

IRISH POLITICAL REVIEW

March 2019

Vol.34, No.3 ISSN 0790-7672

and *Northern Star* incorporating *Workers' Weekly* Vol.33 No.3 ISSN 954-5891

Anti-Semitism And Islamophobia

An English girl went to Syria in order to live in the freedom that would exist there when the Assad tyranny was overthrown. She lived contentedly for a number of years in a region of Syria where the Assad tyranny had been pushed back and the freedom that was being asserted against it was in control.

But that freedom has now been destroyed and the Assad tyranny is dominant again and she wants to come home. But there is great unease in England, both in governing circles and in the populace, about letting her back in because she is a terrorist. She left a liberal culture to live in a society governed by Islamic Law. The dominance of Islamic Law in the region of Syria where she lived had been established through terrorist struggle against the liberal secular regime in Syria, also known as the *Assad Tyranny*. She was therefore a terrorist, if only in the sense of living contentedly in a system of Law brought about by terrorist action against the lawfully constituted Government of Syria.

Violent action against lawfully constituted authority—that's what terrorism is, isn't it? If the authority against which rebel action was directed was not lawfully constituted, and was an assertion of mere force, action against it would not be terrorist, would it?

The Assad Government was the lawfully constituted Government of the Syrian state, and the Syrian state was itself lawfully constituted, according to the only authority that exists in these matters: the United Nations. But the British Government, at the time when Shamima Begum went to live under Islamic Law in the rebel part of Syria, did not recognise the Assad Government as the legitimate State authority. It declared that the Assad regime was a Tyranny, withdrew recognition from it, and declared that the rebel Opposition to Assad was the legitimate authority in Syria. And that still remains the official British position, as far as we know, even though the State structure established

continued on page 2

Cathal Brugha And Brexit!

The *Dublin Review of Books* carried a review by Thomas Earls FitzGerald of *Cathal Brugha*, by Fergus O'Farrell (University College Dublin Press, 96 pp, €17, ISBN: 978-1910820278) on 1st February 2019. I have not read the book and this is a short review of the review. The reviewer is unremittingly negative about Brugha and says he—

"would disagree with his (O'Farrell's) conclusions but anyone interested in the Irish revolution should read this attractive and well-researched volume. O'Farrell argues that Brugha was political, but he never quite defines what he means by this. I will return to this question shortly. Whatever else he may have been, Brugha was certainly a particularly ineffective politician."

A major issue in the War of Independence was ensuring political control and direction over the armed struggle, because Ireland was politically leaderless at the time. Its political leaders were wiped

continued on page 5

February Brexit summary

Brexit needs to happen!

In the course of presenting a paper to the Royal Irish Academy in January of last year, a former administrative head of the European Commission, Catherine Day, recalled that, when it became clear in December 2011, a critical time in the Euro crisis, that the UK would not support a new EU Treaty that eventually became the Fiscal Compact, she had "*a shock feeling that no reasonable accommodation was*

possible" between Britain and the EU. From that time, she said, quoting former UK diplomat Ivan Rogers, movement in the direction of Brexit has been inexorable.

In truth the irreconcilable differences at the heart of the UK-EU relationship go back a lot further. Right from the date of British entry, there were different conceptions in London and Brussels about what

the EU should be. Feelings of abhorrence for the federalist objectives of the European project were shared by all sides of the political spectrum in Britain, including by many who are now staunch Remainers. Brexit is thus a natural political development that needs to happen. If by some mischance of politics it is averted in the next few weeks, the long term repercussions will be more adverse for both parties than the immediate adverse effects of its going ahead.

This article discusses the latest developments at Westminster and in the EU. It
continued on page 12

CONTENTS

| | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------|
| Anti-Semitism And Islamophobia. Editorial | 1 |
| Cathal Brugha And Brexit! Jack Lane | 1 |
| Brexit needs to happen! Dave Alvey (February Brexit summary) | 1 |
| Readers' Letters: History Of League Of Nations. Martin Mansergh | 3 |
| A Spooky British Fairy Tale: More Funny Than Grimm? Donal Kennedy | 3 |
| Godly Historians And God-Awful Revisionists. Donal Kennedy | 6 |
| LEST WE FORGET (3). Extracts from <i>Irish Bulletin</i> . This issue lists British Acts Of Aggression, 2nd May - 7 June 1919 (ed. Jack Lane) | 7 |
| Professor Cathal MacSwiney Brugha Speaks! Cathal MacSwiney Brugha | 10 |
| Es Ahora. Julianne Herlihy (Clair Wills and the Story She Tells (Part 9) | 11 |
| Dessie O'Hagan—Some Memories. Wilson John Haire | 15 |
| Northern Ireland Under The Microscope! Colin Patrick Gleeson (Review of Pat Walsh's <i>The Catholic Predicament In 'Northern Ireland'</i>) | 16 |
| Protectionism And 'Alien Penetration'. Manus O'Riordan (Lemass In The De Valera Era, Part 5) | 19 |
| Banking And Money Creation. Martin Dolphin | 22 |
| NAMA: A Pointer To The Future? Angela Clifford | 23 |
| The Russian Revolution. Brendan Clifford (Part 14) | 24 |
| Biteback: History And Political Violence. Tom Cooper. Tom Partridge (reports) | 28 |
| The Green Flag Flew, And The Red Flag Flew... Manus O'Riordan | 29 |
| Biteback: 'Should we stop building social housing?' <i>Jim O'Sullivan</i> (report) | 29 |
| Does It Stack Up? Michael Stack (Democracy—where has it gone?; National Children's Hospital) | 30 |

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

The Friends of Small Nationalities

Irish Worker, 12 September, 1914

(back page)

by the rebellion has been defeated and the Assad Government is back in control of most of Syria.

It would surely be relevant to the case of Shamima Begum, who wants to come home now that the State in which she went to live in Syria has been destroyed, to mention that Britain had de-legitimised the Assad Government and encouraged its overthrow, and had recognised the rebel Opposition as the legitimate authority in Syria. But there has been no mention of that fact, either by British politicians or British media commentators, or vox pops.

As we recall, the British Government at the time did mention an obscure and ineffectual group within the Opposition as its candidate for recognition as the legitimate Government. The group was allegedly liberal and secular in its aims. Whether it actually existed on a minute scale, or was a propaganda invention we cannot say. If it did exist, then it lived on easy terms with the Islamist groups which constituted the substance of the Opposition.

Comment on the Shamima Begum affair concentrated on ISIS. But, when it seemed possible that the Opposition would sweep away the Assad regime and take over from

it, there was no demonisation of any element within the Opposition as Islamist. The only demonisation was of the Assad regime.

If the Opposition had won, Syria would be an Islamist State, regardless of which group was pre-eminent. The liberal secular group would have been of no consequence. There were no liberal secular grounds for overthrowing the Assad regime, whose offence to the Opposition was that it was liberal secularist.

The ground for free party-political conflict within a liberal secular regime—which in effect is what is meant by "democracy" in Western usage—did not exist in Syria, and the overthrow of an existing liberal secular regime would have been a move in the opposite direction.

British democracy has now blotted from its memory what its Syrian policy was a few years ago. And it is now busily dehumanising the Opposition to Assad, which it then supported, without revoking its demonisation of Assad.

But public unease about Shamima Begum really has very little to do with this

aspect of the matter. What is disturbing is that an articulate English girl of Muslim background went to Syria to live as a housewife under Islamic Law, was content with that life until it was destroyed by external force, and only wants to come home because it has been destroyed.

Was evil inherent in her, or was she 'groomed' into it? Was she 'radicalised' by a devilish programme of indoctrination, and if so can she be de-radicalised and indoctrinated back into the English prejudices of the moment? Because it cannot be—it must not be—that her decision to go and live under Islamic Law was rational, and her experience of it as good must have been perversion.

And it is on those grounds that there has been free discussion of taking away her baby, should she return to England, to be brought up in a right-thinking English manner. Apparently, this has been done in other cases.

Shamima Begum's response to beheadings caused particular outrage. They were not in breach of Islamic Law, and she assumed that the authorities had sufficient reason for doing what they did. And is that not how the 'ordinary decent citizen'—about whom we heard so much from the BBC during the Northern Ireland War—regards actions by the authority which he sees as legitimate, even though others see them as self-evident atrocities?

England has a strongly developed national culture. It worked at reinforcing that culture, even while asserting its dominance over a large part of the world. It compared itself with the Roman Empire, but it did not dissolve itself into its Empire, as Rome did. It was a nationalism with an Empire, and it became more nationalist as it became more democratic. It became increasingly incapable of seeing that there was any valid way of life in the world but its own. The saying that was in common use not very long ago, that "*The wogs begin at Calais*", was one of those characteristically rueful English jokes that are not jokes at all. The word "*wog*" has been ruled out of order as inexpedient, but the sentiment is not less than it was when the word was OK.

The issue of Islam was given some consideration within British ruling circles in the late 19th century. There was a suggestion that it should be recognised as a major world culture and that provision should be made for its orderly continuation. But Christianist (i.e., Protestant) Messianism was still very strong in English culture—it was in fact coming into political power

as a consequence of the Reform Acts—and therefore a course involving the destruction of Islam was adopted.

It was Germany that had a foreign policy conservative of the Ottoman Empire for the purpose of giving orderly expression to Islam as a necessary element in the culture of the world. And it was the opinion of some well-informed observers that this German policy towards Islam, which obstructed the extension of the British Empire across Arabia, was one of the reasons why Britain decided to make war on Germany.

Britain conquered the Middle East region of the Ottoman state, began to construct it into an extension of the Indian Empire, but then changed its mind and set up a series of Arab nation-states which had no national foundations. It had, in the face of unexpectedly strong Turkish resistance, procured from the Islamic authorities in Mecca or Medina a declaration of Jihad against Turkey, while retaining the basic assumption that Islam was in the historical process of withering away.

Groundless 'nation-states'—nation states with no prior history of nationalism—were set up to function under Imperial tutelage: British in Iraq, Jordan and Palestine, French in Syria. At the same time, the Saudi regime extended its territory over Mecca and Medina, and would have extended northwards if it had not been stopped by British machine-guns.

Saudi Arabia is an Islamic State in the full sense. And it has the strength and prestige of being the only authentic Arab State, constructed by its own power. Imperialism has to live with it, but it is in no sense an Imperial contrivance. And the status of Western liberal condemnation of it is devalued by the fact that Western liberalism has repeatedly interfered by force to prevent any liberal regime from consolidating itself anywhere in the Arab world, the justification being that, though it is liberal and secular it is not governed through free party-conflict. Thus the only Arab state that is tolerated by the West is the Islamist theocracy.

There is of course a second religious fundamentalism in the Middle East that is not only tolerated by the West, but is actively supported by it: the Jewish State, Israel.

But Israel is a state conceived by the British Empire for its own purpose and given its foundation by the British Imperial administration. After thirty years of being supported and given life by Britain, it rebelled in 1947 and fought an all-out terrorist war against the British administra-

History Of League Of Nations

In the February issue of *Irish Political Review*, Donal Kennedy regretted that as a librarian in London he had never come across a history of the League of Nations, and in particular one that dealt with how Britain discharged the obligation of membership as one of the then Great Powers. There is in fact a two-volume very detailed and comprehensive history of the League of Nations published in 1950 under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) and written by a former Deputy Secretary General, F.P. Walters, who joined the organisation, having been a British official, and who stayed with it through the 1920s and 1930s. I believe he is quite critical of his own government, but, as I have only dipped into it, I cannot vouch for it.

There are some positive references to Ireland. With regard to the Assembly of September 1923, the history recounts: "The Irish Free State, established, after many tragic events, by the treaty of December 1921, put forward its request to join the League, and was accepted with universal pleasure". However, that universal pleasure did not extend to the UK, which had tried to discourage it from joining. The history also records de Valera's principled support for the admission of the Soviet Union in 1934. It states of the USSR's membership that between 1934 and 1939 it was "a convinced supporter of the League", and that "her record in the Council and in the Assembly, and her conduct towards the aggressive powers, were more consistent with the Covenant than those of any other great power".

Martin Mansergh, 9.2.19

A Spooky British Fairy Tale: *More Funny Than Grimm?*

Readers of my BLOG, "HITLER'S BRITISH FRIENDS" (15 February 2015, Jude Collins site) have already been introduced to MI5's Guy Liddell, and MI6's Frank Foley who accepted the NAZI invitation to the Party's newly acquired Berlin HQ, where, over several days in early 1933 they transcribed lists of persons whom the NAZIS disliked so that they might keep tabs on them if they surfaced in Britain or her Empire.

Those readers might be surprised that Britain's Prince William unveiled a statue of Frank Foley in London in the Autumn of 2018, having been persuaded that Foley had risked his skin to save Jews from the clutches of the Nazis.

Those who read London's *Irish Post* over the years, when it was unlikely to swallow Establishment Propaganda, will be surprised that in this matter they swallowed a fairy tale *hook, line and stinker!*

In its letter column I told the story of Liddell and Foley, much as I did in "HITLER'S BRITISH FRIENDS". And was contradicted by one Michael Smith, the author of a book on Foley, and one James Casement. I answered, quoting my source in the *London Review of Book*, a 10,000 word transcription of a talk given in the British Museum, entitled "*Stuck on the Flypaper*", which you can find on the net.

There's not been a peep out of Messrs Smith or Casement since.

Donal Kennedy

tion. The British Foreign Secretary of the time, Ernest Bevin, a Labour Trade Union boss, tried to check the Jewish rebellion, in order to implement the guarantees that had been given to the native population. He was condemned as an Anti-Semite by the Jewish-nationalist movement (Zionism) naturally enough. But the cry of Anti-Semitism was taken up by senior figures within the Labour Party and it was made impossible for Bevin to do anything but surrender to the Jewish terror campaign, the central event of which was

the blowing up of a hotel—the King David Hotel in Jerusalem.

The immediate consequence of the British surrender was a massive ethnic-cleansing campaign against the Arab population in the territory awarded by the United Nations General Assembly, under combined Soviet and American influence, for the construction of a Jewish State. In addition, Arabs were driven out of Jerusalem, which the UN intended to be an international city.

The non-Jewish population of the territory allocated to Israel by the UN was reckoned to be far too large for a Jewish State to be constructed in it. It was possibly a minority of 49%, but may have been a majority. Anyway, it was heavily reduced very quickly, and Jewish military power was extended beyond the territory awarded by the UN. It was further extended after later Jewish military offensives, and conquered territory was subjected to Jewish colonisation. The process of colonisation continues. And Israel has refused to say where its final borders will lie. It will not define them short of the Biblical borders, so it seems that there is a lot of conquering and colonising still to be done before the Jewish nationalist impulse that gives life to Israel can rest.

Support for Palestinian resistance to the ongoing Jewish colonisation, which is dispossessing families and destroying a way of life, has now been declared to be Anti-Semitic by Jewish authorities. And even exact historical description of how the state of Israel was formed is now Anti-Semitic. The leader of the British Labour Party has refused to apply this definition of Anti-Semitism to Palestinians who are resisting Jewish occupation and oppression, and that is now cited as a valid reason for MPs to betray the mandate on which they were elected and seek to destabilise the Labour Party by highly-publicised splintering.

The Jews are not the only victims in the world, nor are they only victims. In the Middle East, to apply the dichotomy of victims and perpetrators that is applied to Germans, they are perpetrators. And they were perpetrators, with the backing of the British Empire, *before* Hitler came to power in Germany.

But everything that they do in this line—past, present and to come—is justified by reference to the "*safe haven*" that Nazism proved to be a necessity for them. However, the safe haven which enabled them to survive was not Israel. Palestine, a country occupied by another people on which they imposed themselves by conquest, was more in the nature of a death-trap in which they can only survive by means of absolute military supremacy over all neighbouring states. (They have been described as "*the Prussians of the Middle East*". This is grossly unfair to Prussia, but is a reasonable comparison in terms of what *Prussian* means in English propaganda usage.)

The safe haven which enabled them to survive the 2nd World War was Commun-

ist Russia. Stalin opened Russian borders to Jews from Eastern Europe at a crucial point, allowing free entry. And it was Communist Russia that supplied the arms for the 1947-8 "*War of Liberation*". But, once the state of Israel was securely established, it aligned itself with the United States and it declared Communist Russia to be a hotbed of Anti-Semitism, with Stalin the worst of all.

Stalin, in the emergency of late 1941, gave priority to the Jews. Two and a half million of them were transported eastwards out of reach of the German advance. If Stalin had a trace of Anti-Semitism in him, he need only have treated the Jews as Soviet citizens like any other and let them be. Instead of doing that, he diverted resources from the War in order to save them.

If he had just let them be, there would now be no Jewish Question, and no Anti-Semitic Problem, because the Jewish presence in the world is the presence of the millions saved by Stalin and their descendants, and what they were enabled to do with Soviet support after the War.

The world that is now so concerned about the Jews, and which looks for traces of Anti-Semitism everywhere with a microscope, absolutely refused to take them when they were facing extinction.

Actual genocides cause no bother at all in the world. Nobody batted an eyelid when Gladstone's lieutenant, Sir Charles Dilke, boasted in his best seller, *Greater Britain*, that the English (the Anglo-Saxons) were the greatest exterminators of peoples the world had seen. Why should they? He only stated the obvious.

Stalin prevented a genocide of the Jews. That is why we're still discussing Anti-Semitism.

The major Gentile work about the Jews published before the Great War was Karl Kautsky's *Are the Jews A Race?* The right answer to the question then was: *No!* The Jews were individuals with a particular religious belief which was of no political consequence. The word "*race*" was then used interchangeably with "*nation*".

There were some who argued that the Jews did have collective existence as a distinct nation to which they were loyal, and that they could not therefore simply be loyal citizens of the other nations amongst which they were dispersed. That was the Anti-Semitic position then.

There was a movement amongst the Jews which asserted that they did have collective existence as a nation. That was

the Zionist movement. And the Zionists insisted that the Jews had national rights on Palestine where there was a Jewish State two thousand years ago, and that those rights were prior to the rights of the people who happened to be living in Palestine, even though they had been there continuously for centuries.

In 1917 Britain recognised the Jews as a nation, and by that act brought them into existence as a nation. Thereupon those who had been condemned as Anti-Semitic said: *We told you so.* And Britain further adopted the Zionist programme of making Palestine into a Jewish State. There is some ambiguity in the wording of the *Balfour Declaration* but Lloyd George, Churchill and others who had been involved in the making of the *Declaration* later said that the intended meaning was that Palestine was to become a Jewish State.

In the early 1930s, defending British suppression of Palestinian resistance to the Jewish colonisation, Churchill compared the Palestinians, the mere inhabitants of the territory, to "*the dog in the manger*".

The *Balfour Declaration* was adopted as a manoeuvre in the war against Germany. Its purpose was to turn the Jews against Germany, where they were feeling so much at home, and to bring the very considerable Jewish financial influence in the world—an Anti-Semitic thought nowadays—over to the British side.

Whether, as a matter of fact, the Jews were an actual nation or not in 1914 is debatable. What the Balfour Declaration did, and its adoption by the League of Nations, and the establishment of the Jewish Agency as a political power in Palestine under the British administration, was increase the influence of the Zionist organisation in its ambition to hegemonise Jewry and make it nationalist.

When the Jewish State was being established, there was a line of propaganda, designed to reassure Western opinion that its Jewishness would be merely nominal. But there were Jews at the time who said that, if the construction of a Jewish State proceeded, it would involve a revival of Jewish fundamentalism.

Over the decades the Jewishness of the State has gradually become more pronounced. A qualitative change happened last year, when the right of Jews to insist on Arab-free neighbourhoods was legally recognised, reminding some people in Britain with long memories (which could recall the day before yesterday) of the racist assertion of the right not to have a nigger for a neighbour.

That was when the campaign against Anti-Semitism was broadened to include things which it had never included in the past, particularly the application of liberal-democratic standards to the criticism of Israel.

The recent extension of the meaning of Anti-Semitism to include factual description of the colonising activities, past and present, in Palestine, of the Jewish Nation that was officially constituted in world affairs by the British Empire as a war measure in 1917—and was then in 1919 set on course for colonising of the British conquest of Palestine—is somehow connected with the decision of the British electorate, when consulted by referendum, to withdraw from the European Union, as well as with Jewish race legislation introduced in Israel.

The flock of MPs which has resigned from the Labour Party on the grounds that it is institutionally racist and Anti-Semitic and that its leader is not sufficiently hostile to the Brexit decision of the electorate, seems to consist entirely of members of the *Friends of Israel* organisation, and also to be Blairite in sentiment. Its components seem to be opposed to party-politics. They say it is 20th century and we are in the 21st century. They find party discipline and party programmes alien to the spirit of the new age. And parties consist of people with a wide range of opinions who are always arguing with each other on behalf of their own shade of opinion. And that is not the kind of organisation that Chuka Umuna wants to be in. But it is, unfortunately, the kind of organisation that made democracy possible.

The alternative is a Leader and his following. And that is what the Labour Party was under the amazing leadership of Tony Blair.

At one moment during that leadership, the idea was held by the inner Blairite group that governing by plebiscite could be a good thing. The party was putty in their hands, but it was nevertheless a bit of a nuisance, so why not bypass it and establish a direct connection between the Leader and the people?

