

P/117/1309

UNIFICATION OF IRELAND

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H. J. Res. 59, H. Con. Res. 30, H. Res. 270

H. Res. 463, H. Res. 529, H. Res. 533

RELATING TO THE UNIFICATION OF IRELAND

APRIL 28, 1950

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1950

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JOHN KEE, West Virginia, *Chairman*

JAMES P. RICHARDS, South Carolina	CHARLES A. EATON, New Jersey
JOSEPH L. PFEIFER, New York	ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, Illinois
THOMAS S. GORDON, Illinois	JOHN M. VORYS, Ohio
HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, California	FRANCES P. BOLTON, Ohio
MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana	LAWRENCE H. SMITH, Wisconsin
THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania	CHESTER E. MERROW, New Hampshire
LAURIE C. BATTLE, Alabama	WALTER H. JUDD, Minnesota
GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida	JAMES G. FULTON, Pennsylvania
A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Missouri	JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
THURMOND CHATHAM, North Carolina	JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Connecticut
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin	DONALD L. JACKSON, California
A. A. RIBICOFF, Connecticut	
OMAR BURLESON, Texas	

BOYD CRAWFORD, *Staff Administrator*
 IRA E. BENNETT, *Staff Consultant*
 SHELDON Z. KAPLAN, *Staff Consultant*
 GEORGE LEE MILLIKAN, *Staff Consultant*
 JUNE NIGH, *Staff Assistant*
 WINIFRED OSBORNE, *Staff Assistant*
 DORIS LEONE, *Staff Assistant*
 MABEL WOFFORD, *Staff Assistant*
 MARY G. CHACE, *Staff Assistant*

II

CONTENTS

A		Page
Addonizio, Hon. Hugh J., a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey, statement of		141
American Friends of Ireland, State of Washington, letter to Hon. John Kee, from		157
American League for an Undivided Ireland, Chicago, Ill., delegation of	115,	117
Ancient Order of Hibernians of America:		
Ladies Auxiliary of, letter to Hon. John Kee from		162
Middlesex County, Mass., chapter of, letter to Hon. John Kee from		159
Resolutions adopted by		67
Ayers, Thomas J., president, United Irish Counties Association of New York, testimony of		120
B		
Barrett, Hon. William A., a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, statement of		142
Barry, Frank J., Nogales, Ariz., telegram to Hon. John Kee from		47
Buckley, Hon. Thomas H., commissioner of administration, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, testimony of		55
Building Service Employees International Union, New York, letter to Hon. Jacob K. Javits transmitting resolution adopted by		25
C		
Case, Hon. Clifford P., a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey, letter to Hon. John Kee from, transmitting letter from J. J. O'Callaghan, United Irish Society of New York		151
Celtic Democratic Club, Inc., Bayonne, N. J., resolution adopted by		106
CIO, resolution adopted at annual State convention of, New Haven, Conn. Clan-na-Gael:		108
Of Greater Boston, resolution adopted by		61
Of New York, letter to Hon. John Kee from		151
Clifford, Daniel J., telegram to Hon. John Kee from		158
Clifford, Mrs. Nonie E., letter to Hon. John Kee from		158
Comerford, James J., chairman, executive committee, American League for an Undivided Ireland, testimony of		82
Committee from Portland, Oreg., consisting of Messrs. Ellis, Healy, and Brady, statement of		156
Cooney, John, statement of		155
Corkmen's B. P. and P. Association, Bayonne, N. J., resolution adopted by		106
D		
Dalton, Richard F., testimony of		133
Damon, Elizabeth, Commodore John Barry Club, Cleveland, Ohio, statement of		121
Davenport, Hon. Harry J., a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, statement of		142
Davis, Anna, Antipartition League, Cleveland, Ohio, statement of		121
Delaney, Hon. James J., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, statement of		143
Dever, Hon. Paul A., Governor, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, letter to Hon. John Kee from		55

iii

IV

CONTENTS

Doherty, Daniel, chairman, Committee for the Unification and Liberation of Ireland, testimony of.....	Page	32
Dollinger, Hon. Isidore, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, statement of.....		48
Donegal Men's Association, Inc., Bayonne, N. J., resolution adopted by.....		107
Donohue, Hon. Harold D., a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts, statement of.....		145
Donovan, Dr. Herbert D. A., historiographer, American-Irish Historical Society, testimony of.....		69
Dorgan, Thomas, clerk, Suffolk Superior Civil Court, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, article by.....		62
Dowd, Michael J., national director, Ancient Order of Hibernians, statement of.....		49
Dowde, Mrs. M. J., Ladies Auxiliary, Ancient Order of Hibernians, testimony of.....		55
Duffy, Mrs. Mark K., statement of.....		121
Dunn, Joseph, statement of.....		155
Durkin, James, P., Pawtucket, R. I., testimony of.....		86

E

Egan, Edmond, president, Brian Boru Club, New York, statement of.....	152
Emmet Associates, letter to Hon. Thomas H. Buckley, Boston, Mass., from.....	65
Emmet Club, Woburn, Mass., resolution adopted by.....	63

F

Fallon, Michael, New Haven, Conn., letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	47
Flood, Hon. Daniel J., a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, statement of.....	112
Fogarty, Hon. John E., a Representative in Congress from the State of Rhode Island, testimony of.....	7
Furcolo, Hon. Foster, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts, statement of.....	146

G

Gallagher, James H., letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	154
Granahan, Hon. William T., a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, statement of.....	146
Greater New York St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee, letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	151
Green, Hon. William J., Jr., a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, statement of.....	147
Griffin, Neil, American League for an Undivided Ireland, statement of.....	107

H

Harford, Matthias, American League for an Undivided Ireland, testimony of.....	80
Haugh, John R., Pittsburgh, Pa., testimony of.....	114
Havener, Hon. Frank R., a Representative in Congress from the State of California, statement of.....	148
Herbst, Robert Van Cortlandt, testimony of.....	87
Horan, John J., president, Greater Boston Industrial CIO Union Council, letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	64
House Concurrent Resolution 30, text of.....	2
House Joint Resolution 59, text of.....	1
House Resolution 270, text of.....	2
House Resolution 463, text of.....	2
House Resolution 529, text of.....	2
House Resolution 533, text of.....	3
Hynes, J. B., mayor, city of Boston, letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	56

I

Irish-American Associates of Middlesex County, letter to Hon. Thomas S. Buckley, Boston, Mass., from.....	66
Irish 32 Counties Association, Inc., of Massachusetts, resolution of.....	66

CONTENTS

V

J

Javits, Hon. Jacob K., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, testimony of.....	Page	31
Jones, Patrick, New York, letter to Hon. John Kee from.....		46

K

Kearns, Anne B., American League for an Undivided Ireland, testimony of.....	52
Keating, Hon. Kenneth B., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, statement of.....	49
Keating, Sean, chairman, executive council, American League for an Undivided Ireland, testimony of.....	121
Kelleher, Thomas J., Jr., letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	159
Kelley, Kenneth J., letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	63
Kelly, Hon. Edward A., former Member of Congress from the State of Illinois, statement of.....	128
Kennedy, Hon. John F., a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts, statement of.....	89
Klein, Hon. Arthur G., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, statement of.....	89
Knights of Columbus, General Sherman Council, Queens County, N. Y., resolutions adopted by.....	132

L

Lane, Hon. Thomas J., a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts, testimony of.....	21
Lillis, Allan F., testimony of.....	91
Lynch, Hon. Walter A., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, statement of.....	149

M

McCole, John J., testimony of.....	119
McCormack, Hon. John W., a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts, testimony of.....	3
McCoy, James Coleman, letter to Foreign Affairs Committee from, transmitting statement on Irish partition.....	159
McDermott, Harry, president, Gaelic Athletic Association, Los Angeles, Calif., letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	157
McDonough, Hon. Gordon L., a Representative in Congress from the State of California, testimony of.....	51
McGinnis, Arthur J., vice president, Donegal Society, Philadelphia, Pa., statement of.....	124
McGrath, Hon. Christopher, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, testimony of.....	25
McGrath, Michael A., national president, Ancient Order of Hibernians, statement of.....	50
McLaughlin, Thomas J., statement of.....	127
McNamara, M. F., telegram to Hon. John Kee from.....	156
McNelis, Patrick J., president, Federation of American Societies for Irish Independence, statement of.....	123
McNulty, Eneas, statement of.....	119
MacBride, Anne, letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	47
MacDermott, Seamus, editor, the Gaelic American, testimony of.....	138
Madden, Michael J., letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	154
Maginnis, Charles D., telegram to Hon. John Kee from.....	158
Maguire, Joseph, New York, N. Y., testimony of.....	90
Malloy, W. J., city clerk, city of Boston, transmitting resolution adopted by City Council of Boston.....	61
Marinan, John J., president, Sons and Daughters of the Society of St. Patrick, statement of.....	118
Massachusetts Catholic Order of Foresters, letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	64
Mitchell Club-Clan-na-Gael, Roxbury, Mass., letter to Hon. Thomas H. Buckley, Boston, Mass., from.....	64
Murphy, Peter J., statement of.....	117
Murphy, Thomas F., assistant United States attorney, New York, letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	46

N

National Lawyers Guild, letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	161
Neenan, Cornelius F., American League for an Undivided Ireland, statement of.....	140
New York State Legislature, resolution adopted by.....	24

O

O'Brien, Hon. George D., a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan, statement of.....	48
O'Callaghan, Jeremiah J., testimony of.....	92
O'Doherty, John J., statement of.....	125

O

O'Doherty, Mrs. Marcella, letter to Hon John Kee from.....	153
O'Doherty, Sheila, statement of.....	156
O'Dwyer, Paul, American League for an Undivided Ireland, testimony of.....	76
O'Leary, John T., Clan-na-Gael Club, Baltimore, Md., statement of.....	111
O'Malley, Robert Emmett, statement of.....	104
O'Neill, Daniel F., Los Angeles, Calif., telegram to Honorable John Kee from.....	46
O'Reilly, Mike, statement of.....	139
O'Sullivan, Daniel, General Sherman Council, Knights of Columbus, Queens County, N. Y., statement of.....	131
O'Sullivan, Sean, Butte, Mont., statement of.....	105
O'Toole, Hon. Donald L., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, testimony of.....	31
O'York, Patrick N. H., letter to Hon. John Key from.....	157

P

Purtell, Edna M., statement of.....	156
-------------------------------------	-----

R

Reilly, John J., American League for an Undivided Ireland, testimony of.....	53
Reilly, Michael J., statement of.....	155
Rice, Charles T., testimony of.....	35
Roche, David R., statement of.....	127
Rooney, Hon. John J., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, testimony of.....	27
Rossiter, Anna H., statement of.....	153
Ryan, John E., statement of.....	152

S

Scott, Joseph, national president, American League for an Undivided Ireland, letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	41
Scullion, Michael, statement of.....	126
Selectmen, Watertown, Mass., resolution adopted by.....	65
Shaloo, James, statement of.....	132
Shamrock Club of New York, statement submitted by.....	45
Shelley, Hon. John F., a Representative in Congress from the State of California, testimony of.....	30
Sieminski, Alfred D., statement of.....	118
St. Brendan Society, resolution of.....	68

T

Tables relating to Irish elections.....	39, 40
Toal, Peter, member executive committee, American League for an Undivided Ireland, statement of.....	109
Tompkins, Leslie J., chairman, American Defense Society of New York, letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	137

U

Ulster Irish Liberty Legion, letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	114
United Irish American Societies of New York, letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	151
United Steelworkers of America, District No. 1, letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	63

W

Walsh, Henry C., Worcester, Mass., telegram to Hon. John Kee from.....	47
Walsh, Martin T., letter to Hon. John Kee from.....	155
Wayne, John E., statement of.....	138

UNIFICATION OF IRELAND

FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 1950

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. Mike Mansfield presiding.
MR. MANSFIELD. The committee will please be in order. The clerk will read the titles of the resolutions before the committee for its consideration this morning.

(The clerk read the titles of the following resolutions:)

[H. J. Res. 59, 81st Cong., 1st sess.]

JOINT RESOLUTION To provide for the American Joint Commission to assist in the unification of Ireland

Whereas the fictitious border between the North and South of Ireland constitutes a threat to the peace and security of the world; and

Whereas there is no justification in law, decency or equity for the continued existence of this artificial border; and

Whereas the people of Ireland have an unalienable right to have a free, independent, and united nation; and

Whereas the ending of partition and the unification of Ireland will remove the most important barrier to free and complete understanding between England and the United States; and

Whereas a complete understanding between England, Ireland, and the United States is important and necessary to maintain peace and support the great democracies in their fight against communism: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is hereby requested to appoint, within thirty days from the date of enactment of this joint resolution, a commission of ten members to be known as the "American Joint Commission", and to authorize and direct the members of such Commission (a) to consult with the British Government and make such arrangements as shall be necessary to meet with representatives of the British Government, either in the United States or in Great Britain, to consider and to recommend an immediate and final settlement of the Irish question leading to the abolition of the border between the North and South of Ireland, and (b) to sign on behalf of the people of the United States a settlement agreed on between the representatives of the United States and Great Britain. Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

SEC. 2. The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and prescribe the duties, and fix the compensation, of such employees as are necessary for the execution of its functions. The Commission may make such expenditures as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution, including expenditures for necessary traveling expenses and subsistence expenses of the commissioners and of employees of the Commission. All expenditures of the Commission shall be allowed and paid upon presentation of itemized vouchers therefor, approved by the chairman of the Commission.

UNIFICATION OF IRELAND

[H. Con. Res. 30, 81st Cong., 1st sess.]

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

In order to encourage a peaceful and prosperous order in Ireland but with no intention of imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people, it is hereby

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the political federation of Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland.

[H. Res. 270, 81st Cong., 1st sess.]

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

In order to encourage a peaceful and prosperous order in Ireland but with no intention of imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people, it is hereby

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the political federation of Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the House of Representatives, Sixty-fifth Congress (1919), third session, by H. J. Res. 357, duly passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desired to live; and

Whereas, in the intervening thirty years, the people of Ireland have so determined but the effect of their determination has been thwarted, and they have in fact been deprived of the right to the form of government under which they desire to live; and

Whereas twenty-six of the thirty-two counties of Ireland have been successful in obtaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has, as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution: Now, therefore, be it.

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House of Representatives that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

[H. Res. 463, 81st Cong., 2d sess.]

RESOLUTION

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that the maintenance of international peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland and that the people of all Ireland, including the people of Eire and the people of Northern Ireland, should have a free opportunity to express their will for union and that this be attained by a plebiscite of the people of all Ireland under the auspices of a United Nations Commission for Ireland, to be designated by the General Assembly pursuant to articles 11 and 35 of the Charter, which shall establish the terms and conditions of such plebiscite with the objective of the entry of Ireland as a member of the United Nations.

[H. Res. 529, 81st Cong., 2d sess.]

RESOLUTION

Whereas the House of Representatives, Sixty-fifth Congress (1919), third session, by H. J. Res. 357, duly passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desired to live; and

Whereas, in the intervening thirty years, the people of Ireland have so determined but the effect of their determination has been thwarted, and they have in fact been deprived of the right to the form of government under which they desire to live; and

UNIFICATION OF IRELAND

Whereas twenty-six of the thirty-two counties of Ireland have been successful in obtaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has, as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

[H. Res. 533, 81st Cong., 2d sess.]

RESOLUTION

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that the maintenance of international peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland and that the people of all Ireland, including the people of Eire and the people of Northern Ireland, should have a free opportunity to express their will for union and that this be attained by a plebiscite of the people of all Ireland under the auspices of a United Nations Commission for Ireland, to be designated by the General Assembly pursuant to articles 11 and 35 of the Charter, which shall establish the terms and conditions of such plebiscite with the objective of the entry of Ireland as a member of the United Nations.

MR. MANSFIELD. The first witness this morning before the committee will be our distinguished majority leader, the Hon. John McCormack, of Massachusetts.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

MR. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in May of 1949, the British Parliament perpetrated its latest act of intrusion into the internal affairs of Ireland by passing the so-called Ireland bill, and presuming to declare that Northern Ireland will never cease to be a part of the United Kingdom without consent of the Parliament of Northern Ireland.

Thus, Great Britain upholds the hand of its own creature which it foisted upon Ireland by the unfair and basically wrong Partition Act of 1920.

By its legal and moral, not to mention armed, support of the Parliament of Northern Ireland, the British Government seeks to perpetuate the unnatural division of a gallant little nation which has never ceased to struggle for freedom and national integrity.

Unfortunately, that freedom extends today to only 26 of Ireland's 32 counties.

The six remaining counties are arbitrarily held by England as part of His Majesty's dominions with the Parliament in London as the true sovereign.

The British position and propaganda would lead one to believe that the present division of Ireland is both desired by the people and justifiable. The facts indisputably prove the contrary to be true.

Before the First World War, the problem of national integrity for Ireland was well on the way toward solution under the enlightened home rule policy of the Liberal governments of Gladstone and Asquith. The unionist faction of the Tory Party, however, successfully frustrated the effectuation of that policy.

When World War I intervened, and home rule was laid aside, the Irish people attempted to solve the problem themselves by the uprising

of 1916. In December of 1918, a national plebiscite was held and the whole of Ireland was solemnly proclaimed as an independent Republic.

In January of 1919, the elected representatives of the Irish people began their struggle to maintain the newly proclaimed Republic, but before any program of unification could be worked out, Lloyd George succeeded in passing the Partition Act through Parliament and cutting off the six northeastern counties in Ireland into a gerrymandered British principality. The duplicity of the British Prime Minister at that time, and the true attitude of his party, was clearly revealed in a letter written by him to Sir Edward Carson, the Tory leader in Belfast, wherein he stated that: "We must make it clear that Ulster does not, whether she wills it or not, merge in the rest of Ireland."

It will be noted that this severed portion of Ireland is referred to as Ulster, and the impression is intended to be left that it corresponds with the ancient Irish Province of that name. The fact is, however, that the British Government and its subservient Parliament in Belfast could not maintain its rigged majority if it included all of Ulster in the severance.

Only six of the counties in historic Ulster were cut off.

Three of Ulster's nine counties—Donegal, Cavan, and Monaghan—had to be excluded from the operation of the Act of Partition so as not to endanger the dominant electoral position of the Unionist majority around Belfast.

Ironically, therefore, not only Ireland, but Ulster itself, was partitioned to serve British interests by constituting northeastern Ireland as a foreign outpost of England across the Irish Sea.

This unnatural and arbitrary division of Ireland was, therefore, perpetrated by Britain and it has been maintained ever since by British power and influence.

The electoral boundaries of the constituencies in the severed six counties have been studiously drawn to keep the Irish Nationalist minority effectively suppressed. In the most recent election a large majority of the citizens of so-called Northern Ireland reaffirmed the tie to Britain, and seemingly repudiated the idea of national integrity. On the surface it would appear that democracy has spoken, and the continuance of the division is the desire of the people.

Such outward appearances, however, do not correspond with the realities, and while that election had the form of democratic procedure, it was completely lacking in democratic substance.

Not only are three of the counties of historic Ulster excluded from the northern bloc, but the six counties that are included are so gerrymandered that Unionist majorities are absolutely guaranteed.

Statistics published before the election show the following glaring electoral inequalities:

In County Tyrone 60,000 Unionist voters can elect 16 members of the Parliament of Northern Ireland, while 74,000 Nationalist voters can elect only 11 members.

In County Fermanagh 26,000 Unionist voters elected 13 members, while 33,000 Nationalist voters could return only 7 representatives.

In Derry City, the second largest municipality in the six counties, 27,000 Nationalist voters can elect only 8 members to the city council, while 18,000 Unionist voters can choose 12 members.

Over 20 instances of such electoral imbalance can be cited; and actually it is only in Belfast and its immediate vicinity that there can be found a uniform, substantial majority for union with Great Britain. If the Nationalist minority were allowed a true plebiscite in which the exercise of their free choice were permitted, its total vote in four of the six counties would actually constitute a majority for reunion with the 26 counties of free Ireland under the Republic.

If the reason, therefore, for cutting off the 6 counties from the total of the 32 is that a Unionist majority can be assured, then by the same logic the 4 counties in which a Nationalist majority is possible should be cut off from the 6.

The Republic of Ireland is and, of right, ought to be one integrated and solidified nation. Its natural territorial limits are the ocean and the seas which surround it. Any division within it based upon an arbitrary demarcation of contiguous units as small as the Irish counties is unnatural, unhistoric, and, particularly when imposed from without, completely unjustified.

Partition is the sole remaining issue which is a source of contention within the natural boundaries of the beautiful Isle of the West.

That issue has now been brought into prominence and highlighted by the pending question of the ratification of the Atlantic Pact.

No realist will dispute the fact that, from time immemorial, the primary concern of Britain with Ireland has been principally a matter of defense. England has tenaciously clung to Irish territory as a western bastion of her own perimeter of defense.

Disregarding all other factors that cry out against this unjustified and unnatural partition, from the angle of defense alone, not only from the immediate but from the long-range angle, a united Ireland, with the resultant cordial and friendly relations that are bound to exist between the two countries would be a strengthening influence to England's defense, enure from a defense angle to the benefit of Ireland, would fit definitely into the national interest of our own country, and make a marked contribution to the defense of the free nations of the world and toward the ultimate peace we all seek.

To me the obvious fact appears that it would be far better to have the whole of Ireland as a cordial, cooperative neighbor of England rather than to hold a small segment of Ireland in the face of the righteous resentment of the vast majority of her people.

I remember well in latter 1943, when I was in to see Franklin D. Roosevelt on one of the many occasions I saw him during the war, in speaking of Ireland, he told me he had a plan to solve the problem of Irish division.

His remarks on that occasion clearly conveyed to me that in looking ahead to the world conditions that would exist after the war was over he recognized the unjustness of the partition of Ireland, and the necessity for its solution in the postwar world.

His plan was the plebiscite method, a plebiscite in the six counties or in each of the six counties of Northern Ireland, or what is known as Ulster.

He told me then that in his opinion the people of at least three, and possibly four of these counties would unite at once to join with southern Ireland. He said that the other two counties in later plebiscites would follow. He expected Belfast would resist in the plebiscite or

referendum, in which case satisfactory plans could be devised to meet the situation.

This conversation remained vividly in my mind since that time and it clearly showed me that the late President realized that the partition of Ireland could not in the long run and should not stand and that its solution was a matter of great concern in solving the problems of the postwar world.

Great Britain, who owes so much to both Ireland and the United States, now has the opportunity to display the greatest statesmanship of which the genius of her polity is capable.

The Ireland Act of 1949 should be repealed.

The people of all of Ireland should have the right and the opportunity through a referendum or a plebiscite to pass upon the question of the unification of all of Ireland.

The homogeneity of the Republic of Ireland should be permitted to become a political and a territorial fact.

The principle of self-determination should be advocated for Ireland with the same vigor that we have advocated self-determination for other nations before and following World War I and before and following World War II, the principle of self-determination being one of the basic policies of our country, for other nations, particularly small nations as it has been one of the basic policies of our country during its entire constitutional history.

Britain's preaching of democracy should find its first practice in Ireland.

Partition in the Emerald Isle should be abolished forthwith so that the Republic of a united Ireland may be voluntarily forged as a link of steel in the sturdy chain of free and independent Atlantic nations.

It is a pleasure for me, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, to appear in support of the resolutions pending before the committee and to urge that the committee report out forthwith, and certainly in the immediate future, an appropriate resolution which, as the majority leader of the House, I shall program for as immediate consideration thereafter as is possible.

May I say also that Congressman Lynch of New York, one of our most valuable members, as we all know, was here earlier this morning, but had to go to the Committee on Ways and Means, as they are sitting in executive session on the tax bill and votes in the committee are coming up. He asked me to record him as in favor of the several resolutions pending and that he hopes an appropriate resolution will be reported by the committee. He will submit his remarks to the committee and requests that they be incorporated in the record. So I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that our distinguished colleague, Mr. Lynch of New York, be granted such permission.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Without objection, it is so ordered.

I want to say to our distinguished majority leader that this is just another indication of his great interest in this particular problem and we are delighted to have his word that if a bill is reported out of this committee—and I sincerely hope we shall be able to do so—that he will program it for action at the earliest opportunity.

There is only one question I should like to ask Mr. McCormack. We are trying today to help bring about the so-called integration of western Europe. Do you not think that the initial step in that inte-

gration should be to bring about the integration of all of Ireland into one republic?

Mr. McCORMACK. The answer is emphatically yes. This matter should be viewed impersonally and rationally and in its historical aspects, in the present circumstances and in connection with the future world. It is fundamental that a people should be united.

Sovereignty exists in the Republic of Ireland. The island of Ireland is a unit. There is no argument against unification that I can see except perhaps the strained argument of expediency. And there is no argument even of expediency that justifies the existing partition. It is unnatural. It is wrong and I would feel the same way about it if it were any other part of the world and any other people that were similarly situated. Wherever there are unnatural partitions or divisions, it is just fundamentally and basically wrong.

It cannot last, and the sooner the condition is remedied, particularly in the world of today, the more marked will be its contribution toward meeting the major challenge that confronts the disturbed world of today.

In and of itself, and outside of the present world conditions, the partition of Ireland is absolutely wrong. Certainly nobody can argue that it is not wrong to prevent a people from passing upon a question themselves, such as happened approximately within the past year, in the passage of a bill by Parliament that even precluded the people of the six northern counties, known as Ulster, from expressing their opinion either in a plebiscite or a referendum. That is completely indefensible, whether it happens in Ireland or in any other part of the world.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Thank you, Mr. McCormack, for your very illuminating statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Thank you very much.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Carnahan, do you have any questions to ask at this time?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I have no questions at this time, Mr. Chairman. I certainly appreciate the statement of the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Thank you very much.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Our next witness is Congressman Fogarty, of Rhode Island, a man who has done a great deal, as all of you know, in behalf of doing away with this unnatural partition; who was successful in the House last month, for the time being at least, in having passed an amendment which sought to accomplish the end in which we are all interested.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is John E. Fogarty. I represent the Second Congressional District of Rhode Island and have represented that district for the past 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, I have a prepared statement and I should like the permission of the Chair to introduce that statement for the record, and with the view of saving time, I shall proceed with other thoughts of mine at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

In connection with House Resolution 270, which I introduced on June 28, 1949, and which is now before this committee for consideration, I desire to make a brief statement, giving a general picture of the situation in Ireland, due to which I was impelled to offer my resolution. Other witnesses will appear following my testimony, and I am sure that these gentlemen will give you in greater detail the history of the partition of Ireland, the facts regarding the two Governments in Ireland, the economy of both sections of the nation and facts regarding the military and other phases of the present situation in Ireland.

Among the early settlers in Ireland, the most important were the Celtic people, who arrived in the fourth century before Christ, from central Europe, and who gave to the island its language and customs. The various sections of the country were ruled by local kings, who in turn were in general subject to a High-King, who had his throne in Tara. The High-King issued laws for the whole island and his authority gave a unity to the country, which was unequaled elsewhere in Europe.

In 432 A. D., St. Patrick brought to Ireland a new unity, that of Christian faith. He had lived his youth in Ulster and it was there that he built his first church, established the chief see of all Ireland at Armagh, and was buried in 461 in the Province of Ulster. Even today the primacy of the Catholic Church, as well as the Church of Ireland and the Presbyterian Church, are located at Armagh, whence is directed the nation-wide activities of each of these three major religions in Ireland.

In 1167 the Normans, having previously conquered England, came over from England and invaded Ireland. But it was not until nearly 300 years later that the English firmly established their conquest of the land. English rule, however, was frequently disturbed by the sequence of uprisings which took place from time to time. Even the Normans, who had come to be known as Anglo-Irish, resented the foreign domination of England. In an effort to stamp out these uprisings and to complete the subjugation of the Irish, the English embarked on a program of colonization, taking away from the Irish their lands, and planting thereon Scotch and English settlers, as well as the soldiers who had fought for England. The only successful plantation, thus undertaken, was that in the Province of Ulster where 500,000 acres were taken from the Irish and Scottish Presbyterians placed on the land. In time these Scots became as staunchly Irish as the original inhabitants. Later under Cromwell the Irish were driven out of most of three provinces into Connaught, and the land given to a new batch of "Planters."

Then followed the penal laws, affecting both Catholic and Presbyterian alike, which for a hundred years victimized three-fourths of the people and constituted the blackest pages of persecution in the history of England. Laws also destroyed Irish industry, specially if it competed with English industries, and heavy taxes further impoverished the native people. These conditions occasioned the great migrations from Ireland, particularly to America, where these Irish, both Catholic and Presbyterian, played an important part in our War for Independence.

It is little wonder that, under these conditions, there arose in Ulster countless movements to regain civil rights, liberty, and finally independence, movements lead in great part by Protestant patriots, incensed at the cruelty and injustices of English domination. The Irish Parliament, constituted of Planters, had to submit all legislation in advance to the English King and his Privy Council. Moreover the English Parliament attempted to legislate Irish affairs, despite the existence of this so-called Irish Parliament.

No century has passed for 800 years without seeing in Ireland at least two and as many as eight or more major uprisings on the part of the Irish in their eternal warfare to regain their rights as a people and a nation. 1837 brought an end to the hated imposition of tithes, and the struggles of 1880-90 finally secured a measure of justice for the tenant farmers. The rising of 1916, though it continued for only a week, struck a lasting blow for Irish independence. The ruthless execution of the 14 leaders, all signers of the proclamation of the Republic, served only to inflame the national urge for independence. A war of independence was waged from January of 1919 until July of 1921, when negotiations began to effect an agreement. Dissatisfaction with the agreement of December 6, 1921, occasioned the further guerrilla warfare from June 1922 to April of 1923.

I have reviewed this part of Ireland's history because I feel that it clearly demonstrates that from earliest times Ireland has been one nation occupying

an island, set off from the rest of Europe equally as much as from the British Isles. There has been in Ireland one national culture and an undying nationwide aspiration for liberty and freedom. Yet, despite all this, not only has Ireland been partitioned, but likewise the ancient Province of Ulster has been partitioned, and an attempt made to create two separate nations by the mere establishment of a fictitious border, which has no justification on a geographic, economic, or ethnic basis.

As has been seen the Irish people have struggled for civic rights and national liberty and finally won the support of the Liberal Party in England, which had pledged itself to promises of home rule for Ireland. In 1886, Gladstone proposed a home rule bill before the London Parliament. The Tories, under Lord Randolph Churchill, father of Winston, seized this as an opportunity to win control of the government. Journeying to Belfast he aroused the people of the area to riot and bloodshed by raising the specter of religious bigotry amongst the people. His vicious tactics gained him victory in the English elections and the matter of Irish home rule was cast aside.

The Liberals returned to power and in 1912 Asquith again presented a home rule bill in keeping with his party's pledge. Now it was Bonar Law who rushed to Belfast to renew religious bigotry, play one group against another, and set Protestant against Catholic in brutal assaults. Then was organized the first private army of present-day Europe, when the Carsonite Volunteers were assembled, armed with weapons smuggled from Germany, and pledged to resist a British act of Parliament establishing home rule. When British Army officers mutinied rather than put down this conspiracy against the Crown, Asquith submitted to the pressure and initiated the proposal of partition for the first time. The issue had always been either self-government for Ireland or a continuance of the union with Great Britain. Advocates of either side never for a moment considered the possibility of a division of the nation, but were adamant in their desire for their plan of government for the whole of Ireland.

Mr. Robertes, a Liberal Member of Parliament in England, first offered the amendment on July 12, 1912, to exclude four counties from the Home Rule Act, namely: Antrim, Armagh, Down, and Derry. The other five counties of Ulster were known to be preponderantly Nationalist in voting strength and so opposed the union with Great Britain. The amendment was in fact offered as a means of wrecking the legislation so that the Nationalists would be compelled to vote against it. Needless to say the amendment was defeated. For two years various proposals were put forward until in March of 1914 it was suggested that any county or county borough in the Province of Ulster might vote to exclude itself from the effect of the Home Rule Act for a period of 6 years.

This new proposal met with the immediate opposition of the Unionists under the leadership of Sir Edward Carson, a native of Dublin of Italian descent, who assumed the leadership of the Unionists. Nothing came of this due to the intervention of the First World War, in which more than 350,000 Irish volunteered, with 50,000 casualties, for service on the promise that, at the end of the war, Ireland like other small nations would be given the right of self-determination. It was then that many Irish distrusting British promises, so freely given and so promptly repudiated, took matters into their own hands and brought about the famed Easter rising of 1916. Though it lasted but a week, it struck a blow for Irish independence which has today brought about the demand for complete severance of all forms of British control over any part of Ireland.

The ruthless suppression of this rising and the execution of all the signers of the proclamation of a Republic turned American sympathies away from Great Britain. So Lloyd George attempted to regain American favor by proposing the application of home rule with six counties excluded or else a representative convention to settle the dispute. The convention was made an appointive body in which only 5 seats went to members of the Sinn Fein movement, although they represented the majority of the Irish people, out of a total of 101 seats. As soon as America had been induced to enter the war, the convention was speedily disbanded. However during the course of the discussions, Redmond, leader of the Irish Parliamentary Party, had accepted temporary partition as a possible solution. He thereby lost the support and confidence of the Irish electorate, as shown in the elections of 1918, when his party returned only 6 out of 73 sitting members.

In the elections of 1918, held while the British had complete control of the nation, the Irish elected 79 candidates pledged to complete independence for all Ireland, while only 26 of the opposition were elected. The popular vote was 1,211,516 for self-government and only 315,394 against. Despite this over-

whelming voice of the majority in Ireland, partition was nevertheless put into effect so that the minority was not required to submit to the popular will. Instead the six county area was cut off, and now a new minority, in this case Nationalist, was forced to submit to the dominance of the newly created Unionist majority in that area.

A second election was held throughout Ireland in 1920, prior to partition becoming effective, and, in this election for local offices, 182 corporations elected Nationalists, and in only 19 were Unionists elected, with five corporations being even in a total of 206. This election was the answer of the Irish to Lloyd George's proposal of December 22, 1919, to establish two governments and two parliaments in the country, later to be united in one parliament and one government for the whole of Ireland. It was finally enacted into law on December 22, 1920.

Meanwhile guerrilla warfare continued throughout Ireland until negotiations were entered into, with a view to drafting a treaty. This was the treaty of December 6, 1921, which the Irish delegates signed without the authority to do so and which was only signed at the threat of war—"and war within 3 days." So, without a single Irish vote, partition became law and was accepted by the Irish through a shotgun treaty.

The population of Ulster is divided between 700,000 Catholics and 900,000 Protestants. While most Catholics were Nationalists, not all Protestants were Unionists. Hence Ulster had to be itself partitioned and the largest county, Donegal, along with Monaghan and Cavan were excluded. Thus 70,000 Protestants and 260,000 Catholics were eliminated from the new government, giving the Unionists control by reason of the large Unionist majority in the Belfast area of County Antrim.

To further assure control of this new government a system of gerrymandering at its worst was employed, and even today districts are still being rearranged to still further deny to Nationalists their representation in the government. In an average of 44 percent of the election districts there are no contests and during 30 years there has been no change in the government. Only in Russia has such a record been approached—not even the Democrats in the United States have been able to boast such control over so long a time. Control is secured in various ways. There are 52 seats in the Belfast Parliament, of which 34 are filled in the Belfast region, although it is but one-third of the area. Then the number of votes per seat varies in the region, the largest number of votes being required where the Unionists are strongest. Thus in Belfast and County Antrim 19,628 votes are required per seat. In this way 28,000 Nationalists are prevented from ever winning a seat. But in Fermanagh, where the Unionists are weakest, only 11,314 votes are required per seat, with the result that, the county being divided into three districts, 15,891 Nationalists win one seat, but 13,885 Unionists win two. The manner of gerrymandering is best demonstrated in Derry City where there are 27,000 Nationalists and 18,000 Unionists. One-third of the city has been carved out of the city division and added to the predominantly Nationalist Foyle Division. The remaining city area has had a section of the countryside added to it, going 8 miles out of the city, in order to guarantee a Unionist majority.

Under these schemes the voting is controlled in the six counties to such an extent that no election, as now conducted, can be considered to be an expression of popular sentiment.

Let me draw attention to a few other facts concerning the six counties. It is an agricultural area, just as the rest of Ireland is. Its industrial output is less than its agricultural, although half of the industry of all Ireland is concentrated in Belfast and Derry, the other half being located variously in the rest of Ireland. Linen and shipbuilding are the two major industries of the six counties, both luxury activities, which were so hard pressed during the depression of the thirties as to make this area the worst depression area of all the United Kingdom. Economically this area is unsound, and only when united with the balance of the country can a reasonable assurance of economic stability be attained.

Partition was created to satisfy the whims of British politicians through the stimulation of religious bigotry. Today the cry is still used to fight unification, with the false assertion that the Catholic majority of Ireland would oppress the Protestant minority. The fact is that no single instance of oppression can be demonstrated, although the Protestants are but 6 percent of the total population in the 26 counties. Nevertheless Protestants hold 37 percent of the representation on various boards, commissions, judgeships, and other offices. In the six-county area, where the Catholics are 33 percent of the population, they share in only 4 percent of the government payroll, and usually in the less desirable

positions. Only in the Northern area is any actual discrimination practiced—the Constitution of the Republic of Ireland especially granting full religious freedom.

From a military viewpoint, so small a country can only be defended as a unit. A friendly Ireland would have proven of greater value from a security standpoint to Great Britain in the last war than the existing situation did. Until Ireland is united, no government can speak for the whole country, and the country cannot be committed to the Atlantic Pact under the present situation. Hence from our own viewpoint, a united Ireland, joining the Atlantic Pact, would provide the northern pivot for the defense of western Europe.

Partition cannot be justified on any sound basis. Geographically, racially, economically, historically every approach leads to the conclusion of a unified country. We can help to bring about this reunification by the adoption of my resolution, as a forceful expression of the mind of the Congress that Ireland should be united, unless a majority of all the people determine otherwise. Only the majority rule can function in a democratic country. In approving this resolution, your committee will be following the precedent established after the First World War when the Gallagher resolution was passed by the Congress, thereby announcing to the world that we firmly believed that Ireland, like other small nations, was entitled to the right of self-determination of her own form of government. This she never got—only in part. Now we urge that complete self-determination be granted and that the country as a unit can progress in economic development and assume her full place among the nations of the world.

MR. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I might say for the benefit of those who are here that I believe we have a very friendly acting chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee this morning in Mike Mansfield from Montana. He has been in the forefront of the fight for this cause for the past 8 years, since he became a Member of Congress.

There are a great many of us in Congress who have for years been wanting to do something about this problem that exists over in Ireland. But I think I speak for a great many Members of Congress when I say that we just did not know how to go about it or know what to do about it. And so a year ago, after talking to many Members of Congress and many people interested in this problem, not only in Washington but in various sections of the country, I introduced an amendment to the foreign aid bill similar to the amendment that was adopted by the Committee of the Whole, about a month ago. That amendment was first introduced about a year ago in an attempt to bring the issue out into the open, not only here in Washington but all over the world. The press did not, at that time, seem to think it very important, because the amendment was not carried—it was defeated by 20 votes and as a result there was no publicity given to it.

So in June of last year, June of 1949, I introduced House Joint Resolution 270, which I would like to read into the record at this point:

[H. Res. 270, 81st Cong., 1st sess.]

RESOLUTION

Whereas the House of Representatives, Sixty-fifth Congress (1919), third session, by H. J. Res. 357, duly passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desired to live; and

Whereas, in the intervening thirty years, the people of Ireland have so determined but the effect of their determination has been thwarted, and they have in fact been deprived of the right to the form of government under which they desire to live; and

Whereas twenty-six of the thirty-two counties of Ireland have been successful in obtaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has,

as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House of Representatives that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that this resolution needs much explanation. I think the resolution speaks for itself. It is very plain and very simple and it is one that I believe the majority of the Members of the Congress could support and feel right in supporting.

The reason I introduced this type of resolution is that I thought it would have a better chance of getting through the Congress, in view of the fact that a similar resolution was passed by the House on March 4, 1919. It was the old so-called Gallagher resolution and I have before me this morning the Congressional Record of March 4, 1919, containing the report of its passage.

It made me feel good, reading this Record, to learn that we had two Members of Congress from Rhode Island back in 1919, Congressman Kennedy, who is still living and is a Republican, and Congressman O'Shaughnessy, who has gone to his eternal reward, a Democrat, both of whom supported the Gallagher resolution.

It made me feel very pleased to know that back 31 years ago we had two men, one from each of the parties representing Rhode Island, who spoke on the floor of the House on March 4, 1919, in support of the Gallagher resolution. The Gallagher resolution to which I refer read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the earnest hope of the Congress of the United States of America that the Peace Conference now sitting in Paris in passing upon the rights of various peoples will favorably consider the claims of Ireland to the right of self-determination.

You can see from the reading of that resolution that my own resolution, House Resolution 270, presently before the committee, is practically the same as the old Gallagher resolution which passed the House back in 1919 by a record vote of 216 to 45. Reading through the debates I find that only one Member of the House actively opposed the resolution and how in the world he got 45 votes to go along with him is more than I can understand.

I earnestly hope the committee will give this House Resolution 270 serious consideration. You have just listened to our majority leader plead for it. He, like a great many of us, has always been interested in this problem. But the question was how we should proceed to do something about it. How could we get some action?

Since this resolution was introduced in June of 1949, we heard nothing about the matter of partition until a month ago. Then, in another effort to get the problem out into the open, before the peoples of the world who believe in free democratic government, I introduced it again as an amendment to the ECA authorization bill, a bill to carry into effect the Marshall plan. As you know, the amendment carried on the floor of the House, in the Committee of the Whole, by a vote of 99 to 66. In contrast to what happened a year ago, when we lost the same amendment by 20 votes, as soon as the recent vote was announced in the House, at least within 24 hours, every paper in the world knew that this problem existed in Ireland.

I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that, when I introduced that amendment, there was no idea in the back of my mind, nor in the minds of any of those who supported the resolution, of attempting to do any harm to the ECA program. As you know, I have supported that program 100 percent since it was initiated. I have voted against every attempt to cut the appropriation for the ECA program and will continue to do so, because I sincerely believe that the Marshall plan, or the ECA program, is, without a question of doubt, our only possibility of stopping the flow of communism in the world. And any person who believes in stopping communism, whether it be in this country or any other country throughout the world, would have to be for the Marshall plan and for the appropriation of money to help rehabilitate those war-torn countries which are so open to the entry of Communist elements.

But the amendment served its purpose. It brought to the attention of the peoples of the world the fact that this unjust condition exists in Ireland.

Now, the question is, what can we do about it? I, personally, think we can do something about it by adopting a resolution similar to the one I offered.

I do not believe it is necessary for me to go into the history of Ireland before you or other members of this committee, because some of you know much more about the history of Ireland than I do. And I know I am right when I say that there are many, many men and women in this room this morning who know much more about it than I do. But I should like to think of the situation over there or talk of the situation over there as it has been within my own lifetime. We are not talking of something now that happened 700 years ago. In practically every speech that we listen to on St. Patrick's Day, we hear about the persecution that the people of Ireland have suffered for the past 700 years. I admit that is true and I have touched on it in my preliminary statement. But I think we should particularly consider what has happened since 1916. That was the beginning; that was the turning point; that was the first effective attempt for freedom that was made. It was from then on that the people in America, regardless of whether they were of Irish extraction or not, began to sympathize with the cause of Ireland.

I do not believe the people of this country are going to forget that the good men who signed that declaration for independence were all executed within a few days by the British Government.

I do not think the people of this country are going to forget the unhappy situation that existed in the next 4, or 5, or 6, or 7 years. I am sure that the people of this country are not going to forget the tremendous amount of help given to the United States, by men coming to this country from Ireland, in our struggle for independence, back in 1776. When we were in trouble in 1776, Ireland was one of the few nations of the world that helped us in our fight for independence. And I do not believe that any American citizen, who has read our country's history, who has gone down the list of Irishmen who took part in that Revolution and in every fight for freedom since, will forget the sacrifices that were made, and the blood that was shed by those men of Irish extraction so that you and I might live today in the greatest and freest democratic country in all the world.

This resolution of mine has been sponsored by many associations throughout the country. There is one that I would like to read for the record at this time and leave with you. This resolution was passed in January of this year by the Knights of Columbus at their supreme board of directors meeting in Washington on January 14-15, 1950. It reads:

Whereas the Honorable John E. Fogarty, Representative in Congress of the Second Rhode Island District, submitted to the House of Representatives, June 28, 1949, the following resolution (H. Res. 270):

"Whereas the House of Representatives, Sixty-fifth Congress (1919), third session, by House Joint Resolution 357, duly passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desired to live; and

"Whereas in the intervening 30 years, the people of Ireland have so determined but the effect of their determination has been thwarted, and they have in fact been deprived of the right to the form of government under which they desire to live; and

"Whereas 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland have been successful in obtaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has, as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House of Representatives that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the supreme board of directors of the Knights of Columbus endorses the sentiment and purpose of House Resolution 270; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this action of the supreme board of directors be forwarded to Congressman Fogarty and to the members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

That is just one example of many, many organizations that have endorsed this resolution, including both major labor organizations representing in the neighborhood of 15,000,000 workers in this country.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to say in all fairness and justice that I do not believe that we who favor this resolution or similar resolutions, have to justify before this committee the need for action by the House of Representatives. I know that a great many of us have in the past said, "Oh, something should be done. It is unjust, it is unfair." But we have never done much about it.

I think we now have an opportunity, by the passage of a resolution like House Resolution 270, or a similar one, to do something about it. If the Congress will take this action we will be letting Great Britain know that the people of this country believe in self-determination for people all over the world, and believe in free democratic rule for all peoples. We will be letting her know that we want them to do something about this question in the northeast section of Ireland.

I think the time has come to do something about it and if we can get the House of Representatives to go on record, that will be a step in the right direction. And I have the idea in the back of my mind that if something like this can be done, the British Government will attempt to straighten the situation out in some way. I honestly believe that they do want to straighten this situation out but, because of it being political dynamite in England, none of them want to get up and demand that something be done; because if they got into a political fight, they might be defeated in the next election. I am firmly convinced that that is the feeling over there.

So that if we could in some way express our opinion and have this country take the lead, in an attempt to settle this problem, I think the Government of England would welcome it. There is no doubt it would be to the benefit of England if Ireland could be united, because she would then have a friendly nation only a few miles across the sea.

I believe it would be of military benefit to this country to make sure that there was one united country we could positively depend upon, especially in the fight that we are now waging world-wide against the flow of communism extended by the tentacles that Russia is spreading out all over the world.

There is one country that is more free of communism than any other—southern Ireland. There are no Communists in southern Ireland, but there is a fertile field for communism in the northeastern section of Ireland, because there is where it has a chance to infiltrate, in a section where a dispute is raging.

I am sure that if Ireland could be united and undivided, that what few Communists may exist today in the northeastern section of Ireland would be driven from that grand island, because of the feelings of the vast majority of the people in Ireland.

They do not believe in that ideology. They have fought against that type of ideology for hundreds of years and I am sure that we would find, in case of some trouble in the future—and I hope we can avoid it—but if it should come and we had an undivided and united Ireland, we would have a bastion of strength there that would be willing and eager to help us, as they helped us 150 or 200 years ago.

I would like to conclude my testimony today with this summary:

The essence of democracy lies in the right of a people freely to determine how they are to be governed.

The unit for this self-determination is the nation.

Ireland through a nationhood never questioned in almost 2,000 years has that right.

Partition is the denial of the right to self-determination.

It is a refusal to accept the majority will of a people in choosing the government they themselves desire.

No group, party, or political organization in Ireland sought for or desired partition.

It was imposed by the British Government against the passionate protest of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people.

First established by force, it is now maintained by British support and by flagrant manipulation with British consent of electoral boundaries within the area.

The perpetual interference in Ireland's internal affairs by an outside power sets an example destructive of the rule of law among the nations.

Partition gravely injures both parts of Ireland; it injures Britain too, for as long as it lasts Britain cannot sustain her claim to stand for democracy in western Europe.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that any of us are practicing what we preach unless we affirmatively show that we believe in what the people of southern Ireland are fighting for at the present time. If we believe in the principles of the country that we live in; if we want to maintain our rights of freedom of religion, freedom of as-

sembly, freedom of speech, there is no other action that we can take than to stand up and fight for the cause that these people are fighting for in southern Ireland.

If we do that, if we take some definite action now, I am sure that we will be on the right road and that the elimination of partition will be accomplished. I am sure that if we stand up and let ourselves be counted, and if we keep on with the fight, all Ireland will again be one.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Carnahan, have you any questions?

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no questions at this time. I would like to relate an interesting experience I had in southern Ireland during the First World War. I was stationed there with a naval aviation unit, as an enlisted man in the Navy.

You may recall that in southern Ireland there is an old castle, called Blarney Castle, of which the Irish are quite proud. I visited this castle with a group of American sailors and found it most interesting. Of course, the most interesting part of the castle is the Blarney stone. You remember the tradition that if you kiss the Blarney stone you will be gifted with eloquence, so that you can win the heart of any maiden you desire, and you will some day be a member of Parliament.

While we sailors were talking about the ceremony of kissing the Blarney stone, we asked the Irish guide about this matter of becoming a member of Parliament. We were not particularly interested in that. He said, "Well, I can fix that up for you." So he repeated the old tradition in this form: He said, "If you kiss the Blarney stone, you will be gifted with eloquence, so that you can win the heart of any maiden you desire and you will some day be a Member of Congress."

With that change in the conditions we kissed the stone and my presence here today proves the strength of this fine old Irish tradition.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that Congressman Carnahan had the opportunity of getting to Ireland and I am very happy that he kissed the Blarney stone and became a Member of Congress. And in view of that I am sure we have another friend on the committee.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I might add this further remark, that since an election is coming up again, I may have to go over there and kiss it again.

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, if it will help to elect you, Mr. Carnahan, I might be willing to introduce a resolution to set up such a trip over there, and I should want to go with you.

I have been over there twice and kissed the Blarney stone twice, and I think it is one of the greatest thrills I have ever had.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Fogarty, first, let me thank you for being here. We all know you have been a leader in this fight and it is a fact that your resolution has been very widely favored, as I know from the people of my own district.

I would also compliment you on your statesmanlike statement with respect to the European recovery program and its importance to our victory in the cold war.

I would also like, Mr. Chairman, if I may, to ask Mr. Fogarty a question or two. But first I would like to emphasize that this is a very serious hearing and a very serious matter. And it is entirely compatible with the foreign-affairs activities of the United States.

It is my sincere feeling, from a visit that I made to Dublin in 1947, that action by the Congress of the United States of this character will be a material influence in respect of British considerations and North Ireland considerations in bringing about this long-desired and so-ardently-fought-for unification of all Ireland. I would like to emphasize that, because I hope that the press and the public will feel that we are engaged here in very serious business which can have very helpful results in a very critical area of the world.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. Fogarty, who knows a great deal about this subject, what he considers to be the economic implications of the unification of north and south Ireland.

Mr. FOGARTY. Of course, I am no expert on economics, as you well know. But I will say that they are in a similar situation to Norway, Sweden, or Denmark, countries similar to that; that is, that it is very difficult now for Ireland, divided as it is, to be stable economically.

I am sure that if partition were eliminated, Ireland would be in a much more economically stable condition because of the industry that is in and around Belfast. Even though agriculture is still important in those six counties and means more than industry does, in view of the fact that a lot of industry does remain in those six counties, if they were united with the rest of Ireland there would be a free economic market and they could get on by themselves much better.

Mr. JAVITS. Ireland is not today a member of the Atlantic Pact nations, is it?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, it is not.

Mr. JAVITS. What do you consider to be the defense implications, as far as the security of the United States is concerned, of the unification of north and south Ireland.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think that they should be in the Atlantic Pact, but I do not know how they can enter the Atlantic Pact under the conditions of a divided Ireland. I am sure, just as sure as I sit here, that if we could in some way help to eliminate the partition over there, as soon as the partition is eliminated, Ireland would become a member of the Atlantic Pact immediately. I know that it should be a member of the United Nations today, and would be if it had not been for the veto power of one country.

Mr. JAVITS. So that you feel that we would be making a contribution to our own general security, which is so intimately tied up with that of the western European powers, if we helped this aim and ambition of the Irish people?

Mr. FOGARTY. There is no question about it.

Mr. JAVITS. There are six resolutions which have been introduced, one of which is your own, and it certainly is entitled, in view of your great record in this whole fight, to very prime consideration.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, for the record, that those resolutions have been introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Montana, who graces the chair this morning, by myself, by Mr. Fogarty, by Mr. Lane, of Massachusetts, who I see is here to testify, by Mr. Dollinger, of New York, and by Mr. Keating, of New York; six resolutions in all.

Now, Mr. Fogarty, your resolution says:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House of Representatives that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary

Would you tell us, so the record is complete on this subject, what you had in mind by the way of a plebiscite, in view of the fact that my resolution and that of Representative Keating—and incidentally the memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, which I hope to put in the record here, also refers to the possibility of a plebiscite under United Nations auspices, pursuant to article XI of the United Nations Charter, which I have before me and which, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read into the record, which would make possible very much the same kind of action as has been taken by United Nations commissions in other areas; for example, Korea.

I just wondered what you had in mind.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Javits, I think that would be the fairest way to hold an election, and I would be willing to gamble and to take the chance, if England would only allow all of the people of Ireland to vote on this issue, as they did back in 1918, and under the same auspices as the election was held back in 1918. Then, over 200,000 military men of England were in control of Ireland. They put into jail practically every official in every election district that was not for them. But under all of those conditions and fighting against even those odds, the people in Ireland, back in 1918, voted 3 to 1 for complete independence of Ireland. I am sure they would today, even if Great Britain held the election.

I would not care how or under what auspices the elections were held as long as they would have the right to a free election so that all of the people could take part.

Mr. JAVITS. So that you would recommend that the language we use, assuming that the resolution is reported out—and I am certainly very much in favor of it and I am very hopeful that we will get favorable action—but assuming we do report it out, would be the language of your resolution?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the language of article XI of the United Nations Charter permits any state, which is not a member of the United Nations, to bring a question affecting international peace and security before the United Nations. And certainly this is a question affecting the peace and security of the world and Ireland is not a member of the United Nations.

Thank you very much, and my compliments to you on your splendid statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Ribicoff, have you any questions?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am very pleased to have had the opportunity of listening to your testimony, Mr. Fogarty, and in my acquaintanceship with you since I have been in the House, I have gained respect for your ability and integrity.

I think it was very important for you to have said what you did today, because there was considerable misunderstanding when your amendment came up in the House. I think the press generally gave it the interpretation that you were against the Marshall plan and were trying to blast the importance of the Marshall plan. I know from my experience with you and from your record in the House that you believe that one of the keystones in our fight against the spread of world-wide communism, is the continued success of the Marshall plan.

Mr. FOGARTY. Positively.

Mr. RIBICOFF. And if that impression had gotten out, I think it would have done the Irish cause a great deal of harm, because in my experience with the Irish people, in my district especially, there are no greater fighters against communism than the Irish. They realize that this anti-God philosophy of communism seeks to destroy free men and free religion all over the world.

The Irish have always been fighters in the forefront of freedom of religion and democracy as we understand it. And consequently it was very important for you to have said what you did today, to clear up any possible misunderstanding. Because I know from all the Irish people that I know, that they are ardent supporters of the Marshall plan and the purpose of this Congress and the President of the United States to contain the further spread of communism.

Mr. FOGARTY. I wanted to make that very plain, Mr. Ribicoff, because it was possible, from the way that some of the newspapermen write these stories, for my viewpoint to be misunderstood, and for the impression to be had that I was against the Marshall plan. But they have only to look at the record and see that I voted for it a year ago and voted for it again this year. And I have been recorded often on roll-call votes opposing cuts that were offered to the bill. I have voted against those cuts and voted against the efforts to cut the bill that were made in the next 2 or 3 days after I offered my amendment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Not only that, you have always continued fighting for the full appropriations in your committee, which is as important as the authorization.

Now, of course, the situation geographically in Ireland is very important from a strategic standpoint that we have a united Ireland and an Ireland that would be certainly friendly to the west when we look at the map. Certainly it helps in the approaches to Europe. It would certainly be an important bastion in any military plans that might be made.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct. By looking at the map of Ireland you can see the partition penciled out there, and we can note the situation that develops. Most everyone refers to that section of Ireland as the northern section of Ireland, but you can see by looking at the map that it is not the most northern part of Ireland. So if they wanted to be fair in the beginning and wanted to take Ulster, or if there was some river that divided up that particular section, or some mountain range as a natural barrier, there might be some excuse for it. But you can see by the map that they did not do this nor did they take all of Ulster. They took only six of the nine counties of Ulster and carved out that small portion up there to maintain their control.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Your study of history and current events certainly teaches you, does it not, that the partition and the dividing of any nation tends to weaken that nation?

