage of Stead's is an argument which I had not come across expressed elsewhere, when I drew attention to it about 10 years ago. I thought I

was mistaken in seeing anything of significance in it. But I did feel it odd that the great anti-Turk went so far to defend the Turk on principle. And then, a couple of years ago, I found someone who also saw it as significant and referred to it in his writings for the *Continental Times*.

This was W.T. Stead's friend, Sir Roger Casement.

I think that, though Stead could not see the real reason behind Grey's actions in relation to the Ottoman Empire, he observed the momentous revolution in British Foreign Policy that was tearing up the Treaties on which the peace of Europe and beyond rested and which ultimately led to the Great War on Germany and Ottoman Turkey:

"The Treaty of Paris, of 1856,' said Mr. Gladstone, 'is the public law of Europe.' That law was reaffirmed at the Conference of London in 1871, and again re-enacted at the Berlin Congress of 1878. Great Britain took a leading part in 1856, in 1871, and in 1878 in defining and in defending this public law of Europe. It has been invoked time and again by successive Foreign Ministers of both parties to resist the isolated action of any Power in the affairs of the Ottoman Empire. It has been used repeatedly to silence the repeated demands made by the friends of Humanity in this country that something drastic should be done to suppress anarchy in Macedonia or to punish massacre in Armenia.

The doctrine of the European Concert formally embodied in the Treaty of Paris is that each of the great Powers binds itself to abstain from isolated action in the affairs of the Ottoman Empire. Any intervention must be collective. The Powers constituted themselves a Board of Trustees for the protection of the Sick Man's estate, and bound themselves by a solemn treaty to abstain from any isolated action. That remains to this day the recognised public law of Europe on which the peace and security of the modern State system depends... It absolutely forbids any isolated action by any single Power in any part of the Ottoman dominions, it guarantees the integrity of the Ottoman Empire and it expressly prescribes that in the case of any dispute arising between any of the signatories and the Ottoman Government, no recourse shall be had to arms until the other signatory Powers have had an opportunity to compose the quarrel by peaceable mediation.

The action of the Italian Government in suddenly launching an expedition to seize Tripoli, which is part and parcel of the Ottoman Empire, without offering any of the other signatories of the Treaty of Paris an opportunity to compose the dispute by mediation, was not only a gross breach of treaty faith, it was a

deliberate violation of the public law of Europe.

How was it met by the British Government? By protest, by warning, by remonstrance, by a declaration that Great Britain would not tolerate this breach of the public law of Europe?

Lord Granville in 1871, and Lord Salisbury in 1879 had confronted a much mightier Power than Italy, and that in a much more questionable quarrel, with the resolute statement that Great Britain was not prepared to tolerate the trampling under foot of the public law of Europe and the contemptuous tearing up of treaties to which the signature of Great Britain was attached.

But we are living in other days, when the spirit of Gladstone and Salisbury no longer inspires our Foreign Office. The action of our present Government appears to have been limited to issuing a Declaration of Neutrality!

Is this an adequate discharge of the duties and obligations of Great Britain in the present crisis?

That we have a duty need not be argued, because it has not been and cannot be disputed. Great Britain is one of the great Powers of Europe which has taken a leading part in the past—perhaps the leading part—in framing the treaties which embody the public law of Europe with regard to the Ottoman Empire of which Tripoli is an integral part. We have fought in one great war to secure the right to an equal voice in the settlement of all Turkish questions, and we have faced without flinching the possibility of having to wage war single-handed in defence of that right" (pp.9-11).

Writing about the Ottoman defeat in the war with Russia of 1877-78, Stead explained how the Public Law of Europe worked and how Britain upheld it to ensure observance to International Law, bringing the Russians to order by the threat of force:

"The war ran its course. The Turkish armies in Europe and in Asia were defeated, and the victorious Russians only halted at the gates of Constantinople. Before the Russians imposed their treaty of peace upon the vanquished Turks, although the British Government had declared its neutrality, it did not hesitate to intervene.

On January 14, in view of the reports which had reached Her Majesty's Government as to the negotiations for peace which were about to be opened between the Russian Government and the Porte, and in order to avoid any possible misconception, Her Majesty's Government instructed Lord A. Loftus to state to Prince Gortschakoff that, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, any treaty concluded between the Government of Russia and the Porte affecting the Treaties of 1856 and 1871 must be a European treaty, and would not be valid without the

assent of the Powers who were parties to those treaties.

With this warning before them the Russians concluded the preliminary Treaty of San Stefano, and sent it round to the other Powers with an intimation that portions of it affecting the general interests of Europe could not be regarded as definitive without general concurrence. But this did not satisfy the British Government. They insisted that every single article of the new *treaty must be submitted to the Powers for their approval*.

