



**TIPPERARY HISTORICAL JOURNAL  
1995**

**© County Tipperary Historical Society**

**[www.tipperarylibraries.ie/thc](http://www.tipperarylibraries.ie/thc)  
[society@tipperarylibraries.ie](mailto:society@tipperarylibraries.ie)**

**ISSN 0791-0655**

# *Class, Community and Conflict: the case of Muintir na Tíre Limited*

---

By Eoin Devereux

## Introduction

The important work undertaken by the Tipperary-based voluntary national community development organisation Muintir na Tíre (People of the Land or Country) has been by and large ignored by social and economic historians.<sup>1</sup> In tandem with this oversight is the fact that, in the accounts of Muintir na Tíre's history which do exist, there has been a tendency to bypass the movement's first organisational manifestation as a co-operative society.<sup>2</sup> For the six years of its short life Muintir na Tíre Limited was to act as a parent body for rural commodity organisations. However, its stated ideal of working to unite the farmers and labourers of rural Ireland failed to materialise. In practice, farm labourers were reluctant to join its ranks and there were also obvious conflicts between the various commodity producers who were members of MNTL.

In fact, those who joined the co-operative society as shareholders were in the main members of the Catholic clergy and middle class professionals from the cities and towns of Ireland. Other difficulties arose in the context of the movement's ideological framework. The main source of MNTL's inspiration, the encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, was to be updated by its successor *Quadragesimo Anno* just one week after MNTL had unveiled itself to the world. Thus it was quickly realised by the movement's promoters that they would have to reconvene at the drawing board.

The society's work was mainly that of a broker for the commodity organisations which had joined forces under its banner, but it also promoted a number of smaller projects such as, for example, vegetable allotment schemes for the unemployed in Tipperary town. Despite the difficulties which it experienced, however, perhaps MNTL's greatest importance was that it provided a forum in the form of Rural Weekends to discuss possible improvements in Irish rural life between the years 1933 and 1937.

Having noted the background to the origins of MNTL, the main discussion in this paper is divided into four main parts. First, the ideological basis of MNTL is examined with particular reference to MNTL's ideas on class conflict in rural Ireland. Secondly, the membership of the organisation is discussed with regard to its shareholders and constituent commodity organisations. Thirdly, the paper examines the activities of MNTL during its six-year life. Fourthly, the paper explores the reasons for the collapse of MNTL in 1937 and its decision that the organisation should be replaced by a more broadly based organisation both at national and local level.

## Origins

On May 8 1931, Fr. John Hayes, a Catholic curate in the parish of Castleiny, co. Tipperary announced to a large gathering in the Commercial Buildings, Dame Street, Dublin the setting up



of an agricultural producers co-operative society for farmers and their labourers. Shares valued at ten shillings each were issued and the organisation, which shortly afterwards (following a newspaper competition) was to receive the title *Muintir na Tire* Limited, was registered with the Registrar of Friendly Societies. MNTL was to act as parent body for rural commodity organisations such as wheat growers, fruit growers and beet growers.

Since 1927 Fr. Hayes had been actively involved in the Athy, Co Kildare based Irish National Grain Growers Association (INGGA), serving as chairman of that organisation in the years 1930 and 1931. Under his leadership the INGGA had 52 branches in existence by 1931 in counties Tipperary, Carlow, Cork, Kildare, Kilkenny, Laois, Louth, Offaly, Galway, Monaghan and Wexford. The INGGA continued as an independent organisation until 1933, when it decided to affiliate to MNTL in the face of financial difficulties. The formation of MNTL signalled the realisation by Hayes and his counterparts that there was a necessity to form a federating body as an umbrella organisation for the various commodity producers in rural Ireland.

The decision to set up an organisation along the lines of MNTL arose after a period of intensive discussions between Fr. Hayes and his colleagues in the years 1930 and 1931. Those involved in the discussions included J.J. Bergin of Athy, and William Dwan, the Thurles, Co. Tipperary soft drink manufacturer. It was the clear intention of those involved that MNTL would operate as a federating body for rural commodity organisations and that it would also seek the participation of farm labourers. To this end MNTL offered farm labourers free membership of the co-operative society.