Mr. FOGARTY. Positively. That was Hitler's idea when he started the World War. That is Stalin's idea at the present time. That is the way that he has conquered some of these countries behind the iron curtain.

Mr. RIBICOFF. It is his policy to take a nation, cause trouble within the nation itself, so that they will not be strong enough to resist outside aggression.

Mr. FOGARTY. That was the philosophy of Hitler and is now the philosophy of Stalin.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I do want to say for the benefit of everyone here that Congressman Fogarty has been a great fighter for this cause, and Congressman Lane and Congressman Rooney, and all the other men here. I do want to pay tribute to our own gentleman from Montana, Mr. Mansfield. I have known him for 2 years and worked intimately with him on this committee, and I think there is no opportunity going to be overlooked by him to press the cause of a United Ireland in the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

Mr. FOGARTY. Although I cannot speak for him, I feel quite confident that he is going to be friendly on this issue.

Mr. JAVITS. He has, and not only in public session.

Mr. BURLESON. I am sorry I was not present to hear all of Mr. Fogarty's statement. I am apologetic to him. As a result, I could not be as well prepared to discuss this matter as had I been here.

I would like to ask Mr. Fogarty if he feels that if his resolution or one similar were adopted, it would have a salutary effect, to say the least, upon the propaganda now rampant over the world that there is an imperialistic attitude on the part of the United States—I think it is usually referred to as capitalistic imperialism—and that it would have the effect of counteracting that type of propaganda.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know that I get your question.

Mr. BURLESON. By the passage of such a resolution as you have it would be the sense of this Congress that Ireland be united and free. Would that have the effect of offsetting accusations against the United States that we have a feeling of imperialism within us? There is such a feeling in parts of the world, as you recognize.

Mr. FOGARTY. I agree. It would have that effect.

Mr. BURLESON. You think so?

Mr. FOGARTY. Positively. Every democratic country in the world would recognize the distinction between the promotion of democracy as against the extension of imperialism.

Mr. BURLESON. That is a preface to my next question.

What is the answer to the accusation which likely will be made, that we are, by such action, trying to tell England how to run her business? What is the answer to that?

Mr. FOGARTY. As I said before, I honestly believe that the Government of England would like to ease out of this situation if they could, but they find it very difficult from a political standpoint. If they attempted to solve this question at the present time, I am sure in the next election those who led the fight would be defeated because of the political reaction. I feel deep in my heart that the Government of England would like to see this question solved, and they would like to see some way of its being done so that some other country would take the lead in accomplishing the purpose.

Mr. BURLESON. Do you think that it should be the policy of this Government to oppose colonialism anywhere in the world?

Mr. FOGARTY. I think we should. I think that is what the Constitution was founded on. In my opinion that is what we believe in as American citizens.

Mr. RIBICOFF. In mentioning the names of Congressmen here I overlooked Judge McGrath, of New York. I certainly do not want the record to indicate that I omitted him. He and I came in as freshmen to the Congress, and the judge, I think, is one of the most able men

we have in Congress. I know that he will be a stalwart fighter in this cause, both from conviction and from common sense. I do want the record to speak for Judge McGrath as far as my attitude toward that gentleman is concerned.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I join with you in that statement. We have Congressman McGrath listed here as a witness today. I am quite sure that he will display his attitude in no uncertain terms about this particular question.

I want to say before Congressman Fogarty leaves us that I am in wholehearted accord with what he has said, and in my opinion Congressman Fogarty has been the outstanding leader in the fight against this injustice down through the years since I have been a Member of Congress.

I thank you very much, Mr. Fogarty.

Our next witness is Congressman Lane, of Massachusetts, who has introduced a resolution covering the subject that we are discussing this morning, and I want to say for the record that no one has been more vigorous than Tom Lane in his advocacy of an end of the partition of Ireland.

We will now hear from Congressman Lane.

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS J. LANE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. LANE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Thomas J. Lane, representing the Seventh Massachusetts District in the Congress of the United States.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I wish to extend my thanks and my appreciation to each and every member of this committee for their thoughtfulness and kindness in allowing us to have this opportunity to present our remarks here on a very important matter.

You have heard from our majority leader, Mr. John W. McCormack, and you have heard from Hon. John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, who have given to you some very illuminating and worth-while suggestions as to the reasons for the passage of these bills, or one of these bills, that your committee is considering today.

I have come before you to favor these bills, and, of course, I am in favor of the bill that I presented to the Congress, House Joint Resolution 59. The fact that so many of the Congress of the United States have come here personally to speak to this honorable committee; the fact that there are so many persons here representing, not only themselves, but organizations from all over the United States, speaks so well that no speech is necessary. I am more than pleased to see so many gathered here to signify their interest in these bills that are pending before your committee. The fact that they are in such large numbers, not only here in the room but out in the areaway and the corridor also, shows the amount of interest that has emanated throughout the United States, and, as Congressman Javits has so well stated, on a matter that is serious and is of importance to our United States.

The Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Pact—economic aid and military aid—will not themselves guarantee peace and security.

The world is engaged in a struggle between two ways of life. Those of us who believe in freedom must be consistent in that belief and in its application if we would win the cooperation of those vast numbers of people who are now undecided as to what course they should take.

Three out of every four persons on this earth have never lived. They have merely existed. In Africa and Asia they are stirring. The ferment of revolt against the imperialisms which kept them in bondage may turn against us if we become identified with such practices.

We are, in our friendship with Great Britain, in tacit support of Irish partition. Many centuries ago the Irish became the victims of British aggression, in no way different from the fate of those nations that have been subjugated by Russia in our times. The fact that the Irish have won independence for most of their island does not solve the whole question.

As long as the British hold on to the six northern counties of Ulster, the wrong persists, and as long as we fail to exert every ounce of pressure—in the name of freedom and a united Ireland—we shall stand indicted before the world as falling far short of our splendid aspirations.

Africans and Asians and every down-trodden people are measuring us in our new role of leadership. They are balancing our actions with our words to see if they place their faith in us and go along with us. Our complacency on the issue of a divided Ireland will not win their confidence and support. It will link us with a decadent imperialism of which they want no part. That has already been brought out here by Congressman Fogarty, stating to you here in the committee that we have been complacent over some period of time.

This could be disastrous for the cause of freedom.

The collective security of the north Atlantic area needs England, France, and Holland—but without liabilities of nineteenth century imperialism in this changing era when subject peoples are rightfully demanding their share of independence and opportunity.

Our alliance with England is unfortunately jeopardized by millions of Americans who bitterly resent Britain's refusal to restore to Ireland the county or counties which rightfully belong to her.

If the principle of divide and conquer is still a part of British policy, it may well backfire in this case, when it alienates the sympathy of so many Americans.

Communism will exploit every weakness in our armor, and this is one of them. We who speak for freedom must practice it, or the hundreds of millions of people in this world who are finding their voice and their power will turn away from us and be lured into the fatal embrace of communism.

The forced and unnatural division of Ireland plays right into the hands of the Kremlin. From Burma to Ethiopia its propagandists can point to the stubbornness of imperialism and claim that it is condoned by the United States.

At the same time, partition injures Ireland, Britain, and the United States.

American taxpayers are sacrificing much to save England. England in turn is spending \$150,000,000 a year to subsidize partition,

and I believe that some of this finds its way indirectly from the pockets of men and women here whose ancestors fled from the famines and persecutions from which Ireland suffered under British conquest. Small wonder that there is a rising demand in the United States for an end to this cruel injustice.

Ireland is largely an agricultural nation. It needs the industries of its several countries to give it a balanced economy. Until this inevitable result is realized, both Ireland and England will suffer, and there will be no neighborliness between them.

The issue of partition has become an international question. It has become a test as to how soon and how well the western world can solve those old problems which stand in the way of progress.

Stand-pat attitude will not suffice.

The people of the world, who are emerging from bondage to others, need fresh and inspiring leadership. They want facts, not words. Democracy must prove itself to them by its performance, or be rejected.

Britain is not helping us to win the cooperation of the millions who are hungry for real freedom by her denial of it to the whole of Ireland.

We shall not have unity in our opposition to the danger of communism while we withhold from any people the right to govern themselves through a freely elected assembly.

The people of Ulster (or Northern Ireland) do not have that genuine right today. It is being defeated by subtle pressures and ingeniously contrived political maneuvers that mock a clear expression of public opinion.

I believe that the English people themselves, motivated by the belief in liberty for which they sacrificed so much to win, favor the immediate unification of all Ireland. But their government, in matters outside England proper, lags behind the times.

In order to clear up this unfortunate situation, I recommend the enactment of House Joint Resolution 59, providing for an American Joint Commission to assist in the unification of Ireland.

For the foregoing reasons I urge that it be—

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is hereby requested to appoint, within thirty days from the date of enactment of this joint resolution, a commission of ten members to be known as the American Joint Commission, and to authorize and direct the members of such Commission (a) to consult with the British Government and make such arrangements as shall be necessary to meet with representatives of the British Government, either in the United States or in Great Britain, to consider and to recommend an immediate and final settlement of the Irish question leading to the abolition of the border between the north and south of Ireland, and (b) to sign on behalf of the people of the United States a settlement agreed on between the representatives of the United States and Great Britain. * * **

This is a dynamic opportunity for two great nations to solve a problem with honor and justice. It will strengthen the cause of freedom the world over by fully recognizing the rights of the Irish people who stand second to none in their devotion to our common cause.

That is the end of my statement, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for which I am indeed grateful for this opportunity to present. I know that you have many other speakers here from the Congress and many other speakers representing State and

National organizations interested in this Irish movement who are desirous of being heard at some length. For that reason I conclude my remarks at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to introduce into the record an original memorial from the Legislature of the State of New York, being Resolution No. 121, by Mr. Roman, who is the assemblyman from my district. It memorializes the Congress to adopt my resolution expressing itself against Irish partition and for Ireland's unification. The New York State Legislature recommends my resolution, but I have no pride of authorship in that. I would like to put this into the record.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Without objection, it will be inserted in the record. (The memorial referred to is as follows:)

THE ASSEMBLY,
STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, April 21, 1950.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN JAVITS: I am enclosing herewith resolution which was adopted by the New York State Legislature.

Very truly yours,

OSWALD D. HECK.

STATE OF NEW YORK—IN ASSEMBLY

ALBANY, March 22, 1950.

[Resolution No. 121, by Mr. Roman]

Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly memorializing Congress to adopt resolution for a plebiscite in Ireland under the auspices of the United Nations

Whereas it is essential for the United Nations to encourage a peaceful, prosperous, and United Ireland without imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people; and

Whereas the maintenance of international peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland and that all Ireland, including the people of Eire as well as those of Northern Ireland should have an opportunity to express their free will for or against union; and

Whereas there is pending in the United States House of Representatives a resolution, House Resolution No. 463, favoring a plebiscite of all the people of Ireland under the auspices of a United Nations Commission for Ireland, to be designated by the General Assembly pursuant to articles 11 and 35 of the United Nations Charter, the objective being to establish terms and conditions upon which Ireland would be admitted as a member of the United Nations, and the adherence of Ireland to the Atlantic Pact: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully memorialized to speedily adopt the resolution, House Resolution No. 463, now pending in the House of Representatives or a similar resolution to bring about a plebiscite of all the people of Ireland under the auspices of the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purposes of this resolution.

By order of the assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI, Clerk.

In Senate, March 22, 1950. Concurred in without amendment.

WILLIAM S. KING, Secretary.

Mr. JAVITS. I request permission to put into the record by unanimous consent a resolution of the Building Service Employees, International Union of New York, Local 32B.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The resolution referred to is as follows:)

BUILDING SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION,
NEW YORK LOCAL NO. 32B,
New York, N. Y., April 21, 1950.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The enclosed resolution was adopted unanimously by the joint executive board of local 32B, of the Building Service Employees' International Union, A. F. of L., at its regular meeting held in New York City on April 20, 1950.

Local 32B is a labor organization consisting of 36,000 organized wage earners of every race, creed, color, and nationality in the city of New York, and the resolution mentioned above expresses the feelings of this vast group of American workers.

We therefore urge you to support House Resolution 270, that was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman John E. Fogarty, on June 28, 1949.

Sincerely and respectfully yours,

DAVID SULLIVAN, President.
THOMAS G. YOUNG, Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF THE BUILDING SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION, NEW YORK LOCAL NO. 32B

Whereas it is the inalienable right of every nation in a civilized Christian society to establish the form of government under which its people shall live and be governed; and

Whereas the people of Ireland collectively, should have the right to determine their own destiny and the form of government under which they desire to live; and

Whereas, after many years, the people of Ireland have fashioned an instrument of government modeled upon our own American Constitution, under which they desire to live in peace and freedom with other nations; and

Whereas their efforts in this respect have been strenuously opposed by a superior military power that has pursued an aggressive policy which has kept the six counties of Northern Ireland from organic and political unity with the other 26 counties of the Republic: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Joint Executive Board of Local 32B, of the Building Service Employees International Union, A. F. of L., in meeting regularly assembled on this 20th day of April 1950, record its wholehearted endorsement of House Resolution 270, introduced in the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress by Congressman John E. Fogarty, on June 28, 1949.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Our next witness is Judge McGrath, who, like his predecessors, has shown himself to be one of the outstanding friends for a free and united Ireland.

STATEMENT OF HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished committee, I was very much impressed, as I think everyone in the room was, by the nonpartisan approach that has been presented here. There is no party political line. I think that everyone is trying to approach this question from a nonpolitical viewpoint and from an approach that is best for America, because what is best for America I think will work out as what is best for Ireland.

Mr. Fogarty, who has presented one of the resolutions and who is one of the outstanding Members of Congress, I think made a very important distinction here today when he pointed out that the Marshall plan was something that was necessary to be continued and it had no connection with partition itself.

The Fogarty resolution is a very good one, but I believe that the committee with its experience in these questions will select the resolution which, in their good judgment, will be for the best interests of the people of America and the people of Ireland.

When Congressman John Fogarty spoke about communism in Ireland he hit upon an important fact. While I was there last December I was told that there were only 50 Communists in the whole country, and while we are working in this attack to stop communism all over the world, here is a country that has been able to show by its democratic processes in the south of Ireland that communism cannot make any strides.

The relationship of the people of Ireland, not only historically but today, is very close to America. They have a deep and abiding faith in the Government and in the Congress of the United States.

In answer to one of the questions asked here—as to how it would affect the relationship—I think that it would solidify and cement the friendship between America and Ireland, two great liberty-loving peoples.

Secondly, the English Government, as Mr. Fogarty pointed out so well, should be more than anxious to solve this problem. Once it is solved, while the people of Ireland will never forget their 800 years of sufferings any more than we have forgotten our history, yet they will begin to look ahead to the economic development of the country in the next 100 years. It will bring a closer and better relationship between those countries who are trying to fight against communism.

The distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. Javits, asked a very significant question when he inquired about the economic effect of the end of partition. Southern Ireland has a national economy that is very sound, and of course that economic condition will become better as there is integration between the north and the south.

In December there were only 54,000 people unemployed in the south of Ireland, which is a very negative number, but yet, if the country were united, I am sure that even this small number of unemployed would not be present.

Now, Ireland has two great airports, as the distinguished gentleman from New York knows, the one at Shannon and the one at Dublin. A great effort is being made to internationalize the airport at Dublin. That would be an important factor were any trouble to develop. I hope, however, that there will not be, but these airports would be very important to our defense.

When Mr. Fogarty made the amendment to the basic legislation on ECA the other day, along with my distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. Rooney, and many others, and when we voted for that, we had in mind what was best for America, and we foresaw that the partition question would be brought to the floor.

I have been asked by my colleagues, Mr. Buckley of New York; Mr. Isadore Dollinger, of New York; and Mr. Chester Gorski, of Buffalo, N. Y.; and Anthony J. Tauriello to express their position favoring a united Ireland. Mr. Walter Lynch, of New York, is also strongly in favor of the end of partition.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you for your reference to me, and I wish to thank Judge Ribicoff for his reference, and I am sure that from this committee there will come something that will be best for America and at the same time will be best for Ireland.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to compliment my distinguished colleague from New York on his fine testimony and his great adherence to this cause.

Is it not a fact that what the Congress is being asked to do in the matter of these resolutions is entirely consistent with the great tradition of the United States which has always sought to help people fight for their independence and freedom? The people of the United States are helping the State of Israel, and this is very much along the pattern of the great American tradition to help peoples toward freedom.

Mr. McGRATH. I think that what you say is historically correct, and we can point to many instances in our history where either as a Government or as individuals, we have helped countries, as you have indicated—Israel and other countries—come into the family of nations because we have always maintained the doctrine of self-determination of nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Thank you very much, Judge McGrath, for your very splendid statement.

Our next witness is our colleague, the Honorable John J. Rooney, from Brooklyn, who has worked very closely with Mr. Fogarty and the rest of us who have been very much interested in this particular problem.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN J. ROONEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the great Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am grateful for this opportunity to give testimony in behalf of the Fogarty resolution. I might first point out that there is presently pending in the Senate a similar resolution introduced by the junior Senator from New York, Senator Lehman, containing exactly the same language as is contained in House Resolution 270, introduced by Mr. Fogarty.

As far as presentation of the facts is concerned, I feel that the brilliant presentation made by my distinguished friend and colleague from Rhode Island, Mr. Fogarty, cannot be surpassed.

However, there was a question raised a while ago with regard to American capitalistic imperialism by my distinguished friend and colleague from Texas, Mr. Burlison. May I say in regard thereto that while one who may be on the other side of the picture—and I am not assuming that the gentleman from Texas is on the other side of the picture—might call this American protest capitalistic imperialism, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. Fogarty, there is precedent in the Congress of the United States for exactly what is sought to be done in this instance with regard to the partition of Ireland.

We know that in the Sixty-fifth Congress in the year 1919 the House of Representatives passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desired to live. I believe that this Congress, the Eighty-first Congress, would concur 100 percent in that resolution.

It was not meant then, nor is it meant now, that this right of determination should apply to only 26 of the 32 counties in Ireland; that the people of Ireland who live on that island which we all see there on the map were not meant to be cut up into two subdivisions so that

the economy of the country would be split; nor that the Irish people in the north living today under the British form of government would have a different form of government from the people living in the south of Ireland.

I might say, insofar as the Fogarty resolution is concerned, the delegation in the House of Representatives from Brooklyn, composed of nine Members, supported the Fogarty antipartition amendment to the ECA bill some weeks ago, en bloc, and I am confident that the entire delegation of nine Members from the Borough of Brooklyn will support the Fogarty resolution if this committee is so kind as to report it to the floor of the House for a vote.

I am quite sure it was never intended that the Government of the people of America should interest itself in such propositions as freedom for the people of Israel, freedom for the people of India, freedom for the people of Burma—all British colonial constituencies—and not interest itself in freedom for all the people of Ireland. I was pleased to note on the House floor during the course of the debate on the Fogarty amendment that the distinguished chairman of the great Committee on Foreign Affairs, Judge Kee—who, unfortunately, is ill, I understand, and unable to be with us today—made the statement that not only would he hold hearings—and his promise has been fulfilled, since we are here today—but that he would support such a proposition as was contained in the Fogarty amendment which was before the House some weeks ago.

Mr. Chairman, after hearing the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island and my colleague from New York, Judge McGrath, and my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. Lane, I do not know what further I can add to this presentation which would not be cumulative. I will yield to the gentleman from New York to answer his question.

Mr. JAVITS: I would like to ask Mr. Rooney a question. Our colleague has not only been pursuing this question for some time before us and on the House floor, but he has been pursuing it in the Subcommittee on Appropriations of which he has the honor to be the chairman, the Subcommittee on State, Commerce, and Justice.

I would like to call attention, because I think it would be helpful to us here and helpful to us in getting known what our colleague wants known, to a colloquy that he had with Mr. Perkins, who is the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of western Europe in the State Department, in the hearings of the Department of State's appropriation bill in January of this year. I would like to read the questions and answers so that they may be in the record. They indicate no position by the State Department.

I am now quoting from page 572 of the hearings:

Mr. ROONEY. Now is it possible that you, as an Assistant Secretary in charge of this important desk, as well as our diplomatic people in Ireland, have no opinion to state one way or the other with regard to this important matter?

Now he referred to this "important matter" as being the unification of Ireland.

Mr. PERKINS. I think that it would be very inadvisable of us to have opinions on that, sir.

That is the colloquy.

Mr. Rooney, would you care to comment on that?

Mr. ROONEY. I shall make this observation: that if Mr. Perkins and the other folks in the Department were to listen to the people of America, all of whom believe in fair play in regard to this problem rather than to the British Foreign Office and Mr. Bevin, there would be no question but that Irish partition would soon be abolished.

Mr. JAVITS. And you are satisfied as to that from what I find to be a very comprehensive cross-examination which you gave those very people in the State Department?

Mr. ROONEY. I assure you that I am.

Mr. BURLISON. I appreciate very much your frank statement, which was so ably presented, and I appreciate also your enlarging upon my questions directed to Mr. Fogarty. I was simply trying to provoke thought.

If we could assume for just a moment that Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico desired independence, do you see any analogy between the situation which this country would face and that which the British face with reference to Ulster?

Mr. ROONEY. I see no analogy because the United States of America and the people of the United States of America would not permit to go on in Hawaii or Alaska or Puerto Rico what is permitted by the British Government to go on in Northern Ireland. We would treat the Hawaiians and the folks of Alaska and Puerto Rico with decency and respect.

Mr. BURLISON. Of course, they are asking for statehood, and it would be hard to assume that they would want independence. I was just wondering if we could assume such a situation and make comparisons.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure that if the people in the six northern counties were attached to, we will say, the State of New York, the situation might be different, too.

Mr. BURLISON. I notice in Mr. Fogarty's resolution that all the people of all Ireland should participate in a plebiscite. The outcome of that probably would be obvious. Do you concur in that mechanism, in that approach, that method?

Mr. ROONEY. I most certainly do. I will say that I am sure that everyone in this room and every interested person in America, who is acquainted with this problem, would agree to the following: That the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless a clear majority of all the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determined and declared to the contrary. That is all we ask.

Mr. BURLISON. I am trying to get your reasoning why the whole of Ireland should participate in such a determination.

Mr. ROONEY. Well, you see, the line of partition was a man-drawn unnatural line of some 30 years ago, drawn for the express purpose of causing trouble and dissension; drawn as the result of the usual British policy to "divide and conquer." At that time the British deliberately drew this line for the purpose of causing trouble. They did it so that Ireland would be under John Bull's thumb for many, many years to come, and she has been under his thumb for the past 30 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would it be well to cite as a possible analogy the plebiscites that have been taken in both Alaska and Hawaii insofar as the desire of the people of those Territories are concerned in the

matter of becoming States? All the people were considered, not certain portions, so there was unanimity and no unnatural line of demarcation in any part of the two Territories.

Mr. ROONEY. Your analogy is perfect.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The committee's next witness is Congressman Shelley, of California, Congressman Shelley is just as good a friend of Irish unity as was his late lamented and great predecessor, Congressman Welch.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is John F. Shelley, Congressman from the Fifth District, San Francisco, Calif. I appear at this time to support the resolution asking for a plebiscite to be held among the people of all Ireland as to whether the northern counties should remain independent or become a part of Ireland.

I feel that this country in justice to its own cause, and to be consistent with the principles upon which it was founded and for which it stands today, must take a stand on this subject matter. I cannot sympathize with the argument advanced by some that we should not do so because that would be mixing in other peoples' affairs. I point to the very leading part taken by this country in setting up the State of Israel, a cause that I supported. It is a position taken by this country which I think was laudable.

Take the history of this country in the handling of the Philippines, the subject matter just mentioned by the previous speaker. I wish to point out that in the southern Philippines where some of the southern provinces in Mindanao and Cebu wished to divide, it was proposed by several of the Americans appointed as Governors General that a plebiscite of the entire Philippine people be held. The subject matter was dropped and this country went on to eventually give the Philippines their independence and thereby contribute again to the purposes and causes for which this country was founded and to which it is dedicated.

I think that the people of Ireland are being made the victims of a policy on the part of the British which is age-old, which we can see again in their dealings with Asia, their dealings with the north Communist Government in China; simply to hold onto a bit of territory in Hong Kong and Singapore for their own commercial advancement.

I think that all these actions are contrary to the principles that this country has stood for and I think the time has come when the United States and the people of the United States, and particularly the Congress of the United States representing the people, must express itself to England and say: "We feel that the Irish people should be given a chance to vote on having a single united nation which can be a great contributor toward peace and harmony in the world."

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to thank you on behalf of the committee for your splendid statement.

Our next witness is Congressman O'Toole, of New York, who, like his colleague, John Rooney, has always been in the forefront in the cause of Irish unity.

STATEMENT OF HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, there is very little that I could add that has not already been said. However, it seems very strange to me that these United States that have beset themselves with the partitions of other countries have never expressed a proper interest in Ireland whose friendship toward this country has been expressed from colonial days.

The histories of the two lands are so interwoven that they could be read as one. Neither Ireland, nor any other country, can maintain its nationalism when its physical components are divided. Was it not Lincoln who said in another sense, but still true as far as Ireland is concerned, "A country divided against itself must fall."

Those in the north who stand for the existing order of things are for the major part not of Irish blood. Their ancestors were sent there in the days of Elizabeth and Cromwell to divide. They succeeded in their purpose. They have taken unto themselves powers that were against the natural law. With the assistance of the British Government they have thwarted the will of the mass of the Irish people and have made it impossible that there be a true Irish nation.

Ireland must take its proper place in the world. It is one of the oldest of all civilizations. Centuries ago when civilization seemed doomed, it was Ireland that held it together and made possible its perpetuation. If Ireland is allowed to become a real nation, perhaps again in the day of the H-bomb it will once more be the bulwark of civilization.

These United States have benefited greatly from Irish blood and from Irish friendship. Each war has seen the men of Irish blood in the front ranks. In the days of peace they built our railroads, our institutions, and founded the local governments in our frontier outposts. Each page of our history will find men of Irish blood contributing to the writing of the page.

And so today, once again Members of this Congress who share the Irish heritage ask that our Government do everything in its power to give Ireland a real existence.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Before I call the next witness I would like to say that the committee is indebted to Congressman Javits, who has introduced one of these resolutions, for relinquishing his priority in appearance so that our distinguished majority leader could be heard first. If Mr. Javits has anything further to say now we shall be glad to hear from him. I want to say to you that we are all grateful for letting us have the benefit of the advice which you and our other colleagues have given to us.

STATEMENT OF HON. JACOB K. JAVITS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I will have, and have had, as a member of this committee, so great an opportunity to bring light and information to bear on this subject of the unification of Ireland in which I have such a deep interest and which I favor so strongly, and I have so little pride of authorship that I do not think I need testify at all.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Thank you very much.

Before our next witness, Hon. Daniel Doherty, is called, I would like to make a comment in regard to the question raised by my colleague, Mr. Burleson, a few minutes ago. It may be well to bring out that one of the most recent examples of disunity in a country is to be found in the case of Korea, where a United Nations commission was sent for the purpose of trying to bring about a unified whole. Because of the fact that the U. S. S. R. which dominated north Korea would not agree to such a plebiscite—we are faced with the actuality today of a divided nation, not that we want it that way but because we have no other choice in the matter. What we really want in Korea is a united Korea, and by the same token, what we really want in Ireland is a united Ireland.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that the Congress can proceed with the firm assurance that if the United Nations should request of Great Britain the entrance of a plebiscite commission into northern Ireland there would be little question but that Great Britain would agree?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would assume so.

STATEMENT OF DANIEL DOHERTY, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE UNIFICATION AND LIBERATION OF IRELAND

Mr. DOHERTY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Daniel Doherty, residing at 128 Hamilton Street, North Chester, Mass.

I appear here as the duly selected representative of the Central Council of Irish County Clubs of Greater Boston, in the capacity of chairman of the Committee for the Unification and Liberation of Ireland.

Resolutions were unanimously adopted by our organization 12 months ago. These resolutions were addressed to the President of the United States, to the Department of State, and to the Congress of the United States of America, asking for the unconditional recognition of the Irish Republic as the rightful and lawful government of all Ireland.

These resolutions were signed by more than 22,000 people. They have been regularly notarized, and I am presenting these resolutions to your committee, together with copies of resolutions adopted by the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations at their respective conventions of last year.

Since the resolutions of both the two great labor organizations originated in Boston, and were sponsored by our people, it is in order for me to present them with our own at this time. The resolutions of both the American Federation of Labor and the CIO have petitioned you on behalf of the unifications and liberation of Ireland. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will read these resolutions and speak very briefly upon their merits. You will see here a copy of a letter from Mr. Kenneth Kelley to me from the convention of the American Federation of Labor, when they were in session last year in St. Paul, to the effect that he has, after sponsoring such resolutions before the State branch in Massachusetts, presented them to the national body which unanimously adopted them.

PETITION OF THE CENTRAL COUNCIL OF IRISH COUNTY CLUBS OF GREATER BOSTON

To the President of the United States of America.

To the Secretary of State.

To the Congress of the United States.

Whereas the Irish Nation affirms its inalienable, indefeasible and sovereign right to choose its own form of government, to determine its relations with other nations, and to develop its life, political, economic, and cultural in accordance with its own genius and tradition;

Whereas the national territory consists of the whole island of Ireland, its islands and territorial areas: Be it

Resolved, That we, the undersigned American citizens and residents of the United States of America who believe that all truly democratic governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed, do hereby request:

1. The recognition of the rightful government for all Ireland, the Republic, which was proclaimed on April 24, 1916, ratified January 21, 1919, endorsed by a general election of all 32 counties of Ireland on December 14, 1918.

2. The withdrawal of all British armed forces from the six-county area of Ireland now being unlawfully deprived of the rights of free government by the unnatural partition of Ireland.

PARTITION OF IRELAND

Resolution No. 116—By Delegate Kenneth J. Kelley, Massachusetts State Federation of Labor.

Whereas there still exists throughout the world governments that do not recognize the rights of people in regard to their majority rights of free, self-government; and

Whereas there is a government in northern Ireland being perpetuated by a foreign power which is breeding bigotry and tends to destroy the unity of a race of people; and

Whereas the Irish people have contributed over the centuries more aid to the freedom of oppressed people than any nation in the world; and

Whereas organized labor has always raised its voice to espouse the cause of freedom and the rights of government that is of, for, and by all its people; and

Whereas the partition in Ireland is not a healthy or natural condition; and

Whereas the present government in Great Britain is controlled by the Labor Party: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the sixty-eighth annual convention of the American Federation of Labor record itself against the continuation of the partition dividing all of the people of Ireland and call upon the President of the United States, the State Department and the Congress of the United States to do all in their power to end once and for all this unjust condition to the end that the government of Eire will truly represent all of its people within its natural borders so that she may take her rightful place among the family of nations.

[Resolution No. 36. Eleventh constitutional convention, Congress of Industrial Organizations, October 31 to November 4, 1949, Cleveland, Ohio]

PARTITION OF IRELAND

There still exist throughout the world, governments that do not recognize the rights of people in regard to their majority rights of free self-government, and

There is a Government in Northern Ireland being perpetuated by a foreign power which is breeding bigotry and tends to destroy the unity of a race of people, and

The Irish people have contributed, over the centuries, aid to the freedom of oppressed people.

Organized labor has always raised its voice to espouse the cause of freedom and the rights of government that is of, for, and by all its people, and

The partition of Ireland is not a healthy or natural condition, and

The present government in Great Britain is controlled by the Labor Party: now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we record ourselves against the continuation of the partition dividing all of the people of Ireland and call upon the President of the United States, the State Department, and the Congress of the United States to do all in their power to end once and for all this unjust condition to the end that the Government of Eire will truly represent all of its people within its natural borders so that she may take her rightful place among the family of nations.

Committee Secretary CURRAN. The committee recommends adoption. The recommendation of the committee was adopted.

Mr. DOHERTY. Democracy is a word that is being much used and often abused in recent years. Some have spoken the word with the deepest sincerity and reverent regard for its broad beneficial implications, while others have used it as a cloak or smokescreen while they are undermining and endeavoring to destroy the foundations upon which the life and liberty of humanity depends.

But here today in this chamber we have powerful proof that the potential strength of democracy can become a living reality. You, the democratically elected representatives of the American people, assembled to hear the petitions of the American people in behalf of the democratically established Government of Ireland, the Republic of all Ireland.

The business before your committee at this time is in a manner unfinished business—the unfinished business of the Sixty-fifth Congress of the year 1919, when a resolution was passed by the House of Representatives declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live.

At a general election in Ireland December 14, 1918, the people of all Ireland voted by an overwhelming majority in favor of complete independence. The elected representatives of the Irish people, assembled in Dublin January 21, 1919, and lawfully ratified the independence of their nation. They established the Irish Republic as the government of all Ireland.

According to all democratic principles, the Republic of Ireland is the rightful and lawful government of the whole Irish Nation.

In 1920 Ireland was divided by an act of the British House of Commons, but it must be remembered that not one Irish man or Irish woman voted for the division of their country.

Ireland was united against partition.

At the time of the general election in Ireland in 1918 there were 2,000,000 American soldiers still encamped on the battleground of France and Belgium. I was one of those 2,000,000. The First World War, so far as the United States of America was concerned, was fought for the world democracy and the freedom of small nations.

Well, Ireland is a small nation, and the most democratic nation in all Europe; and Ireland has honorably earned the right to recognition by the greatest and most democratic Nation in the world, the United States of America.

Never before in the history of this Nation have so many people petitioned the Congress of the United States as they have on this occasion. Fifteen million Americans in the ranks of organized labor, hundreds of thousands of veterans, and numbers of social and fraternal organizations, from Boston to San Francisco, have petitioned you in behalf of worthy Ireland.

These millions of Americans, whose ancestors have come from many lands, and are of different creeds and color, speak with one voice in favor of the unification and liberation of Ireland.

The partitioned part of Ireland is sometimes referred to as Northern Ireland, while at other times it is called the Ulster Government, but it is neither, and I can speak with authority on this particular phase of the subject, because I was born in Ulster, and at the most northerly point of the Irish Nation, at Malin Head, County Donegal. There are nine counties in Ulster; there are only six counties in the partitioned area. Partition divides Ireland, and in addition to that, Northern Ireland, or Ulster, is divided, too.

Why was Ulster divided? Because the majority of the people in the nine counties of Ulster believed in, and still believe in a free and independent Ireland. They could, and they would, outvote the pro-British Tory.

Eighty percent of the people of the most northern county of Ireland, which is Donegal, voted for complete independence in 1918. County Cavan and County Monaghan also voted for freedom. Donegal, Cavan, and Monaghan are in Ulster, so you can readily see that the whole British scheme is one of deception. The partitioned area of Ireland is not a government at all. It is a British satellite created by an act of the British House of Commons, established by night, and maintained in keeping with England's well known policy of divide and conquer.

In the name of human progress and in the name of human liberty and justice, and for the edification and enlightenment of all mankind, we present these resolutions in behalf of Ireland's right to nationhood.

May you be guided by the light of righteousness in your deliberations. May you have the unconquerable courage and wisdom of the heroic Americans who established and maintained this great Republic, dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, and that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Thank you, Mr. Doherty, for that very fine statement.

Are there any questions on the part of the members?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The next witness will be Mr. Charles T. Rice, who has been before us on many occasions in the past.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES T. RICE

Mr. RICE. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, I will give the particulars of my qualifications as a witness before your committee, before proceeding with the discussion of some of the very important features of this most vital question.

My name is Charles T. Rice. I reside in New York City and I am a practicing lawyer, with 25 years' membership at the New York Bar.

I am a veteran of the United States Army, World War I. I am national vice president of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, a national organization which is sponsoring and supporting with all its resources, and marshalling public opinion behind and in

favor of the resolution introduced by Hon. John E. Fogarty, Congressman from Rhode Island.

I am also treasurer of the American League for an Undivided Ireland and I am a member of the Executive Council of the American-Irish Historical Society of New York and president of the Shamrock Club, New York.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am inspired not only by the marvelous and extraordinary representation appearing here today before your honorable committee from all parts of the United States, but I am equally inspired and encouraged by the reception which you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of your honorable committee in attendance at this hearing, have accorded to us in scheduling this public hearing on the Fogarty resolution.

I may say that the American League for an Undivided Ireland, through its national executive council, which speaks for the American League throughout the United States, wholeheartedly endorses and approves the Fogarty resolution which is before your committee.

I am heartened and encouraged, too, by the sentiments that have been expressed not only by you, Mr. Chairman, who have always been most courteous and friendly to our delegations in their appearances before your committee, but by those of each and every member of the very important Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives who is in attendance here this morning. I am glad to note the presence of the members here and the sentiments that they have expressed, those of Congressman Carnahan, Congressman Javits, Congressman Ribicoff, Congressman Burleson, and particularly the magnificent statements that were made by the majority leader, Mr. John McCormack, of Massachusetts, by Congressman Rooney of Brooklyn, by Congressman McGrath, and the sponsor of the resolution, Hon. John E. Fogarty, and by Congressman Shelley, of California, and Congressman O'Toole, of Brooklyn, and the others who have made such a remarkable contribution to the discussion and shown such an understanding of this great question which is before us today.

I am impressed with the intimate knowledge of the features and the entire heart of this question as has been demonstrated by the members of this committee, and by the Members of Congress who are not members of the committee who have appeared here today.

In consideration of what they have said, you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, to review not only the sentiments that they have expressed, but to emphasize the chief features of this question which calls for a solution, and a solution in our time and on the basis of which we are appearing here for the support of the Congress of the United States.

I have always been greatly impressed by the courtesy and the cordial reception that have been given one in my four or five appearances before congressional committees. It is a great privilege to appear before congressional committees in the democratic and in the American way, to discuss important questions that are before our people.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it would be well for the record, to review quickly the origins of the partition of Ireland. There is no need, as Congressman Fogarty has pointed out in his testimony today, to go back over the 780-year history of Britain's invasion of Ireland, her attempted occupation, the wars and the aggressions and the oppressions, the series of oppressions which through the generations and the centuries they have perpetrated on the Irish people.

Coming into the nineteenth century, let me say that in every century and in every generation the Irish people have in one form or another, by uprisings and by every method within their power, in the days gone by, definitely demonstrated their unalterable opposition to the occupation of their country by a foreign power and have endeavored, within the means at their disposal at the various times, to repel and to drive out the enemy from their country.

And in all the history of Ireland, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, there has never been raised the question, until recent times, of the essential unity of Ireland. It was always considered one nation, a united nation, one and indivisible. And even when the conquering forces, all the forces that attempted to conquer the country were there, it was always the policy of the invaders to consider Ireland as one, and to attempt to complete the conquest of the country as a whole.

Geographically, economically, politically, and in every other way by which a nation may be considered one and indivisible, Ireland stands at the head, with all of the essential elements present.

Now, as I say, coming into the nineteenth century, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the fight for Irish freedom and for Irish independence continued. There was the revolution, the rising of 1798. There was the rising of 1848. There were the various movements of independence and freedom; the great Fenian organization and movement for the complete liberation of Ireland.

There was afterward the constitutional movement headed up by that most masterful of men, Charles Stuart Parnell, and followed afterward by the party leader, John E. Redmond.

There was the home-rule movement sponsored by a united people in Ireland for home rule and favored and advocated by Gladstone, the Liberal leader of England, when he introduced the home-rule bill in the British House of Commons in 1886. Then the first signs of trouble arose, which bred this question of partition. For the advantage in British party politics, the Tory Party in England sought by every means within their power to thwart and to defeat the moderate and modest measure of home rule that was introduced by the Liberal Party under the leadership of Gladstone, and with the united support of the Irish people.

The Tories fomented racial and religious and sectarian and class strife in that part of Ireland known as northeast. They defeated the home-rule bill and for 26 years after the defeat of that bill, and with the defeat of a similar bill in 1893 or 1894, the agitation for home rule and for independence and for freedom and for separation from England continued. Then public opinion, not only in Ireland and England, but in the civilized world and particularly in the United States, forced England to come in with a measure of home rule, which was passed after great efforts by the British House of Commons.

It was a home-rule bill of very limited power and it was passed and became the law of the land. The home-rule bill was the bill of 1912.

The same situation was created by these people who sought to hold Ireland for the British, and who sought to keep a stranglehold on Ireland—the same situation was created in the northeast by fomenting discord, racial, religious, and class warfare, reaching to the depths of outrages and murder.

Then the World War came on and fortunately from the point of view of the British, and with characteristic duplicity, the Home Rule Act was shelved, but the Irish people would not be denied and in the general election of 1918—and I have pointed out this to your committee before, Mr. Chairman—this was an election which was held under the auspices of the British in all Ireland, the question was squarely put up to the Irish people. On the principles enunciated by President Wilson, who was then the recognized leader of democratic forces during World War I, on the principle of self-determination, the Irish people, not in the 6 counties alone, and not in the 26 counties alone, but in all of the 32 counties, for the entire Irish Nation, went to the polls and they returned a verdict, of all of the Irish people, of over 75 percent of the voters in favor of complete independence and separation from Britain.

On the basis of that vote, 79 Irish members were returned to the British Parliament, who favored the independence, the unity and the freedom of Ireland, as opposed to 26 who still held out for a connection with England.

Gentlemen, the British were not to be outdone. They refused to apply the principles of self-determination to Ireland, as evidenced by this tremendous vote for Irish freedom and Irish independence. They refused in the face of that to recognize the justice of the principles announced under the principle of self-determination, and the refusal was fomented, organized, and prosecuted by the British, culminating in the atrocious warfare conducted by the Black and Tans, which shocked the civilized world and particularly shocked our own American people.

Measuring the effects of the historic rising of Easter week, 1916, and seeing that the Irish people were absolutely determined to cut off from England and to separate from Great Britain and to establish an independent Irish Republic, Britain, through her politicians, led by Lloyd George and others, again resorted to the technique of fomenting discord in the places where the Tories were strong, in the northeast of Ireland.

That culminated in the introduction of a bill in Parliament in 1919 which eventually became the act of Parliament known as the Government of Ireland Act of 1920. Under that bill, which became the Act of 1920, Ireland was divided and partitioned. The Province of Ulster was divided and partitioned. They did not take the entire province because, as has been pointed out here today many times, the entire province could not be controlled by Britain—but they carved out from Ireland the six counties. That is the infamous act, perpetrated and organized by Britain and inspired and carried through by Britain, to attempt to continue and make permanent her occupation of a small part of Ireland.

In passing that act of Parliament, gentlemen, let me emphasize this, that that was a law passed by an alien Parliament, without the consent of the people of Ireland who were vitally affected by this act. And when the act was passed and when the debates were on and when the vote finally came on, not one Irish member of the Parliament, either of those who favored complete independence and separation from Britain or those who favored the continued union with Britain—not one Irish representative voted for that act of Parliament.

Now, that is the story. This is essentially not a question between the group of Irishmen in the 26 counties and the group of Irishmen in the northeast 6 counties of Ireland. This, gentlemen, is a question between Ireland and England. This is occupation of a part of Ireland by England, against the expressed wishes of the Irish people.

And so in coming to you today, we are trying to present this case in a simple fashion, recognizing the simple fundamentals and the essential elements and we are asking for your favorable consideration of this resolution which is before you.

Now, I do not want unduly to take up further the time of this committee, because we have many representative people here from all parts of the country, able men and women who will present to you their opinions and their views and their desires, through their oral statements and their written statements, and which will, I believe, justify the reporting out of the Fogarty resolution.

We are entirely in favor of it and we feel certain that with the sentiments that have been expressed here today this great question, and the elements making up the question, will receive the favorable consideration of you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the committee.

As I say, I do not want further to take up the time of the committee in discussing the operations of the government of the six counties since the Partition Act, and since it came into operation in 1921, because that will be ably treated by others of my colleagues here.

There are several important elements there that will shock the conscience of the members of this committee when they see the operations of administration in the six counties which will be reviewed for you. I think there is permeating the Government of Northern Ireland a studied policy of discrimination and persecution.

They talk about gerrymandering. I ask the courtesy of the committee to submit some tables and figures on that for your further consideration.

(The tables referred to are as follows:)

The following table shows the utter impossibility of there ever being any change in the make-up of the Belfast Parliament. Seven parliaments have been elected since the creation of the Northern Ireland Government in 1921:

Year	Unionists	Nationalists	Others
1921	40	12	-----
1925	37	12	3
1929	40	12	-----
1933	40	12	-----
1938	41	11	-----
1943	37	13	2
1949	40	12	-----

The 40 Unionists grouped above in the present Parliament consist of 37 Unionists, 2 Independent Unionists and 1 nonparty member (favoring British union). The remaining members are 9 Nationalists, 1 Socialist-Republican, 1 Independent Labor and 1 Independent; all favoring Irish nationalism.

The 52 seats in the Stormont Parliament at Belfast are filled by 4 members representing Queen's University in Belfast, 28 elected in contested districts and 20 elected without any contest. In some districts there have never been contests and never a vote cast. That 38 percent of the seats are filled without contests is too unusual and unique to be accidental.

By contrast consider the results of elections in all Ireland in the general elections held since 1874, when the issue has been either for home rule or finally for complete independence as against continued British union.

	For home rule	Against home rule		For home rule	Against home rule
1874.....	60	45	1900.....	83	20
1880.....	65	40	1906.....	83	20
1886.....	86	17	1910.....	84	19
1892.....	81	22	1918.....	179	26
1896.....	82	21			

¹ For independence.

These elections were all held under British jurisdiction in the country, and show a constant high percentage of all the people favoring independence and self-government. Yet this majority opinion was denied control of the country by means of partition.

The real effects of gerrymandering are best observed in the local governmental bodies, where the number of seats are variously allotted to prescribed areas, without regard to the number of voters contained in such areas. In this manner an area containing a small number of voters who are in the majority Unionist is given a greater number of seats than another area which contains a larger number of Nationalists. Through this device the control of the county councils, the poor-law unions, and the rural urban district councils is assured to the Unionists, even in County Tyrone and in County Fermanagh, where the Nationalists predominate.

	Tyrone		Fermanagh	
	Nationalist	Unionist	Nationalist	Unionist
Total electorate.....	73,683	59,109	32,455	25,529
County council.....	11	16	7	13
Poor law unions.....	56	100	32	50
Rural and urban councils.....	85	125	37	60

In Derry City the Nationalists total 29,321 while the Unionists are but 18,492. Yet the city district is represented in Parliament by a Unionist. This was accomplished by eliminating more than a fourth of the city area, which was extremely Nationalist, and replacing it with a large county area containing strong Unionist voters. So Derry City district has a Unionist Member of Parliament at Stormont and the corporation council has 12 Unionist members and only 8 Nationalists.

They talk about the Special Powers Act and membership on public boards, and about all of the facets of administration, all of which will be ably covered by the other speakers.

But I merely mention these for your attention, and I hope that in the brief time that I have spoken to you and to the members of the committee, Mr. Chairman, I have made some of these elements clear, and will have persuaded you to direct your judgment to a favorable consideration of the bill that is before you.

Now, before closing, I will ask permission to submit some statements here. Particularly I ask that this letter be incorporated in the record. It is a letter from the national president of the American League for an Undivided Ireland. I think he is known to you, Mr. Chairman, and to most of the members of this committee, because he has testified here before. I refer to the Honorable Joseph Scott of Los Angeles, 83 years old, but young in spirit; a great lawyer, a great advo-

cate, a great friend of the downtrodden, a great friend of humanitarian causes, a great fighter for justice, the national president of our organization, beloved Joe Scott of Los Angeles, whom we all love and admire.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, for the introduction of this letter in the record. I have been asked to read the letter. I think it is rather long, but let me read just a paragraph from it.

(Mr. Rice read from the letter which is in full as follows:)

AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR AN UNDIVIDED IRELAND,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 21, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,
Chairman, House Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As national president of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, may I express my keen regret that I am, unfortunately, unable to have the privilege of being present on this momentous occasion, as circumstances utterly prevent my having the privilege of journeying from California to Washington.

I would particularly like to attend so that I might by my presence indicate how very much concerned I am for the proper presentation of this question of antipartition, and at the same time extend my heartfelt thanks on behalf of our organization for the courtesy and privilege they have accorded to us in having a comprehensive review made of this problem.

I hope that in these days with the devastating and corroding influence of communism your committee will bear in mind that the one bright spot in all of Europe, where communism is utterly detested, is in little Ireland, which through the centuries has been fighting for the principles of human liberty as a God-given right. I hope you will also bear in mind that this is not a religious question in any way. The great upheaval in 1798 to free Ireland from its alien government was generated to a large extent in the northeast corner of that little island, and the spearhead was Wolfe Tone, a man of religious faith and of Presbyterian affiliations. It was the Presbyterians of northeast Ireland who welcomed Franklin when he made his memorable speech in the dark days of our Republic, looking to Ireland for sympathy and consideration. While it is true that the present so-called Belfast Government is animated by religious bigotry in its most contemptible political activities, the rest of Ireland under the Dublin Government is conspicuous for its generous and conciliatory attitude toward all religions. One of the reasons for Ireland's detestation of communism is because of the horrible destructive power of its atheistic drive to destroy every aspect of religion from the hearts of men and their children.

If we can only save the world from that terrible cancer, emulating Washington on his knees at Valley Forge. In Ireland from the days of Patrick to this day, they have not been ashamed or afraid to profess God before all things, and in the humility of the founding fathers they have carried on the principles that animated the men who gave us the Declaration of Independence.

Therefore, we come here as Americans, concerned for the welfare of our country and eager to help in any way to destroy the diabolical influence of communism. As taxpayers we have the inherent right, we respectfully submit to this committee, to protest against any money being sent over to London under the Marshall plan, to be siphoned over to this unrepresentative type of government so that our money can be utilized in that sacred northeast corner of Ireland to fasten still further the yoke of oppression and tyrannical discrimination upon the liberty-loving minority of that corner of the Emerald Isle.

You may rest assured that the sympathy and prayers of multitudes of people outside those of Irish blood concur in these sentiments.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH SCOTT,
National President, American League for an Undivided Ireland.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. Burleson, have you any questions?

MR. BURLESON. Mr. Rice, as a lawyer, and from your experience before congressional committees, you know without my saying that questions which may appear antagonistic are not necessarily so but are asked rather to develop issues.

Mr. RICE. That is merely the outward aspect, Mr. Congressman. I know that you are not antagonistic.

Mr. BURLESON. I hope I am never antagonistic concerning anything which could possibly have any merit.

I gathered the impression that one of the preoccupations of those who would have the responsibility in submitting a plebiscite, would be whether or not the question should be submitted only to the people in northeast Ireland. Do you agree that that would be a problem to determine?

Mr. RICE. No; I do not believe that is a solution of the problem at all, with all due respect, Congressman Burleson. I believe that we have demonstrated that Ireland is a historic united nation; that you cannot arbitrarily prejudge the question, and prejudice the issue by taking out from a part of a historic nation, geographically, politically, ethnically, one part or any piece of that country and say, "Here, we will take a plebiscite."

The very principle of self-determination presupposes—and the principle of democratic rule which was, of course, ratified in the principles that we fought for in the War Between the States in 1861-65—is that all the people, in the democratic way, all the people of the country, will have an opportunity to express their wishes and their desires concerning the form of government under which they wish to live and when the votes are cast and counted, that the majority votes will be the votes that will decide; majority rule will be the rule that will receive the approval of the people of all the Nation.

Mr. BURLESON. I followed very carefully your historical analysis of what the parliamentary situation has been. The people who are actually under British rule are the ones who are going to have to determine what government they will join, what government will rule over their existence. If it were against their wish that they remain under British rule, would they not be in a better position, if they so expressed themselves by voting to join the whole of Ireland?

I know that Congressman O'Toole made a reference that Ireland must be united to survive. Would there be difficulty, would there be trouble with the people in the northeast of Ireland, with the remainder of Ireland, if they were forced against their will to come into a united nation?

Mr. RICE. Let me answer that question. Let me give you what I consider a fair answer to an important question.

Mr. BURLESON. I think it is fundamental.

Mr. RICE. Let us look at past experience. It will be developed here, this afternoon, as to the kind of administration that has been conducted in the six counties. Let us take it by contrast, because you just cannot compare it, with the conditions that obtain in the 26 counties, in regard to administration and maintenance, and the observance of civil liberties and the protection of the rights of minorities.

In the 26 counties, there is a minority of about 6 percent, 6-percent-plus, of the entire population, who possibly might be considered sympathetic with union with Great Britain. But throughout the 30 years since the establishment of this Irish Government, now known as the Republic of Ireland, in one form or another since its establishment, there has been uniform testimony on the part of the representatives of that minority, of the magnificent administration, of the mainte-

nance of civil liberties and of the recognition of rights of minorities and generous participation accorded to that minority in the public affairs of the country, so that that minority has on the public boards, on the high courts, in the professions, in business, a far greater share in directing the affairs, political, economic and professional, of the country, than the number of their people could warrant.

Contrast that with the condition in the north; and bear in mind that we are going back to the fundamentals, that this is a most arbitrary partition of a country that had been united for more than 1,500 years, considered a great, historic, united nation, since the time of St. Patrick. But this was only done in order that Britain, a foreign country, might have a bridgehead, might still retain some part of Ireland as occupied Ireland. And so they have fomented and organized and perpetrated all these disturbances, sectarian and class warfare, primarily for and in the interests of the British Government.

Now that is against all of the elements of our conception of democratic rule or the principles of self-determination which we all, I am sure, believe in.

Mr. BURLESON. Do you think if the election was held only in the northeast part of Ireland it would carry or not?

Mr. RICE. That is an academic question and certainly would not be a practical solution to the problem. The six counties, as has been pointed out by speaker after speaker, were purposely carved out in order that those who were going to control that little state, or statelet—it has become a police state—would be assured of a perpetual majority. They partitioned Ireland. They went further and partitioned the Province of Ulster because as speaker after speaker has pointed out they knew they could not control the Province of Ulster. Partition was forced on Ireland by the British Government. They wanted to continue control of some part of Ireland, so they artificially carved out what they thought they could control with a perpetual majority, so much so that they do not conduct their system on a two-party system as we do, but they have developed into a one-party government. It is the same style of government that exists behind the iron curtain today.

Mr. BURLESON. You think they could not have a free election?

Mr. RICE. It would not mean anything. Do you mean in the whole of the country?

Mr. BURLESON. I mean in the northeast section, the part under British rule now.

Mr. RICE. They could have an election at any time they wanted to but it would not decide anything. It would only decide what has been decided for British purposes through artificial means. There has been no reference of the question to the people of all of Ireland.

Mr. BURLESON. If this portion only were to participate, what would be the result?

Mr. RICE. The present population in northern Ireland from the latest figures is about 800,000 people who are said to believe in the union with Britain and over 400,000 who ardently wish to be reunited with the rest of Ireland.

Mr. BURLESON. Then the result of such an election would be about two to one opposed to union?

Mr. RICE. Approximately that, but that is a territory artificially carved out and previously known to contain a unionist majority to

serve the imperialistic purposes of Britain. Have I made that clear to you?

Mr. BURLESON. Yes; but the reasons for the participation of all Ireland in an election is not.

Mr. JAVITS. Let me see if I can emphasize what the witness' argument is so that we can understand it. As I understand it, the witness claims this is tantamount to taking an area that had seceded and asking it to have a plebiscite. Suppose that we take the State of Texas, which is traditionally in the Democratic column, and suppose—and this of course purely fanciful—that it seceded, and then argued that you could not put it back into the United States until they had a plebiscite and voted Republican. That could possibly never be done. That is why the witness says the British did it the way they did in Ireland.

We have to come back to this fundamental original fact—the witness says that the original error, the original mistake, the original fault was in the partition: hence, the result is that you cannot possibly get a plebiscite to favor unification from that part of Ireland. We will in executive session discuss that again, but I want to sharpen what I gather to be the witness' point.

Mr. BURLESON. From logic, however, and disregarding the historical aspect of the situation so ably stated here by Mr. Rice, the result of the action of an entire vote of Ireland would impose upon the northern portion a will which may perhaps not be their own.

Mr. JAVITS. The witness has said that if the British had taken a plebiscite when they should it would have shown a majority wanting unification. Now he says all they do is try to take a conclusion from the original fault. I am only trying to sharpen the point so that we can all understand it clearly.