As Russia appeared to hesitate, the British Government beat the war-drum with vigour. The Reserves were called out, the Sepoys were brought from India; six millions were voted for military preparations; the British fleet was ordered to force the Dardanelles and anchor in the Sea of Marmora. Lord Salisbury, on April 1, issued his famous Circular, in which, after citing the Protocol of 1871, he declared in the most categorical fashion:—

'It is impossible for her Majesty's Government, without violating the spirit of this Declaration, to acquiesce in the withdrawal from the cognisance of the Powers of articles in the new treaty which are modifications of existing treaty engagements, and inconsistent with them.'

Threatened in Europe and in Asia with war by sea and land, and menaced also by Austria, Russia consented to recognise this extreme interpretation of the Treaty of Paris, and submitted her treaty, lock, stock and barrel, to be revised, mutilated, and transformed by the Congress of Berlin.

At Berlin the representatives of the Powers converted the Treaty of San Stefano into the Treaty of Berlin, and while doing so they expressly re-enacted the articles of the Treaty of Paris which were not affected by the articles in the new treaty. Among these re-enacted and doubly confirmed articles are Seven and Eight, which assert the principle of collective dealing with the Porte, which guarantee the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire, and which bind each of the contracting Powers to afford the co-signatories an opportunity of mediation before having recourse to force.

Here we have the plain, straightforward story of the public law of Europe as it was made in the first instance, and then emphasised and insisted upon by the British Government. We see how that the essential principle of the law of nations was formulated by a British Government in our own capital and accepted by all the Powers, including Italy. We see how, on the only two occasions on which their authority was threatened British Governments, one Liberal, the other Conservative, instantly asserted their authority and proclaimed their readiness to defend it by arms, with or without allies. In deference

to the energetic action of these British Governments, the principle has been unanimously accepted by all the Governments of Europe. Here, if anywhere, is the traditional policy of Great Britain. Here, if anywhere, we may expect to find applied the principle of continuity which has been proclaimed by successive Administrations of both parties" (pp.13-16).

Stead wrote about the way Britain had previously threatened war against anyone who dared threaten the Public Law of Europe, even though that might mean acting unilaterally against a most powerful State. But suddenly it was so different:

"We come, therefore, to the examination of the action of our present rulers with no room for uncertainty as to the principles upon which they were expected to act.

The public law of Europe specifically sets forth (1) that no Power having a dispute with the Porte shall have recourse to arms until after it has invoked the friendly mediation of its co-signatories; and (2) that no modification whatever of the existing arrangements of the Ottoman Empire shall be made without the concurrence of all the signatory powers.

How, then, has Sir Edward Grey applied these principles when he was suddenly faced with the intimation that Italy was going to war with the Turks for the purpose of seizing Tripoli?

We are, of course, left in the dark as to the action of the Foreign Office, and we can only infer what has been done or what has been left undone by the evidence of known facts, and the meagre admissions of the Foreign Secretary. What everyone would have expected would have been done if the Foreign Office had been occupied by Lord Palmerston, Lord Granville, or Lord Salisbury would have been a sharp unmistakable public intimation to the Italian Government (1) that her proposed action was a flagrant violation of the public law of Europe (Article 7 & 8) of the Treaty of Paris; and (2) that whatever arrangements she might attempt to carry out by force of arms in Tripoli would have no validity until they had received the concurrence of the signatory Powers. That much, at least, might have been regarded as certain. But Lord Palmerston or even Mr. Gladstone might have gone further and have intimated that if the Italian Government persisted in so high-handed a defiance of the essential principle of the law of nations, Great Britain would be compelled to consider the necessity of intervening to defend the public law of Europe.

That was what might have been done. If even the first stern warning had not been backed up by an unmistakable intimation that Italy might have to reckon with the British fleet, everyone knows the invasion of Tripoli would never have taken place.

But Sir Edward Grey did none of these things. He, the custodian of British honour, the keeper of the great trust which we have inherited from our fathers, does not appear to have uttered one word of protest, of remonstrance, or of warning.

Neither does he appear to have offered his services as mediator between Italy and Turkey. For a whole month the nation waited in vain for a single word of information as to what he was doing to protect the public law of Europe from this insolent and defiant assault.

...Unless our traditional policy was thrown to the winds and the principle of continuity abandoned, we had a right to expect from the British Foreign Secretary the very next day a declaration couched in the spirit, if not in the actual words, of his predecessors to the effect that the status of the African provinces of the

Ottoman Empire is by the Treaties of Paris and Berlin a matter which must be dealt with by the signatories of those treaties acting in concert, and that until their consent was duly had and obtained any alleged or attempted alteration of the *status quo* in Tripoli was *ipso facto* null and void" (pp.16-17).