## Ideology

The ideological basis of MNTL's theory of self-help made reference to ideas from both home and abroad. Such a framework appears to have been an amalgam of the ideas of the European Catholic Social Movement, the National Land League, Sinn Fein, the *Semaine Sociales* of Rural France and the Belgian *Boerbond*. The coping-stone of MNTL's ideology was undoubtedly *Rerum Novarum*.<sup>3</sup> That encyclical had essentially two main concerns. Firstly, in response to what the Roman Catholic Church perceived as the ever growing threat of socialist doctrine which placed great stress on the apparent (or potential) conflict between employer and worker, the Pope called for greater harmony between the social classes. Secondly, he argued that harmony between the social classes could be ensured by the State adopting a supervisory role.

Irish interest in the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* did not begin, however, with MNTL. Several groups had already expressed interest in the Pope's teachings. These included The Leo Guild (1912), The Legion of Mary (1912), *An Ríoghacht* (The Kingdom) (1926), and the Catholic Young Men's Society (1928). The Jesuit journal *Studies* also discussed the content of *Rerum Novarum* at some length.<sup>4</sup>

MNTL's acceptance of the Pope's pronouncements was not without some qualification. As Leo XIII's ideas were in response to the alleged conflict between employer and worker in the industrialised world, they did not easily fit the Irish situation, and more specifically *Muintir's* task. Yet such a position can be explained in the following way. MNT was one of the most important members of the domestic Catholic social movement which had cast itself in the role of protector. What had happened on mainland Europe in terms of greater industrialisation,



Fr. Hayes at a *Muintir na Tire* Rural Week in the mid-1940s.

urbanisation and a subsequent increase in conflict between the social classes would not be allowed to happen at home.

In choosing, therefore, to confine themselves to rural Ireland, MNTL held that rural Ireland was, as of yet, free from class conflict. The sub-committee set up as precursor to MNTL, in quoting the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* as a source of justification for their existence, put it as follows; rural Ireland was “..... still undisturbed by class war, there is hope for their application [the Pope’s teachings] and the practice of the great virtue of charity and co-operation strongly advocated by the venerable Pontiff”.<sup>5</sup> In announcing the genesis of MNTL, Hayes stated that “On the principles laid down by the Pope, we wish today to unite the rural workers of this country and save them from the destructive elements now raging in the vast expansion of industrial pursuits”.<sup>6</sup>

MNTL’s idealisation of social relations in rural Ireland mirrored Catholic thinking at the time, which was essentially anti-urban in character. But MNTL’s image of rural Ireland as being untainted with class conflict does not tally with the ample evidence provided by social and economic historians in recent years. These writers have pointed to much bitter and often violent conflict between farmers and farm labourers in the early decades of the twentieth century, particularly over land and conditions of employment. The decades preceding that in which MNTL was set up proved to have been particularly marked by agrarian unrest and conflict between employer and labourer. Muintir’s historical memory therefore suffered from acute amnesia.

Tying in with its mission for rural Ireland was a tunnel-vision which refused to acknowledge the existence of any form of class conflict in the setting for their work. Conflict in rural Ireland was, according to MNTL’s viewpoint, confined to the party political divisions in the fledgling Irish Free State. Founded just nine years after the Civil War, MNTL was particularly conscious of the conflicting and divisive nature of contemporary Irish party politics. This is not to state, as is sometimes believed, that the movement was essentially apolitical. It had, as was already stated, explicitly referred to the ideas of two domestic political movements – the Land League and Sinn Fein – as a source of inspiration.

The first sub-committee set up to examine which path the movement might follow stressed that “... the society will be maintained without reference to party politics”.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, Hayes emphasised that MNTL “... would have no politics in the ordinary sense of the word, but would in time consider its position in the administration of the nation”.<sup>9</sup> The co-operative society’s short life span was to refuse it that privilege. Yet Hayes’s biographer Rynne refers to an AGM of MNTL which took place in 1934, where in the absence of Hayes’s control partisan conflict broke out between the rival groups. Hayes responded swiftly to this by forming a new committee to head the co-operative society.<sup>10</sup>

The co-operative society does not appear to have been taken up with the question of State encroachment. In fact, as Rynne notes, MNTL’s founder had attempted without success to gain official recognition and support from the State. Thus in an undated submission to the Government Hayes stated, “That we ask the Government to give official recognition to Muintir na Tire Limited, and to provide in the estimates for a subsidy of £1,000 per annum to enable the society with its programme of agricultural organisation”.