Mr. BURLESON. I think that it depends upon the premise which you select.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct. We cannot get away from the fundamental question: Was it right or wrong when it was partitioned?

Mr. RICE. When you speak about forcing people, and imposing a will on them what about the 400,000 people who were without any consultation or consent forced to live under this government?

Mr. BURLESON. Do not ask me the questions. I cannot answer. I only ask them.

Mr. RICE. I think that no one else can. It is an arbitrary rule. It is the imperial policy of Britain occupying a country where she has no right.

Mr. Chairman, the statements to which I referred previously are the following:

1. Statement presented by the Shamrock Club, New York.
2. Letter addressed to Hon. John Kee by Mr. Thomas F. Murphy, a distinguished attorney of New York City.
3. Telegram sent to Hon. John Kee by Mr. Daniel F. O'Neill, 926 South Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
4. Letter of Mr. Patrick Jones, 165 East Eighty-eighth Street, New York City 28, N. Y., and addressed to Hon. John Kee.
5. Telegram sent to Hon. John Kee from Mr. Frank J. Barry, an associate of Barry & Barry, attorneys at law, 307 Morley Avenue, Nogales, Ariz.
6. Telegram sent to Hon. John Kee by Mr. Henry C. Walsh, 340 Main Street, Worcester, Mass.

7. Telegram sent by Michael Fallon of New Haven, Conn.
8. Letter of Miss Anne MacBride of Seattle, Wash.

IRELAND'S RIGHT TO UNITY—WHY IRELAND WAS PARTITIONED

(Statement presented by Shamrock Club, New York)

Ireland is a geographic entity. She is an island the size of our State of Maine. Ireland has no natural geographic divisions within itself. There is no natural boundary to set off the 6 northeastern counties, which have been partitioned from the other 26 counties by a meandering boundary line that is purely fictitious. It cuts through towns and houses, as well as across rivers and highways.

Throughout history the Irish nation has been grouped in four ancient provinces: Ulster, Munster, Leinster, and Connaught. Partition not only divides Ireland into two unequal parts, but splits Ulster into two parts. Three of Ulster's nine counties were purposely omitted from the so-called northern Ireland.

Why was this small nation divided? Why likewise was historic Ulster divided? The answer to these questions lies solely within the field of British politics.

The British invaded Ireland seven centuries ago, but never secured complete dominance of the land or of the people. Throughout the centuries, the Irish have constantly engaged in warfare and uprisings in a continuing effort to regain their freedom.

In an endeavor to placate the Irish, the Liberal Party in Britain pledged home rule for all Ireland. Gladstone submitted his home rule bill to the London Parliament in 1886. The Tories opposed, creating an issue to defeat the Liberals and regain control of the British Government.

The Tory father of Winston Churchill (Lord Randolph Churchill) traveled to Belfast avowedly to arouse religious and racial animosities. Riots and fierce bloodshed ensued. Winston Churchill wrote of it:

"Dangerous riots, increasing in fury until they almost amounted to warfare, occurred in the streets. * * * Firearms were freely used. * * * Houses were sacked and men and women killed."

All this in order to win an election in England.

The Liberals lost the election.

In 1912, Asquith once more introduced a home rule bill. Again, the same infamous tactics were employed.

Now it was Bonar Law who journeyed to Belfast as Tory leader to incite new outbreaks.

By incendiary speech he encouraged the people of Belfast to riot, and promised the full support of his Tory Party.

New riots and fresh bloodshed followed his visit. The flames of hatred, once enkindled, were not to be easily extinguished.

But even more drastic measures were needed. Edward Carson, of Belfast, was encouraged to establish a private army. Sponsored by former Premiers of Britain, former Cabinet Ministers and military officers, and guaranteed Tory Party protection, arms and ammunition were smuggled in from Germany to equip this force.

Faced with the mutiny of British Army Officers in Ireland, who refused to suppress the revolting Carsonite Volunteers, Asquith proposed for the first time the partition of Ireland, as a temporary expedient in restoring calm and order. Thus was partition conceived.

Full assurance was given that this act of partitioning would be but a temporary affair, not to last more than 5 years, and affecting not more than four counties of Ireland. While these representations were being made to John Redmond in Dublin, pledges were also being given to Edward Carson in Belfast that partition would be permanent. In this welter of diplomatic deceit and double dealing was partition born. Not a single Irishman voted for it.

In the First World War, more than 300,000 Irish volunteers fought in the British forces, and suffered twice the casualties that all of the Belgians did. Many of these Irishmen believed that they were fighting for the right of self-determination by all small nations, and that thus all countries, including their own, might be given freedom.

Other Irishmen (and Irish women), distrustful of British diplomatic promises, were convinced that only through force of arms would Ireland ever gain her freedom.

They resorted to arms, and, in Easter week of 1916, their leaders signed and issued the Proclamation of a Republic for all of Ireland. In form, it followed our American Declaration of Independence.

All of the signatories of Ireland's declaration of independence were executed by England's firing squads. So too were most of Ireland's top military leaders. American public opinion was shocked.

It became Lloyd George's task to endeavor to restore the confidence of America. By 1918 the doors of the English prisons were opened, and Irish patriots made their return to Ireland.

In December 1918 came the first opportunity for a Nation-wide Irish plebiscite. The issue between candidates was solely whether they favored self-rule or not. Seventy-nine candidates favoring a self-governing Ireland were elected, as against twenty-six who opposed. The popular vote was 1,211,516 for self-government; 315,394 opposed. But in Ireland the will of the majority was not to be permitted to control the destiny of the country.

Instead, Lloyd George introduced into the London Parliament a new Partition Act, for which not a single Irish vote was cast.

The votes of British Members of Parliament, exclusively, created and forced partition on Ireland.

So it was that, in the autumn of 1920 British Members of Parliament rent asunder a nation that had been a united entity since the dawn of history.

The Irish people will not rest until their country is once more united, and the Irish nation comprises the full extent of their island territory from sea to sea. Until partition is ended there can be no authority to speak with the voice of all of the people of Ireland, nor to commit Ireland to any program of international cooperation, such as the Atlantic pact. Until Ireland is a unified whole she cannot take her rightful place among the other freedom-loving nations of the world. Moreover, a divided country is a continual threat to security, and, from a military standpoint, a divided Ireland makes an insecure anchor on the northern end of the western line of defense in Europe.

The partition of Ireland must be ended.

The partition of Ireland should be ended peacefully.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 27, 1950.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

(Attention Hon. John Kee, chairman.)

GENTLEMEN: I would be pleased if you would record my wholehearted approval of the spirit of resolution, House Resolution 270 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session, introduced by Congressman John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island.

I believe in these trying times that such a resolution from so eminent a body will do much to solve an international injustice.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS F. MURPHY,
Assistant United States Attorney.

HON. JOHN KEE,

Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

Sincerely urge Foreign Affairs Committee endorse Fogarty House Resolution 270, next Friday. Ireland united as one nation will be our ally in North Atlantic. Thirty million Americans of Irish heritage will forever be grateful to you as our chairman.

DANIEL F. O'NEILL,
Los Angeles, Calif.

APRIL 22, 1950.

DEAR MR. KEE: I am strongly in favor of House Resolution 270, by Mr. Fogarty, that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland, and hope that you will do all you can to bring about the adoption of this resolution by the House of Representatives.

Anything you may be able to do to bring about the unity of all Ireland as a free republic will be deeply appreciated.

With every good wish, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

PATRICK JONES, *New York, N. Y.*

NOGALES, ARIZ., April 26, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Re Fogarty resolution, by every democratic principle fought for in two world wars, Ireland should have the right of self-determination. The Fogarty resolution asks only that America's constantly declared adherence to that principle be given practical application in Ireland's case. India, Indonesia, Israel, why not Ireland. Because of her consistent and staunch friendship for America ever since her sons fought and died for American independence and because her record in the cause of human liberty is not excelled by any nation on earth, Ireland united and free could be a bulwark in western Europe against forces who would destroy our liberties and our civilization. By all means the Fogarty resolution should be passed by the House of Representatives.

FRANK J. BARRY.

APRIL 27, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Urge immediate favorable action, House Resolution 270. Nature made Ireland indivisible. No artificial barrier should divide Ireland. People of Ireland should determine their own form of government. Interference from beyond its borders violates fundamental principles of democratic government.

HENRY C. WALSH, *Worcester, Mass.*

TELEGRAM SENT BY MICHAEL FALLON, OF NEW HAVEN

APRIL 26, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,

Chairman, House Committee of Foreign Affairs,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to go on record as being fully in favor of Congressman John E. Fogarty's resolution for a united Ireland of all 32 counties, as it is time that England remove her army from the six counties and give to Ireland what every man of Irish blood fought and died for in two wars, the freedom of small nations.

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL FALLON, *New Haven, Conn.*

LETTER OF MISS ANNE MACBRIDE, OF SEATTLE, WASH.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 22, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,

Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE KEE: I support wholeheartedly Congressman Fogarty's resolution, at public hearing on April 28, making provision that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the whole territory of Ireland.

Also I request that the Committee on Foreign Affairs keep the record of the hearings open so that the people may have a chance to emphasize their interest in the unity of Ireland.

Thanks for your interest in this worthy cause.

Sincerely yours,

(MISS) ANNE MACBRIDE.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Thank you, Mr. Rice.

I have statements here from the Honorable George D. O'Brien, of Michigan; Isidore Dollinger, of New York; and Kenneth B. Keating, of New York, which, with the committee's permission, I will have inserted into the record at this point.

(The statements referred to are as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives will report favorably House Resolution 270 so that the membership of the House will have the opportunity to vote on it and I shall be more than pleased to give it my support.

Our action thus could encourage the peaceful end of partition in Ireland and remove from the international scene a potent cause of strife and discontent. Does anyone doubt that the end of partition in Ireland would serve the cause of liberty and justice? No nation wants itself to be partitioned and every nation in history upon whom partition has been imposed has struggled to be free of it. The theory of partition stems from the motto of the Roman conqueror, Divide and Rule. We sully the purity of our own motives unless we repudiate it.

In all the world there is no greater repository of good will for the United States than that which exists among the people of Ireland. They have cherished and fought for freedom with their whole hearts and have ever earnestly prayed and exerted themselves for the success of this great free Republic of the United States. Now that we have grown so large, Ireland may seem comparatively small in importance. But that should not weaken our zeal for the justice of her cause. The passage of this resolution will be a sign to the world that we not only speak in the cause of freedom and justice when it serves our own ends but also unselfishly for a small and exploited country. And who can measure the moral good that will come to us as our action is hailed by the fair-minded people all over the world.

STATEMENT OF HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak against the present partition of Ireland, and to ask that your committee give favorable consideration to the legislation now before you. I introduced House Resolution 529, which was referred to you. However, I am interested in the final result, and am in favor of any measure which would assist the people of Ireland to establish their complete independence.

We know that during the First World War, Great Britain gave a guaranty to Ireland that immediately after the war the people of Ireland could have a free election. When the election was held in 1918 the people in Ireland voted 4 to 1 for complete independence. Thereafter, England by threats and force, did all she could to cause the people to rescind their vote. When these attempts proved futile, she brazenly broke her promise and kept a strangle hold on the six northeastern counties, allowing Ireland to keep 26 counties in southern Ireland. For this breach of faith there is no excuse.

The Irish people today are asking that a free election be held in all of Ireland to determine whether or not it shall be one united country. Ireland's right to take her place as an undivided nation in the world's family of nations is denied her because of England's tyranny and oppression. Ireland must be given the opportunity to settle, by a majority vote of her people, how she wishes to be governed. She must be given a chance to free herself from the rule of any foreign power.

We cannot forget the contributions of the Irish to our own Nation in its fight for freedom and democracy. They gave of their lives and efforts in our struggle for independence, and they have never failed to carry their share of the burdens of any nation when democracy was at stake. We owe it to the people of Ireland to assure them that we believe in independence for them too, and that we sincerely believe they should be allowed to govern themselves. We will prove our sincerity when we demand that the partition of Ireland be removed. There is

no question that a free plebiscite would result in a united Ireland. Then, Ireland would be enabled to join the Atlantic Pact, which in turn would be an advantage to Ireland, Great Britain, and the United States from the standpoint of defense.

I urge your committee to help us fulfill our duty to Ireland, and to report favorably the necessary measure looking toward the end of Ireland's partition and aiding unification.

STATEMENT OF HON. KENNETH B. KEATING, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

I am happy to have this opportunity to testify on my resolution favoring a plebiscite for Ireland.

Thousands of years before Christ, the Irish had attained a high degree of civilization and culture. From the beginning of the history of the island until the twelfth century, it was governed by one supreme ruler, the Ard-Ri, or highest king. After St. Patrick spread Christianity through the island, its monasteries became centers of learning from which went forth scholars to all the Christian world. Irish envoys and learned men were honored at all the courts of Europe where they were noted for their culture and erudition. Thus, until the twelfth century when Ireland came under the domination of England, Ireland was a proud, independent nation. Even under the English, the Irish spirit and pride in their race made complete subjugation impossible.

An economically strong Ireland could be a contributing factor to the stability of the world, both now and in the future. A sound nation in the sterling bloc would be able to assist materially in the common cause of restoring normal trade relations between free nations. Ireland then could utilize all its efforts to promoting and becoming an active part of the society of free nations. The famous spirit and energy of the Irish could then be put to work for the constructive cause of an abundant future.

If the Irish were given the opportunity to work as hard and contribute as greatly to building a united Ireland as they pioneered and worked in this country there would be no limits to the future greatness of the Emerald Isle.

House Resolution 533 states that it is the sense of the Congress that the maintenance of international peace requires the settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland and that a plebiscite on the question should be held by the United Nations to determine the will of the Irish people.

House Resolution 533 would serve as a declaration of congressional policy. We cannot ignore the practical fact that such an expression on the part of Congress would give impetus to the peaceful settlement of a problem which has caused strife and suffering for centuries.

In no way could it be considered to be interference in the internal affairs of another sovereign nation, since it merely states that Ireland should have the opportunity to express its will in the matter. Democratic people everywhere recognize the principle that each nation is entitled to such an expression of its desire for unification.

Certainly, if the United Nations Organization sets up a commission for Ireland and conducts a plebiscite, both Ireland and England would be more likely to settle their differences peacefully and amicably. It is in the best interests of all concerned to arrive at some solution to the problem, so that Ireland may join with the rest of the free nations in working toward world peace and prosperity.

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL J. DOWD, OF WASHINGTON, D. C., NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF THE ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS

Mr. Dowd. I have a statement here from the president of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, and I would like to have that inserted in the record.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL A. McGRATH, NATIONAL PRESIDENT, ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS IN AMERICA

Mr. Chairman and members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, my appearance before your committee, is in my capacity as the national president of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and Ladies Auxiliary, in America.

We are an American organization, organized in 1836, and our membership covers the United States and Canada.

The thousands of men and women enrolled in the membership of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and Ladies Auxiliary, are deeply concerned with the action of the British Government, in its continued insistence on the division of Ireland into two separate governments.

We support House Resolution 270, as introduced by Hon. Congressman, John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island.

For 700 years, Ireland suffered persecution from the British Government, for its religious and political beliefs. During all of those years, Ireland's entity as a nation was never questioned. It was an entity of 4 provinces and 32 counties. Then in 1920, against the will of 80 percent of the Irish people, and with the opposition of all members from Ireland, north and south, in the British Parliament, Ireland was partitioned by the votes of members of the British Parliament from England, Scotland, and Wales.

Mr. Fogarty's resolution requests the Congress of the United States, to recognize the right of the people of Ireland, to decide for themselves the form of government under which they will live, and the right to determine as to the division of their country.

Our opposition to the partition of Ireland, is as American citizens, relying upon the declaration of the United States and its allies, in the First World War.

"That the war was being fought for the freedom of small nations, to see that no nation shall have the right to extend its policies over other nations, but that each nation shall have the right to choose its own government, unhindered, unafraid."

Contrary to this declaration, Great Britain, our ally, violated this promise.

In the Second World War, again Great Britain, our ally, joined with the United States in publishing the Atlantic Charter, and in the third paragraph declared:

"They respect the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Surely this applies to Ireland.

American boys and Irish boys fought and died in both wars for these declarations.

The United States was a party to these promises. The Fogarty resolution attempts to have our Government respect its promises, and request its ally, Great Britain to do likewise, as Great Britain is responsible for the partition of Ireland, and only Great Britain can rectify the wrong it continues to enforce upon the Irish people.

This request comes from millions of men and women in the United States, who wish to see justice done to the people of Ireland. I call your attention to favorable resolutions adopted in national conventions of the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus, the Ancient Order of Hibernians and Ladies Auxiliary, the Clan-Na-Gael, the American League for an Undivided Ireland, and many other groups.

The Ancient Order of Hibernians and Ladies Auxiliary join with the American League for an Undivided Ireland, in respectfully submitting our request for favorable action by your committee on H. R. 270, so that it may be considered by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD, I would like to ask the committee that there be unanimous consent to the allowing of our colleagues 5 days to put in statements they may have affecting the question. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Our next witness, speaking of Joe Scott, Mr. Rice, will be our colleague, the Honorable Gordon L. McDonough, of Los Angeles, Calif.

Congressman McDonough, likewise, has been in the forefront in the fight against partition, and we are delighted to have him at this time and hear his views on this particular proposition.

STATEMENT OF HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. McDONOUGH. In reference to our beloved patriotic and great American, Joseph Scott, I could not by any means approach the eloquence and the intelligence and the greatness of that great defender of this great question. Personally, I have taken a position in favor of a united Ireland because I believe it to be fundamentally right insofar as the Irish people are concerned. It is a question that has lasted over the centuries, and it is filled with persecutions and evasions and innuendo and all sorts of attempts on the part of Great Britain to defend its position.

In the manner that we know governments to be ruled by the majority, it seems only proper and fitting that the United States Government should take the position recommended by the various resolutions before this committee in favor of the minority and give them an opportunity to express their will as to whether they want a united Ireland or not.

The question of religion has been brought into this. That, I believe, is a smoke screen for the purpose of prejudicing the question. I do not think there is any religion in it whatever.

The question of economic development of Ireland is certainly one of the important questions involved here because a united Ireland would become much stronger economically, and it is entitled to that development.

The political question, I think, is one that has forestalled the action more than anything else, and all the attempts on the part of Great Britain to prevent an expression, a free expression of the people of the northern counties, has been done with a presumed desire on the part of Great Britain to set up a defense area.

In that respect I would like to say for the benefit of the committee, and I do not think that I have to inform them of this, that there has never been a time in the history of the world when Ireland has not been loyal to the battles that Great Britain has fought across the world. She has always sent her sons into battle and they have always come out glorious with a fine record.

The present argument, that retaining the six northern counties for the coastal defense of Great Britain is not sound by the facts borne out by history.

The other point that I think is very important is that in the formation of the Atlantic Pact, Ireland must necessarily take a position of neutrality because it cannot afford to use its resources on the part

of Ireland now free to defend that part of its own nation that is not free.

I am happy to find that the committee is taking this up as a separate issue, and I think they will bring it to the floor of the House. At that time the question can be resolved in favor of this very necessary proposition of the defense of a minority and a nation that has always been loyal to the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. May I point out now that the circle is really complete. We have nonpartisan or bipartisan introduction of resolutions and unpartisan or bipartisan support for them on this committee, and now from my distinguished colleague from California, unpartisan and bipartisan testimony.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is really a healthy sign.

Thank you, Congressman McDonough.

I am going to skip down the list a bit and call upon Miss Kearns, who seems to be the only woman witness.

STATEMENT OF MISS ANNE B. KEARNS, AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR AN UNDIVIDED IRELAND, LOS ANGELES COUNTY UNIT

Miss KEARNS. I do not have a prepared statement, Mr. Chairman. I did not think that I would be called upon. I will prepare one and submit it, with your permission. I am from the American League for an Undivided Ireland.

Mr. JAVITS. Are you an officer?

Miss KEARNS. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. What is your position?

Miss KEARNS. Secretary and organizer in California.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Anne B. Kearns, 821 South Green Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. As the recording secretary of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, Los Angeles County unit, I have been directed to appear here today and present to you the views of the members of our group in California.

Although California is far removed from Washington, yet it is not distant in point of time when one flies across the continent. So it is that we on the Pacific coast, although we face the Pacific, we are yet not unmindful of affairs on the Atlantic coast nor of European problems and their possible effect upon us in the West. The air age has brought all the world into closer union and distance in miles is no longer a factor in international problems.

So it is that even in California the present situation in Ireland is not only of interest to us who trace our ancestry to the various cities and counties in Eire, but is also of concern to all westerners who love liberty and cherish the rights of the individual. When we perceive that in the northeast section of Ireland the people are denied the civil rights won through Magna Carta and subsequent laws in England, and are subjected to discrimination and oppression, we rebel against this unjust situation.

To criticize the government in the six-county area, to demand fair and equal treatment under the law, to speak for freedom and the rights of the individual, all these things constitute crimes against the govern-

ment and can be punished with unconscionable penalties. The lawyers always refer in this country to the basic laws of England as the foundation of our laws and out of which developed our code of civil rights and liberties. Hence people are amazed to learn that in the six-county area of Ireland the freedoms granted to British citizens in England under the British law are in turn denied to the people resident in this area, which is ruled by the same British crown and dominated by the same British Parliament.

Few people are aware that the government of the six counties is in the hands of a small group of titled aristocrats, mainly the large landowners and the big industrialists of that area. The Belfast Parliament is subject to the control of this ruling class, who are able to direct its every activity to their own benefit and thus to thwart the interests of and the will of the vast body of the people, who are held subservient to them. The vote is restricted to landowners so that a very large group of the people have no voice whatsoever in the political affairs of their country. In the last election, of which much has been made by way of false propaganda, the returning soldiers of the war having no property and no fixed residence in a housing-short land, were practically a voteless group, despite their wartime sacrifices.

I do not wish to detain you unnecessarily, but I do hope that you distinguished Members of the Congress will appreciate to some degree the truth concerning this dictatorial type of government and the nature of the police state which exists in this small corner of Ireland. One cannot readily conceive that in liberty-loving Ireland or in a presumably democratic British country, that these conditions can and do exist, and have persisted from the very founding of this unsought and unwanted Belfast government, when the British Parliament created a new nation to their own fancy through the establishment of a fictitious border in Ireland. We in California wish to join others throughout the country who are today protesting this situation and to ask that you aid in bringing about the elimination of the Irish border by approving the Fogarty resolution and bringing it before the House, so the Members of the House of Representatives may have an opportunity to join in this protest against dictatorship and injustice.

Gentlemen, it has been indeed a real privilege for me to be present at this hearing and to present this statement on behalf of the Los Angeles County unit of the American League for an Undivided Ireland. There is no graver situation in world affairs than this, in which I am so deeply interested, and no cause today crying louder for prompt redress than the matter of the partition of Ireland. I can only urge, with all the vigor at my command, that you earnestly consider this problem and I am confident that as a result you will act favorably upon the Fogarty resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Thank you very much.

The next witness is John J. Reilly.

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. REILLY, NATIONAL VICE PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR AN UNDIVIDED IRELAND

Mr. REILLY. My name, Mr. Chairman, is John J. Reilly. I am from Philadelphia. I am one of the national vice presidents of the American League for an Undivided Ireland. In addition to that,

I am chairman of the executive committee of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, a very old organization that was born in Philadelphia in 1771 before the independence of America was established.

We speak for that grand old society and for the members of the American League in the State of Pennsylvania, which numbers well into the thousands.

I was born in Pennsylvania, the son of American parents, and I went to Ireland at the same time as our distinguished Congressman, a member of your committee, Mr. Carnahan, and I sojourned in a little place across the bay of Queenstown. While I was there I learned a lot about Ireland. Before that time I knew very little.

I accompanied a board of investigators that were investigating your station because you had a lot of equipment there that belonged in Brest. We had to report the condition to the Secretary of the Navy when we came back.

I was in Ireland and was tremendously impressed with the attitude of the people there, the young people. I asked questions, and the answers were illuminating to my interest in Ireland. I learned from the little fellows who picked up your bag that if the people in America knew Ireland's question, knew their trouble, it would not be long until the English would get out of Ireland.

I was in Ireland at the time of the election that this distinguished gentleman from Boston referred to, and I was amazed at the interest that the Irish people took. I observed, first-hand, the supervision by the British soldiers and the policemen, walking two by two over the large cities that we visited, and how it was necessary for them in those days to go in pairs. I observed how the soldiers were armed. I got interested in Ireland.

Gentlemen, it is very kind of you to have us here and letting us take up your time on a problem that affects so many people in Ireland and that is so dear to the hearts of the American people who know Ireland's problems.

I think that I might say to you gentlemen today, by giving you some of the history that I have read, that it is no exaggeration to say that one defense which English rule has in Ireland is not its arms, not its soldiers, not its ships that ride the seas and turn the mouths of their gaping guns toward the Irish coast, it is not the ingenuity of the lawyers that frame statutes to support the English power, but it is the extraordinary capacity of the misrepresentation which has enabled English statesmen to shroud this whole Irish question in mystery so that the judgment of the world is puzzled to decide upon its right and upon its truth.

Now, what is this Irish question? I think it can be defined within a very narrow compass. The Irish people are the only people in the world who enjoy neither the soil on which they live, nor the government under which they live. They have demanded the control of both. They are demanding it now. The English Government is determined that it shall have neither. That is the issue. That is the Irish question, gentlemen. It is good to people like myself who have been in the World War, whose grandfather and uncles fought in the Civil War in this country, to realize and know that this great committee of outstanding American citizens representing the greatest parliament in the world, the greatest governing body in the world, the elected representatives of this great Republic of the west, that you

have taken this problem to yourselves. I feel quite confident and certain that the representatives of the greatest Government in the world will study this problem, that you will resolve it, and in the light that the Great Creator has established in making this the most advanced Government in the world, you will come out with justice for a people who want justice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The next witness is Mrs. M. J. Dowd.

STATEMENT OF MRS. M. J. DOWD, DISTRICT PRESIDENT OF THE LADIES AUXILIARY OF THE ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS

Mrs. Dowd. Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, I do not have any statement.

I am district president of the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians. We have 10,000 women in the United States, and we are solidly behind the Fogarty resolution for united Ireland.

Thank you very much.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The next witness is the Honorable Thomas H. Buckley.

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS H. BUCKLEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman and honorable members of the committee, I am Thomas H. Buckley, of Abington, Mass., commissioner of administration for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and chairman of the commission on administration and finance, the executive agency of the Commonwealth, national vice president of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, member of the bar of the Commonwealth and the Federal bar, president of the Union of the Holy Name Society of the Archdiocese of Boston.

Mr. Chairman, today I have the unusual opportunity of presenting to the acting chairman of the committee a letter addressed by the able and I might add brilliant Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Paul A. Dever, who expected to be here in person to present the sentiments which he has expressed by letter. He was here in the Capitol yesterday on matters affecting the welfare of the Commonwealth, but his schedule would not permit him to remain over. With your permission, I would like to read this letter addressed to the Honorable John Kee, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. (The letter read is as follows:)

APRIL 25, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Commonwealth of Massachusetts recently observed the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the battle of Concord and Lexington, which marked the beginning of the American Revolution and the driving from the soil of the United States of the invader whose oppressive acts of tyranny and taxation had aroused the spirit of independence and liberty which has characterized our Nation since those days.

You and your committee are now starting hearings on resolutions designed to express the feeling of the American people toward injustice in another part of the world, injustice toward a nation and its people whose sons' and daughters' contribution has been so closely identified with the progress and maintenance of liberty in the United States—Ireland.

There were men of Ireland in the ranks at Concord, and there were men of Ireland in every army under Washington and the generals of the Revolution during the war of liberty started at Concord April 19, 1775. Men of Irish blood have served in the Armed Forces of the United States in every war waged by this Nation to obtain liberty for the peoples of the world. You recall with me the declaration of Woodrow Wilson that World War I was fought to preserve the rights of small nations.

The cause of World War II, in which I served, was the tyranny of the individual over the God-given rights of all people and the threats expressed by such form of government to the free peoples of the world.

Today, despite the disappearance of tyrannical control in most of the countries of the world, with the restoration to national independence of nearly all nations except those under the control of Soviet Russia, we find one single nation in western Europe despoiled and divided—Ireland.

It is my belief, which I hope the committee and Congress will share, that the 6-county area of Ireland, set apart by parliamentary act of Great Britain, should be restored at once to the entire nation of Ireland, predominantly under the government elected by majority of all the people of the 26-county area, to the end that Ireland, united, may assume its proper place in the nations of the world and, with that assumption, likewise assume some of the burdens necessary in these days to preserve the liberty of free peoples.

I have referred to the service of the men of Ireland in time of war. I need not point out to this committee the equally valiant service of men of Ireland in time of peace in these United States. Their service has been founded on the ideal of the American citizen of Irish blood comparable with the ideal of all Americans, that liberty is a precious right, not to be alienated by legislative act or tyrannical edict.

The partition of Ireland is a division of a country set apart as a geographical, racial, and historical unit, against the wishes and expressed opinion by ballot of the tremendously substantial majority of the people of all Ireland in the last national plebiscite, a quarter century past. It is even against the wishes of the majority of the people of two of the counties set apart and is comparable to the setting apart of a section of the United States which did not cast its electoral vote for the majority Presidential candidate.

The partition is against the equal justice which is the inherent tenet of every American. To my mind, vigorous action by the Congress of the United States at this time should be taken to end partition for the benefit of the people of the United States.

The ending of partition and the unification of all Ireland will establish a united Ireland which will prove to be the strongest ally of the United States in the Western World. The two nations have a common republican system of government, and a constitution which expresses faith in God, on whom all constituted authority is dependent. The ideals of the American way of life are the ideals of the people of a united Ireland.

The United States needs a stalwart ally in its fight against the encroachment of a hostile ideology of government in the Western World, under which the rights of the individual are made subservient to the state.

It is my sincere belief that no greater contribution may be made to the future peace of the world than strong action by the Congress to impress upon Great Britain the need of removal of the parliamentary division of Ireland to end the world charge of injustice against a free people by a democratic nation, and to strengthen all nations in the Western World in their joint opposition to the forces of tyranny and oppression.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL A. DEVER.

I am very happy to be here following the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from our Commonwealth, the Honorable John W. McCormack, majority leader, and Thomas J. Lane, of the Seventh Massachusetts District.

We ask action at this time because Ireland is one of the few countries divided against the will of the people of the land. There has been an 80-percent poll favoring a united land.

Every political party in the southern Republic is united in that demand.

This committee has recognized in the past the appeals made by other people—the people of India, Israel, Korea—and the setting up of the national units after World War I, the removal of the domination of border territory in every land: Alsace-Lorraine, Trieste, Yugoslavia, the Balkans; all but Ireland.

Today Ireland's economic and political leadership, expressed through the 26 county governments, is retarded in full performance through lack of unity which had never existed prior to 1920.

I shall not discuss at great length the prospect of speedier economic development were the industrial north united with the agricultural south for a more balanced productive economy.

I cannot bypass the unparalleled leadership of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Ireland, Mr. MacBride, in the economic councils of government ministries toward real European and national cooperation for the benefit of participating countries of western Europe and to lessen the burden on the American taxpayer.

Unfortunately, his efforts have been blocked by objection by England to the detriment of the political unity and economic cooperation of all the nations of western Europe.

These are economic and financial appeals. Ireland has a claim based on more than economic discussion.

I would like to think of Cowper's reference to liberty:

The liberty of a people consists of being governed by laws which they have made themselves under whatsoever form it be of government, the liberty of a private man being master of his own time and actions as far as may be consistent with the laws of God and his country.

Here is the essence of Ireland's appeal. The historic story of Ireland is known to all members of the committee. The political story has been and will be presented.

May I point out the debt owed Ireland by these United States, irrespective of religion or irrespective of the rights of England.

I say with conviction Ireland did more than any other nation to create the present United States of America. I will refer to the organization in Boston, The Charitable Irish Society, in 1737, of which I have the honor of being a member, as is the junior Senator of the Commonwealth, Senator Saltonstall.

This society represented more than a society. It represented the banding together of immigrants of English descent. From Ireland came later the hordes of men who filled the ranks of Washington's Army. From France there was Lafayette. It is not alone dislike of the English that prompted Irish enlistment; it was the opportunity to create liberty in the land of their adoption.

These Irishmen served in the Revolutionary War in the seaboard colonies of the Thirteen Original States.

The men of Irish blood participated in the Constitutional Convention which founded the documents under which we live and enjoy American liberty. Their voices upheld the Federal Government and our Constitution under which we have enjoyed liberty to this day.

England and her historians have admitted that the loss of her colonies might well be attributed to the ranks of those men in the Revolutionary War, an army of Irish blood. The devotion of men of Irish blood to the United States has been continued through the years.

Faith in God and faith in their country may truly be said to be outstanding attributes of the Americans of Irish blood. Those attributes are good for the country.

We have repaid in part our debt to France in two world wars. We have saved England in those two world wars. We have sacrificed in both wars the very flower of our American youth, first in the belief that it was to establish the rights of small nations, to destroy the European concept of the balance of power, and create a Federation of European States. They fought for the liberty of states in the first war.

The Second World War was due to the oppression of people by individuals exercising domination over people, and among them England continued to oppress nations during and after the war—India, Palestine, and Ireland—but in both wars liberty was the goal.

In the second war another factor was present in the unselfish participation by the United States for self-protection. The new military armor made our Nation no longer impervious to attack. Liberty prompted our alliance with nations in support of democratic forms of government as opposed to the tyrannical rule by the individual.

We remembered George of England and his treatment of his colonies in the days of the Revolution. That element of self-protection helped us maintain our position in world affairs. There has been no addition of land to these United States by reason of victories with our Allies. Our postwar efforts have been guided by charity and the establishment and maintenance of liberty with justice.

I refer in passing to the efforts made under the Marshall plan and the support so generously expressed by Congressman Fogarty in his reference to that plan in the ECA administration earlier in the hearing. In that effort we have not been too strongly supported by our erstwhile allies. There has been a hostile attitude by Russia, the self-seeking service of Great Britain, the critical acceptance by France, and the unfortunate failure of European countries to appreciate their changing status, and their dependence upon the funds supplied by this Nation.

In the postwar efforts the one friend of the United States in the council of Europe has been Ireland. That is not unusual. The one voice raised between World Wars I and II in support of European unity of states and world liberty was the scholarly voice of De Valera, whose efforts at Geneva were unselfish and likewise unproductive. He represented Ireland.

Ireland's representatives have been supporting the program of the ECA.

Ireland's leadership has been recognized by the foreign ministers of the small and large nations of Europe.

Ireland's voice has the enthusiasm of a people who accept conditions as the wisdom of God and whose leadership is inspired by that faith in God.

Ireland speaks with the authority of a nation which has survived oppression and tyranny. Ireland is living proof that liberty in the hearts of a people can never be exterminated by legislation.

Sad to say, the only opposition to Ireland's leadership has come from England. And I would like to quote there, if I may, Mr. Chairman, with your kind permission—and incidentally if I can find the item—the remarks of M. Henri Spaak.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, I will insert those in the record.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Without objection, it may be inserted.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

M. Paul Henri Spaak, now president of the Council of Europe Assembly, and former Belgian Foreign Minister and president of the assembly of the United Nations, summarized Britain's attitude to Europe in his speech at the University of Pennsylvania on January 14, 1950:

"We are confronted here with the well-known British tendency. Great Britain which for centuries has always been drawn into our quarrels has also refused to proclaim unreservedly her European character. We are to remember her policy has always been to be the arbiter of our disputes. But times have changed and conditions are entirely new. * * * A balance-of-power policy has become impossible. Great Britain can no longer be the beam of a balance of the scales of which no longer exist. She must be herself a positive and an active element in Europe. If not, it will be a great misfortune for the latter but in the long run I am convinced that it will be a misfortune for Great Britain too."

Mr. BUCKLEY. We refuse, as Americans (on the basis of the remarks of M. Henry Spaak) to be the lever to destroy the plan suggested by the Congress of the United States, and to maintain the old European balance of power, that old autocratic theory.

England's attitude in postwar cooperation is similar to that of her position in Northern Ireland. England has no right in Northern Ireland. England is the invader by legislation, by the Act of Parliament of 1920.

It is as though England, by parliamentary act, and against the will of all the people of the United States had, by the same construction, after our national election in 1936, set apart the territories of Maine and Vermont as separate units of this great Government of ours.

What to do? We endorse each and every resolution before you. If the Fogarty resolution will accomplish the goal, we are for it. If the Lane resolution will accomplish the goal, we are for it. If the Javits resolution will do the job, we are for it. If the Mansfield resolution is the way, we are for it. If the Keating resolution is the answer, then we should use it. If the Dollinger resolution is the best way of our attaining the goal, then we are for that.

We believe, however, that this committee, Mr. Chairman, in its wisdom, for its membership includes good friends of Ireland and—we believe that this committee can provide the forceful act which will end peacefully, we trust, by the pressure of the Government, if necessary, partition in Ireland.

If the committee feels that the expression of the sense of the Congress will cause our ally, England, to withdraw, pass that resolution. I feel that the innate generosity of the authors of the pending resolutions will permit them to support any resolution, under the name of any one of the distinguished Representatives who have submitted these resolutions.

It is important, Mr. Chairman and honorable members of the committee that definite action be taken forthwith, and as expressed by Congressman John W. McCormack, the distinguished majority leader, if favorable action is taken forthwith on the pending resolution, and the majority leader will grant such a resolution a priority, it will certainly lead to the speedy passage of it by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

I might add—and perhaps here I speak unofficially—the question of bipartisanship of the resolution has been raised. I would hesitate to

take upon myself this duty, did I not feel that I speak the fact that the distinguished minority leader of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, of Massachusetts, I am sure, would also lend his generous support to the passage of any resolution affecting the advancement of the cause of Ireland.

We know the blood that flows through the veins of this distinguished Congressman from our district.

Mr. Chairman, if there is no objection, I would like to present within the next 5 days a letter which unfortunately I failed to bring with me, from His Honor, the Mayor of Boston, the Honorable John B. Hynes, which he has written and addressed to the chairman of the committee.

I would also like to present for the record the resolution of the City Council of the city of Boston, attested by W. J. Malloy, the city clerk, April 24, 1950.

I would like to present for the record, resolutions of the Clan-Na-Gael of Greater Boston, signed by Peter Conroy, president, and Patrick F. Dundas, secretary.

I would like to present a clipping, containing a statement by Thomas Dorgan, clerk of the Suffolk Superior Civil Court in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

I would like to present the resolution of the Emmet Club, of Woburn, Mass., signed by James Winn, president; and a letter signed by Kenneth J. Kelley, secretary-treasurer-legislative agent of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor, expressing the action of the federation.

Also a letter from District Director Martin J. Walsh, District No. I, United Steelworkers of America, addressed to the chairman of this committee.

Also a letter from John J. Horan, president of the Greater Boston Industrial CIO Union Council, addressed to the chairman of this committee.

Also a letter from Vincent P. O'Brien, high chief ranger of the Massachusetts Catholic Order of Foresters.

Also a letter from Mortimer O'Connell, president of the Mitchell Club Clan-na-Gael, Roxbury, Mass.

Also a letter from Joseph F. Quinn, president of Emmet Associates, Lynn, Mass., addressed to me.

Also a resolution from the Office of Selectmen, Watertown, Mass., which I offer for the record.

Also a resolution sent to me by the Irish-American Associates of Middlesex County, signed by the president and the recording secretary.

Also copy of a resolution by the Irish 32 Counties Association, Inc., signed by John H. Harold, its president.

Also a resolution of the Massachusetts State Board of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America.

Also a resolution of the St. Brendan Society, signed by Daniel O'Keefe, president.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The papers referred to will, without objection, be received for the record.

CITY OF BOSTON,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
April 25, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN KEE: May I record myself as in favor of approval by your committee of the resolution concerning the termination of the partition of Ireland. It is my belief that world conditions, and more especially cordial relations between the American people and the English-speaking people of Europe, will be enhanced if this unnatural condition existing in Ireland is ended.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

J. B. HYNES,
Mayor of Boston.

RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF BOSTON

Whereas the unjust partition of Ireland is a continuing factor in disturbance and distrust to the peace of the world; and

Whereas such partition, against the will of the people of Ireland, is also against the principles of justice expressed by the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas such partition is against the best interests of the people of the United States, since Ireland a divided nation cannot take its proper place in the councils of the nations of the world; and

Whereas Ireland's absence from the North Atlantic Pact weakens the military defense of the United States as therein expressed and weakens the efforts of the United States to aid in the economic recovery of all Europe; and

Whereas Ireland's absence from the United Nations, to which the United States subscribes as a member, results from the veto of Soviet Russia, due to the hostility of Ireland to communism and its evils; Be it

Resolved, That the city Council of Boston, in meeting assembled, respectfully urges the Foreign Relations Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress to report forthwith a suitable resolution expressing the sentiment of the people of the United States against the unjust partition of Ireland and demanding a plebiscite of the people of all Ireland on the matter of a united Ireland.

In city council, April 24, 1950. Adopted.

Attest:

W. J. MALLOY, *City Clerk*.

RESOLUTION OF CLAN-NA-GAEL, OF GREATER BOSTON

Resolved, That we, the members and friends of the Clan-Na-Gael assembled in the New England Mutual Auditorium, 125 Clarendon Street, Boston, Sunday night, April 23, 1950, to honor the men of our race who fought and died for Ireland's freedom in Easter week, 1916, pledge ourselves to work earnestly in cooperation with all the other American Irish organizations, in the support of the demand of the people of Ireland for the withdrawal of the English armed forces and the English flag from the six counties of Northeast Ulster, which were arbitrarily separated from the Irish Nation by a partition act passed in the English Parliament in 1920; and be it

Resolved, That, as the English Government dismembered Ireland in 1920 for the evil purpose of fostering division and discord among the people of Northeast Ulster to serve the interests of English Imperialism and did so without the approval of even the Irish Unionists who were sitting in the Imperial Parliament at the time, we charge that government with being solely responsible for the grievous wrong which was done to the people of Ireland and to the Irish race everywhere by the Partition Act, and we demand that the English Parliament, which perpetrated this injustice, undo it by restoring to Ireland the six separated counties that have been part of the Irish Nation from time immemorial; and be it

Resolved, That we endorse House Resolution 270, presented by Congressman Fogarty, and we respectfully request the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives to give said resolution their unanimous approval when submitted to them for their consideration.

PETER CONROY, *President*,
PATRICK F. DUNDAS, *Secretary*.

DORGAN DEMANDS "FREE IRELAND"—URGES STUDY BEFORE FURTHER AID TO GREAT BRITAIN IS GRANTED

(By Thomas Dorgan, clerk, Suffolk Superior Civil Court)

The amendment proposed by Congressmen Fogarty, Lane, Mansfield, Keating, Dollinger, and Javits to House bill 7797 provides that before we furnish any more economical assistance to Great Britain, we should carefully examine the iron curtain in the north of Ireland which was placed there by that self-styled defender of freedom and liberty—Great Britain.

The question is asked by all sincere, peace-loving, democratic people, "What is this 'iron curtain', we thought the Kremlin conspirators were the only ones who had an 'iron curtain'?" Well, it is the mutilation, or cutting up, of one of the homogenous nations in the world.

Ireland was always regarded as one nation, clearly defined and bounded by the hand of God. Even before the Christian Era, Ireland was recognized as a single unit and that unit has survived for thousands of years.

In 1914, at the beginning of World War I, Premier Asquith of Great Britain promised the Irish people, in return for their assistance during the war, absolute home rule at the end of the war. Great Britain took the field in World War I for the freedom of small nations. Premier Asquith said, "We are fighting to vindicate the principle that small nationalities are not to be crushed by the arbitrary will of a stronger and overmastering power."

Because of Premier Asquith's pledge, 300,000 Irishmen "went to war" and over 50,000 of them were killed in battle. But, after the war was over, Ireland was given "the old harpoon" by one of the greatest quarterbacks England ever produced—Lloyd George. For instance, this was one of Lloyd George's deceptive plays. In a lateral communication by quarterback Lloyd George from the famous "T" formation, to Sir Edward Carson, a notorious British Tory from the north of Ireland, sent from Whitehall on May 29, 1916, he said, "We must make it clear that Ulster does not, whether she wills it or not, merge in the rest of Ireland."

CHARTERS FLOUTED

Such a statement might be expected from the Kremlin conspirators but not from the self-styled peace loving and liberty loving Great Britain. In World War II, people were led to believe that they were brought into conflict for the salvation of civilization and in behalf of liberty and democracy to vindicate the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," and to maintain the freedom of small nations against an aggressor or any other tyrant. We know now that the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" were just simply words. There is, at the present time, more slavery, more dictatorial rule than ever in the history of mankind.

If other nations, and there have been plenty, pleaded for help from America—it was graciously given. Why, then, not Ireland's cause? We must not forget that millions of young men and women of Irish descent were led to believe when they took the field in World War I and World War II that liberty and freedom would be granted to all nations, whether big or small.

Just imagine, even though Ireland was strictly neutral in World War II, over 275,000 Irish volunteers went into the army, navy and air force of Great Britain. No such percentage of nondrafted men offered themselves for any other country in the world. And for the information of Sir Basil Brooke, the Tory Premier for the north of Ireland who is now paying us a visit, the southern part of Ireland receive 12 Victoria Crosses from the British Government. This decoration is equivalent to our Congressional Medal of Honor. Irish heroes also received thousands of other decorations from the English Government—and this is all part of the record.

It is also a matter of record that there was no conscription in the English dominated countries in the north of Ireland and the only Victoria Cross awarded in that part of the country was given to an Irishman—not a Tory.

The only way to crystalize public opinion on this important resolution is to contact your Senator and Congressman by telegram or letter asking them to record themselves in favor of this bill at the hearing Friday before the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, John Kee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C. Explain in your telegram or letter that you think the flow of American taxpayer's money to Great Britain should be stopped until such time as the iron curtain in the north of Ireland is eliminated.

Thomas H. Buckley, commissioner of administration at the State House and president of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, will represent Massachusetts.

RESOLUTION OF THE EMMET CLUB, WOBURN, MASS.

Resolved, That we, the members of the Emmet Club of Woburn, Mass., in regular meeting assembled at 371 Main Street, Woburn, Monday night, April 24, 1950, respectfully request that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives take favorable action on House Resolution 270, submitted by Congressman Fogarty, of Rhode Island, in order that said resolution be presented to the Congress for consideration.

JAMES WINN, *President*.

APRIL 25, 1950.

Congressman JOHN M. KEE,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Subcommittee, United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEE: I understand that there is currently pending before your committee legislation relative to the partition of Ireland.

As delegate from the Massachusetts Federation of Labor to the sixty-eighth annual convention of the American Federation of Labor held in St. Paul, Minn., October 1949, I introduced the enclosed resolution condemning the partition of Ireland.

This resolution was unanimously adopted by the delegates representing the 8,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor in the United States.

This action by a great labor movement was motivated by a traditional devotion to the principle of self-determination and self-government.

The intolerable partition of Ireland is a source of great concern to the working men and women of this Nation.

On their behalf, I strongly urge favorable action by your committee, to the end that the intercession of the United States may secure the unification of all of the people within the natural border of Ireland into one nation.

Respectfully yours,

KENNETH J. KELLEY,
Secretary-Treasurer-Legislative Agent.

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
DISTRICT No. 1,
Boston, Mass., April 25, 1950.

Congressman JOHN W. KEE,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEE: At the national convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations held in Cleveland, Ohio, the resolution was adopted condemning the continued partition of Ireland.

It should be evident to all clear-thinking people that the democratic nations of the world can hardly expect the active participation of the Irish Republic in plans that are allegedly aimed at spreading the democratic way of life and condemning communism, when a section of their own nation is occupied by England by force of arms.

It would appear that the American Government should do all it can to convince Britain of the necessity of rectifying this age-old injustice in an effort to create unity among all the democratic nations.

Millions of American citizens of Irish descent feel very strongly on this matter and, as one of them, I urge you to do everything in your power to bring the seriousness of this matter to the attention of the Congress of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN J. WALSH,
District Director, District No. 1.

APRIL, 25, 1950.

Congressman JOHN W. KEE,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEE: The National CIO at its 1949 convention unanimously passed a resolution condemning the partition of Ireland.

The Boston CIO Industrial Union Council would like to call to your attention the reaffirmation of this policy, and we respectfully urge that you and your committee report favorably on the legislation that is now before you to end this intolerable situation.

While we here in Boston have a predominantly Irish group, our council is composed of representatives of all creeds and races and are unanimously opposed to unfair treatment of any minority.

We hope that your committee in its wisdom will take the necessary steps to clear up once and for all this unfair partition of Ireland.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. HORAN,
President of the Greater Boston Industrial CIO Union Council.

MASSACHUSETTE CATHOLIC ORDER OF FORESTERS,
April 24, 1950.

Hon. JOHN W. KEE,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEE: I enclose a copy of the resolutions adopted at the last annual session of our organization advocating the ending of partition in Ireland and the establishment of a completely free and independent united Ireland.

The members of our organization are unanimous in their advocacy of an undivided Ireland, knowing that a united Ireland would be a signatory member to the North Atlantic Pact and would thus strengthen the hemispherical defenses of our own Nation.

We believe that a plebiscite of the people of all Ireland on the matter of a united Ireland would be a logical and democratic step and that the holding of such a plebiscite would show the true will of the Irish people for the union of their land as one completely independent and united nation.

We hope that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives will do all in its power to bring about the termination of the present unhappy condition which now transcends mere national interests.

The sons and daughters of Ireland are scattered throughout the world serving well and faithfully the lands they or their ancestors adopted yet they ever remain sentimentally interested in the Emerald Isle.

Very truly yours,

VINCENT P. O'BRIEN,
High Chief Ranger.

MITCHELL CLUB—CLAN-NA GAEL,
Roxbury, Mass., April 26, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS H. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Commission of Finance,
State House, Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the club held in Intercolonial Hall, Sunday, April 23, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved: We respectfully request the Foreign Affairs Committee of the National House of Representatives to act favorably and soon on the Fogarty Resolution—House Resolution 270—which declares that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the whole of Ireland and the partition of Ireland be discontinued.

Very truly yours,

MORTIMER O'CONNELL, President.

WEST LYNN, MASS., April 25, 1950.

Mr. THOMAS H. BUCKLEY,

President, American League for an Undivided Ireland, Boston Chapter.

DEAR SIR: Please place on record at the hearings of the Foreign Affairs Committee the following:

The Emmet Associates at this regular meeting held in Hibernian Hall, Federal Square, Lynn, Mass., April 16, voted unanimously to support Congressman Fogarty's Resolution No. 270. The body ordered the president to send a telegram to Chairman John Kee, House Foreign Affairs Committee, Washington, D. C., telling him of their action and expressing their hope that favorable action be taken by his committee when the Fogarty resolution came before them.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH F. QUINN,
President, Emmet Associates.

THE UNIFICATION OF IRELAND

(Resolution of the selectmen, Watertown, Mass.)

Whereas Ireland, the ancestral home, either by birth or descent, of so many of our law-abiding and God-fearing citizens, has suffered from oppression for over 700 years, and today still is economically and unnaturally partitioned by Great Britain in a manner definitely opposed to the geographic boundaries as Almighty God planned it, surrounded only by the sea, and against the American concept of liberty for all small nations; and

Whereas American citizens of Irish blood of our town, county, State, and Nation have contributed mightily to the civil, cultural, education, industrial, commercial, and religious progress and development of our great country, and in every war gave unselfishly of their time, talents, wealth, and, when necessary, suffered, and some are still suffering, sacrificed their lives in the defense of the United States of America, from the Revolutionary War down to World Wars I and II. They fought in these wars also to protect the small nations of Europe and the world from oppression by outside powerful nations; and

Whereas these and all liberty-loving American citizens are still contributing of their wealth through taxes and United States bonds to the Treasury of the United States of America for the protection of small nations and to fight communism and bring peace to the world; part of this money through the so-called Marshall plan or European recovery plan is given or loaned to Great Britain for recovery purposes, and in turn a portion of this loan or grant is siphoned from the Government in London to the puppet government in Belfast, Northern Ireland, to subsidize and maintain the Northern Ireland puppet government of six of the nine counties of the Province of Ulster as the last British foothold in Ireland; and

Whereas these American citizens of Irish blood are among the strongest foes of communism, through their Christianity, in this Nation of the United States of America, so too through their faith in Almighty God, among all the nations of Europe, the Republic of Ireland, in the 26 counties, stands as a bulwark against communism in Europe, and as America's only hope to find a nation in Europe free of communism today in case of war; and

Whereas the town of Watertown, the county of Middlesex, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, through its citizens, have always been foremost in efforts to aid the oppressed at all times even to the extent of war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the town of Watertown, at its annual town meeting of March 21, 1949, does hereby memorialize and petition the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, United States Senator Leverett Saltonstall, United States Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., and United States Congresswoman Mrs. Edith Nourse Rogers to take necessary action to prevent the allocation or spending of American taxpayers' money by Great Britain to support armed forces to maintain the border or partition between the 6 northeast counties of Northern Ireland from the 26 counties of the Republic of Ireland, and further to take necessary steps to prevent the allocation or spending of American taxpayers' money by Great Britain to subsidize the puppet government in these six northeast counties of the Province of Ulster, namely, the counties of Antrim, Armagh, Derry, Fermanagh, and Tyrone; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, United States Senator Leverett Saltonstall, United States Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., and United States Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers, and that these resolutions be spread on the historical records of the town of Watertown, Mass.

DANIEL JOSEPH CLIFFORD.
JOSEPH W. ANDREWS.
WILFRED J. PAQUET.
JOHN G. REARDON.
THOMAS J. KELLY.
MICHAEL J. SULLIVAN.

I, Wilfred J. Paquet, selectman of the town of Watertown, hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted at the annual town meeting of the town of Watertown on March 21, 1949, and it appears on the records of the town clerk.

WILFRED J. PAQUET.

IRISH-AMERICAN ASSOCIATES OF MIDDLESEX COUNTY,
Cambridge, Mass., April 17, 1950.

HON. THOMAS BUCKLEY,
Abington, Mass.

MY DEAR MR. BUCKLEY: The above association at a special meeting held on Monday, April 17, 1950, unanimously adopted the following resolutions:

"Whereas the unjust partition of Ireland is a continuing factor of disturbance and distrust to the peace of the world; and

"Whereas such partition, against the will of the people of Ireland, is also against the principles of justice expressed by the Constitution of the United States of America; and

"Whereas such partition is against the best interests of the people of the United States, since Ireland a divided nation cannot take its proper place in the councils of the nations of the world; and

"Whereas Ireland's absence from the North Atlantic Pact weakens the military defense of the United States as therein expressed and weakens the efforts of the United States to aid in the economic recovery of all Europe; and

"Whereas Ireland's absence from the United Nations, to which the United States subscribes as a member, results from the veto of Soviet Russia, due to the hostility of Ireland to communism and its evils: Be it

Resolved, That the Irish-American Associates urge the Foreign Relations Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress to report forthwith a suitable resolution expressing the sentiment of the people of the United States against the unjust partition of Ireland and demanding a plebiscite of the people of all Ireland on the matter of the united Ireland; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Foreign Relations Committee of the House of Representatives, to the President of the United States, to the Department of State, and to the Members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation."

Sincerely yours,

TIMOTHY J. HOLLAND, *President.*
CATHERINE HEALION, *Recording Secretary.*

RESOLUTION OF THE IRISH 32 COUNTIES ASSOCIATION INC., OF MASSACHUSETTS

Whereas the unjust partition of Ireland is a continuing factor of disturbance and distrust to the peace of the world, and

Whereas such partition, against the will of the people of Ireland, is also against the principles of justice expressed by the Constitution of the United States of America, and

Whereas such partition is against the best interests of the people of the United States, since Ireland a divided nation cannot take its proper place in the councils of the nations of the world, and

Whereas Ireland's absence from the North Atlantic Pact weakens the military defense of the United States as therein expressed and weakens the efforts of the United States to aid in the economic recovery of all Europe, and

Whereas Ireland's absence from the United Nations, to which the United States subscribes as a member, results from the veto of Soviet Russia, due to the hostility of Ireland to communism and its evils; be it

Resolved, That the Irish 32 Counties Association, Inc., urge the Foreign Relations Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress to report forthwith a suitable resolution expressing the sentiment of the people of the United States against the unjust partition of Ireland and demanding a plebiscite of the people of all Ireland on the matter of a United Ireland; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Foreign Relations Committee of the House of Representatives, to the President of the United States, to the Department of State, and to the members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation.