Here lies the reason why the Public Law of Europe was undermined and led to the catastrophe of 1914, and all the events that followed. It was nothing to do with the *system*, which actually worked, and had kept the peace—relatively—for a century in Europe.

It was all to do with its subversion by the British Foreign Secretary, who, having instituted a revolution in British Foreign Policy, brought the whole house down.

Pat Walsh

Israel And The 'Song Of Bernadotte'

There's a forest in Israel dedicated to Eamon de Valera, by the Jewish community in Dublin in 1966 when Dev had still another nine years left. There's another dedicated to Count Folke Bernadotte, since 1952, four years after the Count's death. Both New York and Israel have forests dedicated to Raoul Gustaf Wallenberg, who disappeared in 1945.

The Jewish Community in Ireland has played a positive and significant part in the in the political, professional, cultural, legal, labour and industrial life of Ireland for a very long time. One of the longest Bureau of Military History Bureau Witness Statements (W.S. 707) is by the Solicitor Michael Noyk, born Lithuania 1884, who served as Solicitor for Arthur Griffith and Sinn Fein from 1912, campaigned for his election in 1917 and defended Republican Prisoners on trial for their lives in 1920 and 1921.

His statement includes material he prepared for the trials, material for which British troops, in contempt of all legal protocol, raided his office (in vain). Noyk helped run the Republican Courts, and also in acquiring buildings for the Ministerial Departments founded by Dail Eireann—which the British were trying to suppress. His funeral in Dublin in 1966, was attended by many thousands, including Taoiseach Sean Lemass and other veterans of the Dublin Brigade IRA.

The late President of Israel, the Irish-born Chaim Herzog, recalled in his memoirs the strong friendship between his father, Ireland's first Chief Rabbi, and

de Valera, who used visit his house with Robert Briscoe, when, if I'm right, the British were pursuing Dev with evil intent. I believe Dev used sometimes stay there, Robert Briscoe was a founder member of Fianna Fail, a committed Jew and a Zionist, who served more than two terms as Dublin's Lord Mayor. De Valera was never anti-Semitic, nor hostile to any nation, religion or race. But he was not a Zionist nor did he ever profess to be.

A story has been put about in an Israeli paper that Ireland and Fianna Fail are anti-Semitic and that Eamon de Valera was an Anti-Semite. I have sufficient faith in the decency and honesty of most Jews, indeed of most Zionists, that that story will be refuted.

It was written by a regular columnist in *The Times* of London, Melanie Philips, who sometimes moonlights for BBC Radio 4 as a contributor to *The Moral Maze*. It's amazing she hasn't the moral courage to fly her story up a flag-pole nearer London or Dublin and see if anyone salutes.

Both Raoul Gustaf Wallenberg and Count Folke Bernadotte were Swedish Diplomats and both put their lives on the line while war was raging in Europe to rescue numerous Jews from murder by the Nazis. (Unlike Frank Foley of MI6, neither ever visited Horst Wessel Haus at the Nazi's invitation, to transcribe the names of those disliked by them, lest they surface in Britain or her Empire.) Wallenberg disappeared in Budapest in 1945 and Count

Bernadotte was murdered in Jerusalem, together with a French Colonel serving with the UN, in September 1948.

Wallenberg is commemorated on at least three continents by statues, postage stamps, books, plays and has post-humously been awarded citizenship in countries far from Sweden. Stockholm and Copenhagen honour Bernadotte with streets named for him. I don't think the United Nations, whom he served has any memorial to him in the UN Headquarters.

A book of essays attributed to Gordon Brown devotes itself to profiles of courageous persons, including Wallenberg, but, Surprise? Surprisingly? — not a peep about Bernadotte.

If I were to put my name to a collection called "Profiles in Cowardice", I could not, in all conscience fail to omit Gordon Brown and Melanie Philips.

I see that the *Eurovision Song Contest* is coming up. Is there time to submit a Song for Bernadotte?

It might start –

"Who fears to Sing for Bernadotte,
Who blushes at his Name,
When cowards erase a hero's tale,
Who hangs their heads in shame?"

Donal Kennedy

Editorial Note:

Count Bernadotte was killed in 1948 in Jerusalem, while he was a UN Peace Mediator, by the Jewish terrorist group, LEHI (under the leadership of Yitzhak Shamir and others). At the time he was canvassing an alternative plan to simple partition for the future of Palestine.

An Open letter to Simon Kingston, West Cork History Festival

Dear Simon,

I was most interested in your recent mailing aimed at attracting paying friends of the West Cork History festival. Despite the steep price (€290 per annum) it is worth considering by community and historical organisations, if you could answer some questions about how the festival relates to the large geographical area of West Cork.