## Indigenous Ideas

Fr. Hayes and his supporters looked to the Land League and Sinn Fein as the domestic source of their ideology. In terms of specific self-help ideas, Hayes appears to have been particularly impressed by the co-operative efforts engaged in by the Land League during the 19th-century Land War, and he also referred regularly to the Sinn Fein notion of self-



sufficiency. Thus, for example, in his inaugural speech to the shareholders of MNTL, Fr. Hayes stated that – “On the principles of these, [the Land League and Sinn Fein] we place our new organisation”.<sup>11</sup> Speaking in Cork in 1932, Fr. Hayes declared that “We must look to no other party within the country to enable us to do this. We must look to ourselves”.<sup>12</sup>

### “Born in a Land League hut”

Hayes’s biographer Stephen Rynne was quite critical of the profound influence that both organisations had on the founder of MNTL, stating that “He [Hayes] had an exaggerated estimate of the continuing importance of the Land League and Sinn Fein. He nailed their tattered flags to his mast from the very beginning”.<sup>13</sup> Rynne’s criticisms were unjustified in that, in attempting to promote the ideas of co-operation and self-help, Fr. Hayes’s continuous references to the Land League and Sinn Fein must be seen as an attempt by Hayes to utilise models of self-help with which the people were already familiar.<sup>14</sup> Also, such references on Hayes’s part underline the indelible marks which his family’s experience of the Land War and the rise of the nationalist movement had left on his mind.

Other commentators have attempted to link MNTL’s development endeavours with those of Sir Horace Plunkett’s Irish Agricultural Organisation Society (IAOS). Sir Shane Leslie’s assertion, for example, that MNTL was in fact “... an apotheosis of what Plunkett and his helpers struggled to bring about”,<sup>15</sup> is invalid. O’Connor similarly has attempted to suggest that Plunkett’s IAOS was influential on the formation of MNTL.<sup>16</sup> His argument lies in tracing the similar experiences of both Hayes and Plunkett.

Yet nowhere in their literature do MNTL acknowledge Plunkett’s IAOS as being influential. Throughout my own research I did not find a single reference by Hayes in his speeches or writings to Plunkett’s work. The former Archbishop of Cashel and Emly Dr. Thomas Morris agrees. He argues that mainly because of a changed political climate, and the fact that Plunkett was a unionist, no reference was made to the IAOS.<sup>17</sup>

In terms of organisational structure MNTL largely imported its ideas from rural France and Belgium. One key Muintir activist (J.J. Bergin) had attempted to guide MNTL along the lines of the English National Farmers Union, whereby MNTL would simply exist as a parent body for farmers only. Bergin’s proposals were quickly rejected by Fr. Hayes, who wished to unite both farmer and labourer.<sup>18</sup>

The Rural Weekends which MNTL used to spread its ideas were a truncated version of the *Semaine Sociales* (Social Weeks) held in rural France. Ryan, however, states that in the foundation of MNTL the *Boeronbond* had served as a model with explicit emphasis on the statute, which reads:- “The general purpose of the Boeronbond is to work for the religious welfare of its members and to watch over their material interests, and in a word it seeks to weld our agricultural population into a class, well educated and truly Christian”.<sup>19</sup>

MNTL and its Belgian counterpart had therefore similar objectives, although Morris notes that the Boeronbond model was adapted of necessity to suit the Irish situation.<sup>20</sup> MNTL’s theoretical framework consisted therefore of a combination of European and indigenous self-help ideas, as well as contemporary Catholic social teaching in the form of *Rerum Novarum*.

### Membership and Shareholders

MNTL’s difficulties in attempting to put its co-operativism into practice become clear when one examines the membership of the organisation for the period 1932–1936. Our discussion



below is divided into three parts. First, the number of shareholders subscribing to MNTL is discussed. Secondly, attention is given to the composition of the organisation's national executive. Thirdly, lack of participation of farm labourers and the conflicts between the various commodity organisations which were affiliated to MNTL are discussed.

Despite the often repeated claims by the movement's founder Fr. Hayes that MNTL had well in excess of 300 shareholders, the numbers never exceeded 211. As Table One demonstrates, the numbers subscribing to MNTL were in fact quite small. Its first returns in 1932 to the Registrar of Friendly Societies show that there were only 81 shareholders. Although this number grew over years, the ceiling of 211 members was reached in 1935. At this high point in the organisation's life the share capital subscribed reached £151.00.