Blair made a shambles of Iraq without even the fig leaf of a UN Resolution. And he did it in defiance of a million people demonstrating against doing it. But that was not why he fell. He won the next Election with Iraq having been reduced to a murderous ruin. The British electorate has never been much concerned about what its State does to foreign peoples.

Blair fell because he had made a deal

with Gordon Brown that they should take turns at being Leader. Brown insisted on having his turn. He was not charismatic. Party life resumed. The Tories won an election. The Government was bothered by a minority group in the Party that was making a case for leaving the EU. It decided to close the question for the time being by putting it to the electorate in the form of a Referendum, which is not quite a Plebiscite, but close to it. It took it for granted that the electorate would vote according to its advice, supported by that of the Labour Party and the Liberal Democrats. But it didn't

The populace voted against the elite. The elite denied that that was democratic and has been searching for ways to negate the Referendum.

A good argument could be made that a Government decision made by the populace is not democratic. The populace in a market system is not like a flock of starlings that moves as a mass and steers itself. There is a *Dialogue* by Plato, which is rarely referred to, that puts the case that the famous Athens democracy was actually a disguised aristocracy. And British electoral democracy, the most functional in Europe, is a diluted form of the aristocracy that built the state and governed it for two centuries. The Prime Minister is the King. But the rather shabby post-aristocratic elite, whose function was usurped by the populace to which a basic decision of state was irresponsibly put, cannot argue the matter straightforwardly in those terms, which are the terms that lie behind the chicanery that is rife in British politics now.

The Brexit question was put to the populace, and the election of a Labour leader was put to the mass membership, and an 'extremist' was elected. He is an *extremist* because he remembers too much and forgets too little of what the British State has done to the world in recent times.

He remembers how Israel was founded within living memory, and he sees that its foundation is not a historic event that is over and done with, but is still a colonial work in progress. He will not condemn the victims of the Jews today as Anti-semites or see the Jews only as having been victims a few generations ago, therefore he is an Antisemite. And yet he is in some respects an Islamophobe in agreement with those who denounce him as an Antisemite. He thinks that Shaman Begum should be prosecuted for the scandal she gave by going to anti-Assad Syria—the Syria from which the Tyrant had been excluded—just to live as a housewife under Islamic law.

Cathal Brugha And Brexit!

continued

out in the 1918 Election and armed resistance to the continuing British terror could easily have developed into anarchy. Brugha, as Minister for Defence, realised this—as did Terence MacSwiney—and ensured that the army became subject to the elected Parliament. This was a major achievement of Brugha's.

This democratic accountability was not pursued by Collins and the IRB, who continued to reckon on the tried and tested methods of conspiracy and assassination. They did not appreciate that due to the IRB's success in 1916, combined with British terror, a movement had been created that was far beyond the parameters of their thinking. A democracy of Republicanism now existed that would be limited and constrained by any further reliance on their methodology.

Democracy not conspiracy was now the *zeitgeist*. And Brugha personifies that. Obviously he did not shrink from any necessary terror and conspiracy but they were strictly means to an end.

The crucial differences between Brugha and Collins/IRB came to the fore over the so-called 'Treaty'. Brugha had argued for a neutral venue for—which would have made a huge practical difference to the way they were conducted. One need only imagine the difference in atmosphere if Lloyd George and co. had to go to Paris, Rome or New York!

When Lloyd George made his 'final' offer, that was discussed by the Irish Cabinet on 3rd December 1921, On the one side, Griffith argued for acceptance and putting it to the Dail and the people. Brugha, on the other, argued that, as the Cabinet was divided, such a move "*would split the country from top to bottom*". Collins did not take sides and talked nonsense. David McCullagh in his biography of de Valera puts it as delicately as possible: "*Collin's view was more confused*" and, on the crucial question of the Oath, "*he was ambivalent, pointing out that it wouldn't come into force for 12*

Britain, Zionism And The Holocaust by John Smith. 32pp. £6, £5
Serfdom Or Ethnic Cleansing? A
British Discussion On Palestine.
Churchill's 'Dog in the Manger' Evidence to the Peel Commission (1937). Intro: Angela Clifford. 48pp. £6, £5 postfree

months, and it might be worth taking that time" (p. 237). He seems to be the only confused person at the 7-hour meeting which provided plenty of time to clear up minds. Confused thinking is not the usual attribute associated with Collins. The reality was that he held the Cabinet in contempt and had provided a copy of the proposal to "the lads", i.e., the Irish Republican Brotherhood, and that is who he was listening to and taking advice from. The Cabinet was a sideshow for him and he treated it with contempt.

Griffith came to agree with Brugha and said he would not sign the Lloyd George document and that he would bring back any other proposed agreement before signing it.

Ironically the strength of Brugha's argument has now been borne out by the behaviour of the British Cabinet over Brexit. When the Cabinet agreed to a referendum, six members openly rejected the policy of the rest of the Cabinet. But they did not resign and were not sacked. This disoriented Parliament and the electorate and 'split the country from top to bottom' as we see every day. Brugha had predicted correctly that this would happen in Ireland over the 'Treaty' with a divided Cabinet.

The British Cabinet in 1921 was not so crazy as to expose their divisions to their Parliament, in asking it for confirmation of the same 'Treaty'. That would not have entered their heads as a Cabinet, which like the biblical house divided against itself will fall. But British Cabinets are not what they were.

Because the British were able to intimidate and divide the Irish negotiators, the divisions in the Irish Government/Cabinet became public—despite the intentions of Brugha and De Valera—and the First Dail was left in the absurd position of having to debate the 'Treaty' in the face of a divided Cabinet.

Parliaments do not, because they cannot, govern. They can form and support Governments, oppose them, criticise them, hold them to account etc., etc., but they cannot replace, or be, a *government*. But, in the Dail debates on the 'Treaty', a Parliament was asked to decide on the major policy of the day because the Cabinet/Government could not do so.

In this circumstance the debate was a cerebral exercise—the only Government reality present being that of the British Government's threat to recommence the war on an enhanced scale, if the offer was not accepted. In this circumstances, the

amazing thing is that the *Articles of Agreement for a Treaty Between Great Britain and Ireland* document was still only carried by a handful of votes.

FitzGerald, the reviewer, ignores all this and says: "*He (Brugha) did admittedly believe in the supremacy of the Dáil, and unlike many of his anti-Treaty colleagues believed that the people should have their say on the Treaty. However, he still fought against their decision*".

But the fact is that Brugha held that the Dail he had served abolished itself in accepting the 'Treaty'—which is strictly and legally true. Brugha really did believe in a free and independent Dail. That is why he opposed the rump parliament that created itself after the vote, in accordance

with the dictates of the 'Treaty'. Brugha was totally consistent. He could not support an independent Dail that had abolished itself and did not now exist.

And of course Collins, even after all this fall-out from him taking matters into his own hands, could not resist his penchant for assassination, in the killing of Sir Henry Wilson which was a crazy provocation in the circumstances and led to him having to obey Churchill's order to attack the republicans esconsed in the Four Courts—who were a totally innocent Party in the Wilson killing—and thus bring about a division in the Irish body politic to England's benefit. And the rest is history—as they say.

Jack Lane

See page 10 for Commemoration Speech by Cathal MacSwiney Brugha

Godly Historians And God-Awful Revisionists

In 1634 Seathrun Ceitinn completed *Foras Feasa ar Eirinn*, (A Foundation of Knowledge on Ireland), a narrative covering the days from the creation of the Earth to the arrival of the Normans in the 12th Century of the Christian Era. Ceitinn had been born about 1570 during Elizabeth's reign, left Ireland about 1603 after the Battle of Kinsale, studied for the Priesthood at the Irish College in Bordeaux, earned a Doctorate of Divinity there and returned to Ireland as a Priest about 1610 after the the disastrous Flight of the Earls.

Ceitinn wrote poetry and religious works but his most historically important was "*Foras Feasa*". He wrote it as a counter blast to the genocidal goadings of the English poet Edmund Spenser (1552-1599) and the anti-Irish slander of the 12th Century Giraldus Cambrensis which Spenser drew on in his own time.

In 1636 Micheal O Cleirigh, a Franciscan Friar, Cu Choigriche O Cleirigh, Fearfasa O Maol Chonaire and Peregrine O Duibhgeannaiin finished *Annala Rioghachta Eirinn* (Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland) a narrative starting with the Deluge, 2972 years after the Creation of the earth and ending in 1616 AD. They dedicated their work—*Do chum Gloire De agus Onora na h Eireann*. ("To the Glory of God and the Honour of Ireland").

Some of today's Snowflake Millennials and older know-nothings will be amazed that literate people believed in God, and anyone's duty towards Him/Her, Creation and an Earth only a few thousand years old. But the very learned Church of Ireland Archbishop of Armagh, James Ussher,

(1581-1656) Dubliner and Graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, had established, to his own and his generation's satisfaction that God had created the Earth in the year 4,004 BC. As a Christian, Ussher would have no quarrel with St Paul's urging—*Whether you eat, drink or whatever else you do, do it all for the Glory of God*.

Ignatius of Loyola, in the Basque region of Spain, died when Edmund Spenser was about four years old and was Beatified in 1609, the year of the Flight of the Earls. Members of the Order he founded, the Society of Jesus, had been advisors of Hugh O'Neill during the Nine Years' War, which helped inspire subsequent strugglers for Irish freedom. Ignatius was no 'plaster saint' but an ex-Soldier in the service of Spain.

The Society of Jesus quotes St Paul with the Motto—*Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam*—"To the greater Glory of God." Pupils in their schools head all their essays and projects *A.M.D.G. to this day*.

Perhaps members of the Society similarly dedicate their contributions to public discourse. But, to be brutally honest, or Honest to Jesus, I cannot believe it.

Because, when a member of the Society has solemnly, and falsely, declared, in the *Rite and Reason* column of the *Irish Times*, that Daniel O'Connell never shot anybody, and today conducts, in the same organ, an anti-historical, anti-democratic propaganda war, an appropriate response might be "*O.M.G.*" and a sprinkling of Holy Water.

Donal Kennedy

See also page 28, for other replies to Séamus Murphy SJ

LEST WE FORGET (3)

**The following are the Acts of Aggression committed in Ireland
by the Military and Police of the Usurping English Government,
during the week ending
June 14th, 1919.**

SUMMARY

| Date | Arrests | Raids | Sentences | Months | Armed Assaults | Suppressions & Proclamations | Unofficial Execution | Courts Martial | Daily Total. (Exclusive of terms of imprisonment.) |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|---|
| 9th | 1 | 8 | 2 | (5) | - | - | 1 | - | 12. |
| 10th | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | 2 | - | - | 4. |
| 11th | 6 | *3 | 2 | (2) | 1 | 2 | - | - | 14. |
| 12th | 1 | 5 | 28 | (7) | - | - | - | - | 34. |
| 13th | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | 5. |
| 14th | 1 | 1 | 1 | (12) | - | - | - | - | 3. |
| Totals | 11 | 20 | 33 | (26) | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 72. |

MONDAY, JUNE 9th, 1919.

Arrests:-

Mr. Michael O'Connell, Main Street, Thurles, was arrested and sent under strong escort to Cork Jail. The charge has not been mentioned.

Raids:-

Three houses were raided at Thurles, Co. Tipperary. The five Railway Stations in Cork were raided by armed police, late at night, and searched.

Sentences:-

Bryan Shanahan, Grantstown, Co. Tipperary, was sentenced to four months imprisonment for "being suspected of having an intention to commit an illegal act". The evidence against Mr. Shanahan was that he answered police questions in Irish and had possession of the key of a house in which two Irish Volunteers Uniforms were kept. Dr. T.F. Higgins of Maryborough was sent to gaol for one month for failing to admit police to a Language Movement Concert.

Murder:-

Mr. Matthew Murphy, shot on the 4th June by a sentry posted without notice outside Dundalk died of his wounds.

TUESDAY, JUNE 10th, 1919.

Raids:-

Armed police raided the house of Mrs. O'Mullin, Kilmallock, Co. Limerick. The police arrived at 2 o'clock in the morning and searched the premises for several hours.

Armed Assaults:-

Seven baton charges took place in Killarney. The local Aeridheacht was proclaimed and a crowd having gathered in the streets of the town were attacked by the police. Many were injured.

Proclamation:-

A football match at Tipperary was proclaimed by the Military authorities.

WEDNESDAY, 11th JUNE, 1919.

Arrests:-

Mr. Matthew Butler was arrested at Thurles Co. Tipperary. No charge was made against him. Mr. Thomas Shanahan of Knocklong was arrested by military and police. No charge was made against him. Messrs. Denis Murphy, James McKenna, Michael Callanan and D. Fitzgerald were arrested for collecting for the Irish Self-Determination Fund without a permit from the English authorities.

Sentences:-

Mr. Owen Sweeney, President of the Athlone Sinn Fein Club, and Mr. Michael Dillon, Sacristan, St. Mary's Church, were sent to gaol for one month on a charge of "unlawful assembly". The "unlawful assembly" consisted in attending a meeting addressed by Mr. Ginnell, Member of the Irish Parliament for the Constituency of Westmeath. The intention to hold the meeting was advertised for ten days but the proclamation suppressing it was not issued until the night of the meeting itself. There was then no possibility of preventing the people coming to the meeting. The police admitted that the people did not know the meeting was proclaimed and further stated that the crowd was quiet and orderly until charged by the soldiers with bayonets fixed.

Raids:-

The house of Mr. Mat. Butler of Thurles was raided by armed police and searched. Military and police raided many houses in the Knocklong district, Co. Limerick. At Rathnure and Clonmel Railway Stations raids and searched were made by the police.

Suppressions:-

A Labour meeting was being held in the Parochial Hall, Golden, Co. Tipperary, when the Hall was forcibly entered by a strong of police and military who ordered a dispersal of the meeting. At the threat that the military would use force if the meeting continued it was abandoned. Military with machine guns invaded the village of Ballylongford, Co. Kerry, to suppress a Republican meeting. The meeting was held secretly elsewhere.

Armed Assaults:-

Many people were batoned by the police at Thomastown, Co. Kilkenny, for cheering g the removal of political prisoners. Mr. M. O'Connell, Main Street, Thurles, arrested for having a revolver in his possession was brought to Cork under a military and police guard of 35 men.

THURSDAY, 12th JUNE, 1919.

Arrests:-

Patrick McCormack, Cappamurra, Co. Tipperary was arrested on a charge of being a person of ill fame, and a prominent member of the Irish Volunteers.

Raids:-

The Wagons containing the properties of Mr. P. J. O'Brien, Cinema proprietor and Dramatic entertainer, were held up and searched by the police. Three houses at Feahanagh, West Limerick, were raided and searched by armed police. The house of Mr. W. R. Gubbins, J.P., Chairman of Limerick County Council, was raided and searched by military and police.

Sentences:-

Twenty-eight residents of Clonmel, Co. Tipperary, including several members of public boards, were sentenced in their absence, each to 7 days imprisonment for collecting for the Irish Self-Determination Fund, without permit from the English authorities.

FRIDAY, JUNE 13th, 1919.

Arrests:-

Mr. James O'Keefe was arrested at Rathdrum, Co. Wicklow, by armed police.

Raids:-

Avondale House, Rathdrum, the home of Charles Stewart Parnell, was raided

and searched by a strong force of police. During the raid the town of Rathdrum was occupied by a strong force of military and police. Armed police raided the house of James Shannon, aged 19, who lives at Glenmore, Ashford, Co. Wicklow. The raid took place in the early hours of the morning and the boy's parents, sisters and brothers were put out of their beds while the search proceeded.

Proclamation:-

A Concert and Lecture to be held in the City Hall, Waterford, in aid of the Irish Labour Party, was proclaimed and suppressed by the English Authorities.

Court Martial:-

Patrick Quill of Drumnaculla, Co. Kerry was Court Martialled for having a shotgun in his possession.

Houses raided:-

The residence of Liam Mellows, M.P., 21 Mountshannon Road. Mrs. Mellows, mother of Liam Mellows, was the only occupant of the house at the time. The residence of Sean McGarry, T.C., 37 Philipsburgh Avenue, (Mr. Mc Garry while at the sea-side a few weeks earlier, after a severe illness, was visited by armed police at midnight, turned out of bed and had his bed and personal effects thoroughly searched). The residence of Mr. O'Loingsigh, 24 Reuben Road, South Circular Road. The residence of Mr. MacMahon, 10 Lomond Avenue, Fairview, father of Mr. Phil MacMahon, who was Sinn Fein Food Director in succession to Diarmuid Lynch, M.P. The residence of Mrs. Murphy, Albert Place, mother of Mr. C. Murphy, Manager of "Nationality". Fitzgerald's newsagency, 173 Gt. Brunswick Street. The raiding

party here consisted of seven armed detectives, accompanied by a military motor lorry. The residence of Mrs. Lynch, Richmond Road, Drumcondra, the second time in a few weeks.

Sentences:-

Patrick Quill, Drumnacurra, Co. Kerry, tried by Court-Martial was sentenced to a week's imprisonment for having in his possession a double-barrelled shot gun. Frank Gallagher, Sinn Fein Propaganda Department sentenced to four month's imprisonment for statements alleged to have been made in a speech at Myshall, Co. Carlow. According to the evidence he told the people "You owe no allegiance to any alien government. England has no more right to govern you than China. You belong to Dail Eireann, and whatever it asks you to do, you must do from a Christian as well as a moral standpoint."

SATURDAY, JUNE 14th, 1919.

Arrests:-

Armed police raided the house where resides Countess Markievicz, Member of the Irish Parliament for St. Patrick's Division, Dublin, and Mrs. Clarke, widow of Thomas Clarke (Signatory of the proclamation of the Irish Republic 1916, who although 74 years of age was executed by English Military). Countess Markievicz was arrested, no charge was preferred. She was taken alone in a special train from Dublin to Cork, under a heavy fully armed guard of military and police.

Sentences:-

James McCann, Loughrea, Co. Galway, was sentenced to one year's imprisonment with hard labour, for possessing a revolver and ammunition without permission from English authorities.

**The following are the Acts of Aggression committed in Ireland
by the Military and Police of the Usurping English Government,
as reported in the Irish daily press, during the week ending
June 21st, 1919.**

| Date | Arrests | Raids | Sentences | Months | Armed Assaults | Suppressions & Proclamations | Court Martials | Daily Total. (Exclusive of terms of imprisonment.) |
|------|---------|----------------|-----------|--------|----------------|------------------------------|----------------|---|
| 16th | 2 | Approx. 500 | - | - | - | 1 | - | About 500 |
| 17th | 2 | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 6. |
| 18th | - | - | 2 | (13) | - | - | 3 | 5. |
| 19th | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 20th | 1 | * | - | - | - | - | - | * |
| 21st | - | 7 | 2 | (4) | - | - | - | 9. |

* Number undetermined.

police. Mr. Lenahan, Rosnaree, in the same county had his house raided and searched. The Dublin residence of Mr. Harry Boland, member of the Irish Parliament for South Roscommon, was raided by a strong force of Military and Police. All private correspondence found in the house was read and all the personal belongings of Mr. Boland minutely examined. Mrs. Boland, the mother of the M.P., and her daughter were the only occupants of the house when the raid took place. The premises of Mr. Hoban, Newsagent, Parnell St., and Mr. Michael Brady, Talbot street, Dublin, were raided by armed police and exhaustively searched.

Armed Assaults:-

Mr. Martin Rice and his father Michael Rice, a man of nearly 60 years, and the father of eleven children, were shot by police at Ardatacole, Queen' County. The Police came at 1 o'clock in the morning to Rice's house "protecting" a process server who brought presumably a notice of ejectment. The father refused to admit the process server, and after an argument the police retired and brought with them two other process servers. The party then entered Rice's yard, and one of the police, a Sergeant Mattheson, ordered Rice to take the ejectment order. "Take it" he said "or I'll shoot you". Rice refused, and in the effort to prevent them coming into his house he was knocked down, beaten with the policemen's batons and the process servers' loaded ashplants. Martin Rice, the son of the assaulted man, declaring that he could not see his father being murdered, was rushing to his father's aid when his mother called to him "They'll shoot you". Martin turned round to speak to his mother when he was shot in the back by the police and fell unconscious into her arms. The old man who was at this time lying on the ground half unconscious from his beating, was shot immediately afterwards. No action has been taken by the Government against the police engaged in this dastardly assault. The English censor has refused to permit the publication of the full facts of this incident.

The Annual Feis (Language Movement Festival) at Kilmallock, Co. Limerick, was proclaimed by the English Military and police fully armed and accompanied by machine guns and armoured cars invaded the town and occupied the main streets. The Feis was not held, but a crowd which gathered in the streets that evening was savagely set upon by the police, and many were injured with blows from their clubs.