How does one go about applying for membership of the festival organising committee, what criteria apply in terms of nomination and election, how often does it meet (where) and who are the current members?

· Biteback · Biteback · Biteback · Biteback · Biteback · Biteback · Biteback · Biteback

Boycott Eurovision In Israel

As RTÉ prepares to announce its Eurovision entrant, the Irish Campaign to Boycott the Eurovision in 2019 in Israel reiterates its call for the broadcaster, the performers and all workers to heed the call from Palestinian civil society, echoed by over 16,000 people in Ireland and thousands more internationally, not to participate in this year's contest.

Given the shocking news that Israel's state broadcaster KAN will reserve 500 rehearsal tickets for Israeli soldiers, the claim that the competition is "a non-political music event" does not stand up; rather, it reveals it to be an explicitly political and militaristic event. On February 28th, as reported in *The Irish Times*, ("UN says Israel should face justice for Gaza protest killings"), the UN Independent Commission of Inquiry on the 2018 Great Return March in Gaza found that Israeli forces intentionally shot dead Palestinian civilians including children, journalists and medics, killing 183 and wounding thousands. The Israeli military has been repeatedly accused of war crimes by the UN and human rights organisations, and also routinely spies on LGBTQIA+ Palestinians in order "to extort/blackmail" and "turn them into a collaborator[s]", as revealed by former Israeli intelligence operatives in 2014.

The locations on the "visual postcards" to be broadcast between Eurovision acts will feature the occupied Golan Heights, and likely include the Old City in Palestinian East Jerusalem. It is clear that Israel intends to use the event to portray land that is internationally recognised as occupied and illegally annexed—including by the Irish Government, the EU, and the UN—as being part of the Israeli state.

It is absolutely unthinkable that RTÉ would facilitate or participate in providing entertainment to Israeli soldiers, or broadcast Israeli state propaganda that normalises its occupation.

Our campaign has broad support internationally and in Ireland from artists, human rights activists and public figures, including a former Eurovision winner, commentator and presenters: it also has the endorsement of the Musicians' Union of Ireland (MUI) and Irish Equity, and the NUJ Dublin Broadcasting Branch has committed to supporting members refusing to cover the contest due to Israel's "continued attacks on journalists and on freedom of expression".

This is the moment to stand on the right side of history and to heed the call for solidarity from the Palestinian people. We must refuse to take part in pinkwashing and artwashing Israel's decades long oppression of the Palestinian people. We must not participate in Eurovision 2019.

Zoe Lawlor, Betty Purcell

on behalf of *Ireland-Palestine Solidarity Campaign*
Irish Times, 8.3.19

I could only consider financially supporting such a venture if it could be demonstrated that it is democratically accountable to the community it purports to serve.

Your past reluctance to answer these questions, plainly put in a number of emails, was discouraging.

As you know, the Aubane Historical Society published material at a high standard, to coincide with the 2017 and 2018 festivals. In 2018, for instance, we published *West Cork's War of Independence*. It reproduced lively correspondence from the *Southern Star* and the *Irish Times* on the nature of the festival, on the showing of a flawed television documentary (*An Tost Fada*) and on Peter Hart's flawed history of the Kilmichael Ambush. As a result of an initiative by Tom Cooper, one of the correspondents, RTE heard about the 2017 festival showing of *An Tost Fada* and, as reported by the *Southern Star*, RTE insisted that it be edited to exclude mistakes RTE admitted, made by programme makers Eoghan Harris and Gerry Gregg.

Like the *Southern Star* we have an interest in promoting an accurate narrative on past events, in particular during the hundredth anniversary of the War of Independence and the 'Civil War'. As no one holds a monopoly on truth, unravelling what happened involves interpretation, debate and discussion. The best way to manage objective outputs is to ensure democratic inputs. Does the festival want people like us and others in West Cork inside the tent? Or does it want us to contribute from outside our understanding of absences in the festival programme and speakers list?

When the history of the West Cork History Festival comes to be written, I am sure you would wish it recorded that the festival was reflective of all shades of local opinion and organised accountable structures demonstrating that to be so.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours etc.,

Jack Lane

PRO, Aubane Historical Society
4/3/2019

Does It Up

Stack ?

BRITISH PARLIAMENT IN ACTION

We have seen on our TV screens that the Westminster Parliament when in action is a savage wild place. In the week ended 15th March 2019 there were several votes concerning Brexit and the conduct of members of Parliament was truly savage. The whole throng of MPs joined in full throated howls and roars of roar, roar, roar or wah, wah wah to drown out the speech of anyone they did not agree with. The MPs became in effect a baying mob.

There were some MPs who tried to appeal on one side of the argument and then actually voted against what they themselves tried to attain—this applies to the Tory Chief Whip himself who behaved disgracefully. What we were seeing, although it looked and sounded complicated, had a very simple explanation.