**TABLE ONE**

**No of shareholders subscribing to Muintir na Tire Limited 1932-1936**

<b>Year</b>	<b>No.</b>
1932	81
1933	122
1934	206
1935	211
1936	211

*Source:* Registrar of Friendly Societies, Dublin.

Crude figures tell us very little, however, about the organisation other than its membership or its share values during its six-year life. A more interesting question, perhaps, might be to examine the membership of MNTL to ascertain exactly who was advocating co-operation between the two main class groups in rural Ireland. In looking at the returns made by MNTL it is clear that a majority of those subscribing to the organisation were catholic clergymen. There is also quite a strong showing from urban-based professionals such as doctors and solicitors. The returns also show that there were a number of the Anglo-Irish gentry involved in this attempt at promoting class harmony in rural areas. Such a membership is reflected in the organisation's management committee. In 1934 for example the following were elected to serve MNTL:-

**TABLE TWO**

**MNTL's Management Committee 1934**

Right Rev. Monsignor Lyons (Drogheda)	J.B. Hamill Solicitor (Dundalk)
Rev J.M. Hayes (Castleiny)	E. Purcell (Kilkenny)
Hon. Count P.J. O'Byrne (Killiney)	E.C. Semple (Dublin)
Hon. The Lord French (Dublin)	J.J. Nash Solicitor (Templemore)
Dr. James McPolin (Limerick)	J. Hanley (Dublin)
A. Fitzgerald ACP (Limerick)	J.C. McCormack (Tipperary)
J.P. Kearney (Louth)	J. Thorney Jun. (Belfast)
M.J. Lennon (Dublin)	J. F. Maguire (Belfast)
William Dwan, Merchant (Thurles)	E. Gallen (Donegal)

*Source:* The Registrar of Friendly Societies, Dublin.

Such a membership profile had important implications in terms of the movement's success or failure. A majority of those involved in MNTL had little or no experience of farming; so how could they purport to represent the interests of farmers? As I have argued elsewhere, many of those involved with MNTL who were concerned with "saving" rural Ireland were themselves city or town dwellers.<sup>21</sup> Farmers did join MNTL, but not to the extent anticipated by Fr. Hayes and his followers.

Encouraging farm labourers to join MNTL proved even a more onerous task. Despite an initial offer of free membership and a later suggestion that labourers might join at a reduced rate, farm labourers declined to join MNTL. Given that the organisation served to represent the economic interests of commodity producers in rural Ireland, it is not difficult to understand why farm labourers refused to join its ranks. In the face of MNTL's idealisation of social relations in rural Ireland, the existence of class conflict between farm labourers and farmers was further reinforced by their non-participation in MNTL. Their reluctance to participate would serve as a reminder to those involved in MNTL that if it wished for maximum participation in rural parishes the basic unit of organisation being used by MNTL would have to change.

There were also conflicts between the various commodity organisations affiliated to MNTL. As one study of MNTL states, there was conflict between "... agricultural producers ... cereal producers, for instance desired to sell dear while pig farmers desired to purchase grain cheap".<sup>22</sup> Although MNTL had initially requested assistance from the State, its acceptance of the latest papal encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* with its firm views on state subsidiarity meant that MNTL was thrown into self-doubt as to whether it should be attempting to negotiate with the State at all. This ideological question was not MNTL's only worry. As O'Cearbhaill and Varley observed, "Increasing state regulation of commodity markets under protectionism meant, moreover, that producer groups frequently found themselves in conflict with the state".<sup>23</sup> MNTL appreciated that conflict of any kind be avoided at all costs.

## Activities

The activities which MNTL was involved in during its brief existence may be divided into three parts. First, the parent body operated as a broker for the commodity organisations affiliated to it. Secondly, MNTL was responsible for a limited amount of development work at local level. Thirdly, its main task was that of investigating rural problems and organising Rural Weekends where they could be discussed. MNTL had encountered some difficulties operating as a broker for its affiliated commodity organisations. We know that certainly in its first three years the organisation had some success at the negotiating table. In 1931, for example, the co-operative society successfully represented the beet growers in negotiations with the Guinness Company of Dublin over the price of beet.<sup>24</sup>

At local level MNTL was responsible for encouraging farmers and labourers to avail themselves of free seeds and fruit plants being made available by the County Committees of Agriculture. In Hayes's parish of Castleiny local people received rhubarb stools and apple-tree saplings. In Tipperary town it was responsible for organising a vegetable allotment scheme for the town's unemployed. Nationally, MNTL's most tangible activity was its organisation of Rural Weekends. These attracted a curious mixture of Catholic clergymen, politicians, intellectuals, and advocates of rural co-operation. The themes for discussion at these study groups included the imminent "threat" of communism and socialism, the growth in individualism and materialism, and the onset of atheism and State control.