JOHN H. HAROLD, *President.*

RESOLUTION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS STATE BOARD OF THE ANCIENT ORDER OF
HIBERNIANS IN AMERICA

Whereas our membership, as American citizens of Irish birth or descent, are justly proud of the contributions, sacrifices and efforts the Irish have always so unselfishly made for the preservation of the great American principles: freedom, liberty, and the unity for the people of the United States of America, and these same Irish contributions were made in every war to preserve these same principles for the peoples and nations of the world oppressed by totalitarian groups or governments through communistic or other un-American practices; and

Whereas the Republic of Ireland is the one country in the world free from communism and its liberty destroying theories and practices which today threatens the United States of America and the whole world; and

Whereas the Government of Great Britain has been the recipient of financial gifts and grants from the American taxpayers, including some 30,000,000 taxpayers of Irish blood, and from this aid, Great Britain has supported a puppet government in the six northeast counties of the Republic of Ireland against the will and votes of the majority of the people of Ireland; and

Whereas Great Britain has recently given its governmental recognition to communism in another nation of the world; and

Whereas in the event of war between our United States of America and the forces of communism, the Republic of Ireland, united with its 32 counties free from the Great Britain made partition, would be the United States of America's strongest bulwark in Europe against communism; Therefore be it,

Resolved, That the Massachusetts State Board of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, in regular meeting assembled at Boston, Mass., urgently requests the President of the United States of America, the Secretary of State Department of the United States of America, the Members of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives to take proper action to have the Government of Great Britain to remove this unjust partition of the Republic of Ireland immediately by the passage of the Fogarty bill now before the Legislature of the United States of America; and that copies of this petition be sent to the presiding officers of Government in Washington, D. C.

THE MASSACHUSETTS STATE BOARD OF THE AOH
Rev. Michael J. Houlihan, chaplain, Watertown; Paul E. Tierney, president, Somerville; William P. Sullivan, vice president, Holyoke; Thomas C. Phillips, secretary, Worcester; James P. McCarthy, treasurer, Malden; Hugh P. Caffrey, organizer, Brockton; Thomas H. Murray, mission chairman, Brighton; P. Frank Kean, director, Brighton; Thomas F. Hall, Sr., Pittsfield; William J. Ronan, New Bedford; Joseph P. McMcKenna, Methuen; Daniel J. Clifford, Watertown; Daniel F. Slattery, Norwood; Richard Fitzmaurice, Brockton; Hugh A. Moriarty, Worcester.

A true copy:

THOMAS C. PHILLIPS,
State Secretary.

[H. Res. 270, 81st Cong., 1st sess.]

RESOLUTION

Whereas the House of Representatives, Sixty-fifth Congress (1919), third session, by House Joint Resolution 357, duly passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desired to live; and

Whereas in the intervening 30 years, the people of Ireland have so determined but the effect of their determination has been thwarted, and they have in fact been deprived of the right to the form of government under which they desire to live; and

Whereas 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland have been successful in obtaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has, as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House of Representatives that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

RESOLUTION OF THE ST. BRENDAN SOCIETY

Whereas the unjust partition of Ireland is a continuing factor of disturbance and distrust to the peace of the world; and

Whereas such partition, against the will of the people of Ireland, is also against the principles of justice expressed by the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas such partition is against the best interests of the people of the United States, since Ireland, a divided nation, cannot take its proper place in the councils of the nations of the world; and

Whereas Ireland's absence from the North Atlantic Pact weakens the military defense of the United States as therein expressed and weakens the efforts of the United States to aid in the economic recovery of all Europe; and

Whereas Ireland's absence from the United Nations, to which the United States subscribes as a member, results from the veto of Soviet Russia, due to the hostility of Ireland to communism and its evils: Be it

Resolved, That the St. Brendan Society urge the Foreign Relations Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress to report forthwith a suitable resolution expressing the sentiment of the people of the United States against the unjust partition of Ireland and demanding a plebiscite of the people of all Ireland on the matter of a united Ireland; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Foreign Relations Committee of the House of Representatives, to the President of the United States, to the Department of State, and to the Members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation.

DANIEL O'KEEFE, *President, St. Brendan Society.*

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply grateful for the opportunity of being here today and representing in part the men and women of Irish blood of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, who are deeply and sincerely interested in the attainment of the goal that we all very devoutly hope will be the result of the deliberations of this committee.

I would like to close with a quotation from that great statesman of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts who served the Congress of the United States many years, Daniel Webster [reading]:

Justice is the great interest of man on earth. It is a ligament which holds civilized beings and civilized nations together. Wherever her temple stands, so long as it is duly honored, there is a foundation for social security, general happiness, and the improvement and progress of our race. And whoever labors on this edifice with usefulness and distinction, whoever clears its foundations, strengthens its pillars, adorns its entablatures, or contributes to raise its august dome still higher in the skies, connects himself in name, and fame, and character, with that which is and must be as durable as the frame of human society.

It is on that concept of justice that I ask this committee to render a favorable decision on the petition submitted to you and on which I know from the questions that have already been asked by so many members of this committee there is evidenced a tremendously favorable opinion of the cause of which we are the protagonists and the cause which we so deeply feel.

As the son of parents born in Ireland, I know I express the wishes and the prayerful petitions of so many people of the Commonwealth of which I have the honor to be a resident and a native son, that I ask your favorable consideration, Mr. Chairman and honorable members of the committee, of this resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Thank you, Mr. Buckley.

The next witness is Dr. Herbert Donovan.

STATEMENT OF DR. HERBERT D. A. DONOVAN, HISTORIOGRAPHER OF THE AMERICAN-IRISH HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am the son of an Irish immigrant, Patrick Donovan, born in the county of Cork and brought to this country in 1871 as an infant.

I was the first member of my immediate family who visited Ireland after a lapse of 91 years and I was there in 1922 during the civil troubles. Much to the surprise of my friends, I had a very happy experience and have been there twice since.

I have spent my adult life of approximately 50 years in the study, teaching, and writing of history and I am presently historiographer of the American-Irish Historical Society.

I have prepared a statement here based largely upon original sources.

We are asking you to adopt the Fogarty resolution not only because of the innate justice and morality of the resolution itself, but also as an expression of American gratitude to a people to whom the United States owes more than it can ever pay, a debt that has been long accumulating and long unpaid. There are impressions prevalent among many people in this country, and especially in certain sections—impressions that have been created and fostered by many people who should know better, if they do not; impressions that bear directly upon the issue we are considering. There is an impression that the Irish question is a modern one, that the Irish contributed little or nothing to the formation of the United States, that there were few Irish here before the famine, that most of those who were here were of a peculiar species of Irish whose representatives today are opposed to the independence and unification of their own country, that America's debt to the Irish has in any case been fully paid by affording them shelter and sustenance.

These impressions are totally false and in case any of you have been misled by them and might be inclined because of it to dismiss this resolution lightly, I propose to give you facts, figures, and references that must convince you of their falsity and mischievousness.

Well-known books by famous authors, including some used as textbooks, frequently contain the assertion that the people who started our various States and who formed this Republic were almost exclusively of English birth or descent. The main reason for this idea is the lack of accurate and officially recognized data on our early popu-

lation, together with the circumstance that those who controlled the writing of history up to a recent period were chiefly of English descent and characteristically intolerant of others.

It is obvious that all the early settlers were immigrants, yet it was not until the census of 1820 that official recognizance was taken of the sources of immigration. For our information prior to that date, therefore, we are obliged to study such sources as ship registers, land transfers, marriage records, and statements of individuals concerning their own or their families' history. It is only in this century that such study has been systematically made, and the results that it has brought out have been surprising and often offensive to those trained in the earlier tradition. Yet these results, documented and proved as soundly as any in our records, are pertinent to your consideration today.

There was a steady flow of Irish people coming to this country from its earliest beginning. Two distinctively Irish groups made settlements, one near Newport News, the other at Savannah very soon after the foundations of Virginia. Those attempted colonies disappeared, but in the case of Savannah left written records. Mostly, however, the early Irish in America came as individuals, often as indentured servants, as did many of the English too.

Occasionally they "made the headlines," as we would say today, when they did anything spectacular. Thus Governor Winthrop of Massachusetts Bay records in his journal under the date of June 8, 1642, that—

One Darby Field, an Irishman, being accompanied by two Indians, went to the top of the White Hill. He made his journey in 18 days, being about 100 miles from Saco.

This is the earliest reference to the White Mountains of New Hampshire. Mostly, however, the Irish were not mentioned—as for that matter, most of the English were not.

After Cromwell's invasion and massacres in Ireland, the Government of the protectorate authorized the seizure and shipment to English overseas colonies of Irish "rebels," particularly young ones who were sold practically as slaves to English planters—practically the same policy followed by Hitler's Germans with Poles and others.

A. J. Thebaud, author of the *Irish Race in the Past and Present*, asserts that between 1653 and 1657, 6,400 Irish were so shipped to the Colonies.

Sir William Petty testifies that—

Annual immigration from Ireland was about 6,000 during that same period; when in 1698 the English Parliament proscribed the exportation of Irish woolsens to any country except England, the death knell of that industry was sounded, as it was meant to be.

Lord Fitzwilliam declared that the law drove 100,000 or more woolen operatives out of Ireland. Great numbers of them came here and laid the foundation of the American woolen industry.

Woodrow Wilson wrote in his *History of the American People* that for several years following 1725, Irish immigrants arrived in America at the rate of 12,000 yearly, and that 5,000 arrived in Philadelphia alone. A record exists showing that in December 1729, the immigrants arriving in Philadelphia, then the chief port of entry of the Colonies, were: English, 267; Scotch, 43; Germans, 345; Irish, 5,655. So noticeable was the trend that petitions poured in upon the Pennsylvania Legislature asking them to forbid the entry of the Irish.

The most hospitable colony to the Irish was Pennsylvania on account of William Penn's liberal attitude. Penn had lived for years at Kinsale, in County Cork, managing his father's estate. There he became well acquainted with Irish peasantry, and upon coming to America he brought some Irish with him, including some "people of property." More important, he brought James Logan, of Lurgan, County Armagh, whom he made one of his principal assistants. Logan was very friendly to his Irish fellow countrymen, and it is due largely to him that various sections of the Province were settled chiefly by Irishmen. These include Bucks, Chester, and Lancaster Counties, and the Cumberland Valley. Dr. A. Nevin writes that—

for some years previous to the Indian Wars, the Irish and Scotch immigrants constituted the great mass of the effective population of the province. They settled in great numbers in * * * Lancaster, York, and Northampton Counties, and formed the entire population of the Kittochtinny Valley.

Pennsylvania historians—e. g., John D. Rupp—show that many Irish settled in each of the counties he describes, and in referring to their descendants he writes: "The greater proportion of them are Catholics, and have priests officiating in the Irish language." Due to racial feuds, York County was eventually restricted to Germans, and Cumberland County to the Irish. From this latter district came many soldiers of the famous Pennsylvania Line, of which Gen. Henry Lee wrote that "they might have been, with more propriety, called the Line of Ireland". Gen. Anthony Wayne was the commander.

St. Joseph's Church in Philadelphia was founded in 1733 and at the time of the Revolution was the principal Roman Catholic Church. There were others, however. Fernow, in the *Middle Colonies*, page 160, says there were five in Pennsylvania with double number of priests and several thousand communicants.

Just before the Revolution a great wave of Irish immigration occurred. It was, as before, occasioned by the policy of the English Government. (The Antrim evictions in 1772, especially.)

Marmion, in a *History of the Maritime Ports of Ireland*, reports that between 1770 and 1773 ships sailing from the three ports of Belfast, Derry, and Newry, carried 25,000, and the *Baltimore Advertiser* of August 20, 1773, said, "3,500 immigrants have arrived from Ireland within a fortnight."

These figures suffice to show that far from being almost nonexistent, the Irish were a substantial element of the population at the beginning of our Revolution. They were, for the most part, but not entirely, poor people and laborers, but there are many notable exceptions among them: Thomas Dongan, Governor of New York in 1683, who drew up the first charter for the New York Colony; Sir William Johnson, Governor of the Indians, during the second half of the eighteenth century; James Moore; Arthur Dobbs; Matthew Rowan; the Rutledges; and Thomas Burke—all governors in the Carolinas; John Hart, Governor of Delaware, a native of County Cavan.

John McKinley, Governor of the State of Pennsylvania in 1776; George Clinton, Governor of New York for 18 years, then Vice President of the United States, son of an immigrant from the County Longford; James Duane, first mayor of New York City after the Revolution.

A very important contribution of the Irish to our early history was the work of the Irish schoolmasters. Driven out by the penal laws (1695 and following among whose provisions were):

Schools were ordered closed, a price was put on the head of every schoolmaster who dared to practice his profession. * * * The penalty was transportation. * * * The laws were prosecuted relentlessly. * * * Hundreds were transported. * * * They came in great numbers to America. It is reasonable to assume that they seized every opportunity to inspire their young charges with anti-English sentiment.

M. G. Brumbaugh, superintendent of Philadelphia schools, states:

Of all the immigrants, statistics show that the Irish immigrants produced the largest number of teachers in our American civilization.

The most famous of these was John Sullivan, born in Limerick in 1696, who came to Maine in 1723. It is recorded of him that as a qualification for obtaining a position as teacher in the new country, he wrote his name in seven languages. He taught school in New England for 60 years. Two of his sons became State governors.

Another was the Revolutionary general who broke the power of the Mohawk Confederacy in 1779.

Other teachers included George Taylor, a signer of the Declaration of Independence; Peter McLouth, a graduate of Maynooth, who was the tutor of John Hancock; William Evans, from Sligo, was the tutor of Daniel Webster; William Killen is credited with having given John Dickinson his style as a writer; Roger B. Taney said, "My first tutor was an Irishman, a ripe scholar, an able and accomplished man"; Thomas Halfpenny fought through the Revolution, then wandered to Illinois where he established the first school in that State.

Thomas Halfpenny was the schoolmaster general of Illinois. This preceptor taught almost all the children in Illinois in his day that received any education at all.

That is taken from Governor John Reynolds' History of Illinois.

Ida Tarbell says that Abraham Lincoln's first teacher was John Riney, "whose institution of learning had considerable local fame in his day." Also that many of the itinerant teachers of Kentucky were Irish Catholics.

The Presbyterians were equally active in the field of education. It is well known that the Neshaminy Log College developed into Princeton University, two of whose early presidents were Irishmen, and where Blair S. S. Smith and others were professors.

Finally, the philosopher, Bishop George Berkeley, of Cloyne, County Cork, gave great financial aid and his library to Yale, Harvard, and Columbia.

Thus at the coming of the Revolution there were many thousands of Irish scattered throughout the Colonies, particularly the Middle and Southern Colonies. What would their attitude naturally be with their background? They were constitutionally democrats, whether Protestant or Catholic. An exasperated Federalist writer wrote a while after the Revolution, "These Irish are the fiercest democrats this side of hell."

There is overwhelming evidence to refute the idea that few Irish were active in the Revolution. G. W. P. Custis, Washington's stepson, said, "Up to the coming of the French, Ireland had furnished a ratio of 100 to 1 of every nation whatever."

The English historian, J. A. Froude, certainly not a partial witness, writes: "Washington's Irish supporters were the foremost, the most irreconcilable, the most determined, in pushing the quarrel to the last extremity."

William E. H. Lecky says, "In the War of Independence they were almost to a man on the side of the insurgents."

Joseph Galloway, a Pennsylvania Tory, under official examination in the House of Commons, said, "I don't think that one-fifth part of the inhabitants of the revolted Colonies have supported the present rebellion." Asked if he had accurate information about how the rebel army was composed, he said:

The names and places of their nativity being taken down, I can answer the question with precision. There were scarcely one-fourth natives of America; about one-half were Irish; the other fourth were English and Scotch.

Major General Robertson testified, "I remember General Lee telling me he believed half the rebel army were from Ireland—I mean the Continental Army." The General Lee referred to was General Charles Lee.

Sir Henry Clinton said, "The immigrants from Ireland were in general to be looked upon as our most serious antagonists."

Joshua Pell, in his diary, June 1, 1776, remarks, "The rebels consist chiefly of Irish redemptioners and convicts, the most audacious rascals existing."

General Washington's friendliness to the Irish was evident. Many of his staff generals, such as Generals Montgomery, Hand, Knox, Wayne, and others, were Irishmen. His aides-de-camp were, successively, Joseph Reid, Joseph Carey, Stephen Moylan, John Fitzgerald, James McHenry. One of his closest friends and neighbors, General Andrew Lewis, was a native of County Donegal.

Repeatedly, during the Revolution, Washington authorized the observance by the Army of St. Patrick's Day, and in his General Orders of March 16, 1780, he—

congratulates the Army on the very interesting proceedings of the Parliament of Ireland * * * as they appear calculated to * * * restore to a brave and generous people their ancient rights and freedom, and by their operation to promote the cause of America.

On December 18, 1781, George Washington was unanimously adopted a member of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick (of Philadelphia). In his reply—still preserved among its papers—Washington wrote:

I accept with singular pleasure the ensign of * * * a Society distinguished for the firm adherence of its members to the glorious cause in which we are embarked.

Benjamin Franklin visited Ireland twice, in 1769 and in 1771, in his capacity as diplomatic agent of the American Colonies. He was received with the greatest cordiality there—in striking contrast to the hostile reception he got from many in England. In a letter describing his tour there, Franklin said:

I found them disposed to be friends of America, in which I endeavored to confirm them, with the expectation that our growing weight might in time be thrown into their scale. * * *

In the third year of the War, Franklin sent from Versailles an "Address to the Good People of Ireland," beginning with these words:

The misery and distress which your ill-fated country has * * * so often experienced, by such a combination of rapine, treachery, and violence as would have disgraced the name of government in the most arbitrary country in the world, has most sincerely affected your friends in America, and has engaged the * * * attention of Congress.

In O'Brien's Hidden Phase of American History, on page 226, he notes 544 surnames of officers of the Army and Navy of the Revolution—Irish names. In the appendix there is a list of noncommissioned officers and enlisted men of Irish names, only 12 names. But this list covers 85 pages, starting with page 443 and ending on page 528. There were only 12 Irish names, but included are 1,331 names, people of the names of Murphy and Reilly—and there were 345 McCarthys. And in spite of that fact statements are made—and I can show you them in print—to this effect. One person says that not 300 Celts figured in the American Revolution. And these are people who are supposed to be authorities and they are educators in school.

I will call attention of the committee to statements that I have here, testimony of people who showed that they knew what was the fact at that time as to Irish work in the Revolution; among them Mr. Custis, the stepson of Washington; and so forth.

In the civil field it is worthy of note that eight signers of the Declaration of Independence, including two from South Carolina and two from Delaware and one each from Pennsylvania, Georgia, New Hampshire, and Maryland, were Irishmen either by birth or immediate family. The well-to-do Irish in the Colonies supported Washington with substantial financial help, particularly Thomas Fitzsimons, of Philadelphia, and Charles Carroll, of Maryland.

We come now to a situation which would be amusing if it were not so mischievous. I refer to the studied attempt to try to indicate that any Irishmen of prominence in colonial times were Scotch-Irishmen. It is interesting to know that the term "Scotch-Irishmen" is a modern term, not one of the men whose names I have listed above or their contemporaries referred to themselves as anything but Irishmen.

The Charitable Irish Society of Boston was formed in 1737. The Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick started in Philadelphia in 1771 and in New York in 1784. George Washington was an honorable member and attended its banquets. Furthermore, the term "Scotch-Irishman" is automatically applied by some people to any Irishman whose ancestors came from Ulster. For example, Andrew Jackson is called Scotch-Irish because his family came from Carrickfergus. As a matter of fact, there is no proof whatever that the majority of the population of Ulster in those days were of anything but Irish descent, and the Scotch and English settlers, who had been transplanted there about the year 1608 to begin with, had lived in Ireland, as you can see, for a century and a half, and yet according to these writers they were not Irishmen.

It must not be forgotten that Ireland, like nearly every country, received immigrants, voluntary or involuntary, from many countries, not merely from Scotland or England, and it is noteworthy that no attempt is made to single out the descendants of Danish or Huguenot immigrants from those of the original Gaels, with whom they live so amicably. For that matter, let us take the case of Vice President

George Clinton. His first Irish ancestor, i. e., living in Ireland, came over from England in 1649; have you ever heard of George Clinton referred to as an "English-Irishman"? Never. But you may have heard that he was a Scotch-Irishman.

You might as well attempt to distinguish the Germans now living in the United States as Bavarian Germans or Prussian Germans as to distinguish between the Irishmen of the different provinces.

The name Jackson, for example, is an English transliteration of the Irish McShane, meaning the son of John (or Jack). And the same is true of many other names. I am sure that were Andrew Jackson, with his fiery temper and Irish impulsiveness, alive today he would be the first to repudiate the idea that he was anything else but an Irishman. And when Sir Basil Brooke would say to him, "We wish to be British," I can imagine Jackson's response.

The Rebellion of 1798 drove many Irish into exile to America. Among them the grandfather of President William McKinley, who would have been executed for participation if he had been caught in Ireland.

Many professional men came here at that time, including Dr. McNevin, who has been called the father of American chemistry, and Thomas Addis Emmet, who was long an outstanding citizen of New York City.

Of course the great bulk of Irish immigration began in the nineteenth century and was greatly accelerated by the terrible famine. Bromwell's History of Immigration, 1856, based on official figures, shows that from September 1819 to December 1855 the total immigration from Europe was 4,212,624, of which the Irish numbered 1,747,930; the Germans 1,206,087; English 207,492.

In the censuses of 1860 and 1870, Irish exceeded all other immigrant groups, and in those of 1880, 1890, and 1900, they were second only to the Germans. Of the foreign-born population in this country in 1850, as the census tells us, 42 percent were of Irish birth.

I have not time, nor do I think it necessary, to go into details as to the great share played by the Irish in the Civil War, and for that matter, in every American war that followed it.

My conclusion is that Irish, in the words of the old Roman formula, "deserve well of this Republic." How shall our debt to them be better repaid than by giving our approbation to the movement to which they are so seriously committed, to see that the territory of Ireland, ordained by nature to be one unit, shall be under one government from sea to sea. And we are confident that if this is accomplished there will be no more trouble between the racial and religious groups in Ireland than there is in our own United States.

I wish to make a statement about a matter that would be amusing if it were not mischievous. And that is the idea that any Irishman of prominence in the colonial times or immediately thereafter was a Scotch-Irishman. I would like to ask why it is that they call these people Scotch-Irishmen—they allege, for instance, that Gen. John Sullivan was a Scotch-Irishman. His mother was born in Cork and his father in Limerick. He is only called a Scotch-Irishman, because they wished to take away the credit from the Irish-Irishmen, that is all.

And I would like to know why, if these people whom I have referred to here were all Scotch-Irishmen, they did not join the Scotch societies. At the time that the Charitable Irish Society was formed in Boston in 1737, there was a Scotch Charitable Society in Boston.

The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick were formed in 1771, as you have already been told and in New York in 1784 their members included Irishmen from all parts of Ireland, and not one of them referred to himself as anything else but an Irishman.

Andrew Jackson is commonly called a Scotch-Irishman, simply because he was born in Carrick-Fergus in the north of Ireland. The name Jackson is an English transliteration of the Irish word McShane, meaning the son of John or Jack.

I am quite certain that if Andrew Jackson, with his impetuous Irish temper were alive today, he would not be complimented if he were called a Scotch-Irishman.

If by any freak of fortune I should become the Librarian of Congress, it would presently appear in the records that I was a Scotch-Irishman—which God forbid.

I might say in regard to there being no Irish here before the famine, that I think I can demonstrate that there were substantial numbers of Irish here before the famine. The famine, of course, greatly accelerated emigration to this country, so that the census of 1850 showed 42 percent of the foreign-born population were of Irish blood.

To sum up, gentlemen, the record of the Irish in this country, both in peace and in war, demonstrates that they have, to use the old Roman phrase "Deserved Well of the Republic." That was the customary formula and it was the highest tribute that the Roman Senate could pay its people in those days, to pass a resolution that they deserve well of the republic.

If the Irish have deserved well of the republic then, gentlemen, a consideration of their reward will have to do with the fate of this resolution.

I thank you.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Thank you, Dr. Donovan.

The next witness will be Mr. Paul O'Dwyer.

STATEMENT OF PAUL O'DWYER

Mr. O'DWYER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I had a prepared statement, but I think I would like to have permission to insert it afterward.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'DWYER. My name is Paul O'Dwyer and I am the national chairman of the committee on joint activities of the American League for an undivided Ireland, an organization that has representation in every State in the Union and in the Territory of Alaska.

I want to point out some erroneous positions that are taken today by many who think that this is purely an Irish question. I believe it is an American question. It is an American question because our money is being utilized at the present time to finance many countries of the world, including Great Britain, and we cannot divorce ourselves from the fact that whatever happens to that money we are morally as well as legally responsible.

That brings up the next question. What is happening in the northeast portion of Ireland? It is an important question for every American to have answered to his satisfaction, because our heritage is one wherein we believe and have fought for liberty and freedom, not only in our own land, but in every part of the globe, from the time of the foundation of the Republic up to the present time.

This brings me to the consideration of the conditions that exist in northeast Ireland for which we unfortunately must bear some of the blame, because our money is being used to pay 17,000 secret police that at the present time maintain a reign of terror in that portion of the globe.

We have heard reference by Mr. Rice and others here today about the Special Powers Act, and I think you realize what that is. The Special Powers Act makes a police state out of the northeast portion of Ireland.

Under the provisions of the Special Powers Act, a policeman may enter the home of any citizen without a warrant, at any time of the day or night, and arrest any of the occupants without any charge, and without the necessity of preferring any charge against him. This person may be lodged in a jail for an indefinite period of time, although recently there has been some amendment to that to limit the period of time during which he may be held incommunicado and without any charge being preferred against him.

However, they have cleverly devised another scheme of permitting the prisoner to be released after an allotted period and then rearresting him; and they can keep on doing that all year long.

By the provisions of the Special Powers Act, any man who sings an Irish song calling for the liberation of his own country, may be imprisoned for a period up to 14 years.

Under the provisions of the Special Powers Act, any Irishman living in that section of the country, cut off, as we see it, may be given 14 years in jail for waving an Irish flag, in his own country.

We, unfortunately, cannot take the position that we are not part of it, because we are financing it to the tune of \$150,000,000. That statement has been made by Congressman Fogarty already and has never been refuted. We are financing that type and kind of program.

It certainly is not in keeping with the American heritage. Our forefathers fought against these very things. They fought against unlawful search and seizure. They fought against imprisonment with the writ of habeas corpus suspended. Everything that is now being done through the use of our money, our forefathers in 1775 fought against and they started the War of Independence to wipe it out on this side of the Atlantic.

We cannot just say that it is none of our business and I would like for the moment to refer to Congressman Burleson's statement or comment with respect to another feature of it, and that is whether or not we might be accused of interfering in the business of Great Britain if we were to take action as indicated by the various resolutions that have been presented here.

We have taken on the role of the leader in ideas and ideals of democracy throughout the world. We cannot isolate Ireland in that connection. If we have done it—and I think very properly so—in various other countries that were fighting for their liberty; if we took a

stand for a democratic position when that question came before our Government, there is no reason in the world why we should halt when the question of Ireland is presented.

There is one thing that I would like to put at rest here today and that is the suggestion, or the idea suggested by the questions presented by Congressman Burleson with respect to what would happen to the people in the north of Ireland if the whole country were united.

We see here clearly demonstrated what Mr. Reilly referred to earlier in the hearing; that is, that the propaganda has been successful in confusing the whole Irish issue. The fact that Congressman Burleson has that idea in mind attests the success of that campaign and I compliment him for the forthright manner in which he asked the question in the first instance, because we would much prefer to have a question like that out in the clear light of day, where we can answer it, and where the question can be considered, than to have it whispered in conversations in corridors and other places.

Let me say that we have an experience with respect to what happens to minorities, and I think it was referred to by Charles Rice previously. Accompanying the propaganda you have the idea always presented that the peaceful force of the invader is keeping different groups within the country invaded separate and apart from one another. For instance, they say that if the British force of imperialism were removed from Palestine that the hordes of Arabs would swoop down and wipe out the Jews in no time at all and that what was protecting the Jews in Palestine was the peaceful group of Britains who were keeping these people separated.

Palestine is a free nation and the hordes of Arabs did not come down and wipe out the Jews, and within the territory of Palestine itself Jews and Arabs get along very well together today.

In India, the Moslems and the Hindus were supposed to start a holy war, so that there would not be a living creature left alive in the territory of India, if Britain were to remove its forces from that country. But Britain has removed its forces and the other day we had a pact signed by the leaders of both of these groups, so that in a very short period they were able to get together very well.

So far as Ireland is concerned, if the British will leave, where they have no business to be, these people will get along among themselves. They will get along very nicely. There will be no differences of opinion and there will not be the slightest recrimination against anybody. It is British influence which is there and which is keeping the people apart and stirring up trouble at the present time. Whereas if you remove the cause of the evil, you will have no evil.

One of the things that Congressman Javits referred to I would like to discuss. That is with respect to the effect of partition on the economy of the country. I think by his comment Congressman Javits has shown that he has studied the situation very carefully, because it does have a very serious effect upon the economy of the country.

In many European countries, you have one section of the country industrial and the other agricultural. That is true in Italy, France, Germany and many other countries. One way of crippling the economy of a country is to put up customs barriers between the agricultural and the industrial sections of the country.

For instance, if in the United States we had customs barriers placed around, let us say, Kansas and Iowa, so that all of the clothing and all

of the manufactured goods that went into these two States could go in only upon the payment of duty by the people in Kansas and Iowa, and in return, the people in the neighboring States had to pay a duty on the farm products that were sent from Kansas and Iowa into the manufacturing areas, we would really have a completely confusing economy right here in this country. That is what is happening in Ireland.

Now, to come back again to the question about whether or not there should be an election only in the north as against an election in the whole country. It presupposes that the six-county area constitutes a legal entity, separate and apart from the rest of the country, if you are going to limit the plebiscite to this area. The fact is that the six counties should not be now, as they never were prior to 1920, a separated part of Ireland. If they are to be permitted to set up a separate and distinct country within Ireland, then granting the right to do so rests with the people of all Ireland, not just those in the affected area, and certainly not with the British Parliament of Westminster. If any portion of the United States wished to join Canada or Mexico or just establish a separate and distinct country within the United States, then the permission to do so would have to emanate from all the people of the United States, not just from the people of the affected area, and certainly not from either Canada or Mexico.

The situation in Ireland is no different. This area was cut off by Great Britain, because it was the largest part of Ireland, which they could effectively continue to dominate. They took as much territory as the Unionist voters of the Belfast area could control, without regard to the nature of the various sections, which were added to the Belfast area. To hold a vote only in this section, and then apply the principle that the majority vote should control, would be a farce, since that was the very reason that this section was created. We insist most strongly that only the people of all Ireland have the right to divide up the nation if they so desire. Neither the government in either area, nor any group of political leaders, in or out of Ireland, have that right. The people of all Ireland are the sole judges in this matter.

Congressman Burleson has asked if the vote of all Ireland would not impose on the northern people a will that was perhaps not their own. Of course it would. That happens every time the majority votes in any election and thereby imposes its will upon the minority. The majority in Ireland voted in 1918 and in 1920 for complete independence. But the will of the majority was defeated by partitioning this small area, in which most of the minority group resided. If then a vote is to be taken only in the six counties, then why not a vote county by county or even a vote person by person? Why not let every man decide for himself? Why not? Because chaos would result, and that is why in every democracy the will of the majority must prevail. So it should be in Ireland—the vote of all the people should be taken on the issue of partition directly, and let the majority decision stand.

If you assert that the minority as set apart in the six counties should have a separate vote, then I say that when that vote is taken you should again partition the new minority wheresoever it appears and let that minority rejoin the rest of Ireland. But when you are finished, there will be no six counties, but only a small remnant of that area showing a majority vote in favor of continued union with Britain.

I do not want to prolong my testimony, Mr. Chairman, because there are many speakers here from various parts of the country.

I should like to compliment the committee on their generosity in permitting us to come here and speak. But it is important for us to know that it is not any longer an Irish question, particularly when Ireland is not in the Atlantic Pact and cannot be in the Atlantic Pact so long as one of the provisions of the Atlantic Pact is to the effect that each signatory to the Atlantic Pact guarantees the political and territorial integrity of each of the other countries that are signatories. That would mean that Mr. MacBride the Minister for Internal Affairs, in signing, if he wanted to join the Atlantic Pact, would in effect give full approval to the British occupation of a portion of his own country.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Are there any questions?

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to say that I am glad to see Mr. O'Dwyer here. In the last campaign, in 1948, he was my doughty and eloquent opponent. And he is carrying out that tradition on the question on which he is speaking here today.

I am glad that Mr. O'Dwyer emphasized the matter with relation to the economy of Ireland, because there is involved not only that, but there are involved the interests of the United States because of its support of the economy of the United Kingdom. It only underlines what I would like to make more clear again, and what I know he agrees with, that this is serious business and what is being sought here is a very serious result.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'DWYER. Thank you.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. O'Dwyer, I am glad to know, on the basis of Congressman Javits' remarks, that the question of Irish partition is still unpartisan.

Mr. JAVITS. Completely.

Mr. MANSFIELD. You will furnish for the record the prepared statement that you referred to?

Mr. O'DWYER. I will, sir. Let me say that when I was campaigning against Congressman Javits at the last election, the question of Ireland was not at issue.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The next witness is Mr. Matthias Harford.

STATEMENT OF MATTHIAS HARFORD

Mr. HARFORD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Matthias Harford, of Chicago. I am president of the Illinois District Council of the American League for an Undivided Ireland. Incidentally I happen to be past commander, department of Illinois, of the Disabled American Veterans.

I am speaking here to urge you to support the Fogarty resolution. I speak, not as an Irishman, although I was born and raised in Ireland, but I speak as one of the millions of Americans who crossed the ocean to fight for certain definite, basic principles of democracy. Those principles are universal. They should be applied universally, without fear or favor, without discrimination, against any nation or any people.

I sincerely believe that in using its good offices to effect a friendly solution of Irish partition, the Government and the Congress of the United States will be not merely serving the best interests of the people of Ireland, but primarily the best interests of the United States.

We can render no greater service to our own country at the present time than to solidify western European defenses against communism. The unification of Ireland will not only place at western Europe's disposal the great harbors and airports that they control, which control the Atlantic shipping lanes, but will also have an incalculable psychological value in offsetting the insidious propaganda that America has embarked upon a crusade of imperialism.

Your distinguished colleague, Congressman Burleson, of Texas, in seeking to clarify one part of this subject asked for analogies. If I am in order at this time, Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would like to suggest two. May I do so?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Surely.

Mr. HARFORD. One: At the time of its war for freedom 30 years ago Ireland was deprived of six of its counties by arbitrary fiat of the British Parliament on the pretext that a majority of the inhabitants of that area were Tories, loyal to England.

At the end of our War of Independence in 1776, the State of New York had a preponderance of Tories. I ask you to consider this. Suppose England at that time had laid claim to the State of New York and had occupied it by a military force on the ground that the majority of its population were Tories. Would the people of America have considered that seriously? What actually happened? How did the American people handle that Tory issue? President Washington confiscated the property of those Tories and chased them out of the country. That is a historical fact.

Now, the people of Ireland are not suggesting anything so drastic as that. All they are asking is that the United States use its friendly offices to bring about a rational solution of this problem in the interest not merely of Ireland, but of England and of the United States itself.

Now my second analogy. In laying claim to Irish soil, whether it be a foot or an acre or a county, if we admit the right of the British Government to occupy Irish county, then we must admit her right to occupy all of the 32, because her claim to occupy even 1 county of the 32 counties is based on nothing but brute force, military occupation. That, gentlemen, is precisely the claim that Mr. Hitler made in Belgium, in Denmark, and in Norway. We cannot even consider it.

Gentlemen, out of consideration for your patience and the limitation of time I would like to extend my remarks in writing later, if I may, and close at the present time; thank you.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

EXTENSION OF ORAL TESTIMONY BY MATTHIAS J. HARFORD, CHICAGO, AT HEARING BEFORE THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

To indicate how even social service can be used as an agency of oppression consider the administration of the unemployment compensation law in British-occupied Ireland. A worker discovered to have national sympathies or to favor the extension of republican rule to all Ireland is discharged from his job. Suppose he applies for unemployment compensation pending the finding of other employment. Willingness to accept an offer of work being a basic eligibility re-

quirement, he is offered a job, not in Ireland, not in Ulster, not in the occupied area, but in London, Birmingham, Manchester or some other city across the sea in England! Why? Because an act of the British Parliament has decreed that the occupied area of Ireland is not in fact a part of Ireland but a part of England.

Thus, the very service designed to promote social security is debauched into a system of economic tyranny which destroys that security and enforces the emigration of political opponents. Thus, Irish nationalists are driven out of the homesteads their people have occupied for centuries, forced into the actual status of displaced persons without being legally eligible for the aid extended to displaced persons in other parts of Europe.

I have likened British occupation of Irish territory to German occupation of Belgium, Denmark, or Norway. Another significant analogy is in order here. When Hitler seized power and sought to build a secret police force he found no suitable model on the mainland of Europe. But in British-occupied Ireland he found the perfect model for an instrument of oppression in the "B-Special" police. Their equipment, standards, and methods were adopted in toto and applied to Hitler's purpose. We find the exact replica of the "B-Specials" in Hitler's Gestapo, the heavily-armed, plain clothes, superlegal police whose crimes of oppression and repression shocked the conscience of the civilized world. While the crimes of Sir Basil Brooke's "B-Specials" cover a smaller land area than those of Hitler's Gestapo, the foulness of their deeds is no less revolting.

Mr. Paul O'Dwyer, of New York, has referred to a public meeting which he attended in Enniskillen, County Fermanagh, during the month of June 1948. At that meeting the Premier, Sir Basil Brooke, sat on the platform and by his silence gave consent to the views expressed. At that meeting the chairman, a local Tory leader named E. C. Ferguson, said "This is a Tory constituency. The Nationalist majority must be liquidated. * * * for my part I care not how drastic the measures we use, the Nationalists must be liquidated." A "Tory" constituency with a Nationalist majority to be liquidated. This, 3 years after Hitler, the Great Liquidator, had been called to account.

Forcible occupation of the territory of a small nation against the will of a majority of its population by a larger and stronger nation, constitutes international aggression within the meaning of the United Nations Pact. I submit that the occupation of Irish territory by British military and civilian forces constitutes an act of international aggression within the meaning of the United Nations Pact and that the government is liable to indictment before the bar of world opinion as an international aggressor, subject to action by the United Nations Assembly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The next witness will be Mr. James Comerford.

STATEMENT OF JAMES J. COMERFORD, CHAIRMAN OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR AN UNDIVIDED IRELAND

Mr. COMERFORD. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is James J. Comerford. I am a practicing attorney in New York City, a former president of the United Irish Counties Association of New York, am active in many Irish-American societies, and chairman of the executive committee of the American League for an Undivided Ireland which is a national organization with branches in American cities from coast to coast. Let me say that I endorse the views of my associates from the American League which they have presented today in the course of these hearings.

I also am here to speak in favor of H. R. 270—popularly referred to as the Fogarty resolution. Knowing that you have a very full calendar of business before you today, I will be as brief as possible. With this purpose in mind, I will confine myself to just two points.

My first point is that I believe that the partition of Ireland is an evil which is injurious to democracy, because the existence of this partition contradicts the basic American principle that the powers of government should be derived from the consent of the governed. The

people of Ireland never consented to establish partition; they never consented to set up a separate government exclusively for 6 of their 32 counties. The people within these six counties are not being governed by the consent of the people of all of Ireland.

We believe in democracy. We have consistently supported it in many parts of the world and we have a democratic government of our own. However, it would be a very crude arrangement of democracy if two governments were permitted to exist in this country, one for the majority and one for the minority. We have that situation in Ireland today. We have a government for the majority of 76 percent of the voters existing in Dublin. However, by the imagination of somebody, the minority is allowed to have another government, a minority of only 24 percent of the entire country, existing in Belfast. Democracy is not based upon that principle. Minorities have their rights and we in America always take care of their rights, but we have never permitted minorities in America to set up an independent government and function alongside of the government of the majority.

Unfortunately, too, we American taxpayers find ourselves financing a police state in northeast Ireland by our dollars sent to Britain in accordance with the Marshall plan. An explanation of the functioning of that police state has been adequately, eloquently and competently presented to you by Mr. Paul O'Dwyer.

We are financing that police state by our dollars which we sent to Britain in accordance with the Marshall plan. We are paying secret police in that part of Ireland to prosecute its inhabitants, deprive them of those civil rights, which are so dear to us Americans. We are permitting our money to be used in northeast Ireland for purposes which are not only repugnant to our democratic principles in America but which are also offensive to decency and to justice. We are sending our money to northeast Ireland by way of Britain to be used for propaganda, intolerance and bigotry against a freedom-loving people.

In other words, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we are sending money to Britain for the purpose of subsidizing the partition of Ireland and all its consequent evils.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I rely on all my other representatives here. In conformity with all real Americans we believe the Marshall plan is essential. It is essential to the recovery of Europe; it is essential for our own stability and our own future. But despite that firm belief that I have with all other Americans, I still oppose the idea of having American money being sent to Britain and thereafter used by Britain to be sent to the Belfast Government to kill democracy in Ireland.

Gentlemen, we must never forget as Americans that a bloody civil war was fought here for 4 years in these United States in order to prevent the partition of this nation.

Daniel Webster, that great statesman from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts said, "The Union must be preserved." He did not partition then and neither do Americans favor partition of their country today. There has never been a plebiscite taken in the United States for the purpose of satisfying a segment of the country, geographically.

What I am coming to, gentlemen, is this, that there are certain sections of the United States, at various times in our history, which

claimed that they had a right to secede from the Union, but they were never permitted to have a plebiscite among themselves and to determine the outcome of that issue. Any vote or any plebiscite ever conducted in the United States upon that policy was a vote taken of the entire territory of the United States, which was then in existence. Sometimes it was 30 States, sometimes 35 States and sometimes it was even our standard 48 States.

Now one of our great ambitions in the United States is to make democracy attractive to all those countries in the world which do not enjoy democracy, today. We wish to sell them this idea that democracy is really good for them. How will these people believe us? Will they, or will they not believe us to be on the level as long as we oppose democracy in Ireland? I believe, with millions of other Americans, that House Resolution 270 should be passed in order that our enemies in those non-democratic countries throughout the world may be now stopped from charging us with using bad faith in our doctrine of democracy and particularly with our dealings as they apply between Ireland and England.

My second point, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, is that the presence of Ireland as a member in the Atlantic Pact is most essential to the national security and the defense of the United States.

As we see on the map, Ireland lies across the gateway from the United States to Europe. It controls the food line, the life line of these countries in any time of an emergency, in any time of war with any nation in Europe.

The Republic of Ireland cannot become a member nation of the Atlantic Pact today because she is a partitioned country. As long as this partition exists in Ireland it would be unjust for us as Americans and unreasonable for us as ordinary people to expect Ireland to become a signatory to the Atlantic Pact.

The reason for the Republic of Ireland staying outside the pact is easy to understand despite all the confusion that Britain's sources of propaganda may distribute throughout the world.

The Atlantic Pact, as you know very well, guarantees to every signatory nation that its existing boundaries at the time of entering that pact shall remain, as they were at the time of signing, for the next 20 years.

The Republic of Ireland by joining the Atlantic Pact would, ipso facto, for 20 years, guarantee the existing partition boundary that now separates 6 of their 32 counties from the other 26.

Joining the Atlantic Pact under these conditions would mean a surrender of Ireland's birthright to be one nation, to be free and independent as a 32-county entity, to be governed by one government of her own choosing and to be bounded only by her natural boundaries, the waves of the ocean.

By joining the Atlantic Pact, now or at any time within the near future under present existing conditions, Ireland would be agreeing to make permanent the partition of her nation which she is justified now in removing.

Gentlemen, the present partition of Ireland, because of a threat to American security in time of war, in time of modern war, is a problem which calls for solution by the United States of America. It is no

longer merely a domestic matter between Ireland and England. We do not have to be military experts. We do not have to study logistics. We need only to use common sense to understand that Ireland is just outside the gates of the United States today in terms of distance or time.

Today we find an unarmed and unfortified Ireland lying only 12 hours away in time from the eastern flank of the United States.

The United States, under the terms of the Atlantic Pact, is fortifying several countries in Europe. She is pouring millions of dollars into Europe for security purposes and she is justified in so doing. However, the United States fails to realize the important strategic value of Ireland and the Congress of the United States or others have taken no steps to give Ireland an opportunity to join the pact. Good sense, clear foresight, and sound judgment today, all these things point out to America the urgent need of having the partition of Ireland removed and a unified Irish nation placed under one central government, chosen by all the people of all of Ireland.

An opportunity should be given therefore to Ireland to join the Atlantic Pact as a partner with the United States and other democratic nations for their united defense against the common foe. Should a nation hostile to the United States—and this is not impossible in future wars, and there will be a future war—should a hostile nation ever occupy Ireland, a nation hostile to the United States, the security of the United States would be seriously and undoubtedly threatened. You will agree with me that the ultimate success of the Atlantic Pact, in the light of this knowledge, the ultimate success of the pact is really jeopardized by leaving Ireland outside the pact and a prey to the greatest enemy the United States has today.

I do not have to mention her name but everybody knows who this nation is. Because of her geographical position in the Atlantic Pact, Ireland in time of modern war holds the strategic key to victory for the United States in case of any war in Europe. The passing of House Resolution 270 by Congress, after being voted out of your committee first, may help us Americans to obtain the use of that key at a time when we in the United States may very badly need it.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, thank you for your patience. I will conclude by saying that in the name of American justice, in the interests of American democracy, and above all at the present time in the cause of American military security, I, with my colleagues, urge you members of this committee to vote in favor of House Resolution 270.

Gentlemen, thank you very much for your courtesy and attention.

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad that Mr. Comerford pointed out that though we should not use our power in the European recovery program beyond the normal influence of one nation upon another, we should not be inhibited by any slanders of the Soviet propagandists from using our prestige in a normal and traditional way in order to achieve the just result which is what you are seeking. That is pretty much what you had in mind?

Mr. COMERFORD. That is the purpose I had in mind and in addition I have the purpose in mind that we are not against the Marshall plan. We do not make this solely an Irish issue. We are proud that a nation like Palestine has recently become the great free nation of Israel to the honor of a great and honored people.

Mr. JAVITS. Thank you very much.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). The next witness is Mr. James P. Durkin. Mr. Durkin.

STATEMENT OF JAMES P. DURKIN, PAWTUCKET, R. I.

Mr. DURKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The hour is getting late and I will read my statement. I am representing the Eire Society of Rhode Island. We are from Congressman Fogarty's State and he has incorporated many of our ideas in his resolutions. They coincide with our thoughts. On behalf of many hundreds of the people of Rhode Island, I would like to make this statement to your committee.

We have come here as representaives of the Eire Society of Rhode Island to express the views of several hundred American citizens of our State on the partition of Ireland and to urge on your honorable body to act favorably on House Resolution 270 submitted by Hon. John E. Fogarty stating that—

it is the sense of the House of Representatives of the United States of America that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

Great internal wars have been fought to establish the principle of self-determination which, in a democracy as we know it, is the right of a people to determine freely how they are to be governed. America fought a Civil War to preserve this principle. That war insured that self-determination belonged only to the whole people of the Nation.

Ireland claims that right today. Geography and history have combined to establish it. Ireland has a national language, a separate culture and code of laws, a distinctive national tradition.

Her churches and religious bodies—Catholic, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, the Religious Society of Friends and other denominations—are now, as in the past, organized on a national all-Ireland basis. Her learned bodies, her major universities, her sports organizations, are, and have been, nation-wide. The people in all parts of the country are, and speak of themselves as, Irish.

It is therefore to the people of Ireland that the right to self-determination belongs. It is they who must decide national questions and policies—the nation's status, Ireland's relationship with other countries, the form of its government. As in other democratic nations, the final decision of these matters should, and must, lie with the majority of the adult citizenry of the nation.

Partition was brought about by an act of a foreign Parliament, and not one elected representative of the people of Ireland North or South ever voted for it. It is maintained by force and subsidy against the will of the vast majority of the people of Ireland.

The question of Irish unity cannot be construed as a matter for the inhabitants of the partitioned area alone, but is a vital matter of grave concern to the entire Irish Nation. Abraham Lincoln, speaking at Indianapolis on February 18, 1861, said:

On what rightful principle may a State, being not more than one-fiftieth part of the Nation in soil and population, break up the Nation and then coerce a proportionally larger subdivision of itself in the most arbitrary way.

Lincoln fought against this principle and saved the Nation. Ireland is fighting today against the same principle and invites the support of all freedom-loving peoples in this, her just cause.

The partitioned area of Ireland never was an entity before the passage of the Partition Act in the British Parliament. It is not Ireland's ancient Province of Ulster which comprises nine counties. It has no natural boundaries. It has no unity within itself. In fact, within the partitioned area there was and is a majority in 4½ countries for freedom and for unity with the rest of Ireland.

Ireland's claim to the restoration of her six northeast counties is not made with any bitterness for past wrongs. She claims this area as part of her national territory and she feels that perpetual interference in her internal affairs by an outside power sets an example destructive of the rule of law among the nations. Partition gravely injures both parts of Ireland; it injures Britain too, for as long as it lasts Britain cannot sustain her claim to stand for democracy in western Europe.

We, therefore, ask your honorable body to act favorably on this resolution, not only because of the justice of the claim of the Irish Nation but also because of the close friendship that has always existed between the Irish and American people. We would wish Americans everywhere to keep well in mind the loyalty of men and women of Irish birth and extraction to this—our Nation in all its struggles since its beginning.

They were among the most enthusiastic supporters of Washington and Lincoln. Their names may be found on the roster of all our wars for the preservation of democracy both here and throughout the world. And it is not too much to say that when some chronicler pauses in the future to dwell on the virtues and deeds of Americans from 1776 up to the closing hours of the twentieth century, he will look in loving admiration upon the talents and traits of those of Irish blood who have found and fought to preserve here that freedom of thought and liberty of action which have been denied their fathers for 800 years, who love this Republic and its institutions next only to their God, and who have found happiness and the fulfillment of all their earthly hopes in the enduring glory of these United States of America.

I would also like to introduce Thomas O'Brien and Hugh Heaney who accompany me.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). The next witness is Mr. Robert Herbst. Mr. Herbst.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT VAN CORTLANDT HERBST

Mr. HERBST. My name is Robert Van Cortlandt Herbst. I made a study of Irish partition in March 1948. I studied this for a thesis at college and did it from a scientific angle.

A scientist wishing to study a disease first determines the cause by isolating the infection and studying it in its undiluted, pure form. So, too, with the study of political questions where there is a real conflict—a conflict of principles—or more accurately, contradiction of a principle. Very often, however, a purely academic border question is confused with this conflict of principles, and may even be intermingled with it. On the continent of Europe that is possible, so that

the question involving the conflict of principles must first be washed of the academic questions which are merely a matter of correct definition.

In the case of Ireland, however, where there is no doubt of the natural border of the sea, we have not a muddled case of border question per se, but the conflict of principles in a pure form—between the principle of nationality on one hand and the principle of the garrison on the other.

Ireland has always been considered one—up to 1920, that is. That it was a nation was proved by a long and continuous struggle in which Protestants from the North spearheaded the movement in its present form. Thus it is an all inclusive nationalism including everything within the well defined boundary of the ocean.

Against this principle of nationality is the principle of the garrison. The British plantation formed a garrison in Ireland, but the territory it inhabited was never considered a separate entity—but as a garrison in Ireland as a whole. As a garrison could best be described as a settlement ruling a country without taking part in its life, it is a negation of the principle of nationality.

My purpose in dealing so much with the theory behind partition is to show why the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, which partitioned Ireland in such a way as to give the garrison full recognition could not result in peace.

The 34-percent Nationalist population of northern Ireland complain about how they are discriminated against in the securing of government jobs, in the obtaining of houses, in gerrymandering, etc. The justification given for such action is that they have no desire to keep the northern Ireland border. And that is correct, for they are against the border. But how can they subscribe to an entity whose national holiday is sectarian in nature and which serves only to keep the "loyal" Protestant majority united against them until the following year? Their only crime is to know the full history of the land they live in, and to believe that nationality is an all inclusive idea. How natural it is, then, that the partition automatically makes them traitors—and they are treated as such.

What all this shows is that an expedient justification of a negative principle weakens a true principle—in this case the principle of nationality. I want it understood that what I mean by nationality is not the egotistical Rheingold god nationalism which is something in itself, but rather the feminine nationalism—that which helps give birth to all the individual enterprises. You will find its purest vision in the form of a woman as Kathleen Ni Hooehhan, Dark Roseleen, etc.—those visions which stick out despite the long subjection of the people.

It is therefore my opinion that any question concerning partition should be decided by Ireland as a whole; and support the House Resolution 529 and Senate Resolution 240 as the best statements of my stand.

Thank you.

MR. MANSFIELD (presiding). I have here statements in behalf of the measures before the committee by Hon. John F. Kennedy and Arthur G. Klein, which will be incorporated in the record at this point.

(The statements referred to are as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 270

Mr. Chairman, I want to add my voice to the many others which have been heard in support of House Resolution 270.

In view of our American tradition of liberty and democratic processes and in view of the glorious pages which men and women of Irish descent have written into our Nation's history, I believe that justice will be served in great measure if all of the people of Ireland are given the opportunity to choose their own form of government.

The free plebiscite, as suggested in the resolution under consideration, will give the Irish people that opportunity.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: To my deep and sincere regret, other commitments prevent my appearing before your committee today in behalf of House Resolution 270, by the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. Fogarty, which would formally record the sentiment of this House that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

I hope that you and the members of your committee will accept this statement in lieu of a personal appearance in vigorous support of the resolution, and will incorporate it in the record of hearings.

Mr. Chairman, there are at least three profound issues in the world on which true Irishmen and Jews unite with no single word of disagreement: The establishment and maintenance of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine (now a happily accomplished fact in the Republic of Israel); the unification and freedom of Ireland; and the Ku Klux Klan.

Perhaps I should have included a fourth issue, which is really an emotion: A hatred for the brutality of British imperialism.

Jews and Irishmen have suffered alike at the hands of the masters of British foreign policy, and they have suffered in the same way, in loss of life and liberty, in intellectual degradation, in frustration of national aspirations.

The Englishman at home may be a cheerful, tolerant chap appreciative of the brilliance and irony of the Irish and the Jews; abroad he is a heartless con- niver, an oppressor, a jailer, sometimes a complacent murderer of human beings and human hopes.

Unfeeling exploitation of subject peoples has been the keystone of British foreign policy for so many centuries that the origin of the policy is virtually lost in the mists of antiquity; but the bloody spoliation of Ireland and the consistent policy of insult to its proud people has been carried to its greatest depths since the Cromwell Commonwealth, just as the long history of exploitation and broken promises to the Jews has shown increasing virulence since that time; and just as the Ku Klux Klan is the spiritual descendant of the harsh bigotry, authoritarianism, and intolerance of the Roundheads.

I am not the first to point to the close parallel in history of the Irish and the Jews, nor is this the first or the last time that I have made the point; wherever a free-willed people have been held in oppressive captivity by force, the strong sympathy of Irish and Jews has rushed forth out of the depths of their common experiences.

There are a few Jews who are cool to the idea of a Jewish state; and I suppose there are a few Irishmen who are cool toward unification of Ireland; but, with no derogation of the patriotism of Jews and Irishmen who owe fealty to the United States, they must be few indeed.

The Republic of Israel exists today; and the Republic of Ireland exists today. The major step has been accomplished in spite of British perfidy. Our only remaining anxiety is to insure the sovereign safety of both. While British imperialism maintains its despotic sway in North Ireland, the Irish Republic cannot be wholly free or wholly safe; while British imperialism continues to

furnish arms and aid to the enemies of Israel, that republic cannot be wholly safe or wholly free.

I am certain, Mr. Chairman, that a majority sentiment exists in this House for the purposes of House Resolution 270; I hope, and I urge, that the resolution be reported favorably, in the belief that it will be adopted by acclaim to renew the pledge of sympathy of our America to all who seek after freedom.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR G. KLEIN, M. C.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). The next witness is Mr. Maguire.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH MAGUIRE

Mr. MAGUIRE. My name is Joseph Maguire, I am a resident of New York City.