There are three motivating forces which cause MPs to vote one way or another. Firstly, it is the party whip—though in the foregoing case that went out the window. As W.S. Gilbert in H.M.S. Pinafore makes the Admiral famously sing:

"I always voted at my party's call, I never thought of thinking for myself at all. I thought so little they rewarded me"

The foregoing procedure is the normal method of voting at Westminster.

But with BREXIT it is different because, unfortunately, David Cameron, the former Tory Prime Minister, ill-advised by the then Attorney General or perhaps not advised at all, decided to hold a referendum of the people and the people decided by a majority vote to exit the European Union (EU). The people who voted were Scottish, Welsh, Northern Irish/British (from the North East of Ireland) and two very different voting blocks in England. One block being the city of London and South East Coast, which wants to stay in the EU, and the Midlands and North of England who want to leave the EU.

Feelings are running high among the voters on both sides and so this brings into play the second big reason why MPs vote a certain way—they want to keep their

seats at the next election and so they want to be seen to favour their voters' views, which they do by their speeches in Parliament—speeches that are publicly reported and widely disseminated through TV and the print/social media.

But the third influence on MPs is not public and that is the influence of the lobbyists who waylay the individual MP within the lobbies of the Houses of Parliament and in the eating/drinking places in the vicinity. The lobbyists make promises of donations, of travel trips, of farms and estates—whatever it takes to get the MP to vote for the lobbyist's employers.

On the BREXIT matter those most opposed to leaving the EU are the bankers, merchants, insurers, developers, property moguls of the South East Coast and of London in particular. These interests are used to getting their own way and they are prepared to pay well for it.

The lobbyists are there, present in the House, to ensure their money is well and truly spent when votes are taken. The voters are mostly not there and have to depend on the media to show what their MPs are saying and presumably doing.

But saying and doing are two very different things, as the MPs know to their advantage. And so all this hopping and trotting and humming and hawing by the MPs has the purpose of confusing the voting public and concealing what the MPs are actually doing.

There are many unfortunate precedents in the past. It was the London Merchants and the Property owners who did not like King Charles 1 because of his taxation policy so he was beheaded. Then later they got rid of the Lord Protector, Cromwell because of his creeping republicanism.

The London Merchants forced King James 11 to flee for his life and they imposed King William of Orange and Queen Mary on the three nations. There were the Peter's Field (Peterloo) Massacre of ordinary people by the Cavalry and the Pilgrimage of Grace whose leader was executed traitorously in London.

And so the probability is that the London supporters of staying in the EU may win this chaotic pandemonium charade in Westminster Parliament. And, if they do not, there is always the British Army. Hopefully it will not come to that. But the present *impasse* does not stack up and the London Merchants have serious form in these matters in the past.

When the Acts of Union were being passed by the English Parliament and the so-called Irish Parliament, there was wholesale bribery and corruption of MPs as named in the Red List and the Black List after that time. There were also 40,000 English soldiers stationed in Ireland when the Union was being passed. One MP at the time stated of Parliament: "*I have 40,000 bayonets pointed at my heart*".

And who would dare to suggest that it is not the same today—except perhaps in the ways it is executed! Leopards do not change their spots!

Michael Stack ©

LIB-FIB-LEFT-BEREFT

What do we call ourselves
when they steal our labels
with reason expelled.

They took the clenched-fist salute
and added it to their cognitive dissonance.
They fly as friends to make a war zone
where only the dead keep their beliefs,
the rest are ready to be honed
as they advance
their notion of a Western cargo cult
to their
post-traumatic-stress-disordered
dolts.

DRILL MUSIC

They rap of pain,
of revenge, of lost love,
jealously, blame,
regaining territory,
manors they once
had
as inheritory,
then buckle on their blades,
check the ammunition,
prime the guns
and
make a blood-spattered glade
where once lambs skipped
with joy.
But that's what makes heroes,
bawling threats
to annoy.
Hoods up now,
march to the rap:
Britannia Rules the Waves.
Not young blacks!
Not young blacks
filling
a desert cultural gap!
It's the British Army
with Drill Music.
Think anything else
and you're barmy.

WJ Haire
30.8.2018

Dáil continued

was Johnson's and following some textual amendments by O'Ceallaigh was put before the Dail and adopted. Johnson was overcome with emotion and was restrained by Cathal O'Shannon from loud applause.