Typically, it was argued that rural Ireland was as of yet free of these influences, but that the “danger” was close at hand. The first Rural Weekend (held in Mount Saint Joseph’s, Roscrea, County Tipperary, in 1933) discussed “Catholic Action in Practice”, with much emphasis in the debates on how farm labourers might be integrated into the organisation’s activities. On a practical basis the Rural Weekend offered farmers advice on more efficient production techniques. The farmers who did attend were from counties Tipperary, Laois, Offaly, Galway, Louth, Dublin and Kildare. Farm labourers, however, were wholly absent.

## Collapse of MNTL

Our preceding discussion has stressed the difficulties which MNTL encountered in attempting to carry out its work in rural Ireland. It was quickly realised by MNTL that perhaps they had been unwise in choosing the type of organisational structure that they did. As early as 1933 it was admitted by the organisation’s leaders that the form of the organisation would have to change completely.

Proceedings to wind down the co-operative society began in 1933; but MNTL’s divorce from the Registrar of Friendly Societies took four frustrating years of negotiations. (Their intention to dissolve MNTL was published in Irish in *The Irish Times*!). The formal dropping of the term “Limited” in its title did not happen until November 1937, nearly four months after MNTL adopted the following resolution at a special general meeting held in Tipperary town- “That as we are satisfied that the social aims and objects of Muintir na Tire Limited could not satisfactorily be attained while the society is in its present form, it is hereby resolved that the society be wound up”.<sup>27</sup>

The co-operative society structure was to be replaced by a new more broadly based unit of organisation at local level. Muintir na Tire now believed that rural self-help was possible through the organisation of Catholic rural parishes into guilds, which would in turn elect a parish council. It was believed that all class groups in a rural parish would participate in the activities of the guild and avail themselves of representation on the parish council. So what brought about this change of mind? Clearly the problems which the organisation had encountered in practice, such as conflicts between different class, partisan and commodity groups went a long way in convincing them that things simply were not working out as well as they had planned.

Yet perhaps the most significant development was in fact an ideological one. A major change came about in the main source of its ideas, namely that of the social teachings of the Catholic Church. For just one week after MNTL was launched a new papal encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* was published. This document, which MNTL readily welcomed, argued that the state should play a subsidiary role in society, and that class conflict could be abated by the formation of corporations or guilds by employers and workers. Underlying such suggestions was a fear on the part of the Catholic Church of the increase in class conflict in the industrialising world and a subsequent rise in socialism.

MNTL quickly realised that it would have to change its direction in favour of a much more broadly based organisational structure to help in the development and renewal of rural communities. Thus, by accepting the vocationalism being suggested by the Catholic Church, the organisation had for all intents and purposes rendered itself redundant just eight days after it formally began its work.





## Conclusion

It has been argued in this paper that MNTL failed in its objectives due to a combination of difficulties involving its chosen organisational structure, its low membership rates and its failure to attract farm labourers into its ranks. It was noted also that, although MNTL was responsible for a limited range of project activity during its six-year life, it ran into further difficulties in its negotiations with the State and that its affiliated commodity producers were in conflict with one another.

MNTL clearly held a blinkered vision of the state of social relations in rural Ireland between farmers and their labourers. Only rarely did they admit that there were hostilities between the two. It was precisely because of these hostilities that MNTL's objectives were doomed to failure from the very beginning. In conclusion, the question to ask might be whether in its next manifestation as a vocationalist movement did Muintir na Tire overcome such difficulties? There is a strong body of evidence to suggest that conflicts of a class kind were to have their impact on future MNT projects during the 1940s and 1950s. Many farm labourers refused to participate in the activities of MNT's guilds, and we must ask ourselves whether any real lessons were learnt by the leadership of MNT following the demise of MNTL.