Among those wounded were many women and children. One woman who complained to a constable about the injuries inflicted by the police upon her brother who had served for four years at the front in the British Army, was herself batoned for making the protest. A U.S.A. Chaplain who was a witness to the occurrence said he had never seen such an attack made upon peaceful citizens. Military and Police numbering 3,000 Invaded South and West Tipperary. They were accompanied by armoured cars, machine guns and aeroplanes. The Glen of Aherlow was first surrounded and although it was 2 o'clock in the morning every house was entered and searched by English troops and police. The troops were in full equipment. One huge military force then proceeded through the entire district entering every house in it. Aeroplanes meanwhile manoeuvred overhead. Armoured cars and motor lorries went up the Tipperary Hills and brought down the herds that were minding cattle there and cross-examined them. The raid lasted all through the night. The English Censor also suppressed the full facts of this outrage on the peaceful people of Tipperary.

Treatment of Prisoners:-

The Westmeath County Council unanimously protested against the treatment of the Member of the Irish Parliament for Westmeath, Mr. Lawrence Ginnell. They declared that the Government while professing to uphold the rights of small nations could "not allow the people's representatives liberty even to walk under arrest without being manacled". The Galway council passed a resolution protesting against the treatment of prisoners in Galway Jail, stating that Messrs. Hoey, Stanton, Dogherty and Jordan, all political prisoners from Galway, had been deprived in prison of their clothes and bedboards and manacled. They also declared that Mr. Sheehy of Kiltimagh who was subject to epileptic fits was more than once found in his cell in a state of collapse.

TUESDAY, JUNE 17th, 1919.

Arrests:-

Patrick Halloran, farmer's son, Scallagheen, Tipperary was arrested. The house had been visited by Military and Police. Patrick Brennan, Meelick, Co. Limerick, was arrested at home by police and military. He had been "wanted for over a year".

Raids:-

Raids were made at the residence of

Mr. P. O'Keeffe, M.P., the business establishment of Mr. J. P. Atkins, South Circular road, and his private residence, Portobello, Dublin, the premises of Messrs. Donnelly, Welford Street, the residence of Seamus Hughes, Iona Park, Glasnevin, Dublin, and a number of tents of people camping out at Ticknock, Dublin Mountains.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18th, 1919.

Raids:-

During police and military searches in the Glen of Aherlow, Tipperary, a farmer at Ballycrane, Kilross, hearing the aeroplane at dawn, went out to see what was happening. He was stripped by the search party and examined for marks of wounds. Another farmer was taken out of bed and similarly examined.

Courts-Martial:-

Private Fox, of the Black watch, was Court-Martialled on a charge of having been guilty of conduct to the prejudice of military discipline. Evidence was given that at Knocklong, Co. Limerick, on the occasion of the rescue of a prisoner accused stood looking out of a carriage window and shouted "Up, de Valera", "Up, Sinn Fein". Maurice Crowe, Kilross, Tipperary, was Court-Martialled in Cork for having a document of a "seditious" nature in his possession. Defendant said he was a soldier of the Irish Republic and he refused to recognise the Court. James Barry, Gevagh, Fermoy, was charged with having a single-barrelled shot gun without a permit.

Sentences:-

Laurence Breen, Ballybeg, Tipperary, was sentenced by Court-Martial to 9 months' imprisonment with hard labour. According to evidence he was stopped and searched on April 27th, while cycling, by a patrol of police and soldiers, and was found to have in his person "documents" of a seditious nature. Countess Markievicz, Member of the Irish Parliament for St. Patrick's Division, Dublin, and Minister for Labour in the Cabinet of Dail Eireann, was sentenced at Mallow to four months' imprisonment on a charge of "inciting the people against the police" in a speech at a meeting in Newmarket, Co. Cork, on May 17th. The Countess was brought from Cork Prison with an escort of military and police, with an armoured car, and hundreds of soldiers in full war kit were drafted from Buttevant. A large force of police occupied the Courthouse. In a letter to a friend in Dublin from

Cork Gaol, the Countess said "I was taken from Dublin to Mallow in a special train, with a huge escort of military and police and two policewomen. At Mallow they went through a dress rehearsal of a trial for the benefit of the police so that they would get their story pat. They had changed the charge from the first warrant. Unless they change it again, I am now arrested and charged for advising the people to socially ostracise the police; for telling girls not to talk with them, and the boys not to drink with them."

THURSDAY, JUNE 19th, 1919.

Treatment of Prisoners:-

At Dundalk Urban District Council, the chairman said that a local man named Berrills was arrested five weeks ago. For three of the five weeks he had been kept in a military barracks. He had been taken from there to Belfast Jail. There he had been for a fortnight, denied visits from his friends, refused food from outside, and refused leave to smoke a cigarette. The worst feature of the case was that the man was kept in jail without a trial either by a military or a civil court.

Check out the FaceBook page, "**Irish War of Independence as it happened**", for previous issues of LEST WE FORGET - and recommend the site to your friends!

<https://www.facebook.com/FrankGallagher1919/>

FRIDAY, JUNE 20th, 1919.

Arrests:-

Mr. Frank Gallagher, Propaganda Department, Sinn Fein Headquarters, was arrested and removed to the Bridewell.

Raids:-

Many houses in Greenore district, Tipperary, were searched by military and police.

Treatment of Prisoners:-

The Mullingar District Council protested against the removal of Mr. Laurence Ginnell, M. P., in handcuffs to and from Dublin.

Raids:-

Military and Police raiding parties in Dublin had a field day. Seven premises, private houses and business places were raided and thoroughly searched. The search in every instance was thorough, every room and every article of furniture being examined. Pianos were taken to pieces, seats and cushions of chairs and sofas were prodded, wardrobes opened, beds searched, and occasionally roofs were visited. Apparently no incriminating "finds" were made.

Treatment of Prisoners:-

The Limerick Corporation protested against the treatment in Limerick Prison of a political prisoner named Moran who was imprisoned on December 2nd, 1918 and since December 8th, 1918 has not been heard of by his parents or friends. It was stated at the Corporation that criminal prisoners got tolerable treatment, solitary confinement was the treatment for political prisoners.

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

Volume 4, 3rd January 1921 to 16th March 1921: in preparation

€36, £30 paperback, per volume
(€55, £45 hardback)

POSTFREE in Ireland and Britain
<https://www.atholbooks-sales.org/>

Commemoration of 100th Anniversary of 1st Dáil, Mansion House 21st January 2019

Professor Cathal MacSwiney Brugha Speaks!

My name is Cathal MacSwiney Brugha. My grandfathers Cathal Brugha and Terence MacSwiney were both members of the First Dáil.

Terence MacSwiney was in prison, on this day, and over a year later was to die in the cause of freedom, when his daughter Máire was just two years old.

His daughter, my mother, successfully lobbied for the fiftieth commemoration of the First Dáil. Máire would be especially happy that we are celebrating our independence here today.

Today I also remember my father Ruairí, who inherited his strong, quiet, independent spirit from his father, Cathal Brugha, in whose place I stand today.

Cathal arrived at this meeting on a bicycle, because his wounds from battle in 1916 made walking difficult. He also gave his life within a few years of this meeting.

Many other people and families of that generation suffered and died, in the cause of independence.

Some of those elected stayed away because they supported British rule.

Others were in British jails and couldn't attend.

Some wanted to drive the formation of a new Irish state, with Irish people taking over as rulers instead of the British, which meant for many, Catholic rule instead of Protestant, and for some, socialist rule instead of capitalist.

Others were drawn by a vision of a democracy, where the Irish nation served the good of all the people actively, directly and independently.

Cathal Brugha began his address to the representatives elected to the First Dáil Éireann as follows:

Friends, we have important work to do today, the most important done in Ireland since the Gael came, and it is holy work.

We are all people who have hope in God, and interest in God's laws, and so

we should ask God for help in the work we have to do.

He asked, whatever their beliefs, that all present would offer a prayer asking for guidance.

De bharr gur chreid sé go raibh luachanna na Críostaíochta le braith níos láidre sa Ghaeilge ná mar a bhí sa Bhéarla, theastaigh uaidh go mbeadh an Ghaeilge in uachtar.

As we recollect the heroic generation that asserted Irish independence, we reflect on their dreams of uniting and serving the nation, and ending centuries of subjugation, but also on the divisions which followed, and have yet to be reconciled.

Today we have an opportunity to reconcile those strands of the nation who responded differently, and be inspired by those who had the vision and self-determination to serve the good of all the people actively, directly and independently.

One of the first acts my grandfather had to do as *Ceann Comhairle* was to manifest our independence by firstly declaring it.

A chairde, the Declaration of Independence... ■

".. if it has not been for the loyalty and friendship of Northern Ireland we should have had been forced to come to close quarters with Mr. de Valera or perish for ever from the earth. However, with a restraint and poise to which, I say, history will find few parallels, His Majesty's Government never laid a violent hand upon them..."

Winston Churchill 13th May 1945.

"Mr. Churchill makes it clear that, in certain circumstances, he would have violated our neutrality and that he would justify his actions by Britain's necessity. It seems strange to me that Mr. Churchill does not see that this, if accepted, would mean that Britain's necessity would become a moral code and that when this necessity became sufficiently great, other people's rights were not to count."

Eamon de Valera 16th May 1945.

Clair Wills and the Story She Tells (Part 9)

When Professor Clair Wills published her book *'That Neutral Island: A Cultural History of Ireland During the Second World War'* in 2007, she leaned into her academic discipline of *'Literary Studies'* and therefore gave a rather unusual perception of Ireland's war years. She can't be faulted for that—after all that is her *forte*. But there is no doubt that it skews the picture rather alarmingly when one realises that her sources are basically literary people and of course *'The Bell'*. To use the latter as source material for an analysis of the history of the period is, to say the least, very misleading. I have read a number of issues and I have to say that today many of the essays would never pass muster for publication and I could almost agree with the conclusion of Conor Cruise O'Brien who said of the magazine in a critique in 1946:

"In its caution, its realism, its profound but ambivalent nationalism, its seizures of stodginess and its bad paper, it reflects the class who write it and read it—teachers, librarians, junior civil servants, the lettered section of the Irish petty bourgeoisie."

Now with O'Brien there is definitely a hint of class *hauteur* which I wouldn't agree with and he gives no thought to the very unedifying aspects of forelock-tugging which, I maintain, imbues the magazine and is nowhere more evident than in the *'Bellman'* Larry Morrow's interview with Elizabeth Bowen. The introduction of this *'lady of the big-house'* is such awful sycophantic bilge that one immediately feels rather unwell reading it! And much worse, Elizabeth Bowen afterwards told her handlers in the Ministry of Information and Dominion's Office that she was able to get information out of

Morrow so that it certainly wasn't a one-way interview as Morrow thought. But one can hardly blame Morrow because, behind it all, was the Editor, Seán O'Faoláin, who was blinded by his infatuation with the 'Big-House' aristocrat.

In 1937, while working in London in the British Museum and also doing some teaching, O'Faoláin wrote a fan-letter to Bowen and they met and soon after that, they became lovers but by 1939 the affair—if it could be called that—was over. Initially, from letters to a former lover Humphry House, at Wadham College, Oxford, Bowen seemed to have quickly become infatuated with O'Faoláin, whose drooling over her seems positively nauseating. But for me, there is always that feeling that Bowen needed an entry into Irish literary and political circles and how propitious that it was O'Faoláin who could and indeed did provide that when the war commenced.

In his biography of O'Faoláin, Maurice Harmon conceded that, for the two writers:

"They spoke to each other across a religious, social, cultural, and racial divide, but they spoke as writers who knew that literature could, even should, transcend such divisions" (Italics—JH).

Through O'Faoláin's interventions, Bowen was inducted into the Irish Academy of Letters in 1937 and was put on its Council shortly after that and attended many of its meetings where she met the *literati* of Dublin. Indeed in a 12th July 1940 report to the Ministry of Information, she secretly acknowledged how important that first interview in *'The Bell'* was for her *Irish credentials*. (Italics—JH.) In that interview, she waxed lyrically about Cork. As Morrow was to write:

"If Elizabeth Bowen has any regrets in her life, which one doubts—it is that, in all other aspects a Corkwoman, she was born in the city of Dublin... I'm *frightfully* proud of Cork, she will tell you, screwing up her eyes... Ever since I saw Cork, as a small girl, I have regarded it as my capital city... As long as I remember I've been extremely conscious of being Irish—even when I was writing about such very un-Irish things as suburban life in Paris or the English seaside." (Italics—Morrow.)

Indeed. Even Bowen has to admit here that her writings were not about Irish things, which was why O'Faoláin begged her to write an Irish novel which he thought her more than capable of—but it was not to be. I have often thought that, with all the censorship going on, that it was very revealing that none of Bowen's books were ever censored. Surely the reason was that they were never conceived of being in any way Irish—but no literary critics seem to have thought about that very important point. As far as I know, only Jack Lane in his introduction to the Aubane-published *'Notes on Eire: Espionage Reports to Winston Churchill, 1940-42'* seems to have noticed her very English mien—writing in 1999:

"Her" (Bowen) "literary outlook, the themes of her books, and her characters derived from another culture. They were not influenced by the social life of North Cork, and they did not influence it."

Even Maurice Harmon saw the *"racial divide"* when he published his biography of O'Faoláin in 1994 (Constable & Co.) in London as attested by the fuller quote above. I have to admit that I never liked any of O'Faoláin's works and it was on re-reading this biography that my intense dislike of the man became even more pronounced. And Harmon was a great friend of his subject so I can only imagine what a disinterested biographer would have exposed.

There is a book, *'The Bell Magazine: And the Representation of Irish Identity'* by Kelly Matthews (noted on the back cover as the "Assistant Professor of English at Framingham South University, Massachusetts"), Four Courts, Dublin 2012, and it is unfortunate that it had not been published when Clair Wills wrote her *'That Neutral Island'* because it could have helped her frame O'Faoláin and *'The Bell'* much better.

After the war, when the Marshall Plan was announced—named after the then Secretary of State—the US offered Ireland \$18 million dollars but Trade Unionist Louie Bennett argued:

"that the Irish government should consider whether America wished, by offering aid, to secure Ireland's support for its future military campaigns"

—and this argument enraged Sean O'Faoláin who launched a campaign in the pages of *The Bell* arguing against what he termed the "*Autoantiamericanism*" of Bennett and her associates. O'Faoláin vehemently argued against what he saw as plain old—

"anti-American prejudices, which ... were based on British influences as well as on cynicism, suspicion and misapplied patriotism."

There was a lot more in this vein. But—

"Louie Bennett did not take this accusation lying down. She responded in the pages of 'The Bell' that she fully appreciated American contributions to human knowledge and human affairs and did not reject Irish involvement with the outside world." (Always a great canán from O'Faoláin- JH.)

Bennett—

"questioned American motives, however, as did other letter writers to 'The Bell', and speculated as to the return Washington would expect on its investment. Bennett insisted that the preservation of Irish identity depended on maintaining a healthy distance from American influence."

"Bennett based her objections on the assertion of Irish cultural, political and economic independence."

Another letter writer, D. Sevitt, described "*Marshall aid as martial and asserted that America wants to involve Ireland in her plans for conquering the world. She needs Ireland's ports and fields for naval and air bases.*" Sevitt closed by stating:

"It is therefore fitting that Louie Bennett, an Irish Trade Union leader, should warn the Irish people against America's real motives, against joining Wall Street's preparations for war and conquest."

Other letter writers concurred with Bennett. But O'Faoláin contemptuously dismissed their concerns as wrong-headed but in particular he labelled Sevitt as a communist and stated: "*In my heart I hate Communism.*"

And so indeed he should! After all, O'Faoláin, "who as a young man had spent three years in America as the beneficiary of a Commonwealth Fellowship at Harvard", knew where his bread was buttered and therefore acted accordingly. I now wonder whether he fellow writers knew of this very propitious part of his

education that necessitated such admiration for the American way of life.

Poor old Peadar O'Donnell, the Editor who succeeded O'Faoláin, tried his best to get into the open society that America was—as the latter attested—but his cards were marked and he was refused entry on the grounds of his "*Communism*". But Clair Wills, another beneficiary of American academic largesse with her Professorship in Princeton wrote:

"Despite his republican background, between 1942 and 1944 Peadar O'Donnell spent some time in England investigating conditions for Irish workers as the Fianna Fáil government's Advisor on Migratory Labour. He estimated in 1945 that there were a quarter of a million Irish workers on war contracts, in addition to seasonal migration."

Julianne Herlihy ©

To be continued

Elizabeth Bowen: "Notes On Eire". Espionage Reports To Winston Churchill, 1940-42; With an extended Review of Irish Neutrality in World War 2 by *Jack Lane* and *Brendan Clifford*. Fourth edition with extra items. 296pp. €24, £20

Brexit needs to happen!

continued

concludes with a brief review of Kevin O'Rourke's *Short History of Brexit* which places the subject in a much needed longer historical perspective.

WESTMINSTER DEVELOPMENTS

In last month's summary various Amendments to a neutral Motion from Theresa May were described. Those allowed by the Speaker were debated on January 29th. To the surprise and frustration of many anti-Brexit commentators, the Amendments that would have had the effect of enabling Parliament to assume control of the Brexit process were defeated.

The key Amendment, proposed by Labour MP Yvette Cooper, proposed that an extension to Article 50 must be requested in the event that a deal cannot be endorsed by the House of Commons. This was defeated because 14 Labour MPs from pro-Brexit constituencies voted with the Government, in the process cancelling out the 17 Tory MPs who were supporting Cooper. The size of this Labour revolt, if it can be called such given that it probably had the tacit approval of Jeremy Corbyn, was significant, as the number of Brexit

supporters on the Labour benches who have consistently voted with the Tories on Brexit matters has been half a dozen. Dominic Grieve's Amendment that would have allowed the holding of various indicative votes to ascertain the most widely supported option in the Parliament was also defeated.

The defeat of the Cooper and Grieve Amendments was a clear win for Theresa May, as was the passing of Sir Graham Brady's Amendment which proposed replacing the backstop with "*alternative arrangements*". The other successful Amendment—Tory MP Caroline Spellman's simple proposal that the UK should not exit without a withdrawal agreement—was meaningless in the sense that condemnations of unemployment without concrete proposals are meaningless; without an alternative option to a disorderly No Deal, it must necessarily remain the default outcome.

The end result of the Commons votes on January 29th was remarkable. A mere two weeks after suffering the largest Parliamentary defeat of a sitting Government in history, Theresa May had regained the support of the Commons for a slightly altered Brexit strategy, and the position of anti-Brexit rebels who had banked on "*Parliament taking control*" was shown to be weaker than expected.

In the following days and weeks a clamour filled the air waves on how Prime Minister May was now seeking to renegotiate a deal she had already agreed and how the negotiations could not be reopened. Downing Street replied that the deal had been rejected on January 15th and that a way needed to be found of circumventing the impasse. Meanwhile a new unexpected warmth was reported in relations between the Labour and Tory leaderships, a development that some pundits, over-optimistically perhaps, believe could allow a withdrawal agreement to be passed by the Commons. Then we learned on February 11th that the talks between the UK and EU negotiating teams had recommenced in Brussels.

In a subsequent Parliamentary show-down on February 14th, the British Government very nearly managed to undo its previous success, nearly but not quite. Instead of presenting a neutral Motion to Parliament noting her Government's continuing efforts to modify the backstop, Theresa May asked the Commons to reaffirm its support for "*the approach to leaving the EU expressed on January 29th*". This created a difficulty for the

Brexiters who had voted for the Brady Amendment but not that of Caroline Spelman. It is possible that the move represented a devious manoeuvre by Downing Street; had the Brexiters supported it they could have been reminded at a later date that they had voted against No Deal. In the event they abstained, the Motion was defeated by 45 votes and the Prime Minister suffered a setback.

The degree of damage caused by this to the British Government's negotiating stance in Brussels has probably been exaggerated by the anti-Brexit press. Denis Staunton of the *Irish Times* seems to be confident that the Commons will vote for an extension to Article 50 at the end of the month. He says:

"The Brexiters have weakened May's negotiating hand in Europe and diminished her chances of winning the concessions on the backstop that they are demanding.

For the EU, Thursday's vote is confirmation that last month's majority for the Brady amendment was a freak phenomenon and that the will of the House of Commons remains unsettled. EU negotiators have no incentive to offer any concessions to the UK ahead of a vote on February 27th, when MPs will be able to back an amendment that would force the government to seek an extension to the article 50 negotiating period" (*Irish Times*, 14 February).

A different view was provided in a British Government press release following the vote. It stated:

"The motion on 29th January remains the only one the House of Commons has passed expressing what it does want—and that is legally-binding changes to address concerns about the backstop. The Government will continue to pursue this with the EU to ensure we leave on time on 29th March."

Theresa May is holding to the course she set after the passing of the Brady Amendment. She is attempting to wring concessions from the EU on the backstop so that the Withdrawal Agreement can win majority support in the Commons from her own party and the DUP. If that strategy fails, the likely choice will be between requesting an extension to the negotiations and proceeding with Brexit without an agreement.

An interesting side story to the Government's defeat on February 14th was that the ten DUP MPs voted with the Government. Since the DUP has up until this point staunchly supported the Brexit position, that vote is something of a turn-up for the books. That the party may be

moderating its position on the backstop, as argued by Newton Emerson (*Irish Times*, 14 February), is unexpected. At the end of the day such a shift may turn out to be important beyond mere voting arithmetic when the final meaningful vote is called.