Johnson was no great admirer of Pearse but had deliberately included his words in his draft. These were diluted by O'Ceallaigh. The historian and economist Patrick Lynch has encapsulated the draft of Johnson thus:

"There were indeed surprising omissions from the Programme adopted by the Dail. Johnson's draft had declared that 'no private right to property is good against the public right of the nation'— words ironically taken from Padraig Pearse in the *Sovereign People* on 31 March, 1916. Pearse was already being expurgated" (Patrick Lynch, Prof. of Political Economy, UCD) 'Overview' in Donal Nevin (Ed.) *Trade Union Century* (1994) p.163).

The Democratic Programme was read to the Dail in Irish by Piaras Beaslai, the deputy for East Kerry, 1918-1923, who had twice escaped from prison after the Rising and subsequently became a commandant-general in the army after voting for the Treaty. The Dublin Sinn Fein deputy, Alderman Tom Kelly, read the document in English; it was proposed by Richard Mulcahy and seconded by Con Collins. Michael Collins and Kevin O'Higgins were singularly unimpressed by the content of the Programme. Beaslai was a close confidant of both men. Nevertheless, there was no dissent on that historic occasion.

In 1926, Beaslai, in his compendium *Michael Collins and the Making of a New Ireland*, recalled this benchmark development during the proceedings of the First Dail. He wrote:

"The 'Democratic Programme', it may be remarked, was a very radical nature, or much so, that it is doubtful whether a majority of the members would have voted for it, without amendment, had there been any immediate prospect of putting it into force. Many would probably have objected to the communistic flavour of the declaration, quoted as "the language of our first President, Padraic Mac Phiaris" (P. H. Pearse), that "the Nation's sovereignty extends, not only to all the men and women of the Nation, but to all its material possessions, the Nation's soil, and all its resources, all the wealth, and all the wealth-producing processes with the Nation," and that "all right to private property must be subordinated to the public right and welfare." If any charge of insincerity could be made against this first Dail it would be on this score.

It is of note that those who drafted the Democratic Programme and those who adopted it held no prior consultations with the Church authorities" (*No Workers' Republic! Reflections on Labour and Ireland, 1913-1967*, Barry Desmond, *Watchword*, Dublin, 2009).

Brendan Howlin addresses Anniversary of the 1918 Election in Dail Eireann

"After the election, the Leader of the Labour Party, Thomas Johnson, was asked to write the Democratic Programme of the First Dáil.

The socialism of Tom Johnson's Democratic Programme is evident in its vision of the State's role in the economy, designed to bring all wealth-producing processes to serve the whole people.

It proposed an end to hunger and the lack of shelter, and the development of what became our social welfare system.

Labour's Democratic Programme was the plan to combat poverty and to share wealth more equally in the new Ireland.

In the First Dáil, women were finally emancipated to the extent of standing as candidates and some women being given the vote. Although it was not until 1922 that women got the vote on the same terms as men.

That advance for women's political rights was testament to the struggle of socialist suffragettes, including Tom Johnson's wife Marie, who actively campaigned for recognition of the rights of women, including their full political rights as candidates as well as voters.

That campaign continues today as political equality for women remains incomplete.

Labour's Democratic Programme underlined our commitment to the pursuit of progressive, socialist policies through democratic means.

With the achievement of a democratic and independent Irish parliament, Labour rejected the path of violent nationalism.

In later years, Labour provided the official Opposition in the 1920s Dáil, and so strengthened Ireland's fledgling democracy.

And in the 1930s, Labour facilitated the peaceful transfer of power between the parties split by the Civil War.

Throughout the twentieth century, Labour's Democratic Programme, written by the socialist Englishman Tom Johnson,

has provided a vision of decency, justice and equality that continues to inspire to this day.

Editor's Comment:

Of course Catholic Social Teaching was paramount in this whole development. *Rerum Novarum* [*Condition of Labour*] after its publication 1891 was a best-seller in every Catholic country, indeed, in many others, but especially in the post Cullen era and the rise of the new property owning tenants in Ireland. Poor Michael Davitt found that out when he suggested that the new proprietors work their properties on a lease-hold basis.

When the encyclical was issued in 1891, it was considered by many conservative Catholics to be revolutionary.

Some Fabian from Liverpool was never going to threaten their new found property status. They had gained what they wanted in the land war and now they were on their way to political control.

Mr. Howlin waffles on about the vote for women in 1918, what about the enfranchisement of millions of working men? Did that mean anything? Some Labour leader!

Barry Desmond writes that: "It is of note that those who drafted the Democratic Programme and those who adopted it held no prior consultations with the Church authorities." They didn't have any need, they would have understood *Rerum Novarum* better than many priests!

"All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in the countries where they live. They must penetrate, wherever possible, in the administration of civil affairs; must constantly exert the utmost vigilance and energy to prevent the usages of liberty from going beyond the limits fixed by God's law. All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of states and legislation to be modelled on the principles of the true Church" (Pope Leo XIII (1810-1903).