Mr. JAVITS. And I might say a constituent of mine.

Mr. MAGUIRE. I am a constituent of Mr. Javits. This is the first time I have had the pleasure of meeting the gentleman under these auspicious circumstances. I have been a naturalized citizen, Mr. Chairman, for the last 25 years. I am a member of the Resident Liquor Dealers' Association of New York, a past president. I am past president of the County Commanders Association of New York. I am a member of the executive committee of the American League for an Undivided Ireland in New York. I come to speak in favor of the Fogarty resolution.

I might say I have a unique position here in that I am the first witness coming before you to testify, coming from that part of Ireland known now as the six counties. I was born and bred and raised in the county of Fermanagh, which lies directly in the center of that little corner that you see marked off there in the six counties of Northern Ireland.

I am quite familiar with the mechanics and the workings of the British Government in that part of Ireland.

I not only speak for my American friends, Mr. Chairman, but I too speak for the minority in that part of Ireland. I have kept very close to them all down through the years. Not a day goes by that I do not receive some communication from them. I feel that if you could but read, or had an opportunity to read some of the excerpts of those letters that I received from that minority group in Northern Ireland, that you too would be spurred to greater efforts to right the wrong that has been committed in that little part of Ireland from which I come. There is no better way of demonstrating that than getting personal.

The old farmstead, where I was born and raised in County Fermanagh, is now owned by my brother who has a large family there.

Because of this Special Powers Act on which you heard Paul O'Dwyer so ably elaborate, members of his family, Mr. Chairman, as they stroll down the road on a summer's evening, may be and have been intercepted by this so-called secret police, financed indirectly by the Marshall plan, and then given the usual command to halt and be identified. Now keeping in mind that no law has been broken, they have been submitted to arrest and without recourse to judge or jury, they can be incarcerated and imprisoned at the pleasure of the Premier of Northern Ireland and his Government.

It is because of those wrongs, Mr. Chairman, that we are here. This problem is very near and dear to our hearts. These children of my

brother have also been denied the right to participate in any of the public positions, to compete in civil-service examinations, and all that because of their political affiliations.

As I said before, could you but realize the conditions under which the minority exists in Northern Ireland I fear that you and the other members of your committee would have no hesitation in going ahead and doing what you could to bring about the freedom of that last remaining remnant of Ireland.

There is only one recourse left for these children that I speak of, Mr. Chairman, and that is emigration. They are denied the rights of holding public office, denied the rights of being appointed to office, and mind you we have several lucrative positions in the little county I come from, such as borough surveyor of the town, county surveyor, and so forth. While these people come up to all the specifications required for those positions, yet they are denied that right, whether because of political beliefs or religious discrimination. There is only one relief for them and that is to emigrate. That is the prime thought in the backs of the minds of that minority group in Northern Ireland, today. As I said, I wish you could but read some of the excerpts of the letters pleading for me to do what I can to bring them out here and alleviate their conditions over there. To get back to my own family—while my nieces and nephews are still young yet, two of them have already come here and are domiciled in New York and they in turn are making arrangements to bring the rest of their family out all because of the conditions which I have cited.

I appeal to you as a representative, not only as I said of this minority group, but of our fellow Americans, freedom-loving Americans, to give your utmost consideration to this Resolution No. 270. I feel that perhaps through it we will get some recourse, we will get some semblance of freedom from these terrifying conditions that exist in Northern Ireland, today.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, of thanking our Congressman Javits for his magnificent stand on this vital question that is very near and dear and close to the hearts of all of us and I just want to tell him that I shall carry back to his district the felicitations and the good will not only of myself but of every man and woman in this room.

Thank you very much.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Thank you.

Mr. Allan Lillis.

STATEMENT OF ALLAN F. LILLIS

Mr. LILLIS. Mr. Chairman, members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for the purpose of the record, I wish to introduce myself. I am Allan F. Lillis. I am a native of the State of Michigan, and a resident of the city of Detroit and have been for the past 45 years. I have been a deputy clerk in the records court in that city for the past 26 years.

For the past 31 years I have been associated with Irish organizational activities, and I have been delegated to come to this hearing by a joint meeting of the Gaelic League, and the Irish-American Club of Detroit, Mich.

I am also authorized to speak for and on behalf of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, Michigan unit; the Ancient Order of Hibernians; and the Gaelic Athletic Association, whose combined membership is approximately 20,000.

They are unanimous in their opinion that the House of Representatives should have an opportunity to express itself on House Resolution 270, because it would afford a means of expression of the sentiment that is prevalent throughout the United States, that differences should be settled in a democratic manner.

We are agreed that if a vote were taken in all of Ireland on the question of partition, the result would be overwhelmingly opposed to its continuance as in favor of a United Ireland.

Within the past 2 years I have had an opportunity to visit in Ireland. I was in 28 of the 32 counties of Ireland, including four of the six northeast counties of Ireland. I have first-hand knowledge of the workings of partition, and the detrimental effect that it has had upon the economy of that country.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of saving time, I ask for the privilege of extending my remarks in a future addition to this statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Thank you very much, Mr. Lillis. Mr. Jeremiah J. O'Callaghan.

STATEMENT OF JEREMIAH J. O'CALLAGHAN

Mr. O'CALLAGHAN. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am not going to take up too much time myself either; it is getting late. For purposes of the record I will tell you my name is Jeremiah J. O'Callaghan. I am a lawyer from Jersey City, N. J. I was born and brought up in Cork City, Ireland and came over here in 1934. I am the chairman of the New Jersey branch of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, president of division 1 of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in New York City and I have been delegated to come up here and make their sentiments and expressions known to the committee today.

First of all I am going to be frank about it, when I came up I expected to meet a lot of indifference on the part of the committee. It is ignorance on my part I guess, but time after time, I have heard that committees of Congress in Washington were a waste of time, but from the bottom of my heart I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that I am very, very deeply impressed. When I go back to Jersey City and New Jersey I will do my level best to dispel this misinformation that has seeped through to the people. You have been very, very kind and the Congressmen have amazed me with their grasp of the situation in Ireland as it exists today.

The people whom I represent urge the adoption of House Resolution 270. We believe it is consistent with the best American principles and concepts of good government. The American Government is formed and formulated and grounded in the fundamental principles that people are entitled to be governed as they see fit. I have no doubt that it is intended to cover everybody and not just a few.

The government in the north of Ireland has been pictured here pretty generally as a government maintained by force. The figures have not

been quoted, and I will quote them right now. There are approximately 33,500 armed British troops in the north of Ireland in the six-county area. There are 11,000 armed policemen, yet there are no policemen, by way of parenthesis, armed in southern Ireland or over in England, but 11,000 are armed in the north of Ireland. In addition to that, they have, and I am sure no one could refer to them by any other term, actually a storm-troop corps, known as the B-Specials. There are 15,000 men, civilians, a quasi-police and military organization, fully armed with powers to walk into anybody's house any time of the day or night and without warrant or writ of habeas corpus, yank him out and put him in jail with no trial. Or at the pleasure of Sir Basil Brooke, the Premier of the "north" of Ireland.

A gentleman, who is a commentator on Station WOC, only 2 weeks ago in Philadelphia, by skillful questioning of Mr. Brooke elicited from him in a flat statement that the government of the north of Ireland, the six-county government, is maintained by armed force.

Now, I was a captain in the United States Army. I served for 5 years in the American Army. It is not to spectacularize but I came up from private to captain. I had sensitive positions in the Army and it is a great honor to the Irish people that even though I came from Ireland, I was trusted with figures and facts that if they had been disclosed to the enemy in Italy might have affected the outcome of the war.

Now, every moment of the day that I worked and sweated during that war I had in the back of my mind all the time that this was a worth-while fight for the freedom of everybody all over the world and I can assure you that at no time did I exclude the thought that Ireland was included in that idea. I can tell you quite frankly that if I had thought at that time that Ireland would be excluded I would not have been as ambitious and paid as much attention to my details and duties as I did, because the thing would have been a farce.

I would remind everyone that the Americans who fought in a war for the principles I have just mentioned, if they are not to be convinced by passage of this resolution that it is the sense and the responsibility of the American Congress to be for the freedom of everybody, they could hardly prosecute vigorously a war in the name of freedom.

Now, as an exsoldier, the single and most important thing that has not been mentioned here today specifically is this: The danger to America of something happening in Ireland as a result of the problem as it exists. There was only one pistol shot that started off World War I. One man shot another man and we had a world war. Whether that be the real reason or not I am not concerned with it. All I know is one shot started the war. That is the ostensible reason.

I have received letters just as Mr. Maguire has from Ireland every week and the prevailing sentiment among the young people in Ireland is this, that if this situation is not disposed of in an orderly, parliamentary way they are going to do what they have done for generations and that is go out with a gun. If somebody starts a war in Ireland, let nobody be fooled that that war is going to be confined to the island of Ireland. It will not be. It will spread all over. I cannot imagine how we could send money to England in the event of a war with Ireland, if that money was being used to oppress the Irish people. You say, "He is an Irishman." I am. Above that I am an

American. I am here today because I am vitally concerned with the things I have learned in the American schools, that we stand for liberty for everybody. We stand for liberty for the Irish, the Jewish people, the Arabs, for the colored people, for everybody in the whole world. How we can get up and say that and not recognize that we are today actively participating in the keeping on of the partition in Ireland is something I cannot understand.

Now Mr. O'Dwyer, the distinguished gentleman from New York, who has worked day and night for this hearing and for the abolition of partition, told you that over in Ireland right now people are getting concerned, they are getting excited, they are getting worried. They did infer that Ireland was the gateway and strategic key today to activity on our part against somebody else, against an aggressor in Europe.

If we do not get this resolution through, people will feel, "Well, we do one thing and say another." The eminent gentleman from Texas on my left, asked would it not be possible that we might be considered, the American people, as interfering in the affairs of England or a foreign government.

I say yes, to a certain extent. Then the term "logic" is used. That is a two-edged sword. I submit my logic and it is this: Interference is one thing, but if we give the money to England in the Marshall system or set-up we permit them to use that money in any way they see fit. Here is the way they see fit: They lop off \$150,000,000 every year and send it up to the North of Ireland to subsidize 33,000 armed troops, and policemen. If we are not indirectly responsible for the continuance of partition, then logic is a pseudo science. That is the fact and that is the interference.

Now, on behalf of the people whom I represent from New Jersey I would urge upon you, Mr. Chairman—I do not think you need much urging but I would urge upon you anyway for the record that when you and your committee meet together please give consideration to this. It is momentous. It is the most important thing that is happening today. We may, if we are careless, plunge the world into another war. If that is so, we will not be worrying about Ireland, nor Washington, nor any other place. We will be worrying about our continued existence. Preserving peace in Ireland will strengthen us for preserving peace in Europe.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). Thank you Mr. O'Callaghan. I want to assure you that this committee considers this proposal very, very seriously, that what you have said will be given every consideration and I am very pleased that you brought out some of the significant points which have not heretofore been mentioned. Thank you again.

Mr. O'CALLAGHAN. Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF JOHN M. COSTELLO, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE OF THE AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR AN UNDIVIDED IRELAND

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I had hoped that I would have the privilege of presenting to you at this time, Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, formerly Secretary of War and also an Ambassador of the United States, to testify before you regarding the military significance of the continuance of the partition of Ire-

land, and the importance of Ireland in the defense of Europe in the light of present day problems. Although the General had indicated his desire to attend these hearings, it became necessary for him to journey to New Mexico, where he is at present, and so it was not possible for him to be present today.

Had General Hurley testified before you, I am sure that he would have convinced you that a divided country in time of war is a military liability, especially when that country is small and an island as well. Ireland can be a strong outpost in any program we undertake for the defense of Europe, provided it becomes possible for us to welcome Ireland into the Atlantic Pact. So long as that pact requires the acceptance and recognition of the territorial integrity of the signatory nations at the time of signing, Ireland cannot join. To do so would guarantee Britain's continued dominance of the six county area for at least a period of 20 years, and possibly longer should there be any renewals of the pact in later years.

Frequently the matter of Ireland's neutrality in the last war is attempted to be used as a means of criticizing Ireland's method of cooperation in international affairs. However, it is well to note that Sweden and Switzerland remained neutral without being questioned as to their right to do so, and no demands were made that they should have joined in the war, nor are they maligned for not having done so. The United States, likewise, remained neutral until it became the victim of ruthless and violent attack at Pearl Harbor. Being the victim of such a brutal onslaught, we then had no choice but to become an active warring Nation. Ireland, however, suffered no such attack and hence was entitled to continue her neutrality throughout the war, if such was the will of the Nation. Despite much vicious propaganda, it has been conclusively proven that no aid was given to the Fascist enemies during the war, but that much benefit was derived by ourselves from Ireland's official actions and attitude throughout the war.

Propagandists from the six counties attempt to make much of the fact that a few bases were made available to United States troops in northeastern Ireland during the war, while the harbors and camp sites in the Republic were withheld. If there be any blame for this situation, I lay that directly at the feet of Great Britain and of the Government at Belfast itself. In the First World War, Ireland was given absolute promise of full home rule following the war. The right of self-determination was to be applied to Ireland and to Belgium in like manner. British perfidy ignored the wartime promises given to some 350,000 Irish volunteers, when England needed soldiers; and postwar political chicanery betrayed the 50,000 casualties that suffered and gave their all in the expectation of Irish freedom. In place of freedom Ireland was given a division of her country, and the Republic of Ireland was only established as the result of continuing guerrilla warfare on the part of the Irish against British troops, police and Government officials, who used every means conceivable to prevent the establishment of the Government following the elections of 1918 and 1920.

Little wonder that Ireland, recalling the false promises of the British Ministry of War in the First World War and the treachery of her diplomats following that war, should turn a deaf ear to Britain's proposals and worthless promises set forth as inducements to enter

this late war. The ridiculous statement has been made by Unionists of Belfast "that the whole matter of partition might have been settled now, had Ireland joined in the war." Ireland rightly ignored Britain's empty appeals and did maintain her neutrality in strict accordance with international law, preventing German, Japanese, or Italian from obtaining either information or benefit from their diplomatic representatives in Dublin, which facts have been admitted by United States authorities and conclusively proven for the sake of any who might inquire.

Ireland would have received no benefit from Britain had she participated actively in the war, and the same crowd of British sympathizers would have retained control of the six counties as they do today. Moreover, they would have retained that control in the same manner as in the past by so rigging election districts as to preclude forever any change in the dominance of the Parliament at Belfast or the local governing bodies. You have been told that districts have been gerrymandered in the most outrageous fashion. May I present to you some figures to demonstrate this fact, so that you can understand why we make the statement that no reliance can be placed in elections in the six-county area.

First, let us consider the religious division of the people there, since the religious question is so frequently assigned as a justification for the continuance of partition. I don't know what we would do in the United States if we attempted to divide the Nation on a religious basis; in fact, religion no where else has been, nor should it be, the basis of dividing and splitting up a nation. The Catholics in the six counties number 428,290. The Presbyterians number 390,931; Church of Ireland (Episcopalian), 345,474; Methodists, 55,135; and all others, 59,915.

Not all Catholics are necessarily Nationalists, although the great majority favor the union with the rest of Ireland. Likewise not all Protestants are Unionists. In fact it has been from the great body of the Presbyterians in this area that a vast number of the leaders of Irish revolts against British tyranny have developed. During the religious persecutions, the Presbyterians along with the Catholics, suffered at the hands of the intolerant British rulers of the day. It was out of this oppression that the yearning for liberty and freedom was nurtured and the great national heroes, Protestant and Catholic alike were born.

Irish patriots have always fought side by side in the countless struggles to regain freedom, and the matter of religious differences was never a hindrance to their effective cooperation any more than it is today in the free 26 counties, nor will be, when all 32 counties are united. It has only been in the present century that an effort has been made by the British politicians to arouse religious bigotry in an effort to create dissension between the people, and thus create a pseudo explanation for the existence of partition. In the creation of this dissension, the British have made use of those people in the northeast, who, in spite of a history of three centuries of living on Irish soil, have retained their British ties and sympathies.

It is this same group of British sympathizers who have been given the control of the government in the six counties, and who are fearful lest they should lose that control and dominance over all the people

resident in that area. Once established, there has been absolutely no change whatsoever in the government throughout the 30 years of its existence. There can be no change when the intolerable method of allocating votes, gerrymandering of districts and unfair distribution of seats in governmental bodies continues as the basis of the elections. Large landowners and industrialists have as many as six votes while many of the people are denied the vote entirely. The truth of gerrymandering and unfair distribution of seats can best be learned from studying the actual situation in the six counties.

Two counties are unquestionably Nationalist politically, yet the Nationalists do not control the government. These counties are Tyrone and Fermanagh. In County Fermanagh in the 1949 elections the results in the three parliamentary districts were as follows:

Enniskillen: Unionist, 5,706; Nationalist, 4,729; Unionist majority was 977.

Lisnaskea: Unionist (Sir Basil Brooke), 5,593; Nationalist, 4,173; Unionist majority, 1,420.

South: Unionist, 2,596; Nationalist (Cahir Healy), 6,680; a Nationalist majority of 4,084.

The total electorate in this county are estimated to be 32,455 Nationalists and only 25,529 Unionists, yet the Unionists elect two members to parliament as against a single member for the much larger majority of the electorate.

In the county council, the 32,455 Nationalists have seven seats, each thus represents an average of 4,636 voters; while the 25,529 Unionists elect 13 to the council, each representing thus 1,963 voters.

The poor law unions have their representation divided thus:

Enniskillen Union: 11,927 Nationalists have 11 seats, average 1,084 voters each; 10,754 Unionists have 21 seats, averaging 512 voters.

Lisnaskea Union: 13,205 Nationalists have 13 seats, averaging 1,016 voters each; 8,251 Unionists have 18 seats, averaging 458 voters each.

Irvinestown Union: 7,323 Nationalists have 8 seats, averaging 915 voters each; 6,524 Unionists have 11 seats, averaging 593 voters each.

The rural and urban district councils show the following results:

Enniskillen U. D. C.: 2,727 Nationalists have 7 seats, averaging 389 voters each; 2,156 Unionists have 14 seats, averaging 154 voters each.

Enniskillen R. D. C.: 9,200 Nationalists have 9 seats, averaging 1,022 voters each; 8,598 Unionists have 17 seats, averaging 505 voters each.

Lisnaskea rural district council: 13,205 Nationalists have 13 seats, averaging 1,015 voters each; 8,251 Unionists have 18 seats, averaging 458 voters each.

Irvinestown rural district council: 7,323 Nationalists have 8 seats, averaging 915 voters each; 6,524 Unionists have 11 seats, averaging 593 voters each.

Despite the Nationalist majority in Fermanagh the election results always produce two Unionist members of Parliament; against one Nationalist; 13 Unionists on the county council against 7 Nationalists; 50 Unionist seats on the poor law unions against 32 Nationalist; and in the rural and urban district council, the Unionists receive 60 seats as against 37 for the Nationalists.

That is the story in County Fermanagh. In County Tyrone the results are much the same. Three Nationalists are elected to Parlia-

ment and two Unionists, with an electorate which shows 73,683 Nationalists and 59,109 Unionists. In this instance the results are in keeping with the difference in political registration of the voters. The last election showed the following votes:

East: Nationalist, 7,443; Unionist, 6,122; difference, 1,321 Nationalist.

Mid: Nationalist, 8,113; Unionist, 4,018; difference, 4,095 Nationalist.

North: Nationalist, 6,728; Unionist, 8,017; difference, 1,289 Unionist.

South: Nationalist, 5,630; Unionist, 8,855; difference, 3,225, Unionist.

West: Nationalist, 7,859; Unionist, 5,396; difference, 2,463, Nationalist.

When one looks at the local governing bodies the results are far from being in keeping with the difference in partly affiliation of the voters. Look at the results attained through the gerrymandering of districts.

County council: 73,683, Nationalists have 11 seats, averaging 6,698 voters each; 59,109 Unionists have 16 seats, averaging 3,694 voters each.

THE POOR LAW UNIONS

Omagh Union: 23,332 Nationalists have 19 seats, averaging 1,228 voters each; 14,281 Unionists have 22 seats averaging 694 voters each.

Dungannon Union: 14,895 Nationalists have 7 seats, averaging 2,128 voters each; 13,717 Unionists have 15 seats, averaging 914 voters each.

Cookstown Union: 10,689 Nationalists have 7 seats, averaging 1,527 voters; 10,020 Unionists have 12 seats, averaging 835 voters.

Strabane Union: 13,328 Nationalists have 12 seats, averaging 1,110 voters; 9,868 Unionists have 22 seats, averaging 448 voters.

Clogher Union: 6,281 Nationalists have 5 seats, averaging 1,256 voters; 6,231 Unionists have 13 seats, averaging 597 voters.

Castlederg Union: 5,158 Nationalists have 6 seats, averaging 859 voters; 4,990 Unionists have 16 seats, averaging 311 voters.

RURAL AND URBAN DISTRICT COUNCILS

Omagh rural district council: 20,173 Nationalists have 18 seats, averaging 1,120 voters; 12,317 Unionists have 21 seats, averaging 586 voters each.

Strabane rural district council: 9,522 Nationalists have 8 seats, averaging 1,617 voters; 8,518 Unionists have 20 seats, averaging 426 voters.

Dungannon rural district council: 12,936 Nationalists have 8 seats, averaging 1,617 voters; 11,914 Unionists have 13 seats, averaging 916 voters.

Cookstown rural district council: 9,157 Nationalists have 7 seats, averaging 1,308 voters; 7,999 Unionists have 9 seats, averaging 888 voters each.

Castlederg rural district council: 5,158 Nationalists have 6 seats, averaging 859 voters; 4,990 Unionists have 16 seats, averaging 312 voters.

Clogher rural district council: 6,281 Nationalists have 5 seats, averaging 1,256 voters; 6,231 Unionists have 13 seats, averaging 483 voters each.

Omagh urban district council: 3,159 Nationalists have 9 seats, averaging 351 voters; 1,964 Unionists have 12 seats, averaging 163 voters.

Strabane urban district council: 3,806 Nationalists have 9 seats, averaging 423 voters; 1,350 Unionists have 3 seats, averaging 450 voters.¹

Cookstown urban district council: 1,532 Nationalists have no seats; 2,021 Unionists have 12 seats, averaging 168 voters.

Dungannon urban district council: 1,959 Nationalists have 7 seats, averaging 280 voters; 1,803 Unionists have 14 seats, averaging 128 voters.

In this fashion the local governing bodies are controlled by the minority in County Tyrone: 73,683 Nationalists have 11 seats on the county council, while 59,109 Unionists occupy 16. The Nationalists have 56 seats on the Poor Law Unions as against 100 for the Unionists. On the rural and urban councils, the Nationalists get 85 seats, while the Unionists control 125.

The worst example of deliberate connivance in an effort to gain control of an area exists in Derry City (Londonderry), where one-fourth of the city district was excluded from the city and added to the District of Foyle. Foyle to the west adjoining Donegal is largely Nationalist, and so this preponderantly Nationalist area of the city was added to Foyle. Then to augment the Unionist total in the city district, a large area of the county to the east was added, by means of a squirming, meandering line, which ran as much as 8 miles into the county, in order to encompass as many Unionist landowners as was possible. In this way the Unionists gained control of the parliamentary representation of the city.

In 1920 the population of Derry City was divided between 6,868 Nationalists and 6,340 Unionists, who elected respectively 21 Nationalists and 19 Unionists to the corporation council under the system of proportional representation. Today the membership of the corporation has been reduced to 20 seats, and these are divided into 8 Nationalists and 12 Unionists, whereas the electorate has changed so that it now consists of 9,691 Nationalists and only 7,444 Unionists. Here are the figures: North ward: Nationalists, 2,021; Unionists, 3,515; 8 representatives elected. South ward: Nationalists, 6,227; Unionists, 1,590; 8 representatives elected. Waterside ward: Nationalists, 1,443; Unionists, 2,339; 4 representatives elected. Thus Derry City with 29,000 Nationalists within its confines and only 18,000 Unionists, has been carved up in such fashion as to exclude a large bulk of Nationalist votes and include known Unionist votes to defeat the will of the people in an apparently democratic form of election.

I would like to read from some recent letters addressed to Brig. Gen. Dorman O'Gowan, who served 32 years in the British Army, and who is at present visiting in the United States, addressing public gatherings and informing his audiences regarding the facts of misrule in the six-county area. The first of these is dated April 20, 1950, and reads in part as follows:

I have been asked to convey to you the following resolution from a meeting of the seven anti-Partitionist members of the Enniskillen Borough Council:

"The seven anti-Partitionist members of the Enniskillen Borough Council, representing the majority of the people of Enniskillen, wish to congratulate you upon the magnificent work you are doing for Ireland during your American tour.

¹ This is the single instance where the minority does not control.

"Tell American Democrats how we anti-Partitionists had a majority of local government votes, but how the Brooke party gerrymandered our town to snatch control and how, by denial of houses and jobs to us anti-Partitionists, and by the creation of an undemocratic property franchise, they have built up an artificial Brooke majority, giving them 14 representatives on the borough council, while we have only 7, although we still have a substantial majority of the population."

This letter is signed by Charles McKeown, alderman of Enniskillen Borough Council.

A letter dated April 21, 1950, also addressed to Brigadier O'Gowan, reads in part as follows:

Will you see that this challenge is publicly issued in our name to Sir Basil Brooke in the United States, so that he may be further exposed? We hereby challenge him to hold a plebiscite of his native country of Fermanagh on the issue of whether it wants to join Free Ireland or to remain in this quisling state?

We have no fear of the result, but we know Brooke will not dare to accept, because both he and we have the figures of the last six county elections held here, in February last year. These figures showed 15,382 electors voted for freedom, and 13,895 voted to remain British puppets.

And these figures were attained in spite of the most shocking efforts of the Brooke party to liquidate (liquidate is the Brooke party word) our anti-Partitionist majority.

In spite of these figures, the Brooke party were able to elect two members to Parliament, one of those Brooke himself; while we anti-Partitionists could only elect one, Mr. Cahir Healy, member of Parliament. That is how gerrymandering works in County Fermanagh, Sir Basil Brooke's native county, where his home is situated.

Further, in population there are, in round figures, 32,000 anti-Partitionists in County Fermanagh, and 24,000 Brooke party people; yet on Fermanagh County Council, the chief local authority, we anti-Partitionists can elect only 6 representatives (the 6 representatives who are sending you this letter), while the Brooke party have 18 representatives—another result of Brooke party gerrymandering.

Keep on exposing Brooke and his quisling party before the American people. Show freedom-loving Americans what "democracy" means in this quisling state.

The above letter is signed by Hugh McMahan, county councillor of County Fermanagh in behalf of the 6 anti-Partitionist members of the county council.

The third communication from which I wish to quote is from a letter by Cahir Healy, member of the Imperial Parliament (London) for the District of Fermanagh and South Tyrone, as well as the member of the Northern Parliament (at Stormont, Belfast) for South Fermanagh. It reads:

As representing 32,188 voters in Fermanagh and South Tyrone, and as the member of Parliament for Sir Basil Brooke's home constituency to the Imperial Parliament, I am asked to offer our congratulations upon the fine work you are doing in the United States of America in enlightening American people on the issue of mutilation of the Irish Nation.

Fermanagh and South Tyrone with mid-Ulster comprise one-third of the area known as Northern Ireland. In the recent Parliamentary election that area returned two anti-Partitionists members of Parliament to Westminster. Mr. Brooke's party could return none.

The Northern Government will not permit Nationalists to march on any street inside the walls of Derry City. Yet the last register of voters shows (1949—since the late elections):

North ward: 3,277 Nationalists; 4,900 Unionists.

South ward: 11,233 Nationalists; 2,302 Unionists.

Waterside: 2,640 Nationalists; 3,891 Unionists.

Total: 17,150 Nationalists; 11,093 Unionists.

The south ward, which contains more Nationalists than there are Unionist voters in the entire city, return 8 representatives to the corporation but the

other two wards send 12 Unionists there. That is the effect of gerrymandering the electoral areas.

The Northern Government have a Franchise Act which enables persons or companies with £60 of valuation to exercise six votes, whilst denying any vote to a family living in part of a house which is not rated (for taxation) separately. This is democracy as exercised in the six counties. They give votes to bullocks and bricks but deny it to working people who cannot find houses.

This letter is signed by Cahir Healy, M. P.

I have read from these letters to emphasize the fact that the election situation of which I have spoken continues as of today, exactly as it has through the 30 years during which the current Government has operated. Moreover, I wished to call your attention to the requirements of the election laws in Northern Ireland, whereby a person or company having a tax valuation of £60 is able to cast a total of six votes, whereas the ordinary individual of lesser wealth casts but one vote. Moreover any person who is not a taxed property owner enjoys no electoral rights.

In order to take advantage of these election requirements, Sir Basil very hastily called for an election in February of 1949, ahead of what would have been the regular period for a new election. The reason was that he wished to take advantage of the old voters register, thus denying the vote to all persons who had moved their residence within the prior 3 years, and likewise to prevent the returning soldiers to cast a vote, since they were unable to find homes of their own due to the housing shortage, which continues in Northern Ireland as elsewhere. The new register of voters would have been in effect on April 1, 1949.

By comparing the figures given by Mr. Healy, those of the new register, with those I have cited above, from the old register, one understands why the election was called for fear that the increases in voters might change the results in some districts. Now however they have time to study the new register and make the new gerrymandering changes where needed to guarantee the continued control by the Unionists throughout the entire six-county area.

If these results can be obtained in sections where the Nationalists have such clear majorities, it is easy to understand how control in other areas can be maintained with even greater ease. These nefarious practices make a mockery of democracy and render futile the election results obtained at the polls. Because of these conditions, we contend that no election in the six counties is representative of the voice of the people nor an expression of the popular will. Instead it is a demonstration of the Hitlerian method of iron-clad control which the puppet regime in Belfast has foisted upon the area so as to entrench themselves permanently in power.

Despite this situation, the British Labor government only last year attempted to wash their hands of the question of partition, by passing a new act of Parliament, declaring that they recognized the existing boundary and the six counties as a part of Great Britain, until the Parliament of the six counties should declare otherwise! Britain created partition and now like Pilate they profess that the determination of the guilt rests with the Parliament of Belfast—not with the people in a plebiscite, although this was suggested as an amendment in London, but rejected by the Parliament. No puppet Parliament, created by rigged elections is going to disfranchise itself and thus lose to itself and the wealthy landowners and industrialists whose cause it serves the domination and control of the land over which they have been given jurisdiction by the acts of the London Parliament, and is maintained by the presence of British troops on its soil and

a civilian body of armed guards who are protected in their illegal acts under the provisions of the Special Powers Act.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the entire provisions of the Civil Authorities (Special Powers) Act (Northern Ireland), 1933, together with its 25 pages of regulations, in order to show just how tyrannical are its provisions, included in this hearing. However, I realize that would be asking too much. But I do hope that the members of this committee will read at least some of those provisions, in order to understand just how the civil rights of a people can be destroyed and taken away, until all liberty is but a whim of the ruling power.

Throughout the year 1935, a Commission of Inquiry, sent by the British National Council for Civil Liberties, made a thorough study of the government in the six counties. The report made by these Englishmen gives a factual account of their impressions as to the government in the six counties and the operation of the Special Powers Act. The government of 1935 is the same as that of 1920 and that of 1950. An item in the New York Times of Sunday, May 24, 1936, gives the story of the report of this commission. It reads as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sunday, May 24, 1936]

REGIME AT BELFAST HELD DICTATORSHIP—COMMISSION ON CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSAILS THE SUPPRESSION OF REPRESENTATIVE RULE—PRIVATE COURTS SCORED—DOMINATION OF ONE PARTICULAR POLITICAL FACTION ATTACKED AS UN-BRITISH IN PRINCIPLE

[Wireless to the New York Times]

DUBLIN, May 23.—A scathing denunciation of the methods of the Government of North Ireland is embodied in a report just issued by a Commission of Inquiry appointed by the British National Council for Civil Liberties. The report follows an investigation carried out by the commission in a six-county area during the past year.

Having examined closely into the operation of special powers and acts in Northern Ireland and having taken evidence in both Belfast and the House of Commons in London, the commission, of which the late Commander Edward Digby, attorney, was the chairman, came to the conclusion that the conditions of government obtaining in North Ireland are parallel only by the continental dictatorships.

"The existing conditions of rule," says the report, "secured by the suppression of representative government and by the abrogation of the rule of law and the liberty of a subject cannot be described otherwise than as totally un-British."

The Northern Government, which is Protestant in personnel, has according to the report, made little use of the drastic dictatorial power conferred upon itself against the Orangemen and their sympathizers, but has used these powers "toward securing the domination of one particular political faction and, at the same time, curtailing the lawful activities of its opponents."

The powers referred to give unlimited authority to the police to make arrests without warrants, to search persons, premises and vehicles, to seize property, and to detain persons indefinitely.

The commission particularly comments upon the creation of private tribunals under which the resident magistrate may examine any person in camera, and the refusal to answer any question, even where it may incriminate the person interrogated, is in itself a punishable offense.

HELD CONTRARY TO LAW

This last provision, the commission observes, contravenes the basic principles of English criminal law.

"Whereas formerly," says the report, "some balance was present in the appointments of resident magistrates between the two leading religious sects, today 11 officials number among them but 1 Roman Catholic. More than half the resident magistrates are now former police or former military officers."

According to the last census, the population of Northern Ireland comprised 420,428 Catholics, 393,374 Presbyterians, and 338,724 Protestant Episcopalians.

On the question of maltreatment of prisoners, the commission says that from the material before it there is now no general physical ill treatment of prisoners. Dealing with interrogations, the commission says that cases were reported to it in which boys and young persons were subjected to interrogations by the police. The method of rounding up practiced in North Ireland, the report continues, does not differ from similar practices carried out in countries under Fascist rule.

Late at night or in the early hours of the morning armed police in protected lorries swoop down upon a selected district and proceed to enter and search houses without a warrant, rousing the inhabitants of the area and frequently accompanying the search with brutality and damage to property, it is said.

On the political aspect the report says: "There is a large body of opinion in six counties in favor of a united Ireland not confined to those professing the Roman Catholic faith."

"This opinion," the report states, "tends to find an outlet particularly in Belfast in the secret support of republicanism. Special powers are freely employed by the Government against persons known or suspected to entertain republican sympathies whether or not they are members of an organization such as the Irish Republican Army proclaimed under the Special Powers Acts."

CURB PUT ON CANDIDATES

"These powers have, in fact, been so used as to deprive the republican movement of all lawful modes of conducting propaganda or engaging in legitimate political activity. Not only are its newspapers, emblems, colors, and associations proscribed, its supporters intimidated or penalized, but through recent changes in the electoral law its candidates are prevented from standing for election."

Concluding, the report says: "It is sad that in the guise of temporary emergency legislation there should be created under the shadow of the British Constitution a permanent machine of dictatorship—a standing temptation to whatever intolerant or bigoted section may attain power to abuse its authority at the expense of the people it rules."

H. G. Wells, commenting on the commission's findings, said:

"The report speaks for itself. Don't ask my opinion on it, read it—if you care for human freedom and dignity under the British flag—and form your own conclusions."

The London News Chronicle states that the report is of such nature that "it will almost certainly engage the attention of the British Parliament."

The conditions under which Catholics live in Northern Ireland received much prominence last year when, following the riots in July, the Reverend Dr. MacGeean, Catholic Bishop of Belfast, addressed a strong appeal to Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin requesting the British Government to inquire into affairs in the six counties. Mr. Baldwin did not accede to the Bishop's request, but the National Council for Civil Liberties, composed of prominent British university people, writers and liberal thinkers, decided to take action on its own initiative.

It is interesting to note that in the six counties, where the Catholic population totals 33 percent of the people, they only receive 4 percent of the Government payroll. From this it is self-evident that the minority group within the six counties is thoroughly discriminated against and is denied their proportionate share in the administration of the Government. Attempts are likewise frequently made to exercise the same unfair discrimination in the matter of nongovernmental employment.

By way of contrast in the free Republic of Ireland, where the Protestants number but 6.6 percent of the total population, they nevertheless hold nearly a third of the governmental offices. The same situation holds true throughout the economic field, where the Protestants own 26 percent of the farms over 200 acres in size; form 32.5 percent of all industrial employers; form 25 percent of the professional men, lawyers, doctors, civil engineers, etc.; are 50 percent of the heads of commercial business; are 33.59 percent of the bank clerks; are 45 percent of bank officials, other than clerks; are 30 percent of the commercial travelers and agents; are 36.9 percent of the shipping clerks; are 33 percent of the brewery clerks; and are 33.9 percent of the insurance clerks.

It is recognized and admitted, and the above figures clearly prove, that there has been no discrimination of any kind against the minority groups in the Republic of Ireland. On the contrary they have been shown a definite preferment far beyond what their numerical strength would justify. With the unification of all Ireland, the same constitution, which now protects the minority in the enjoyment of their civil and religious rights in the 26 counties, would also protect the same minority in the 6 counties. Once united, the cause of dissension would be eliminated. With the British dominance removed, no more would

British politicians see to it that the various groups in the 6 counties were pitted against one another. Instead they would live in peace and harmony as they have always done, until alien pressures have fomented strife and discord, and so created and aroused the passion of intolerance and bigotry.

In the interests of the restoration of the wrongfully separated territory, of the establishment of a unified nation, and of the creation of a strong bulwark as the northwestern outpost in the line of Atlantic defense, your committee should consider favorably the Fogarty resolution, which is before you. In reporting this resolution to the floor of the House, you will be expressing the consistent belief of the American people in the rights of small nations to self-determination of their form of government and be protesting against aggression on the part of any government against another, especially a smaller and weaker government. I urge your favorable consideration of House Resolution 270.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the following statements may be inserted at this point in the record: The statement of Mr. Robert Emmet O'Malley, of Kansas City, Mo.; the statement of Mr. Sean O'Sullivan, of Butte, Mont.; the resolution of the County Corkmen's B. P. and P. Association, of Bayonne, N. J.; the resolution of the Bayonne Celtic Democratic Club, Inc., of New Jersey; the resolution of the County Donegal's Men's Association, Inc., of Bayonne, N. J.; and the statement of Mr. Neil Griffin, of Waterbury, Conn., together with the resolution of the CIO of Connecticut.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT EMMET O'MALLEY, KANSAS CITY, MO.

KANSAS CITY, Mo. April 25, 1950.

Re House Resolution 270.

HON. JOHN KEE,

Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. CHAIRMAN and MEMBERS of the COMMITTEE: I deeply regret my inability to join my fellow workers of more than 30 years, who will appear before you, in the long struggle to preserve American independence and aid in the liberation of Ireland, India, and other countries struggling to achieve independence.

Imperialism is the mother of socialism, communism, nazism, and fascism. Socialism rules in England. Imperialism has a puppet military government in the northeast corner of Ireland, the sole support of which comes from bond-buying tax-paying Americans. If our country would withdraw as the lone financial backer of that antiquated system, fanatical Lord Basil Brooke and his Crown-worshipping followers would speedily evaporate.

The unspeakable Black and Tan invasion in Ireland 2 years following the First World War, in which American blood was copiously shed and American money was lavishly spent to make the world safe for democracy, is a reminder that the leopard does not change its spots.

For more than a half century our country has been swayed if not controlled by Britain, with its "English-Speaking Union," Carnegie Foundation, and other Anglophobia, modern Tory organizations, and I think a not only uninformed but misinformed America has suffered almost irretrievable loss therefrom.

The Socialist Government of England has recognized communism in China, and doubtless Uncle Sam will be asked to finance this recent British project.

Add to the foregoing the almost unbelievable rape of Poland, we wonder if these outrages are proof of democracy in action, or is it hypocrisy gone berserk? I am sure that freedom-loving Americans, without exception, want our beloved country to refuse financial and moral support to the potential enemies of world peace. If we will merely be neutral in the Irish situation, real Irishmen, Protestant and Catholic, North and South, will vote overwhelmingly for a united Ireland under one republic, patterned after our own, which could not

have been erected had the Colonies allowed Nathan Hale's red-coated executioners to remain or occupy one county, to say nothing of six, in Massachusetts or any part of American soil.

It is my fervent and confident hope that our country will retain its world prestige and confidence and that in this year of our Lord 1950, the United States of America will get credit down through world history for being responsible, in a peaceful way, for the writing of Robert Emmet's epitaph.

Again expressing my regrets that I cannot appear before you to speak, if that privilege were granted, in support of the highly meritorious Fogarty resolution, I am,

Yours very truly,

ROBERT EMMET O'MALLEY.

STATEMENT OF SEAN O'SULLIVAN, BUTTE, MONT.

Gentlemen, over a long period of years I have taken a most active part in Irish affairs, and so I appreciate very much this opportunity to present to you my considered views on certain aspects of this question of partition in little Ireland.

It should be appreciated that this matter of restoring the historical unity of Ireland is not a question of sentiment, though it is a question of justice. But it is not only a matter of justice, it is one of necessity. Before 1918 no one in their senses would have thought fit to attempt to govern so small an island, which is so natural a unit of government, by means of two separate governments in the island and a third external government. Until then, although Ireland was governed from London, it was governed through one central mechanism. It stands to reason that this in itself makes for efficiency in the fields of economics and defense and, indeed, makes for a stronger framework of society.

For 300 years Ireland has been afflicted with a minority problem. It is unfortunate that the minority has been concentrated in the main around the industrial city of Belfast in the northeast corner. This made it easy for the English to justify the separation of two-thirds of the northern province of Ulster from the rest of Ireland in order to retain economic and strategical control of a valuable portion of the territory of Ireland. The excuse for this imperial high-handedness was the protection of this minority 20 percent of the population, originally of Anglo-Scottish extraction. The mechanism was to draw the Anglo-Irish border, without the consent of the Irish people, on the line where numerically the minority would remain a permanent majority. The practical and important problem created by this 25-year-old stupidity is that Ireland as a whole is prevented at this critical period from achieving the proper strategical and economic coordination necessary for her defense in the event of war and for her full economic contribution to European recovery. America is at the moment subsidizing this inefficient set-up. It is essential that this problem be approached in the light of this time and the necessities of this time. It is as practical and as important and as cold-blooded a problem as the necessity which compelled the American people to establish the State of Israel, even in defiance of British financial and strategical requirements in the Middle East.

In Northern Ireland the Government in London employs the colonial element in the population as its agents for controlling local affairs in the imperial interest, while London retains direct control over defense, foreign affairs, and taxation, thus justifying the presence of representatives in the English Parliament from the minority element in Ireland, the artificial majority in Northern Ireland. The practical problem is to persuade the English to relinquish control over these major items of government, thus breaking the representative link between Northern Ireland and Britain and compelling the minority around Belfast to come to terms with the over-all majority in Ireland. This to Britain should be a minor concession in the over-all interests of Ireland's full participation in the Atlantic Pact and in the economic restoration of Europe.

There is, however, one other aspect which no well-informed American can overlook. Within the territory which the English Government still controls in Ireland a colonial element of 800,000 strong dominates an Irish element 500,000 strong. Since the fundamental issue concerns the very existence of this state of affairs, it is impossible that this control be exercised without the suppression of many of the normal safeguards of a democratic society. There is ample evidence (in fact, the Prime Minister of Ireland admitted at Philadelphia the

full facts of the case) that the British-sponsored Government of Northern Ireland is oppressive and undemocratic. The Irish people are well aware of this fact and no Irish government which attempted to come to terms with England so long as England controls the northeast corner of the island, could hope to stay in office for 24 hours. I believe that my contention that this problem is a modern problem demanding the urgent consideration of all democratic Americans, in the interest of America and of humanity, is fully justified. I also believe that so soon as the American people, through their Government, direct the attention of the British people to the abuses, the inefficiencies, and the dangers inherent in this situation, facts which their press conceal from them now, it will not be difficult to bring Ireland into full economic and strategical efficiency by restoring the area under the rule from London to the control of an all-Irish government.

RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY CORKMEN'S B. P. AND P. ASSOCIATION, BAYONNE, N. J.,
MAY 1, 1950

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The following is a copy of a resolution adopted by our organization:

"Whereas the County Corkmen's B. P. and P. Association of Bayonne, N. J., is a fraternal corporation organized under the laws of the State of New Jersey; and

"Whereas the County Corkmen's B. P. and P. Association of Bayonne, N. J., is in full sympathy with the existence of democracy throughout the entire world, and has always been proud of the stand taken by the United States of America in protecting the rights of small nations, and is deeply conscious of the important part played by the Irish people in the foundation of the American Republic; and

"Whereas House Resolution 270 introduced by Hon. John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, proposes that it be the sense of the House of Representatives of the United States that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland; and

"Whereas the County Corkmen's B. P. and P. Association of Bayonne, N. J., is in full accord with the Fogarty resolution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the County Corkmen's B. P. and P. Association of Bayonne, N. J., urge favorable action on the Fogarty resolution by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States House of Representatives."

Sincerely,

CORNELIUS COLLINS, *President.*

RESOLUTION OF THE BAYONNE CELTIC DEMOCRATIC CLUB, INC., BAYONNE, N. J.,
MAY 2, 1950

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The following is a copy of a resolution adopted by our organization:

"Whereas the Bayonne Celtic Democratic Club, Inc., of Bayonne, N. J., is a fraternal corporation organized under the laws of the State of New Jersey; and

"Whereas the Celtic Democratic Club, Inc., of Bayonne, N. J., is in full sympathy with the existence of democracy throughout the entire world, and has always been proud of the stand taken by the United States of America in protecting the rights of small nations, and is deeply conscious of the important part played by the Irish people in the foundation of the American Republic; and

"Whereas House Resolution 270 introduced by Hon. John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, proposes that it be the sense of the House of Representatives of the United States that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland; and

"Whereas the Celtic Democratic Club, Inc., of Bayonne, N. J., is in full accord with the Fogarty resolution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Celtic Democratic Club, Inc., of Bayonne, N. J., urge favorable action on the Fogarty resolution by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States House of Representatives."

Sincerely,

JOHN MOONEY, *President.*

RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY DONEGAL MEN'S ASSOCIATION, INC., BAYONNE, N. J.,
MAY 3, 1950

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The following is a copy of a resolution adopted by our organization:

"Whereas the County Donegal Men's Association, Inc., of Bayonne, N. J., is a fraternal corporation organized under the laws of the State of New Jersey; and

"Whereas the County Donegal Men's Association, Inc., of Bayonne, N. J., is in full sympathy with the existence of democracy throughout the entire world, and has always been proud of the stand taken by the United States of America in protecting the rights of small nations, and is deeply conscious of the important part played by the Irish people in the foundation of the American Republic; and

"Whereas House Resolution 270 introduced by Hon. John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, proposes that it be the sense of the House of Representatives of the United States that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland; and

"Whereas the County Donegal Men's Association, Inc., of Bayonne, N. J., is in full accord with the Fogarty resolution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the County Donegal Men's Association, Inc., of Bayonne, N. J., urge favorable action on the Fogarty resolution by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States House of Representatives."

Sincerely,

JOHN D. GALLAGHER, *President.*

STATEMENT OF NEIL GRIFFIN, REPRESENTATIVE OF THE WATERBURY CHAPTER OF THE
AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR AN UNDIVIDED IRELAND

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Neil Griffin, 141 Scovill Street, Waterbury, Conn. I appear as the representative of the Waterbury chapter of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, and wish to express to you in its behalf our profound interest in the favorable consideration of the Fogarty resolution, House Resolution 270.

Nowhere else in history can one find a nation which has struggled so long and so valiantly to throw off the shackles of an invader as have the Irish people for nearly eight full centuries. Without any bitterness in their hearts for the British people, but with a deep and abiding resentment of the tyranny of the British rulers, who have oppressed them, the Irish have continuously and earnestly fought to regain their ancient freedom and their God-given right to liberty.

Heroic figures have risen in each generation to champion the cause of the Irish Nation and to lead the people step by step on the road to independence. Civil rights have slowly been won and unjust taxation gradually wiped out. Oppressive land laws were finally eliminated and unjust discrimination against the Irish people was finally ended. All these things were accomplished by great leaders from north and south, by Protestant patriots from Ulster as much as by Catholic leaders from other sections.

The Irish people were inclined to expect great things, when Gladstone espoused the cause of home rule for Ireland, and great was their disappointment when the Liberal Party in England was sent to defeat on this very issue. New hopes were aroused when the Liberals again, now under Asquith, undertook to effectuate the home-rule policy for Ireland only to be stayed in their efforts by

the advent of the First World War. This was followed by the bitterest irony of all, when the Parliament of Westminster proceeded to partition their country and create disunity for the first time in the land by means of the Government of Ireland Act of 1920.

For 30 years now, the Irish people have seen their country split in two and with each passing year have protested more strongly against the continuance of this unjustifiable division of their country and their nation. With the advent of a Labor Government in Britain it was thought that at last, a so-called people's government, would surely make right the wrong inflicted upon Ireland by the Conservative Party 30 years ago. Instead they were utterly amazed to find the Labor Party making an attempt to strengthen the control of the ultra-conservative Unionists in the six counties by the passage of a new act to Parliament, which left the matter of partition, as far as Britain was concerned, in the hands of the controlled Unionist Parliament at Belfast. No worse reversal of form or greater betrayal of principles has yet been witnessed, than this latest perfidy on the part of British politicians in an effort to retain their empire and force the imperial will upon an alien people.

Little wonder that this performance on the part of a government, directed and controlled by the Labor Party in England, should raise a storm of protest amongst laboring groups in the United States. One is not surprised to find various labor organizations protesting this new denial of the cause of freedom and the rights of self-government for the people of Ireland. As a part of my statement I desire to include the resolution which was adopted by the CIO of Connecticut at their annual State convention, held in New Haven, Conn., in January of this year, and also to express my appreciation to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for making it possible to present this testimony at this hearing today.

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT THE ANNUAL STATE CONVENTION OF THE CIO OF CONNECTICUT HELD AT NEW HAVEN, CONN., JANUARY 13 TO 15, 1950

RESOLUTION ON THE PARTITION OF IRELAND

Whereas there still exist throughout the world governments that do not recognize the rights of people in regard to their majority rights of free self-government; and

Whereas there is a government in Northern Ireland supported by a foreign power and being perpetuated in power by the denial of franchise to its citizens by the rankest sort of gerrymandering of districts; and

Whereas the Stormont Government in Northern Ireland is breeding and fostering bigotry which tends to destroy the unity of a race of people; and

Whereas the Irish people have contributed, over the centuries, aid to the freedom of oppressed people; and

Whereas organized labor has always raised its voice to espouse the cause of freedom and the rights of government that is of, for, and by all its people; and

Whereas the partition in Ireland is not a healthy or natural condition; and
Whereas the present government in Great Britain is controlled by the Labor Party: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we record ourselves against the continuation of the partition dividing all of the people of Ireland and call upon the President of the United States, the State Department, the Congress of the United States and our trade-union brothers within the government of Great Britain to do all in their power to end once and for all this unjust condition to the end that the government of Eire will truly represent all its people within its natural borders so that she may take her rightful place among the family of nations.

Mr. COSTELLO. I am going to make a suggestion that I think might help to expedite the hearing. We have been here and have been received very graciously for 4½ hours. There are a number of people present who have prepared statements. I do not think it would be necessary for them to read them or present them in that manner. I think if we would have them come forward and identify themselves to the reporter and give those statements to the reporter, I think it would help to expedite our procedure at this time and I make that suggestion to you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Peter Toal, for example, has a statement, and if he would rise, identify himself and present his statement, others might do the same and those who have statements could place them in the record at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). Is that satisfactory, Mr. Toal?

Mr. TOAL. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). Will you give your name and organization and then give the reporter your statement?

STATEMENT OF PETER TOAL, MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR AN UNDIVIDED IRELAND, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. TOAL. Yes. My name is Peter Toal. I am a member of the executive committee of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, New York City.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Peter Toal is as follows:)

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Peter Toal. I am a businessman, having a fleet of taxicabs in New York City, and have been a resident there for 24 years.

My ancestral home, where I was born, is in County Tyrone, Ireland. Tyrone is a part of occupied Ireland. By this I mean that County Tyrone is held with force by British troops and secret police against the wishes of the people of Tyrone.

I am sorry to say that my home is located in a "Police State," and that my friends and neighbors are denied their civil rights by the British Government through the machinery of a puppet government in Belfast.

Unfortunately, this puppet government is being subsidized by United States dollars which are being sent to Britain under the Marshall plan and then transferred by Britain to Belfast for the purpose of maintaining that "Police State."

It grieves me to have to say that American money is being used to deny democratic rights and civil liberties to the freedom-loving people of occupied Ireland.

Gentlemen, for your consideration I offer a speech which describes the situation in occupied Ireland more eloquently than I could attempt to describe it.

I ask your permission to have it inserted in the record.

Gentlemen, it gives me great pleasure to present to you a speech delivered by Edward J. Flynn at a dinner in his honor given by the Bronx Zionist Organization on October 27, 1949, at the Commodore Hotel.

SPEECH BY EDWARD J. FLYNN, OCTOBER 27, 1949

I have tried, in my own way, to work for the establishment of the State of Israel. The thought that I may have been of some small help in the achievement of that goal is a source of great satisfaction to me. The recognition, by the world, of the independent State of Israel is an historical accomplishment. It was realized against great odds and stands as a proof that courage and determination, when joined with a just cause, arouse the sympathy and help of right-thinking peoples and nations.

Being of Irish descent, I was in a position to understand the desire of Jews everywhere to accomplish the final fulfillment of centuries of struggle because the parallel which exists between the long and tragic history of both the Jews and Irish needs no new emphasis. Now that the dream of an independent State of Israel has been realized, I think it is not amiss if I say a few words about the fight of the Irish people against the partition of their country, imposed upon them by Britain. Little has been said in the past few years about this injustice to Ireland and most people have assumed that the establishment of the Republic of Ireland in 1920 was the achievement that has been sought. In this they have been mistaken because, unfortunately, not enough people are aware of the manner in which Britain, in seeming to grant Irish independence, created within the borders of the island its own separate principality.

For more than 2,000 years Ireland was one nation whose boundaries were fixed by the sea. This unity survived the tides of invasion. The changes of the

centuries left this unity untouched. Ireland then meant, and still means, the whole of the island and nothing less.

When, in 1918, by a free vote of the vast majority of its inhabitants, Ireland declared itself a free nation, it declared for freedom not only of a part of Ireland, but all of it. Just as Britain, in the struggle for realization of its true boundaries, sought at every opportunity to limit these borders, so it has, by the same strategic means of playing peoples and religions against other peoples and religions, accomplished the partition of Ireland. That partition was intended, as was the partition of Israel, to promote perpetual friction and dissension.

In 1919, when the freely elected representatives of the Irish people gathered together and declared their existence as a nation, the tides of patriotism were so compelling that Britain was forced to recognize them. This she did reluctantly, after failing, by sheer armed might, to subdue the manifest will of the great majority of the people. When it was apparent that Ireland would achieve its independence, forces were set to work to create disunity. Northern Ireland was seized upon as a logical toehold because of the preponderance of Protestants in the cities of Derry and Belfast and a schism was sought to be created on religious lines. Hatred was incited and rioting and destruction, that could have been halted by the British, were permitted to continue unchecked. We all remember similar tactics in Israel. The same devious pattern is unmistakable. Having carefully nurtured and created this unhealthy atmosphere, the time was deemed ripe to thwart the expressed will of Ireland. And with this intent in mind, a bill was introduced in the British Parliament which, while it purported to recognize Irish independence, at the same time severed six counties from the rest of Ireland and set them up as a separate political entity. Not one Irishman in the British Parliament voted in favor of the bill. Although some of the Irish members opposed separation from Britain, none of them favored dismemberment of Ireland. But the bill was passed and partition was imposed on the Irish people. A piece of Irish soil was reserved for domination by an alien power.

The portion of Ireland which Britain partitioned and still retains, had in it not only large industries, the absence of which would seriously impair Ireland's ability to exist as a well rounded economic unit, but also contained shrines of historic importance to the Irish. All of this was wrested from Ireland by the same type of thinking that motivates the attempts to exclude from Israel areas to which it is historically and geographically entitled.

The six counties of Ireland, selected by Britain to remain under its control have no geographical reason for being a separate unit. Their borders are completely artificial and are devoid of natural boundaries. The area is referred to as Northern Ireland or Ulster, although it is neither the most northerly part of Ireland nor the historic province of Ulster. It is called Protestant Ireland although the most numerous religious group is Catholic. It is purely and simply an area that was selected because it contained the greatest concentration of people who favored union with England, although the majority of the people in four of the six counties favored joinder with the State of Ireland.