If on February 27th the Westminster Parliament votes to seek an extension to Article 50 in the formulation of Yvette Cooper, it will mark a victory for the anti-Brexit camp. However, a short technical extension of 3 months would be a different matter. Jacob Rees Mogg has argued that such a delay for the purpose of passing a withdrawal agreement into law would be acceptable but that "*to delay for the purpose of vacuous discussions would be solely to thwart Brexit*" (*The Telegraph*, 1 February). Similar sentiments have been expressed by Trade Secretary Liam Fox. In any case these matters will be resolved, by all accounts, on the next big Westminster occasion on February 27th.

Before leaving Westminster it is necessary to take account of a political event that may increase the volatility inside British politics: the defection of eight Labour MPs who have formed the Independent Group. That a Blairite grouping has decided to form a new party will be a welcome fillip for the supporters of Jeremy Corbyn. The decision to split from Labour has probably been triggered by a threat of de-selection now hanging over some such MPs.

The volatility may arise from pressure to join the Independent Group coming on centrist anti-Brexit elements in both main parties (three Tories joined the breakaway on February 20th). An editorial writer for the *Irish Times* considers that the split "*will make it even more difficult to stop Brexit*" (*IT*, 19 February) because it associates the '*people's vote*' demand with Jeremy Corbyn's detractors, and Corbyn may now see a concession on a referendum as a capitulation to such detractors. I am habitually sceptical of *Irish Times* editorials but there may be something in that.

EU DEVELOPMENTS

Following the defeat of May's deal at Westminster on January 15th, the prestigious *Halle Institute for Economic Research* in Germany conducted an investigation into the global effects of a No Deal Brexit on 43 countries. Based on estimated job losses, the research results (published on February 11, file:///C:/Users/Dave_2/Downloads/iwh-press-release_2019-03_en_harter_Brexit.pdf)

suggested that Germany would be worst affected, losing as many as 100,000 jobs, 15,000 of which would be in the BMW and Volkswagen companies. The assumption underpinning the research was that demand for EU goods in the UK would drop by 25 per cent because of tariffs.

While this sounds drastic, such forecasts are notoriously unreliable and, even if the predictions proved accurate, the affected economies (Germany, China, France, Poland and Italy, as well as the UK and Ireland) would easily survive the damage.

What has changed the calculations is an unexpected slowdown in the Eurozone economy in the last quarter of 2018. This has meant that a sudden exit by the UK at the end of March could add to other adverse global factors—tensions about a trade war between the US and China, worries about the Chinese growth rate, continuing problems over the move away from diesel for car manufacturers—in pushing the Eurozone into recession. The point is confirmed in the following quotation from the Open Europe blog of February 20th:

"This comes as Vice-President of the European Central Bank, Luis de Guindos, told French newspaper *Le Monde*, 'A disorderly Brexit would represent... a significant macroeconomic risk, at a moment when the European economy is already fragile', adding that a decline in the UK's GDP in case of No Deal would automatically affect the Eurozone."

This explains in part at least why the negotiations have resumed and why the chance of a modified agreement that meets some of the UK's concerns has increased. The headline statements about the negotiations being over and May having unreal expectations have turned out to have been a manifestation of Brexit '*noise*'.

This turn of events puts added pressure on the Irish Government. As Cliff Taylor put it:

"the Irish tactic of maintaining that a backstop is needed while simultaneously arguing that there are no plans to put a border in place in the event of a no-deal exit could face increased questioning" (*IT*, 16 February).

While there is no doubt that the stance of Varadkar and Coveney, by keeping Ireland close to the EU, represented a vast improvement on the pro-British position of their predecessors, it has the disadvantage of being based on developments outside of Ireland's control. In the light of all this, the subjects of conversation in the diplomatic channels between Dublin and Brussels at the present time are anyone's guess.

USING BREXIT FOR COVER

A spin-off from the main Brexit story a few weeks back was the manner in which Minister Simon Coveney chose to bring it into his case for voting down the *Control of Economic Activity (Occupied Territories Bill 2018)*. In his speech on the Dail Second Stage Debate on January 23rd he stated:

"We are not in a position to raise a barrier and declare that it is prohibited to bring to Ireland, for sale or personal use, goods which enter the EU legally, and are freely circulating elsewhere in the Single Market. This is the meaning of the Single Market—the defence of which is something which the EU takes very seriously, as we have seen in the context of Brexit. The integrity of the Single Market is in Ireland's overall interest" (Dept of Foreign Affairs website).

Fortunately this attempt to put a Brexit spin on the subject of illegal settlements on occupied territories around the world had no effect. The Bill passed Second Stage. An important article by Fianna Fail Spokesperson on Foreign Affairs and Trade Niall Collins on the issue was published in *thejournal.ie* on January 2nd. Labour leader Brendan Howlin gave the Government's case a commendable answer when he proposed that the State should be ready to argue the issue in the courts including the European Court of Justice.

KEVIN O'ROURKE'S BOOK

Like Tony Connelly's book on Brexit, Professor Kevin O'Rourke's short history is a valuable contribution to the Irish debate that will have strong international appeal. Given that he is an academic, his book is mercifully short and readable. Reading it I found the most valuable parts to be the historical context behind the mutual incomprehension between Britain and Europe that lies at the heart of Brexit.

Before summarising that useful information, I will briefly identify what I see as the main failing of the book. In describing the loopholes and inconsistencies in the Brexiteer position, O'Rourke focuses on the statement attributed to Boris Johnson that the *UK was determined to simultaneously have its cake and eat it*. In a rhetorical flourish O'Rourke refers approvingly to the term '*cakism*' to describe Johnson's approach and then applies it to the overall approach taken by the UK Government throughout the negotiations.

But how successful is Professor O'Rourke in avoiding thought evasions in his own analysis? When he argues in favour of globalisation in the form of

increased international trade, and then advocates political provisions to defend those who lose out as a result of such trade, is he not trying to keep a foot in both camps? Is he not himself a '*cakist*' in that instance?

Likewise he demonstrates very persuasively the fundamental incompatibility of the British and European approaches to cooperative trade arrangements and at the same time clearly considers Brexit to be a mistake. It is noticeable that he makes no reference to the British refusal to facilitate an EU Treaty that later became the *Fiscal Compact* in 2011. Nor does he provide detail on the damage to the EU caused by the UK's disruptive tactics over the years. He avoids the hard questions because his starting point is a wishful desire to see Britain adapting to European norms.

Nonetheless Kevin O'Rourke's contribution to various economic debates, especially since the Crash, has been valuable as has been his belief in economic history as an antidote to theoretical economics. When the prevailing view a few years back was that the Irish economy was a basket case until free trade was introduced in the sixties, he defended De Valera's protectionist policies and identified economic dependence on Britain as the key factor inhibiting economic development here.

The following paragraph roughly summarises his take on Brexit's historical background.

The consensus of opinion on the Continent and in the US in the 1950s was that a permanent means of preventing future European wars needed to be found: thus with US backing the Franco-German relationship became a driver of European integration (p. 4). Armistice commemorations in France and other Continental countries are occasions for celebrating peace and the common European identity, not so those in Britain (p. 6). In the crucial decade for the formation of the European project, 1945-55, there was a greater readiness to confront the reality that the age of Empires was over on the Continent than in Britain (p. 10). Pure free trade in Europe was seen as a threat to employment and welfare protections, therefore free trade arrangements had to be governed by supranational institutions (p. 14). If trade in agricultural products was to be liberalised, a European level agricultural protection policy (Common Agricultural Policy) was needed (p. 16).

As Britain industrialised and its popula-

tion rapidly increased in the nineteenth century it became much less agricultural than other European countries (p. 21). The abolition of the Corn Laws in 1846 was a decisive British move towards free trade and away from agricultural protection (p. 23). Defence of the Empire was a core policy of the British Conservative Party but also of a breakaway group from the Liberal Party, the Liberal Unionists (p. 24). Links with Australia, Canada and New Zealand were seen by the pro-Empire mainstream strand of British opinion as a vital strategic asset (p. 25). In 1903 the famous Liberal Imperialist politician, Joseph Chamberlain, proposed that Britain and her colonies adopt a system of preferential tariffs (p. 26). From that time the pro-Chamberlain tariff reform wing of the Conservative Party remained influential (p. 29). In 1932 Chamberlain's son Austen, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, introduced the protectionist system of Imperial Preference (p. 31). The system survived the Second World War and the international adoption of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) (p. 36).

There is enough in the above to show that Britain and Europe are like oil and water on the critical issues at the core of the European Union. That O'Rourke understands these matters but still opposes Brexit is not surprising. Inconsistent and apolitical thinking is now common among large sections of the liberal European elite and he is most definitely a representative member of that elite.

If the current negotiations result in a long extension of Article 50, followed by an unravelling of the entire project, the EU will be left as an international bloc permanently pulled in contrary directions. But the European Commission seems to be incapable of thinking about such matters. As a technocratic body, its priority is to focus on the loss of revenue that Britain leaving the Customs Union will cause and the loss of Budgetary contributions that Britain leaving the Single Market will cause. On the other hand, the European Council, operating in a permanent state of intergovernmental tensions, rivalries and worries about domestic election results is equally tied to a short term perspective.

The next few weeks will probably be the critical time for Brexit. The important question is: will Brussels have the backbone to ensure that the necessary parting of the ways with London actually happens?

Dave Alvey

Dessie O'Hagan—Some Memories.

An academic treatise on Saor Uladh, 1951-1959, by Walter Leonhardt circulated recently on Academia. edu brought back memories of that organisation and Dessie O'Hagan who was involved with it—mostly on the political side.

He invited a delegation from the Young Workers League (the youth section of the Communist Party of Northern Ireland) to visit St Mary's Hall, Lower Falls, Belfast, where an Irish dance was in progress. There was some hostility from his comrades as he showed us around. We didn't get a chance to discuss politics. It seemed more like a social visit, and maybe an introduction to talks in the future.

He was so completely at ease, despite the continuing hostility: we got the feeling he was leader and what he said went and therefore we ignored it. Maybe they objected to us as communists or as Protestants. I was one of six who wasn't.

Finally he gave us some literature to do with Saor Uladh. We weren't sure what it was at the time but one member of our delegation knew all about it. He was the Protestant who visited the Falls a lot to take lessons in the Irish language. He advised me to get rid of it because, as a *fenian*, I might be arrested if I were stopped by the RUC. The idea of Protestant privilege was reinforced for me when they kept their Saor Uladh as a trophy.

I wanted to burn it in case my fingerprints could be traced on it. In the end I put it down a drain while the delegation laughed their heads off.

It is interesting that the Soviet Union is mentioned in this treatise. O'Hagan, in reaching out to us, must have had some strategy for Republicanism. It was no doubt a bold move from a movement that was usually very anti-communist. I learnt later that the Irish-speaking Protestant had been in further contact with O'Hagan but we didn't want to go on any more delegations. Personally I would have found it dangerous, caught between some hostile Republicans and the RUC.

Some time later a Catholic lad joined the YWL. He claimed he was finished with the IRA and was now more interested in pure international socialism. The Irish speaker suspected him of infiltration. The new member liked taking photographs of us. Cameras were few back in the early 1950s. But we had been photographed so

many times in the street by RUC Special Branch, another photographer would make no difference. And to have another Intelligence service viewing us wasn't going to make any difference either. Our political views were in the open for all to know.

The Fire Brigades Union Secretary was a member of the CPNI, and so were a number of its members. The new member of the YWL settled in well and was very active in our activities in selling the *Daily Worker* around doors and at pitches in central Belfast. He also engaged in painting slogans on walls in the middle of the night in aid of the Five-Point-Stalin-Peace-Plan. He showed us tricks, like putting an ear to the pavement in the middle of the night, in a silent city, while slogan-painting, in order to hear any approaching RUC heavy boots on patrol. That was before vehicle patrol.

Our new member became very well-liked by members of the CPNI. He complained that, as a Catholic, he was finding it difficult to find a job. The Secretary of the Fire Brigade Union became so concerned that such a dedicated *communist* couldn't find a job that, within weeks, the lad was training for the fire brigade. Tokenism was maybe all that could be managed back then. Wide-spread agitation on behalf of the Catholic population could have led to the wrecking of the Protestant-communist-led- Trade Union movement.

It must have been around 1951 when we met Dessie O'Hagan. Saor Uladh seemed to spring from nowhere. Our new YWL member brought up its values a number of times. I did think at the time it brought hope to the Catholic population but I wasn't willing to be interned, nor was the Catholic population. I put more hope into communism. I suppose, with a third of the world Red at the time, I thought the march of communism would continue.

The communist movement in the North or Ireland was in Protestant hands that also backed partition. They rarely mentioned the Catholic plight, The word *plight* wasn't in their dictionary. A EC member of the CPNI even vocalised the idea that the Catholic population should move South. She mentioned the transportation of the Chechens, and the Crime Tartars. There were also other ethnic minorities which she rhymed off. They had helped,

or were in danger of collaborating with, the Nazi invader during WW2. Who the Catholic population were about to help, or had collaborated with, was a mystery.

There was no danger of Saor Uladh ideas being taken on by the YWL and the CPNI with people like that around. And she wasn't the only one. Some of these people are being lauded in the literature of Communist Party of Ireland today. I doubt if the CPI will examine the history of the CPNI. That would mean axing some iconic figures from the past. It had been all about power, highly paid Union jobs, and free trips to the communist world. The ridiculous idea was that you down South go communist and we up North will do the same. Then we will unify.

On leaving St Mary's Hall a couple of our delegation began to ape Irish dancing. Another one said that Irish music was monotonous as it repeated itself, went on too long, and never came to any conclusion. They didn't seem to worry that I was watching the aping and listening to the criticism of Irish music. That was Northern Ireland with Unionism in full control. You said what you liked in public and generally acted the conqueror. Woe behold if a Catholic acted in the same manner.

After St Mary's Hall I met Dessie O'Hagan once in central Belfast. He had just got out of a short internment. Whenever a member of the British monarchy visited Northern Ireland, a hundred or so Republicans would be interned for a couple of weeks until that member of the monarchy went back to England. Their employer, if they had a job, would be informed. That could mean the loss of a job. He was later to do the full four-year internment for his Republican activities and would complain of having to defend himself against attempted homosexual rape.

A friend of mine, the Irish-speaking Protestant, met him by sheer coincidence in a London pub in the early 1960s. He was drunk and disoriented and into stealing pint beer glasses. But in the end he found himself back in Belfast and re-united with the Republican cause. There will be disagreement about the path he took in Republicanism but there is no doubt he gave his life to it and subsequently suffered for it all.

Wilson John Haire

PS: There is an interesting 'family tree' of the IRA from 1922-2019 given in the treatise, which it is not possible to reproduce here.

Book Review: *The Catholic Predicament In Northern Ireland*

Volume One: **Catastrophe. 1914-1968** (334pp)

Volume Two: **Resurgence. 1969-2016** (586pp)

Author **Pat Walsh**.

Published by Belfast Historical & Educational Society

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

Northern Ireland Under The Microscope!

First some background on the reviewer, we are none of us neutral. I wrote some basic notes whilst reading the two volumes because I kept coming across challenging ideas and arguments that really impressed me and after sharing them with Athol Books was asked to expand them into a book review. This cannot be a comprehensive review since the two volumes come to around 900 pages of analysis. Secondly I'm not a historian and can therefore hardly critique it for its scholarship, but its story makes the most sense out of all the opinions, books, pamphlets and comments on NI that I have read/listened to/observed and spouted over the past 40 odd years.

I am from what Pat Walsh describes as a traditional "*anti-partition*" republican background that felt that, when the civil war was lost, so was the capacity of the new Ireland to bring about radical social change. The big farmers, lawyers, doctors and clergy were now in charge and not the visionaries, or indeed the volunteers, who had lost the civil war and with it the 'Republic'. As a child I had neighbours and relatives who had fought as volunteers so the spirit of armed republicanism seemed perfectly natural to me.

My early adulthood was deeply affected by the war in the North and then the neoliberal attack of Thatcherism. I was born in the 1950s as a child of Irish immigrants to England so came of age with the civil rights movement, Free Derry and Bloody Sunday, Motorman and the Hunger Strikes. Based in London, years of meetings, marches, picketing, leafletting, etc, mostly with the Troops Out of Ireland movement. Then came the final ceasefire. I felt the people had no agency as negotiations were carried out in secret to find some conciliation between the sides. Conciliation of course is the Fianna Fáil road to government and I was initially supportive of the sell-out position, even though I knew the war was a stalemate. People were dying and maimed, the prisons were full and daily life was rife with anti-depressants, Brits, RUC/UDR, hoods, death squads, etc, etc. Those outside the negotiations had nothing to do. So at that point, like many of my comrades, I heaved a sigh of relief thinking I'd finally got back

part of my life and would not need to continue to tramp roads shouting Troops Out!

Any book claiming to explain the history and development of Northern Ireland must identify where it came from, why it failed as a stable form of governance and of course was the IRA declaration of war against the British state, a war that lasted nearly 30 years, justified. The visceral images remain of shovelling up body parts following city centre bombs. It came to an end with the 1998 Good Friday Agreement or what has been dubbed '*Sunningdale for slow learners*'.

CATASTROPHE

So, Volume 1: Three main themes may be said to be presented—Home Rule and separate nationalities; Partition and the 'hook'; and British 'balance of power' politics.

Walsh introduces the specifics of Falls Nationalism—Joe Devlin, Home Rule imperialists with a stake in the Empire, the WW1 voluntary enlistments from the Falls which were greater *per capita* than those of the Shankill. This is a radically different Ireland from that that I knew from my childhood understanding of Tipperary nationalism and having read Connolly, *et al*. This was an eye-opener—Ireland as Canada or South Africa—a respected member of the Commonwealth/Empire still bowing to the King and taking orders from Westminster HQ while we run our own branch office. This is the UK of GB & I, united under the Crown, ruling the greatest empire and with wealth creation sufficient for welfare socialism and therefore worthy of fighting for politically, irrespective of imperialism/colonialism at home and abroad.

Most important, I had never heard the argument that the 6 Counties were the 'hook' designed to hold back the Free State/Republic in developing a totally independent future both politically and economically as a resurgent sovereign nation. The end of partition required Britain's consent and that would only be likely if the 26 counties continued to follow in the train of British diplomacy. Hence

the position of de Valera is much clearer for me now that it can be argued that Dev was one of the few who saw this hook and his refusal to consider NI, his seemingly contradictory anti-IRA policies, and his focus on developing an independent 26 County Ireland, politically and economically.

I would have liked further argument to enforce this '*hook*' position. The hook agenda is one of the core arguments and I felt the need for further development, especially since there may exist those naïve readers (like me) who just cannot believe that British statesmen could cook up the perfect balance between losing 26, keeping 6, but holding onto the 26 through their own pursuit of the final 6. Fiendishly clever. This is great political analysis.

The implications of the hook argument are complex. Economic statistics show that in 1955, 89% of exports were to the UK. In 1972, 61%. By 1978 exports to Britain were 47% with 30% EU and 23% other. By 1984, 34% UK; 34% EU; and 32% other (ref: Ireland in the European Community, 1989. Online: <http://edepositireland.ie/handle/2262/72080>. Accessed 2 Feb 2019)

Just some idea of the perceived centrality of Britain to Ireland's economic future may be observed from the following Irish government publication:

"By the late 1950's the protected Irish economy, in particular its dominant agricultural sector, was opened up to foreign markets, a new export-led economic policy. Irish GNP grew by over 4% in 1959 and 1960. Ireland needed to expand its foreign trade further. But was Ireland sufficiently economically developed to withstand the impact of free trade and competition that EEC entry would bring? Could Ireland join the EEC if Britain, its main trading partner, did not? Aware that a British application was becoming a distinct possibility, in July 1961 the Lemass government published a White Paper on the EEC and let its six member states know that in the event of Britain applying for EEC membership Ireland would also apply." (Ref: The background to Ireland's first ECC application—1950-1961: online <https://www.dfa.ie/media/dfa/alldfawebsitemedia/ourrolesandpolicies/irelandintheeu/ireland-in-the-eu-history.pdf>. Accessed 08 Feb 2019.)

The hook remained in place. At the height of the 1969 crisis the UK retained its principal market status thus the Republic continued to rely on the UK economically. At the same time, UK diplomatic pressure, *Realpolitik*, combined with the fear or the threat of unleashing a loyalist backlash within the 26 Counties resulted in a *volteface* as the Southern leadership

climbed down from its confrontationalist position. The Southern bourgeoisie sat comfortably in charge of a growing economy and, I suspect, a united Ireland would have presented them with more problems than they thought it worth. For those in power, anti-partitionism had become largely rhetoric, a constitutional position, necessary for public consumption but a threat to the business of making money. During the 1970s, the hook clearly retained much of its original intent, its impact observable in a gradual withdrawal of open support for northern republicanism.

I was also really impressed by the 'balance of power' concept about British foreign policy, developed and promoted from the 1500s, again something I have not come across before. Walsh argues that Britain's foreign policy is really to ensure that rival Powers are manoeuvred to fight each other. Thus Britain has no real allies; it sees its needs as above all others.