### FOOTNOTES

*This research was made possible through the co-operation of Muintir na Tire in Tipperary town. I would like to thank Tom Fitzgerald and Dr. Thomas Morris for their help. The paper is drawn from a bigger study of Muintir na Tire which formed the basis of an MA dissertation at University College Galway under the supervision of Professor Chris Curtin.*

1. An earlier unpublished version of this paper was presented to M.Phil. in Irish Studies Seminar Series, University College Galway 27/2/92. I wish to thank Dr. Tom Bartlett for his encouragement and support. I have attempted to set in train a reconsideration of the role of Muintir na Tire. See for example 'Potatoes, Turf and Fireside Chats: Muintir na Tire and the 'Emergency' in Limerick City in *The Old Limerick Journal* Winter 1989; 'Saving Rural Ireland: Muintir na Tire and its Anti-Urbanism' in *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies* Vol. 17 No. 2 December 1991 and 'The Lonely Furrow: Muintir na Tire and Irish Community Development' in *The Community Development Journal* Vol. 28 No. 1 January 1993.
2. See for example Morris, T. *Muintir na Tire: A Sketch of its History*. MNT Rural Publications. (1958) Tipperary; or Thomason, G.: Muintir na Tire's role in Irish Community development in *Studies*, Autumn 1962.
3. *Rerum Novarum* is discussed by Whyte, J. *Catholics in Western Democracies*, Dublin: Gill and MacMillan (1980); and Diamont, A. *Austrian Catholics and the First Republic*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press (1960).
4. See Lyons, F.S.L. *Culture and Anarchy in Ireland*, Oxford: Oxford University press. (1979) and Whyte, J. *Church and State in Modern Ireland*, Dublin: Gill and MacMillan. (1971).
5. See *Tipperary Star*, May 16, 1931.
6. *Ibid.*
7. The issue of class conflict in early 20th century Ireland is discussed by the following: O'Connor, E. 'Agrarian Unrest and the Labour Movement in Co. Waterford' in *Saothar* 6 (1980). See also Fitzpatrick, D.: 'The Disappearance of the Irish Agricultural Labourer', *Irish Economic and Social History*, Vol. 12 (1984) and the review essay by the same author, 'Unrest in Rural Ireland' *Irish Economic and Social History* Vol. 13. pp. 98-105 (1985).
8. Hayes, quoted in Hayes, J.M. and Bergin, J.J. *An Organisation to develop Rural Ireland*. Tipperary: MNT Rural Publications (1932).
9. Hayes Personal File (nd) Tipperary.



10. Rynne, Stephen. *Fr. John Hayes*, Dublin (1960), p. 111.
11. For an account of Sinn Fein's economic ideas, see Davis, R. *Arthur Griffith and Non-Violent Sinn Fein*, Dublin (1974).
12. Hayes, quoted in *The Need for Rural Organisation in Ireland*, by Hayes J. and Bergin J.J. Tipperary: MNT Rural Publications (1932).
13. Rynne, op. cit., p. 113.
14. See Patrick McNabb in Newman, J. (ed.) *Report and Papers of the Gormanston Conference*, Tipperary: MNT Rural Publications (1963).
15. Leslie, Sir Shane, in a foreword to Jerome Toner's *Rural Ireland, Some of its Problems*, Dublin (1965), p. 7.
16. O'Connor, J.D.R., *The Origins, Ethos and development of Muintir na Tire*, unpubd MA thesis, UCC. pp. 73-75 (1988).
17. Interview between the author and Dr. Morris, Thurles, 19-1-1988.
18. Rynne, *Fr. John Hayes*, Dublin, p. 111 (1960).
19. Ryan, John, 'Diamond Jubilee of Belgian Boeronbond', *Studies* (Autumn, 1957), p. 315.
20. Morris, Thomas in Newman J., op. cit., p. 94.
21. Devereux, Eoin, 'Saving Rural Ireland Muintir na Tire's Anti-Urbanism', in *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies* (1991), December, Vol. 17, No. 2.
22. O'Cearbhaill and Varley, *Muintir na Tire and The Crisis of Community Development*, Social Sciences Research Centre (1990), UCG. p. 3.
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Leinster Leader*, Sept. 5, 1931 and Nov. 28, 1931.
25. Minutes of Special General Meeting of MNTL, 29 July 1937.