However, by careful arrangement of the electoral areas in the six counties, this majority is so divided that the representatives favoring unity with England must necessarily be elected. It is an example of gerrymandering at its very worst. One county, Fermanagh, is divided into three constituencies. In the 1949 elections 16,000 voters favoring joinder with Ireland elected one member to Parliament while 14,000 voters favoring union with England elected 2 members. That is how democracy works in the six counties.

The political nuances and stratagems are particularly revealing when it is discovered that in an act of Parliament passed by Britain in this year we find that partition must continue unless the principality, as constituted, itself votes favorably for joinder with the rest of Ireland. Since this cannot be accomplished because of the manner in which the districts have been established, the British objective of partition necessarily will continue.

Religious discrimination is rampant in the six counties. Catholics are excluded from state employment as a matter of policy. This evil, of which you are all aware, is just another ugly aspect of the picture. British troops are permitted to remain on Irish soil. Basic civil liberties are seriously infringed. The right of arrest without charge, imprisonment without trial, and search without warrant are vested in the government. This strikes a familiar note to those who remember the internment camps at Cyprus.

Britain professes to be guided by the high principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter. Yet the most basic of these principles, the right of national self-determination, is denied to Ireland just as it was attempted to be denied to Israel.

It is said that this is a matter with which we, as Americans, are not concerned, that it is a problem for settlement by Britain and Ireland. The same argument was urged long ago with respect to Israel. But this is not so. The matter is one with which all peoples who believe in justice must be concerned. To Americans it has a particular interest. Because of partition Ireland has not joined in the Atlantic Pact for the common defense against the advance of communism. Ireland is a vital link in that chain of defense. Her absence from it remains a source of danger to the United States.

The objective of Ireland is a very simple one. It is the unity of the whole island, free from outside interference by Britain. Ireland is a nation. By every fair standard of self-determination Ireland has declared her wish to be free and united and has demonstrated her ability to fully rule herself. The majority of the people have expressed themselves. This expression should not be permitted to be defeated by clever political devices.

The principles of justice and the right of freemen to govern themselves transcend national lines. Infringement of these principles anywhere weakens them everywhere and is the concern of the free peoples of the United States.

Because of the parallel between Ireland and Israel, Irishmen the world over welcomed the famous decision of President Truman last winter which did so much toward the recognition of the cause of Israel. As you all have read, that decision was accomplished without the assistance of the State Department. The same inertia exists in the State Department with respect to the injustice perpetrated upon Ireland, and so the British are able to continue to impose upon Ireland an unsupportable division of its territory.

There is no reason for such inertia. Just as the United States Government lent its efforts to accomplish the creation of Israel, so it can now assist in the settlement of this problem. For Britain's sake, as well as Ireland's, the problem must be settled. For so long as partition continues it will be a source of irritation to Britain in the eyes of the world. A nation cannot very well espouse high principles and flout them at convenience without embarrassment.

If we, in America, fully recognize our common interest in assisting in the right of national self-determination, we can be sure that as certainly as the injustices inflicted on Israel were overcome, so the injustice inflicted on Ireland will be overcome. In such a result we can all rejoice.

I hope that you have borne with me in my emotion concerning the Irish situation. I have felt strongly about it for a long time and this occasion, because of the striking analogy between Israel and Ireland, seemed an appropriate one to call it not only to your attention but to the attention of all Americans.

Why am I making a speech of this character to this audience? Because I believe that the Department of State of the United States should do something about this deplorable situation. We in this country have always prided ourselves on our interest in the small nations of the world. Here we have a glaring example of oppression by a great power over one that is weak. It is certainly a situation that the United States should interest itself in—it is certainly a situation that our Department of State should do something about.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). We have only this one day for the hearings and I would like to give all the witnesses a chance if at all possible. If you have been inconvenienced through this continuous session, please understand the reason behind it.

STATEMENT OF JOHN T. O'LEARY, CLAN-NA-GAEL CLUB, BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. O'LEARY. I am here representing the Clan-na-Gael Clubs of the District of Columbia and Maryland. I am from Baltimore. I have a prepared statement expressing our views.

(The prepared statement of Mr. O'Leary is as follows:)

A special committee of the Clan-na-Gael Clubs of the District of Columbia and Maryland was appointed to manifest their sentiments and feelings on House Resolution 270 submitted by John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, now give expression to their feelings as American citizens:

Whereas Ireland suffered a week of centuries of persecution and slavery, deprived of education and opportunity to follow their religious beliefs under penalty

of death, starved and murdered, defeated many times but never conquered, have under Divine Providence and the force of arms achieved freedom for 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland;

Whereas the British Parliament, without one Irishman's vote, by the threat of force annexed the six counties of the northeast counties of Ireland to the fast decaying British Empire existing now on American beneficence;

Whereas an opportunity has been offered the citizens of America to express their approval of House Resolution 270 to give to all the people of Ireland choice, by a fair plebiscite to approve a united or a divided Ireland and thus avoid a forceable diversion of this question;

Whereas the main obstacle to united Ireland is Sir Basil Brook's quisling government, fat salaries paid by loans of American taxpayers' money and kept alive by political and religious bigotry, an example of which was manifest on St. Patrick's Day when the only country in the world to prohibit a celebration was Sir Basil's little quisling annex: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the special committee representing and speaking for the Clan-na-Gael Clubs of the District of Columbia and Maryland as follows:

We most emphatically protest against the forceable and unnatural separation of the six northeast counties of Ireland from the Irish Republic whose constitution is modeled on and follows the freedom-loving lines of our own United States of America Constitution recognizing as free and equal all men, we favor the unity of all of Ireland under one central government chosen by all of the people of Ireland.

We hold with Charles Stewart Parnell that no one has a right to set a limit to the aspirations to a nation, and that all countries have the right to maintain their territorial rights when menaced by a foreign power or a quisling minority in their own country.

We pledge our undying support while life lasts to House Resolution 270 proposed by Mr. John E. Fogarty, Representative from Rhode Island, that the Republic of Ireland shall embrace all of the territory of Ireland, from the center to the sea.

We urge and most respectfully ask favorable consideration by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and we urge our Representatives in Congress from Maryland to vote in favor of the adoption of this resolution.

This committee is instructed to sign and send to Hon. John Kee, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and also a copy to all Maryland Representatives in Congress and to the Honorable John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, a copy of this statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). At this time, I have another statement from Congressman Daniel J. Flood, of Pennsylvania, in behalf of the legislation which I will give to the clerk for insertion in the record.

(The statement of Hon. Daniel J. Flood, a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, is as follows:)

Mr. Chairman, it is for me a particular pleasure to appear before this distinguished committee upon which I had the honor to serve in the Seventy-ninth Congress. May I take this opportunity to compliment this committee and the House and our country upon being so fortunate as to have you, the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. Kee, serve as chairman of the committee on Foreign Affairs. I am here to make this statement in support of the resolution introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. Fogarty.

One of the most thrilling sights for any American is to walk into a classroom of any school in the United States of America and to see the children there standing with their right hands over their hearts and reciting the pledge of allegiance to the flag. And in this pledge is this phrase: "One Nation indivisible with liberty and justice for all." Thank God that in the United States of America, the home of millions of Americans of Irish ancestry, this is true.

It is tragic indeed that this cannot be said of Ireland itself. Because there the country has been divided unjustly and contrary to the will of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people.

It is difficult to explain in this day and age of the United Nations and of the Four Freedoms and of the many international agreements, to which the British Empire is a party, how it is possible for anyone to justify the arbitrary enforcement of partition on a friendly nation and the maintenance of that division by troops of a foreign power.

The division of Ireland, which brought about the separation of the northern countries from the present Republic of Ireland, was the result entirely of the action of Great Britain. Had this move not been initiated by the Federal Government, it could not have been successfully brought about. It could not have been successfully maintained and every reasonable effort will be continued toward the permanence of such a disestablishment.

It is the established policy of the United States of America to frown upon colonialism anywhere. Hardly a day passes now but that the Government of the United States, through official sources, forceably reiterates America's principle of the right of determination of freedom-loving people everywhere through the establishment and maintenance of their free, independent, and sovereign right within their native land.

This Government never fails to express its distaste for the maintenance of a minority government by a foreign nation upon the soil of another nation contrary to the well understood and unequivocal wishes of the peoples of that nation. The most glaring inconsistency in the field of international relations today is that of Great Britain, at one moment protesting its adherence to the cause of democracy and the maintenance of free governments; and at the next moment, being the supporter, directly and indirectly, of the maintenance of the Government of Northern Ireland—an obvious minority, physically and numerically, on the island of Ireland.

Mr. Chairman, recently I had the great pleasure of visiting Ireland during the weeks before Christmas in 1949. In conversation and meetings with leading statesmen of this brave and courageous new nation, I was impressed to the depths of my soul, with their integrity, their deep and abiding patriotism and burning allegiance to the cause of a united nation and a free and sovereign state. Never, for any reason, or under any circumstances at any time, will there be any compromise with the Republic of Ireland insofar as the problem of partition is concerned. This is not a question of unreasonableness or stubbornness. It is a question of being right—absolutely right—with the realization that all freedom-loving people everywhere have rallied to the support of their cause and the certainty in their hearts as God-fearing, law-abiding Christian peoples that, under Almighty God, justice shall prevail and Ireland be united.

The demarcating line drawn as the result of the partition is a scar not only across the face of Ireland itself, but is a searing and burning wound across the heart and soul of this independent nation and of every one of its citizens. Contrary to the claims made, this is not a religious matter. Some of the most forceable and patriotic citizens of Ireland and some of the most effective leaders in the fight against partition are distinguished Protestants. These, too, have a full love in their hearts for their country and abhor its enforced division.

Today, thanks to the long-standing friendship of the United States of America for Ireland and its people, Ireland is a free, independent, and sovereign nation and takes her place at the meeting table with her sister nations of the world.

There are no two countries in the world between which there is a more long-standing and firmly cemented bond of affection than the United States and Ireland.

No longer is it necessary for Americans of Irish ancestry to recite Ireland's contribution to America. This history is today known to everyone in both Nations, and, for that matter of fact, in the world.

With firmness and certainty in the justice of her cause and with a full awareness that in the hearts of the American people there is forever enshrined the belief and support of such a cause, the Republic of Ireland looks again to the United States of America for her support in her righteous fight to destroy this evil of partition.

I have every right to believe that the House of Representatives of the United States of America, this great forum of democracy, will as always express its feeling on a matter so close to its own fundamental beliefs.

Mr. Chairman, as a Member of the Congress from the Eleventh District of Pennsylvania, I urge upon this distinguished committee the speedy adoption of the resolution of the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. Fogarty.

Mr. COSTELLO. I have a statement from the Ulster Irish Liberty Legion, of Chicago, Ill., which is signed by Mr. Bernard MacGillan. We also have a large Chicago delegation who are here in Washington, numbering 19 people from Chicago, for the purpose of being at this

hearing. I would like to submit the statement for the record at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). Without objection, it is so ordered.
(The statement referred to is as follows:)

ULSTER IRISH LIBERTY LEGION,
Chicago, Ill., April 26, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,
Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEE: May we take the liberty of again calling to your and your committee's attention the fact that Ireland's location—on the flank of western Europe—is of supreme strategic importance to the United States in the herculean task which confronts us. Possessing the finest natural harbors on that continent, together with airports unexcelled in all the world, Ireland united could and would give incalculable aid to United States forces. The Government and the people of Ireland are eager to participate in the defense of Christianity and civilization against the menace of godless communism. Yet they cannot, nor can they be expected to, enter into an alliance as partner of a power which has mutilated the nation's territory, maintains an army of occupation on her soil, and has virtually annexed six Irish counties—an act of aggression equaled only by Hitler's seizure of Austria.

Addressing you as American citizens of Ulster-Irish ancestry, we of the Ulster Irish Liberty Legion plead for favorable action by your committee on House Resolution 270. We take leave to remind your committee that this, our beloved country, is committed, irrevocably, to the doctrine of national self-determination for all peoples. Again we ask: Is Ireland alone, of the nations west of the iron curtain, to be denied this right? Would not American acquiescence in such denial subject us to the reproach of paying but lip service to the principle for which we fought two world wars and for which we fought four long years to preserve the integrity and unity of these United States? Are we to repudiate our principles and stultify ourselves as a nation by aiding England in keeping her neighboring island divided, thus frustrating the will of the overwhelming majority of the Irish peoples, as demonstrated repeatedly at the polls?

Would not failure to demonstrate, through our representatives, that our espousal of the doctrine of national self-determination for all peoples, is honest and sincere be a big blot on the national escutcheon? Happily this cause for reproach can be averted, readily. Adoption of the Fogarty resolution—House Resolution 270—will prove our sincerity. Your committee needs but report the resolution to the House floor for discussion and decision. By doing so you will give to the people's representatives the opportunity to which they are entitled, so they can assure our country the aid of a friendly people in the struggle to save Christendom from the hordes which now are threatening to engulf all that civilized men hold dear. Yours is a great opportunity to do a signal service to America and Ireland alike—and to civilization.

Faithfully yours,

BERNARD MACGILLIAN,

Publicity Director, Ulster Irish Liberty Legion, an organization of Ulster men and women formed in 1938 to aid in restoring Irish unity and independence.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). The next witness will be Mr. Haugh.

STATEMENT OF JOHN R. HAUGH, REAL ESTATE BROKER,
PITTSBURGH, PA.

Mr. HAUGH. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have a prepared statement here and because of the time that has been taken up, I will just pass it on to the clerk for the record.

My name is John R. Haugh, real-estate broker. I am licensed by the State of Pennsylvania. I represent the United Irish Societies of Western Pennsylvania. I am financial secretary for that organization and the Wolfe Tone Club which is a branch of the Clan-na-Gael of

Western Pennsylvania. I am a member of division 8 of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Allegheny County, Pa.

(The prepared statement of John R. Haugh is as follows:)

I came here from Pittsburgh, Pa., as a representative of the United Irish Societies of Western Pennsylvania, comprised of six organizations, namely, Knights of Equity, Allegheny County; Ancient Order of Hibernians, Allegheny County; Ladies Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians; All-Ireland Athletic Association; Anti-Partition League, and the Wolfe Tone Club.

I am a natural-born American citizen born in Pittsburgh, Pa., and a real-estate broker.

By my activities in Irish organizations I came in contact with a lot of people, both Irish and non-Irish, and the sentiment is that they are in favor of the Fogarty bill, H. R. 270, getting the approval of this committee and eventual passage by the House of Congress.

There are two reasons that stand out why this bill should be approved:

First, all the people of Ireland should enjoy freedom and liberty as you and I enjoy it.

Second, we need Ireland in the Atlantic Pact and if this partition was removed, I am sure Ireland would join.

Gentleman, I conclude by appealing to you members of the Foreign Affairs Committee to give this your serious consideration and pass the Fogarty resolution.

Mr. COSTELLO. I have been asked to identify the Chicago delegation.

Mr. Jack Hagarty.

Mr. HAGARTY. I am State organizer of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, for Illinois, and I am secretary for the United Irish Counties Association of Illinois, and I am here supporting those groups who support the resolution.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Toal.

Mr. TOAL. My name is Bernard J. Toal, 1007 North Lawler Avenue, Chicago, Ill. I am president of the United Irish Counties Association of Illinois.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. John McGinnis.

Mr. MCGINNIS. I am John McGinnis from Chicago, Ill., 1352 North Monitor Avenue. I am a member of the Ulster Irish Liberty Legion and have been for the past 12 years. I am also a member of the Annual Irish Day, Inc., and I am here in behalf of the Fogarty bill. It is not necessary to go further than that.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Tom Keely, 4418 West Fulton Street, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. KEELY. I am Thomas Keely of the Irish Club of Chicago, Ill. We are all in favor of the Fogarty resolution.

Mr. COSTELLO. Hugh McElroy, 3253 West Fulton Street, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. MCELROY. My name is Hugh McElroy. I am vice president of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, in Chicago. I favor the Fogarty resolution.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. David Griffin, 3825 West Flournoy Street, Chicago, Ill.

(No response.)

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Michael McLaughlin, 1129 North Lawler Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I am Michael McLaughlin, here in support of the Fogarty resolution.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. H. O'Neill Quinn.

Mr. QUINN. My name is H. O'Neill Quinn, 1259 South Colin Avenue, Chicago, Ill. I am here as a duly elected delegate from the Irish

Liberty Legion and I am also president of the Patrick Pearse Council of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, and have been instructed to come here from the Liberty Legion in support of the Fogarty resolution.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mrs. Ena Reilly, 945 Marshall Avenue, Bellwood, Ill.

Mrs. REILLY. I am Mrs. Ena Reilly, of Bellwood, Ill., first vice president of the Ulster Irish Liberty Legion; first vice president of the Patrick Pearse Council, American League for an Undivided Ireland; financial secretary of the Chicago District Council, American League for an Undivided Ireland; and am here on behalf of 500 members of the Ulster Irish Liberty Legion to support the Fogarty bill. While I am on my feet, I want to verify what Mr. O'Dwyer and Mr. O'Callaghan said about the Special Powers Act. I am an Ulster-born American citizen and through the persecutions in Ireland, it was the result of that, that my family, my mother and father and we youngsters, were brought to this country and we are very, very glad to be here.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mrs. Sally McElroy, 3253 West Fulton Street, Chicago, Ill.

Mrs. McELROY. I am Mrs. Sally McElroy. I represent the Ulster Irish Liberty Legion and I am in favor of the Fogarty bill.

Mr. COSTELLO. Miss Mary Sullivan, 7800 South Laffin Street, Chicago, Ill.

Miss SULLIVAN. I am recording secretary of the Illinois District, American League for an Undivided Ireland, and I am in favor of the Fogarty resolution.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mrs. Margaret O'Malley, 1939 North Lincoln Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

(No response.)

Mr. COSTELLO. Mrs. Verl Doyle, 5055 North Claremont Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Mrs. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, my name is Verl Doyle. I am corresponding secretary of the O'Shay Parish Council of the American League for an Undivided Ireland. We are in favor of the Fogarty bill. I might add, I am not Irish. I am American through my ancestors for over 300 years and we are fighting for everything; everything that promotes the full freedom of small nations.

Mr. COSTELLO. Miss Katherine O'Shea, 444 St. James Place, Chicago, Ill.

Miss O'SHEA. I am a delegate from the district council of Illinois, American League for an Undivided Ireland, and I am here for the Fogarty bill.

Mr. COSTELLO. Michael McNamara, 8157 Elizabeth Street, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. Chairman, my name is Michael McNamara. I by chance belong to all the organizations. The land of which we speak today, the six counties, is all confiscated land. I am in favor of this Fogarty resolution and I hope you do a good job on it. Thank you.

Mr. COSTELLO. I might add that Mr. McNamara is a youngster of 84 years, like our good friend Joe Scott, the president of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, who is 83 years of age.

Mr. Tom Walsh, 4217 North Damen Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

(No response.)

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Con Scannell, 8840 South Aberdeen Street, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. SCANNELL. My name is Con Scannell. I am past president of the Patrick Henry Council of the American League for an Undivided Ireland and I favor the Fogarty bill.

Mr. COSTELLO. Pat J. O'Connor, 2059 West Seventy-first Street, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am treasurer of the American League for an Undivided Ireland. I am here as a delegate and American in favor of the Fogarty bill.

Mr. COSTELLO. Are there others from the Chicago delegation whose names I have not called?

Mr. HAGARTY. Mr. Walsh and myself also represent the Irish Prisoner's Relief Association of Illinois. For the record I would like to say I am an American who has never seen Ireland and spent 4½ years in the infantry of the United States Army, going through France, Belgium, Holland, and Germany, and am doing everything I can in this cause.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). If there are others who have statements they wish to submit at this time, I will be very happy to have them do so.

Is Patrick McNelis or Robert Clarke here?

(No response.)

Mr. MURPHY. I am Peter J. Murphy, from Chester, Delaware County. I am president of the Delaware County Irish-American Society.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). Mr. Murphy, we have your statement and we will put it in the record. Thank you very much, sir.

(The statement of Peter J. Murphy is as follows:)

My name is Peter J. Murphy. I am president of the Delaware County Irish American Society of Delaware County, Pa.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank your committee for the privilege of appearing before it.

The maps of Ireland, the maps of Europe, and the maps of the world and the history of Ireland, the history of Europe, and the history of the world show no boundary lines until after the First World War.

Men of different faiths down through the centuries have fought and died to keep Ireland free and undivided.

That present boundary line was implanted against the wishes of the Irish people and is being maintained by force, gerrymandering, and false propaganda.

Therefore it is the wish of my organization that you report favorably Resolution 270.

Mr. McGRATH. I think it is a great privilege for me to be here. I was born in Ireland and this is the first time I have had the opportunity to see democracy at work. I feel good about it.

I fought against the English in 1921. I have no particular argument with the English. I have an argument with the United States Government if they continue to send my hard-earned dollars, my tax dollars, to contribute to a police state in the north of Ireland. I have no argument with England; I like the English people, but I like my dollars too, and I don't want them to be spent in maintaining the partition of Ireland.

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. MARINAN, PRESIDENT, SONS AND
DAUGHTERS OF THE SOCIETY OF ST. PATRICK

Mr. MARINAN. My name is John Marinan, Jersey City. I am president of the Sons and Daughters of the Society of St. Patrick. I bring Mr. Sieminski, who is of Polish origin, to be our spokesman here today, to approve of the American way of life. I myself was born in Jersey City. He, as a candidate for Congress, came out praising a united Ireland. I publicly had gone out and made statements supporting him for his stand and so, for our society, we asked him to be our spokesman here today.

Mr. Sieminski.

STATEMENT OF ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I have 5,000 people who voted for me because I think I expressed the nonpartisan way of life and it seems that the tables have turned. As a boy, Colonel House, Woodrow Wilson, and my uncle and a few friends were fighting for the freedom of Poland. It is in the brown portion of your map, today, under a dictatorship. I was in Poland and I saw it wiped out. I was in Italy and I saw the chagrin on the faces of the boys who fought at Monte Cinto because their wishes were not fulfilled after World War II. The men who fought with the Allied armies are scattered all over the world and will never go back to Poland unless people like you, people like myself, and people like this grand and glorious committee put democracy to work.

I have a statement here which I want to put in the record. I do not think very many people understand us who have pride in the countries abroad from which we sprung. We did not come over here on the *Mayflower* or spring from Jamestown. We have funny-sounding names and it is a psychological powder keg that many people do not understand. It is just this, that although we have funny-sounding names, when people offend the countries from which we sprung, they will have a fight on their hands. I say if the Irish, if the Poles, and all the people behind that iron curtain, stick together here in America, keep proud and stay proud of the lands from which they came, in the future then no Tojo in Japan is going to go off half-cocked because the Japanese-Americans are going to let him know that they will go over there first and stop him. And no Japanese armies are going to Italy, they are going to Japan.

In the next war the Americans of Polish extraction, if despots in Poland transgress our sensibilities too much, are going to go over there and roll those Soviets right out of Poland. I say, too, as long as they let you be insulted in Ireland, and you have gestapo troops in there, they should either change the name of that northern part of Ireland so that your sensibilities for people of Irish extraction are not insulted, or drive them out. The State Department today seems to have but one school of thought: That the people who came over on the *Mayflower* alone know how to run world affairs. I say that is wrong. The first thing we should realize is we must make friends with the people around the world, and who better than an Irishman can make friends with the Irish people? Who better than someone of Polish extraction can win Poland away from the Communists

today? The people who came over on the *Mayflower*, granted, they are a little too much interested in commercial development and in creating a profit for the Nation. There is something more than profit and something more than dollars, and that is pride that is in the Red, White, and Blue, the bright banner with the 48 stars—the Americanism for which we stand. I will not rest until Poland is a free nation; and, before we can get to Poland, we have to have a D-day in Ireland, and then we will go on and win the world democracy for which we stand.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). Thank you, Mr. Sieminski.

The next witness is Mr. Eneas McNulty.

(No response.)

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). Without objection, his statement will be included in the record.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Eneas McNulty is as follows:)

From a military standpoint, Ireland is a nation which constitutes a base close on the flank of our ally England. As a former major of the United States Army, and a Reserve Army officer now, I am interested in preserving the peace and good will of the people of that nation.

In the past, the enemies of England have used Irish antipathy toward England as a means of harassing England on her exposed western frontier. As an important partner in our present alliance against the spread of atheistic communism, England should not be permitted to endanger that important country by continuing the unnatural, artificial partition which now exists.

England's responsibility as our partner is to maintain free and cooperative relations with her immediate neighbors, in order that the cold war, or anything hot that may develop, will be carried on to success for us and our friends without unnecessary friction over internal political questions.

In strict justice, the partition of Ireland has no basis in geography, race, or popular inclination. It was imposed by the will of a British Cabinet against the will of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people. Like the Polish, my own ancestors, who have fought for their freedom for hundreds of years, the Irish suffer diminution of their natural rights as free citizens by a cold, imperial device of "divide and conquer." To do justice to our responsibility as a member of the God-fearing nations united against communism, England should take immediate steps to end the partition, and with the unity that will come from justice given to all we will gain renewed strength.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). The next witness is Mr. John J. McCole.

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. McCOLE, BAYONNE, N. J.

Mr. McCOLE. Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, my name is John J. McCole. I am an attorney at law of Bayonne, N. J. I represent the American League for an Undivided Ireland of Bayonne, N. J. It has been a pleasure for me to come here today and to see the cordial representation, the cordial greeting that has been presented by you as chairman, Mr. Mansfield, and by the members of your committee, and hearing this matter so important to all in America.

I am here as an American citizen and taxpayer who urges the support of House Resolution 270, the Fogarty resolution. I am here supporting the Fogarty resolution, and believe independence should be sustained and extended to include the entire area of Ireland. That the independence of Ireland should extend to the 32 counties of Ireland.

The fundamental of democracy lies in the right of the people to determine for themselves how they are to be governed. The unit for ex-

pressing the determination of the people as to the way in which they shall be governed is the nation. Ireland has had a history of 2,000 years of nationhood, and an attempt to restrict its nationhood to approximately five-sixths of its area against the wishes of the majority of its people is a clear violation of the democratic and the American way of life.

Partition is the denial of the right to self-determination. It was imposed by an outside power, Britain, and against the wishes of the Irish people. No party, no group, or political organization in Ireland sought partition, and yet partition was imposed by force and is today maintained by force. Partition is maintained by the force, prestige, power, and arms of Britain, by playing with electoral divisions, by refusing to the people within the partitioned area the right to determine for themselves their willingness or refusal to join the 26 counties.

It is bad enough that the will of the people of Ireland is flouted; bad enough that an alien government has imposed and continues to impose and maintain a separate government within Ireland, but the unfortunate part of it is that funds of this country, funds which have come out of my pocket and yours, are being given to Britain, and these funds, which are earmarked for the preservation of democracies, are used by Britain to maintain this unjust partition in Northern Ireland.

Gentlemen, I again appreciate the courtesy extended to me and all the members who appeared before you, and I know that you will do your utmost and give the consideration to the Fogarty bill that it justly deserves.

Thank you.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). The next witness is Thomas J. Ayers.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS J. AYERS, PRESIDENT, UNITED IRISH COUNTIES ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK

Mr. AYERS. My name is Thomas J. Ayers. I am the district sales manager for Rheingold Breweries. I am president of the United Irish Counties Association of New York, and have been designated to speak for that body. The association is made up of delegates from societies representing all 32 counties of Ireland.

The association carries on its benevolent, fraternal, and social functions without regard to religious persuasion or geographic location. They do not believe in any boundary imposed by a foreign government under the threat of "immediate and terrible war."

More of our members served in the armed forces of the United States during the recent war than from any similar organization in America. All of those who returned feel that the principles of democracy for which they fought are not only being denied in Ireland but are being made a mockery of.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I respectfully submit this statement so that we, as Americans, will not be guilty of handing out our dollars to perpetuate one of the gravest injustices of modern times. My association heartily endorses the Fogarty resolution. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). Now that the distaff side is showing up to help the lady from California, as indicated by the ladies from Chicago and Illinois, I understand we have more ladies from Ohio, who will be introduced by Mr. Costello.

Mr. COSTELLO. We have Mrs. Mary K. Duffy, of 3812 Woodridge Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio.

STATEMENT OF MRS. MARY K. DUFFY, CLEVELAND HEIGHTS, OHIO

Mrs. DUFFY. I am here as a delegate from the Antipartition League of Ohio and also from the Irish Cultural Garden League of Cleveland, Ohio. I am here in favor of the Fogarty bill. I have a short article here which, with your permission, I want to read.

As an American citizen and a resident of Cleveland Heights, I am 100 percent for the Fogarty bill and am definitely opposed to any of our American dollars being used to maintain the puppet government of Northern Ireland.

I call on the worthy members of this committee of the House of Representatives to see that justice is done.

There should be a free and united Ireland.

STATEMENT OF ELIZABETH DAMON, COMMODORE JOHN BARRY CLUB, CLEVELAND

Mrs. DAMON. I am Mrs. Elizabeth Damon, Cleveland, Ohio. I represent the Commodore John Barry Club of Cleveland, and I am in favor of the Fogarty bill.

STATEMENT OF ANNA DAVIS, ANTIPARTITION LEAGUE, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Miss DAVIS. I am an American citizen of Cleveland, Ohio. I belong to the Antipartition League, and I am not in favor of the partition of Ireland. I am in favor of the Fogarty bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). The next witness is Mr. Sean Keating.

STATEMENT OF SEAN KEATING, CHAIRMAN, EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR AN UNDIVIDED IRELAND

Mr. KEATING. I am chairman of the Executive Council of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, and the director for the United Irish Counties.

I have a prepared statement that I will file later, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to make this remark that will perhaps simplify the whole problem:

On the map over here you display the Union Jack on England; but you should also imprint the Union Jack on the northeast corner of Ireland. It is a British territorial possession, Britain imposing her will against the wishes of the Irish people and maintaining possession of northeast Ireland by force. That is a threat not only to the peace of Ireland but to the peace of the world, and I hope this committee will report favorably on the Fogarty resolution, House Resolution 270, which provides for an expression upon the part of the House of Representatives that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

As has been shown by other witnesses today, the small island on which the Irish people dwell provides no natural reason for any division of the country into two separate and distinct countries, since it is one land and one people. Partition was forced on Ireland to serve the purposes of British imperialistic policy, primarily to prevent the Irish from creating a free and independent self-governing nation, and to split and divide the people on a permanent basis. "Divide and conquer" is still Britain's motto.

It was the Tory Conservative Party in Britain which was the driving force behind partition, which forced the Liberal Party to abandon its pledges for home rule in Ireland and engineer the passage of the Government of Ireland Act in 1920, which finally and—they hoped—permanently split the nation in two. However, it was much to my surprise to find that the present Labor government of Great Britain, following in the footsteps of their predecessors, and likewise attempting to throttle the Irish with partition as an indelible mark on their countryside.

The present government in Great Britain passed a new act, wherein it is stated that the British Government recognizes the existing status and will oppose any change unless it is approved by the Parliament of Northern Ireland. An amendment, which was proposed to this legislation, would have left the decision in the hands of the people of Northern Ireland, but this was defeated. Instead, the Northern Ireland Parliament, which can in no sense be deemed representative of the people in the six counties, was left as sole judge of whether or not Ireland should someday again become a united country.

I say that this was an amazing situation in view of the fact that I had considered the present government in Great Britain as a staunch believer in the fundamentals and principles of true democracy. Hence it was not at all surprising to find that the American labor movement should look askance at this action on the part of the British Government. So it was that in the autumn of last year we witnessed not only the major national labor organizations but also numerous State and local bodies adopting resolutions throughout America recommending that Ireland should be a united country. Our own labor leaders were quick to sense the injustice of the latest British move in preserving an imperial outpost in Ireland despite what the wishes of the people of that country might be.

No one can question the fact that the Irish are one people and that Ireland is one country. Only those who today benefit from the existence of the Northern Ireland Government are desirous of seeing the fiction of a border maintained in Ireland. The beneficiaries are the large landowners and the heavy industrialists on the north, who are able to control the government, dictate legislation, and thus protect their own selfish interests. Naturally, a class of officeholders likewise has now been created who desire that no change take place. Yet, all these are but a mere handful in the total of the Irish people; and it should be left to all the Irish people to determine what they desire to do in their own country.

The Parliament at Dublin, no more than that in Belfast, would have any right to partition the country without the consent and approval of the people of all the country. This has never been asked and has never been given. Hence the resolution, which is before you,

is but the appropriate expression of the right of the people, who alone constitute the Irish Nation, to determine for themselves what they desire to have done in their own country. We as Americans can very properly express our deep concern over this situation and express our continuing belief in the rights of small nations to determine for themselves the mode of government which they desire. In approving this resolution, House Resolution 270, you will be giving to the House of Representatives an opportunity to proclaim once more our faith in democratic principles and our conviction that no power should coerce any other nation regarding the type and form of government which they should have, not even Great Britain.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). Is any of the Philadelphia delegation here? Patrick J. McNelis, Robert V. Clarke, Arthur J. Maginnis, John J. O'Doherty, Michael Scullion, and Thomas J. McLaughlin.

Mr. COSTELLO. I believe they have had to go out but I will obtain statements from them. They were all here. I will submit them to you.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They will appear in the record at this point. (The statements referred to are as follows:)

STATEMENT OF PATRICK J. MCNELIS, PRESIDENT FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SOCIETIES FOR IRISH INDEPENDENCE

Mr. Chairman, my name is Patrick J. McNelis. I am president of the Pennsylvania Federation of American Societies for Irish Independence, representing 26 organizations with a total membership in excess of 50,000. I wish to thank you gentlemen most sincerely for your courtesy in permitting me to testify before your committee.

Following World War I, several states, some new and some recreated, emerged as a result of the peace treaty and we saw Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Albania, and others join the family of nations. It is a matter of record that due to long occupation of these countries by the foreign powers that had ruled them for centuries, there were many that did not desire the new status of independence.

However, no special concessions were made to these dissenters, as was done in Ireland, because the victors in World War I had no particular interest in these groups. I would like to emphasize this point because Great Britain, which had promised Ireland self-determination in return for support in World War I, and which Ireland gave with more than 300,000 volunteers, repudiated that promise in 1920, when following a British-supervised election in December 1919, the Irish people voted 80 percent for an independent Ireland. She sent in her Black and Tans and shocked the world with her savage determination to maintain her stranglehold on the Irish people, despite her professed aims in entering that great cataclysm, to defend rights of small nations and giving them a guaranty of self-determination.

For 2 years the Irish people grimly defended, against insuperable odds, their right to that self-determination. Then Britain called for a truce, the result of which was the so-called "Shot Gun" Treaty of 1922 when Prime Minister Lloyd George forced the Irish delegates' acceptance of the act of Britain's Parliament known as the Better Government of Ireland Act adopted in 1920 as an answer to Ireland's vote for self-determination which provided for the division of Ireland, partitioning the six counties of northeastern Ireland from the other 26.

It became very evident that the Irish people, and particularly those of the six-county area would never be satisfied until Ireland was totally free and independent.

The federation, of which I have the honor to be president, was called into existence to aid the people of Ireland to attain the freedom for which she fought Britain's battles, and then in turn had to fight the British when they welched on their promise. We are most happy to appear at these hearings and to voice our approval of the provisions of House Resolution 270, proposed by Congressman John E. Fogarty. We sincerely pray you gentlemen to give the measure favorable consideration and to urge on the Congress its speedy adoption.

STATEMENT BY ROBERT V. CLARKE, PUBLIC RELATIONS DIRECTOR, AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR AN UNDIVIDED IRELAND, PENNSYLVANIA CHAPTER

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Robert V. Clarke, Philadelphia, Pa., public relations director for the American League for an Undivided Ireland, Pennsylvania chapter.

The petitioners who appear before you today, from many widely separated communities in the United States, represent the unanimous sentiment of hundreds of thousands of American citizens. It is my privilege to be associated with them.

We appreciate your demonstration of friendship for the people of Ireland and your interest in their age-old struggle for freedom. That bitter fight to attain this ideal is known to all of you. For almost 800 years there has been scarcely a generation that has not seen a renewal of that struggle, which often degenerated to a fight for the right to live. Not alone have the Irish people waged a bloody fight for the establishment and preservation of their own rights, but they have given generously of their lives and their labors to establish and defend those same rights for other similarly oppressed peoples.

In the First World War they fought as never before, sustained by the promise that they were fighting for the principle of national self-determination for all peoples.

Immediately following the termination of that war they chose the form of government they wanted. Eighty percent of them cast their ballots for an all-Ireland republic. Their choice was not only ignored, but 2 years later their country was partitioned by the same ally at whose side and under whose flag their sons had bled and died. In the long and unhappy history of Anglo-Irish relations there was never a more deliberate and cold-blooded betrayal than this.

As you already know, gentlemen, not a single Irish representative of any political persuasion voted for the misnamed "Better Government of Ireland Act"—the British statute under which the partition of Ireland was created. To the contrary, the leaders of all Irish political parties denounced the scheme before withholding their votes.

That partition outrage still persists, and to make it yet more despicable, a government by tyranny, which differs only in degree from those under Stalin, has been functioning in the partitioned area.

But that is not the end of the sordid story. The final act in the drama was played by the British Labor Government a year ago when another misnamed statute was enacted. Known as the Ireland Act, this instrument guarantees that the partition boundary cannot be changed without the consent of the puppet government of that area. The word "government" here is significant. If the people of the subjugated area should ever want to join with the free portion of the country—and in four of the six partitioned counties a majority of them want to do just that—the Ireland Act is there to prevent them. It is, therefore, apparent that the policy of the present British Labor Government is not one iota different from that of its Tory predecessor of 1920, when the original crime was perpetrated. The Ireland Act is reminiscent of the secret message written by Lloyd George in 1916 to Sir Edward Carson. "We must make it clear," the letter said, "that * * * Ulster does not, whether she wills it or not, merge in the rest of Ireland."

From the beginning until the present day, not a single convincing argument has been advanced to justify the partition of Ireland. That criminal act, perpetrated against a helpless people over a quarter century ago, is now a menace to the security of western civilization. If for no other reason than this, gentlemen, we feel that the people of Ireland should be given a chance to pass judgment on the partition of their country.

We are happy, therefore, to endorse House Resolution 270, Eighty-first Congress, first session, and we ask for its adoption by your committee.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR J. MCGINNIS, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE DONEGAL SOCIETY OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. Chairman, my name is Arthur J. McGinnis. I am vice president of the Donegal Society of Philadelphia, an organization composed of almost 1,000 men, who, either themselves or their ancestors, were born in County Donegal, Ireland.

May I say first, that I deeply appreciate your courtesy in permitting me to testify before this committee.

The membership of our organization is deeply interested in the subject you are considering today. First as American citizens, interested in seeing that justice is accorded to a small nation that has contributed so much to the history of our country. Nearly 200 of the members of the Donegal Society have defended these United States in our Armed Forces in World Wars I and II, and four have made the supreme sacrifice on the altar of liberty. Then as natives or progeny of natives of the ancient Province of Ulster, we are shocked at the continued oppression of Irishmen and the subtle and well-planned campaign of Britain to maintain her bridgehead in Ireland. County Donegal is the most northerly point in Ireland, but under this absurd arrangement, is considered part of "Southern Ireland." The farce of partition is clearly illustrated in that one may stand in "Southern Ireland" and look southward on "Northern Ireland." The town of Pettigo, partly in Donegal and partly in the partitioned area, has this line of partition running through homes, farms, and even places of business. Donegal is contiguous to the partitioned area, and its people and those of the neighboring counties have many problems in common, but find the situation almost insoluble due to partition. As men of Ulster blood, it is our desire and the goal of our earnest efforts, to see these stolen counties returned to the unity of the Republic of Ireland. We protest the partition of this ancient Province of Ulster and the continued support, moral and financial, by the British Government.

On behalf of the membership of the Donegal Society of Philadelphia, I wish to express our accord and endorsement of House Resolution 270, introduced by Congressman Fogarty. We urge you gentlemen to give it favorable consideration and that you recommend to the House of Representatives, its speedy adoption.

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. O'DOHERTY, DARBY, PA.

My name is John J. O'Doherty, of Darby, Pa. I am corresponding secretary of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, Philadelphia, and I am appearing here not merely in that capacity, but as a representative of our membership.

We are not opposed to the Marshall plan, as some would have us believe, but we do protest against aid to Britain at the present time. This protest is based simply and solely on the fact that Britain is exercising an active dictatorship in six of the counties of Ireland, and we do not believe there is any basis in justice for rendering assistance to a power that deliberately partitions a small nation for imperial purposes, and deliberately prevents the exercise or functioning of democratic principles.

The party in power in these six counties has not changed since 1920, and neither has their method of operation. In March 1922 this party introduced and passed a special powers bill, which denied to a very large minority the rights fundamental to the dignity of mankind. A leading liberal English newspaper, the Manchester Guardian, had this to say on the passage of the bill:

"While envenomed politicians in the Ulster Parliament are voting themselves power to use torture and capital punishment against citizens whom they forbid to defend themselves while they scarcely attempt to protect them from massacre, some of their own partisans in Belfast carry wholesale murder to refinements of barbarity hardly surpassed in the Turkish atrocities in Armenia and Constantinople."

This Special Powers Act was originally declared to be emergency legislation, but it has since become constitutional law, and is still in effect. According to the New York Times of April 7, 1950, seven men were arrested by the police and lodged in jail without trial for the sole reason that the police thought that these men might be thinking of commemorating the anniversary of the establishment of the Republic. This is a perfect example of the methods being used by the British in Ireland to maintain their hold on a corner of that country and prevent the people from securing the liberty for which they have fought for almost 800 years.

I say that these are methods of the British Government, and the record bears this out. When the act partitioning Ireland was passed by the British Parliament on November 11, 1920, no member of that Parliament from any part of Ireland, north or south, voted for it. The act was passed by the votes of members from British, Welsh, and Scotch constituencies. In other words, the partition of Ireland had been decided upon in high-level policy and the act was passed to give an appearance of legality to the setting up of that State by force.

Since then, that State has been supported by Britain, its police armed by Britain, and, in addition, a body of storm troopers was mobilized and armed by Britain. These sectarian storm troopers, known as B specials, wrought destruction and pillage on the minority who were helpless to defend themselves. At present this force is estimated to number approximately 13,000, and if it is not yet believed that this is a sectarian body, Sir Basil Brooke, in Philadelphia last week, declared that Catholics are not permitted to join their ranks. Can it be believed that these quasi-policemen exist for any other purpose than the persecution of a minority? They occupy an even more commanding position in Northern Ireland than did Hitler's Elite Guard in Nazi Germany. As a matter of fact, a member of the British Parliament, Geoffrey Bing, stated that he found it difficult to distinguish between the Government, the Orange Order, and the B specials.

With repression such as this, our people in these six counties are hardly encouraged to vote, and if they do vote the tortured boundaries of electoral areas render their vote into a meaningless protest that endangers only the voter. This gerrymandering has been carried out to such an extent that the whole idea of elections is just as much a mockery there as it is in the equally infamous dictatorship of the Communist Party in Russia.

Is it just, or is it logical, to ask any American to contribute his tax dollars to aid Britain while such a situation continues? The people whom I represent here are unalterably opposed to granting any form of aid to Britain while the partition of Ireland continues. We are not trying to hinder the Marshall plan, but instead to point out that the whole spirit of the American efforts to secure peace and recovery is violated when we aid a government that still encourages and sanctions persecution of a people. In essence there is no difference between the dictatorship in Northern Ireland and the dictatorship of the Kremlin, and the crimes committed by the puppet junta in Belfast are no less than the crimes committed in the Lubianka prison. They both bear the same label, that of "crimes against the state," and the purpose of both is the same, degradation and enslavement.

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL SCULLION, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

My name is Michael Scullion, of Philadelphia. I am privileged to represent the Derry Society, composed of American citizens of Irish birth or descent who were born, or whose parents were born in the County of Derry. May I call to your particular attention the fact that Derry is one of the ill-fated counties of Ireland which has had the misfortune to be included in the area known as Northern Ireland, but which we prefer to call Occupied Ireland.

I personally take pride in the fact that I am a citizen of these United States, as do the people whom I represent here today. And because of this pride, a just pride, because we know what the privilege of American citizenship means, we protest most emphatically against the extending of Marshall plan aid to England as long as Britain continues to violate all the written and unwritten laws of human decency and human conduct in her dealings with Ireland. Other speakers have told you in more detail the facts attending the establishment of partition, and I do not wish to burden you with a repetition of those facts. The one thing that I would wish to develop, and I know whereof I speak, and that is the terrible insecurity in northeast Ireland, if you are a member of the minority party. Gentlemen, we in America do not and could not know or appreciate this feeling. It is not a feeling of insecurity as far as life itself is concerned, for the B specials have not in recent years concerned themselves with outright murder. I am referring to the insecurity that comes from the constant awareness that there is always a member of the British Gestapo at your elbow.

From the moment you leave the comparative security of your home in the morning until you return at night, the feeling of being watched, of being listened to, of being shadowed, is a constant one. The cat-and-mouse game in these six counties is known as the Bridewell system. You are suddenly arrested without charge, detained for 24 hours, and released. Twenty-four hours later you are arrested again, then released. The game goes on until you are ready to emigrate or commit justifiable homicide.

This is a situation which we are confident the liberty-loving people of America would not countenance if the facts were known as fully as they might be. They would resent handing out American dollars to Britain in order to finance the

military occupation of another country and in order to subsidize a Gestapo no less criminal than the Gestapo of Hitler.

You may ask, gentlemen, why these facts are not known. There is a censorship in occupied Ireland, censorship of the mails, of the telephone, and of every other method of communication. It is not official, but it has never been denied. Supporting this censorship is the power of the British propaganda machine, which would have us believe that this is a family feud, that it is a fight on the part of the people in northern Ireland to preserve their religious liberty. Nothing could be further from the truth. The British propaganda machine tries to make us believe that if the Protestants of the north were left to the mercy of the Nationalist Catholics in the south that they would be robbed of all of their rights and possessions. Well, let's look at the record, as a noted American figure used to say.

In the Republic of Ireland, slightly over 6 percent of the people are Protestant. Yet, 32.5 percent of all industrial employees are Protestant, as are 50.8 percent of the heads of commercial sections of business, 45 percent of bank officials, and of landowners, of those holding farms of 200 acres or more, over 26 percent are Protestants. And I may state that ownership of 200 acres of land in Ireland is very uncommon. Does this indicate that it is a feud over religious rights?

All Ireland wants is its freedom, its full and complete freedom, without the armed garrison of a neighboring nation on its soil, without the nightmarish spectre of party police, without the fear of arrest without warrant and imprisonment without trial. In brief, gentlemen, what we want for Ireland is the same full measure of freedom which we enjoy in these United States, by the grace of God. While an English garrison remains on Irish soil this is not possible, and we believe that while this garrison remains to intimidate and persecute a people that England is not deserving of and should not receive any aid from this country.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS J. McLAUGHLIN, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Foreign Affairs Committee, my name is Thomas J. McLaughlin. I am president of the Galway Society of Philadelphia. I want to thank you for your kind permission in allowing me to speak before this committee today.

Many men and women have appeared here today for a cause that is very dear to their hearts. I shall not burden you with a reiteration of the facts as they are by now very plainly known.

We earnestly request that you, Mr. Chairman, and you gentlemen of the Foreign Affairs Committee will give our cause sincere consideration. It is a moral cause and surely such a moral injustice should not be overlooked by our great Government. It is impossible for the Eighty-first Congress to remain indifferent when the majority of the people of Ireland want the ending of the partition and the unification of their country. This will, I feel, lead to a better understanding between the citizens of England and Ireland and make for greater cooperation in the Atlantic Pact to help combat communism. All that we ask is that the Irish people be allowed to determine their own affairs democratically without any interference by a European power.

In conclusion, may I again thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of your committee for your considerations of our problem and for allowing a just cause to be heard.

STATEMENT OF DAVID R. ROCHE, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

My name is David R. Roche. I am executive secretary of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, Philadelphia, excombat infantryman, and at present captain in the Organized Reserves.

We realize fully the magnitude of the problems facing the Congress, and, as citizens we are willing and anxious to help. It is as citizens that we are here today, to voice the thoughts and aspirations of those whom we are privileged to represent.

We are cognizant of the fact that the economic recovery of Europe is vital to a stabilized world economy, and, because we are convinced of this, we are very much in favor of the Marshall plan as the main instrument in achieving this economic recovery. We realize that it is not practical to attach restrictive con-

ditions to each grant or loan to any country, or countries, but neither is it wisdom or practically to hand out money blindly, without regard for the future consequences. We believe that the policy of the Government should be in accordance with the high principles which have been enunciated from time to time, the principles upon which the peoples of Europe have based their hopes for the future.

If one of the primary purposes of our foreign policy today is the *cr*ataining of communism, its corollary must be the encouragement and aid of nations and peoples whose aims and principles are similar to ours. Any aid which we extend to countries that countenance and engage in practices diametrically opposed to the principles of democracy will not only continue to undermine foreign confidence in America, but will, in addition, give to the forces of communism a strong and potent weapon, and actively promote the discords and enmities which will make it impossible to attain either peace or recovery.

Britain's actions in Ireland are the antithesis of all the principles in which every American firmly believes. Five unassailable facts characterize her program of imperialism:

1. Northern Ireland is a puppet state, established by an act of the British Parliament alone, and imposed on Ireland by the superiority of British armed forces.
2. The institution of this state was imposed on the Irish people under the threat of "immediate and terrible war."
3. From the time of its inception in 1920 Britain has continued its support and maintenance.
4. The basic rights of democracy have been denied to over 30 percent of the population of that area.
5. There has been a very effective disfranchisement of the same proportion of the population by gerrymandering and by highly restrictive voting qualifications, both of which have been carefully framed to insure a continuation of British power by the same sectarian party.

Since this partition of Ireland was planned by Britain, established by Britain, is maintained by Britain, and guaranteed of continuance by that same power, it is obvious that only direct action by Britain can end this unnatural division of a country. Any different premise or any different viewpoint cannot be other than an evasion and a refusal to appraise the situation in the light of existing facts. As long as the Congress of the United States appropriates funds to aid British recovery then the Congress, in effect, is subsidizing the repression and persecution of 420,000 Irish men and women in Northern Ireland.

I am confident that the Congress would not consciously espouse such a program, and I am equally sure that the thought of subsidizing persecution is altogether repugnant to your committee. But, gentlemen, cause and effect are inseparable, and, in our opinion, therefore, it is not only highly desirable, but very essential, that the Fogarty resolution be favorably reported. If this is done, it will be serving notice to the world, and to the Kremlin in particular, that the policy of the Government of the United States is emphatically not one of expediency, but one based on the principles which have become known throughout the world as the "American way of life." It will be a policy based on morality and justice which will also serve our enlightened self-interest in matters of national defense. The Congress of the United States will not then be placed in the anomalous position of trying to stem the tide of an eastern European dictatorship while at the same time giving active assistance and support to a western European dictatorship.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). I would also like to insert a statement from Hon. Edward A. Kelly, Third District, Illinois, one from Daniel O'Sullivan of New York, and a resolution from the General Sherman Council No. 259 of the Knights of Columbus, New York, and also a statement of James Shalloo of Chicago, Ill.

(The statements referred to are as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD A. KELLY, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE THIRD DISTRICT, ILLINOIS

HON. John Kee and members of the committee, as a former Member of the United States Congress and having had the pleasure of serving in this distinguished body for 16 years, I join with the distinguished American citizens who

represent the American League for an Undivided Ireland, Inc. and other citizens in registering my protest against the allocation of any grant of money to the British Empire under the so-called Marshall plan or any other relief agency which would be used to continue the six-county government known as the Belfast Parliament, in the northeastern section of Ireland.

It is unthinkable to me as an American citizen and taxpayer that your committee or any other committee of the Congress of the United States would for one moment give serious consideration to such a proposition.

Mr. Chairman, we have been generous with our money and our blood in an effort to save the world for democracy. Millions of Americans fought for this ideal. As a war veteran of the First World War and the father of two war veterans of World War II I do not hesitate to say that the British Empire has been in a large measure the object of our bounty during the past quarter or more of a century, all at a tremendous sacrifice to the American taxpayer.

Let us call a halt to any effort anywhere in the world by the United States of America in frustrating the ambition and aims of any nation large or small in deciding for themselves the form of government under which they choose to live.

You are familiar with the magnificent contributions made by the men and women of Irish blood to the establishment and maintenance of this Republic.

Do not, by any act of our official government, add insult to that record.

As a sitting Member of the United States Congress in 1946 I opposed the British loan of \$3,750,000,000 on the ground that this money then was to be placed in the hands of a socialized government and would not serve any benefit intended by Congress.

I well remember the vicious propaganda that was organized in America by puppets of the British Government to force this obligation on the taxpayers of America.

If we ourselves are sincere in stopping the spread of communism in Europe, as the great cry went out at that time, I could not conceive then, or now of giving money to a government controlled by Socialists, which is one step away from communism.

Four years have proved that those of us that voted against that loan were right as this money was practically used to further the cause of socialistic ideas and regimentation of the people of the British Isles and was not used for the purpose of rehabilitating the English people as was so nobly explained to us by propaganda agents of the Socialists of England. I am proud today that I opposed this measure.

For we who believe in freedom must preserve that tradition horn and kept alive by those who gave their lives that all men may enjoy freedom.

Our purpose of gathering here today is greater and more significant than anything we have ever attempted perhaps in our lives. We are gathered to formulate and build an organization of all people who cherish and who believe in the freedom of all people today.

What is freedom and just what does it mean. There are of course many interpretations of its meaning but it all simmers down to but one cause, and that is: The state or condition of being free: liberty; independence; immunity.

Mr. Chairman, the partition of the historic Irish Nation is a question that is engaging the minds of thoughtful people not only in Ireland, Britain and the United States, but even throughout western Europe.

The importance of this question not only from the point of view of the Irish people, but having regards to the interests of the United States, cannot be stressed too much. In the disturbed conditions of the world today, I am sure that the great majority of our fellow citizens favor the reunification of Ireland and the abolition of the border which separates six counties from 26 counties of that historic land.

The ties that bind the people of the United States and Ireland are strong and enduring. The traditional friendship of the Irish Nation for the United States has been strengthened through the generations by the contribution of the sons and daughters of Ireland in the building of our Republic. In the anxious days that lay ahead, I think that a statesmanlike effort should be made to restore "The Lost Province" to Ireland. It will be an evidence of good faith on Britain's part, and it will be of immeasurable benefit in cementing the good relations that should exist between the free democracies of the Western World.

Mr. Chairman, now what is the actual position in Ireland today: Twenty-six counties in Ireland are as free as the people in any country in the world. That part of Ireland is completely free. They may make their own laws, choose

their own policies, mold their own destiny insofar as it is permitted for human beings to do so. The aim of their people throughout their long struggle has been achieved so far as that part of Ireland is concerned. Their constitution declares them to be a sovereign, independent, democratic state. They are all that, and if they could say that of the whole of their country, then we could truly say that the aspirations of the Irish people have been achieved. Unfortunately, we cannot say that. Their country has been cut in two. Six of the 32 counties of Ireland have been cut off, without any reference to the people of Ireland. The people of Ireland in a plebiscite held in the general elections, which were indeed a plebiscite, held in the year 1918, by an overwhelming majority, decided to declare their independence and to establish a republic, a republic for the whole of Ireland.

The vote was overwhelming. The vote took place at a time, you will remember, when the world had been listening for several years, during World War I, to the declarations of the various powers involved in the war, to the effect that the war was being fought for the freedom of all the small nations, to see that no nation should have the right to extend its policies over another nation, but that each nation would be permitted to choose its own policy, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid.

That was the Wilson policy after the First World War. These words and these ideals stirred the imagination of the people of the whole world. They saw in them a hope of getting a real foundation for peace, a peace that might endure, a peace, at any rate, that was not going to be threatened by the natural desire of a nation held in subjection to get its rightful freedom.

And, mind you it was not merely the President of the United States who held these ideals. These ideals were held and these statements made by the statesmen of Britain; and made also by the statesmen of France. It was at that time, then, that the Irish people determined to form an independent republic. But these principles that were so eloquently enunciated were not going to be put into practice. They in Ireland had to endure great suffering before these principles would be admitted, even for 26 of their counties. But they were denied to them by partition. Their country was cut in two by an act of the British Parliament passed in the year 1920. Six of the counties were cut off. These six counties were not just cut off by any just principle. But many suggestions have been made and were made by propagandists that there is in that part of Ireland a different people; that there is something peculiar in the inhabitants of that part of Ireland which distinguishes them from the inhabitants of the rest of Ireland.