THE ROAD TO REALITY:

Next Steps Towards a Real Economy.

A successful model of trade union participation in running a State? 20 Years

of Social Partnership in the

Republic of Ireland

by Philip O'Connor

The End of Consensus Politics?

How can the Left solve the Economic Crisis?

by Mark Langhammer.

Published by Bevin Books.

Dáil continued

"That was Sean T. O'Kelly who read it the night before and realised it wasn't acceptable. I don't think that enough people in the Dáil, to judge by proceedings yesterday, are even aware of that.

"Mr. Doherty challenged especially the claim by Taoiseach Leo Varadkar that the assertion in the programme that "the right to private property must be subordinated to the public right and welfare" was a legacy of the Labour movement, reflected in how the Constitution enshrines property rights "subject to the common good".

"This is Catholic all over", Mr. Doherty said. "Anyone who thinks that the common good is a key tenet of socialism simply doesn't understand socialism, certainly at the time. Of course, it may have evolved over the time to appropriate that, but that would be far more associated with Catholic social teaching."

"The original Johnson text acknowledged no right to private ownership of property at all, Mr. Doherty said, pointing out that it spoke instead of trusteeship, and said that the nation could take possession of property "whenever the trust is abused or the trustee fails to give faithful service".

"Leo XIII's 1891 papal encyclical *Rerum Novarum* has specifically repudiated the socialist notion that there is no right to private property, while teaching that such a right could never be absolute, Mr. Doherty explained.

"Similarly in line with Catholic social teaching, Mr. Doherty said, "the element of duty is much stronger in the final text of the democratic programme than it would have been in the Johnson text, where the obligations were only owed to the poor.

"The democratic programme said that everybody has a duty to care for everybody, and that that duty falls especially on the rich because they're in a better position", he noted.

The failure to grasp the importance of Catholic thinking to the document is largely down to a backlash against the Church, he said.

"Certainly the reaction against the Church in recent decades is the reason why its important role in 1916 and its influence on the Democratic Programme of the first Dáil", is overlooked" (*The Irish Catholic*, 24.1.2019).

"LET it be taken for granted that workman and employer should, as a rule, make free agreements, and in particular

should agree freely as to wages; nevertheless, there is a dictate of natural justice more imperious and ancient than any bargain between man and man, that remuneration should be sufficient to maintain the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. If through necessity or fear of a worse evil the workman accept harder conditions because an employer or contractor will afford him no better, he is made the victim of force and injustice" Pope Leo XIII, (1810-1903) *Rerum Novarum: On The Condition Of Working Classes*

Gabriel Doherty. Letter to *Irish Times* Anniversary of First Dail

"Given its primary focus, there was an understandable omission relating to the role of Sean T O'Kelly in amending the Democratic Programme in Brendan Halligan's otherwise stimulating essay on the subject, as contained in your excellent supplement on the first Dáil. There were, of course, tactical considerations (well understood by O'Kelly) that had to underpin the wording of such a document. Michael Collins, for one, vigorously opposed any such explicit statement of social policy for fear that it would expose class and other divisions within the movement for political independence (between, for example, the recently created, and highly heterogeneous, owner-occupying farmer class and its landless labourer counterpart).

Beyond this, however, one must also consider possible philosophical influences that led O'Kelly to amend Tom Johnson's original text in specific ways into its definitive and final form. Comparing the two texts (as given in Brian O'Farrell's *The Founding of Dail Eireann*) it is clear that, consciously or otherwise, O'Kelly's emendations reflected elements of contemporary Catholic social thought, expressed primarily through his excisions from Johnson's draft.

Such omissions included references to class struggle; worker "control and administration" of industries; and two references to the power of the State to appropriate (in Johnson's words "resume possession [of]") property "wrongly used" - if necessary, without compensation.

An obvious exception, where O'Kelly went beyond Johnson's text, official Catholic thought, and considerations of tactical prudence, was, interestingly

enough, that subordination of all right to private property "to the public right and welfare" correctly highlighted by Brendan Halligan as the document's key phrase.

In view of James Connolly's ultimate *rapprochement* with Catholicism, might it be suggested (to the sound of a ball being hopped) that the necessarily rushed and ad-hoc fusion of some of the more attractive elements of Irish social thought and Catholic social doctrine articulated by the much, and unfairly, maligned Sean T was rather closer in spirit to the ideas of the towering father figure of the Irish Labour movement even than those suggested by Tom Johnson himself—truly one of the great, unsung figures of modern Irish history." Gabriel Doherty, Department of History, University College Cork. [23.1.2009].