Again this is a 'big theme' and, like the hook argument, assumes the reader needs little evidence (although I suspect Britain's contrarian role in the EU and the current Brexit negotiations provide evidence of its veracity). I actually found it best supported by articles on Dr Walsh's own website (<https://drpatwalsh.com/>), especially in his papers on Britain and WW1. I also guess that those who would buy/read/discuss a book from the Athol Books stable would be familiar with these two fundamentals—the hook and balance of power.

I know from experience that political nationalists in the North do have a phenomenally astute understanding of politics generally and so suspect the book may be mainly aimed at them.

The first volume is excellent in its cogent introduction to the North as being historically different from the rest of the island due to the two nationalities argument and the role of industrial labour in the heartland of imperial Britain. The opening chapter makes clear the continuing vehement hatred of the colonisers for the natives even into the early 20th century—before partition and long before 1960s/70s. Rather different from the more uniform countryside culture of Catholic small farmers and businesses/tenants/landless and con-acre found in much the rest of the country.

I was also unaware of Sinn Féin's Vice-President O'Flanagan's recognition of a separate unionist nationality. The image of unionists being the underclass in a republican Ireland clearly did not chime

with his ideas of the "Republic" and therefore the need for Sinn Féin's policy to evolve to include unionist views and needs. Here the very concept of 'anti-partition republican' is challenged since any recognition of a separate, self-identified protestant nationality requires coming to terms with separate cultural and ideological positioning rather than to tritely call on Orangemen to remember Henry Joy and the Belfast 1798ers.

Home Rule challenged the hegemony of the union, especially for Ulster unionists. Why risk losing your seat at the high table of Westminster for a minority role as you are subsumed into a Dublin-based Dominion? Loyalism simply cannot be wished away and Martin McGuinness appeared to be continuing in the same vein as O'Flanagan in his approach to Ian Paisley.

Walsh describes the Battle of Pettigo and Belleek. Few people I have spoken to since reading of the event even know about Collins and the Border attacks in 1922, I certainly didn't. Views on Collins are generally polarised, however this episode shows how fluid and contradictory were his responses to his own actions. As IRA Director of Intelligence and Finance Minister, Collins was sent to London for treaty negotiations where he signed the treaty in December 1921. Four months later, in April, anti-Treaty republicans occupied the Four Courts in Dublin thereby setting up an alternative *locus* of government. Rather than to negotiate to bring together the full force of the republican army, Collins' response was to lead an open attack on the North in May—the Battle of Pettigo and Belleek, thus taking up the anti-treaty position. Then in June, following the collapse of the attack, as head of Free State forces, he was responsible for the artillery attack on Four Courts before being killed in August of the same year—an extraordinary 9 months.

Walsh demolishes the whole idea of a NI parliamentary political life within a NI 'state'. Unionists are described as having made the 'supreme sacrifice' of opting out of any real political life in order to police Catholics on behalf of the British hook. From being intimately engaged in Westminster politics through Conservative and Liberal identification, the 6 counties population was effectively expelled to Stormont with none of the governing powers that identify a state, such as control of taxation or foreign policy. Real power remained in London.

And, anyway, Stormont could not by definition be a parliament if there was no possibility for change of government

(surely a fundamental requirement for any parliamentary democracy). Catholics, as the demographic minority, were locked out in perpetuity with nowhere to go since physical republicanism had failed and constitutional politics were impossible at Stormont as there would never be a chance to either influence or govern. While unionists followed on the coat tails of the Conservatives at Westminster, Catholics were effectively locked out, since none of the British parties operated in NI and the Labour Party refused entry to nationalist representatives. This then is the scene-setting for the next 50 years of Orange rule on behalf of Westminster.

RESURGENCE

Thus NI festered as Catholics attempted to break the deadlock with a mixture of militant and constitutional politics while looking for support from south of the border as unionists applied the security state to any perceived problem. Whilst voting at Westminster with the Tories against the welfare state, welfare reforms arising from Westminster, were passed by Stormont. Unionist politicians treated Stormont as a club rather than a parliament; their problems began when they began to take themselves and the idea of a 'NI State' seriously.

Sean Lemass began the opening up of north/south dialogue in 1965 with a meeting with Terence O'Neill and persuaded northern constitutionalists to engage with Stormont. Any engagement, Walsh argues, was doomed to failure since the 'no surrender' unionist culture could not countenance any unleashing of Catholic political advance.

As nationalist frustration grew, the civil rights campaign exploited the 'one man one vote' situation in local government and the housing crisis. Although working class protestants suffered under the same voting restrictions, the civil rights campaign was seen as a Catholic uprising by the majority of unionists, leading to clashes with the RUC and B Specials and eventually to the police attack on the Bogside in Derry. The failure of the state to crush what was to become 'Free Derry' in 1969 led to a Belfast backlash as loyalists, with the support and leadership of RUC and Specials, vented their spleen on nationalists with armed attacks and street burnings.

The defence of Catholic enclaves was led by locals with the support of Catholic ex-servicemen, former British soldiers. The IRA had turned to Marxism, dumped weapons and focused on the idea of a unified protestant and Catholic working class overthrowing the Stormont regime ushering in socialism. This lack of funda-

mental insight into the nature of NI, its 'separate nationalities' and its implications for the armed protection of the nationalist community, plus the sheer violence of the pogroms led to the split in the IRA and the formation of the Provisional IRA. The entry of the British army and the Falls curfew set the scene for defensive and counter-offensive measures; the war was on.

Some months after finishing Volume 2, I am still mulling over the plethora of detail with its description of the events post 1968/69. With this in mind, it is still possible to identify two main themes that inform the argument: the nature of the nationalist revolt—both constitutional and martial, and the perils of a negotiated disarmament—'destruction by peace'.

The first, which flows from volume 1, is around the mutuality/mutability of constitutional republicanism and armed republicanism. Contrary to how they were represented (usually peaceful John Hume and gunman Gerry Adams), the Provos were the virtual armed wing of the SDLP throughout the 1970s. The SDLP had no negotiating power without the Provos' military campaign (as witnessed by 50 years of constitutional stalemate) and the Provos, knowing they could not militarily defeat the Brits, had no political outlet to negotiate a settlement.

Post Hunger Atrike, IRA/Sinn Féin realised that if they built an electable SF they would no longer need the SDLP and they could get on with their goal of a united Ireland as the only Irish political party operating both sides of the border. Thus the inevitability of the split with the traditionalist Ó Brádaigh/Ó Connail Dublin faction. Here is what Walsh portrays as pragmatism in action driven by the North. No longer did the North look to the South for salvation. This is excellent and helps explain why it was important for the pragmatists to move on from a traditionalist, '2nd Dáil', viewpoint both over representation in Dáil Éireann and in the NI Assembly in order to wind up the war and win the peace.

Walsh argues strongly that throughout the conflict the IRA understood the enemy to be Britain and not 6 counties protestants. Whilst there were sectarian murders by IRA members, this was never an integral IRA tactic, unlike with loyalist paramilitaries. The focus on not being drawn into a sectarian war, even during the period of 'Ulsterisation', is developed through volume 2.

Most impressive is the discussion of

the armed retreat, beginning with Adams/Hume meetings and the involvement of Haughey. Walsh identifies the link to Cardinal Ó Fiaich and his analysis of Hugh O'Neill after Kinsale, and '*Destruction by Peace*'. Come forward 400 years, after 30 years of armed struggle, the IRA is manoeuvring. What can be learned from history—the long view—that peace is still war but without the shooting and destruction by peace an ever-present threat.

The author appears to have great respect for Gerry Adams and the IRA command, considering them to be sophisticated political players able to take into consideration all aspects of both war and peace and the British enemy.

The details around negotiating and bringing into operation the Good Friday Agreement are well set out, showing a Republican dispassionate approach to every hurdle presented to the final objective of equal political representation within NI. The end goal was a political presence both north and south of the border with representation in both Houses to smooth the route to final unification, ultimately backed up by the demographic change in NI population ratio.

This justifies the author's in-depth treatment of the South, its anti-republicanism, its contradictory claim of sovereignty whilst offering little or nothing in support for those fighting for that sovereignty and the character assassination of Gerry Adams and through him Sinn Féin. I was also pleased to read a critique of revisionist Irish historians having met a student of Roy Foster who lectured me on Irish history claiming "*original sources*"—written of course in English and presented from an English perspective. Countering Anglocentric approaches to Irish history appears to be a theme of Athol publications.

I was impressed by the supportive view of some of the main characters especially Charlie Haughey, John Hume, Brian Faulkner and Gerry Adams whilst Martin McGuinness remained a bit of a mystery although clearly of high importance. I would have liked Pat to write more regarding his view of Haughey as the most important republican politician since de Valera. Haughey was undone by the financial scandals but Walsh implies these were targeted character assassinations—more here would be useful since Haughey provided the necessary State-backing for serious negotiations between Adams, Hume and the British.

John Hume is repeatedly drawn as the only constitutionalist who understood the

importance of the IRA war and the symbiosis of politics and the gun. Brian Faulkner is presented as a moderate unionist, willing to do a deal to bring nationalists into government although admittedly to maintain the union—certainly a compromiser in comparison with other unionists. Adams was the voice of the IRA high command that understood the overall picture of war, politics and the British enemy, the destruction of the peace, the need to drive the agenda. More on McGuinness would be useful as the accepted face of the high command (given Adams' public denial of IRA involvement), as would more on the thinking behind the unknown characters in the IRA high command, clearly out of the question at this moment.

Walsh states that, without the war, there would have been no Good Friday Agreement, no fluid settlement that recognised an equal voice for nationalists who could work towards a united Ireland whilst sharing some form of governance with unionists. Whilst the GFA is very similar to Sunningdale, the IRA war had changed the power politics in the north and the ground-rules upon which the GFA negotiations took place.

There are genuine differences especially the removal of Articles 2 and 3 of the constitution. Sunningdale had expected unionists to take part in all-Ireland bodies whilst the Irish courts confirmed the Republic's claim to the 6 counties. In addition, the successful implementation of the GFA was also undoubtedly its inclusion of all paramilitary groups within its discussions thus undermining outright opposition from players such as the UDA and UVF. However, the recognition by loyalist workers, whose strike brought down Sunningdale, that the situation had changed, the croppies would never lie down, meant that, while opposing the North-South dimension, there would never again be the hegemonic solidarity of workers and paramilitaries that could shut down the north to kill reform while the British claimed neutrality.

GFA weighted majority rules require the support of 60 per cent of assembly members present and voting, including 40 per cent of nationalists and 40 per cent of Unionists. This is a far cry from the 1920 settlement, '*a protestant state for a protestant people*'.

The current dysfunction of the GFA is partially attributed to the St Andrews Agreement and the need for cross-ministerial agreement before any major actions can be implemented. We wait to

see what the result will be from the Tory/DUP alliance and the Assembly's necessary collapse to protect Arlene Foster from the 'renewable heat' fallout and future SF projects. The ultimate weakness of the Assembly is that it remains subservient to Westminster, we are back at direct rule for all the GFA posturing, however, NI is no longer the same.

IMPRESSIONS

Finally the impression given of the nationalist population in the north—critical, disaffected, war weary but ultimately unwavering in their support for the necessity of armed struggle, immune to state propaganda and politically astute enough to play both constitutional and militant roles as necessary. The mutability of constitutional/republican approaches is the key. Walsh effectively argues that the war was necessary to advance to the current *status quo* and the importance of the peace, contrary to those who claim that the war was a prolonged act of terrorism driven by the myth of martyrdom and sacrifice or that its ending was a sell out. Irrespective of current frustrations, the foundations of the union have been

undermined, NI has changed, there can be no return to the 1920s settlement.

This review is somewhat disjointed, necessarily fragmented and missing so many of the points made by the author. However, I hope it provides some idea of why I think the books are critical reading. They are the most detailed and persuasive arguments I have read for years. I have passed them on to those who will appreciate them, and discussed the findings with those disinclined to read nearly 900 pages of political argument. My thanks to Dr. Pat Walsh and to Athol Books.

Colin Patrick Gleeson

08.02.19

Readers will find the 'hook' argument set out in:

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

The two volumes reviewed above are obtainable from Athol Books, at a price of €24, £20 for Volume One; and €30, £25 for Volume 2.

All items Postfree in Britain and Ireland.

Lemass Part 5

Lemass In The De Valera Era —Protectionism And 'Alien Penetration'

I concluded Part 4 of this series, published in the December issue: "*But—enough already—of literary or political biographies and histories! I should now examine how economists have assessed Lemass's role in de Valera's Ireland.*" Yet I spoke too soon. I should have also referred, at least in part, to last year's publication of David Mc Cullough's biography: '*De Valera—Volume II—Rule 1932-1975*'. This is not a review, as I never review a book that I have not gone to the trouble of reading in full, in order to do it justice. But, in dipping here and there into McCullough's biography, I have found a few passages that are of particular relevance to this series.

On Dev/Lemass protectionism in the 1930s:

"As de Valera told the Dáil (29 April 1932), he did not 'believe in tariffs as if they were some kind of religion. I have regarded tariffs simply as a present means to an end... To protect our own industries, to enable them to grow and to be built up...' The previous government had introduced a number of tariffs, and had it remained in power it would almost certainly have introduced more, given

the international climate of protectionism. But Fianna Fáil was far quicker to introduce them. As the British trade representative in Dublin, William Peters, put it, de Valera's government was attempting to do in two years what Cosgrave might have done in five or ten. Employment and unemployment statistics for the period are notoriously unreliable, but there do appear to have been gains from protection. The number of people in industrial employment increased from 100,000 in 1932 to 166,000 in 1938. In protected industries the number of jobs rose from 45,348 in 1932 to 80,092 seven years later. Despite the increase in industrial employment, unemployment and emigration remained high, partly because agriculture was shedding jobs and partly because many of the new jobs went not to the unemployed but to 'the marginal self-employed, who had not been entitled to appear on the unemployment register'. Without protection, and given the international depression and the effects of the Economic War with Britain, both unemployment and emigration would have been much worse" (pp 19-20).

On the 1938 Anglo-Irish Agreement:

"The return of the ports has been seen in Britain as a disaster largely because of

Winston Churchill's condemnation: 'A more feckless act can hardly be imagined.' ... De Valera was unrepentant about the damage inflicted on the Irish people by the Economic War, arguing that their 'suffering was necessary in order to secure the position we have got today'. The handover of the ports 'recognises and finally establishes Irish sovereignty over the 26 Counties and the territorial seas'... (p 149).

On wartime neutrality:

"Éamon de Valera, July 1940: 'Whoever comes first will be our immediate enemy.'... On 10 May 1940 two developments increased the threat to Irish neutrality. Hitler finally unleashed his armies in the west, beginning a stunning military campaign that would culminate only six weeks later in the surrender of France. On the same day the botched Norway Campaign forced Chamberlain from office, to be replaced by Winston Churchill who, ironically, was more culpable for the failures in Norway than was Chamberlain. The change of Prime Minister could only be bad for relations between Britain and Ireland. A month before, Churchill complained in private that the Irish people were 'stabbing England in the back'... De Valera referred to the plight of Belgium and the Netherlands in a by-election speech in Galway two days later: 'I think I would be unworthy of this small nation if on an occasion like this I did not utter our protest against the cruel wrong which has been done them.' (German Minister) Eduard Hempel was instructed to protest, but he reported to Berlin that he had already done so and that the Department of External Affairs had been 'apologetic'. Some controversy would arise in the late 1950s when the historian Nicholas Mansergh wrote that de Valera himself had apologised for his remarks. The Department of External Affairs went into the matter in some detail, eventually unearthing from the German archives Hempel's account of his conversation with de Valera. This showed that de Valera did not apologise" (pp 185-6).

On the immediate post-war years:

"De Valera was acutely aware of Ireland's international isolation and of 'false and malicious reports about Irish affairs'. For instance, when legislation was introduced in 1945 to punish army deserters 'this was spread all over the world as penalising those who fought for Britain'. This issue led to considerable and continuing criticism of de Valera, culminating in 2013 with the passage of legislation introducing an amnesty for deserters, amid much self-congratulatory verbiage about fighting fascism. The verbiage missed the point: those involved were not being punished for serving in the British forces; they were punished for deserting the Irish forces in a time of national emergency. Even Bertie Smyllie of the 'Irish Times' thought at the time

that their treatment was not unduly harsh. 'While he will not be given any government job, or allowed to share in government relief schemes, the Irish 'deserter' now is quite free to come back to his home'..." (p 266).

McCullough's account added:

"De Valera tried to burnish Ireland's image by alleviating post-distress in Europe. Ten days after VE Day he announced that £3 million in supplies would be sent to the Continent. He told the Dáil that some of these commodities would have to be rationed at home as a result, 'but the sacrifice involved will, I am sure, be readily accepted by our people'. There was all-party support for proposal."

But here McCullough's account was incomplete, and consequently misleading. De Valera's action would subsequently be denounced, not only by the pro-Nazi TD, Oliver J. Flanagan, but by the pro-British and no less viciously anti-Semitic TD, James Dillon, as I highlighted in my Part 4 article. In fact, Flanagan and Dillon operated in tandem on this issue. They would become Fine Gael bosom buddies, with Flanagan serving as Parliamentary Secretary to Dillon as Minister for Agriculture in the 1954-57 Government.

McCullough's account continued:

"But de Valera would meet with opposition to another suggestion: the settlement of refugees in Ireland. The Department of Justice was quite open in its anti-Semitism as it argued for restrictions on Jewish immigration. (Its Secretary was Peter Berry, later the great 'hero' of the anti-Haugheyites during the 1970 "Arms Crisis"—MO'R.) ... Lemass told the Government that he 'would be in favour of a liberal policy on a highly selective basis'—a contradiction in terms if ever there was one. By far the most generous attitude was that of de Valera, who said he was ready 'to contemplate the admission, ultimately, of at least 10,000 aliens'. But even this strong direction wasn't enough to overcome ingrained resistance, and the number of refugees eventually admitted was a tiny fraction of this figure..." (pp 266-7).

In my December article (Part 4), I further wrote of the anti-Semitism of Elizabeth Bowen's British Intelligence confidant, the future Fine Gael leader James Dillon:

"Until recently, I believed my own article in the August 2009 issue of 'Irish Political Review' stood alone in addressing it. This October has, however, seen the publication of 'Irish Questions and Jewish Questions', edited by A Beatty and D O'Brien, which contains a very worthwhile essay, entitled 'Rethinking Irish Protectionism: Jewish Refugee Factories and the Pursuit of an Irish Ireland for Industry'... Writing of the

1938 campaign against one such Jewish factory in Galway, author Trisha Oakley Kessler relates: 'Encouraged by leading Fine Gael politician James Dillon, Les Modes Modernes hats were boycotted by consumers and wholesalers, which placed the owners in a precarious financial position and challenged Fianna Fáil's investment in the factory as a flagship of its industrial policies.' (119)..."

I will now take a closer look at Kessler's essay, which related in detail:

"Economic nationalism advanced in the 1930s in response to rising unemployment, concerns about national identity, and a downturn in the economy. Ireland, like many other countries, initiated protectionist policies that began to shape the economic and cultural life of the nation. Éamon de Valera, the leader of Fianna Fáil, Ireland's new governing party in 1932, offered a national solution to Ireland's economic problems... As Jewish communities in Europe were 'othered' and expunged from the economic life of their native countries, a broad range of Irish voices pressured the government to bar Jews entering the economic life of Ireland. Oppositional voices raised fears that Fianna Fáil's industrial drive was bringing Jews into the Irish economy, which was harmful to the nation. A developing anti-Jewish economic discourse was used to portray Fianna Fáil's economic policies as non-national and fraudulent. Although Ireland offered very little refuge to Jewish refugees, some refugee workers and industrialists did settle in Ireland. They were given employment permits because their manufacturing skills were of use to the nation..." (pp 107-8).

Kessler described the origins of the Galway factory that would be targeted by Dillon's hate campaign:

"Twenty-five expert technicians, many of them former Böhm employees (of the Austrian Jewish hat manufacturer Victor Böhm), arrived in Galway in 1938. Established by the two Jewish businessmen from Paris, Henri Orbach and Marcel Goldberg, Les Modes Modernes was the flagship factory of a new Irish hat industry supported by protectionist measures. Its managing director, Orbach, had embraced the opportunity to invest in Ireland and had borrowed money from colleagues and family to provide a capital investment of £40,000 matched by Irish investors. Although Orbach and Goldberg were both French citizens, as Jews they were forced into hiding after 1940 and their principal factory was taken from them and assigned to the Commissariat Général aux Questions Juives in 1941. Trapped in France and desperate to return to Ireland, Orbach and his sister, Sophie Philipson, the wife of Serge Philipson, manager of the factory in Galway, were deported to Auschwitz in February 1944. Both Orbach and Goldberg had been called back to France,

from Ireland, to join the French army in 1939. Irish visas were extended for Orbach and his sister, thanks to the continued pressure from her husband Serge Philipson and Senator John McEllin, but both struggled, in vain, to leave France..." (pp 109 and 241).