There is no truth in that.

The fact is that in Ireland—they are, in all Ireland, mixed. You will find there the blood of the ancient Celts, mixed with the blood of the Norman, the Saxon, and even the Dane. They are mixed throughout the country as a whole. It is inevitable that after some 700 or 800 years of possession, domination, invasion, implantation by another power, that should be so. So that there is in fact no racial difference between the people who inhabit the 26 counties and those who inhabit the country as a whole.

An excuse, of course, had to be given. But the fact is that this partition of their country had its origin in British party politics, and in nothing else. Those of you who know English history, the history of the end of the last quarter of the nineteenth century, would know the Tories opposed the granting of home rule in Ireland, and the liberals, under Gladstone, supported by the Irish party under Parnell, wanted home rule. The Tories at that time, to defeat their rival party, the liberals raised the cry, "Ulster will fight, and Ulster will be right." That cry was fairly effective. But, just before World War I, the people of Britain were converted by a majority to the cause of home rule for Ireland. It was true that it was a limited measure, yet in quick time a home-rule bill was passed. But the Tories, to prevent it from being put into effect, again raised the old cry, "Ulster will fight," and they set out to arm their supporters in the northern part of Ireland, because there are a greater number of Tory supporters in that part of Ireland than in any other.

They set out to arm them for the purpose of once more preventing home rule from being granted to Ireland.

With the beginning of World War I home rule was suspended and it was suggested the four of the counties of Ireland should be excluded from its operation. The war was on; the volunteer movement had made progress. Easter week had taken place. Ireland's independence, established by a plebiscite, had taken place. Ireland's independence as a republic was declared in our National Capital

on the 21st day of January 1919. And so when Mr. Lloyd George introduced his Partition Act, it was done after the Irish people had indicated quite clearly what their desire was.

The question is why are these people cut off?

If it is right to say that Ulster must not be coerced, then what about these Nationalists in the six counties? They are, of course, being coerced. They are being held separate from their fellow countrymen by force and by nothing else. British troops are in occupation in that area. If this policy is the right principle in any case, and you were to accept such a principle, there is no democratic state in the world that could maintain its integrity—none.

Would it be right if certain States in the United States because they were in the minority such as happened in the national election of 1932 when Vermont and New Hampshire went Republican and the rest of the States went Democratic, would it be right to deny those two States the right of self-government? Of course not, any more than the similar situation now prevailing in Ireland. Is it right to subject the people in this given area by a minority of partitioners, to deny the right of representative government to the majority? Of course not, because no democratic form of government can last under this system.

I believe it was Patrick Henry who said a nation divided against itself cannot endure.

With the unsettled conditions prevailing today after another terrifying war, a war waged at least we thought, to rid the world of evil and the wrongs of mankind that prey upon defenseless nations and people for power, exploitation, and greed; and while we have set up a United Nations for the purpose of looking into these problems of smaller nations that the wrongs committed may be righted, it is up to us to bring pressure upon those who sit, in these conferences or else this will be a lost cause for Ireland. I have witnessed organized groups pleading their cause and we who gave so much to the cause throughout the world for unity should not now be frail in our demands upon the President of these United States and those in control of our Government that they may instruct countries that are receiving material aid from us for the purpose of maintaining peace that they demand those countries get their house in order before another single dime be extended to them. With your help we can win and with the help of Congress our objective can be accomplished.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a partisan problem. This is a problem that involves every person that believes in liberty. As the older Members of this chamber know that I introduced House Resolution 390 on the first day of November 1945, in behalf of the Republic of Lithuania to reaffirm the policy of the United States as expressed in the Atlantic Charter.

I did so because I believe that all nations who believe in democracy should not be suppressed.

STATEMENT BY DANIEL O'SULLIVAN, GRAND KNIGHT, GENERAL SHERMAN COUNCIL No. 569, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, QUEENS COUNTY, N. Y.

My name is Daniel O'Sullivan and I reside in Queens County, N. Y. I am a practicing attorney at law, a member of the bar of the State of New York, and I am grand knight of the General Sherman Council No. 569, Knights of Columbus, Queens County, N. Y.

At the regular meeting of our council held at Corona, Queens County, N. Y., on April 14, 1950, a resolution was unanimously adopted by which the members of our order went on record in favor of the Fogarty resolution which is before the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives for consideration.

Many of the members of our council of the Knights of Columbus are veterans of World Wars I and II, and in addition to the adoption of the resolution aforementioned, we are delighted to advise your honorable committee that the supreme council of the Knights of Columbus, at its midwinter meeting in Washington in January 1950, also went on record in favor of a united and independent Ireland.

The liberty-loving people in our community have given evidence in public meetings and repeated declarations that they are in favor of the application of the principle of self-determination so that the Irish people may have an opportunity once and for all to decide the form of government for all of Ireland.

I respectfully urge that the members of the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives give favorable consideration to the Fogarty resolution before the committee so that the House of Representatives may have an opportunity to vote on it before the end of this session.

I also respectfully ask that the attached copy of the resolution passed by the General Sherman Council, Knights of Columbus, Queens County, be incorporated in the record of your committee.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY BY GENERAL SHERMAN COUNCIL, No. 569, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, AT CORONA, QUEENS COUNTY, N. Y., APRIL 14, 1950

Whereas a resolution (H. Res. 270) favoring the unity of all Ireland under the Government of the Republic of Ireland, has been submitted to the House of Representatives at Washington, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for consideration; and

Whereas a public hearing is to be held at Washington on April 28, 1950, by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to ascertain to what extent said proposed resolution is supported by public opinion; and

Whereas the partition of Ireland by England, for the benefit of England, is regarded by liberty-loving people everywhere as a political crime of the first magnitude, and need not be further characterized here; and

Whereas it is the duty of American citizens to express to the Committee on Foreign Affairs their views on the subject to be considered: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the General Sherman Council, No. 569, of the Knights of Columbus, with a membership of about 800 men residing in the County of Queens, State of New York, in regular meeting assembled at Corona, New York City, on April 14, 1950, as follows:

We favor the abolition of the unnatural separation of a segment of the North of Ireland from the rest of that country;

We favor the unity of Ireland under one central government chosen by all the people of Ireland;

We adhere to the proposition that all nations have the right to maintain their territorial integrity whenever the same is threatened by another country or an internal minority;

We denounce the creation and continued support of the quisling government set up by England in Northeast Ireland against the wish of the majority of the Irish people;

We strongly support the resolution proposed in the House of Representatives by Hon. John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island (H. Res. 270), that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland; and

We respectfully request its favorable consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and we urge our representatives from the County of Queens to vote in favor of the adoption of said resolution when it is brought before the House;

We direct that copies hereby be forwarded to Hon. John Kee, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to Hon. John E. Fogarty, and to each of our four representatives from Queens County, and to the local press.

Unanimously adopted:

JAMES F. PHILLIPS, *Grand Knight*.
LAWRENCE McALLISTER, *Recorder*.

STATEMENT OF JAMES SHALLOO, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, this is the third time that I have had the privilege of appearing before your committee and I appreciate the opportunity of submitting the following statement in favor of the passage of the Fogarty resolution.

There is no nation which has given more for the cause of liberty than the historic Irish Nation. In these United States where truth, justice, and the pursuit of happiness are not to be denied under our Constitution, we should be sympathetic with the expressed wish of the people of Ireland for the unity of their country. The Irish people through, blood and tears, throughout the centuries have struggled for the ideal of complete freedom. They believe in the principles of democracy and in every generation for the past 700 years they have shown that they have not been afraid to give their lives for the unity and independence of their land.

In these anxious days the Irish people should be given the right to fight side by side with the democratic nations of the world to provide a natural and formidable bulwark against the further spread of communism.

In examining the situation as it now stands in Ireland, it is absurd to attempt to maintain that 4,000,000 people on one island can reasonably sustain two governments. Our European recovery program should embrace the application of sound economic principles and regard the maintenance of an army of occupation by England in North Ireland against the expressed wishes of the Irish people as oppressive, wasteful, and tyrannical.

Enlightened public opinion amongst American taxpayers calls for the recognition by the United States of the Republic of Ireland as constituting the entire 32 counties of that historic country. The Fogarty resolution should be approved by our House of Representatives as an indication that the United States believes in its traditional policy of democratic rule for the free nations of the world and surely that should include Ireland.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). We now come to our last witness, who has been with us many times before, Richard F. Dalton.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD F. DALTON, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. DALTON. I am Richard F. Dalton of New York. I appreciate the honor that has been accorded me by asking me to sum up, today. I suppose it is because I am the only one here who testified for the Gallagher resolution 31 years ago. But I am not going to spoil these hearings, Mr. Chairman. I am not going to sum up. I am just going to wind it up. I am going to wind it up this way: I hold in my hand the record of that old hearing. I sat all through today listening to see if there was any question left unanswered, if there was anything left to be said. I have heard nothing left unanswered. I do not believe there is anything left to be said.

I want to thank the committee, not only for its courtesy today, but for its courtesy during the days when we were down here previously, working along toward today.

I am convinced that the Fogarty resolution is in the safest of safe hands and I am just asking your permission to file a statement of my own, perhaps as a matter of pride.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). Without objection, it is so ordered. (The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF RICHARD F. DALTON, OF LONG ISLAND CITY, N. Y.

In the year 1863 the young men of Ireland, in their generation, were once again beginning to assert the right of Ireland to freedom, just as that right had theretofore been asserted by each generation of their forbears.

The then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, speaking for the English Government of the day, rebuked them, and bluntly stated the English viewpoint with respect to Ireland. Lord Carlisle said (and I quote him exactly from the histories of the times): "The destiny of Ireland is that she shall be the fruitful mother of flocks and herds for England's table."

I have personally spent more than 4 months out of the past 2 years, in Ireland, and I unhesitatingly assert to this honorable committee that the purpose of England remains in 1950 the same as it was in 1863.

By continuing to maintain the English pale under the guise of a puppet statelet in six of the northeastern counties of Ireland; by foisting upon Ireland—a little country only the size of our State of Maine—the uneconomic burden of two governments with all their appurtenant expenses; by splitting the country with an unnatural customs boundary; by calculated dumpage of English-manufactured goods, at less than cost of production, into every section of free Ireland which starts up an infant industry; by overcharge to the merchants of free Ireland for coal of inferior quality, filled with slate and rubbish; by shipment into free Ireland of inferior stock feed at inflated price;

by delivery into the liberated portion of Ireland of low-grade steel and of soft and inferior agricultural machinery repair parts; by dumpage of semidefective and short-wearing hand tools, England strives to hold back the progress of the 26 liberated counties, and to bring them back to heel if possible.

By paying preferential prices for beef on the hoof, for mutton on the hoof, for young pigs and for fowl to the producers or sellers of these items within the police state or six-county area England actually does maintain an artificial subsidy for the farmers in occupied Ireland and encourages the breakdown of Irish morality by inducing smuggling across the border.

By adverse differential in the price paid for such crops as flax, England's henchmen strive to support England's persistent propaganda that Irishmen in occupied Ireland are more prosperous than their brother Irishmen in liberated Ireland.

By every device perfected through the centuries, England uses the wiles and the guiles of the colonizer to infiltrate herself back again into the Ireland which has won her partial freedom, and England does not hesitate to do all of this by the free and liberal use of American money.

From England's standpoint, the prize is a rich one. England is overpopulated and overdeveloped; while—because of England's repression of Ireland through the centuries—Ireland is underpopulated and underdeveloped. England's purpose in maintaining her last foothold in the English-soldiered police state which she guarantees, and maintains by the use of American money, is therefore quite understandable and apparent.

England's persistence can lead to but one thing unless checked by American influence. That one thing is bloodshed. The proclamation read upon behalf of the men and women of Ireland in Easter Week 1916 recounted that six times in 300 years the Irish had risen in armed protest. History forbids us to assume that if the present denial of liberty and democracy is permitted to continue the young men of the six counties will do any differently than their forbears.

I submit to you Mr. Chairman that in 1919, by the passage of the Gallagher resolution, Congress passed upon the propriety of such a declaration as is presented by Mr. Fogarty of Rhode Island, and I submit that in the light of the advancement of American moneys to England it becomes the duty of the Congress to make declaration.

That it has been American money with which England has supported, and continues to support, the six-county government, there can be no question, because Sir Stafford Cripps, speaking for the Labor Government of Britain, has stated repeatedly that Britain's economy could not presently survive without the financial aid which Britain has been receiving, and expects to receive, from the United States of America, and Winston Churchill, speaking for the Conservative Party Opposition, far from criticizing the acceptance of such aid, has indicated that if in power his party would have been able to have that aid made even more generous.

For more than 2 years past, spokesmen for the American League for an Undivided Island have appeared before the appropriate committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives at Washington, opposing the sending by the United States of financial aid to Britain for so long as England maintains her armed occupancy of any portion of the land of Ireland.

Ireland as a whole could be easily and prosperously economic. The six-county area is far too small to be economic. I endeavor to give a summary word picture of the drain down which our American money is poured:

FACTS AND REFERENCES

The finances of the six-county government are regulated almost entirely by England. The six-county Minister for Finance in the Parliament in 1936 said: "Our province is not a dominion responsible for its entire finance. No less than 89 percent of our total revenue is collected by the imperial authorities on a scale settled at Westminster in accordance with the needs of the Kingdom as a whole and, even the remaining 11 percent within our purview does not admit of much variation."

Finance is the key to the closed door of partition. England holds the key. (Cahir Healy, M. P., *The Mutilation of a Nation*. The Derry Journal, Ltd., Derry, 1945.)

The British Parliament, in 1920, accorded to the six-county area certain limited powers of self-government under a representative of the King of England, with a Senate and a House of Commons for the six-county government.

Thus the Government of the six counties is a purely statutory body of limited authority, exercising powers determinable by law, and as unquestionably subject to the British Government as is the County Council of London. (Henry Harrison, O. B. E., M. C., *Ulster and the British Empire, 1939*, Browne & Nolan, Ltd., Dublin, Robert Hale, Ltd., London.)

The area which was carved off from the body of Ireland in order to create the six-county area was not determined as a matter of sound economics. It was determined solely to answer the political question: "What is the largest area that can be safely and permanently controlled by the Unionist majority in the 30-mile sweep around Belfast?" (*Ireland's Right to Unity*, p. 7, Browne & Nolan, Ltd. Dublin, 1950.)

England's first theory was that this six-county area would constitute an economic entity. The facts over the elapsed 30 years show the contrary, but England carefully conceals these facts, so far as possible.

Harrison says that they "depend upon the detailed application of a formula so complex as to defy the scrutiny of publicist, journalist, legislator, or economist statistician who has not access to unpublished treasury figures."

The theory at the beginning was that the six counties were to pay a prorata share of ordinary collected taxes to the British treasury. This had to be abandoned, and it came to be that the six-county government merely makes a contribution from what is left, if anything. Actually, the six-county government, with embarrassing frequency, seeks a grant-in-aid from the Imperial Exchequer.

Again quoting Harrison: "Gently and most unobtrusively Northern Ireland was gathered to the ample bosom of the British Exchequer, there to revert to the status of an unweaned suckling, but yet—reposing there—to retain all the privileges of adult freedom."

The relative taxable burdens of Britain and of the six-county area were fixed by the Joint Exchequer Board of Britain, and the six-county proportion was to be deducted as a first charge upon each current year's revenue. The six-county figure, based upon the financial year 1919-20 was \$31,680,000. (Hansard, and Answers of Sir John Simon, Chancellor of the British Exchequer, as compiled in table B, *Ulster and the British Empire*, supra.)

In 1922-23, the six-county area actually paid against this allocation \$26,742,400, but, the yearly payment steadily declined until in 1934-35, the six-county government only paid \$96,000, and in 1935-36, it had to get a "hand-out" from England of \$1,590,000 in order to get along.

The British Exchequer also takes responsibility for unemployment insurance in the six-county area, and the following is quoted from a memorandum embodying the agreement (Appendix III, Harrison).

Modifying the agreement previously existing, it provides that " * * * The United Kingdom Government will not exercise their right to reopen the question of the amount of the contribution of the United Kingdom Exchequer under the Northern Ireland Unemployment Insurance Agreement, of the 29th April 1935, if such contribution exceeds £1,000,000" (Hansard May 12, 1938, cols. 1708-1709).

Some palpably fraudulent propaganda literature, under the obviously fraudulent title "Ulster Speaks" (by its imprint apparently paid for by His Majesty's Stationery Office), has just been handed out in the United States as part of a propaganda campaign,¹ and it purports to show a six-county imperial contribution, net, since the six-county Government was set up. Actually, the figures show a deficit. This, without allowance for English maintenance of the Constabulary in the six counties; without allowance for English maintenance of the "Water Guard," which officers the Border; without the English contribution for the six-county unemployment insurance; and without allowance for the maintenance of various special "Services" needed by a military puppet state.

The facts are that in time of war emergency, when England is relying upon the shipyards, the rope works, and the canvass and linen-making facilities of Belfast, the six-county area makes vast earnings, and is in position to make very substantial imperial contribution. But, in normal years the unemployment in the six-county area is more than twice the unemployment in Britain as a whole, and the six-county area is the No. 1 distressed area of the United Kingdom.

Contrast this with the situation before partition:

"Official statistics show that for a period of 20 years the Belfast area had the lowest rate of unemployment in the three Kingdoms" (Hansard, Feb. 22, 1926).

¹How this propaganda is paid for may be drawn from the attached photostats:

"Printed in Northern Ireland for His Majesty's Stationery Office on behalf of the Government of Northern Ireland by W. and G. Baird, Ltd., Belfast.

"Printed in Northern Ireland for H. M. Stationery Office by John Cleland & Son, Ltd., Belfast."

As soon as it became absolutely obvious that the economic set-up of the six-county government was headed "for the rocks," England set up a commission consisting of Lord Colwyn, Sir Laming Worthington-Evarts, Sir Josiah Stamp, with Mr. William Piercy, C. B. E., as secretary.

It certainly applied the principles of bankruptcy reorganization to the imperial tax structure in the six counties.

The act of 1920 had assessed payment for imperial services as a first charge on six-county revenue, and subject to this charge, the six-county government could dispose of the balance, as it wished, for its own purposes. The new method recognized six-county expenditures, for six-county purposes, as a first charge on six-county revenue, and arranged that, subject to six-county government expenditures, a contribution to imperial services might be paid. England did not like it, but England approved the change. (Ulster and the British Empire p. 121, supra.)

But even that did not solve the problem.

At Portadown, toward the end of 1947, we find Sir Basil Brooke holding his hat out to the Imperial Exchequer for a special grant-in-aid of \$40,000,000, for the six-county government.

Apparently, Sir Basil was low in his estimate, because the London Economist of December 26, 1947, increases his requirement by about one-half.

The whole of the six-county area embraces less than 5,300 square miles (about 70 miles by 75 miles), and it obviously is unable to sustain the cost of: (a) Grandiose institutions of government for so small an area; (b) a system of double sets of administrative and executive officials; (c) an elaborate system of holding a virtually disfranchised minority in subjection by armed and implemented executive repression (Harrison (supra), p. 141).

That England realizes this is evident from debates and speeches of Mr. Philip Snowden, an ex-Chancellor of the British Exchequer.

Speaking upon a motion for "a grant-in-aid of the revenues of the Government of Northern Ireland," Mr. Snowden said:

"It is a most extraordinary proceeding that we should have what is, in effect, a new estimate for a 1¼ million pounds, and that is proposed to the committee without one word of explanation or justification by the party responsible for it. * * *

"It is ostensibly a vote on behalf of special constabulary in Northern Ireland. It is nothing of the kind. If it were permitted by parliamentary usage, I should describe this vote, and quite accurately, by a very ugly word. This proposal is the last concession—the latest rather; not, I am afraid, by any means the last—which has been wrung by the Government of Northern Ireland from the British Exchequer without any justification and quite illegally (Hansard, cols. 1,652-4).

* * * * *

"It is quite true that similar grants have been made in previous years, but they have never been made except after a long contest between the Government of Northern Ireland and the British Treasury. The British Treasury have invariably resisted this demand until the pressure upon them by their political friends has become so strong that the Treasury were unable any longer to continue resistance."

In his attempted reply, Mr. Winston Churchill was forced to admit:

"It is occasionally asked: 'Why does Ulster want to come for money to this House? Why does she not live on her own revenue like the south of Ireland?' And Mr. Churchill proceeded to attempt a lengthy explanation which Mr. Harrison shows to be fallacious.

We now come to two queries:

The first query, Why should England thus permit herself to be "milked" by the six-county government?

The answer is simple and obvious: The six-county government is but the military bridgehead of England in Ireland.

The aroused public opinion of the world at large and, more particularly, Irish opinion and influence in the United States of America, serves to restrain England from attacking Ireland with force of arms; but, by the retention of a foothold (the remnants of the old English Pale) in Ireland, England hopes to infiltrate Ireland, and eventually get Ireland back again.

Why? Because England, the size of our State of Illinois, is badly overpopulated and badly overdeveloped. Ireland, the size of our State of Maine, is badly underpopulated and underdeveloped as a result of centuries of oppression by England.

The English statesmen see that England badly needs several areas for expansion and exploitation. To their eyes, Ireland is one such area, and, because of its contiguity, a particularly desirable one.

England wants to regain her former partial conquest of Ireland, and is willing to make speculative installment payments so long as the United States of America is really putting up the money.

The second query, Why does the United States of America put up the money to bolster England's gain?

And the answer is simple and obvious again:

Uncle Sam began to put up the money during World War II; Uncle Sam (without too much inquiry as to England's purposes) continued to put up the money in an effort to rehabilitate England after World War II; but, Uncle Sam is not likely to continue to put up the money after the facts have been brought home to the voting public by the educational efforts of the Irish-American electorate.

Let England hark back to the words of her own Lord Curzon, who, when Britain's Foreign Secretary, said: "There has not been a Foreign Minister in this country during the last 50 years who has not felt, and indeed, often stated, that the strength of England was diminished and her moral influence jeopardized by the unsolved position of the Irish question. This was felt not merely in the Dominions where the Irish have been so disturbing a factor, but most of all in the United States of America, where the understanding we so warmly desire has not only been rendered difficult, but almost impossible, by the existence of the Irish question."

Our Irish-American electorate is asking the House of Representatives to declare itself and to thus open the way for ending Ireland's trouble now.

Not once, but again and again, the heads of the present Government of the Republic of Ireland, and also the head of the responsible opposition, Mr. deValera, have declared that there is but one issue remaining at odds between England and Ireland, and that is the issue of partition.

Favorable report upon the resolution of Representative John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, is respectfully recommended.

Mr. DALTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have inserted at this point in the record a letter from Mr. Leslie J. Tompkins, a prominent attorney of New York City, formerly the dean of New York University and at present the chairman of the American Defense Society of New York City. The letter, addressed to the Honorable John Kee, reads as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., May 2, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: The last few years (perhaps months) would more nearly express it) have seen political independence become an accomplished fact in a very large part of Asia and the Middle East. England has released her hold on a large part of India and has been a party to negotiations freeing certain of the Middle East countries in which she had an interest.

In the face of all this, why, we ask, is Ireland two-thirds free and independent and one-third a subject country and still a part of the United Kingdom?

The subject of discrimination has plagued us in the United States, largely based upon color and race. State after State is enacting legislation in the attempt to remove it. No questions of race, or color, or creed are involved in Irish independence. Here we have a homogenous people who can trace their ancestry back for a thousand years, who have been struggling for the independence they so richly deserve.

One may rightfully ask why this condition should be allowed to exist? It surely cannot be said that the Irish people are unable to govern themselves, or that, left to themselves, they will interfere with England's rights in other quarters of the globe. The present well-established and now well-recognized Irish Government is the answer to this.

Nor is it a question of creed—Protestants and Catholics dwell together in amity—nor is there any attempt on the part of either to interfere with each other. The day of schisms is past. As a Protestant who has "lived long in the

land of my birth" (Minnesota 1867), I have never encountered any controversy over the fact that there is a question of creed involved in the situation.

I am heartily in accord with the Fogarty resolution (H. Res. 270).

Yours very truly,

LESLIE J. TOMPKINS,
Chairman of the American Defense Society.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). I want to say thank you, Mr. Dalton. You have been before the committee on many, many occasions. I want to assure you that this committee is going to give very, very serious consideration to these resolutions and it is my hope that we will be able to report out shortly the Fogarty resolution.

I must, however, apologize to those of you who have been inconvenienced, but as you know we have only had this 1 day to hold hearings. If we had recessed, it might have been impossible to have gotten all the witnesses here to testify today. As it has turned out, everybody has had a chance to say something, so I will say thank you.

Mr. COSTELLO. I think there are one or two more who may have statements who have not identified themselves.

STATEMENT OF JOHN E. WAYNE, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. WAYNE. I am John E. Wayne, of Cleveland. I am a member of the American Association for an Undivided Ireland. I am an American citizen who lived in Ireland 33 years. In the name of freedom and democracy I support the Fogarty resolution and I also agree heartily with what has been said here today.

STATEMENT OF SEAMUS MACDERMOTT, EDITOR OF THE GAELIC AMERICAN, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. MACDERMOTT. I am Seamus MacDermott. I am national secretary for the American League for an Undivided Ireland and editor of the Gaelic American of New York, N. Y.

In addition to that, I want to report that I have been requested to report for the St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee of New York, the Clan-na-Gael, and the United Irish American Societies of New York, all who are in favor of the Fogarty resolution. I present this statement for the record.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF SEAMUS MACDERMOTT, EDITOR OF THE GAELIC AMERICAN,
NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of course I am here in favor of the passage of the Fogarty resolution. It is not my intention or desire to take up the time of your committee with a long recital of England's injustice and misrule in Ireland.

The gruesome and sordid story of British brutality and inhumanity inflicted on the Irish nation is pretty generally known to you gentlemen.

The sacrifices made by the Irish people all through the centuries for their country's freedom are likewise known to you all.

Yet, after all the sacrifices, England still holds on to 6 of the 32 counties which comprise the entire Irish nation.

Ireland has paid a tremendous price for the measure of freedom which the 26 counties now enjoy, which is known as the Republic of Ireland. I think the editor of the Brooklyn Daily Eagle, on March 31 last, summed this up very well when he wrote:

"There is little in the history of Britain's treatment of Ireland that is creditable. It has been a history of denial of freedom, attended by oppression and

bloodshed. Ireland's gains have been at a heavy price, paid in far too many instances by patriots who fell before a firing squad or on the gallows. In recent years, however, some of the old bitterness and hatred has disappeared and a spirit of understanding has made progress. It may lead within a short time to the national unity which is so essential to Ireland's well-being."

Oppression and bloodshed have always been synonymous with England's ruthlessness in Ireland. And bear in mind, gentlemen, I am not going back to ancient history to bear out this fact. I will only go back to 34 short years ago, to Easter 1916 when 16 noble-souled Irish patriots were placed before a British firing squad and shot into eternity, for the crime of loving Ireland and fighting for her freedom. I might mention here also that among the gallant martyrs at that time was my own blood brother, Sean MacDermott, who was one of the signers of the Irish declaration of independence.

The Black and Tan war which followed that period, and continued up to the signing of the treaty, forced upon Ireland by the threat of "immediate and terrible war," remains one of the most brutal and bloodthirsty episodes of England's long and sordid history in Ireland.

Today in the six counties which England still holds, practically the same conditions exist, but in a more subtle form. Today they have, and I mean the British Government, a Special Powers Act, under which Irishmen and Irish women can be thrown into prison on the most trivial excuse, and held without trial by judge or jury, at the pleasure of the puppet government which Britain has set up in Belfast.

It is because of these damnable conditions, and unfortunately too, that American taxpayers are indirectly helping to sustain these conditions by the money which the United States is giving to England, and which England uses to keep a military bridgehead in the partitioned portion of Ireland, that we are here today, appearing before you, gentlemen, pleading for the passage of the Fogarty resolution. Passage of this resolution would enable the Irish people to determine in a free plebiscite to embrace the entire territory of Ireland, all 32 counties in the Republic of Ireland.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I move that if there are additional statements that come in, the chairman be authorized to accept them and include them in the record within 5 days.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DALTON. May there be a word of thanks for your former associate and colleague, Mr. Costello? Mr. Costello will undoubtedly put a statement in the record.

STATEMENT OF MIKE O'REILLY

Mr. O'REILLY. My name is Mike O'Reilly. I was the assistant corporation counsel of Jersey City and now I am the presiding magistrate of the courts of Jersey City. I am a member of the American Irish Historical Society and I am also a member of the Sons and Daughters of St. Patrick. We had our representative here to speak, but what I would like to get permission for is this: I also represent the Sons of Poland, and I know they are heartily in accord with the stand to end the partition of Ireland. My firm, of which I am the senior member, also represents the American Jewish Congress in our city and I feel quite certain that those organizations are very interested, and interested as all Jewish people are in the interests of liberty of all people. At this time I would like permission to hold the record open for at least 5 days so that those organizations and many similar organizations I am sure throughout the country, will have an opportunity to submit resolutions favoring the passage of the Fogarty resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). The committee has already agreed to that procedure.

Mr. COSTELLO. We also have here Mrs. Elisha O'Conner and Pearl O'Conner of the Irish Advocate of New York. I wonder if they would stand up.

Mrs. O'CONNOR. We are in favor of the Fogarty resolution.

Mr. COSTELLO. Also I believe Mr. Cornelius Neenan is outside but I would like to have the record show his presence here during the hearing. He has been here and is a very hard worker on behalf of the American League for an Undivided Ireland.

(The following statement was submitted by Mr. Neenan:)

STATEMENT OF CORNELIUS F. NEENAN, NEW YORK CITY, MEMBER OF NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR AN UNDIVIDED IRELAND

My name is Cornelius F. Neenan, of 7 Columbus Avenue, New York City. In company with the splendid representation of delegates from all the important centers in the United States attending at this hearing, I join with them in support of House Resolution 270, known as the Fogarty bill.

It is to be hoped that the members of this honorable committee will make a favorable report on the Fogarty resolution and that the House of Representatives will give a unanimous endorsement to this resolution which is in favor of a united and independent Ireland.

I also take this opportunity of protesting the use of American dollars, presumably employed for the rehabilitation of Europe, when in reality, it is apparent that England uses these very same dollars to prevent the rehabilitation of Ireland. The British Government uses the very same means of financial strangulation on Ireland by maintaining there an army of occupation in defiance of the expressed wishes of the Irish people, and in plain contravention of the purposes of the Marshall plan. Britain definitely uses these same funds to create economic chaos in Ireland and to maintain its imperialistic grip on Ireland by the policy of divide and conquer.

It is impossible for any nation, let alone a small nation, to survive by suffering its territory to be artificially split in two, thus making it necessary for the maintenance of two governments, two armies, and two police forces. The government now maintained in the six northeastern counties of Ireland is in fact a police state, comparable to the satellite states behind the iron curtain. In this police state in Northern Ireland the flag of Soviet Russia can be displayed with immunity while the display of the flag of the Republic of Ireland is an offense punishable by imprisonment and fine. The practices in the police state of Northern Ireland are entirely contrary to recognized democratic principles and to the traditional policy of the United States which is doing so much to help the rehabilitation of Europe. American funds must not be used by Britain to maintain a bridgehead and another Polish corridor in Ireland.

The Irish people should be permitted to implement the decision which the great majority of them have made for a united Ireland. It is quite clear that a free and united Ireland on the western flank of Europe will be the best means of insuring the integrity and independence of Ireland, and at the same time will be a powerful force in the onward march of free nations.

Mr. COSTELLO. As you conclude, Mr. Chairman, may I express to you and the members of your committee and more particularly to your secretarial staff outside, our thanks. All of you have been very helpful. All of the people in the outer office have not used their typewriters because of this hearing in here with witnesses overflowing the outer office, and they will probably have to work quite long tonight because of that. I want to thank you for your extreme courtesy and kindness to us.

Mr. MANSFIELD (presiding). Mr. Costello, I want to say thank you and also thank all these people who took the time and the trouble to come down and attend this meeting and show their interest in this very important question.

The meeting is now adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 3:10 p. m., the committee adjourned to reconvene at the call of the chairman.)

APPENDIX

(The following statements have been submitted for inclusion in the record:)

STATEMENT OF HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to register my support of the Fogarty resolution favoring a free plebiscite by all the people of Ireland on the question of the unification of Ireland.

This is in accordance with the traditional American policy on the self-determination of peoples. It is the policy which can assure peace in those corners of the world where people must still strive for their right to lead their own lives.

Thirty-one years ago, in the Sixty-fifth Congress, this House declared in House Joint Resolution 357 that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desired to live. In 1916 the people of Ireland took up arms against the nation which had oppressed them and had refused them their right to freedom for 700 years. Five years later, in 1921, Britain agreed to a settlement which divided the country. Six of the thirty-two counties were withheld from the Irish people and these counties are to this day under the British Crown. They called this mutilated segment Northern Ireland, for they had to recognize that it was part of Ireland. They set up a separate parliament, known as the Stormont, which is supported by money from the British treasury.

The division of Ireland into two parts is morally indefensible. It is the old Machiavellian policy of playing parts of a whole against each other. In Ireland proper this policy of divide and rule is known as partition. It cuts the country into two unequal parts. The state they created is entirely artificial and takes no cognizance of racial forces, the existence of geographical factors, or the demands of popular sentiment. In setting up this rump State, geography was flouted and immemorial boundaries were ignored. It is kept alive by political gerrymandering. The Stormont government is still maintained in Britain's imperial interest.

The division of Ireland into north and south is a ridiculous classification. Ireland is an island country, a natural entity. The Irishmen in the north and in the south belong together in a united nation.

The thin veil of legality which holds the six counties apart is no more valid than the separation of two or three American States from the United States of America would be. In only two of the six counties is there a substantial majority in favor of the British connection, and this must be weighted by the overwhelming sentiment for independence and freedom in the 26 counties which make up the present truncated country of Ireland. Taking the country as a whole—north and south—80 percent of the people are believed to be in favor of independence. Great Britain can show her good faith in democracy and freedom by submitting this issue to a plebiscite of all the people of Ireland. The Government of Ireland will then rest on the consent of the governed.

A united Ireland would be a great bulwark of the west in its world-wide struggle with Soviet imperialism. The Government of Ireland has already announced that it would gladly join the Atlantic Pact if partition were removed. Instead of a small sullen ally, we would have a large and enthusiastic free nation cooperating fully with the west in the defense of our way of life. To this day Ireland does not have any diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. Everything we know about this nation and the way freemen behave should convince us that we would have a most dependable ally in a strategic part of the world if the sore of partition were removed and if the Irish people had representation as an equal in the pact of the western nations.

It is difficult for a people, no matter how liberty loving, to consider freedom and democracy for the world at large when it is denied them at home. It is high time that the injustice of partition is removed. The entire western world would be strengthened by the further evidence that we mean to live up to the ideals of freedom and independence which is a cornerstone of western civilization. Let the people of the Irish Nation decide.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE WILLIAM A. BARRETT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

The struggle of the Irish people for the right to control their national destiny has a history extending over 700 years. Their struggle goes on today, and it shall continue until the whole of their beloved island is once again fused in unity.

During the course of their long fight for liberation, the Irish have been subjected to a persecution that would have broken a less courageous people. Their will to survive, however, proved too strong even for the immense power of their conqueror. Instead of accepting the fate of subjugation to which he had consigned them, the Irish people fought back. They increased their determination to preserve their national cultures in proportion as pressure was exerted to undermine it. Never did they abandon the hope that one day they would strike off the alien shackles and they worked faithfully to hasten the coming of that day.

Gradually their efforts bore fruit. After a bitter and bloody struggle, self-government was obtained in the early 1920's. Subsequently, the completely independent Republic of Eire was born.

One task yet remains, however, before liberation becomes a full and final reality. The Irish people are not likely to slacken their efforts until the six northern counties of the Province of Ulster have been reunited in freedom with the rest of the Nation. They will not rest content until this artificially imposed division shall have been removed from the Nation.

Unification with the north is the prerequisite to the full economic and political progress of Eire. Even more fundamental, it is essential to the peace of soul of the Irish people.

We in America cannot remain indifferent to this burning issue on the other side of the ocean. We have traditionally sympathized with the struggle of the Irish people to gain their freedom and we are behind them now in this, the final phase of the fight.

It is not surprising that we should support Eire in this matter. Our sympathy stems historically from the similar experience which we underwent in achieving liberty and in forging our own national unity. And there is, perhaps, an even more compelling reason for our support. In the present hour of world crisis, the western world needs the full and active support of all the free societies of which it is composed. It cannot afford inconsistencies in its midst. It cannot tolerate major points of friction between its members. The very existence of western society depends on the degree of unity which it can achieve.

Nevertheless the issue of partition remains a constant thorn in Irish-British relations. Until it is resolved, furthermore, it is impossible for Eire to cooperate fully in political and military matters with the other nations of the Atlantic community. This has an adverse effect on the interests of the United States. We want and should have full Irish cooperation in all the measures which we are undertaking with other nations of the Atlantic community to strengthen the free world.

It is clear, then, that in our own self-interest as well as in the interest of justice and traditional friendship, the United States must continue and intensify its legitimate efforts in support of the peaceful achievement of Irish unity.

STATEMENT OF HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 270

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in support of the resolution introduced by Congressman John Fogarty, of Rhode Island, House Resolution 270, declaring it to be the sense of this House of Representatives that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland, I wish to say:

A few months ago the Congress of Industrial Organizations, headed by Philip

Murray, at its annual convention in Cleveland, passed a resolution condemning the partition of Ireland and a little previously the A. F. of L., headed by William Green, passed a similar resolution at their convention in St. Paul, Minn. I shall read the resolution for you.

Whereas there still exist throughout the world governments that do not recognize the rights of people in regard to their majority right of free self-government; and

Whereas there is a government in northern Ireland being perpetuated by a foreign power which is breeding bigotry and tends to destroy the unity of a race of people; and

Whereas the Irish people have contributed, over the centuries, more aid to the freedom of oppressed people than any nation in the world; and

Whereas organized labor has always raised its voice to espouse the cause of freedom and the rights of government that is of, for, and by all its people; and

Whereas the partition in Ireland is not a healthy or natural condition, and

Whereas the present government in Great Britain is controlled by the Labor Party: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the American Federation of Labor go on record against the perpetuation of the partition dividing all of the people of Ireland, and call upon the President of these United States, the State Department, and the Congress of the United States to do all in their power to end, once and for all, this unjust condition to the end that the government of Eire will truly represent all of its people with its natural borders, so that she can take her rightful place among the family of Nations.

You will note in the text of the resolutions that it condemns partition as unnatural. So well they might. Did Allen, Larkin, and O'Brien say "God save the greater part of Ireland"? Did they and Connolly and others die to liberate 26 counties only of the 32. Should the Irish national anthem be and I have it parodied as such—"God save the greater part of Ireland"? The answer to these questions is emphatically no and again no. They died, and men like Tom Barry fought to achieve freedom for the 32 counties of Ireland and not for 26 counties leaving 6 counties in British control.

Why should Ireland be partitioned? In my opinion it is part of classic British policy. We have only to look around the world. Wherever you find British control you find sooner or later partition. I am not concerned here with India but they have a great deal in common with the Irish. So have the Jews in the State of Israel much in common with the Irish and since American opinion—aye and Irish-American opinion—was such an important factor in bringing about a solution of the Israeli problem why cannot it be organized to help in a solution of the question of Irish partition.

How can such a solution be found? In my opinion it can be achieved only by peaceful methods, by men sitting down around a table as labor and industry do today—men with the will—with the desire to find a solution—and men with the power to negotiate a solution. Our State Department has enough influence with the British to induce them to consider such a proposal. American opinion if properly registered is certainly strong enough in the world for any country to be influenced by it.

No reasonable man could expect Ireland to join the Atlantic Pact to guarantee that part of her own territory shall remain in the possession of another country. Still I am not without hope that our administration may see the wisdom of taking steps to settle partition and that then we shall see a united Ireland restored to the full and proper possession of all her natural territory.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the committee will act favorably on the Fogarty resolution and that it will be reported out as quickly as possible so that action by the House can be taken on it during the present session of Congress.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES J. DELANEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK, IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 270

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in accord with the purpose of House Resolution 270, introduced by Mr. Fogarty, of Rhode Island. I was very pleased to learn that such a resolution had been offered, because it is incumbent upon the House of Representatives at this time to declare its position in favor of the free determination of form of government of all peoples.

As the resolution recalls, the Sixty-fifth Congress in 1919 adopted a similar resolution, declaring that the people of Ireland have the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live.

In making such a declaration, the House of Representatives carried on an honorable American tradition of speaking out for freedom and democracy for all the peoples of the world. It has never been the American custom to say that some, but not all, should be free, that some, but not all people, should have the right of self-determination of their form of government. No; the American way has been to declare for freedom and self-determination for all peoples.

That is why the resolution adopted by the Sixty-fifth Congress is not an isolated action, but rather an integral part of a long-established, well-respected American policy.

It is in keeping with the spirit of democracy that the national legislature of the foremost democracy in the world should speak out for democracy whenever occasion demands. When the rights of free people elsewhere are suppressed or threatened, it would be strange indeed if the American Congress were to take no note of this blow aimed at democracy.

In the matter of self-determination, our Government can point to a consistent and commendable record of recognition of the rights of peoples who came under its sovereignty. The people of Cuba and the people of the Philippines are today free and self-governing because of the basic honesty of our Government. When we set out to free the Cubans from Spanish rule, we promised to leave the Cubans to their own choice of government, and we kept that promise.

In this regard our policy has been the direct opposite of imperialism. We did not follow the lead of those world powers which extended their rule over distant areas and kept the people of those areas in subjection. Instead we blazed a new path in international relations by recognizing the right of self-determination in occupied territories, or in other cases, clearing the way for local rule which would in turn lead to self-government.

With so clear a record to point to, surely the United States has a fair claim to the attention of the free world when the House of Representatives is prompted to declare its belief that a free and democratic nation with whom we are on friendly terms—Ireland—should enjoy the rights of every free nation, of territorial integrity and sovereignty over all its citizens.

There are other good reasons for our concern about the unity and complete freedom of all Ireland. One notable reason is our interest, political and financial, in the economic recovery of western Europe. We have poured out funds, supplied expert advice, furnished equipment and materials to help the free nations of Europe. In furnishing this aid, we have no imperialistic designs in mind; we have no plans to exact payment in terms of freedom for the aid we lent.

If it be said in criticism by some that we have sought to influence the governments of some of the nations we have helped, we can honestly answer that our influence was in the cause of freedom and democracy. We have advised the Greek Government, and we have advised the Italian Government. We have advised the new government of western Germany. In no case did our advice spell special advantage for the United States in terms of dollars or in terms of power. For all of the advice we have given in Greece, in Italy, or in Germany, we have not a speck more power, nor a single dollar in unfairly gained profits. Our influence was exerted in the cause of freedom and democracy, and the good results of that influence are to be plainly seen in the advances made by the governments we have advised.

Since we have thus used our influence to good purpose in the countries just named, surely we have a right to exert our influence in other regions of the world where we have close and long-established ties.

Specifically, I refer to the United Kingdom and its neighbor, Ireland. Until now we have made no attempt to influence the Government of the United Kingdom, as we influenced the Governments of Greece and Italy, for the obvious reason there was no danger of the United Kingdom falling under the sway of Communists—a danger very evident in both Greece and Italy.

But while there was no pressing reason for advising the Government of England against the dangers of communism, there is a pressing reason for advising the Government of England that its policy toward Ireland is not the policy of a free and democratic nation.

Before citing the special reason justifying our concern about the relations of England and Ireland at this time, I would like to point out that there is no regard for freedom in a policy which forces the signatory to a treaty to accept a partition of its territory virtually at gun point. Yet such is the truth in the terms of the treaty whereby England recognized the Irish Free State.

Nor is there any regard for democracy in a government policy which imposes a partition of territory contrary to the wishes of the people resident in that territory. The claim has been made that the partition of Ireland reflects natural or political or religious differences in the northern part of Ireland. The fact is that there is no clear-cut division of any kind between the people who live in the northeastern tip of Ireland and those who live in other parts of Ireland.

That is not to say that the people of Ireland are without differences of religion, political beliefs, or local traditions; there are such differences, yet in no sense are they so clearly defined that one can speak of any part of Ireland as so distinct it could be at any time separated from the remainder of the country.

But that is what some would have us believe is the case.

The truth of the matter is that the partition of Ireland is so completely a fabrication of British foreign policy that British arms and troops are needed to maintain the partition. That truth is ugly enough; the picture worsens when we stop to reflect that the troops occupying free Ireland are there with the support of American dollars, materials, and equipment. The economic cooperation program, approved by the Congress, is thus used by one nation not to bolster the defenses of democracy, but rather to weaken them.

How long is the United States going to continue to supply the funds and equipment of a democracy to further the undemocratic policy of the United Kingdom? That was the question which faced the Congress when Mr. Fogarty introduced his amendment to the economic cooperation program. The amendment provoked widespread comment, not the least of which was critical on the unformed grounds that the United States had no right to query the British on how they were spending our funds.

Editorials thundered noisily against so-called American interference in the affairs of another government, while news columns in the same newspapers reported our protests to the Governments of Greece and Italy against domestic policies which we did not find to our liking.

I should like to see the Congress cut through the confusion which has been purposely generated around this issue of Irish partition, and get to the root of the question. That is what I believe Mr. Fogarty's resolution would do, and that is why I have spoken in support of it.

I believe that adopting House Resolution 270 is the least the Congress can do by way of meeting the problem posed by the practice of an undemocratic policy by one nation friendly to the United States against another nation friendly to the United States.

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS, IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 270

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, deeply appreciating the multitudinous demands upon each of you, by reason of individual duties and the legislative schedule, I should like to first express my gratitude for your courtesy in receiving my sentiments in support of this resolution now pending before you.

Without unnecessary preliminaries, I should like to remind you that 6 of Ireland's 32 counties were partitioned off by the British in 1920 and given a separate government. Shortly after coming into existence in 1921, the northern government declared a state of emergency and suspended all civil liberties; this emergency has now lasted 28 years. Even in this modern jumbled world such prolongation of an emergency, I think you will agree, seems overextended and requires explanation.

Authoritative and unbiased historians testify this territory of Northern Ireland was carefully chosen so as to be large enough to make it possible to exist under a separate government but not wide enough to enable the most vigorous minority ever to obtain a majority. The absurdity of this geographical division is clear when we realize the fact that Malin Head, in Donegal, the most northerly point in Ireland, was included in southern Ireland. If that is not an example of "gerrymandering" on a large scale, I'd like to know what is.

At this point, I feel it in order to place in the record, for your attention, an evaluation of Northern Ireland which was made, not by Irishmen, but by Englishmen. In 1935 an observer was sent from London to Belfast by the British National Council for Civil Liberties, to report on conditions there. The following is taken from his text on the manner in which the Northern Government operates under the Special Powers Act, and I quote:

"Through the use of the special powers, individual liberty is no longer protected by law, but is at the arbitrary disposition of the executive. The abroga-

tion of the rule of law has been so practiced as to bring the freedom of the subject into contempt.

"The Northern Irish Government has used special powers toward securing the domination of one particular political faction and, at the same time, toward curtailing the lawful activities of its opponents. The driving of legitimate movements underground into illegality, the intimidating or branding as lawbreakers of their adherents, however innocent of crime, has tended to encourage violence and bigotry on the part of the Government's supporters.

"The Northern Irish Government, despite its assurances that special powers are intended for use only against lawbreakers, has frequently employed them against innocent and law-abiding people, often in humble circumstances, whose injuries, inflicted without cause or justification, have gone unrecompensed and disregarded."

This same state of affairs appears to be still going on and Britain has not once taken action to stop it. Is it then not fair for us to ask, by way of adoption of this resolution, the British Government to do something to remove this continuing injustice which, for all these years, British-supported partition has inflicted upon Ireland. No one who examines the map of the Atlantic can fail to see the commanding position that Ireland holds in any scheme of Atlantic defense. If we request Ireland to take her place with us, and other liberty-loving nations, in defending the freedom of the world, is Ireland then not entitled to demand some proof of good faith from her associates? What proof can the British Empire give so long as it continues to maintain in power a government that suppresses a minority? Can anyone say that Ireland's reluctance to join a common defense system is unreasonable if one of the partners in such an association is engaged in active injustice against Ireland itself? Any thought of the Irish Government lacking in international understanding must be rejected in the light of her honorable and vigorous record in that regard.

Standing firm on its spiritual heritage, the Irish Nation has in our times achieved a new birth of freedom. There are those of us who can very well remember when such a birth of freedom for Ireland seemed a most remote and hopeless dream; yet it has happened. The assistance of Ireland's sons to every other nation in carving a destiny of freedom spotlights the pages of world history. Today we are engaged in a terrible struggle, against tyranny, for the preservation of human dignity and Christian ideals. I know that the sons of Ireland and the Irish Nation will stand side by side with America in trying to bring peace to a troubled universe.

I earnestly hope Ireland, whose brave sons gave their lives to fulfill our American dream of independence, may be accorded our support in achieving her ambition of the ages, to be like America, one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. I know, Mr. Chairman, that you and your committee members, will give this resolution thorough consideration. Your committee approval would, in my judgment, constitute a forward step in the promotion of peace on earth.

STATEMENT OF HON. FOSTER FURCOLO, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

I wish to associate myself with all those who stand for a united, happy, prosperous and peaceful Ireland. I believe we all should give our full support to the resolution being considered. I urge its adoption for the reasons I have discussed on countless occasions with members of this committee.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 270

Mr. Chairman, it is not my good fortune to have first-hand knowledge of the situation which confronts the people of Ireland at the present time.

But the subject has always been of interest to me and I have read much literature past and present relating to the subject.

One need not be an expert in the field of international relations to realize that partition is always a point of friction; history proves that.

I am firmly of the opinion that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live and for which they have been seeking for the past 30 years.

There is no racial difference between the peoples of Ireland and those of the partitioned area. They are a homogeneous people of predominantly Gaelic stock and they speak a common language.

In his very excellent treatise, *The Partition of Ireland*, David O'Neill who needs no introduction to students of Irish history writes "For all the years of recorded history and for many a century before history was written Ireland was one nation with indisputable boundaries set in the sea. In the days of her power she sent armies overseas, in the days of her subjugation her sons could arm only in secret but in both periods there was only one meaning to Ireland—that is the whole island."

It would be presumptuous on my part to attempt to deal with so controversial a subject especially in view of my own opinion which is that the partition of Ireland is an outstanding blot on the record of British statesmanship during the past half century.

It has proved itself to be the source of evil for both parts of Ireland and indeed for Britain herself. It can be ended without injustice to the Unionist minority in Ireland and it is my belief that the undoing of partition may prove to be the beginning of a new and more influential life than that minority has known heretofore.

Mr. Fogarty's resolution House Resolution 270 has my unqualified endorsement and I shall work for its adoption with unflagging zeal.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is William J. Green, Jr., and I represent the Fifth Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

I wish to take this opportunity to extend my sincere appreciation for the opportunity of personally appearing before this committee and expressing my views in behalf of House Resolution 270. This resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives by my colleague from the State of Rhode Island, the Honorable John E. Fogarty, for the purpose of having recorded the sentiment of this Congress that the people of Ireland be permitted to hold a plebiscite to determine whether they shall remain partitioned, or function as a nation of the whole, thereby restoring Ireland to her rightful place among the other nations of the world.

I object to the partition of Ireland. Present-day Irishmen, their ancestors, and friends have suffered and worked to achieve only a fractional victory; every effort must be made to increase that fraction to a whole, and make Ireland one. Even those without Irish blood or background should be in this struggle if they believe in the right of small nations to self-determination, or if they adhere to the principle that powers of government should be derived from the consent of the governed. History shows how our own Nation fought partition. After four years of bloody civil war, Daniel Webster's words, "The Union will and must be preserved," were fulfilled. We should remember also the words of our great Civil War President, Abraham Lincoln: "On what rightful principle may a State, being not more than one-fiftieth part of the Nation in soil and population, break up the Nation and then coerce a proportionally larger subdivision of itself, in the most arbitrary way? What mysterious right to play tyrant is conferred on a district, with its people, by merely calling it a State?"

Some issues can be compromised to the benefit of all. This is not one of them. As a member of the Atlantic Pact we have committed our blood and treasure to the common defense against communism. One purpose of the pact is to make democracy attractive to that portion of the world where majority rule is denied, or where it is wavering. Great Britain, another pact member, has our example of granting complete independence to the Philippines. Therefore, we are consistent in urging the same treatment for Ireland, and we have every right to tell our partner that he is causing embarrassment to his fellow members.

The entire history of partition reveals a lack of sincerity on the part of the British. It was first proposed by Prime Minister Herbert Asquith in 1912. His Liberal Party had introduced a home-rule bill for the whole of Ireland which was withdrawn because of Tory pressure in the form of threats of force and actual mutiny by British Army brass hats. A substitute bill provided for cutting off four Ulster counties, but this legislation was tabled because of World War I when Britain went to war to secure the freedom of small nations. In a

speech before the House of Commons Premier Asquith declared that "we are fighting to vindicate the principle that small nations are not to be crushed * * * by the arbitrary will of a stronger and overmastering power." Home rule was promised after the war in which 300,000 Irish served and 50,000 gave their lives.

Partition came up again in 1916. The uprising was brutally crushed and its leaders executed, but outside pressure, chiefly from this country, compelled Britain to seek a solution. Prime Minister Lloyd George persuaded the leaders of the Irish Parliamentary Party to accept a bill which excluded the Ulster counties—a temporary exclusion they were assured. However, the proposal was abandoned because of popular reaction against partition, and the Irish Parliamentary Party which had accepted it was defeated in the general election of 1918. Elected in their place were representatives pledged to an independent and united Ireland. These democratically elected representatives met in Dublin in January 1919 and established Dail Eireann, the Irish Parliament, and declared the independence of the Irish nation.

Two years after the Irish people had willed their complete independence at the polls, the British put partition into operation. No Irish member of the House of Commons voted for the Government of Ireland Act in 1920 which partitioned the country—not even those representing what is now called Northern Ireland.

In this manner partition was accomplished, and it has been continued in spite of an overwhelming majority verdict against it at the polls. It is not an enticing example for the inspection of states scrutinizing Atlantic Pact member nations. The pattern is more in the iron-curtain tradition than that of western democracy.

The mistakes of yesteryear should be forgotten. Everyone would like to see Ireland and Britain side by side—but only when both are completely free. The British like to assume the pose of peacemaker and averter of internal strife. Her argument against the withdrawal of troops from India was that the Hindus and Mohammedans would fly at one another's throats; now the troops have been withdrawn and Pakistan and Hindustan are engrossed in building up home industries, and both are doing a pretty fair job of keeping the peace without outside assistance. This same pattern is repeated about Ireland—that Ireland is a nation composed of Catholics, all of whom are in the south, and of Protestants, all of whom are in the north, and only the kindly intercession of Britain prevents violence between them. There is no such religious problem in Ireland. While the country is preponderantly Catholic, there is religious liberty, and less attention is given the religious affiliation of political candidates than is sometimes true here in America. Throughout the years many of the national leaders have been Protestants and more than a few at the present time are Protestants, and they want a united Ireland.

In the words of Mr. de Valera: "If they left it to be settled in the ordinary democratic way by a majority vote of the Irish people * * * it could be settled overnight. But British statesmen apparently do not like the settlement that would ensue. Our island has therefore to be gerrymandered and remain gerrymandered into two areas. The one designed to give in perpetuity the result the British statesmen desire, though it is in violation of every principle of justice and fair play."

Whatever other effect the Fogarty amendment may have, it has served to attract greater American interest in the subject of complete Irish independence. From now on Britain and America have a common destiny, and they are playing for the high stakes of freedom and democracy. The world they seek to win and hold says that freedom and democracy, like charity, must begin at home. A united Ireland taking her place among us will mean a united front against the menace of communism.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, as a member of Congress, I am very much interested in the legislation which is before you today. For a long time I have looked with concern upon the situation which prevails in Ireland, whereby a large section of that country has been forcibly cut off from union with the rest of the nation. When I recall that this has been done by an outside government, which had no actual rights in the matter other than those of a conqueror, never accepted

by the conquered people, I feel that the situation is very similar to that which exists today behind the iron curtain in Europe.