"It is a capital evil with respect to the question we are discussing to take for granted that the one class of society is of itself hostile to the other, as if nature had set rich and poor against each other to fight fiercely in implacable war. This is so abhorrent to reason and truth that the exact opposite is true; for just as in the human body the different members harmonise with one another, whence arises that disposition of parts and proportion in the human figure rightly called symmetry, so likewise nature has commanded in the case of the State that the two classes mentioned should agree harmoniously and should properly form equally balanced counterparts to each other." Pope Leo XIII, (1810-1903) *Rerum Novarum: On The Condition Of Working Classes*

Barry Desmond on the Democratic Programme

"The first assembly of Dail Eireann took place on 21 January, 1919. Twenty-seven of the seventy-three Sinn Fein members were present; thirty-four had been jailed before the election in December, 1918, and eight were unable to attend. The twenty-six Unionist MPs boycotted the event. Partition was well on its way. Cathal Brugha acted as President for the imprisoned de Valera. The members approved the Constitution of Dail Eireann, the Declaration of Independence and the Democratic Programme. Sean T. O'Ceallaigh, on behalf of Sinn Fein, had been delegated to chair the drafting of the Democratic Programme in consultation with the labour leaders Johnson, O'Brien, O'Shannon and others. The original draft

continued on page 30



LABOUR

Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 37 No. 4

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

Democratic Programme of Dail Eireann

Dail Eireann—Proceedings, 1919-21.

We declare in the words of the Irish Republican Proclamation the right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland, and to the unfettered control of Irish destinies to be indefeasible, and in the language of our first President. Pádraig Mac Phiarais, we declare that the Nation's sovereignty extends not only to all men and women of the Nation, but to all its material possessions, the Nation's soil and all its resources, all the wealth and all the wealth-producing processes within the Nation, and with him we reaffirm that all right to private property must be subordinated to the public right and welfare.

We declare that we desire our country to be ruled in accordance with the principles of Liberty, Equality, and Justice for all, which alone can secure permanence of Government in the willing adhesion of the people.

We affirm the duty of every man and woman to give allegiance and service to the Commonwealth, and declare it is the duty of the Nation to assure that every citizen shall have opportunity to spend his or her strength and faculties in the service of the people. In return for willing service, we, in the name of the Republic, declare the right of every citizen to an adequate share of the produce of the Nation's labour.

It shall be the first duty of the Government of the Republic to make provision for the physical, mental and spiritual well-being of the children, to secure that no child shall suffer hunger or cold from lack of food, clothing, or shelter, but that all shall be provided with the means and facilities requisite for their proper education and training as Citizens of a Free and Gaelic Ireland.

The Irish Republic fully realises the necessity of abolishing the present odious, degrading and foreign Poor Law System,

substituting therefore a sympathetic native scheme for the care of the Nation's aged and infirm, who shall not be regarded as a burden, but rather entitled to the Nation's gratitude and consideration. Likewise it shall be the duty of the Republic to take such measures as will safeguard the health of the people and ensure the physical as well as the moral well-being of the Nation.

It shall be our duty to promote the development of the Nation's resources, to increase the productivity of its soil, to exploit its mineral deposits, peat bogs, and fisheries, its waterways and harbours, in the interests and for the benefit of the Irish people.

It shall be the duty of the Republic to adopt all measures necessary for the recreation and invigoration of our Industries, and to ensure their being developed on the most beneficial and progressive co-operative and industrial lines. With the adoption of an extensive Irish Consular Service, trade with foreign Nations shall be revived on terms of mutual advantage and goodwill, and while undertaking the

organisation of the Nation's trade, import and export, it shall be the duty of the Republic to prevent the shipment from Ireland of food and other necessaries until the wants of the Irish people are fully satisfied and the future provided for.

It shall also devolve upon the National Government to seek co-operation of the Governments of other countries in determining a standard of Social and Industrial Legislation with a view to a general and lasting improvement in the conditions under which the working classes live and labour.

Call to honour Church's key Role in fight for independence

(Irish Catholic, 24.1.2019)

"As politicians met this week for a historic joint sitting to mark the centenary of the meeting of the first Dail, UCC historian Gabriel Doherty has insisted that the influence of Catholic Social Teaching on the foundations of independent Ireland cannot be airbrushed from history.

"Commenting on speeches given in Dublin's Mansion house to mark the centenary of the first Dail, Mr. Doherty, who is historical consultant to the Oireachtas for the centenary programme, took issue with an apparently widespread belief among politicians that the first Dail's Democratic Programme was written by Labour Party leader Tom Johnson.

"They didn't seem to be aware that for all that Tom Johnson wrote the draft of the document, which he clearly did and there are clearly links between that and the final text which was endorsed by the Dail," Mr. Doherty told *The Irish Catholic*.

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
P. Maloney, 26 Church Avenue, Roman
Street, Cork City**

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>

continued on page 31