Kessler's narrative continued:

"The destruction of Jewish industries across Europe and the search for settlement by Jewish refugees came at a moment when Ireland was pursuing a native industrial drive to create a self-sufficient Irish economy... Protectionism ... was in the eyes of Fianna Fáil a means of import substitution, particularly products imported from Great Britain. Trade statistics for 1932 reveal the rising numbers of imports for apparel, textiles, and footwear, and an internal Department of Industry memo on the Irish hat industry disclosed the import numbers for ladies' hats, which in 1935 amounted to almost two million. The development of a substantial hat industry, particularly ladies' hats, was a response to both Ireland's dependence on the British hat industry and the need to expand new industries to generate employment. By 1935-36 it was evident that Fianna Fáil's industrial drive was slowing down... Political discourse focused on the demise of Fianna Fáil's much-promised employment creation scheme, and communities across Ireland still waiting for their factory expressed anger and frustration at the lost opportunities a new factory could have brought with employment and spending power."

"The need to explore new manufacturing possibilities influenced the decision of the Department of Industry and Commerce to reply to a memorandum from the Council for German Jewry (CGJ) in 1936. Following the 1935 Nuremberg Laws, greater numbers of Jews in Germany, many newly classified by this legislation, sought refuge abroad... The Department received a memorandum regarding the possibility of Jewish refugee industries contributing to the Irish economy. It displayed a good understanding of Fianna Fáil's economic policy, noting, 'Many German manufacturers were now looking to find new means of livelihood and could find the required capital to produce new products, which would help improve Ireland's trade balance through the diminution of imports.'... The Council suggested that the Irish Free State might be willing to accept a limited number of German Jewish manufacturers. Its arguments were compelling. Rather than looking for employment, refugees on this scheme would create employment... During a period when Fianna Fáil's policy towards Jewish refugees was deeply restrictive, the response to the CGJ by John Leydon, the secretary of the Department of Industry, was encouraging. The department would be prepared to recommend to the Department of Justice the granting of alien permits for a certain

period of employment if an enterprise offered 'value to the country'... To aid the Department in finding potential industrialists, an unusual partnership formed between a non-national Jewish businessman in Dublin, Marcus Witzum, and Fianna Fáil senator Seán McEllin. Witzum, having lived and worked in numerous countries, had developed extensive trade networks in the European textile industry that were of use to the department. Senator McEllin, a key player in Fianna Fáil's industrial program, had experience, through his work in developing the Irish sugar-beet industry, in bringing outside technical skills to Ireland... Traveling back and forth to Europe, McEllin and Witzum guided industrialists to potential sites in the West of Ireland..."

"With tenacity, Witzum and McEllin located a number of Jewish refugee industries to Ireland, of which a new hat factory was perhaps the most successful... The hat industry created employment for more than six hundred workers... The exact number of refugees who arrived with new factories is not clear, but a conservative number would be seventy in total. The Departments of Justice and External Affairs reminded the Department of Industry that issuing visas for foreign nationals, that is, Jewish workers, would necessitate their staying in Ireland. Their use to the nation had to be carefully weighed. At times correspondence between each department was tense, as Seán Lemass, the minister for industry, requested greater numbers of permits to be given to expert technician..." (pp 110-115).

In my December article I had, however, been too hasty in jumping to the conclusion that Trisha Oakley Kessler stood alone among academics in being willing to tackle the anti-Semitism of Fine Gael icon James Dillon. My attendance this December 12th at the Goethe Institute launch of the paperback edition of *'An Irish Sanctuary—German-speaking Refugees in Ireland 1933-1945'*, by Gisela Holfter and Horst Dickel, alerted me to the fact that the hardback edition had been published two years previously in December 2016, and that this was among the issues systematically tackled by the authors. In their Introduction, they also wrote:

"There is still a surprising lack of awareness that any fugitives from the Nazis were admitted to Ireland. In 1945, when Seán O'Faoláin wrote about Ireland's five and a half years of wartime isolation, one of his reflections was on the absence of refugees." (p 2).

Their publishers have further highlighted the following:

"The monograph provides the first comprehensive, detailed account of German-speaking refugees in Ireland

1933-1945—where they came from, immigration policy towards them and how their lives turned out in Ireland and afterwards. Thanks to unprecedented access to thousands of files of the Irish Department of Justice (all still officially closed) as well as extensive archive research in Ireland, Germany, England, Austria as well as the US and numerous interviews it is possible for the first time to give an almost complete overview of how many people came, how they contributed to Ireland, how this fits in with the history of migration to Ireland and what can be learned from it. While Exile studies are a well-developed research area... Ireland was long neglected in this regard. Instead of the usual narrative of 'no one was let in' or 'only a handful came to Ireland' the authors identified more than 300 refugees through interviews and intensive research in Irish, German and Austrian archives. German-speaking exiles were the first main group of immigrants that came to the young Irish Free State from 1933 onwards and they had a considerable impact on academic, industrial and religious developments in Ireland."

Holfter and Dickel told the story of the refugee handbag manufacturer, Abraham Bayer, who transferred his operations from Germany and was granted admission with his family in January 1934. They further related:

"The Department of Industry and Commerce under Seán Lemass fully understood the potential for Irish industry of investors like Bayer or skilled experts coveted by individual firms. In 1934... a group was formed, headed by Markus Witzum and Mayo Senator John McEllin, whose members were to scout for investors and experts from countries like Austria, Czechoslovakia, France, Belgium, and also Germany. The Department expected foreign capitalists, managers and experts dissatisfied with conditions in Germany and other Continental countries to infuse non-industrialised regions, especially in western Ireland, with new opportunities for a chronically underemployed population ... In 1933... the main opposition party, Cumann na nGaedheal, transformed itself from a conservative-liberal pro-Treaty party to a rightist opposition movement integrating the extra-parliamentary Blueshirts (United Ireland Party / Fine Gael). In November, UIP leaders Richard Mulcahy and James Dillon... indirectly alleged an over-representation of Jews in the Irish business world. Mulcahy and Dillon 'quizzed' Lemass on the question whether certain persons, the likes of Matz, Gaw, Lucks and Silverstein, could be called nationals within the terms of the Control of Manufactures Act. Lemass's combative defence: 'Amongst the names read out by the Deputy are names associated with industry in this country for a long number of years, some of whom are a lot better Irishmen than the

Deputy.' (Dáil Debates, 22 November 1933). Some months later, the idea that the new factories were 'largely under the influence of Jews' was openly expressed at a UIP meeting. ('Jewish Chronicle', 23 March 1934). By November 1934, there was a widespread view inside the Irish Jewish community that the party had 'developed an anti-Semitic stand' since its fall from power'... ('Jewish Chronicle', 23 November 1934)... As in 1933, Mulcahy attacked Lemass on the 'alien penetration' of Irish industries. (Dáil Debates, 18 November 1936). A few months later, the 'Irish Independent' ran an article ('Aliens in Ireland', 5 April 1937) that described the 'process of penetration' as 'somewhat alarming'... Though these voices did not go unnoticed in the Jewish community, they obviously did not shake the trust of its leaders in the Fianna Fáil government. Most historians endorse that assessment, pointing especially to de Valera's personal record" (pp 103-7).

"In the 1930s and the 1940s, the industrial landscape of the Irish Free State began to take new shape. After Fianna Fáil's election victory of 1932, economic planners in Lemass's Department of Industry and Commerce took steps to implement a policy of self-sufficiency and decentralised, state-sponsored industrialisation... The following enterprises owed their establishment or at least an important impulse to immigrants from Germany or countries threatened by German occupation: Les Modes Modernes Ltd (Galway); Wings Ltd (Galway); Hirsh Ribbons Ltd (Longford); Western Hats Ltd (Castlebar); Plunder and Pollack Ltd (Carrick-on-Suir); McCowens Mouldings Ltd (Tralee). Two further enterprises—Tipperary Glove Factory Ltd and Malbay Manufacturing Co Ltd (Co Clare) engaged German-speaking refugees as key staff... Five of the enterprises were located in the west of Ireland, where Fianna Fáil hoped to reverse the depopulation of impoverished rural areas... In Ireland, and specifically in Dublin, Irish-Jewish firms were said to figure largely in the clothing manufacturing sector. A man like Marcus Witzum, co-owner of a Dublin shop selling Viennese textiles and well-connected in the Continental sector, was able to identify potential candidates to set up their own industries or occupy leading positions in the new industries. He could offer not only a life without Nazi harassment but but also favourable economic conditions such as Irish social and wage standards, protective tariffs and quota regulations... Before the advent of Les Modes Modernes, Galway, in 1936 a small city of 18,294 inhabitants, had very few industrial establishments... In summer 1935, Lemass announced the construction of a hat factory... Marcus Witzum's Continental forays led to Paris, resulting in Serge Philipson's trip to Galway... Les Modes Modernes started production in the middle of August 1937 with 40 workers... Even before its comple-

tion the new factory became a public issue... 'The Galway Hat Controversy' revolved around the question of whether the products of semi-foreign enterprises were to be protected by import quota barriers... (The 'Connacht Tribune', 14 May 1938 reported from Jury's Hotel, Dublin, that) James Dillon, the deputy Fine Gael chairman, fulminated against the tariff privileges of the foreign investors ('exploiters'), mixing free-trade rhetoric with claims to have 'those people sent back to the country from where they came'..." (pp 181-6).

Three of those whom Dillon referred to as "those people"—Marcel Goldberg and Henri Orbach and his sister Sophie Philipson—did indeed go "back to the country from where they came", but were then trapped in Nazi occupied Paris, with the Orbach siblings destined to perish in Auschwitz.

The authors continued, with a qualified evaluation:

"A very different public event took place in Galway on 18 July 1938. Here the opening of Les Modes Modernes became a social affair with an official luncheon, the blessings of the Bishop of Galway, Michael Browne, and Lemass praising the enterprise as a strategic operation at the beginning of a 'transition age' towards industrialisation... Les Modes Modernes reached a leading position in the market for ladies' hats in wartime Ireland in spite of difficult periods. The optimistic job expectations were not fully realised. On an average in the war years the total workforce comprised hardly more than 250 workers. The strategic aim of replacing refugee managers by Irish nationals however took shape, at least at top management levels. In June 1842, the company secretary John McDermott took over the position of Serge Philipson, who helped to steer the enterprise from his Dublin office" (pp 186-8).

Notwithstanding any such *caveat*, Holfter and Dickel came to very positive conclusions:

"In November 1945, (Viennese Jewish refugees) Kurt Hainbach and Robert Hirsch founded an innovative textile enterprise, Pallas Manufacturing Ltd, with Hainbach its 'technical and production manager'. Among their suppliers was a 'socialist' knitwear co-operative founded in 1966 by Father James McDyer in Glencolmille, Co Donegal. Hainbach had been involved in the founding of the co-operative, revisiting the leftist ideas of his youth. He died in 1970; Pallas Manufacturing Ltd continues to flourish, with two members of the Hainbach family still acting as owners and directors."

"Although with this one exception the 'refugee factories' failed to meet the later challenges of competitive markets, it would be a mistake to dismiss their modernising influence in the post-war

period. The creation of local jobs was a great boon at a time when high unemployment in the provinces meant that many younger Irish women and men had to move to larger cities or emigrate. The factories transformed the economies of county towns, but innovation was not confined to the economic sphere: tradi-

tional cultural and social values too were modified through the influence of the factories. Since they employed numbers of young women, female lifestyle patterns in particular were changed" (pp 397-8).

Manus O'Riordan

(To be continued)

Banking And Money Creation

John Martin's response to my and Angela Clifford's letters in the January issue of the *Irish Political Review* has made clearer his views on money creation. In his initial article in the December *Irish Political Review*, John talked mainly about Central Bank money. A reader might have concluded that commercial banks were unimportant in the business of money creation. This would have been incorrect. Most money is created by commercial banks. This prompted letters from Angela and me seeking clarification. John's response and article in the February *Irish Political Review* suggests that he does subscribe to a money multiplier/fractional reserve theory of commercial bank money creation.

Specifically he states that commercial banks can create credit which functions as money. The amount is approximately the amount of deposits they have received, divided by the reserve requirement rate that they should follow to remain liquid. So, if the reserve rate is 10% and £1,000 is deposited, then the bank will be able to create additional credit to the value of £9,000. And, since credit has exactly the same function as money, we can effectively call it money. So, £9,000 has been created on the basis of the original £1,000 deposit in this model of banking activity. John objects to this being described as creating money out of thin air, since it could not have happened without the initial £1,000 being deposited, but accepts that an addition £9,000 of credit has been brought into existence.

John's description of money creation is very similar to what is found in the standard economic textbooks, both introductory and advanced. Although John seems to accept the money-multiplier theory of credit creation he does make some remarks which puzzle me. For instance on Angela's letter in the January *Irish Political Review* he says:

"Later on she describes the expansion of credit as being created by the banks. There is no mention of the vast surpluses created by China or Germany..."

But there is no requirement for these surpluses in the money multiplier theory

to explain the creation of credit by commercial banks. At best such surpluses may affect the size of the credit created. This view which references German surpluses seems more to view banks as financial intermediaries taking unused deposits and allocating them to profitable investments which allow the banks to make profits and pay depositors a rate of interest.

Richard A. Werner has written an article 'Can banks individually create money out of nothing?—The theories and the empirical evidence' in the *International Review of Financial Analysis* 36 (2014). I would recommend it as a very comprehensive review of the various theories of credit creation and of the role of banks generally. It is available online at 'https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265909749_Can_Banks_Individually_Create_Money_Out_of_Nothing_-_The_Theories_and_the_Empirical_Evidence'. The article abstract states:

"This paper presents the first empirical evidence in the history of banking on the question of whether banks can create money out of nothing. The banking crisis has revived interest in this issue, but it had remained unsettled. Three hypotheses are recognised in the literature. According to the financial intermediation theory of banking, banks are merely intermediaries like other non-bank financial institutions, collecting deposits that are then lent out. According to the fractional reserve theory of banking, individual banks are mere financial intermediaries that cannot create money, but collectively they end up creating money through systemic interaction. A third theory maintains that each individual bank has the power to create money 'out of nothing' and does so when it extends credit (the credit creation theory of banking)."

According to Werner's review of the literature, the credit creation theory of banking was dominant until about 1930. So it was generally assumed that banks could create money out of thin air until about 1930. The theory was then replaced by the fractional reserve theory of credit creation which remained dominant until

the late 1960s and was then replaced by the financial intermediary view of the role of banks. Since the 2008 financial crash, the credit creation theory of banking is again raising much interest.

According to this theory banks extend credit and the primary determinant of how much they lend is the confidence that the loan will be repaid fully and on time. Assume customer CA comes to bank BA and requests a loan for 100mm (100 million). BA thinks the investment looks good and advances the loan. Now suppose CA spends the 100mm and it all goes into deposits in bank BB. BA now has a problem because it needs to pay BB 100mm. How do banks resolve matters like this? Banks have what are called reserve accounts with the Central Bank. BA would transfer 100mm from its reserve account to BB's reserve account. But what if it does not have that amount in its reserve account? Then it will attempt to borrow the reserves from other banks. These other banks have an incentive to loan to BA because they will earn a higher rate of interest on any reserves that they loan to BA than what is paid to them by the Central Bank for holding the reserves in their reserve accounts. If the other banks in the system trust BA, then the money will be loaned. If not, BA may have to approach the Central Bank and borrow reserves. Borrowing reserves from the Central Bank costs money and so will reduce BA's profit on the loan.

Of course when BA makes its loan of 100mm, BB may have also made a loan of 100mm to customer CB who pays it into BA. In which case BA would owe BB 100mm and BB would owe BA 100mm so it's a wash. Both loans effectively cancel out, while 200mm of credit has been created. In practice the numbers are unlikely to ever exactly match but the differences between the various loans will often be small and so the amount that has to be cleared between banks each night will be small relative to the loans made.

And the Central Bank is happy with all this. The Central Bank does not want commercial banks to forgo profitable investments because they fear they won't be able to access reserves to enable interbank clearing to happen. That would be bad economics. The Central Bank is mainly just concerned that credit creation does not lead to inflation. But it has no intrinsic objection to lots of credit/money being created if it will increase profitable economic activity.

The role of the Central Bank in all this is to ensure that there are sufficient reserves

available to ensure that profitable investments can be undertaken. It would be horrified if banks refused to finance profitable investments because they had already loaned out all their deposits. Has anyone ever heard of a bank giving that as an explanation for not financing a loan?

(I would add a caveat here. I am thinking very much in terms of the UK economy. Being a member of the Eurozone may introduce complications of which I am unaware. However *'Modern Monetary Theory and European Macroeconomics'* (Routledge International Studies in Money and Banking), 16th Jun 2017, by Dirk H. Ehnts, paints a very similar credit creation picture for the Eurozone.)

At this point I am happy if readers of *Irish Political Review* are just aware that there are these several quite different explanations of money creation in a modern fiat money economy. There is a growing literature supporting the *credit creation theory*. For instance, there is an article by McLeay et al, *'Money creation in the modern economy'*, in the first Quarterly Bulletin of the Bank of England in 2014. It states fairly bluntly:

"In the modern economy, most money takes the form of bank deposits. But how those bank deposits are created is often misunderstood: the principal way is through commercial banks making loans. Whenever a bank makes a loan, it simultaneously creates a matching deposit in the borrower's bank account, thereby creating new money. The reality of how money is created today differs from the description found in some economics textbooks:

* Rather than banks receiving deposits when households save and then lending them out, bank lending creates deposits.

* In normal times, the central bank does not fix the amount of money in circulation, nor is central bank money 'multiplied up' into more loans and deposits."

Although I did not find this article particularly good, I am quoting it mainly to show that the credit creation theory is being taken very seriously if it is written up in a Bank of England quarterly review article.

I first came across the credit creation theory in 2012 when I read *'Where Does Money Come From?'* by Ryan-Collins, Greenham, Richard Werner and Jackson at the New Economics Foundation. I found the theory quite surprising (having been taught the fractional reserve theory), but have increasingly been convinced in the light of the financial crisis that it is a more accurate description of the role of

banks in the global economy.

Werner's 2014 article summarises his attempt to prove the credit creation theory by reviewing the activity of a cooperating bank:

"...The question which of the theories is correct has far-reaching implications for research and policy. Surprisingly, despite the longstanding controversy, until now no empirical study has tested the theories. This is the contribution of the present paper. An empirical test is conducted, whereby money is borrowed from a cooperating bank, while its internal records are being monitored, to establish whether in the process of making the loan available to the borrower, the bank transfers these funds from other accounts within or outside the bank, or whether they are newly created. This study establishes for the first time empirically that banks individually create money out of nothing. The money supply is created as 'fairy dust' produced by the banks individually, 'out of thin air'."

I am somewhat wary of Werner's methodology but the article is a useful summary of the various theories. I will leave the matter at this point and will be happy if the readers of the *Irish Political Review* are now aware that there are seriously different theories of money creation in a modern fiat money economy and, of course, which theory is correct will have huge implications for bank regulation.

Martin Dolphin

NAMA: A Pointer To The Future?

When the 2008 Crash struck in Ireland, many projects were dropped before completion and the money spent on them had no hope of achieving a return.

With the property market frozen, and with an overhang of developer bank debt in a depressed market, the late Brian Lenihan—the unsung hero of Fianna Fail heroism in the face of the largely externally-generated crisis—stepped in with the creative solution of establishing a National Asset Management Agency: NAMA. This was a State Capitalist institution in the best national tradition of Bord Na Mona, ESB and the rest. That Agency—despite constant barracking from Leftist, Developer and Financial interests—sorted out the mess created by Anglo-US Capitalism.

It bought almost worthless developer-loans from the banks, saving the latter from collapse. And it acted creatively: some projects with no hope of viability were wound up—using Credit supplied by the Government. Other projects were

brought on to completion in association with the developer—now reduced to the status of a well-paid employee.

Unfortunately there was a change of Government in the middle of this process. Brian Lenihan was replaced by Fine Gael's Michael Noonan and, while Noonan for the most part maintained the NAMA project intact, he set himself the task of bringing its work to an end. For that purpose, NAMA was encouraged to sell off packages of loans to foreign financiers. (I believe Irish investors were not allowed to buy these packages.)

The idea was to wind up NAMA as quickly as possible, disperse the team which had been put together, and grab the quick bucks brought in by the sale of debt to repay loans to NAMA from the Government loans—money which the Government was intent on spending elsewhere. When NAMA was brought into being, the usual newspaper speculation was about how many billion it was going to cost the taxpayer. In the event, it made a tidy profit for the taxpayer!

However, there are some signs that NAMA is not quietly fading away. There are continuing projects, such as building social housing in conjunction with developers.

It seems to me that any sensible Minister for Housing would task NAMA with housing the people of Dublin and other places—using such intermediaries as it saw fit, including Local Authorities. There can be little doubt that it would be superior to the present arrangement which is haphazard, to say the least. NAMA should be empowered to build, acquire, and plan for, homes for rent at affordable prices as a priority.

It is ridiculous to make people depend on the desire of others to make a profit to find somewhere to live, which is the present situation. In bad times, lending institutions are loth to provide funds which could further depress the market and which might not be repaid, while in boom times, costs outrun the purses of those needing a place to live.

The market goes up and down, but a growing population needs homes to live in all the time.

The privatisation of so much credit creation to the banking system leaves Government in a difficult position. Elected bodies are held responsible for services which traditional practice has outsourced to the profit sector.

What was discovered in 2008 (and it came as a surprise to high and low) was

that the private activity of the banks—run on the profit system for the benefit of top executives responsible only to their shareholders—is conducted on an implicit guarantee from the Government, which represents the interests of the mass of society. *Too big too fail!* is the banking mantra—and it is true: a banking collapse would have brought pain to the men of no property, those with nothing much in the bank: Germany in the 1930s comes to mind.

The whole money charade on which modern capitalist society is predicated is a delicate construct which relies on Confidence to proceed. Other social systems are conceivable, which manufacture and allocate goods on a different basis, but they certainly would not appear by magic out of the ruins of a banking collapse and a demise of capitalist credit institutions.

It might be argued that banks are dispensable, that the State can provide

any necessary financial services. And that is undoubtedly true. But, for that to happen, there has to be slow and careful preparation, and a learning process. Hybrid institutions, such as Nama—which operate in a limited sphere, one which was formerly occupied by the banks—are an ideal entry point into social control of credit/money creation.

When the State had to bail out the banks, the price paid was to have a State representative on the Board: the idea was that these would be dispensed with in time. But, surely, the right approach would be to increase public representation on the Boards of Banks and, indeed, to give them a significant say in banking policy? After all it is the credit of the society at large, embodied in the State, which maintains in being the credit system in general and the banks in particular.

Angela Clifford

100th Anniversary
Part 14

The Russian Revolution

A 'Special Correspondent' of the London *Times*, reporting from Russia, wrote, in an article entitled *Lenin's Tendencies*, published on 10th January 1919:

"there are indications that Lenin, with his instinct of leadership and his profound knowledge of Russian psychology, is not blind to certain of its possibilities, and is showing a steadily increasing inclination to move towards the Right, and having established the Soviet system of government, to do what is possible to broaden its foundation by moderating its policy and by conciliating the classes whose support he requires. This inclination is reflected in the probably quite false reports which are now being put about as to his having been arrested by Trotsky. Whether he will succeed in carrying through any policy on these lines, involving the suppression or supersession of many of his old colleagues, remains to be seen. His political ability appears to be so conspicuous that one hesitates to declare him incapable of achieving any object; yet the difficulties he must face are enormous..."

The revolution of October 1917—the assertion that the Soviets, in which the Bolshevik Party had become dominant, would be made into the system of State, and the dispersal of the Parliamentary Constituent Assembly a few weeks later—was enacted on the assumption that the

establishment of Socialist State power in Russia would be followed quickly by Socialist revolutions in Germany and France, and that Russia would then become part of a kind of international European *melange* in which its singularity would be diluted very heavily.

I do not know of any attempt to envisage how this might happen. But it was certainly assumed, in very general terms, that it would happen.

Trotsky had asserted a dozen years before 1917 that, when the Tsarist regime fell, its place would not be taken by a bourgeois regime. The bourgeoisie were too weak, socially and ideologically, to form a State and inaugurate an era of capitalist development. The industrial working class in Russia, though very small, was highly organised, and was highly susceptible to socialist influence. The place of the Tsarist State would therefore be taken by a revolutionary Socialist State.

And that is what happened.

Trotsky, while insisting that socialist political revolution was bound to happen when Tsarism fell, also insisted that the development of socialist society would be impossible in Russia if Russian socialist revolution was not followed quickly by European socialist revolution. But he took it to be a virtual certainty that a

socialist revolution in Russia would be the first act of a general European socialist revolution.

What would happen if there was a socialist political revolution in Russia and Capitalism consolidated itself in Germany and France? The answer was that that was a problem that would not occur. Socialist revolution in Europe was inevitable, and the problem in Russia was to maintain Socialist political power until it did occur.

How long could socialist power maintain itself in Russia, unsupported by European socialist revolution, and surrounded by the overwhelmingly large small bourgeois class it had brought about with its slogan of *The Land To The Peasants*? If the Russian Socialist State was unable to set about the development of socialist society until it was supported by European socialism, and capitalism consolidated itself in Europe—what then?

After Lenin died, and after Trotsky failed to assert himself as leader in succession to Lenin (as he had apparently been urged to do by Lenin), Trotsky, in the role of Oppositionist, began a campaign against the project of *Socialism In One Country*, which he described as a project of the Bureaucracy which had been brought to dominance in Russia by the consolidation of capitalism in Europe. The Socialist State in Russia was degenerating in its isolation from European Socialist Revolution. And the name of that inevitable degeneration was *Stalinism*.

That was in 1924. But, in following through the course of the Revolution, I came to the conclusion that the development of *Socialism In One Country* had begun in substance six years earlier. It began with Lenin's insistence on ending the Russo-German War and making a Treaty with Germany early in 1918. And that was when there was not only talk of arresting Lenin, but grounds for doing so.

Ending the war with Germany was in accordance with the slogan of the Revolution: *Peace, Bread and Land!* But, when it came to ending the war by means of a Treaty with Germany, there was strong opposition to it within the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, and the Left Socialist Revolutionaries, who had supported the Revolution and were in Coalition with the Bolsheviks, were entirely against it. And Trotsky, who was doing the negotiations, agreed that the war should be ended but was against ending it by Treaty. He just wanted the fighting to stop and to leave it at that, so that there would be *"Neither*

War Nor Peace".

But Germany insisted that either the war must be ended by Treaty, or it would continue. It needed security on its Eastern Front so that it could transfer forces to the West, where the United States had entered the war against it.

The leader of the Left Bolshevik opposition to making a Treaty was not Trotsky, but Bukharin, who had been very close to Lenin. Lenin had admired him as a theorist in a patronising kind of way. But, early in 1918, he came out in strong opposition to Lenin on the issue of the Treaty. His position was that, if the German Government did not simply let the war end, Russia should declare *"revolutionary war"* against it—should concentrate on stirring up revolution, rather than try to hold fixed positions in the field. And he gained a majority in the Central Committee for this position. But Lenin, as head of Government, refused to implement it. He insisted that there must be a Treaty. And, if the Party institutions held out against a Treaty and insisted on revolutionary war, he threatened to bypass them and appeal directly to the Party membership.

Bukharin would have been within his rights under the structures of Leninism if he had arrested Lenin (or tried to), so that Party policy could be implemented. The Party was structured hierarchically. That was the substance of Rosa Luxemburg's case against Leninism, and had been Trotsky's until he joined the Party shortly before the Revolution.

Lenin was not an educator of the workers so that they might act for themselves. That was Menshevism. The Bolshevik leadership was conceived as a directive force on the workers, not as a representative body thrown up by the workers who had figured things out for themselves.

Bolshevik leadership, if it gained influence with the mass of the working class, would make purposeful class activity possible. No amount of mere 'education' would give spontaneous political cohesion and purposefulness to the mass of the workers. Lenin stated this view frankly enough. And it was what distinguished his conception of the *"dictatorship of the proletariat"* from Rosa Luxemburg's.

Lenin's threat to appeal to the Party membership against the leading institution of the Party which he had himself designed to be authoritative was therefore, in the form of things, an anarchic subversive assault on his own principles which would

have warranted his arrest.

At Bukharin's trial twenty years later, it was alleged that he had considered arresting Lenin. It would be very surprising if he had not considered it. But it does not seem that he attempted it. And why did he not attempt it? Because he knew in his bones that Lenin was the Party, even though in the excitement of the moment he had lost control of its central institutions.

It seems that the revolutionary war proposal had a clear majority at first, but Lenin wore it down until there was an even split in the Central Committee and policy was stalemated. And that is how things remained for a couple of weeks, while Trotsky used delaying tactics in the negotiations with the Germans at Brest-Litovsk and made revolutionary speeches to the German and Austrian workers, and the German Government became increasingly impatient and stiffened the terms on which they would make a Treaty.

It does not seem that the terms of the Treaty were the main issue for the Bolshevik Party at first, but whether a Treaty should be made at all with either the German Imperialism or the other Imperialisms. But, as the German terms became stiffer in the face of the Bolshevik delaying tactics, the concessions that would have to be made to get a Treaty became an issue.

While the negotiations were going on, the Bolshevik Revolution was getting a grip on the Ukraine, where it was opposed by a Ukrainian nationalist movement backed by Germany. The final German terms included the relinquishing of Bolshevik power in the Ukraine and recognition of it as a sphere of German interest.

Trotsky did not vote for either war or peace in the Central Committee. His position was *"Neither war nor peace"*. It was based on the assumption that, if denied a Treaty, the Germans either would not or could not resume the war. Germany and Austria were ripe for socialist revolution and German war on socialist Russia would precipitate revolution.

He had the fate of Russia in his hands at that point. He could resolve the stalemate in the Central Committee by voting for either peace or war. If he voted for a peace Treaty, he would have given the victory to Lenin. If he had voted for revolutionary war, he would undoubtedly have become the leader of the war party. He was the outstanding leadership figure in the revolution, next to Lenin, and Bukharin's character was not conducive to leadership and was not egoistic.

The reasoning in his "*Neither war nor peace*" policy would of itself have led him to become the leader of the war party, once it became perfectly clear that revolutionary war was the only alternative to a humiliating peace.

The war party appealed to him not to let himself be browbeaten by Lenin. It included some very substantial figures. Dzerzhinsky (the founder of Cheka) was one of them and he was confident that they could easily cope with Lenin's threat to resign and appeal to the masses.

But Trotsky delayed and delayed before finally giving his vote to Lenin—not because Lenin had persuaded him, he said, but in the interest of party unity. The implication was that party unity could not be achieved if Lenin did not get his way.

I published a pamphlet about thirty years ago, arguing that this was the beginning of *Socialism In A Single Country*. It was also the beginning of the one-party state. The Left Social Revolutionaries resigned from the Government in disgust at the submission to German terms and there was never again a possibility of any party but the Bolsheviks being in Office. And Lenin, I think, was relieved to see them go.

Stalin supported Lenin in the Treaty dispute. He was sceptical on the probability of socialist revolution in Germany coming to the aid of the Bolsheviks if stimulated by revolutionary war. There was nothing surprising in that. He had observed Europe prosaically with working-class eyes. He did not see it through the prism of transcendental philosophy masquerading as materialism. The surprising thing is that Lenin, too, was sceptical about the European potential for socialist revolution when he had to consider the matter in earnest and base political action on it.

The pessimism or optimism of the Russian leaders about the prospects for socialist revolution in Western Europe did not influence the course of events in Western Europe, except insofar as it influenced the decision in February/March 1918 to make a Treaty with Germany instead of declaring revolutionary war. And it cannot be known whether Lenin's decision that it was absolutely necessary to make a Treaty was right, because it cannot be known what the consequences of declaring revolutionary war would have been.

If revolutionary war had been launched, and it had provoked a revolutionary

response in Germany and Austria, then the entire course of world affairs could well have been entirely different, and the Russian Revolution would have been what many of those who brought it about expected it to be: the spark that set Europe ablaze.

But that was, I think, the least likely outcome because what socialist revolution would be in advanced capitalist conditions had, as Paul Lensch suggested, been misconceived in terms of bourgeois revolutions.

The Bolshevik Revolution, in a pre-capitalist society, after the fall of an autocracy, was in many respects a bourgeois revolution carried out by socialists because the bourgeoisie was not up to it. And its first major reform was indisputably bourgeois—the creation of a vast class of small landowners.

There was no vestige of bourgeois revolution lying around in Germany waiting to be made in the old-fashioned way. There was no substance to the British war-propaganda description of the German State as an Autocracy that society needed to free itself from. German society was perhaps more bourgeois than British—it depends what you mean by "*bourgeois*". And its economic system was one of advanced capitalism, with socialist enclaves, in which the working class had begun to play an active part.

That is how it was described in James Connolly's *Workers' Republic* in 1915-16. And, on the strength of it, Connolly supported the German Socialists who supported the War of Defence against British wrecking activity ("*The War Upon The German Nation*"). I concluded that this view of Germany was sound, and that the German working class had no sufficient reason for coming out in mass action against the State.

Lenin, looking at the particular situation as the creator and leader of a State, was not prepared to risk the State on the possibility of German revolution, even though as a revolutionary striving for power he might have declared that German revolution was a virtually certain outcome of the World War.

Of course the launching of revolutionary war would not necessarily have resulted in the sweeping away of the Bolshevik State. The State might have survived from March to November, when Germany imploded as American military power was brought to bear on it. And the end might have come earlier if Germany had not been able to transfer its Eastern Armies to the Western Front. And, if the

Bolshevik State had still been there, and at war with Germany, when the Allies won, it would have been an Ally, and the Allies could hardly have made war on it straight away, and Bolshevism might even have been a party to the making of a post-War settlement of Europe.

It is not the case that there was no argument for Bukharin's position in 1918. And, if the view is taken in earnest that there was no future in terms of socialist socio-economic development for the socialist political revolution in Russia if it was not brought into the context of European socialist development, then there was a strong case for Bukharin's position.

A few years later there was a great rupture between Bukharin and Trotsky on the issue of *Socialism In A Single Country*. But in 1918 it was Bukharin who was in earnest about international socialism and it was Trotsky who let him down and who enabled Lenin to isolate the Bolshevik revolution from Europe and to direct it *de facto* into the isolated development of socialism in Russia.

Bukharin held onto the Left, Internationalist, position as long as he could, as Lenin kept the State functional with Right, and effectively nationalist, adaptations to the predominant, private-property, social reality.

The Wars of Intervention obscured the situation for a couple of years, but when they ended with comprehensive Bolshevik victory internal economic realities had to be dealt with. The crucial thing was what was called the *New Economic Policy*, in 1921. This was the establishment of a national market for the millions of peasant/farmer owners of the land to trade in, with the State supplying the cities with food and State industry with raw materials through commercial relations with the farmers. (These owned the land but could not sell it: though leasing came to be permitted.)

Foreign trade was a state monopoly but internal trade was free. And what was that but the working out of the bourgeois revolution that was implicit in the 1917 slogan, *The Land To The Peasants?*

It was what Rosa Luxemburg said Leninism must lead to. It was what Bukharin had tried to prevent it. It was the necessity of Socialism in a single country. And Bukharin, having failed to prevent Lenin from directing the revolution onto this line, adapted to it as an irreversible reality and became its theorist or ideologist just as Trotsky remembered his Permanent Revolution and came out against it.

It was a fixed idea of Marxist socialism that socialism followed on from capitalist industrialisation. Lenin had established a socialist state in a pre-capitalist country and, in order to do so, he had greatly increased the ownership of property. The socialist State then had the task of constructing an industrial base for itself, by socialist methods, against the grain of the predominant private property system.

It was necessary to industrialise because industrialisation was an essential element of capitalist Progress, and Socialism was an outcome of capitalist Progress. Socialism without industrialisation was not a practical possibility. The capitalist world would not allow it. Capitalism was world capitalism. Bukharin said it repeatedly and nobody disagreed.

The theorist of this view was Rosa Luxemburg. Bukharin disagreed with her reasoning but I could never quite grasp his criticism. Capitalism behaved as Luxemburg said it was obliged by its core mechanism to behave. It could not be otherwise, she said. It was incapable of existing as a national system. It was driven outwards as a necessity of its existence. It was Imperialist in essence and not merely through the ambitions of rulers of states. It must expand or die.

She also remarked that it was the first mode of production in history that had a propaganda system as part of itself.

It did not disrupt a stable system of social life based on another mode of production and replace it with its own system which would then endure for generations and centuries and generate its own conservatism. Whatever it created, it then disrupted a moment later.

When Tony Blair, the nominally socialist Prime Minister of Britain, told the British workers that they must no longer cling to the reactionary expectation that they could have a job for life if they acquired a skill, he was expressing an ultimate truth of Capitalism.

Humans in the capitalist market were raw material to be made and remade to meet the requirements of the market in its permanently revolutionary career which could let nothing stand still.

Capitalism therefore could not simply be, and let things rest. It had to justify itself all the way along because, in its disruptive action, it was "*always doing and never done*", as a reactionary poet said of the progressive Puritans of the English Revolution of the mid-17th century—the Puritans being the first form of the capitalist middle class.

This was implicit in Luxemburg's analysis of capitalist reproduction. It was made explicit by Paul Lensch, a War Socialist with whom she parted company, in a pamphlet published in 1917. Capitalism, he said, was the most relentless revolutionary force in the world, and socialists as revolutionaries could not hope to over take it.

Bismarck, at the foundation of the German state, made arrangements that curbed the nakedly destructive effects of capitalism on social life, making possible the condition of working class life in Germany that Connolly appreciated forty-five years later. Those arrangements were reproduced in the post-1945 European development under the influence of the Christian Democracy of Germany, Italy and Belgium, and Gaullism in France. Tony Blair, in order to break up this European social conservatism, appointed a Minister For Competition in Europe, who was effectively a Minister For Free Capitalism. And the Minister was a very radical Socialist, Kim Howells.

The model for Rosa Luxemburg's conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat that would function through the free conflict of parties in a Parliamentary system was England. It was agreed among Marxists that 19th century England was governed essentially by a bourgeois dictatorship, even though the form of State was a monarchy, and the aristocracy that created the State continued to hold important positions within it. The actuality of the bourgeois social presence determined the course of political development. And so, in like manner, the actuality of working class presence would determine the course of development in the 20th century.

I don't recall that Lenin argued against her that that working class was not a class in the way that the bourgeoisie were, but he acted on the assumption that this was the case.

The aristocracy had been the owners of the country in the era before the market became general. After industrialisation within the market, the bourgeoisie were the owners of what became the major form of property. They were constituted as a class by the ownership of property. But the proletariat was a propertyless class.

Proletarians lived by being employed by property owners. Their first sense of collective existence was as the employees of a particular capitalist and that gave them a sense of affinity with the capitalist who gave them a living. It took a fair

degree of agitation and organisation to change that into a sense that it was they who gave the capitalist a living. And, even when that sense was developed, it still remained the case that the capitalist had to be successful in business for them to have a living.

Ernest Bevin, the Trade Union boss who became a statesman, was well aware of the class weakness of the propertyless. He had the idea of somehow establishing a job as a form of property—the ideal which Tony Blair dismissed as reactionary. But, having laid the basis for the welfare state as Minister for Labour during the War, Bevin was sidelined by Attlee in 1945, on the insistence of the King it is said, into the futile job of Foreign Secretary in the Empire that was crumbling because of the War.

The Welfare State boosted working class status for a generation, so much so that in the 1970s Harold Wilson declared that Labour had become "*the natural party of power*" in Britain. This was met with middle class panic. Luxemburg's ideal of the dictatorship of the proletariat was being realised!? It was said that a *coup d'etat* was on the cards.

But it was all an illusion. The working class refused to act as the ruling class. It used the strength of its position for mere wage-bargaining, but overdid it. The Trade Unions refused to engage in the business of management themselves when the Bullock Commission on Workers' Control proposed it. They insisted that the capitalist management should deliver what was demanded of it.

In that case, Margaret Thatcher said, let the management manage, and she won an Election on it. She won a series of Elections. And, when Labour returned under Blair, he scotched the notion of a secure job for life, and he appointed a radical socialist to be Minister for freer Capitalism in Europe.

If Lenin and Luxemburg had been around, he could have said: *I told you so!* But Luxemburg could have said that it bore out her analysis of capitalism as an inherently disruptive economic system.

Her argument was that the values invested in a particular round of capitalist production produced more value than was invested in it. The purpose of the enterprise was to realise that additional value, this surplus value, as profit. But the demand to buy this surplus of the production process and realise it as profit did not exist within that production process.

The surplus had to be sold outside the

Replies to Fr. Seamus Murphy SJ

market that produced it. The individual capitalist could sell his surplus at the expense of a rival capitalist, but that could not be the case with capitalist production as a whole. Existing capitalism as a whole had to find markets for its surplus outside itself, turning pre-capitalist economies into markets for the capitalist surplus. And that was Imperialism.

She argued this in a review of capitalist development, *The Accumulation Of Capital*. It had a disturbing effect on the theorists of German Social Democracy. She replied to their criticism in *Accumulation Of Capital: An Anti-Critique* during the War.

I read Volume 1 of *Capital* in Slieve Luacra. What it describes is the process of production in a single enterprise. I later read Volumes 2 and 3 and the *Theories Of Surplus Value*, and it seemed to me that, as Marx traced Capitalism from the single enterprise to Capitalism as a whole, he found it impossibly difficult to grasp it theoretically.

Bukharin held that he did grasp it theoretically, but in his criticism of Luxemburg he resorted to increasingly complicated forms of algebra which I did not even attempt to follow. I was surprised that he devoted time and effort to this in the early twenties but supposed that it had something to do with his transition from Left Communism, in which the Russian Socialist State must be encompassed by European revolutionary socialism or fail, to Right Communism, which undertook the development of Socialism in isolated Russia as a necessity brought about by the failure of socialist revolution in Europe and the growth of the socialist state as the central element in Russian social life, which could not be undone.

But, while disagreeing with Luxemburg about why it was so, Bukharin said repeatedly: "*Capitalism is world capitalism*". Lenin had therefore set Russia in conflict with the world. Trotsky had helped him to do it. But, when Lenin died, Trotsky reverted to his earlier position that socialist development in isolated Russia was certain to fail, leaving to others the necessity of attempting to do it nevertheless.

(I suppose I should explain how Pat Murphy and myself came to be involved as non-Marxist outsiders in the attempt in the early 1960s to establish common ground between Communists, various kinds of Trotskyists, and Republicans. That will be done in the next article.)

Brendan Clifford

History And Political Violence

Fr Seamus Murphy writes on the violent events that led to the War of Independence and Civil War ("War of Independence seen as Catholic war on Protestants", *Opinion & Analysis*, January 15th). His examples conform to pre-existing conclusions. In Fr Murphy's memory, British violence and coercion are absent, as is unionist sectarianism. So too is the Irish Parliamentary Party's decision to withdraw from Westminster, eight months prior to Sinn Féin winning overwhelming support for the policy in December 1918.

Sinn Féin's election success was due, partly, to British capitulation to a unionist revolt during the 1912-14 period and the sidelining of IPP views in years following. Influential too was the extension of the franchise, making the election more representative of popular opinion. The Irish demand for self-determination led to the setting up of parallel institutions. The British were determined to crush these elements of dual power. In such circumstances Irish and British violence confronted each other.

The use of Irishmen in crown forces to defeat the Irish men and women who rallied to defence of Dáil institutions is unsurprising in an imperial context. It had diminishing returns. Royal Irish Constabulary resignations led to recruitment of new British counterinsurgency forces, adding an extra layer of viciousness. This factor is missing also in Fr Murphy's version of the past.

Fr Murphy misunderstands the threat to unionist sectarian privilege that Irish self-determination represented. The unionist assertion that Home Rule within the British Empire meant rule by Fr Murphy's church disguised a determination to exclude Roman Catholics from social, economic and political equality. Fr Murphy offers no practical suggestion that would have reversed unionist political reaction. His allusion to the 1973 Sunningdale Agreement in Northern Ireland illustrates the point. It was defeated by a rerun of 1912-14, a unionist revolt aided by state forces, occasioning murderous violence in Dublin.

Finally, Fr Murphy fails to address the "Rome rule" exercised by Fr Murphy's church in independent Ireland. Sectarian control over education, health and social services, encouraged within British jurisdiction, was reinforced by Irish governments. Significant, but not sufficient, progress has been made in eroding that influence in recent years. —**Tom Cooper**

Fr Seamus Murphy's condemnation of nationalist violence in 1916 and in the War of Independence might have some moral integrity had he not supported the invasion of Iraq in 2003, suggesting that this was justifiable on the basis of liberation theology. The reasons given to justify the Iraq invasion were considered by many, in knowledgeable positions at the time, to be bogus and are now accepted universally to be so. Many millions of people across the globe protested against the war but to no avail.

We now know the consequences of that war, including the many thousands of deaths of innocent people and the resulting devastation and destruction of the country. The aftermath of such actions has led to the turmoil that now exists in the Middle East.

The Nuremberg tribunal declared, "To initiate a war of aggression is not only an international crime, it is the supreme international crime, differing only from other war crimes, in that it contains within it the accumulated evil of the whole." Therefore Fr Murphy's condemnation of violence, during our War of Independence sounds hollow when one considers his support of violence under other circumstances which were far more egregious and devastating. — **Tom Partridge**

Irish Times, 17 January 2019

"The Green Flag Flew; The Red Flag Flew!"

*"In Dublin City in 1913 the boss was boss
And employed a slave."*

So opens Donagh McDonagh's song of the epic struggle of that year, commencing with the August 1913 Lockout, when the Irish Transport and General Workers' Union led by Big Jim Larkin and James Connolly fought for its very existence. It survived, and it was my honour to serve as Head of Research with both the ITGWU, and its successor Union SIPTU, from 1971 to 2010.

But it had not been an urban struggle only. It had been a rural one as well. One could just as easily sing: *"In Dublin County in 1913"*.

One of the fiercest fights of that year was that waged by agricultural labourers under Larkin's leadership against the farmers of Fingal, North County Dublin, commencing in April 1913. In one incident the farm workers blocked the road in order to prevent their farmer employers bringing their cattle to market. The English writer G.K. Chesterton read a newspaper account that stated:

"A drove of cattle came into a village called Swords and was stopped by the rioters".

Chesterton was inspired to write a poem in honour of those farm labourers, which was published in the British Labour newspaper the **'Daily Herald'**, on 11th October 1913.

Chesterton entitled it **'A Song of Swords'**, but since he left it without a tune, I added one myself. I sang it in Liberty Hall, Dublin, on 30th January 1997, after SIPTU had marked the 50th anniversary of the passing of Larkin with a performance of *"Salute to Big Jim"*. On the stage that night, I had already sung my setting of *"Homage to Jim Larkin"*, a poem by the Cork writer Frank O'Connor, published in the *'Irish Times'*, on 9th December 1944.

See <http://nearfm.ie/podcast/?p=30188> to listen to the podcast, this February 1, of Episode 3 ('Labour') of 'The Indignant Muse' series by Terry Moylan, on the Dublin Northside radio station, Near FM, where the second item is a recording of Chesterton's *"Song of Swords"*:

In a place called Swords on the Irish road
It is told for a new renown
How we held the horns of the cattle, and how
We will hold the horns of the devil now
Ere the lord of hell, with the horn on his brow,
Is crowned in Dublin town.

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

'Should we stop building social housing?'

I was astonished to read the claim that private housing associations could be the answer to the homelessness crisis ("Should the State stop building social housing?", Opinion & Analysis, February 6th).

History tells us that, when properly motivated, governments provide for the housing needs of citizens better than any other entity.

The fact is the State has already all but stopped building social housing and there is a case to be made that private housing associations are a significant part of the problem in that they played a big part in creating the smokescreen that allowed government to walk away from its responsibilities in this vital area.

Given the depth to which they are now embedded in the provision of social housing and their enthusiastic support for the failed outsourcing policy which was pursued over the past number of decades, they must also take their share of the blame for the current housing crisis.

Addressing the housing needs of a nation is not rocket science or in need of charities whether they be "agile, innovative, more single-purpose" or anything else.

All that is required is an acceptance of the proposition that housing is a right which government vindicates by proper planning to ensure that the available stock meets demand.

Citizens should never have to rely on charities or voluntary organisations for the provision of vital necessities

Aside from that, has recent history not thought us of the very real dangers attached to allowing others to act in lieu of the State in providing for vital social and needs?

Jim O'Sullivan

Irish Times, 11.2.19

Light in the East and light in the West,
And light on the cruel lords,
On the souls that suddenly all men knew,
And the Green Flag flew and Red Flag flew,
And many a wheel of the world stopped, too,
When the cattle were stopped at Swords.

Be they sinners or less than saints
That smite in the street for rage,
We know where the shame shines bright:
we know
You that they smite at, you their foe,
Lords of the lawless wage and low,
This is your lawful wage.

Your pinched a child to a torture price
That you dared not name in words;
So black a jest was the silver bit
That your own speech shook for the shame of it.
And the coward was plain as a cow they hit
When the cattle have strayed at Swords.

The wheel of the torment of wives went round
To break men's brotherhood,
You gave the good Irish blood to grease
The clubs of your country's enemies,
You saw the brave man beat to the knees:
And you saw that it was good.

The rope of the rich is long and long—
The longest of hangmen's cords;
But the kings and crowds are holding their breath,
In a giant shadow o'er all beneath

Where God stands holding the scales of Death,
Between the cattle and Swords.

Haply the lords that hire and lend,
The lowest of all men's lords,
Who sell their kind like kine at a fair,
Will find no head of their cattle there;
But faces of men where cattle were;
Faces of men—and Swords.

And the name all shining and terrible,
The sternest of all man's words,
Still marks that place to seek or shun,
In the streets where the struggling cattle
run—
Grass and a silence of judgement done
In the place that is called Swords.

Manus O'Riordan

See also <http://nearfm.ie/podcast/?p=29914> for Episode 1 ('The Gathering Storm') of 'The Indignant Muse' series, broadcast this January 18th, where the first item was my recitation of Arthur M. Forrester's poem, *"Served Him Right"*.

See also www.itma.ie/goilin/song/roll_away_the_stone_manus_oriordan and <https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=fKDRO0cNbo&index=7&t=0s&list=UUuYB8CO7XsJwJvNePEOLmyg> for my recordings of Frank O'Connor's *"Homage to Jim Larkin"*. ■

Does
It

Up

Stack

?

Democracy

—where has it gone?

The City of Cork is the second largest city in political Ireland of twenty-six Counties, Dublin being by far the largest city in the State. Some years ago, when the last Cork City Manager retired, he was not replaced as such. The idea, probably emanating from the Department of the Environment and Local Government in Dublin, was floated on the news media that an amalgamation between Cork City and Cork County was being considered.

Some years ago Limerick City and County had been amalgamated. That amalgamation has taken place on paper and probably also on computer, but physically on the ground, there are still a lot of loose ends to tie up.

In the case of Cork, after much talk, a committee of five was set up to examine the various proposals and to make recommendations on whether there should be an amalgamation or whether the County Council should yield up territory to the City Council in view of the considerable spread of suburban development outside the city boundaries since the boundary was previously extended fifty years ago.

The Committee divided 3:2 in favour of amalgamation but the minority report of the two was so cogently argued in favour of retaining the separate identities of City and County and favouring an extension of the City boundaries, that the latter course was adopted by the Government. There was of course enormous lobbying and pressure exerted by large business interests and also by Councillors on each side.

Local taxation throughout Ireland is based on property values plus there is also a 'Grant-in-Aid' from the Government's national exchequer. The 'Grant-in-Aid' became necessary when Jack Lynch, advised by Martin O'Donoghue, abolished Rates on domestic homes so as to win the 1974 General Election which he did easily with such a wheeze. Somebody said at the time that at least the former British

landlords used their own money to buy elections but our egalitarian TDs use our money to buy their elections. It does not stack up either way, but at least there it is. We are endlessly fooled as an electorate.

The County, having much more industrial and business property than the City, has a much bigger budget. The County budget is about five times bigger than the City budget but, due to the wider spread, the Rates in the County are lower than those in the city—and so lobbying was intense to stop the city spreading. Also, there is the political dimension. County Councillors were going to lose seats and City Councillors, who were going to gain land area, were also facing new seats to be fought for and also new competition from outgoing County Councillors.

And the local elections are scheduled for May 2019!

There was quite a lot of shuffling and manoeuvring going on behind the scenery and, for the May 2019 elections at least, the matter was solved by retaining the same number of seats. This means there will be the same 31 seats in Cork City Council, even though the population of the city has almost doubled due to the boundary extension. There are now going to be six Councillors per Ward, except for Cork City South-West which will have seven Councillors.

What is a great disappointment about all of this is that the older heritage areas of Cork City do not get any specific representation. The historic Cork City Centre consists of an island between two channels of the River Lee '*Intra Fluvios*' and two small areas outside the rivers—Shandon and North Cathedral on the north side and Barrack Street, Elizabeth Fort and St. Finbarr's Cathedral on the south side.

The heritage nature of these three areas is similar to each other but totally different to the nature and needs of the great housing estates and the industrial parks of the rest of the city.

Heritage and tourism seems to have been ignored in favour of political expediency. Perhaps, when the dust settles after the 2019 May Local Elections, something may be done? Due to the boundary extension, there have been huge numbers of public servants also being moved. Nothing is revealed about this at present.

When Tim Lucey, who was a previous City Manager, was appointed as County Manager, there was a lot of speculation

but as it was such an unusual shift that speculation was to be expected. Then it was announced that a new CEO (Chief Executive Officer) was appointed to the City Hall job and her name was Ms Ann Doherty, who was previously an official in the HSE (Health Services Executive). That announcement was unusual too, as the previous way of dealing with incoming new managers was that they had been managers of another city (such as Limerick or Galway) or deputy manager in some other area.

Some years ago the Cork Harbour Board was abolished and its functions transferred to the Port of Cork Company. The Port Authority had its headquarters on the eastern tip of the old historic island on which the City of Cork is built. Along with the Harbour Authority building on the very secure site, there are a number of Jacobean Bonded Warehouses where dutiable merchandise, mainly wine, spirits and tobacco, were held by the Revenue Customs and Excise until the Duty was paid by the importing merchants.

The Port of Cork is leaving Cork and going 20 kms to Ringaskiddy. Where is Ringaskiddy? It is on the Right Bank of the lower Lee where there is a commercial harbour. The Liners come into Cobh which is on the Left Bank.

Cork City's Quays are to be abandoned because Developers want low level bridges downriver of the city so as to connect their developments. So the Port of Cork Authority had to be shifted out of Cork City.

No democratic process is involved in these enormous moves. The people are being told after these things happen. The people have been rendered powerless.

All the heritage buildings of Cork seem to be fair game for a coterie of powerful and unscrupulous developers who seem intent on reducing the city to a heap of rubble and replacing beautiful buildings with concrete and glass boxes.

The developers appear to run the City Planning Office and now there is Statutory Legislation in place so that the bigger developments can by-pass the local Planning Office by going directly to *An Bórd Pleanála* in Dublin. It does not stack up because the *Bórd* knows little about Cork, which is 265 kms from their bubble in Dublin.

The merits of the Developer seem to count for more than the merits of their developments, and little or no regard is given to heritage or to the beauty of the environment, built and otherwise.

Nationalities continued

that was done was the result of civilians firing upon German troops from buildings which those troops had in consequence to attack, I remember that in South Africa Lord Roberts issued an order that whenever there was an attack upon the railways in his line of communication every Boer house and farmstead within a radius of ten square miles had to be destroyed.

When I hear of the unavoidable killing of civilians in a line of battle 100 miles long in a densely populated country, being, as it were, part of the German plan of campaign, I remember how the British swept up the whole non-combatant Boer population into concentration camps, and kept it there until the little children died in thousands of fever and cholera; so that the final argument in causing the Boers to make peace was the fear that at the rate of infant mortality in those concentration camps there would be no new generation left to inherit the republic for which their elders were fighting.

This vicious and rebellious memory of

mine will also recur to the recent attempt of Persia to form a constitutional government, and it recalls how, when that ancient nation shook off the fetters of its ancient despotism, and set to work to elaborate the laws and forms in the spirit of a modern civilised representative state, Russia, which in solemn treaty with England had guaranteed its independence, at once invaded it, and slaughtering all its patriots, pillaging its towns and villages, annexed part of its territories, and made the rest a mere Russian dependency. I remember how Sir Edward Grey, who now gushes over the sanctity of treaties, when appealed to stand by and make Russia stand by the treaty guaranteeing the independence of Persia, coolly refused to interfere.

Oh, yes, they are great fighters for small nationalities, great upholders of the sanctity of treaties!

And the Irish Home Rule press knows this, knows all these things that a poor workman like myself remembers, knows them all, and is cowardly and guiltily silent, and viciously and fiendishly evil.

Let us hope that all Ireland will not some day have to pay an awful price for

the lying attacks of the Home Rule press upon the noble German nation.

Let our readers encourage and actively spread every paper, circular, leaflet or manifesto which in these dark days dares to tell the truth.

Thus our honour may be saved; thus the world may learn that the Home Rule press is but a sewer-pipe for the pouring of English filth upon the shores of Ireland.

(1). **The Denshawai executions in 1906 here referred to are fully dealt with in the preface to Shaw's *John Bull's Other Island*, and in W. S. Blunt's *Diaries*.**

Remembering Gallipoli, President McAleese's Great War Crusade by Dr. Pat Walsh. 20pp, €5. £4.

Aspects of World War II: *Neutrality, Second Front, Nuremberg Trials, Cold War, etc.*, 92pp, €10. £5.

Connolly and German Socialism by Brendan Clifford. 80pp, €5. £5.

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

Stack

continued

Greed and excess profit-making are the gods that rule now in Cork. It will end in tears, as we saw before in 2008. The people are so blinded by propaganda and their own carelessness that they even entertain cries for 'A people's Forum' to oversee the Planning Process. We have two people's fora already which are called *Cork City Council* and *Cork County Council*, elected by democratic votes by the people but why don't they have control?

One thing we do know about developers is that, while they are experts in buying property and in getting Planning Permissions using the banks' money, they are not experts in finance or economics. History shows us that developers keep developing until they go bankrupt. Of course, there is a dishonest way to do that too.

But what happens when a populace finally realises how powerless they have become? Cork City centre has become a ghost town because of the policies of the City Hall mandarins. There has been an ongoing outcry over the decision to take cars out of Patrick Street and only allow buses and taxis. The result has been

catastrophic for city centre businesses. They now have no money to pay their quite considerable Rates and have begged City Hall to relent.

We had one very huge meeting before Christmas in the Imperial Hotel, with over 700 people in attendance. The Cork Chamber (formerly Cork Chamber of Commerce) no longer even maintains a semblance of care, so it didn't even attend. But of course it only looks after the multinationals of this world like Apple and Heineken. It is interesting to notice that the minute they lost their "*Commerce attachment*"—they started acting like commerce was beneath them. But a newer group CBA (Cork Business Association) stepped in and claims it will look after the needs of the small city traders.

Of course it didn't!

And now another new group has emerged, which is challenging all the orthodoxies of the business elite. For the moment it calls itself '*Cork City Traders*', and it is led by a young business woman from South Main Street, Susan Ryan, who owns a beauty salon in that area. So dire is her situation that she was: "*among a number of traders in court last November*

for rates arrears, which she blamed on the car ban on the city's main street as 'the last straw'...", according to the *Evening Echo*, 15th February, 2019.

Now the die is cast and we await how this situation is solved. City Hall are facing a big test as Ms Ryan and her fellow traders are now appealing for a new trading pact which puts them on a firmer economic basis. How this ends is anyone's guess.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

A few days after the controversy broke over the overspend on the new Children's Hospital, Dublin, during which a new figure of two billion Euros was mentioned as a possible cost—to the consternation of the whole country—the National Treasury Management Agency (NTMA) was stated in the financial media to be about to borrow, by the issue of two new Bonds for 1.5 billion Euros and 1 billion Euros. In my opinion, if this goes ahead, the Irish people will be repaying for this debacle for easily fifty years or more into the future. What a debt to be putting on our children's and grandchildren's future!

Michael Stack ©



LABOUR

Comment

ISSN 0790-1712

VOLUME 37 No. 3

CORK

ISSN 0790-1712

The Friends of Small Nationalities

(1914)

(From *Irish Worker*, 12 September, 1914)

The 'war on behalf of small nationalities' is still going merrily on in the newspapers. That great champion of oppressed races, Russia, is pouring her armies into East Prussia land offering freedom and deliverance to all and sundry if they will only take up arms on her behalf—without undue delay. She is to be the judge after the war as to whether they did or did not delay unduly.

The Russian Socialists have issued a strong manifesto denouncing the war, and pouring contempt upon the professions of the Czar in favour of oppressed races, pointing out his suppression of the liberties of Finland, his continued martyrdom of Poland, his atrocious tortures and massacres in the Baltic provinces, and his withdrawal of the recently granted parliamentary liberties of Russia.

And to that again add the fact that the Polish Nationalists have warned the Poles against putting any faith in a man who has proven himself incapable of keeping his solemnly pledged faith with his own people, and you will begin to get a saner view of the great game that is being played than you can ever acquire from the lying press of Ireland and England.

Of course, that should not blind you to the splendid stand which the British Government, we are assured, is making against German outrages and brutality and in favour of small nationalities. The Russian Government is admitted by every publicist in England to be a foul blot upon civilisation. It was but the other day that when the Russian Duma was suppressed by force and many of

its elected representatives imprisoned and exiled, an English Cabinet Minister defiantly declared in public, in spite of international courtesies:

*"The Duma is dead!
Long live the Duma!"*

But all that is forgotten now, and the Russian Government and the British Government stand solidly together in favour of small nationalities everywhere except in countries now under Russian and British rule.

Yes, I seem to remember a small country called Egypt, a country that through ages of servitude evolved to a conception of national freedom, and under leaders of its own choosing essayed to make that conception a reality. And I think I remember how this British friend of small nationalities bombarded its chief seaport, invaded and laid waste its territory, slaughtered its armies, imprisoned its citizens, led its chosen leaders away in chains, and reduced the new-born Egyptian

nation into a conquered, servile British province.

And I think I remember how, having murdered this new-born soul of nationality amongst the Egyptian people, it signalised its victory by the ruthless hanging at Den-shawai of a few helpless peasants who dared to think their pigeons were not made for the sport of British officers. (1)

Also, if my memory is not playing me strange tricks, I remember reading of a large number of small nationalities in India, whose evolution towards a more perfect civilisation in harmony with the genius of their race, was ruthlessly crushed in blood, whose lands were stolen, whose education was blighted, whose women were left to the brutal lusts of the degenerate soldiery of the British Raj.

Over my vision comes also grim remembrances of two infant nationalities and I look on the map in vain for them today. I remember that the friend of small nationalities waged war upon them—a war of insolent aggression at the instance of financial bloodsuckers. Britain sent her troops to subjugate them, to wipe them off the map; and although they resisted until the veldt ran red with British and Boer blood, the end of the war saw two small nationalities less in the world.

When I read the attempts of the prize Irish press to work up feeling against the Germans by talk of German outrages at the front, I wonder if those who swallow such yarns ever remember the facts about the exploits of the British generals in South Africa. When we are told of the horrors of Louvain, when the only damage

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