I am further concerned about the avowed intention of Great Britain, after having imposed its rule upon a smaller nation, to attempt today to profess that they have no right to take any part directly or indirectly in the matter. Having committed the act of partitioning Ireland, they now rely upon the theory that they have no right to interfere in the affairs of other nations. They should have recognized and assumed that position 50 years ago. They come rather late to the realization that the affairs of Ireland are the affairs of the Irish people, after they have disrupted the nation and have pitted group against group in the hope that a truly independent nation might never develop in Ireland.

The Irish people are a peaceful and contented people, so long as their rights are not infringed by another. The Irish are just as capable of living side by side with their fellow citizens, regardless of religious belief or ancient racial origin, as are any other people, as are we ourselves here in America.

The two sections of Ireland could today unite without the least difficulty and with complete harmony, provided the bigots would cease their constant endeavors to inflame the passions of the people of the six counties whenever any question of freedom and independence is mentioned. Throughout the rest of Ireland the question of religious intolerance has not been raised. The constitution of the Irish Republic, modeled after our own, expressly guarantees the right of full religious freedom for all her people, and these principles are jealously guarded and strictly adhered to. Hence there need be no fear on religious grounds that a union of the country would occasion any hardship on any group of the people of the six counties.

It is high time that this disunity within Ireland should be brought to an end and the will of the vast majority of the people be permitted to determine the welfare of that nation. It is high time that a genuine democratic form of government be established for all the people. For too long a time has a very small, but very highly privileged, minority dominated the situation in Ireland and not only thwarted the will of the majority in the country, but also set themselves up as the dominant factor in a small area and forced their own will upon a still smaller minority under their jurisdiction.

Because I am aware of this unreasonable situation I welcome an opportunity for the Congress to express itself and to urge the restoration of democratic principles in Ireland, just as this country is continually urging in numerous other places throughout the world.

STATEMENT OF HON. WALTER A. LYNCH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express to you and to the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs my appreciation for giving me this opportunity to make a statement with respect to House Resolution 270, introduced by our distinguished colleague, Hon. John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, and having to do with the partition of Ireland. I am thoroughly in favor of the resolution. It is my considered opinion that the resolution embodies that great American principle of the right of self-determination of all nations, and that being so fundamental an American principle it should be quickly and unanimously reported out by your distinguished committee. I have no doubt that it will be overwhelmingly passed by the House.

It indeed seems strange to me that there should be any opposition to this resolution. It is founded in justice. There is no reason that a foreign power like Great Britain should say to its small neighbor to the west that "You may have your freedom except as to the people of six counties of your nation, and those people must remain under the domination of Great Britain."

Ireland is an entity; it always has been and it always will be. Naturally and geographically it is an entity with the people overwhelmingly of the same national origin. Ireland has always resented the imposition upon her of the force of British arms. She has never been conquered by the British because her national spirit and her national integrity have ever been bulwarks against any foreign subjugation.

It is as unseemly for the British to carve out six counties from the Irish nation as it would have been for the United States, when it granted independence to the Philippines, to have carved out from those heroic islands, Mindanao, Cebu, or any other part of this new Pacific republic.

In spirit Ireland has been a republic since 1798 when the first Irish republic was initially proclaimed by united Irishmen. On Easter Monday of 1916 the same spirit that had moved Irishmen more than a century previously again brought forth, and for the second time proclaimed the Irish republic. There remained, however, the recurrence of that memorable date in the year 1949, for the Republic of Ireland to be internationally recognized as such. During the intervening years between these two later dates, the voice of Ireland was not unheard in the councils of the world. Unfortunately, it was unheeded. Had the strong protestations of De Valera not fallen upon the deaf ears of the nations of the world when he denounced the invasion of Ethiopia by Mussolini and the criminal attacks of the Japanese in Manchuria, perhaps World War II would have been averted. The Irish Prime Minister knew what it meant to have his small country invaded. He likewise knew that if the great nations of the world chose, as they did, to disregard the fundamentals of nationhood and permit a government to be imposed upon a people, contrary to their wishes, that the result would inevitably lead to further outrages and, finally, war.

It is a strange commentary that the one nation who raised her voice for justice for Ethiopia and Manchuria should now be excluded from the council of the world, the United Nations, by the veto of communistic Russia. It is likewise a strange commentary that this one nation that is so essential to the defense of western Europe should be compelled to refrain from joining the partnership of the Atlantic Pact because to do so would have meant the unthinkable recognition by the Irish Government of the right of Britain to superimpose her will upon a portion of the Irish people, and refuse to them the right of self-determination in conjunction with their fellow countrymen.

Great Britain may delay the day, but she cannot evade the day when all Ireland shall be united as one nation. Despite 12 generations of oppression and degradation under British rule, and despite programs of confiscation, exile, and death, the freedom and national integrity of the Irish Nation will extend, not only to 26 counties, but to all of her counties. Those places in the 6 separated counties that have been hallowed by Irish faith and Irish ties will once again be part of the Irish Nation. When partition is ended Armagh will be what it has always been, a part of Ireland and not of Britain. And so with other places in Ireland made sacred by Irish sacrifice and Irish blood.

To partition Ireland Britain had to commit two crimes; one the partition of Ireland itself, the other the partition of Ulster.

In order for the puppet government of Northern Ireland to exist it was necessary that the British Parliament cut off from Ulster the counties of Donegal, Cavan, and Monaghan. By no other way than by this exclusion from the operation of the act of the partition could the dominant position of the Unionist majority around Belfast be continued.

Mr. Chairman, if self-determination is to be granted to any people it should be granted to the people of Ireland because the country meets every requirement of a united government. There are three well-established tests that bear me out. Ireland's natural boundaries are not man-made, but God-given. The Irish Sea is more of a boundary than the line that separates Canada from the United States. In its second test Ireland has a national history. I venture to say that no nation can claim a longer national history. And finally the inhabitants of the island are of the same race, the same color, and speak the same language. It is true that there is a disparity of religion, but if differences of religion are grounds for national partition, then indeed there would be few nations in the world.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, permit me to urge, with all the sincerity at my command, that your distinguished committee favorably report the Fogarty resolution so that the House of Representatives might record its belief that all nations shall have the right of self-determination and that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 27, 1950.

CHAIRMAN, FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I enclose herewith copy of a letter I have received from Mr. J. J. O'Callaghan, 921 Bergen Avenue, Jersey City, N. J., with reference to House Resolution 270.

I shall appreciate your bringing the views of the United Irish Societies of New Jersey in support of this resolution to the attention of the members of your committee at the hearing scheduled for Friday of this week.

Yours sincerely,

CLIFFORD P. CASE.

JERSEY CITY, N. J., April 21, 1950.

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
*Congressman from New Jersey,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASE: The United Irish Societies of New Jersey at their regular meeting in Newark on Wednesday, April 19, declared themselves unanimously in favor of the House Resolution 270, familiarly known as the Fogarty resolution. This resolution is of vital interest to all Americans, particularly those of Irish blood.

We urge you to support this resolution and request that you favor us with an immediate reply as to your position, inasmuch as the resolution comes up in committee on April 28, 1950.

The Ancient Order of Hibernians of Hudson County and the American League for an Undivided Ireland also have gone on record in support of this resolution.

Very truly yours,

J. J. O'CALLAGHAN.

HON. JOHN KEE,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:*

Your committee is respectfully and earnestly asked by the United Irish American Societies of New York to approve the Fogarty resolution, House Resolution 270, which declares that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the people of Ireland have a right to own and govern all the territory of Ireland according to democratic principles.

Favorable action on the resolution by your committee will show that it regards as sacred the solemn pledges given to the oppressed by spokesmen for our Government in wartime.

MICHAEL J. O'SHEA, *Secretary.*

HON. JOHN KEE,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House Office Building
Washington, D. C.:*

New York Clan-na-Gael respectfully requests and urges your committee to approve Fogarty resolution, House Resolution 270, which asserts the right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of all Ireland and to governmental control over all of it in accordance with principles which were solemnly declared to be United States policy when this country's Armed Forces were fighting for freedom and democracy in Second World War. Fulfillment of those wartime pledges to the oppressed should be regarded as sacred duty by legislative and executive departments of our Government.

JAMES REIDY.

HON. JOHN KEE,
*Chairman Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*

Greater New York Saint Patrick's Day Parade Committee representing 200 affiliated societies and many of whose delegates are veterans of the United States Armed Forces appeals to your committee to approve Fogarty resolution, House Resolution 270, and help to abolish the unjust partition of Ireland.

JOHN J. SHEAHAN, *Chairman.*

STATEMENT OF JOHN E. RYAN, CLEVELAND, OHIO

I was born in Cleveland, Ohio, and spent my boyhood there. I went to Ireland and I lived in Ireland for 33 years. I know from experience that the partition of Ireland has and is being enforced against the will of the majority of the Irish people.

The army of occupation maintained by a foreign power is a transgression against the will of the majority of the Irish people. The Irish people in 1936 voted for the Constitution of Eire in a free election. This constitution which became law was declared for the 32 counties of Eire. I have noticed and read in British newspapers at that time the opinions of English experts on constitutional law. Their opinions have stated at that time that the Government of Northern Ireland was illegal. From that time until the present the British Government has done nothing to remove the illegal government from Northern Ireland, which forces its will against the great majority of the Irish people.

STATEMENT OF EDMOND EGAN, PRESIDENT OF THE BRIAN BORU CLUB, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it is gratifying to me to be afforded the opportunity to appear before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives to urge favorable action on House Resolution 270, now before you, relative to the unjust partition of Ireland. As a member of the executive committee of the American League for an Undivided Ireland and other American organizations, I heartily endorse the statements made by my colleagues at this hearing.

There are a few points which, with your kind permission, I should like to bring to the attention of your honorable committee.

In the month of December 1918, there was a general election held in all Ireland under British law and British supervision. As a result of that election or plebiscite, the Republican and Nationalist candidates, that is, those who desired separation from England, received 1,211,516 votes. The Unionists, who desired to remain under British rule, received 315,394 votes, or a little more than 20 percent of all votes cast in that election.

Two years thereafter, in 1920, the British Government carved six counties out of the nine counties of the Province of Ulster, created a new state, and set up a government in those six counties, which is now known as Northern Ireland. This glaring outrage on the integrity of a nation was perpetrated by England to thwart the will of the Irish people, as expressed by them in the election held in December 1918.

The protection of the minority is the reason the British Government advances for setting up this puppet state in the northeast corner of Ireland. Of course, the problem of minorities is one inseparable from democracy. If the people are to rule the majority must govern, and in the final analysis the interests of the minority cannot be allowed to stand in the way of those of the majority.

Minorities may claim, and are entitled to, fair play and justice, but they are not entitled to a veto.

Every nation striving for independence from foreign rule has to combat minorities. George Washington had his Tories and Loyalists to combat, but the American Tories and Loyalists were not granted the privilege of creating a new State in the section of the Thirteen Colonies where they held sway. They accepted the new Republic, and those of them who did not favor the infant Republic returned to the England they loved so well or migrated to Canada.

In a more recent election held in February 1949 in the six-county area, known as Northern Ireland, the Republicans, or those who desire the unity of Ireland under one flag and one government, received a majority of votes in all, except the county of Antrim, in which the city of Belfast is located. Yet the Unionists, or those who desire to remain under the domination of England, elected a majority of the candidates, because of the shameless gerrymandering of the election districts carried out by the Quisling government of the six counties. It may be interesting to know that in the city of Belfast alone there are as many, or more, who oppose the British connection, as there are in the city of Cork.

There is the old bugaboo raised by England that religious differences cause the division between Northern and Southern Ireland. It is nonsense to make such an assertion, but it is the policy of England all down the years to "divide and conquer." Irish Republicanism was born in Northern Ireland and has been nurtured by Irish Protestants. During the past century and a half almost every

leader of note in the Irish Republican and Nationalist movements in Ireland has been a Protestant—Wolfe Tone, Thomas Russell, Lord Edward FitzGerald, Henry J. McCracken, Robert Emmet, John Mitchel, Thomas Davis, Smith O'Brien, Charles S. Parnell, Douglas Hyde, and many others.

When England withdraws her troops and special police from the six counties of northeast Ireland, Irishmen in that area—Protestant and Catholic—will stand shoulder to shoulder with the Irishmen in the 26 county area—Catholic and Protestant—in defense of liberty and democracy.

It is unfair to expect the Republic of Ireland to send her sons to defend Europe against communism, while British troops and special police are crushing liberty and democracy in the northeast corner of Ireland.

Let Ireland be united, and the United States will have a friendly nation, vigorous and ready, in the struggle to resist aggression and to bring peace to a disturbed world.

STATEMENT OF ANNA H. ROSSITER, WILMINGTON, DEL.

I respectfully request the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to endorse the resolution introduced by Congressman Fogarty of Rhode Island, which calls for a plebiscite of all the people of Ireland on the question of partition of Ireland. I am sure the members of your committee will earn the undying gratitude of the Irish race by reporting this resolution favorably.

I believe also that the majority of your constituents are in favor of extending the principles of self-determination to the people of all Ireland.

LETTER OF MRS. MARCELLA O'DOHERTY

SEATTLE, WASH., April 22, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,
Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE KEE: It is a matter of great regret that I cannot attend in person at the hearing before your committee on the Fogarty resolution for a United Ireland.

However, I have canvassed among my friends and my colleagues in a number of societies in which I am active here in Seattle. I find there is a great sympathy for the people of Ireland in their fight for unity and complete independence. There is no doubt that the ties between the people of Ireland and the people of our own beloved United States are strong and enduring, and the traditions of friendship between the two governments has been strengthened in recent days by the establishment of an Irish Embassy in Washington and an American Embassy in Dublin.

Having in mind that our Government, supported by the great majority of our fellow citizens, has repeatedly sanctioned and advocated the principle of self-determination, it is our firm belief that this principle should most certainly be applied to Ireland.

The Fogarty resolution which has been offered in the House of Representatives and is now before your committee for consideration asks that our Government declare itself in favor of a plebiscite of all the people of Ireland on the question of a United Ireland or the continuance of partition. This is the basis of democratic rule and is the best opportunity for the application of the principle of self-determination. I therefore urge favorable consideration by your committee of the Fogarty resolution so that our Government may take its stand for fair play to the people of all Ireland in their struggle for unity and independence.

Respectfully submitted.

(Mrs.) MARCELLA O'DOHERTY.

LETTER OF MICHAEL J. MADDEN, CHICAGO, ILL.

CHICAGO, ILL., April 24, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,

*Committee on Foreign Affairs,**House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Let it be known that from out the past, at present, and in the future, we, the members of the Patrick Henry Council Anti-Partisan League of Chicago, Ill., are irrevocably and uncompromisingly implementing every possible approach to the confirmation of the Fogarty bill being introduced April 28 and its impact on those who seemingly were not conditioned for its receptive analysis. But we note with pride the convulsive aftermath from the Fogarty resolution, especially from those who heretofore have been passive in their approach to this important bill.

We are notifying our Representatives in Congress to be on the alert and by their voice and interest demonstrate an ability to be equally capable to meet the objections that may be implemented to disillusion gullible element into the negation of this very important bill.

We note with pride the solidarity, the effectiveness, and the determination of our eastern Representatives in Congress and be it known that this Midwest or Far West is no less responsive when it comes to alinement of this worthy resolution regarding the status of Ireland.

We note in our press and publications a contagious response and interest in this question of a mutilated Ireland. We note that Sir Basil Brooke, calling it a "little matter," now learns it boomerangs from a little molehill to a mountain slide, and this mountebank is shriveling to inertness, as he recedes from the stage of his high hopes to the balcony of his unimportance. We despise this diminutive approach to this major question. It could be his mentality, if not his bigotry, is on par with his assertions. Anyway he should know his history and recall that the colonies were lost to England mainly through the Irish soldiery in Washington's army of Revolutionary days. And let it be known that the six counties will be lost to Ulster as were the colonies to the Empire despite antagonisms, selfishness, and malign Tory influence. The tide of triumph will crush that infamous border and Sir Basil and his cohorts might be importuned to take a more realistic approach to this all-important question. As there is a solemn understanding in the U. S. A. as between the vindictiveness of oppression and the lucidity of righteousness.

No chicanery, no trifling, will blind any approach to these bifurcated designs of Tory indignity as regards the border. And its distasteful implications will not be tolerated. These are our sentiments and we accept no compromise. We stand resolute and determined till Ireland is entirely one.

Respectfully submitted.

MICHAEL J. MADDEN.

LETTER OF JAMES H. GALLAGHER, DENMARK, WIS.

HON. JOHN KEE,

*Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee,**Washington, D. C.*

DEAR JUDGE KEE: I was born in Green Bay, Brown County, Wis., 83 years ago of Irish parents.

I am an old man now, but I hope to live to see Ireland free from the center to the sea, and that she will have the opportunity of taking her place among the nations of the world.

I am in favor of the Fogarty resolution which is before your committee and you may be sure that we will keep up this fight for a united Ireland because we believe a free and independent Ireland is one of the best assets for the United States in its fight to preserve peace and democracy throughout the world. I hope your committee will act favorably on the Fogarty resolution, and it will be a great encouragement to liberty-loving people throughout the world if the House of Representatives passes this resolution.

JAMES H. GALLAGHER.

STATEMENT OF JOHN COONEY, CLEVELAND, OHIO

My name is John Cooney.

As an American citizen from the city of Cleveland, I desire to bespeak my support of the Fogarty bill for an undivided Ireland.

The West Side Irish Club is composed of hundreds of persons like myself, men and women of the Irish race, who we believe have contributed to the civic and cultural life of the city and the community.

As American citizens, too, they want to see the Fogarty bill enacted to right the wrong done to the land of either their birth or their forebears.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH DUNN, NEW HAVEN, CONN.

I gladly subscribe to the Fogarty resolution on behalf of an undivided Ireland. I hope that this resolution will be reported favorably by your committee and that it will be passed by a big vote in the House of Representatives.

A united Ireland will be in the best interests of American security and will serve as a bulwark in the onward march of free nations throughout the world.

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL J. REILLY, CHICAGO, ILL.

I am in favor of the resolution submitted by Hon. John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, which calls for a plebiscite of the people of all Ireland on the question of a united Ireland and the abolition of partition.

If the principle of self-determination has been applied in India, Burma, Egypt, and all other countries struggling to be free, then surely that principle should be applied to the case of Ireland.

The people in my community are in favor of a united Ireland and the demand that the partition of Ireland be ended; that the British troops be withdrawn from Ireland so that the historic nation of Ireland once and for all may be united and free.

LETTER OF MARTIN T. WALSH

MICHIGAN CITY, IND., April 25, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,

Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I should like much to be present in Washington, D. C., on April 28 when Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives will hold public hearing on Fogarty resolution, House Resolution 270, but unfortunately, I cannot do so.

The purpose of this letter, however, is to make manifest my desire and that of my friends and associates in the Middle West that House Resolution 270 be acted upon favorably without qualification or reservation. Indeed, we should be considered unmindful of the human sacrifices, the heroic deeds and pleadings of the dying and dead were we not to lend a helping hand a willing ear in freedom's cause for Ireland.

For more than 750 years the people of that little island have persisted in their belief that God ordained them to be free. During that same period in all lands and particularly in these United States, Irish exiles and their children by example, industry, fortitude, and a willingness to sacrifice have contributed much in brain and brawn to the cultural standards of our country to safeguard our institutions and protect with their very lives our sacred rights and liberties.

The cradleland of the Irish race looks to us with a feeling of hope, pride, and admiration while she proclaims:

"Proud be your boast, Columbia,
That since your glorious birth
You've freely shared your freedom
With the shackled sons of earth.
Of the world's new republics
Is there e'en a single one
But owe you thanks, unmeasured thanks,
For what you've nobly done."

Such is the heritage and glorious standard that we leave for the citizens of tomorrow. Ah, please God, there is justice in the minds and hearts of committee members and that everyone recognizes that a free and undivided Ireland will always be from sea to sea a natural bulwark against communism and other isms designed to destroy the principles of democracy here and elsewhere.

Respectfully,

MARTIN T. WALSH.

STATEMENT OF COMMITTEE FROM PORTLAND, OREG.

The undersigned express not only their own sentiment but feel that they faithfully represent the opinions of at least 100,000 citizens and residents of the State of Oregon when we urge the support and passage of House Resolution 270, which declares that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live and for a united Ireland.

CLIFFORD B. ELLIS,
JOE HEALY,
THOMAS F. BRADY,
Committee.

STATEMENT OF EDNA M. PURTELL, HARTFORD, CONN.

My name is Edna M. Purtell. I reside in Hartford, Conn., where I was born. I am authorized to speak for the Hartford chapter of the American League for an Undivided Ireland in urging this committee to report favorably on House Resolution 270.

It is natural, right, and fitting for you to so report this resolution, for it is the very embodiment of the fundamental principle of self-determination on which the United States of America was founded.

It asks simply that the people of Ireland be given the opportunity to express the natural desire for a unified country through that same democratic process we Americans enjoy and guard so zealously.

House Resolution 270, in turn, offers America a splendid and timely opportunity to demonstrate to a confused and watching world the true meaning of our democracy.

STATEMENT OF SHEILA O'DOHERTY, SEATTLE, WASH.

I most heartily approve of the resolution introduced by Congressman Fogarty of Rhode Island which is in favor of a united Ireland.

Certainly the Republic of Ireland should embrace all of Ireland. The partition of Ireland was perpetrated by the British Parliament and no single Irish representative voted for the act which carved out six counties from the historic Irish nation.

The traditional friendship of the people of the United States for the people of Ireland and the strong ties which bind the two countries are a sufficient basis for favorable voting on the Fogarty resolution, and with the help of the Government of the United States this question should be solved now and in the only way dictated by principles of fair play and democracy. The British troops should be withdrawn from Ireland and the Irish people should be allowed to determine their own form of government without outside interference. I am in favor of a united Irish republic and an independent Irish republic for the 32 counties of Ireland.

TELEGRAM FROM M. F. McNAMARA, OF HOUSTON, TEX.

APRIL 22, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,
*Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*

Fogarty resolution. Let us do our part as a democratic Nation toward ending division of Ireland. Observation there last summer convinced me that this country should refrain from aiding a Government maintained by deception and tyranny. Lend your strength and influence toward an undivided Ireland, please.

M. F. McNAMARA.

LETTER FROM AMERICAN FRIENDS OF IRELAND OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,
EDWARD J. COEN, PRESIDENT

HON. JOHN KEE,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: In considering Congressman Fogarty's resolution, asking for an American expression of hope for the complete political unity of Ireland, you will recall, no doubt, that there is precedent enough in our own history to endorse such action. You will recall that we sought foreign aid in our struggle for independence and unity; and that there is hardly an oppressed nation in the world today to which we have denied aid in men, money, and resources.

Ireland gave more than her quota in World War I and II for the establishment of the "four freedoms," and all she asks is an expression of condemnation for the division of her nation.

Be assured, Mr. Kee, that the Irish at home and abroad, are strong security against atheistic communism and its destructive ideologies and that the good will and cooperation of the Gaelic race is worth encouragement and appreciation.

AMERICAN FRIENDS OF IRELAND, STATE OF WASHINGTON,
EDW. J. COEN, *President.*

LETTER OF HARRY McDERMOTT, PRESIDENT, LOS ANGELES GAELIC ATHLETIC
ASSOCIATION

APRIL 24, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I am a native-born Irishman and a citizen of this great United States and a veteran of World War II who was willing to give his life for the Stars and Stripes because they were fighting for a purpose—the freedom of small nations. But the small nations are not free. As a veteran I ask one favor of you gentlemen: Vote for the Fogarty bill and give a small nation like Ireland her freedom, what the United States fought for. May God bless each and every one of you and give you the strength to carry out the laws of this great country.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY McDERMOTT,
President, Los Angeles Gaelic Athletic Association.

LETTER OF PATRICK N. H. O'YORK, OF LIMERICK, MAINE

LIMERICK, MAINE, April 24, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Please consider these facts before taking action on Fogarty resolution:

The first overt act of the Revolutionary War which brought about the independence of this country was the capture of Fort William and Mary in Portsmouth Harbor, December 12, 1774, by Gen. John Sullivan, the son of Irish parents.

The first sea fight of the Revolutionary War was fought and won by another Irishman, Capt. Jeremiah O'Brien, at Machias, Maine.

From those days to the present time the Irish have never failed in their patriotism and loyalty to this country.

God created the Irish nation; therefore he that would destroy the Irish nation is an enemy of God.

For nearly eight centuries England has used her power to destroy the Irish nation.

During the wicked rule of Queen Victoria from 1837 to 1901 one-half of the people were destroyed or driven out of Ireland.

For 5 years that the Irish patriots were fighting for their independence, 1916 to 1921, England sent over to Ireland the notorious Black and Tans who ignored

the rules of war and carried on a campaign of assassination and terrorism against noncombatants.

It is the policy of the United States to unite the western nations of Europe to combat the spread of communism.

England, one of the allies of the United States and greatly in debt to the United States, still holds six Irish counties against the will of the Irish people. There is no justice for Ireland while any part of Ireland is under alien rule.

Out of gratitude to the Irish who have done so much for our country we should make every effort to obtain justice for the Irish Nation by withholding all aid to England until England withdraws her armies from the six counties which she unjustly holds.

We used our influence with Holland to win independence for Indonesia.

Why not do as much for Ireland?

Ireland cannot join in an alliance with England while England holds any part of Ireland in subjection.

PATRICK N. H. O'YORK.

TELEGRAM SENT BY DANIEL J. CLIFFORD

APRIL 27, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,

*Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*

American Irish Minute Men of Middlesex County, Mass., request your committee and Congress to give all people of the Republic of Ireland's 32 counties freedom from partition. Follow Washington's and Lincoln's statesmanship by giving the American way of life to Ireland. God bless you.

DANIEL J. CLIFFORD,
Middlesex County Hibernians, Watertown, Mass.

TELEGRAM SENT BY CHARLES D. MAGINNIS, OF BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

APRIL 24, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,

*Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee,
United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:*

I believe it is a legitimate concern of the United States, at this international juncture, to enter upon negotiations leading to the recognition of Ireland as a political entity and thus create a most effective instrument for world peace.

CHARLES D. MAGINNIS.

LETTER OF MRS. NONIE E. CLIFFORD, WATERTOWN, MASS.

WATERTOWN, MASS, April 17, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,

*Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee,
Washington 25, D. C.*

DEAR MR. KEE: Please support and vote for legislation to assist in removing the Mason and Dixon's partition line from the Republic of Ireland, and thus bring the American type of unity to the only nation in the world free of communism.

Your favorable action will be appreciated.

Yours truly,

NONIE E. CLIFFORD.

THE ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS IN AMERICA,
DIVISION No. 14, MIDDLESEX COUNTY OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Watertown, Mass., April 23, 1950.

Mr. JOHN KEE, M. C.,

*Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to be recorded as an opponent of communism or any other tyranny which may be in existence, not only in these United States of America, but in any part of the world. I am in favor of the American way of life and liberty, for all the peoples of the entire world.

Your committee has before it for consideration the matter of tyranny and aggression by the Government of Great Britain's partition of the Republic of Ireland against the will of the majority of the people of the Irish race, and against Almighty God's design geographically, of the ancestral home of more than 35,000,000 American citizens of Irish birth or descent.

I feel sure that you and your committee and the majority of the Members of the United States House of Representatives will pass the necessary legislation, such as the Fogarty resolution No. 270, in order that this puppet government of Great Britain in Northern Ireland will no longer exist, or be supported by American taxpayers' money siphoned from the Government in London to Belfast.

This stand is supported by resolutions already sent to the United States Government by my organization, of which I am the executive officer.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN GLYNN, *President.*

LETTER FROM THOMAS J. KELLEHER, JR.

SOMERVILLE, MASS., April 24, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE, M. C.,

*Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: It is my sincere wish that you and your committee and the majority of the Members of the United States House of Representatives will pass the necessary legislation, such as the Fogarty Resolution No. 270, in order that the unjust partitioning of Ireland may be dissolved.

It is my firm belief that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live, and the entire territory become a republic.

I am certain that you will use your entire energy towards the above matter, not only for the free people of Ireland, but also for the advantages which the United States of America will receive by an undivided Ireland.

May I take this opportunity to thank you for your kind attention.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS J. KELLEHER, JR.

Similar communications were received from: Mr. Andrew Casey, 74 West Fifth Street, Bayonne, N. J.; Mr. Charles Reilly, 70 Atwater Street, New Haven, Conn.; Miss Catherine Keane, 2050 Park Street, Hartford, Conn.; Col. Edward E. Duffy, 321 Stonewall Road, Dayton, Ohio; Mr. Philip McGovern, 570 West One Hundred and Eighty-third Street, New York City, N. Y.; Mr. Philip Toolin, 181 Merriam Avenue, Leominster, Mass.; Mr. John J. Russell, 8 Wyatt Circle, Somerville, Mass.; Mr. Andrew F. Sullivan, 31 Taylor Road, West Hartford, Conn.; Miss Ellen J. Cummins, 811 Market Street, Wilmington, Del.; and Mrs. George Brown, 626 West Forth Street, Wilmington, Del.

JAMES C. MCCOY & ASSOCIATES,
Cleveland, Ohio.

CLERK, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Foreign Affairs Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As arranged when I was in Washington for the hearing on the Fogarty bill last Friday, April 28, I am forwarding a statement regarding the same, for the record.

Thanking you very kindly,

JAMES COLEMAN MCCOY.

The Greater Cleveland Chapter of the American League for An Undivided Ireland endorses the resolution before the Foreign Affairs Committee, known as the Fogarty bill. As American citizens, we consider it the first step toward a solution of the vicious partition in Ireland.

And as American citizens, we are vitally interested in the unity of the Irish people. The Greater Cleveland Chapter of the American League for An Undivided Ireland is composed of many organizations and individuals working toward that end. Affiliated with us are:

The Irish American Civic Association, one of the most vital and potent forces in the civic life of Cleveland, and which numbers among its members, leaders in the city's business and professional life.

The various divisions in Cleveland of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, a national group that needs no presentation to this committee. We are proud to note that a fellow Clevelander, and the national president of that order, Michael A. McGrath, has introduced his stand into the record today, and it is our stand.

We represent too, a geographical balance, of the Irish element in our city, with the West Side Irish-American Club, a large and aggressive group, two of whose members, Mr. John Cooney and Mr. John Ryan, are present with me before this hearing today, and the Sons and Daughters of Eire, a large fraternal and social Irish club, on the east side of the city. That group, incidentally, I should add, is headed by a son of Ulster, Mr. Cornelius Carr.

The Gaelic Athletic Association of Cleveland stands united with us on this question of the unnatural division of Ireland. Their sports program, it should be pointed out, works in cooperation with the recreation department of the city of Cleveland.

Several ladies of the Irish Cultural Garden Club of Cleveland have journeyed here to Washington today to add their presence on behalf of the Fogarty bill, Mrs. Elizabeth Damon, Mrs. M. J. Duffy, and Mrs. John Davis. The Irish Cultural Garden is a link in the chain of nationality gardens in Cleveland, conceived and built in tribute to the various cosmopolitan forces that made Cleveland the magnificent city it is on the shores of Lake Erie.

The Greater Cleveland Chapter of the American League for An Undivided Ireland too, for many other individuals and members who are persons also active in other civic, fraternal, labor, and veteran organizations.

As American citizens we are concerned with the threat of communism that faces the world today. The American Government launched the North Atlantic Pact as a bulwark against the spread of that red menace. It is now considered our first line of defense. A school child quickly learns that the chain is only as strong as its weakest link. Because of partition, Ireland is not a member of the North Atlantic Pact. Thus what kind of a chain of security can it be with such a gap in it where Ireland should be?

As president of the Greater Cleveland Chapter of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, I say passage by your committee of the Fogarty bill will be the first step toward rectifying that omission.

As an overseas veteran for almost 3 years of the last global conflict, members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I do not want to see the horrors of that holocaust repeated, nor does anyone present here. Wars with their attendant miseries are unmerciful. A completely free and undivided Ireland; with her face resolutely set against the designs of the godless Soviet, is a necessary part in the program for the defense and security of America.

Those of us who served in the last war saw countries that were radically split by tongues and creeds; we observed how impaired peoples could be, by divisions. We felt in their disunity, our own strength, the sameness, that is America.

Yet America was once split in two, had two flags, two capitals.

We thank God that the United States conquered the vicious evil of partition. Let us help Ireland do the same by the passage of the Fogarty bill.

NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1950.

Re House Resolution 270—Fogarty.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KEE: It will be greatly appreciated if you will bring to the attention of your committee the within resolution, adopted by our national convention on May 7, 1950, giving our full support to the above resolution, and urging its adoption by the Congress.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT J. SILBERSTEIN,
Executive Secretary.

THE TERMINATION OF PARTITION OF IRELAND

For 30 years Great Britain has perpetuated the partition of Ireland in violation of the will of its people. This division has been maintained by force of arms and perpetuated under the pretense of protecting the Protestant minority in Ireland. In actual fact, the Nationalists in the six counties (Ulster) controlled by Britain who have sought the union of Ireland have been sorely discriminated against and have been the subject of anti-Catholic pogroms.

The partition of Ireland was accomplished by an act of the British Parliament although the general election of 1918 and the local elections held in Ireland in 1920 showed that less than 20 percent of the electorate opposed self-government. Partition was preceded by a calculated campaign of incitement, inspired by the Tories, directed against the Catholic minorities in Derry and Belfast. The resulting disorders were then exploited to justify the intervention of British troops in Ireland.

The Ireland Act of 1949, passed by a British Labor administration, officially perpetuates this injustice. This act states:

"Parliament hereby declares that northern Ireland remains part of His Majesty's Dominions and of the United Kingdom and affirms that in no event will northern Ireland or any part thereof cease to be part of His Majesty's Dominions and of the United Kingdom without the consent of the Parliament of northern Ireland."

Yet in 1921 an official British Labor Party statement made this promise:

"So far as Ireland itself and Irish affairs are concerned, the Labor Party is unequivocally prepared to allow Ireland to assume whatever form of self-determination the great mass of the Irish people desire, with whatever constitution, under whatever designation, and with whatever arrangements for local autonomy, and thereby allow Ireland to face its own difficulties in its own way—subject only to two conditions (which were accepted by the Irish Trade Union Congress at its meeting on November 16) that it afford protection to minorities, and that the constitution should prevent Ireland from becoming a military or naval menace to Great Britain."

In the Irish Free State where a system of proportional representation has resulted in full representation of all minority groups (11 percent Protestant and 5 percent Jewish groups are represented in the Dail Eireann by that proportion of members) the proposal has been put forward that the artificial and unjust border end. The system under which the balance of Ireland presently operates would then guarantee to the minority, concentrated as it is in two counties in the northeast, full recognition and protection. It has been proposed that the area be permitted to retain its autonomy, but subject to full justice for its own minority (Catholic).

The United States Government, in 1919, passed the Gallagher resolution, which declared that the Congress of the United States supported the right of the people of Ireland to determine the form of government under which the whole Irish people desired to live. There is presently pending in the House of Representatives House Resolution 270 introduced June 28, 1949, by Congressman Fogarty, which would reaffirm the Gallagher resolution and in addition would establish as the policy of the United States the following:

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this House of Representatives that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary."

The National Lawyers Guild, in convention assembled, hereby declares its full support for the Fogarty resolution (H. Res. 270) and urges its immediate adoption by the Congress. Toward the end of developing friendly relations among nations and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, a free plebiscite should be authorized to determine whether the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire 32 counties of Ireland; and the Ireland Act of 1949 should be forthwith abrogated, and foreign troops withdrawn from the entire territory of Ireland.

LADIES' AUXILIARY, ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1950.

HON. JOHN KEE,
Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE KEE: Please have the following statement inserted in the record of the hearing held in your office April 28, 1950.

It was a matter of bitter disappointment that I could not attend that hearing. As national vice president of the Ladies' Auxiliary, of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, in America, I wish to protest in my own name and in the name of the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians against the partition of Ireland.

The action of the British Government in arbitrarily partitioning the six counties after World War I, is and has been of deep concern to our members.

We therefore support House Resolution 270 as introduced by the Honorable John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island.

It is no secret that through 700 years England's energies were concentrated upon an effort, seemingly to annihilate the Irish race. Ireland was partitioned by the British Parliament in 1920 against the will of 80 percent of the Irish people.

The Ladies' Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians join with the American League for An Undivided Ireland and respectfully submit our request for favorable action by your committee on House Resolution 270, House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

Respectfully,

LILLIAN E. FAY.

X

Donegal County Archives

1905 - 1956

CENTRAL COUNCIL OF IRISH COUNTY CLUBS

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

21

OFFICERS

HUMPHREY J. MAHONEY
President
31 Lake Street
Arlington
MI 3-2061

ANDREW McGONAGLE
First Vice-President

MRS. MARGARET COLEMAN
Second Vice-President

THOMAS O'BRIEN
Third Vice-President

MRS. MARY MORLEY DRUMMEY
Recording Secretary

FRANK M. MURRAY
Financial Secretary

MRS. MARY CONCANNON
Treasurer

MRS. CHRISTINE HUNT
Sergeant-at-Arms

JOHN E. KEANE
Sentinel

TIMOTHY J. HOLLAND
Organizer

Office of the Secretary
559 Ashmont St., Dorchester, Mass.
Telephone CO 5-1066

P/11/1/3 (2)

August 7, 1956

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT CHICAGO
BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman:

My name is Daniel Doherty, residing at 128 Hamilton Street, Dorchester, Massachusetts.

I appear here as a representative of the Central Council of Irish County Clubs of Greater Boston, in the capacity of Chairman of the Committee for the Unification and Liberation of Ireland.

Resolutions have been adopted by our organization and addressed to you, Sir, as Chairman of the Democratic Platform Committee.

With your permission, I will read these Resolutions and speak very briefly upon their merit.

“FOR GOD AND COUNTRY”

CENTRAL COUNCIL OF IRISH COUNTY CLUBS
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS



OFFICERS

HUMPHREY J. MAHONEY
President
 31 Lake Street
 Arlington
 MI 3-2061

Office of the Secretary
 559 Ashmont St., Dorchester, Mass.
 Telephone CO 5-1066

RESOLUTION

ANDREW McGONAGLE
First Vice-President

MRS. MARGARET COLEMAN
Second Vice-President

THOMAS O'BRIEN
Third Vice-President

MRS. MARY MORLEY DRUMMEY
Recording Secretary

FRANK M. MURRAY
Financial Secretary

MRS. MARY CONCANNON
Treasurer

MRS. CHRISTINE HUNT
Sergeant-at-Arms

JOHN E. KEANE
Sentinel

TIMOTHY J. HOLLAND
Organizer

To the Honorable John W. McCormack
 Chairman
 Democratic Platform Committee, 1956:

WHEREAS: The Irish Nation affirms its inalienable, indefeasible and sovereign right to choose its own form of Government, to determine its relations with other nations, and to develop its life, political, economic and cultural, in accordance with its own genius and traditions;

WHEREAS: The national territory consists of the WHOLE island of Ireland, its islands and territorial areas:

BE IT RESOLVED that we, the undersigned American citizens and residents of the United States of America who believe that all truly democratic governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed, do hereby request

1. The recognition of the rightful government for ALL Ireland, THE REPUBLIC, which was proclaimed on April 24, 1916, endorsed by a general election of all thirty-two counties of Ireland on December 14, 1918, ratified January 21, 1919.
2. The withdrawal of all British armed forces from the six county area of Ireland now being unlawfully deprived of the rights of free government by the unnatural partition of Ireland.

Democracy is a word that has been much used and often abused in recent years. Some have spoken the word with the deepest sincerity and reverent regard for its broad and beneficial implications, while others have used it as a cloak for a smoke screen while they are undermining and endeavoring to destroy foundations upon which the life and liberty of humanity depend.

At a general election in Ireland, December 14, 1918, the people of ALL Ireland voted by an overwhelming majority in favor of complete independence. The elected representatives of the Irish people assembled in Dublin January 21, 1919 and lawfully ratified the independence of their country. They established the Republic of Ireland as the government of ALL Ireland. According to all democratic principles the Republic of Ireland is the rightful government of the WHOLE IRISH NATION.

In 1920, Ireland was divided by an Act of the British House of Commons, but it must be remembered that not one Irish man or Irish woman voted for the division of their country. Ireland was united against partition.

At the time of the General Election in Ireland, 1918, there were two million American soldiers still encamped on the battlefields of France and Belgium. I was one of those American soldiers. The first World War, so far as America was concerned, was fought for World Democracy and the freedom of small nations.

Well, Ireland is a small nation, and the most democratic nation in all Europe, and Ireland has honorably earned the right to recognition by the greatest and most democratic nation in the world, - the United States of America.

Never before in the history of this country have so many people gone on record in favor of another nation's freedom. Fifteen million Americans in the ranks of organized labor, hundreds of thousands of Veterans and members of social and fraternal organizations from Boston to San Francisco, have petitioned you in behalf of worthy Ireland.

These millions of Americans whose ancestors have come from many lands and are of different creeds and color, speak with one voice in favor of the Unification and Liberation of Ireland. The partitioned part of Ireland is sometimes referred to as Northern Ireland, while at other times it is called the Ulster Government, but it is neither, and I can speak with authority on this particular phase of the subject because I was born in Ulster and at the most northerly point of the Irish Nation, at Malin Head, County Donegal. There are nine counties in Ulster. There are only six counties in the partitioned area. Partition divides Ireland and in addition to that, Ulster or northern Ireland, is divided, too.

Why was Ulster divided? Because the majority of the people in the nine counties of Ulster believed in, and still believe in, a free and independent Ireland. They could, and they would, out-vote the pre-British Tory.

86% of the people of the most northern county in Ireland which is Donegal, voted for complete independence in 1918. County Cavan and County Monaghan also voted for freedom. Donegal, Cavan and Monaghan are in Ulster, so you can readily see that the whole British scheme is one of deception. The partitioned area of Ireland is not a government at all; it is a British satellite, created by an Act of the British House of Commons, established by might and maintained

in keeping with England's well-known policy of "Divide and Conquer."

Last week I was privileged to see and hear you speak in praise and appreciation of the contribution which Commodore Barry, father and founder of the American Navy, made to this nation during the days of the Revolution. It is one hundred and eighty years since the American Revolution began. 180 years is a long time to wait for appreciation and recognition. It is forty years since Ireland's Revolution and the government then established for the WHOLE Irish Nation has not been accorded recognition up until this day. For the last thirty-nine years America's fighting forces have participated in the struggle for human liberty all over the globe. How can we consistently defend rightful principles in any nation or geographical location while we remain silent and inactive, while England pursues her imperial policy of "Divide and Conquer" in Ireland?

If England can divide a nation and maintain that division by armed might against the wishes of the great majority of the people as she has done, and is now doing in Ireland, what becomes of the fundamental right of Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness? The heroic efforts of the Irish people to regain and retain their national independence is an inspiring chapter in the history of mankind's endeavor to live by the light of Liberty and Law. I hope and trust that the Democratic Party will manifest its appreciation of Ireland's right to Nationhood.

Reason directs that we must recognize the validity of strictly historic evidence. The knowledge and truth which I set forth here has not been challenged because they are based upon fundamentals that are indestructible. The forces who are opposed to the recognition of the Republic of Ireland will not, and dare not, manifest

their opposition in a forthright manner in public. They are dependent upon their knowledge of how to effectively operate behind closed doors. Their long years of operating in the field of secret intrigue, their unscrupulous utilization of unlimited wealth are the weapons upon which they depend in their brutal effort to keep mankind shackled and enslaved. More than ever now we need to realize the essential fundamental right of the Irish Nation to full and unconditional freedom. Let our minds and actions harmonize with the laws of righteousness. Let us state in the Democratic platform, in language that all mankind can understand, that we recognize the right of the heroic people of Ireland to maintain the government which was democratically established by a great majority of the entire citizenship of the WHOLE Irish Nation,---The Republic of Ireland.

1905 - 1960
CENTRAL COUNCIL OF IRISH COUNTY CLUBS
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS



Office of the Secretary
15 Magdala Street
Dorchester, Massachusetts
Telephone CO 5-7808

P 11/1/3 (3)

OFFICERS

- THOMAS O'BRIEN
President
29 Brookside Avenue
Jamaica Plain
JA 4-4784
- HUMPHREY J. MAHONEY
First Vice-President
- EDWARD FINNEGAN
Second Vice-President
- MRS. MARY McDONAGH
Third Vice-President
- WILLIAM F. RYAN
Recording Secretary
- FRANK M. MURRAY
Financial Secretary
- MRS. MARY CONCANNON
Treasurer
- JOHN F. O'NEILL
Sergeant-at-Arms
- MRS. MARY E. KELLY
Sentinel
- JOHN B. CARR
Organizer

DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

Los Angeles, California.

July 1960

Chester A. Bowles
Chairman of Platform
Committee

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

My name is Daniel Doherty. I live at 39 Stanley Street, Dorchester, Massachusetts. I was elected by the delegates of the Central Council of Irish County Clubs, Boston, Massachusetts. They authorized me to present to you resolutions which they had unanimously adopted and to ask you for favorable considerations of the ideas, ideals, and principles set forth therein. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will read these resolutions.

Reading of Resolutions.

Whereas the Irish nation affirms its inalienable, indefeasible and sovereign right to choose its own form of government, to determine its relations with other nations and to develop its life -- political, economic and cultural -- in accordance with its own genius and tradition.

"FOR GOD AND COUNTRY"

Whereas the national territory consists of the whole island of Ireland, its islands and territorial areas, be it resolved that we, the undersigned American Citizens, and residents of the United States of America who believe that all truly democratic governments derive their power from the consent of the government, do hereby request:

First, the recognition of the rightful government for ALL Ireland, the Republic which was proclaimed April 24, 1916, endorsed by general election of all 32 counties of Ireland on December 14, 1918, and ratified January 21, 1919.

Second, the withdrawal of all British armed forces from the sixth county area of Ireland now being unlawfully deprived of the rights of free government by the unnatural partition of Ireland.

At a general election in Ireland, December 14, 1918, the people of ALL Ireland voted by an overwhelming majority in favor of complete independence. The elected representatives of the Irish people assembled in Dublin January 21, 1919, and lawfully ratified the independence of their nation. They established the Irish Republic as a government of all Ireland. According to all democratic principles the Republic of Ireland is the rightful and lawful government of the whole Irish nation.

In 1920, Ireland was divided by an Act of the British House of Commons, but it must be remembered that no Irish

man or Irish woman voted for the division of their country and I might add, that Ireland was one of the very few countries where the women had the vote in those days. The 19th Amendment to the Constitution did not become effective until two years later.

For the purpose of showing how the elected representatives of the American Congress of the year 1919 adopted resolutions declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live.

Ten years ago there was a public hearing at Washington D.C. under the auspices of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Many of the delegates to this convention were in Washington at that time and spoke for the resolve which was in favor of the recognition of Ireland's right for complete unification and liberation. There were men and women from nearly every state in the Union. All of them were recorded in favor and the records of the Congress will show that I, personally presented petitions with more than 15 million signatures. I hold in my hand certified papers which proves this conclusively. This was a public hearing and as I said, it was held at Washington D. C. To be exact the date was April 24 1950 and it was widely publicized but no one appeared and spoke in opposition to the resolve.

The forces who are opposed to the recognition of the Republic of Ireland will not and dare not manifest their opposition in a forthright manner in public. They depend upon their knowledge of how to effectively operate behind closed doors. Their long years of operating in the field *of secret intrigue and* unlimited wealth *has sewed them well, and these* are the weapons upon which they depend in their brutal efforts to keep mankind shackled and enslaved.

It is high time that we restore our conscience to the position of complete command to guide us right in public affairs.

At the beginning of the First World War, President Wilson said, "We are fighting for world democracy and the freedom of small nations." In keeping with the spirit of the times, Ireland has accepted the challenge of the British Prime Minister, and at the general election in 1918 voted to establish their form of government. The recognition of that government is 40 years overdue.

We proudly proclaim our belief in democratic government; let us prove our sincerity by stating clearly and emphatically in the Democratic platform that we recognize the lawful, rightful democratically established government of Ireland, the Republic of ALL Ireland.

1905 - 1960
CENTRAL COUNCIL OF IRISH COUNTY CLUBS
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS



Office of the Secretary
15 Magdala Street
Dorchester, Massachusetts
Telephone CO 5-7808

OFFICERS

THOMAS O'BRIEN
President
29 Brookside Avenue
Jamaica Plain
JA 4-4784

HUMPHREY J. MAHONEY
First Vice-President

EDWARD FINNEGAN
Second Vice-President

MRS. MARY McDONAGH
Third Vice-President

WILLIAM F. RYAN
Recording Secretary

FRANK M. MURRAY
Financial Secretary

MRS. MARY CONCANNON
Treasurer

JOHN F. O'NEILL
Sergeant-at-Arms

MRS. MARY E. KELLY
Sentinel

JOHN B. CARR
Organizer

DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

Los Angeles, California.

July 1960

Chester A. Bowles
Chairman of Platform
Committee

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

My name is Daniel Doherty. I live at 39 Stanley Street, Dorchester, Massachusetts. I was elected by the delegates of the Central Council of Irish County Clubs, Boston, Massachusetts. They authorized me to present to you resolutions which they had unanimously adopted and to ask you for favorable considerations of the ideas, ideals, and principles set forth therein. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will read these resolutions.

Reading of Resolutions.

Whereas the Irish nation affirms its inalienable, indefeasible and sovereign right to choose its own form of government, to determine its relations with other nations and to develop its life -- political, economic and cultural -- in accordance with its own genius and tradition.

Whereas the national territory consists of the whole island of Ireland, its islands and territorial areas, be it resolved that we, the undersigned American Citizens, and residents of the United States of America who believe that all truly democratic governments derive their power from the consent of the government, do hereby request:

First, the recognition of the rightful government for ALL Ireland, the Republic which was proclaimed April 24, 1916, endorsed by general election of all 32 counties of Ireland on December 14, 1918, and ratified January 21, 1919.

Second, the withdrawal of all British armed forces from the sixth county area of Ireland now being unlawfully deprived of the rights of free government by the unnatural partition of Ireland.

At a general election in Ireland, December 14, 1918, the people of ALL Ireland voted by an overwhelming majority in favor of complete independence. The elected representatives of the Irish people assembled in Dublin January 21, 1919, and lawfully ratified the independence of their nation. They established the Irish Republic as a government of all Ireland. According to all democratic principles the Republic of Ireland is the rightful and lawful government of the whole Irish nation.

In 1920, Ireland was divided by an Act of the British House of Commons, but it must be remembered that no Irish

man or Irish woman voted for the division of their country and. I might add, that Ireland was one of the very few countries where the women had the vote in those days. The 19th Amendment to the Constitution did not become effective until two years later.

For the purpose of showing how, the elected representatives of the American Congress of the year 1919 adopted resolutions declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live.

Ten years ago there was a public hearing at Washington D.C. under the auspices of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Many of the delegates to this convention were in Washington at that time and spoke for the resolve which was in favor of the recognition of Ireland's right for complete unification and liberation. There were men and women from nearly every state in the Union. All of them were recorded in favor and the records of the Congress will show that I, personally presented petitions with more than 15 million signatures. I hold in my hand certified papers which proves this conclusively. This was a public hearing and as I said, it was held at Washington D. C. To be exact the date was April 24 1950 and it was widely publicized but no one appeared and spoke in opposition to the resolve.

The forces who are opposed to the recognition of the Republic of Ireland will not and dare not manifest their opposition in a forthright manner in public. They depend upon their knowledge of how to effectively operate behind closed doors. Their long years of operating in the field of unlimited wealth are the weapons upon which they depend in their brutal efforts to keep mankind shackled and enslaved.

It is high time that we restore our conscience to the position of complete command to guide us right in public affairs.

At the beginning of the First World War, President Wilson said, "We are fighting for world democracy and the freedom of small nations." In keeping with the spirit of the times, Ireland has accepted the challenge of the British Prime Minister, and at the general election in 1918 voted to establish their form of government. The recognition of that government is 40 years overdue.

We proudly proclaim our belief in democratic government; let us prove our sincerity by stating clearly and emphatically in the Democratic platform that we recognize the lawful, rightful democratically established government of Ireland, the Republic of ALL Ireland.

Speech by Daniel Doherity
at the P/111/1/3(4)

Hearing before the
Comm. on Foreign Affairs
House of Representatives
Wash. D.C.

April 28-1950

On the Unification of Ireland

History can I think
to some degree
enrich and liberate
mankind.

This Speech was written
and delivered with
this thought in mind.

Daniel Doherity

The relevance of history

Written for *The Christian Science Monitor*

Is history relevant? Does it have spiritual content?

Some persons, caught up in an overstressed "nowness" of human experience, would reject much of human history—the story of mankind's slow upward striving—as unnecessary and without present meaning. Especially have some young people, skeptical of how other generations have managed mankind's affairs and how historians have interpreted such stewardship, turned away from the study of history.

Christian Science makes clear the distinction between history that is a mere record of mortal ambition and strife and the history that instances the impact of infinite truth and spiritual law on human affairs. One history is an array of mortal configurations; the other catches glimpses of how divine inspiration has to a degree enriched and liberated mankind.

We should all watch, whether student or adult, that we are not so engrossed with the "instant history" of television and other media that we miss the full picture of mankind's long march of achievement. If we accept only the momentary, sometimes dismaying, scene, we inhabit a shallow environment. We downgrade the inspiring example of a Martin Luther, an Abraham Lincoln, a Winston Churchill. We pay scant heed to history's martyrs, of whom the Discoverer and Founder of Christian Science, Mary Baker Eddy, writes in "Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures" (p. 37), "They are earth's luminaries, which serve to cleanse and rarefy the atmosphere of material sense and to permeate humanity with purer ideals."

In pleasure-oriented sectors of society there are people who prefer not to muster the effort to learn from the past. Some others among the youthful aver that they distrust anyone over thirty. Such apathy and suspicion are engendered by matter-bound thinking, without insight and inspiration. A few professors today in the discouragement of their blind reading of mankind's prospects would indoctrinate their students with their own nihilism, arguing that society is so evil it must be destroyed so humanity can start all over again. This moral astigmatism must not mesmerize mankind.

Negative thinking would hide from human view the impetus for good that God's spiritual law has provided down through the centuries—that which the poet Whittier describes as "the steady gain of man." Those who reject enlightened history would remain ignorant of those great breakthroughs of the Christ, Truth, which have so leavened the human scene: the revelation of the Ten Commandments to Moses; the advent of Christ Jesus who taught the law of Love; the discovery of the healing, demonstrable Science of Christianity by Mary Baker Eddy.

History that is a mere recital of dates and kingships is of relatively

minor value. But scholars inspired by wisdom and genuine love of humanity in their historical research can span the centuries with insight as to motives and results. They can point out the pitfalls of evil and avarice that have generated wars and devastations. They can discover what in the past is relevant to today's problems of race, ecology, poverty, economics.

Idealistic youth will be eager to perceive that man—now and always—is not bound by old dogma, militaristic habit, or mortal mind's inertia. He is not a miserable sinner who must suffer his way forward. He is God's perfect idea, expressing all Godlike qualities, including love for his fellowmen. The Biblical word from on high (Matthew 3:17), "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," applies directly to each of God's children.

Mrs. Eddy declares in *Science and Health* (p. 547), "The true theory of the universe, including man, is not in material history but in spiritual development." Mankind must eventually come to see that in real fact history is the record of spiritual unfoldment, revealing the "nowness" of man's birthright of perfection and harmony.

Entitled

I gave up words for a season
Deciding silently on a tongue-tied
Sleep like pinched balm
Lemon sweetness uncalled rising
And unacclaimed.

Description was a mute
acceptance;
Growth thickened growth
With holly-berry stolidity
Bunch berrying on the stem
Red bead against the spined
unmoving green.

I would be still, I would, for a
season.
And then the words began to climb
again
Like sap
To stretch me and yawn me
And stand me up.

And I said.

CHRISTOPHER ANDREAE

How to subscribe to The Christian Science Monitor

Just fill in the coupon below, slip it in an envelope and mail it to us. In a few weeks you will begin

NO. 26-10M-5-51

RETURN-IN-5-DAYS

~~THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS~~
~~DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICE~~

~~AFFILIATED WITH~~
~~THE UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE~~
~~ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE~~

~~139 CLARENDON STREET, BOSTON 15, MASSACHUSETTS~~

Returns ~~OFFICIAL BUSINESS~~

Mary M. Drummond
559 Ashmont Street
Dorchester, Mass.

Mr. Daniel Doherty
% Mrs. Mary Burns
48 Lake View Avenue
South Braintree, Mass



HIRE THROUGH YOUR MASSACHUSETTS STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE