

ORIGINAL

BUREAU OF MILITARY HISTORY 1913-21

BURÓ STAIRÉ MILEATA 1913-21

No. W.S. 687

ROINN



COSANTA.

BUREAU OF MILITARY HISTORY, 1913-21.

STATEMENT BY WITNESS

DOCUMENT NO. W.S. 687 (Section 1).

Witness

Right Rev. Monsignor M. Curran, P.P.,
The Presbytery,
Aughrim St.,
Dublin.

Identity.

Secretary to Archbishop Walsh,
1906-1919;
Vice-Rector Irish College, Rome, 1920;
Later Rector do.

Subject.

His recollections of Irish national
affairs, 1912-1922.

Conditions, if any, Stipulated by Witness.

Extract from witness' letter of 17th June 1952
attached to statement:

"It is my wish that the statement be accessible
for public reference only after twenty years,
say 1 Jan. 1972. By mutual agreement it may
be accessible to special competent, sympathetic
and responsible investigators that the Bureau
may agree upon with me".
File No. S.1305

Form B.S.M. 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
1. Why my Statement appears disjointed.	1
2. My opportunities, as Secretary to Archbishop Walsh, of frank discussion on public affairs.	1
3. The Archbishop's position in regard to the Labour Troubles of 1913.	1
4. The Labour Troubles' responsibility for the Rising was small.	5
5. The Larne Gun Running and the Curragh Mutiny.	7
6. Establishment of the Volunteers.	7
7. James Collins	7
8. The Archbishop had lost faith in the Irish Party.	8
9. The Archbishop's attitude towards the Volunteers.	9
10. Archbishop's indignation at Redmond's manoeuvres to control Volunteers.	10
11. Archbishop deplores Irish Party's recruiting campaign.	11
12. Archbishop refuses to sign Anti-German Declaration and to allow Church precincts to be used for recruiting.	12
13. Why Archbishop refused to subscribe to Denis Gwynn's paper, 'New Ireland'.	15.
14. The Coalition Government is formed.	16
15. Dr. O'Doherty is reprimanded for Recruiting Speech.	17
16. O'Donovan Rossa Funeral reveals the beginning of a new political era.	17
17. Mr. Quinn, Assistant Commissioner of D.M.P., discloses attitude of the Castle to O'Donovan Rossa Funeral.	19
18. Mansion House Meeting of 29th February, 1916, is attacked by Irish Party and Press.	22
19. The famous Castle Document.	22
20. Good Friday - James McNeill's visit.	27

	<u>PAGE</u>
21. Significant activities of Volunteers and Citizen Army.	30
22. Mr. Quinn tells on Friday night of landing at Ardfert.	30
23. Volunteer Officer informs Priest of Rising on Holy Saturday.	32
24. Seán T. O'Kelly tells about Sunday's Manoeuvres.	33
25. Sensational rumours about Casement, etc., circulated in Dublin.	34
26. Easter Sunday - The Countermanding Order.	35
27. Easter Monday - Count Plunkett describes his Audience with the Pope.	37
28. We are informed by telephone that the Rising has begun.	39
29. I visit Seán T. O'Kelly at 25 Parnell Sq.	40
30. I visit the G.P.O. and am asked to procure a Priest.	41
31. Monday's rumours about the Rising.	48
32. James O'Connor interviews the Archbishop.	50
33. Easter Tuesday.	51
34. Wednesday, 26th April, 1916.	55
35. Minnie and Phyllis Ryan call on Archbishop.	56
36. Haddington Road Church is used by British Military.	59
37. Thursday, 27th April, 1916.	60
38. The Dummy Sniper on Miss Quinn's Nursing Home.	61
39. Friday, 28th April, 1916.	63
40. Saturday, 29th April, 1916.	65
41. Sunday, 30th April, 1916.	69
42. Monday, 1st May, 1916. Arrest of Marquess McSweeney and Count Plunkett.	70
43. I hear of Arrest of Seán T. O'Kelly. Visit of Fr. Aloysius. Arrest of John McNeill.	71
44. Fr. Farrington is present at Funerals of 3rd May.	72
45. Sir John Maxwell asks Archbishop to deport certain Priests. I offer to give evidence at Courtmartial of Seán T. O'Kelly and John McNeill.	73

	<u>PAGE</u>
46. Proclamations and Military Orders.	74
47. Fr. Farrington describes state of dead bodies of Executed Leaders.	77
48. McBride's and Plunkett's Courtsmartial.	79
49. Major Price tries to get McNeill to connect Dillon and Devlin with the Rising.	80
50. Archbishop is asked to seek Reprieve for Mallin.	82
51. Archbishop subscribes £100 to Relief Fund.	83
52. Protests against Executions.	84
53. Archbishop signs Petition for Fair Trial for Alderman Tom Kelly. Many callers arrive.	86
54. Inspector Love's Influence enlisted on behalf of Seán T. O'Kelly.	88
55. I talk with Massingham of the 'Nation' on the Irish situation.	90
56. Courtmartial of John McNeill - My Evidence.	91
57. Archbishop agrees to act as Chairman of Irish Distress Fund.	97
58. Irish Rebellion shows the Continent of Europe that Ireland is not merely a Province of England. Archbishop explains causes to the Members of the Inquiry Commission.	99
59. Dr. Dwyer's famous Letter to General Maxwell. Lloyd George's infamous Letter to Carson.	100
60. Archbishop appoints Deputy-Chairman of National Aid Fund - Amalgamation of two Funds.	101
61. History of the Rising as narrated by Seán T. O'Kelly.	104
62. History of Partition.	107
63. Archbishop visits Mrs. Stopford Green in connection with Casement.	159
64. General Maxwell's Report on the Rising published.	160
65. Archbishop in a Letter to the Press warns the country against the Parliamentary Party.	160
66. Sir Francis Vane defends conduct of the Volunteers.	162
67. Archbishop interviews American Relief Delegates.	162

	<u>PAGE</u>
68. Irish Parliamentary Party not consulted about introduction of Greenwich Time into Ireland.	163
69. 'Freeman's Journal' is on its last legs.	165
70. Sydney contributes £150 to Relief Fund.	165
71. Gavan Duffy shows correspondence about Cardinal Bourne's attitude to Casement's request for reconciliation to Catholic Church.	166
72. Political visit of French Bishops.	169
73. Bishops' discussion on Political Situation.	171
74. First regular American contribution to National Aid Fund.	172
75. Archbishop refuses invitation to Lord Mayor's Banquet for Lord Lieutenant.	173
76. Fall of Asquith - Tories dominant in British Cabinet.	174
77. Irish National Volunteers forbidden to drill - Redmond's attitude.	174
78. Release of Prisoners - Conditions in Frongoch.	175
79. Unionist Opinion of the Rebellion. They object to teaching of Irish History.	178
80. Count Plunkett proposed for Roscommon Seat at Griffith's Meeting of 14th January, 1917.	181
81. Expulsion of Count Plunkett from R.D.S.	182
82. Laurence O'Neill elected Lord Mayor. Archbishop refuses outgoing Lord Mayor's invitation to a Luncheon for Irish-Canadian Regiment.	182
83. German Government in a Note to U.S.A. criticises England's treatment of Ireland and India.	184
84. Newspaper criticism of Treatment of Irish Prisoners in England.	184
85. Result of Roscommon Elections	185
86. Suspicious boat off Kerry Coast. Deportations of Republicans under D.O.R.A.	186
87. Griffith replies to Devlin's attack on Gaelic League and Sinn Féin.	188
88. Bonar Law refuses to publish Proceedings of Courts Martial of Easter Week men.	190

	<u>Page</u>
89. Manifesto of Irish Parliamentary Party shows change of attitude.	190
90. British military activity suggests fear of another rebellion.	192
91. Count Plunkett invites Archbishop to Conference.	193
92. "A.E.'s" interview with General Smuts. Archbishop refuses permission for War Office collections at churches.	194
93. Lloyd George's hypocritical expression of anxiety for Irish settlement. Garvin's role as intermediary.	194
94. Bishop of Limerick's letter on treatment of Prisoners.	195.
95. Important Manifesto against Partition	196
96. Dr. O'Dwyer comments on Lloyd George's proposal for Convention to settle Irish question.	199
97. Longford Election's fatal blow to Irish Party. Criticism by General Council of County Councils.	200
98. Irish Party's unscrupulous attempt to wreck Count Plunkett's Convention of 19th April 1917.	201
99. Alfie Byrne describes Party's state of mind.	205
100. Count Plunkett repudiates Lloyd George's proposed Conference.	206
101. "A.E.'s" 'Thoughts for a Convention', etc., receives support of Cardinal and Archbishop.	206
102. The Convention is held in Trinity College.	207
103. Sinn Féin, Nation League and Gaelic League refuse to participate in Lloyd George Convention.	209
104. Release of political prisoners.	210
105. All-Ireland Meeting in Phoenix Park protests against Partition.	211
106. South Dublin and East Clare Elections. Significant Press comments.	213
107. Prohibition of military uniforms and hurleys.	216
108. Discontent with Irish Party.	216
109. Meeting of Committee of Irish National Volunteers express desire to negotiate with Irish Volunteers. Devlin's letter shows why arms paid for were not received.	217

	<u>PAGE</u>
110. Colonel Moore criticises Irish National Volunteer Committee.	218
111. Seizure by Government forces of Irish National Volunteers' Arms.	219
112. 'Nationality' publishes Joe Devlin's and F.D. Ackland's letters re arms for Irish National Volunteers.	220
113. Passports for Labour Conference refused to Irish Delegates. British Socialist Party's statement of War aims includes Ireland.	220
114. Kilkenny Election.	221
115. Arrest of prominent Volunteers.	221
116. T.P. O'Connor's American mission on behalf of Irish Party.	222
117. Meetings proclaimed.	223
118. Death of Ashe.	224
119. Archbishop Keown protests to Sir Bryan Mahon re discrimination against Sinn Féin meetings.	225
120. Sinn Féin Convention of 25th October, 1917.	226
121. The 'Irish Independent' advises abandonment of Sinn Féin meeting at Newbridge. Ominous situation in Ireland.	230
122. The treatment of political prisoners.	234
123. Cardinal Logue comments on the "dream" of an Irish Republic.	235
124. Dr. Mannix organises pro-Irish demonstration and causes defeat of conscription in Australia.	237
125. Publication of President Wilson's fourteen points.	240
126. Crisis in Lloyd George's Convention.	240
127. Growing evidence of pro-Irish feeling in U.S.A.	242
128. Irish Labour Deputation wait on Litvinoff.	243
129. South Armagh Election.	243
130. Carson resigns from Cabinet. F.E. Smith co-operates with T.P. O'Connor in U.S.A.	244
131. Sinn Féin Food Controller prohibits export of pigs and is arrested.	245
132. Lloyd George Convention disrupting. Death of Redmond.	246

133.	John Dillon elected Chairman of Irish Party. Asks why are not all united on platform of Home Rule. Tulcan's reply.	247
134.	Adjournment - sine die - of Lloyd George Convention.	248
135.	Reactions to proposal for extension of conscription to Ireland.	249
136.	Arrest of Dowling and Cotter brothers.	258
137.	The Mansion House Conference on Conscription.	262
138.	The British press attacks Irish Bishops for organising Anti-Conscription Pledge.	267
139.	Attitude of non-Catholic Irish towards Conscription.	269
140.	The 'Nation' comments on effect of conscription proposal on Ireland.	270
141.	The Lord Mayor, deputed to present an address from the Mansion House Conference to President Wilson, has to abandon his visit.	275
142.	Reaction to Conscription Bill among the Irish abroad.	277
143.	German Plot arrests.	278
144.	Devoy disclaims all dealing with Germany since U.S.A. entered the War.	281
145.	Representations against Ireland and the Irish Bishops in Rome.	283
146.	Resolution directed against Dr. Paddy Browne at the June meeting of Bishops.	284
147.	Lord French promises grants of land to Recruits joining the British Army.	285
148.	Proclamation prohibiting processions and public meetings in Dublin.	287
149.	Result of Cavan Election.	287
150.	Lloyd George's speech in House of Commons on German Plot and Partition Parliament for Ireland.	289
151.	Archbishop refuses to hold Memorial Service for those who died in the War.	290
152.	Cardinal Logue meets Lord French at Scribblestown House.	291
153.	Government proclaims Nationalist organisations.	292
154.	Tim Healy raises the question of the ill-treatment of prisoners.	293

	<u>PAGE</u>
155. Collapse of Irish Parliamentary Party becomes evident.	294
156. Sinn Féin publishes pamphlets in preparation for General Election.	296
157. Lloyd George's hypocritical commiseration of oppressed Armenians.	297
158. Death of Cardinal Farley.	298
159. Mr. Gompers and the German Chancellor comment on Irish claims.	298
160. National Executive of Irish Labour issue manifesto on Ireland's Right to Self-determination.	299
161. British set trap for Cardinal Logue.	300
162. Ex-King Manoel of Portugal presses the Archbishop to attend Red Cross meeting.	301
163. Job-hunting by Irish Party.	302
164. Danger of Conscription is revived.	303
165. Sinn Féin Annual Convention.	305
166. Home Rule abandoned. House of Commons treats Irish Party with contempt.	306
167. Anti-Conscription Conference considers Resolution of Irish Labour Congress on Self-determination.	309
168. Election Manifesto of Coalition Government refers to Irish question.	311
169. Sinn Féin proposal to hold the Nationalist Plebiscite in Ulster turned down by Dillon.	313
170. Ulster Bishops propose Conference to arrange the division of seats between Sinn Féin and Irish Party,	315
171. Letters of Archbishop, "Tulcan" and Dr. Fogarty explain why people lost faith in Irish Party.	319
172. Lloyd George expresses his opinion that Ireland will achieve complete independence.	324
173. Analysis of Election Results.	326
174. Funeral of Richard Coleman.	331
175. Lack of facilities for Mass in English gaols.	331
176. Cardinal O'Connell's efforts to secure presentation of Ireland's case at the Peace Conference.	332

177. Archbishop opposes proposal to invite President Wilson to Ireland. 334
178. The elected members meet at Mansion House. Lord Haldane's visit to Vice-Regal Lodge. Official opening of Dáil. 334
179. Escape of de Valera, Milroy and McGarry from Lincoln Jail. 337
180. Proposal to conceal de Valera in Archbishop's House. 337
181. Nomination of Dublin Corporation Delegation to President Wilson. Seán T. O'Kelly's encounter with Major Price during the interview for passports. 341
182. Seán T. O'Kelly seeks interview with President Wilson and inaugurates his campaign of propaganda. 343
183. Irish Race Convention at Philadelphia. 346
184. Release of prisoners interned in England. Death of Pierce McCann. 350
185. De Valera's departure for America. 351
186. Seán T. O'Kelly succeeds in getting publicity in Paris press. 351
187. American support for Ireland's claim gathers momentum. Mr. Philip Gibbs is impressed by the pro-Irish demonstrations. 356
188. French and Spanish Press comments on Irish situation. 362
189. Raid for Arms on Collinstown Aerodrome. 365
190. English League of Nations Union and Irish claims. 366
191. Cancellation of reception to de Valera. 367
192. Ian McPherson appointed Chief Secretary. 368
193. The delegation from the Irish Race Convention arrives in Paris. 369
194. The Irish-American delegates in Ireland. 371
195. Back in Paris the delegates renew their efforts to obtain safe conducts for the Irish representatives. 374
196. The Irish-American delegates send copies of their Report on Conditions in Ireland to President Wilson and others. 380
197. The delegates obtain an interview with President Wilson. 382
198. Back in America, the delegates agitate against Wilson and the Peace Treaty. 392

199.	The Irish Bishops protest against military government and thank America for espousing the cause of Ireland.	392
200.	The bankruptcy and extinction of the 'Freeman's Journal'.	394
201.	De Valera opens his triumphal campaign in U.S.A. Its effect on Wilson's struggle for ratification of the Peace Treaty.	395.
202.	Irish Dominion League is formed.	402
203.	Dáil Loan Campaign is launched in Ireland.	402
204.	Suppression of Advanced Nationalist Bodies including Dáil Éireann.	403
205.	Carson resumes his Anti-Home Rule campaign.	406
206.	Sinn Féin majority elected to Senate of National University.	408
207.	The 1919 Convention of Sinn Féin is held.	409
208.	Bishops refrain from issuing a statement condemning the murder of policemen.	410
209.	Escape of Sinn Féin prisoners from Strangeways Prison, Manchester.	411
210.	Sir H. Plunkett advocates the grant of Dominion Home Rule to Ireland.	412
211.	Australia supports Ireland's claims.	413
212.	Archbishop subscribes £105 to Dáil Loan.	415
213.	Raid on Dáil Éireann offices.	415
214.	Senate of U.S.A. adopt Reservation to Article X of Peace Treaty.	416
215.	Volunteers attack British launch in Bantry Bay.	416
216.	Alleged understanding between Lloyd George and President Wilson re settlement of Irish question.	416
217.	Prisons Board abrogate political status of prisoners.	418
218.	Rewards offered for information re deaths of policemen.	418.
219.	Proclamation of 3rd July, 1918, extended to all Ireland.	419
220.	Ulster Unionists send deputation to U.S.A.	419
221.	De Valera announces issue of two million worth of Republican Bonds.	421

	<u>PAGE</u>
222. James O'Connor suggests impeachment of Carson for treason-felony.	423.
223. Attack on Lord French.	424
224. Municipal Elections.	425
225. Marsillac of 'Le Journal' interviews Lord French.	425
226. Bishops condemn government by force.	427
227. Arrest of prominent Volunteers.	427
228. De Valera's reception by the State Government of New Jersey.	427
229. Sean T. O'Kelly arrives in Rome.	428
230. Dr. McHugh of Derry condemns proposed partition of Ireland.	428
231. M. Staines informs Archbishop of circumstances of Lord Mayor MacCurtain's murder.	429
232. My departure for Rome.	429
233. Installation of Cardinal Protector of the Irish College gives opportunity for pro-Ireland demonstration.	430
234. Dr. Hagan has the 'Osservatore Romano' taken to task for its attitude towards Ireland.	436
235. Archbishop Walsh protests against treatment of political prisoners as criminals.	437
236. D'Annunzio's followers offer to join Irish Volunteers and carry on guerilla war.	438
237. Seán T. O'Kelly prepares Memorandum on Irish situation for the Pope.	439
238. Beatification of Oliver Plunkett brings Irish Bishops to Rome.	440
239. Unsettled conditions in Italy brought to Cardinal Logue's attention.	441
240. Dr. Hagan determines to frustrate England's efforts to obtain Holy See's condemnation of Irish movement.	442
241. Mr. A. Balfour's audience with the Pope fails in its object.	445
242. Cardinal O'Connell's impassioned address at San Clemente in support of claims of Ireland.	447
243. The Irish celebrations in Rome. Sean T. O'Kelly's reception.	449
244. English chagrin at success of Irish Week in Rome.	451
245. Seán T. O'Kelly has private audience with the Pope.	456

246. Irish Bishops make statements to their people on the Pope's attitude towards Ireland. 458
247. Result of Local Government Elections. 461
248. Dr. Mannix en route for Ireland is honoured in America. 462
249. Cardinal Gasquet's activity in Rome on behalf of England. 463
250. Arrest of Dr. Mannix causes consternation. 464
251. Carl Ackermann explores the possibility of an Irish settlement. 465
252. The case of Terence MacSwiney attracts attention abroad. 466
253. G. Duffy's expulsion from Paris. 468
254. Goblet's book on Ireland is translated into Italian. 469
255. 'Irish Bulletin' exposes British plans for murder campaign written on Dáil notepaper. 469
256. English efforts to induce the Pope to condemn hunger-striking. 471
257. Archbishop Walsh refuses to support M. J. O'Connor's proposed settlement. 477
258. Dr. Hagan and others receive copies of Dr. P. McCartan's protest against British atrocities in Ireland. 478
259. Important declaration of Irish Bishops in favour of self-determination for Ireland. 479
260. MacSwiney's death arouses sympathy for Ireland abroad. 480
261. Italian Deputy plans demonstration of sympathy for Ireland. 480
262. Bishops' October declaration evokes letters of sympathy from Cardinal Mercier and others. 487
263. Remarkable pro-Ireland demonstration in Milan and in the Italian Chamber of Deputies. 490
264. Anglican Bishops condemn military regime in Ireland. 491
265. Donal McHales and Seán O'Shea visit Rome to buy arms from Italian Ministry of War. X 493
266. Italian journalist complains of Reuter's suppression of Irish news. 494
267. Archbishop Clune's account of his interviews with Lloyd George. 495

	<u>PAGE</u>
268. Cardinal Logue's protest to 'Osservatore Romano'.	496
269. Italian Press publishes Resolution of British Labour party on Irish question.	500
270. British pressure on Vatican for condemnation of Sinn Féin increases and is countered by American influence.	500
271. Cardinal Bourne's hostile attitude towards Ireland expressed in his Lenten Pastoral.	502
272. Condemnation of Government Policy in Ireland by various British leaders.	507
273. Judges prohibited from dealing with claims involving allegations against Crown forces.	510
274. Renewal of campaign against Irish movement in Roman Curia.	511
275. Visits of Dr. Amigo and Dr. Clune to Rome.	512
276. Gavan Duffy leaves Rome to visit other Capitals of Europe.	517
277. Copies of Sinn Féin pamphlet distributed to Cardinals.	518
278. Arthur Henderson upholds Ireland's right to a Republic.	522
279. Cardinal Bourne visits Rome.	522
280. Pro-Irlanda demonstration in Rome.	525
281. Archbishop Walsh protests against conviction of Patrick Moran. Archbishop's death.	532
282. Further English protests against administration in Ireland.	533
283. Archbishop Mannix arrives in Rome. He induces the Pope to give a contribution to Irish White Cross.	534
284. 'Irish Bulletin's' comments on Cardinal Logue's reference to "Campaign of Assassination" are shown to the Pope by Dr. Hagan.	538
285. Renewed Peace efforts.	540
286. Lord Lieutenant announces elections for Southern and Northern Parliaments.	544
287. Copy of Dáil Appeal to Italian Deputies is presented to the Pope.	545
288. Mr. Hambro exposes in the 'Times' the systematic circulation of "doped" news on Ireland.	548
289. Issue of Writs of Attachment against General Macready and others.	548

	<u>Page</u>
290. American Hierarchy send good wishes to Cardinal Logue for success of Peace Conference.	550
291. Genesis of Pope's telegram to King George.	551
292. Seán T. O'Kelly warns that Griffith and Collins are surrendering on many points. De Valera does not heed warning.	559
293. Doubts and uncertainties in regard to peace terms.	562

ORIGINAL

BUREAU OF MILITARY HISTORY 1913-21

BURO STAIRE MILEATA 1913-21

NO. W.S. 687

STATEMENT OF RT. REV. MONS. MICHAEL CURRAN,
34 Aughtim Street, Dublin.

Why my statement appears disjointed:

It was arranged that this statement should be composed as much as possible of verbatim extracts from my diaries with a minimum of explanatory matter. This helps to explain its disjointed and often illogical character.

My opportunities, as Secretary to Archbishop Walsh, of frank discussion with him on public affairs:

I was Secretary to His Grace, Archbishop Walsh, from December, 1906, to December, 1919, when I was appointed Vice-Rector of the Irish College in Rome. I did not, however, go to Rome until March, 1920. Recognising that I took a keen interest in public affairs and that my nationalist views largely corresponded with his own, we frequently discussed the political events of his own earlier career as well as those of the time. These conversations, usually after dinner or on our weekly walks, were delightfully frank, spontaneous and covered every phase of the contemporary events and personalities. It was only after some years that I realised that he was speaking more freely to me than to any others on the public events of the day. I gradually found that he was always ready to go over these events of the past with one who was sympathetic and interested.

The Archbishop's position in regard to
the Labour Troubles of 1913:

Beginning with the year 1913, the matter of most vital importance was the labour troubles that excited such public interest, and brought such misery to the workers of Dublin. The Archbishop's position was roughly this. On

the merits of the issue, he was entirely in sympathy with the men against the employers but, on the other hand, he was much opposed to James Larkin. He regarded Larkin as an unpractical man, a demagogue, reckless and irresponsible. He believed that it was not possible to have any dealings with a man whose common slogan was, "To hell with contracts". The employers at once fastened on this unfortunate slogan and took full advantage of it. Their attitude was: "We can't trust any man who won't hold to his word. We won't have any contacts or negotiations with this man, or with the men, as long as he is their head". To a certain extent, the Archbishop sympathised with that view but only as far as it regarded Larkin. In the circumstances, he largely sympathised with the employers' contention: "We require guarantees before we enter into negotiations with the trades union - meaning, of course, guarantees that they will carry out what they say."

The clergy were intensely anti-Larkin and, therefore, the majority of them were not very sympathetic with the men. Their feelings were mixed. On the one hand, they were shocked by the extreme talk of Larkin, who was very wroth with the priests for failing to back him up. On the other hand, they had to recognise that the working men laboured under many intolerable conditions and there was general sympathy with the families of the poor. The first step the Archbishop took when he returned from vacation on 2nd October, 1913, was to subscribe £100 to the fund for the children of the unemployed. This charitable act came almost as a bombshell on the general body of the clergy who, like the general public, regarded this step as practically equivalent to favouring the strikers.

On the 5th October the Archbishop wrote a letter

concerning the proposed terms of settlement of the labour trouble, pleading for private discussion - a talk around a table instead of on the streets. At the time of the carters' strike^{in 1908} he had had experience of Larkin as a negotiator. He fully recognised the grievances of the carters but deplored that the champion of their cause was so impossible a representative at the conference table. He felt that there was a considerable possibility of reasonable discussion but that, as long as the negotiations were carried on by public controversy, whether on the streets or in the press, nothing could be done. He pleaded for private discussion. He wished to bring out that there were two sides to the question. Personally he held that the employers should not have presented their so-called "agreement" to the workers, an "agreement" demanding of the workers that they should not be members of, or support the Transport Union. His contention was that the employers should only have required an undertaking that the men would handle all goods, or wait until the men had refused to handle the goods. While definitely opposed to Larkin as a labour leader, he had no personal prejudice against him. On the other hand, he had a high opinion of Connolly, whom he regarded as a reasonable and able leader.

Lord Aberdeen, the Lord Lieutenant of the time, wrote to the Archbishop, asking him for his intervention. Replying to this letter on 10th October, the Archbishop said that his opinion was that the Askwith Inquiry - Askwith was a very well-known lawyer in London, an expert on economic controversial questions, and was conducting some Inquiry, which had been set up earlier, into the strike - was achieving little good and that it was a grave mistake not to have compelled Larkin to produce evidence

for his statements. Larkin had been allowed to make wild statements unchecked and a certain amount of the accusations in them were bound to stick. The Archbishop in this letter said that an opportunity should have been given to the employers to answer Larkin's statements. Apparently, that was not done. The Archbishop stated definitely in this Aberdeen letter that, on the merits of the case generally, his sympathies were altogether with the workers; and he trusted that the outcome of the case would be a radical change for the better in the position of the workers in Dublin. He said that he was always prepared to take part in mediation when he thought his intervention was welcome, but not otherwise.

Then came the next wild move of Larkin, the deportation to England of Dublin children whom he recklessly arranged to place in charge of philanthropic Socialists of known atheistical or secularist leanings in Liverpool and elsewhere. On the 20th October the Archbishop wrote condemning this scheme. Determined steps were instantly taken by the clergy and sodalities of the Westland Row and the Quay parishes to block the removal. Religious demonstrations were held on the North Wall whence the children were to sail. Failing substantially there and at Dún Laoghaire, Larkin and his British allies tried the northern route by Amiens Street Railway Station and Belfast. It was too late, for the entire city was by this time in an excited ferment of indignation at the perverse interference of English Socialists. Larkin had overreached himself and irreparably ruined himself in the general estimation, even in many Labour circles outside his own Transport Union.

The Archbishop's letter of 20th October, however, contained another vital consideration. It pointed out to

the employers that Mr. Gosling, one of the trades-union leaders of highest standing in England and actually head of the English Transport Union, had offered to give guarantees that terms of agreement would be kept. In these circumstances, there was no reason why the two parties would not meet. Here was a man who could be trusted to stand by his words and, therefore, negotiations could be commenced. But, in fact, the employers did not want peace negotiations. Led by William Martin Murphy, they really wanted to starve the workers into submission and unfortunately the hysterical atmosphere generated by the attempted general deportation of the workers' children stifled all attempts at conciliation. Legal proceedings taken against one of the English deporters revealed that some of the children were removed to Liverpool without the consent of their parents.

The Labour Troubles' Responsibility for
the Rising was small:

There is danger of distorting the origins of the Rising by beginning with the Labour troubles of 1913. These events created the Civic Army but the 1916 revolution had its true origin in the I.R.B. Great and decisive as was the part played by Connolly, the contribution of Labour was in my opinion quite small compared with that of the I.R.B., the Gaelic League, the Language and Irish-Ireland movements, Sinn Féin, the Volunteers and the evolution of political events in Ireland. The influence of Labour is far below another factor rarely alluded to - the education of thousands and thousands of plain Irish boys by the Irish Christian Brothers. I hold strongly that it was the atmosphere of their schools and the training of the Brothers that provided the foundation, the materials and, to a very large extent, the builders of the Irish Separatist movement that culminated in 1916. The articles

in the Irish Catholic Bulletin in July, 1916, and the following months prove this. Until the leadership of Labour passed from Larkin to Connolly, Labour both in Dublin and Belfast was not notable for its patriotism. To the very end, the working man in Dublin preferred to work with the Volunteer bodies than with the political movements of organised Labour. The General Elections since 1932 prove that Political Labour has not the support of the Dublin working man. The Citizen Army was a minute particle of the working classes in Dublin.

In its origins the Separatist movement was essentially a movement of the plain Irish people - the common man - and remained so. It was not markedly Labour or Social in its inspiration, though the rank and file came mainly from the working classes. The Intellectuals were unseen and unheard, though some toyed with it after the Rising. Trinity College from its Provost to its cadets was a stronghold, as ever, of the enemy. Up to May, 1916, the names of Clongowes and the more "select" Catholic colleges do not appear, and only rarely and inconspicuously for years afterwards.

But from August, 1913, the Labour troubles began to dominate Dublin life and brought dire misery to the workers and their families. In its later stages, the Archbishop took an active part. His views may be gathered from his letters to the Dublin Press, dated 5th October, 28th November and a statement to the Freeman's Journal on 17th December, 1913.

In the beginning of 1914 I was in Rome. Consequently I have not anything entered in my diary relating to Irish events.

In the beginning of February, 1914, there was a

complete collapse of the Labour strike, due entirely to Larkin's mismanagement.

The Larne Gun Running and the Curragh "Mutiny":

Two incidents of note that occurred in 1914 were the Larne Gun Running by the Ulster Volunteers and the Curragh Mutiny. The latter has been somewhat misrepresented, as it was really not a mutiny. The Asquith Government was deplorably weak. It gave the option to the officers of resigning. If you follow the documents, you will see that there was no refusal on the part of Gough and the other officers but that they accepted the alternative so indefensibly offered to them by the weak Asquith Government.

The Dublin County Council and local Municipal Elections in June, 1914, went entirely against Larkin.

Establishment of the Volunteers:

Whilst I was naturally deeply interested in the establishment and development of the Volunteer movement, I had no personal relations with it beyond occasional conversation with Eoin McNeill, Larry Kettle and a gentleman who was an ordinary member and whom I met weekly on other matters. Now and again, as differences became acute, I sought information from Seán T. O'Kelly.

James Collins:

Another source of intelligence, particularly on the strength and progress of the I.R.B., was James Collins, the Dublin Corporation Dairy Inspector, who lived on Botanic Avenue. He was an old Fenian and obviously connected with the older I.R.B. He had been a confidential servant of Isaac Butt and a great friend of Davitt. Self-educated, he published a well-known book in 1913, "Life in Old Dublin". He was well versed in old Dublin municipal history and its personalities. Though he had dropped out

of active participation in the I.R.B., he always remained in touch with the older men and was much trusted by them. I don't know how he got in touch with the Archbishop - I think it began with Collins sending the Archbishop interesting and little-known items of parochial history whenever he read that the Archbishop was about to visit and speak at parochial meetings. These the Archbishop often found useful, if only by starting him on the track of further investigation. The Archbishop, who always referred to him as "the conspirator", had a great respect for him, though they only met for a few moments' chat at parochial meetings. Being struck by the Archbishop's references to him, I sought him out in Botanic Avenue and we became good friends. He had built a special room in the garden of his house literally lined from top to floor with out-of-the-common books on local history. He died suddenly on 13th January, 1916, and his unique collection of books were bought by somebody in America who had commissioned a Dublin agent to buy books on Ireland. His specialised books were of no use to the Americans but they were a definite loss to Dublin. It was this man who made me alive to the distinct growth of the I.R.B. in Dublin in 1914 and 1915. He was very reliable and, despite his aloofness from the new generation, he knew everything.

The Archbishop had lost faith in the Irish Party:

Long before the Larne gun-running and the formation of the Ulster Volunteers, the Archbishop had thoroughly realised that constitutional methods to active reform were utterly useless. They had failed in the first instance through the subservience of the Irish Party to the English Liberals, aggravated by place hunting for their supporters. But the final blow came from the downright treasonable speeches and activities of the highest placed and more aristocratic members of the Tory governing classes of

England and their unqualified support of the Ulster Volunteers. Extracts from their speeches may be found in "A Grammar of Anarchy". They included not only members of Parliament but the highest military officers and former members of Conservative Governments. Between the politicians at home and the new rebels in England and Ulster, it was plain there was no longer any prospect that the influence of men in the Archbishop's position would carry the slightest weight. They could only withdraw from public life. If they intervened in any way, their position was misunderstood and misrepresented.

The Archbishop's attitude towards the
Irish Volunteers:

The Archbishop did not welcome the establishment of the Volunteers at the beginning. In fact he disapproved, but as events developed he realised there was full justification for their formation since the arms of the Ulster Volunteers frightened and coerced the weak English Government. His opinion of the Irish Volunteers, therefore, fluctuated from time to time but he never believed that the movement would succeed in its objects. Characteristically, he always feared that some wild irresponsible element would force matters to extremes and ruin the entire national cause. He became more and more pessimistic as much in respect of the helplessness for the time being of Irish effort as of the strength of the anti-Irish campaign in England.

The Archbishop had no belief in Eoin McNeill as a political and much less as a revolutionary leader. Without being openly critical nor in the least way cynical or sarcastic, he was disposed to smile at the scholar turned revolutionary. He knew the McNeill family fairly well. He had an uncle of Eoin's, Dr. Macauley, an old Whig, as a

colleague in Maynooth and first met the McNeill boys studying under their uncle as private pupils. Highly as the Archbishop valued Eoin's work as an Irish scholar and historian and for his outstanding work for the language, he had no faith in his political judgment and regarded him as the least suitable man for revolutionary leadership. Perhaps this contributed considerably to his detached attitude of mind towards the Volunteer movement. Occasionally startling events such as the landing of arms aroused his interest for a time.

Archbishop's Indignation at Redmond's manoeuvre
to control Volunteers:

He was highly indignant with John Redmond's manoeuvre to secure control of the Volunteer body. He regarded the design as dishonest and typical of the Party's unconstitutional and underhand practices.

The truth was that the immense enthusiasm in the country had risen to such a pitch that Redmond and the Party leaders saw that they dare not remain aloof any longer and that they were obliged to turn the movement to their own ends.

My own relations with the Volunteers were entirely confined to the centre and right wing Volunteers. There gradually appeared to us three or rather four sections. There were the Parliamentary Party section, the Eoin McNeill section, firmly resolved to carry out the original Volunteer programme, the underground I.R.B. section, headed by Pearse who supported Eoin McNeill at Council Meetings, and lastly a large body of the rank and file who abstained from the dissensions that began to arise after Redmond's coup and who, inspired solely by the Volunteer ideal, avoided factional conflicts.

Deterioration of Archbishop's Health:

At the end of April, 1914, the Archbishop's health commenced to fail. It is important to bear this in mind, as it prevented him from doing many things which otherwise he might have done. At any rate, the state of his health largely incapacitated him for long periods from active work. In my diary I have noted that on the day of the Larne landing the Archbishop was unable to go out of doors, and on the 28th April I have recorded that the first noticeable signs of failing health showed itself by a nervous shaking of his hands and that Dr. Cox was called in.

Archbishop deplores the Irish Party's Recruiting Campaign:

The Archbishop deplored the Irish Party's recruiting campaign and regarded it as an inevitable result of their parliamentary subservience to the Liberals. Although the Home Rule Act had been given Royal assent and was on the statute book, it had been suspended until after the end of the war, when it could be amended in favour of Ulster. Yet the Party continued to give their entire support to the Liberals. At this stage it would be practically impossible for the Party to break with their masters. The Archbishop deplored especially the Party's meeting held in the Mansion House on the 25th September when Asquith, Redmond, Dillon and Devlin were the principal speakers. But far more than their recruiting efforts he deplored their continued subservience to the Liberals and their deception of their country in representing the Liberals as trustworthy champions of Home Rule and unfailing friends of Ireland. This matter will arise later on.

On the 25th October, 1914, Eoin McNeill's Volunteers held their Convention, at which there was bitter criticism of the Irish Party's recruiting speeches at Kilkenny (18th

October), Belfast, Pallasgreen, Kerry, etc. I have noted in my diary that "Redmond's twisting was exposed" at this Convention.

From their beginning the Archbishop was a subscriber to Arthur Griffith's papers. He read them most carefully and often discussed them freely with me.

I have also a note of John Dillon's speech in November in which he stated:

"I am England's friend in this war."

Archbishop refuses to sign Anti-German Declaration organised by Wilfred Ward and to allow Church precincts to be used for Recruiting, etc.:

On the 15th December, 1914, I wrote in my diary -

"The Archbishop refused a week ago to sign an anti-German declaration, organised by Wilfred Ward, chiefly because it contained a number of sweeping statements, of which he had no knowledge as to whether they were untrue or true. For instance, the statement that England had done all it could to avoid war was discounted by the resignation of Morley, etc."

Such statements formed part of Wilfred Ward's declaration. Wilfred Ward was the father of Maisie Ward and a member of the Catholic publishing firm of Sheed and Ward. John Morley and Burns had resigned at the outbreak of the war. My notes for the 15th December continue -

"To-day he received another appeal from Ward, urging him to reconsider his refusal, especially as many of his Episcopal brethren had signed it."

This refers to the Archbishop of Tuam, Dr. Healy, and another. I have noted that Dr. O'Dwyer and the Bishop of Clogher have also refused to sign the document. A copy of this document of Wilfred Ward appeared in the English "Tablet" of that period. There were not more than two or

three Irish Bishops behind the recruiting, faithful followers of the Irish Parliamentary Party.

A comment on an article by George A. Bermingham in the "Nineteenth Century" Magazine appears in the "Evening Mail" of 31st July, 1914. It shows the anti-British feeling in Ireland about the war.

On one particular occasion in 1914 the Archbishop peremptorily refused a request of the military to allow recruiting posters to be placed on the railings of the Catholic Churches in Dublin and, as the recruiting became more active, he caused it to be known that this procedure met with his strong disapproval. He went so far as to discountenance war hospital and Red Cross collections. He believed that these activities should be financed by the Government and that the appeals were being used for recruiting purposes.

I wrote in my diary under the 31st March, 1915 -

"Father Mooney [Parish Priest, Ringsend, and Chaplain to the Beggar's Bush Barracks] received a very curt letter this morning from Lieutenant-Colonel Owens, Officer Commanding the 3rd Royal Regiment at Beggar's Bush, intimating 'the intention of the military authorities to hold a military parade on Easter Sunday, with a religious service in the Cathedral', and asking him to arrange an hour with the Cathedral authorities. This was announced also in the papers of Thursday. On Fr. Mooney visiting Fr. Bowden [Administrator of the Pro-Cathedral], the latter rang up Archbishop's House and then sent up the letter. The Archbishop at once scribbled out the draft of an equally curt reply for Fr. Mooney to sign:-

"I have, of course, no authority to interfere in arrangements for services in the Pro-Cathedral. The matter has been brought to the notice of His Grace, the Archbishop, who directs me to express his surprise that the military authorities, without having even applied for permission to make use of that Church, announce their 'intention' of

holding a Parade Service there, and I am to add that no such Service can be held." "

(I still have this draft which I shall gladly give to the Bureau.)

So opposed was the Archbishop to recruiting in Ireland that he refused to have anything to do with anything savouring of it. Thus he refused to attend a meeting to provide comforts and entertainments for the soldiers, although asked to do so in a personal letter from Lord Aberdeen.

On the following day Captain Butler, son of Sir William Butler and a great friend and former class-fellow of the Archbishop, called on the Archbishop to express regret, on behalf of the military authorities, for the previous day's letter, and to say that they were going into it. The Archbishop was very firm in his attitude and repeated his opinion of their action.

Under the 12th May, 1915, I have the following note:-

"The Archbishop received this evening a flaming red and blue printed poster from the Central Council for the Organisation of Recruiting in Ireland /whose offices were in the Mansion House/ saying that they 'had taken the liberty of producing it', that at General Friend's request, they submitted a copy for the Archbishop's approval, "and, if it is convenient, we hope that your approval may be intimated by telephonic communication to the above number' - signed by the Honorary Secretary, E.Aston.

The following is a copy of the poster:-

ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN
AND
THE SINKING OF THE "LUSITANIA" -

Describing it

As

"T H A T
H O R R I B L E
M A S S A C R E"

Germany says she will do it again!
Will you do your part to prevent her?
If so - Join an Irish Regiment.
Offer your services

The "approval" they got was the following letter by return of post:-

"Dear Sir, I have received your letter, informing me that your Council "has taken the liberty of producing, and proposes to distribute a poster" containing some words spoken by me last Sunday. In reply I have only to say that, in my opinion, your Council, in producing the poster, a copy of which you have forwarded to me, has taken a very great liberty indeed, and that I reserve my right of taking such action as I may deem fit, if I find the poster "distributed" in the manner which seems contemplated."

On the following day the Archbishop received a letter from the Recruiting Council, saying that, in view of the terms of His Grace's letter, they would not produce the poster, and that they had destroyed what copies they had of it.

My diary shows that on the 20th May, 1915, I wrote, by direction of the Archbishop, to Abbot Marmion, then a Benedictine refugee from Belgium, saying that he was unwilling to invite Monsignor Dr. Wachter of Malines, Co-Adjutor of Cardinal Mercier, as a big subscription had already been given to the Belgians, and because the occasion would be turned into a recruiting campaign. I have made the following note in my diary in regard to this:-

"He has discountenanced the support of those Belgians who fled from their country and has always regarded them as the least deserving of support. He even did not like the advent of the Belgian nuns. He has been justified inasmuch as the Belgians who came across are, in perhaps most cases, worthless and worse-than worthless."

Why the Archbishop refused to subscribe to Denis Gwynn's paper, "New Ireland":

On the 25th May the Archbishop wrote to Denis Gwynn, son of Stephen Gwynn, editor of a new weekly paper, entitled "New Ireland", which was being started -

"Dear Mr. Gwynn, Through an oversight your letter of the 17th has remained unanswered until now. I regret that, as one result of a radical change that has gradually been effected in Irish political affairs through the establishment of a working alliance between the "leaders" of the Irish Parliamentary Party and the late Government, I have now, for a considerable time, found it impossible to take any further interest in Irish politics. I am so saddened and, I may say, sickened by the change of front, the results of which I cannot but see in Government appointment after Government appointment, incontestably due to the active intervention of some of our leading politicians, that I have long since had to give up even the reading of articles or letters touching upon the political situation in Ireland. I never could have thought, thirty years ago when I came to Dublin as Archbishop, that I should live to see the great bulk of the nationalists of Ireland so hopelessly misled by palpable misrepresentation of the obvious facts, as I see it to-day. So I trust you can understand that it is not from any want of interest in your journalistic enterprise that I find myself debarred from becoming a subscriber to "New Ireland"."

Of course, this letter was really intended for his father, Stephen Gwynn, a member of the Parliamentary Party at the time and a Captain in the British Army who took part in the recruiting campaign in Ireland.

The Coalition Government is formed:

A new Coalition Government was formed at this time.

My diary notes under the date, 26th May, 1915:-

"It should be pointed out that the Postmaster Generalship was reserved for Redmond but, in accordance with the decision arrived at, at a meeting of the Irish Party in the Mansion House, he refused to take office. Carson had become the Attorney General.

People are waking up in a despondent kind of way and asking what is to become of Home Rule. Of course, Home Rule, such as it is worth, is in the melting pot.

The "Independent" has a good leading article pointing out that the country has been sold and the only thing Ireland has gained during the Liberal period of office was University building. It might have added "and some jobs for the Irish Party". The old "Freeman" is spluttering with rage."

On the 24th September, 1915, I have recorded in my diary the beginning of a long and serious attack of eczema which affected the Archbishop for more than twelve months. His condition varied at times. At this particular time it became so serious that his legs and arms had to be bandaged.

Dr. O'Doherty is reprimanded for Recruiting Speech:

On the 5th December, 1915, at Bray, Dr. O'Doherty, C.C. of the Pro-Cathedral, made a speech on recruiting, for which he was reprimanded before the Vicars General of the Diocese on the 8th December. About the 17th December two papers - "Spark" and "Hibernian" - had reference to Dr. O'Doherty's speech.

On the 18th December, 1915, an article, signed "Irish Catholic", appeared in the paper, "Nationality", dealing with the Archbishop and recruiting. It alludes to the speech made by Dr. O'Doherty in Bray, to the letter written to Fr. Mooney by Lieutenant-Colonel Owens, and to the red and blue poster which the Archbishop received from the Recruiting Organisation in Ireland. It also alludes to John Redmond's recruiting speech at Aughavanna and to the project to bring Irish-Canadian Rangers to Ireland.

I have here also attached to my diary an extract from the "Irish Independent" of the 14th May, 1915, which deals with Asquith's assurance on 15th September, 1914, in the House of Commons that the Home Rule Bill would be altered and amended and that the coercion of Ulster was "absolutely unthinkable".

The O'Donovan Rossa Funeral reveals the beginning
of a new political era:

The funeral of O'Donovan Rossa on 1st August, 1915, was to my mind the date that publicly revealed that a new political era had begun. It was the prelude to the 1916

Rising. So at least I felt, but I misjudged the strength of the graveside orator. From the accounts of my general informants I formed the impression that Pearse's followers were in a decided minority; that Eoin McNeill was definitely against Pearse's intransigence; that McNeill commanded a majority; and, although it was perfectly evident that Pearse was in favour of forcing a Rising, that he would not succeed in bringing a sufficient number with him. That was my attitude and what I represented to the Archbishop as the attitude, as far as I could ascertain, of people in Dublin.

My general informants were Mr. Collins, who died in January, 1916, Eoin McNeill, whom I only occasionally met, Mr. Keohane of Gill's and manager of the Catholic Bulletin, and Seán T. O'Kelly who was my principal informant. Seán T. was extremely prudent and reliable. As a rule, I was very careful not to ask questions but, in that particular matter, I did. Seán T., I suppose, was the first to make it plain to me that matters were becoming very critical. From all my informants I gathered that the proportion of the Irish Volunteers in favour of a rising was extremely small compared to the number against it. All Volunteers without exception were prepared to resist disarmament by the British. The one thing now perfectly plain was that the crisis was fast approaching but very few believed that the Irish Volunteers themselves would precipitate a direct rising. We were fully convinced that Pearse, who, we knew, was determined to force a rising at any cost, whether in the case of disarmament or otherwise, had such a small body of followers that he would not be able to carry out his intentions. That was the position as it seemed to me, as to most interested observers.

I missed Rossa's funeral, being on duty and in Swords on that day. I arrived at Glasnevin as the crowds were returning. The funeral was most impressive, skilfully organised and carried out. It was a challenge to Dublin Castle and a deeply significant lesson to the Irish people. The Irish Volunteers and a detachment of the Citizen Army marched in uniform, some with arms. Besides the various organisations allied to Sinn Féin, many municipal and Local Government bodies took part. So too did the G.A.A. in large numbers and the National Volunteers, but these without arms. Pearse's graveside oration has become a classic, but the supremely impressive moment was the triple volley fired by the Volunteers. It was more than a farewell to an old Fenian. It was a defiance to England by a new generation in Ireland. I heard the volleys as I hurried up Iona Road.

I saw no military though I was told there were some at the Cross Guns Bridge, placed there, according to my informant, to disarm the Volunteers on their return from Glasnevin. Not a rifle was taken. McDonagh was in command of the procession and Volunteers. The Funeral Committee published an interesting Record of the Funeral. The List of the Sub-Committees is a list of the lights of the whole movement for Irish Independence of the 1915-1916 period. It is a National Roll of Honour and is made up of over ninety names.

Mr. Quinn, Assistant Commissioner of the D.M.P.
discloses attitude of the Castle towards
Rossa Funeral:

A man with whom I was closely in touch was Mr. Quinn, Assistant Commissioner of the Dublin Metropolitan Police. He is still alive. He lived in Riversdale, on Drumcondra Road, a house which is practically on the Clonliffe grounds. I first made his acquaintance when he approached

me for permission to build a garage in the grounds at Clonliffe, thinking the site belonged to Archbishop's House. He had close contact with our chauffeur who eventually married his daughter. Mr. Quinn was continually in and out of the garage and in this way we became quite intimate. He was a typical policeman but, at the same time, he was a sound nationalist of the Irish Parliamentary Party stamp and distinctly anti-military. The police and the military were anything but friends at that time. His conversations and remarks threw light on the background of events as they affected the police in Dublin Castle. Sometimes when events were approaching a crisis, he would come into the garage, perhaps only to walk about and work off his feelings. I met him there on several such occasions and gathered valuable indications of the official views and intentions of diverse sections of Dublin Castle, for they were not a united body.

The day before the O'Donovan Rossa funeral I met Mr. Quinn at the garage. He was extremely agitated. Even when the Rising broke out, he was not so upset as on that day. O'Donovan Rossa's remains had arrived in Dublin on Tuesday, 27th July, and were brought to the Pro-Cathedral. I attended the Solemn Requiem High Mass celebrated there the next day. Mr. Quinn told me that the military were determined to raise the most serious trouble. Finding that they could not stop the funeral, they were resolved to fire on the people. He knew that the Volunteers were equally determined to fire rifle volleys at the graveside and to resist by arms any interference by police or military. I think attempts had been made to dissuade the Volunteers but they would not give way. The military were delighted at this opportunity and were determined to make a clean sweep. Mr. Quinn was fully convinced that a massacre was about to

take place and that the military would seize control and wreak bloodshed. I again saw Mr. Quinn late in the evening of the funeral and never saw a man so relieved. Apparently the military had a free hand since Birrell, the Chief Secretary, was in England and Harrell, the Chief Commissioner of Police, was a malevolent influence and was calculated to cause trouble.

From the day of the Rossa funeral I had not the slightest doubt that Pearse would do his utmost to carry out all that he had written and spoken and that he would precipitate a rising at any price but still I believed he was speaking for a small, though determined, minority.

Death of James Collins:

On the 13th January, 1916, I have recorded in my diary that James Collins, our old Fenian friend, died suddenly.

I have the following entry for the 17th January, 1916:-

"At seven-thirty - went to an All-Ireland protest meeting in the Mansion House against the stoppage of the educational grants. Eoin McNeill presided. The meeting was described as anti-Parliamentarian, strongly Sinn Féin, strongly Irish Volunteers and pro-German. That was the tendency of the speeches."

The meeting was not proclaimed on account of the purpose, protesting against the stoppage of the educational grants.

J.M. Gallagher, an unimpressive Parliamentary Party tool who was Lord Mayor in 1915, was re-elected in January, 1916.

My entry for the 25th January reads:-

"Archbishop came down for first time since beginning of November."

On the 26th February I have the following entry which, however, was entered at a much later date:-

"Devoy's letter, giving all details of German aid to the Rising, was dated 26th February, 1916. See Casement's Diary."

Mansion House Meeting of 29th February is attacked
by Irish Party and Press:

A big meeting in the Mansion House on 29th February came in for much vituperation from the Party "leaders" and press. At this period they could not gather such a meeting themselves.

The Archbishop again became seriously ill with eczema on the 29th March. In my diary, I have recorded:-

"New phase in the Archbishop's illness. Visited by Dr. Cox. Was not feeling well. In bed. Both arms discharging. Temperature high."

From this date the eczema became widespread and most depressing in its effects. He suffered from it very severely for most of that year, 1916. Dr. O'Brien, the skin specialist, was called in.

The Famous Castle Document:

I have noted in my diary that the first intimation we received - and this was to myself - about the famous document from the Castle was on Saturday, the 8th April, 1916. Dr. Seamus O'Kelly, then resident in Rathgar, called on the 8th April, under which date I have the following entry in my diary:-

"Dr. Seamus O'Kelly was very anxious about the information they had received regarding the intentions of the Government to disarm the Volunteers. He said the evidence was incontrovertible and would be available next Saturday. He wanted the influence of neutral personages to intervene to prevent

bloodshed, asserting that the Volunteers were not pro-German."

The following information, which I have also recorded under the 8th April, came principally - but not entirely - from my friend, Mr. Quinn, the Assistant Commissioner. He was on tenterhooks. It reads:-

"The Volunteers have been very evident of late in holding nightly meetings for recruits for their ranks. They march through the streets, 100 strong, with rifles on shoulder, hold their meeting - the police don't interfere - and come back with forty to eighty young men in their ranks [as recruits].

It is said [I don't know if this is from Mr. Quinn] they have from fifty to 150 young Irishmen at Larkfield, Kimmage and elsewhere, who have fled from England to escape conscription. Their camp at Kimmage is said to be entrenched and that they manufacture powder and shot there and elsewhere [and also bayonets', I have inserted]. They have secured rifles, bought or stolen, from drunken or deserting soldiers. They seem to have a good stock of ammunition which is being circulated through the country. I saw both British service ammunition and ball shot for street fighting - twelve balls to a cartridge - and the balls were the size of a raspberry and round.

Their friends deprecate such open challenge to the authorities, and would wish them to keep as quiet as Carson's until the war is over. They, however, fear conscription and disarmament and will certainly resist.

These recruiting meetings of the Volunteers were held during the Special Recruiting Meetings Week of the recruiters for the British Army."

An examination of the lists of speakers at these meetings would surprise you.

On Sunday, the 9th April, 1916, I have recorded in my diary that Seán T. O'Kelly called. He had the same story as Séamus O'Kelly. My recollection is that, on questioning Seán, I ascertained that this document was coming in piecemeal from the Castle. A clerk in one of

the offices had access to the room in which this document was, but could only get access to the document from time to time and for short periods when the room was unoccupied. Seán informed me that the clerk had seen the whole of the document and, therefore, the Volunteers were aware of its entire contents. I put Seán through a severe cross-examination on all the circumstances and details I could think of. Seán was slightly non-committal, reiterating that that was all he knew but that not only did he believe that the document was genuine but that immediate military action against the Volunteers was intended. This imminence of a British coup was the most serious aspect. When and how the disarmament was to take place was the vital information necessary. Seán repeated it would take a couple of days before they could get the actual complete text of the document.

I decided not to speak to the Archbishop until Saturday, the 15th, when the whole document would be available.

On Saturday, the 15th April, 1916, I have recorded in my diary that Paddy Little called on my colleague, Fr. Walsh (later Monsignor and Vicar-General, and author of the Life of Archbishop Walsh). Mr. Little brought the deciphered letter. Then we told the Archbishop. I told him what I had heard from Seán; but that Seán had not the text and could only give me the gist of it as it came from day to day.

On the 18th April, 1916, i.e., the Tuesday of Holy Week, Seán T. O'Kelly came to me -

"... saying that there was little or nothing new but that the situation was very serious. Looks as if document were not intended for immediate use but drawn up in case of invasion".

That is all I have in my diary. I discussed it and the general situation with Seán. Seán knew intimately the history of the I.R.B. movement and the intention to promote a Rising. In fact, he was the official messenger sent by the I.R.B. to acquaint John Devoy in America that the Irish leaders had determined on an immediate rising. That was about February, 1915. The actual day of the Rising was not then fixed. It was Miss Mimi Plunkett who went over to announce the date. It was long afterwards that Seán told me all this.

Although Seán T. O'Kelly never told me that he was in the I.R.B., it was plain to me at that time that he was, and that he was aware of all their proceedings. For many different reasons I never asked questions about it. Seán was very careful about what he told me; and I never asked him about anything that was not above-board and was not known, at least, to somebody else. He never gave me any direct hint about the Rising but, at the same time, I could see perfectly well from his deep anxiety - he never showed nervousness - that he believed a crisis was at hand.

Under Wednesday, the 19th April, 1916, I have the following notes in my diary:-

"Seamus O'Kelly called again. Suppression of "New Ireland" for attempting to publish secret document. The printers of "New Ireland" first objected and went to the "Irish Times" who sent it to the Castle. The solicitor of "New Ireland's" printers advised the omission of the letter. Little, who is editor, then tried to evade the prohibition by publishing notes, giving the gist of the document.

Meanwhile, the Castle stepped in and suppressed the issue, but the document was printed elsewhere and fifty thousand copies circulated.

The document was brought to the evening papers to-day. They also refused to publish it. But at to-day's meeting of the Corporation, Alderman Tom

Kelly published it; and the evening papers went back on their refusal and all published it, with a repudiation from the military authorities who said that it was a fabrication from beginning to end.

The Archbishop does not accept this denial and thinks there is a lot of substance in the document - in fact, that it is at least true in substance. That is his opinion at the moment.

Immediately I called down to Eoin McNeill at the Volunteer headquarters in Dawson Street/Wednesday evening/ and there was great activity, especially of girls making bandages. Saw Eoin McNeill in reference to the document and got copies."

That is all I have written down. I remember distinctly going up to that house at No. 2 Dawson Street. It was near the corner. The first thing you did was to step on a thick stone plaque recording the shooting of the civilians at Bachelor's Walk. It was seized by the military afterwards. It was on the very threshold. I would say it measured about three feet by two feet and about three or four inches thick. It was chained down at the corners and could not be removed easily.

I discussed the document with Eóin McNeill on that Wednesday evening at No. 2 Dawson Street. Then I think I must have seen Seán T., but I certainly saw him the next morning. Eoin McNeill believed that the document was genuine. He said that it was very serious and that they were determined to resist. I could not say whether he said it directly to me that he was going to resist, or whether I said, "I suppose your reaction in the Volunteers will mean --". We were discussing bloodshed. Anyway, it was clearly conveyed to me by him that it would result in armed resistance, and certainly by Seán T., to whom I distinctly remember talking either on that evening of the 19th April, 1916, or next morning.

During the course of my visit to No. 2 Dawson Street on the 19th April, 1916, I enquired as to how it was proposed to distribute the document. When I was discussing the distribution of the document, I had not seen the evening papers - the "Mail", "Telegraph" or "Herald". Thinking that the matter was not published - and I am sure I had not heard of Tom Kelly having read it - in the press, the question arose as to what was the best means of circulating it, and I thought of an excellent means. They had fifty thousand copies ready. I said, "Tomorrow is Holy Thursday. In every Cathedral city, the Holy Oils will be consecrated and the priests will gather round to the Cathedrals to receive the Holy Oils. Send down your documents with these priests and they will see that they will be circulated". It was not necessary to act on this suggestion. I remember distributing a number of copies myself. I dropped them in at the Christian Brothers Past Pupils' premises in Parnell Square and various other places.

I have not recorded anything regarding national affairs in my diary for the 20th April, 1916. I did not see anybody that day. It was Holy Thursday and I was engaged at the Pro-Cathedral and had not much opportunity of moving about.

Good Friday - James McNeill's Visit:

For Good Friday, the 21st April, 1916, the first thing I have noted in my diary is that the Archbishop was unwell, due to a further complication. His condition was getting worse and worse.

I have a note here recording the arrest of Bulmer Hobson on Good Friday. Seán T. O'Kelly believed, like all the others, that Hobson was not to be relied upon - in fact, they would not stop at calling him a spy or something like

one. In those days, naturally, there were all kinds of contradictory accounts of persons and things.

The following is a continuation of the notes in my diary for Good Friday:-

"At 7 p.m. James McNeill /that is, Eoin's brother/ called to see me. He was obviously terribly worried. He says that two men called on Eoin this morning /I did not know who they were/ When they left, Eoin said the situation had become very critical - James fears the worst - and that a small rash act by a fool on either side would cause a blaze and involve everybody.

He tells me that he is not in the council of the Volunteers but realises the gravity of the situation and seeks to find if there is any hope of obtaining an unofficial assurance, which could be given to anybody of responsibility, that no disarmament was intended. Naturally, he dreads a calamity arising out of what may well be a misunderstanding.

I said 'I shall see the Archbishop who, however, could hardly do anything', and I advised him to see Dr. Cox; and that, doubtless, Dr. Cox would learn the Archbishop's views tomorrow.

James was not sent by Eoin, who said he would not disturb the Archbishop when sick."

When James McNeill came to see me, he enlarged upon the position. His main object was to point out that these two men had called, that whatever they had said, they had completely upset Eoin, that Eoin was extremely worried as he himself was. Repeating that he was not in the council of the Volunteers, it had occurred to him that, if there was any person of standing who had the confidence of both sides and who could receive assurances from both sides that no party meant to attack the other, the situation might be eased.

The Archbishop was sick. Nobody was allowed to see him. He was swathed in bandages from head to foot. His malady was now at its climax. I knew that Dr. Cox was a friend of the McNeill's, that he was also a Privy

Councillor and had access to the Castle, that, if anybody could act as an intermediary, he could, and that, if he were fortified by a talk with the Archbishop, it might strengthen his hand. I suggested this to James McNeill and he accepted it. I said I would tell the Archbishop everything he had told me and the suggestion I had made about Dr. Cox and that the latter would doubtless speak to him on the matter in the morning. Of course, I intended to see Dr. Cox beforehand and speak about it.

An entry in my diary for Good Friday (21st April) reads:-

"Heard this evening through Miss K. [formerly of Steeven's Hospital] that an officer at a dance recently told his lady partner, who told her, that he had not taken off his clothes for forty-eight hours; that he and ten other officers and two hundred men were in barracks under arms ready to attack the Volunteers."

I thought this highly significant in view of the disarmament document and the nightly exercises of the Volunteers.

Of course, I told the Archbishop all about James McNeill's visit. He listened carefully but said nothing that night. Next morning I had a conversation on the James McNeill visit with Dr. Cox on his arrival, telling him that the Archbishop would be prepared to discuss the matter with him. He did so, but the attitude the Archbishop took was that he would not interfere.

I have no doubt whatever that Dr. Cox took some step in the matter but he was not able to intervene in any effective manner. At that time the military controlled everything. Not even the highest placed legal or civil authority carried any weight against the military.

I gathered this from Dr. Cox himself. More than once, the observant and well-placed Mr. Quinn told me the same.

Significant Activities of Volunteers and
Citizen Army:

The Volunteers were very active at this period, carrying out exercises and field manoeuvres. I have already alluded to the provocative campaign of the Citizen Army section. Night after night, they would march out and carry out a planned programme, such as the seizure of all the canal bridges around about the city. One night they actually surrounded the Castle. It was not to be expected that the Castle authorities would remain inactive. Rather it was to be feared that the Castle would disarm them and, in any event, it would prepare plans to do so and be ready to put them into effect. These incidents alienated the sympathy of the more moderate people who feared that extremists wished to precipitate events by a coup before the Government actually attacked. I shared these fears myself, believing that it would be a grave mistake to precipitate a crisis. Naturally, I reported these things to the Archbishop. He considered such actions as the height of folly.

I remember James Connolly's disappearance. I may not have heard of it before the Rising but probably afterwards.

Mr. Quinn tells on Good Friday night of a
Landing at Ardfert:

I have recorded in my diary that I met my friend, Mr. Quinn, on Good Friday night, the 21st April, 1916, at twenty minutes to ten. These days I made a habit of seeing him during his evening meditations about our garage. On this occasion we had a long talk on the danger of disarmament and the bad effects it would produce, to which, of course, he was fully alive; but he also held the view that the Volunteers were lunatics, playing into the hands of the military. He certainly mentioned that two men had

landed in Kerry. Whether he mentioned Casement's name in our conversation that evening, I forget and doubt, but I remember distinctly that he was irate and almost awe-struck over the position of affairs.

Though very few in Dublin knew on Friday night of the landing, it was well known in the Ardfert district. It became more generally known through a Central News message, dated Friday night, in London and passed for publication by the Censor, and probably published here on Monday, the 24th April. It stated that -

"News reached Tralee this evening Friday that a collapsible boat containing a large quantity of arms and ammunition were seized about four o'clock this i.e., Friday morning at Currahane strand by the Ardfert police. A stranger, of unknown nationality, was arrested in the vicinity and is detained in custody."

The London comment on the matter ran:-

"It was stated in Dublin yesterday that three Dublin men were arrested in connection with the seizure of arms and ammunition found on the collapsible boat near Ardfert. According to statements current in Dublin, the men were seated in a motor car near the place where the boat came ashore and were arrested on suspicion of being there for the purpose of carrying off the arms when they were landed."

The extract of the paper which I cut out for my diary at the time goes on:-

"(Passed for publication) (From our Correspondent) Tralee - Saturday evening.

"A further sensation has been added to the seizure of a boat with arms and ammunition in Tralee Bay yesterday which would be Friday by the arrests of the Tralee Irish Volunteers, Mr. Austin Stack and Cornelius Collins, Accountant, G.P.O., Dublin. Both were remanded in custody to-day Saturday by Mr. Wynne, Resident Magistrate.

A man of unknown nationality, who refused to disclose his identity, was conveyed to Dublin by the morning train under a strong escort.

Two other men believed to be associated with him in the arms-running are still at large." "

A Dublin paper (The Irish Independent) under date Tralee, Saturday reported the sensation in Tralee that same day created by the news of "a tragic motor accident at Killorglin which resulted in the death of three men unknown". The party travelled in a Limerick registered car from Killarney to Tralee, stopped en route at Killorglin for petrol. An error resulted in the car plunging into the River Laune. The driver extricated himself safely but the others perished. The account went on -

"Contradictory rumours are afloat as to the identity of the unfortunate passengers, the chaffeur, it is alleged, disclaiming all knowledge of who they were."

Dublin was buzzing with sensational rumours as Saturday wore on. They were vague; their details were somewhat contradictory of one another and nobody seemed to know whence they came, but as far as I could ascertain they came from reliable journalists. Everywhere anxiety and tension reigned.

Holy Saturday - Volunteer Officer informs
Priest of Rising:

My diary for Holy Saturday, the 22nd April, having recorded the early morning's ceremonies, mentions Dr. Cox's daily visit and his finding the Archbishop "dull and without appetite". Its next item records the call in the forenoon - before eleven o'clock - of a priest much agitated as the result of a conversation with a Volunteer officer who told him that Easter Sunday's mobilisation meant a Rising. I won't mention the name of this Volunteer officer. He was well known and much esteemed; he took part in the Rising and was killed. He had consulted this priest to satisfy his conscience as to what he ought to do, telling him

plainly that, from what he believed and from what he knew, the object of the mobilisation was for a general rising. While I discounted the probability of this intention on the part of the leaders, I confessed that whatever were the intentions of the Volunteers, there was bound to be a clash within the next twenty-four or forty-eight hours. A clash would inevitably lead to either disarmament or a rising. It made little difference now who provoked the first clash. The Casement landing certainly showed the catastrophe was at hand. Like myself, the priest knew that "the unknown stranger" was Casement. I did not tell the Archbishop about the priest's visit or his information. I told him about the Volunteer Easter manoeuvres, Casement and the rumours in town. He took it very calmly, like a man who saw the inevitable but who had no power to alter events, who felt that both British and Volunteers were more or less equally responsible for the situation of the moment. Physically, he could do nothing in the condition he was in.

Seán T. O'Kelly tells about Sunday's Manoeuvres:

At half-past eleven on Saturday forenoon, the 22nd April, 1916, immediately after the visit of this priest, I went to see Seán T. O'Kelly at the Gaelic League offices, 25 Parnell Square. That is where I used to find him. It was a "safe" as well as the most convenient meeting place for me. He was Manager of "An Claidheamh Soluis" and, I think, Secretary to the Gaelic League. I have noted in my diary that, when I saw Seán T. -

"He told me that the Volunteers were to mobilise on the following day at 4 p.m. /Sunday/ with arms and three days' provisions".

"Seán felt like James McNeill and feared the extremists, including those of his own body, would cause a clash. He was particularly apprehensive of the dangerous influences of Liberty Hall and T.C. /Tom Clarke/. Among the other extremists were Pearse, Fitzgibbon."

It was in answer to a question to Seán as to who were supporting Pearse and who were against him that he told me who the extremists were. I told him all I knew and how alarmed and pessimistic I felt. But we had discussed that a dozen times already.

Perhaps I should mention that for many months my own views had veered round more and more towards the Volunteers, and by the Volunteers I meant Eoin McNeill's supporters. I was entirely opposed to anything in the nature of a rising until the Germans could land. Till then, I considered the Volunteers should be held back and strengthened as a force to be reckoned with. I felt that once we fired our shot, we could do no more. Many took that view.

Sensational Rumours about Casement, etc.,
circulated in Dublin:

By this time vague rumours began to circulate not only of the Casement landing but of the Killorglin tragedy and of the arrest of Stack. Those who heard them associated these events with gun-running and an approaching German landing. I noted the rumours principally to show the sensational and varied nature of the stories on which the people were fed and which they swallowed, but partly to protect myself in case my diary was ever seized. Therefore, I wrote:-

"An unconfirmed rumour says that
the unknown person is Casement".

I knew it was Casement either on Friday night or Saturday morning, but it was a growing public rumour in Dublin in the course of Saturday, supplemented by the news that a couple of other men had landed. The newspapers published "a stranger's" landing on Monday or Sunday; I think it was Monday. On Saturday night the English papers may have had it; the Dublin papers would only have the news on Sunday. My notes of Holy Saturday continue:-

"and that he came in a vessel flying the Norwegian colours, that the ship was taken and scuttled by a patrol ship and that Casement was sent ashore in a boat, in the expectation that a party ashore would be waiting".

That would imply that Casement was arrested at sea. My last entry for Saturday was that Casement was brought to Dublin under strong escort. He was brought up on Saturday morning by train.

That is all I have recorded in my diary on Saturday, the 22nd April, 1916. You can imagine the state of anxious expectation in which we were.

Easter Sunday - The Countermanding Order:

Easter Sunday morning, 1916, passed over quietly. Nothing unusual was to be seen. I have noted in my diary that I had to go to Clontarf to say Mass that morning. I remember I looked out at every corner to see if there was anything unusual taking place. I had been told that the mobilisation was for four o'clock.

Eoin McNeill's order countermanding the Easter mobilisation appeared prominently on the "Sunday Independent". I only saw it on my return from Clontarf after 10 a.m. It was headed in large type "No Parades/ Irish Volunteer Marches Cancelled/ A Sudden Order". It was dated April 22nd, signed by Eoin McNeill and communicated to the press on Saturday night. The parades, etc., were cancelled "owing to the very critical position. I at once linked it up both with the information given by the Volunteer officer to the priest who visited me on Saturday morning, and also with what Seán T. O'Kelly had told me.. I was desperately alarmed and yet I felt greatly relieved that there was some breathing space. I well knew it would prove only a postponement for the day and that the order would only stave off the crisis for a couple of days at the most.

The following is a record of the entry in my diary for
Easter Sunday, 23rd April, 1916:-

"At half-past two, Miss McNeill called about this notice in the "Sunday Independent", announcing from Eoin McNeill the abandonment of all mobilisation to-day.

This notice was sent out late last night and this morning by messengers.

The more extreme side tried to suppress it and to make out that the "Independent" notice was a bogus one and a Government trick. [It is here I have a reference to Bulmer Hobson] They even imprisoned Bulmer Hobson for several hours. [I suppose I added this note immediately after I had written the day's entries to complete the account.]

Miss McNeill brought some copies of a letter of Eoin McNeill, authenticating the Order and saying that the carrying out of the original Order would lead to catastrophe and bloodshed."

I went at once to the Archbishop and told him of the new development. Of course, he said that he could not do anything; and my recollection is that he said it was too late now as whatever had been done had brought matters to a head. The entry for Easter Sunday continues:-

"The Archbishop would not interfere.

I told her I would go myself. I suggested it myself to the Archbishop, and he did not raise any objection. I told her I would go to the priests of the nearer mobilisation districts and deliver the letters. I selected the Fr. Mathew Park at Fairview, Rutland Square and Camden Row districts.

I took the letters. Gave one to Fr. John Flanagan of Marlborough Street who went with Fr. Byrne [later Archbishop of Dublin] to Parnell Square, and there found that Eoin McNeill's countermanding orders were being carried out.

I gave another letter to Fr. Walter MacDonald [then Curate and now Parish Priest of Fairview].

It was after three o'clock by this time and the mobilisation was at four.

Fr. MacDonald undertook to see after Fr. Mathew Park.

I took the third over to Harrington Street and got Fr. Charles Murphy to go with me to Camden Row, where I gave the letter to a score of Volunteers assembled there. They too were carrying out the order. I found they were disbanding when I arrived.

I cycled back by Liberty Hall. There was an assembly of Volunteers there. I did not go inside. There was a crowd of a few hundred men assembled and fifteen or sixteen police watching them. There were no armed military to be seen anywhere about, and very few police. Only two police at each bridge with revolvers. Apparently both police and soldiers were confined to barracks. Two police were armed but not the others.

I have a note that Mr. Quinn was in the Castle all day Easter Sunday and had not returned at 10 p.m. I failed to see him, to find out what was happening. That is all I have got in my diary for Easter Sunday, 1916, except that Dr. Cox did not come on that particular day. He did not report to me how he fared at the Castle, if he went there at all, and I would not ask him.

Easter Monday - Count Plunkett describes his
Audience with the Pope:

Easter Monday, 1916, was a holiday, everybody taking a sleep. I have a note in my diary that Dr. Cox called at a quarter past eleven in the morning.

At half-past eleven on Easter Monday morning, I must have gone down to the garage to meet Mr. Quinn, evidently determined to get the latest news. I found him and had a talk with him on the situation. All I have written down in my diary is, "Serious news". I cannot recollect what it was about. It must have been about disarmament, the Volunteer mobilisation, Eoin McNeill's countermanding orders and all the news from Kerry. We must have discussed what all this would lead to - disarmament straight away? He would not tell and possibly knew little of military intentions.

Between half-past eleven and noon on Easter Monday, I have noted in my diary that, while I was talking to Mr. Quinn down in the garage, a telephone message was brought to me that Seán T. O'Kelly wanted to see me in Rutland Square. I sent word by the messenger that I would be there in half an hour. At that time I had not known that the Rising was going to take place or that it was so desperately close.

Towards noon on Easter Monday I have noted in my diary the page-boy came down again to the garage, where I was still speaking to Mr. Quinn, to say that Count Plunkett had called and was waiting to see me. I told the boy I would be there in a minute. I guessed, of course, that there was some new development. At five minutes past twelve I interviewed Count Plunkett. He said he had come to see the Archbishop. I informed him that the Archbishop was ill in bed and that nobody was allowed to see him except the doctor. I gathered, of course, that it was something urgent, obviously on account of the circumstances. "Well", he said, "it is not necessary that I would see him personally but, if you would tell him, it would be alright".

Count Plunkett then told me that there was going to be a Rising, that he had been to see the Pope and that he had informed Benedict XV of the whole Irish situation and the intended Insurrection. He briefly went over the incidents of his audience. (Later the Count's report was confirmed first by letter and then verbally by Monsignor Hagan, Vice Rector of the Irish College at this time.) Count Plunkett informed his Holiness that a rising for national independence was arranged, that the Volunteers would strike in the course of Easter Sunday and that his Holiness should not be shocked or alarmed. Count Plunkett explained that the movement was purely a national one for independence, the same as every nation had a right to. At the end of his discussion, he

asked the Pope's Blessing for the Volunteers. According to him, the Pope showed great perturbation and asked was there no peaceful way out of the difficulty; that the news was extremely grave, and asked had he seen the Archbishop of Dublin. Count Plunkett answered every question, making it plain that it was the wish of the leaders of the movement to act entirely with the good-will or approval - I forget which now - of the Pope and to give an assurance that they wished to act as Catholics. It was for that reason they came to inform His Holiness. All the Pope could do was to express his profound anxiety and how much the news disturbed him, and asked could their object not be achieved in any other way, and counselled him to see the Archbishop. Count Plunkett informed the Pope that he intended to see the Archbishop as soon as he arrived home. At this time, he was only just back in Ireland.

I should still have the letter I received from Monsignor Hagan, confirming Count Plunkett's audience with the Pope. I have it somewhere and I shall come across it. I don't know how it got through the post in the following weeks. Of course, there was nothing openly significant in it, and he did not mention Count Plunkett's name. It read something to this effect: "The visitor, who will call on you, was seen by me. He had an audience with the Pope." That was the gist of it.

We are informed by Telephone that the Rising
has begun:

I have noted in my diary that, while I was still talking with Count Plunkett on Easter Monday, the telephone bell in the Secretaries' study rang and I was called to answer it. I said to the Count, "Wait a moment!", and I went to the 'phone. The call came from a Mr. Stokes, a jeweller, who rang me up to say that the G.P.O. was seized

by the Volunteers and the Castle was attacked, and he asked could the Archbishop stop it. I told him that was impossible but that I would go down town. I returned to Count Plunkett and told him the Rising had already begun. Count Plunkett, although he implied it was to take place immediately, had not told me when. It was then a quarter past twelve. The Count came to tell the Archbishop that it was going to take place. Some delay had occurred as I was at the garage in the lower end of the grounds when the Count called. It was noteworthy that he came on the Monday and not on the Sunday.

I had to hasten up and tell the Archbishop all about Count Plunkett's report and the telephone news of the seizure of the G.P.O. He thought less of the poor Count than of Eoin McNeill. He looked on the Count as a simple soul and could not conceive a man like him being at the head of a revolution as it really was. Never in my life did I tell so much or so grave a report in such a brief time. I told the Archbishop, "I'll go down town", - I did not say "and see Seán" - "to the G.P.O. to see the situation". I also said I would call in to the Pro-Cathedral.

I visit Seán T. O'Kelly at 25 Parnell Square:

I got on my bicycle and went to see Seán T. O'Kelly. By this time I saw a few Volunteers in the streets, evidently going down town to mobilise. They were in uniform. I was amazed. I saw at least two groups, including one of three; and I remember seeing one individual standing in the doorway of the Christian Brothers Past Pupils' Union building.

I found Seán T. O'Kelly in 25 Parnell Square, as cool as you could imagine. I told him that I knew already what he was going to tell me but that, unfortunately,

all those delays had occurred. He confirmed the news. He told me what had happened the evening before and that Pearse had determined to go on with the Rising. He did not tell me that he had seen Pearse himself. He gave me a packet to give to Miss Kit Ryan. He told me that, if anything happened to him, I was to give this packet to Kit Ryan. I guessed correctly what that meant. It was the first hint. I already knew that Seán was not what he used to describe as "a gun-man". But the organisation insisted he should be a Captain in the Intelligence department. Then he told me he was going out. Up to that, Seán T. always gave me the impression that he was supporting McNeill rather than the extremists; but he never for a moment spoke formally and definitely regarding his own personal position. I gathered that his views coincided with mine, that there should be no resort to arms before disarmament or a German invasion, or the delivery of German arms. I am not quite sure now. Seán T. then confirmed that the G.P.O. was seized. I was scarcely ten minutes with him.

I visit the G.P.O. and am asked to procure a
Priest at the Pro-Cathedral:

Leaving Seán T. O'Kelly in his office, I cycled down at once to the G.P.O. There were several hundred people, perhaps over a thousand, between Abbey Street and Henry Street. I saw Mr. Rock, one of the officials in the G.P.O. who described how the Volunteers had marched in and ejected the entire staff out to the street. I asked him to bring my bicycle over to the Pro-Cathedral presbytery. The first person I saw in the portico outside the G.P.O. was James Connolly in uniform with a huge Colt revolver, shouting out orders. Volunteers were battering out window-panes. When James Connolly saw me, he called out, "All priests may pass!", as the Volunteers were keeping the

inquisitive on-lookers at some distance. The crowd then showed comparatively little excitement. I passed in to the building. The newly arranged central hall was a scene of immense activity but nobody was unduly excited. It must have been then shortly after half-past twelve (Easter Monday).

Speaking to one of the first Volunteers I met in the G.P.O., I gave my name and said I wanted to see Mr. Pearse. "Commandant Pearse?" - he corrected. "Yes", I said. He went off and got Pearse whom, of course, I knew well. He was flushed but calm and authoritative. I at once said that we had just got word by telephone of this attack, that I had informed the Archbishop of the position and told him I was coming down to ascertain the facts and that, if there was anything that could be done, I would do it. "But", I said, "I see now that nothing can be done". "No", he said, "we are going to see it out". "You know my feelings; if there is any possible thing I can do, I will be very glad to do it", I said. I thought there might possibly be some message or other. "No", he said, "but some of the boys would like to go to Confession and I would be delighted if you would send over word to the Cathedral". I promised I would do that, left the G.P.O. and went over to the Pro-Cathedral.

I noticed, when I came out of the G.P.O., a body of about ten or twelve police - D.M.P. - with an Inspector, lined up at the foot of Nelson Pillar, doing nothing but obviously very tense.

I arrived at the Pro-Cathedral and made sure my bicycle was there. I told the priests who were gathered in the Administrator's room that I had been in to the G.P.O., had seen Pearse, that he had asked me to send over

one of the priests and that I had told him I would do all I could. They were anxious about the Archbishop. I gave them an account of what happened to us in the morning - of the Count's visit, of my conveying his report to the Archbishop, partly because I knew one or two of them were not friendly; others of them were. I assured them that the Archbishop was fully informed of the state of affairs up to midday and that we would try and keep in touch with them. I telephoned Archbishop's House, reported all the information I had, saying I would remain on. I took lunch at the Gresham Hotel.

Having spent not more than ten minutes in the Pro-Cathedral, I returned to O'Connell Street. The first incident I observed - and I must say it made an unfavourable impression on me, from a military point of view - was the sight of a number of Volunteers trying to overturn a tram in Earl Street. One Volunteer on his stomach got under the tram, with something like a line of cord, and put a match to a fuse that was apparently to set off a bomb to overturn the tram - and a rapidly increasing number of people all about! Not only that, but he failed even after two or three attempts. That is all they understood about explosives. Later on, before I left, I saw that they had succeeded in overturning the tram. It blocked the thoroughfare and interrupted traffic. It was not a barricade that could be used to fight behind.

It was either during my absence in the Pro-Cathedral or while I was at lunch in the Gresham (I think the latter) that the flags were hoisted on the G.P.O. As far as I remember, there were only two. My diary notes that one was a green flag with the words "Irish Freedom", and the other the then new green, white and

orange. I am morally certain that the tricolour was at the Henry Street corner and the other at the Prince's Street corner.

I remained until after 3.30 in O'Connell Street. About 1 p.m., as I have noted in my diary, -

"a squadron of 100-150 lancers appeared from the Rotunda. Riding up Upper O'Connell Street in single file, the first two who passed the Pillar were shot in the throat. Either four or six were killed. I attended one, but he was dead. He had a medal."

Such is the note I have in my diary. I saw the cavalry riding up, heard the shots, witnessed the moderate commotion. It was much less than I have seen on occasions of civil or political disturbance. In a few minutes several people ran to me to say that one of the soldiers shot was a Catholic and asked me to attend him. I found him lying dead on the west side of O'Connell Street, half-way between the Henry Street corner and Gill's bookshop (52 Upper O'Connell Street). A "miraculous medal" about his neck led these simple people to believe he was a Catholic, but at that time hundreds of English Protestant soldiers wore Catholic medals as charms. It transpired that only one soldier was killed but the number got exaggerated from mouth to mouth. The cavalry were at once withdrawn to the space in front of the Rotunda Hospital. There they remained for an hour or two.

Before 2 p.m. the crowds had greatly increased in numbers. Already the first looting had begun; the first victim was Noblett's sweetshop. It soon spread to the neighbouring shops. I was much disgusted and I did my best to try to stop the looting. Except for two or three minutes, it had no effect. I went over and informed the Volunteers about the G.P.O. Five or six Volunteers did

their best and cleared the looters for some five or ten minutes, but it began again. At first all the ringleaders were women; then the boys came along. Later, about 3.30 p.m. when the military were withdrawn from the Rotunda, young men arrived and the looting became systematic and general, so that Fr. John Flanagan of the Pro-Cathedral, who had joined me, gave up the attempt to repress it and I left too.

After I had attended the soldier, I passed into Lower O'Connell Street. Standing at the corner of Clery's, Sackville Place, I remember seeing a half-drunken British soldier striding along and giving vent to anti-Irish language. As the people were beginning to handle him roughly, I more or less came to his rescue. Immediately opposite, at the corner of the other side of the street, was a chemist standing at the shop door which had a little railing. I asked the chemist to open the railing and hustled him into the shop. I had no sooner got the soldier into the chemist's shop than I noticed a commotion. A Volunteer was being carried along by two men. He seemed seriously wounded and I was told his wounds were due to a bomb exploding accidentally. I gave him Absolution and he was brought off immediately, through Prince's Street, down to Jervis Street Hospital.

The hurriedly entered notes in my diary that Easter Monday evening do not quite record the events of the day in their strict sequence, but the next incident I have noted is:-

"Soldiers - about eight - fired at intervals from the walls that project from the A.B.C. office".

These British soldiers were behind the low walls, three or four feet high, at the A.B.C. office, which is the present

Tramway office (60 Upper O'Connell Street) and the Pillar Picture Theatre. They were on their knees, with their rifles propped up against this parapet, and from time to time they sniped at three Henry Street windows of the General Post Office which were facing towards the Rotunda. Volunteers occupied these windows and from time to time interchanged shots with the soldiers. They might as well have been firing at Windsor! By this time, O'Connell Street was crowded, particularly from Pro-Cathedral Street to Abbey Street. As time went on, the crowds grew more and more reckless, passing under the line of fire of the soldiers and Volunteers.

I turned back towards the Rotunda Hospital where I knew I would find these Lancers, in order to make a report about the dead soldier I had attended previously. I saw the officer on horseback and went over to him. The Lancers so drawn up in front of the Rotunda Hospital could not be seen from the vicinity of Nelson Pillar. I informed the officer that I had attended this soldier who had died, as I was under the impression that he was a Catholic, but that I had learned he was a non-Catholic.

While I was reporting to the officer, I took occasion to make a representation. "Your soldiers", I said, "are firing at the corner windows of the Post Office over the heads of the people. They are doing no earthly good, and people will be killed. You ought either to withdraw these men or disperse the people." Wrong as the soldiers were, I think it was more indefensible on the part of the Volunteers because the former, being low, could have some control of their fire but the men up on high could not. It may have been in the gaiety of their hearts but it looked desperately alarming.

I am sure that eye-witnesses that late afternoon and next day would say that what most impressed them, and impressed them most unfavourably, was the frivolity and recklessness of the crowd, most of all, of the women and children. That is the explanation of the Archbishop's letter which I suggested to him to write. I had in the back of my mind the idea that the less people were on the street, the less looting there would be. At the time it occurred to some that the explanation of the Volunteer firing was to frighten off the crowds and looters.

I went again to the Pro-Cathedral to get my bicycle and had a talk with Fr. Flanagan. I think it was Fr. John O'Reilly, C.C., who went over first to the G.P.O. to hear Confessions. I think he was on duty that day. He was a rather timid man. I have a record that Fr. Bowden who was Administrator was also there. Fr. Flanagan was the last to go and he had to remain in the G.P.O. as he could not get back.

It was after my return from the Rotunda that I noticed that the ten or twelve policemen with their Inspector, whom I had seen at the foot of Nelson's Pillar some hours previously, had now moved right under and against the wall of the G.P.O., near the corner of Henry Street. They were very tense. I spoke very strongly to the D.M.P. Inspector, saying it was a scandal to leave the police there with the firing going on. There they were almost under the fire. I think I ~~added~~ that the situation was one for the military and not for the police. Two or three minutes afterwards they moved off. Quite unhindered they went off towards Store Street. That was some time coming on to three o'clock. Not a hair of these ten or twelve policemen was touched while they stood at the Pillar or while the firing went on. The D.M.P.

suffered no interference from the Volunteers. Their fight was against the British. They did not fire at the D.M.P. at the Pillar.

I was also very much struck by the restraint of the Volunteers in the case of another drunken soldier who was an Australian. This happened when I first went to the G.P.O. and met Connolly. The soldier was not quite drunk and was standing eating something, in an attitude of bravado, right under where the Volunteers were firing. Yet the Volunteers did not fire or even disturb him. The soldier was not armed, of course.

I reported to the Archbishop when I returned on Monday evening and told him what had taken place. I recall that what was uppermost in my mind and in my report was the amazing recklessness of the civilians, that I was certain many of them would be killed and that the women and children were the worst. I have noted in my diary that everything was quiet from 10 p.m. on Easter Monday until 1 a.m. on Easter Tuesday morning when firing recommenced towards Cabra and Glasnevin.

Monday's varied rumours about the Rising:

On Easter Monday evening I determined to write down all the reports that came to the Archbishop's, although I knew the reports were bound to be inaccurate and even fantastic. We were in a favourable way of obtaining information. Our telephone was not cut off for a couple of days. Priests were ringing up, giving us news from the different localities. I wrote these reports down simply as they came. They are as follows:-

"Seizure of two loads of ammunition
by the Volunteers from the North Wall."

They did not seize it; they attacked it.

"A few minutes past twelve, they entered the G.P.O., and seized the whole place, tearing up telegraph system."

"Stephen's Green seized and entrenched, and tram upset and barricade erected at the Shelbourne."

"Jacob's seized by Volunteers. Five soldiers and a woman were killed there."

"The City Hall was seized. If an attack was made on the Castle, it failed."

"The Protestant Synod Hall was seized for a short time and a few windows broken by bullets."

"South Dublin Union was seized but, as a small back door was left unguarded, the military got in and both sides entrenched on the grounds."

I think that is true.

"Three railway stations were seized, Westland Row, Harcourt Street and, perhaps, Broadstone."

"The bridge over the railway on the North Circular Road was seized by the Volunteers."

"The Mendicity Institute and the Four Courts were also seized."

"It is said that 300 Volunteers entrenched at Finglas and that the 5th Lancers were sent out, but returned."

"Church Street is barricaded."

"Firing recommenced at half past five, with the coming of some machine guns from the Bull at the Sloblands, and Wharf A. Some Volunteers fired on them. It did not last long."

"It also broke out on the Upper Quays, on the north side."

Anywhere from O'Connell Street to Church Street, I suppose, would be the Upper Quay.

"The Manure Works at the North Wall were seized by Volunteers."

"Between 9 and 10, the City Hall was recaptured by the military after a big fight. Many Volunteers killed by Maxim Guns."

This would be nine or ten o'clock in the evening.

"The Proclamation of the Irish Republic was put up in a few places. It shows that the outbreak does not include the McNeill section. It is signed by Pearse, Tom Clarke, Connolly, Joe Plunkett (son of Count Plunkett) McDermott, McDonagh, Kent."

"Portobello Bridge was captured, but retaken by the military. Many killed."

Bridge over the Midland Railway on the North Circular Road was blown up, and houses on the city side of it occupied by Volunteers."

James O'Connor interviews the Archbishop:

For James O'Connor's interview with the Archbishop on the evening of Easter Monday, see Appendix to Monsignor Walsh's Life of Archbishop Walsh.

The following verbatim transcript from my diary consists partly of my own observations and partly of

information received by telephone during the day:-

"Easter Tuesday, 25th April, 1916.

On Easter Tuesday morning sniping went on irregularly in all quarters, except Glasnevin and Drumcondra. It was most intense towards the Broadstone and in the direction of the G.P.O. Some machine guns were firing and a few explosions were heard.

At nine o'clock I went to the Pro-Cathedral, from there to St. Andrew's, Westland Row, on to Dr. Cox/Merrion Square then to (visit John H. O'Donnell)/our respected solicitor who died three weeks later Leeson Street, to St. Vincent's Hospital, and back to O'Connell Street. Lower O'Connell Street is largely looted, particularly from Lawrence's in Upper O'Connell Street to the Liffey. The Volunteers occupy the Metropole Hotel, the Hibernian Bank 12, 13 Lower O'Connell Street - corner of Lower Abbey Street and Kelly's at O'Connell Bridge. The military occupy Trinity College. The side streets leading into O'Connell Street are barricaded against traffic. Two attempts to blow up Nelson's Pillar failed. This report was untrue. No such attempt was made. Boland's and Kennedy's bakeries supply bread. The Gas Works are cut off, and James Street is cut off from the central city.

On the whole, everything is much quieter than one would expect. No military or police are to be seen. Sniping was going on between the military in the Shelbourne Hotel and the Volunteers in Stephen's Green. We hear that serious encounters occurred at Beggars' Bush yesterday and there was fighting on the North Wall. It was stated that Sir Roger Casement was shot yesterday in London and that there are German submarines in the Irish Sea. Guinness's (sic) is also occupied by the Volunteers, and the machine-gun mounted on it is firing on the Royal Barracks. The office of the 'Evening Mail' is also occupied with a machine-gun (sic). A platoon of soldiers advancing up Dame Street was dispersed by this gun.

The Castle is surrounded by Volunteers who keep up continuous sniping from Pim's, 'The Mail', etc. Several soldiers were killed and wounded by shots from Pims. It is said the Mendicity Institution is evacuated.

The only newspaper printed since yesterday appeared to-day at 11.30. It was a stop-press edition of the 'Irish Times' and contained no news of interest except a Government Proclamation notifying that stern measures would be taken to put down the insurrection in Dublin and warning law-abiding citizens not to frequent the streets nor to assemble in crowds. As a result of my reports to His Grace on the recklessness of the people, especially of the women and children crowding the streets in dangerous places, His Grace adopted my suggestion that notice should be sent to the local parish priests and to the churches of religious, asking the Catholic people to observe this caution. With great difficulty, the notice was printed and circulated."

In making this suggestion to the Archbishop, I had also in mind the widespreading looting in and about O'Connell Street.

"Dr. Cox and Dr. O'Brien called at 2.30 - (leaving at) 3.20. As the Archbishop was disappointed and discouraged by the failure of the medical treatment, he asked me to arrange with Dr. Cox to invite Dr. O'Carroll to be called in for consultation. Dr. Cox fell in with this suggestion.

Dr. Cox told me of his very unpleasant experience in crossing the city from Merrion Square to Drumcondra and the dangers attending it, although they were dressed, like all the doctors, in white overalls and had come by Butt Bridge and the quieter area of Gardiner Street. He seemed particularly apprehensive of

Beresford Place and of danger from Liberty Hall. Although I told him that our information was that Liberty Hall was unoccupied, he still had such misgivings that I volunteered to accompany him on his return to secure greater safety. We took the Mountjoy Square-Gardiner Street route.

There seemed a perfect lull in the firing and we passed Beresford Place in complete quiet. But, as we had crossed the Quay to step on Butt Bridge pathway, three shots were fired, quite obviously at us, from above the portico of the Custom House. We had an alarmingly narrow escape. One bullet sang between me and a civilian, a yard or two behind me. This man had joined us in crossing the street, as he thought, for greater safety. He was quite definite that these shots from the Custom House were fired by the military. We waited a few minutes under shelter of the (great arcs of) metal work" -

which then formed such a prominent feature of Butt Bridge.

"Dr. Cox could not credit that the shots were fired by the military until a young man in Tara Street came across at a signal from Dr. Cox, from whom he (Dr. Cox) ascertained that it was perfectly true that the Custom House was occupied by the military. It turned out that this young man was a T.C.D. student - known to Dr. Cox - who was acting as intelligence officer for the British. This was at 4.45 p.m."

Later on, I heard of several such intelligence officers, all organised by the military in T.C.D. They included many of those who were members of the organisation nicknamed 'Gorgeous Wrecks'.

"I left Dr. Cox and Dr. O'Brien at Denzille Street where, at Browne and Nolan's printing works, I had to see after the

dispatch of the Archbishop's circulars. I returned by Brunswick Street, O'Connell Bridge and Bachelor's Walk. Owing to the intense sniping in O'Connell Street between the military in T.C.D. and the Volunteers in O'Connell Street, I had to return by Bachelor's Walk, Liffey Street and Dorset Street. There was continuous sniping, sometimes quite close at hand. Several injured people were removed in the city ambulance which seemed constantly employed.

O'Connell Street presented a ruined appearance. Its houses were looted and Lawrence's was on fire. Volunteers occupied Kelly's, the Hibernian Bank and the Metropole Hotel.

The Volunteers attempted to blow up the N.C.R. bridge over the M.G.R. at Phibsborough but were driven into the city by shrapnel. The 5th Dublin Fusiliers from Tipperary occupied Phibsborough, the fork of the road at Glasnevin Orphanage and the top of Iona Road. At 5 p.m. several machine guns and ambulances were assembled in Dorset Street and Mountjoy Street. It is said that some hundreds of Volunteers entrenched at Finglas retreated before the soldiers to Knocksedan. It was rumoured that a few Volunteers deserted during the day. On the other hand, some joined them. I saw four.

From 8.30 p.m. to 10 p.m. an utter stranger, armed with a revolver, stationed himself at the Archbishop's House and made people keep on the other side of the road. He even stopped motor cars and cyclists. We failed to find out his identity. [He seemed to be protecting us.]

We were informed that the Volunteers held some of the N.D. Union building in North Brunswick St. for some time to-day, but left it for other houses in the street. There was some sniping. It was added that they took 4 soldiers prisoners, but released them later and

also left the locality themselves. We also heard during the day that the Volunteers were driven out of Stephen's Green by bombs and machine-guns, fired by the military in the Shelbourne Hotel, and that they lost many killed. The survivors fled to, and held, the College of Surgeons. They were also driven out of the 'Mail' office or, rather, all were killed."

Such were the reports we received on the telephone from priests in different districts. They were supplying the rumours current in their own districts.

My diary continues:-

"Wednesday, 26th April, 1916:

The Archbishop removed to-day to the drawing-room. The doctors were unable to come. This was his first day out of the bedroom since April 1st.

At 7.45 a.m. sniping and machine-guns became active towards the lower Quays. At 8 the 'Helga', in front of the Custom House, battered at Liberty Hall for 12 minutes and fired some 6 shots at longer intervals. Everybody had withdrawn from Liberty Hall. Sniping was very general all day, the streets reverberating with sounds of shooting. A large number of civilians were killed and wounded last evening and during the night. There were 90 such cases in Jervis St. Hospital alone.

Looting is spreading through Henry St. and Mary St. The fire in Lawrence's is extending.

At 9 o'clock a.m. I went to the Pro-Cathedral. Dorset St. was occupied by military sentries. The streets were crowded, including O'Connell St., despite the danger. There were several deaths and many were wounded. There was sniping at the Mater Hospital corner of the N.C.R. and soldiers, lying on the pavement outside Mountjoy Prison, were sniping at

Volunteers in the houses. Some wounded were brought to the Mater Hospital. The Corporation ambulance is working under great difficulties and was fired upon, presumably unintentionally, by both sides. I came back with Mr. Seamus Hughes [whom I met in that neighbourhood] and I met Mr. Murphy.

The Volunteers are said to have been driven from the South D. Union yesterday. The military occupy St. Mary's, Haddington Road, and are using the tower for military purposes. The Volunteers hold the Four Courts and they have strongly barricaded the Church St. area. They sell there their paper, 'The War News'. [Our milkman met there young Dillon (aged about 14/15) armed at a barricade.] From the houses on the opposite side of the Liffey at Winetavern Street, the Volunteers snipe the military on the upper side of the quays. The bridges and quays are most dangerous. The Volunteers are also sniping from the houses in Liffey St.

The soldiers guard the bridges over the M.G. Rly. at Cabra Rd., and the N.C. Rd. About 1 p.m. the soldiers were sniping at Broadstone Station. It is said 5,000 soldiers landed at Kingstown with a gun.

Fifteen soldiers were sniped at at Clanwilliam Place by Volunteers in Mount St. Fr. John McMahon attended the wounded.

Jacobs is still held by the Volunteers. There is much firing at the North Wall.

Minnie and Phyllis Ryan call on Archbishop:

At 2 p.m. Minnie (Mrs. Mulcahy) and Phyllis (Mrs. Seán T.) Ryan called on me at Archbishop's House to report that the military were firing on their Red Cross Post at Clery's, and asked me whether the Archbishop could take steps to dissuade the military from doing so. Unfortunately, I was unable to give them any hope as the military showed a strong disposition to ignore all requests from any quarter.

Many women like these two are working at First Aid for the Volunteers in the G.P.O., Stephen's Green, etc. They also procure news and ammunition.

At 2.30 I went home 211 North Circular Road, between Grangegorman and Cattle Market by Iona Road and Cabra Road, calling at the Vincentians in Phibsboro'. The district had an exciting time while the Volunteers were being dislodged from the N.C. Rd. bridge. The place was shaken by gunfire." This same bridge was an example of the incompetence of the 'explosives' section of the Volunteers. I had seen them attempting to mine the bridge. Later on - (next day?) - I saw the results of their efforts, a mere hollow, no bigger than a bowl, in the middle of the road.

My diary then reads:-

"Incident of scout sent by bicycle to Cork on Easter Sunday."

I can't recollect the details of this incident. It must have been an account I received from somebody I met and doubtless refers to a courier conveying Volunteer messages from Dublin.

"Seán O'Cuiv called. He had just returned from Cork. There is no disturbance in the South except a little in Tralee. In Cork city the Volunteers and military were about to fight when the Bishop and the Lord Mayor intervened and induced the Volunteers to obey John McNeill's orders.

Mr. Hughes told me that the reason why Amiens St. Station was not seized was because that duty was left to the Ulster Volunteers. They arrived in mufti and were to have been armed on arrival. By some mischance, the arms were not at hand and nothing could be done.

Mr. Grace, a D.M.P. detective, said the Volunteers very nearly captured the Castle. The gates were actually open for them, on a policeman being shot.

Fearing a trap, the Volunteers did not enter. Had they done so, they would have captured everything, including Nathan and Campbell. They then seized the City Hall.

(Lieut.) Tom Kettle, M.P., called on me twice to-day in reference to his brother, Larry (a National Volunteer).

Sniping from houses, especially from roofs, has become a regular feature.

All was quiet at 7 p.m. Notices were distributed ordering people off the streets at 8 p.m. The warning was not observed and the streets were crowded.

The fire at Lawrence's (Upper O'Connell St.) is becoming dangerous, not only to the entire block but to the Pro-Cathedral. The fire-brigade was ordered by the military not to go out (sic). Fr. Bowden, Adm., and Fr. John Flanagan telephoned to ask the Archbishop to procure the intervention of the Viceregal. The Archbishop permitted me to do so. After consultation with General Friend, the Viceregal agreed to do their best (to allow the brigade to save the Pro-Cathedral). But nothing was done about the matter.

During the evening there was a big fight at Ballsbridge - perhaps an attack on the incoming troops from Kingstown. The Volunteers were defeated and 60 taken prisoners (sic).

The Swords Volunteers have occupied the village. It is impossible to settle down to any mental work in this tense atmosphere."

Mr. Seamus Hughes, whom I mentioned in my diary as having accompanied me on my way home from the Pro-Cathedral on Wednesday, the 26th April, was in the

Volunteers. I wonder was he doing Intelligence work. He was afterwards secretary to Eoin McNeill. He lived in the neighbourhood of Drumcondra.

Haddington Road Church is used by British Military:

My diary referred to the occupation of Haddington Road Church by the military. This incident was reported to me by Dr. Donnelly, Archbishop of Canea, Assistant Bishop of Dublin and P.P. of St. Mary's. One of the priests there - Father McKee - was ill and he attended him. How much sniping the military did from the tower, I do not know. They certainly used it for observation purposes. The military had first entered on the excuse that there were Volunteers up in the tower and they insisted upon inspecting it. They were allowed up; and from that on, they used it for their own purposes. It may have been to prevent other people from using it; but they pretended they were fired upon from it. They imagined astonishing things and saw strange visions those days. William M. Murphy, Chairman of the Dublin Tram Company in his address (6th February, 1917) on the year's working related how their traffic manager found the military at the Pro-Cathedral about to bombard their premises in O'Connell Street. They were convinced that snipers were firing on them from its windows. As the manager had only just left it, he was able to persuade the officer that there was not a word of truth in the report he had received.

The "young Dillon" mentioned on the same date was a son of our local building contractor. He was an apprentice and had been on jobs about the Archbishop's House a few times.

Father John McMahon, who attended the wounded at

Clanwilliam Place on the same date, was a brother of Archdeacon McMahon. They were staunch followers of John Redmond and very unfriendly to the Volunteers.

I also referred to a visit I received from Tom Kettle on the 26th April, 1916. He wished to enquire had we any news about his brother. I think that was only an excuse. He was in a miserable way over the whole situation. I had two talks with him that week.

Thursday, 27th April, 1916:

The following are my own observations and reports which I heard and were written by me in my diary for Thursday, the 27th April, 1916:-

"The night was comparatively quiet except for the usual sniping and some machine gun fire.

The Castle neighbourhood has been cleared and remains quiet.

At 8.30 a.m. I went to the Pro-Cathedral.

The military are stationed at Cahill's corner on the North Circular Road [at Dorset Street], awaiting with machine-guns the Volunteers from Swords.

A proclamation has been issued ordering the people off the streets between the hours of 7.30 p.m. and 5 a.m.

There are very few in O'Connell Street. There is continual sniping between the military stationed in both the Rotunda and the Ballast Office and the Volunteers in the G.P.O., Metropole, Hibernian Bank, D.B.C., other houses and also in Middle Abbey Street as far as Marlborough Street, that is, in Keating's, etc. Volunteers also occupy Henry Street as far as Moore Street. The houses have been linked up. The Four Courts

and Church Street are strongly barricaded.

Communication with the South side is most dangerous.

Several civilians and looters have been killed. The foolhardiness of the looters - mostly women and children - is amazing.

The Pro-Cathedral was only saved by a miracle from the fire. A change in the wind caused the fire to shift towards Earl Street. The priests had everything ready in bags for departure, including the parochial records. The girls from Hickey's and other houses [in Pro-Cathedral Street] spent the night in the Sacristy. The Brigade were not allowed out. Priests attending calls are in great danger. Fr. John O'Reilly had a narrow escape attending a Volunteer brought into Wynn's Hotel. Fr. Richard Bowden and a Dominican heard Confessions in the G.P.O. for several hours yesterday [Wednesday].

I noted a young sentry of fifteen in Williams Lane. He was carefully watching the approaches from Abbey Street. I was very much impressed by the courage with which he stuck to his post, all by himself, despite his nervous tension. I walked along Abbey Street from the Capel Street end to see how near I could get to O'Connell Street with safety; and I got as far as Williams Lane. Williams Lane is the last thoroughfare - only for pedestrians - leading from Abbey Street to Prince's Street. Middle Abbey Street was absolutely deserted.

The Dummy Sniper on Miss Quinn's Nursing Home:

Returning by Mountjoy Square, I saw [what I thought was] a Volunteer sniper on the roof of what was Miss Quinn's Nursing Home. [This was near Russell Street.] Several soldiers were firing at him from the pavement in front of Mountjoy School. [The soldiers were firing at this target. On the day of the surrender, I passed again along that way and noticed that the "Volunteer" was still on the roof. It was then

I realised it was a "dummy" rigged up by the Volunteers, with the head only over the roof, while they moved along sniping from other roofs.]

Towards 11 a.m. fierce rifle fire took place here [Drumcondra]. We counted several bullets singing by the gate lodge and the house. Later on, one struck the house and several sang over it.

It is stated, on good authority, that the Volunteers seized two machine guns and defeated the military at Summerhill last evening.

Rang up the Lord Lieutenant's Secretary to request that priests would be placed on the same footing as medical practitioners who were allowed out between the forbidden hours of 7.30 p.m. and 5 a.m. [Permission never came.]

After 4 p.m. machine-gun firing was particularly severe for some time. There was some cannonading.

A second fire has broken out at Hugh, Moore and Alexander, and another at Linenhall Barracks.

Cannonading was resumed at 5.10 p.m. It is stated to be the shelling of houses in O'Connell Street and that the military have set on fire the D.B.C., to burn out the Volunteers. There is fierce sniping and machine-gun fire.

Many more bullets flew about the house. Another struck the house, piercing the east window of the billiard room [now the Archbishop's study] and deflected sharply to the left against an open bookcase, smashing the woodwork. I found the bullet. In consequence, we arranged for the Archbishop to sleep on the north side and barricaded the windows with mattresses. Later, however, in the evening shots were fired along Drumcondra

Road from Tolka Bridge towards the Canal. Altogether we are very anxious. We ourselves /that is, the secretaries/ established ourselves in the lower corridor in the centre of the house.

The city fires are extending and look most alarming at darkness. O'Connell Street is burned from Abbey Street to Eden Quay, including the D.B.C., etc. A third centre of fire, though small, is the Provincial Hotel, opposite the Four Courts - and houses in Bridgefoot Street.

Birrell returned to the Castle last night or this morning.

Martial law was proclaimed yesterday. Nevertheless, people crowded the streets after 7.30 p.m. The military had to drive them indoors by discharging rifle shots over their heads. The streets are without light. There is much sniping here at times.

Lusk and Donabate Volunteers who had arms - about sixty - marched and joined the Swords Volunteers yesterday. They occupied the three Post Offices and Police Barracks, got some twelve rifles and marched to Garristown. All Lusk is wild with excitement and, if they had arms, all would rise. /One of the priests there brought this report./"

That concludes the diary entries of Thursday, the 27th April.

Friday, the 28th April, 1916:

The following are the entries under Friday, the 28th April, 1916:-

"The situation is much the same as yesterday except that the streets are more deserted and more dangerous.

The Volunteers still occupy all their posts of yesterday. They are still apparently in the South Dublin Union and also in Marrowbone Lane Distillery. They occupy Carton's Lane in the North City Markets district. Volunteer snipers occupy Merrion Square houses. [Probably this information was obtained from Dr. Cox who telephoned during the day, but could not get over.]

The fires are still burning. Clery's is now on fire.

Many people have taken refuge in the Pro-Cathedral. People entering or leaving are shot at by the military. Under these circumstances, the Administrator applied to the military that they should occupy it. This they did, in great force, later in the day. They occupy both Church and Presbytery, with all the passages, rooms and roofs. [The military had already been in possession of Tyrone House, the Model Schools.] They also stated that they might have to send there the guests in the Hammam and Gresham Hotels.

The military also occupy St. Catherine's Protestant Church.

Father Edward Byrne [later Archbishop] and Father Joe MacArdle are in Jervis Street Hospital [on duty]. It was thought better to leave them there, on account of the danger passing through the streets. Father John Flanagan is in the G.P.O.

Whole districts are without provisions - milk, butter, bread or meat. Only for flour, many would be very badly off. Kennedy's bakeries supply the area.

A sniper close at hand in Fitzroy Avenue or at the railway kept up most persistent sniping from noon to night. He did make things hum." [It was when taking aim at him that the bullets hit the Archbishop's House.

I forget who he was. This man kept up sniping for long after the surrenders - to the best of my recollection, until Tuesday forenoon. The houses in Fitzroy Avenue were searched for him several times but he ran about from roof to roof and was not discovered. I heard afterwards who he was. He lived in Fitzroy Avenue.]

My diary then lists all the priests who telephoned or called and then continues:-

"The military occupy the corner of the North Circular Road and Summerhill, the top of North Richmond Street [or Schools], the top of Russell Street, the Malt House of Portland Street. They have barricaded the bottom of [North] Summer Street. They have a machine gun in Fanning's [corner North Circular Road and Jones' Road].

Telegraphic communication is established with Dublin, but communications with the Provinces go through London.

The military shot an incendiary [bomb] into the G.P.O. at --- o'clock and set it ablaze.

The sight at night was most impressive. Firing had almost ceased and everything was deadly quiet and black, except the fires in O'Connell Street and Linenhall Barracks. An occasional shot from our neighbouring sniper [Fitzroy Avenue] alone disturbed the quietness of a lovely, calm, starry night."

Saturday, 29th April, 1916:

The following is a transcript (practically verbatim) from my diary:-

"Saturday, April 29th, 1916.

There seems to be no change overnight. We hear the usual sniping and machine-gun fire. There is, however, great distress

through scarcity of food.

I paid a visit home - North Circular Road - from 10-12.

While I was out, the military (Major Price) rang up about eleven o'clock to say that the Government were about to issue a proclamation, described to me as offering terms of surrender to the Volunteers and asking whether the Archbishop would ask the clergy to convey this to the Volunteers. The Archbishop replied that it was not necessary for him to ask them. He was sure they would do it themselves if asked by the military. [My recollection to-day is that this, or some similar military telephonic message, made allusion to the danger that churches and civilian property would run if the Volunteers would not lay down arms. I have some doubt as to the objective accuracy of this telephone message. I was not in the house at the time.]

The military are using an armoured motor-car to take houses in the Capel Street area. They charge into the street, back the car into a shop, smashing everything in. The military get out of the back of the car and storm floor by floor. In this way, they have captured sections of streets and pushed in their barricades.

At 4 o'clock I was in the Secretaries' Study when the telephone bell, which had seldom sounded those days, suddenly rang and a girl's voice abruptly told me: 'The Sinn Féiners have surrendered' - and clapped down the telephone immediately and could not be recalled. [I took it that she was an employee in the telephone office, or the Castle, and was anxious that the Archbishop should know as quickly as possible and that she did it without authorisation. I did my best to recall her but I could not.] I at once informed the Archbishop and it was arranged that I would go down town to the Pro-Cathedral for

information and with instructions.

I walked down by Mountjoy Square and North Great George's Street. There were great numbers in the hall-ways, in an atmosphere of expectancy. The cessation of gun-fire for some hours made people speculate in this area whether the fighting was coming to an end, or had already come to an end, and whether the Volunteers had surrendered. But nobody could obtain news and each sought information from his neighbour.

At the Pro-Cathedral I found them similarly without definite news. The surrender was only an unconfirmed rumour. Father Bowden, Administrator, was in the Marlborough Street Schools, finding food and bedding for refugees. I left the Archbishop's directions concerning Sunday, namely, that it was to be announced that there was no obligation to hear Mass on next day, Sunday, and no bells were to be rung.

The Archbishop was anxious concerning Father John Flanagan, as some said he had been killed, others that he had probably found his way from the G.P.O. to Jervis Street Hospital, where we knew Father Edward Byrne [the late Archbishop] and Father McArdle were stationed, and where rumours said Father Flanagan also was to be found.

Even then I was under the mistaken impression that the Volunteers had been disarmed and had left the G.P.O. area. It was known by this time that the G.P.O. was burned out and that the Volunteers had fallen back towards Henry Street or Jervis Street. [We had heard that the place was on fire and the roof had fallen in and, of course, we speculated on all the possibilities.] I have a vague recollection that we had already been told that the Volunteers were turning the whole area around there into a barricaded area in an attempt to keep up communications with the Four Courts and Church Street or join the garrisons there.

I left by Cathedral Street, where a dead civilian lay in the doorway of the then D.U.T. Co. parcel department. Emerging into O'Connell Street, I witnessed an indescribable sight. There was not a soul but myself in the whole street. The G.P.O. was a mere shell. The left-hand side i.e. east of Lower O'Connell St. was a smoking ruin. The right-hand side was little better. Clery's was burned out and the D.B.C. also was a shell. The smell of burning materials pervaded everywhere. Smoke hung low about. The dead Lancer's horse lay killed at the foot of Nelson's Pillar, as I had seen it on Monday. I aimed to go to Jervis St. through Henry St. Moving across, my every foot-step crunched broken glass. The silence was deadly and already I was beginning to have misgivings. Before I was half way across I saw that Henry Street was blocked, and so I turned towards the Rotunda where, by this time, I saw a group of military at the foot of the Parnell Monument. With much uneasiness, I ventured past the tramway office, on the right hand side, i.e., east, the Hammam and Gresham Hotels. This side of the street is uninjured. Gill's west side is considerably injured by fire, shelling and rifle fire, especially the Y.M.C.A. People crowded the doorways and windows of the hotels and called out to me for news. It was then that I began to realise that my notion of the surrender was incorrect, for these people facing O'Connell St. knew nothing about it. When I mentioned the surrender, they came out into the street but were sharply ordered in by the military. At the Gresham Hotel I met Mr. D'Arcy of .?. Upper O'Connell Street, who was full of fantastic slanders of the Volunteers. I cannot remember the number of the house where he lived. Mr. D'Arcy had lodgings in a flat in a house very near John Burke's (solicitor) office. He was one of the D'Arcy's, the brewery people. He was in the Gresham. He had been driven out of his house and got rooms in the Gresham Hotel. The military again peremptorily ordered all indoors

and I continued towards the Rotunda.

At the Parnell Monument I met Colonel Portal, Commanding Officer, to whom I explained who I was and my anxiety to reach Jervis Street Hospital. He at once informed me of the surrender, showed me six copies of the order of surrender, signed by Pearse, and asked me to make it known. I asked him for a copy but, as he had only six, he could not give me one. He warned me that I would need a pass and kindly made out one from his notebook. It must have been the first military pass issued. I had no further conversation with him, and still I did not know the real position and thought that the surrender and disarmament had already taken place (elsewhere). Not many military were to be seen in the immediate neighbourhood of the Parnell Monument. But as I passed down Parnell Street, I saw every street, alley and passage barricaded, with soldiers behind sandbags, and rifles pointed towards the smoking ruins in Moore Street and Henry Street. I was told to slip along these barricades quickly, and then, for the first time, I realised that the disarmament had not yet taken place. But there was no superior officer from whom I could obtain news or information. I continued on to Jervis Street amidst the alarmed warnings and prayers of the people in the doorways.

At Jervis St. Hospital I met the three priests, but was advised not to venture back to Drumcondra. By this time, I saw plainly I could do nothing else and managed to send a telephone message to Archbishop's House [from the hospital].

That ends my direct contacts with the Rising of Easter Week.

Sunday, 30th April, 1916:

Next morning, Sunday [April 30th, 1916], I left Jervis St. Hospital at 7 o'clock and

experienced very considerable difficulty in passing the sentry at Parnell Street.

[Military passes were new things to which these soldiers were unaccustomed.] Even with Colonel Portal's pass, I was not allowed to continue until I returned for an officer. With him I passed through Bolton St., from which I saw that the front and left hand part of Linen Hall Barracks had been burned down, with a block of houses between it and Bolton Street. My accompanying officer engaged in general conversation concerning the rising. He did not seem to be English. I was struck by the sane and rather detached view he took of the situation. [I saw the line of the canal closely watched and guarded by military, to see that nobody escaped that way. I heard that young Dillon slipped through at Cabra Bridge, due to his youth and size.]

Monday, 1st May, 1916 - Arrest of Marquess
McSweeney and Count Plunkett:

Next day, Monday, [May 1st, 1916] Father John Flanagan called on the Archbishop and gave him all the news of the closing days in the G.P.O. and its neighbourhood.

In the forenoon I went to the Pro-Cathedral, O'Connell Street, crowded with people inspecting the ruins, and on to Leeson Street to visit our solicitor, Mr. O'Donnell, then near his end. I called on or met James [later Justice] Murnaghan from whom I learned that Sheehy Skeffington had been shot either at Portobello or Richmond Barracks.

In the later afternoon I went to Blackrock which was the nearest point where newspapers of any kind could be obtained. [The newspapers I purchased had arrived by the mail boat.] Great military precautions were apparent all the way from Westland Row and S. Brunswick St., by Merrion Square and Mount St. Bridge to Ballsbridge and the Dodder. The object was, obviously, to hem in the Ringsend

district. All streets to the left were barricaded by the military. On my way back, I actually saw Marquess McSweeney being arrested at 27 Waterloo Rd. and, following the lorry, I saw it outside Count Plunkett's in Fitzwilliam St. They were taken off in a military lorry.

Tuesday, May 2nd, 1916 - I hear of Arrest
of Seán T. O'Kelly:

Telephonic communication was everywhere cut off for the rest of this week. [But people could move freely about. It was only now the authorities were able to turn their attention to the civilians and commence the arrests. They were preventing the escape of all the people concerned.]

I met Lorcan Sherlock and learned of the arrest of Seán T. O'Kelly. I had met Seán T. in Nth. Charles Street, near his mother's at the corner of Rutland Street, on either Wednesday or Thursday on my way to the Pro-Cathedral. We had only exchanged very general news of the situation [in and outside Dublin] and I purposely abstained from asking of his own doings. [I regarded it as certain that he would be arrested. He was in and out of the G.P.O. all the time.]

Some fighting is still proceeding in the Ringsend district on a small scale. Fr. Paddy Flanagan was asked by the military to try and stop it.

Some people called for letters of identification.

Dr. Cox and Dr. O'Brien had Dr. O'Carroll in consultation from midday on the treatment of the Archbishop's illness.

Visit of Fr. Aloysius. Arrest of John McNeill:

Fr. Aloysius, O.S.F.C., called at 2.30 and gave us a history of the last stages of the fighting at the Four Courts, Jacobs and the South Dublin Union. He stated that he had been

asked by Sir John Maxwell, Field Marshal Commanding the Forces, to say that he was anxious to see the Archbishop. The Archbishop asked me to see Maxwell and arrange the interview; but I missed him both at the Castle and the Headquarters; but arranged at Headquarters for an interview tomorrow.

Fr. Bowden saw the Archbishop at 4.30 p.m. and Fr. Aloysius at 5 o'clock, as he had not seen him when he called earlier.

It was to-day that John McNeill was arrested. (See Diary, May 2nd, for newspaper account of John McNeill's address in Derry on his personal experiences during Easter Week.)
[This is an extract from the "Irish Independent". I have no date on it. From something appearing on the back of the cutting, I see that it must have been before the 30th August, 1917. It is probably August - possibly July - 1917. The extract is headed: 'John McNeill's Story - St. Columba's Hall, Derry - Sinn Féin Meeting'. For full text, see the "Derry Journal". I put that extract there to illustrate another incident. I was one of the persons to whom his account of the incident was sent, by word of mouth. It was through Father [Later Archdeacon] Francis Farrington, the chaplain to Arbour Hill Barracks and Detention Prison. I will come to that later.]

Wednesday, May 3rd, 1916 - Fr. Francis Farrington
is present at Funerals:

"Pearse, McDonagh and Clarke were courtmartialled yesterday and shot this morning at 3.30 at Kilmainham. Their remains were brought at once to Arbour Hill Military Prison and buried, uncoffined, in a trench, 60 feet long. Fr. Francis Farrington read the burial service over them at 4 o'clock." [Father Edward Morrissey, C.C., James Street, was Chaplain to the Kilmainham Prison and he was present at the execution there, which he described to me a few years later when he was on a visit to Rome. He mentioned to me that Father Aloysius

and those who were there before his arrival were not allowed to stay. The reason given by the military was that only the Chaplain could be allowed to stay. It was then arranged that a priest was to be at the execution. Father Francis Farrington, who was Chaplain to the Military at Arbour Hill, was one of the Curates of Holy Family Parish, Aughrim Street, and specially appointed as Acting Chaplain for Arbour Hill. Officially, the Parish Priest is Chaplain.]

Sir John Maxwell asks the Archbishop to deport certain Priests. I offer to give Evidence at Courtmartial of Seán T. O'Kelly and

John McNeill:

"Sir John Maxwell called on the Archbishop with Lord Decies, his aide-de-camp, at 11.30 a.m. He spoke of the bravery of the Capuchins on the one hand and, on the other hand, of the number of priests whom he accused of participation in the Rising. Maxwell wanted to deport them straightaway and was apparently under the impression that the Archbishop could do this himself. On learning the names of the priests concerned, the Archbishop pointed out that he had no jurisdiction in the matter, as no Dublin priests' names appeared on his list. He advised Maxwell to consult their Bishops and, noting the presence of 2 Limerick priests' names, had a little malicious pleasure in anticipating the reply he would receive from Dr. O'Dwyer.

In the afternoon I went to interview the Adjutant General. On my way - at Parkgate, N.C. Rd. - I met Charles and Mrs. John McNeill. They told me of John McNeill's arrest by Major Price on yesterday. After John had arranged by telephone for an interview with General Maxwell, a motor car was sent for him; but when he arrived at Richmond Barracks, he was arrested by Major Price. At Military Headquarters, Parkgate Street, I saw Lord Decies, who introduced me to Assistant-Adjutant General Byrne and told him I

was anxious to give evidence for John McNeill and Seán T. O'Kelly. I was told prisoners could choose themselves their own witnesses and that I should write to them." [John McNeill's family must have a copy of the courtmartial. There was a copy typed. I would say that the original would be burned. From a question that John McNeill asked me a year or two afterwards, I gathered that he had a copy of the report of the proceedings, because he asked me about my evidence. I only went up to Military Headquarters regarding Seán T. O'Kelly but, having met Charlie McNeill on the way, I undertook to give evidence in his case too. By a very strange coincidence, a short time ago, to my surprise, I ran into the R.I.C. Irish note-taker, who was concerned in all these prosecutions and who gave evidence at John McNeill's trial. I shall put you in touch with him as he lives close by on the N.C. Road.]

"Miss Gavan Duffy called at 7 p.m. to ask would the Archbishop request that the bodies of Pearse and the others, who were executed, be given to their relatives. The Archbishop said he believed the military would not do so, in order to prevent demonstrations. He did not say he had already been twice refused what he had asked of the military."

Proclamations and Military Orders:

I may here refer to seven Proclamations or Military Orders issued on April 24th, 25th, 26th, 29th, May 1st and 2nd. They are published all together in the Dublin press (perhaps of May 5th). Those of April 24th and 25th were signed by Lord Wimborne, the Lord Lieutenant. The third was a Military Order, dated 26th April, merely ordering public houses to be closed except from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. By the fourth, dated 26th April, from Windsor, King George declared that a military emergency

existed and, therefore, suspended the right of a civilian to be tried by civil court. The fifth, signed by the Lord Lieutenant, extended martial law over the whole of Ireland. The sixth was a Military Order, dated May 1st, signed by Sir John Maxwell, threatening to "destroy all buildings within any area occupied by rebels". The seventh, likewise signed by Maxwell and dated May 2nd, ordered the surrender of arms, ammunition and explosives.

The "Freeman's Journal" of the combined dates, April 26th, 27th, 28th 29th, May 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th, 1916, contains a "Complete Story of Sinn Féin Insurrection" which ran into seven columns.

Among the press cuttings of these days that I attached to my diary, and others in the bound papers I shall give to the Bureau, I may mention:-

- (1) The press report of Cardinal Logue's telegram to the Pope. It is headed, "The Pope's Joy", and proceeds:-

"Cardinal Logue addressed the following message to the Pope on Tuesday, 2nd May:

'Insurrection happily terminated. Insurgents have surrendered unconditionally. Hope peace soon re-established.'

"The message gave the Pope much pleasure", says the 'Daily Mail'. "At the Vatican the Irish clergy are greatly praised for their efforts to restore order". So the press report ends. Those who know what the British press call "the Vatican" will attach little attention to the 'Daily Mail's' addendum to the Cardinal's telegram.

- (2) An address, reported to have been made by Archbishop Crozier at Portadown on 26th April, stating that those who knew the country knew

that disturbance was bound to come. It was a warning to those of the North and "the Government must put down sedition and the spoilt child must be put in its proper place".

- (3) The "Irish Independent" of 6th May has an eye-witness's account of the zealous and apostolic work of Father Columbus (sic), O.S.F.C., of Church Street and of the Pro-Cathedral clergy. The "Independent's" account concludes with another eyewitness's account of the firing on the north side on Thursday (April 27th).

- (4) An extract from a Blue Paper of 1918 on "the Criminal and Civil Statistics for Ireland for 1916" which purports to give the official statistics of the number of military and civilians killed, wounded, arrested, tried and not tried, the number imprisoned, their sentences and losses to property. I placed it here as more relevant than in 1918. Unfortunately, I have not the date of the Blue Paper but the official List of Government Papers should clear up the date.

- (5) "An Echo of the 1916 Rising", an extract from the "Irish Independent" of 25th July, 1918, describing a British Government publication of excerpts from Reports of Irish Volunteer leaders of Cork, Kerry and Limerick explaining their actions during Easter 1916. P. Colivet's is printed at length in the "Irish Independent".

(6) Extract from "Evening Mail", 5th August, 1916, on the Report of the Executive Committee of the Irish Trades Union Congress and Labour Party to be submitted to the Convention in Sligo on Monday, 7th August. The report describes the reaction of the Rising on the Trades Unions, the attitude of "certain sections of Dublin employers and their spokesmen in the Press", letters exchanged with Arthur Henderson, M.P., with reference to Trades Union prisoners, and important references to the Citizen Army and Liberty Hall.

4th May, 1916 - Fr. F. Farrington describes the state of dead bodies of executed Leaders:

Under Thursday, the 4th May, 1916, I have the following written in my diary:-

"At 4.30 p.m. I paid a visit to Father Farrington, as a result of my talk with Charlie McNeill the previous day. [I was anxious to ascertain from John McNeill, through Fr. Farrington, what I could do.] He [Father Farrington] described to me the burial of Pearse and those executed with him. The military sent a lorry [to his house in Aughrim St.] at three o'clock in the morning to bring him to Arbour Hill Barracks. He described hearing from Arbour Hill the volley of shots at Kilmainham and the arrival of the remains, in pools of blood, still warm and limp, eyes bandaged and mouths open. Those who brought them back said, of Pearse in particular, that he died like a soldier and a man. He was attended by Father Augustine or Father Aloysius. McDonagh was also attended. Clarke also saw a

priest [I have this added afterwards. The first account that I got was crossed out in my diary, and I must have got word immediately afterwards. I have first that 'Clarke would have no priest', but this statement in my diary is corrected and now reads, 'Clarke also saw a priest' -], Father Tom O'Ryan, C.C. Inchicore.

Four more were shot and buried this morning between three and four. Plunkett, son of Count Plunkett, was among those that were shot. He was married last night to the girl to whom he was engaged, Grace Gifford.

All are buried in Arbour Hill Military Prison, behind the Chapel, in the order in which their names appear on paper [newspaper].

Wholesale arrests are being made. Most extensive house searches are being made by military and police combined - even of places where the owners can hardly be held suspect.

A kind of mild reign of terror reigns. Everybody is afraid to express his views. Martial law is supreme, and people must be in their houses at 7.30 p.m. or they will be fired upon.

Among those arrested - John McNeill, Seán T. O'Kelly, Alderman J. Kelly, Alderman Tom Kelly, O'Leary-Curtis, Arthur Griffith and Sweetman.

That ends my diary entries under May 4th.

Under the 5th May, 1916, I noted an early visit of the new doctor (Sir Joseph Redmond) and continued:-

"I met Charlie McNeill at 12 o'clock. Sir John O'Connell, the solicitor to the McNeill family, was unwilling to take up the case to defend Eoin. So Gerald Byrne was engaged. Both Sir John O'Connell and Gerald Byrne were refused permission to see John McNeill."

Right Honourable Louis Harcourt was appointed - 4th May - in succession to Birrell; and Chalmers as Under-Secretary, in succession to Sir Matthew Nathan.

McBride's and Plunkett's Courtmartial:

As John McBride was executed on 5th May, I here noted two interesting items of news we learned about this time referring to him and to Joe Plunkett, executed the day before:-

"Tim Healy told the Archbishop that 'Blackadder' I think he was a Colonel. He was the head of the courtmartial] told him that Major McBride at his courtmartial impressed the officers greatly. He simply said, "I knew nothing of the Rising until Easter Monday. I am a man of action. I joined the Volunteers. I knew we could not hold out three days. We held out six. I know the forfeit is death. Good evening."] Such was the account as given by Tim Healy when he called to visit the Archbishop at Annamoe on 27th June]

I heard from my colleague Father, now Monsignor, Walsh] that one of the young Plunkett's Joe] also made a great impression; that one of the officers - an Englishman whom Father Walsh met - said that

they were of opinion that something must be radically wrong that had such a young man so strong against England. This officer had become a Home Ruler after some weeks' experience in Ireland. He was connected with Lever Bros. at Port Sunlight." [This is another note which I added afterwards under the date, 5th May.]

Under the 6th May, 1916, I have entered the following in my diary:-

"The Archbishop asked the 'Freeman' and 'Independent' to take notice of the 'Daily Mail's' error in ascribing to the Archbishop the bitter letter of Archbishop Bernard to the 'Times', written on the 3rd May. In this letter Archbishop Bernard, reflecting the talk of Dublin Unionists, demanded the continuation of Martial Law and the adoption of the sternest measures. 'This is not the time for amnesties and pardons: it is the time for punishment swift and stern'." [Archbishop Bernard's letter is dated the 3rd May, 1916. It was republished in the 'Daily Mail' in its issue of 6th May. He was the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin and later became Provost of Trinity College.]

Major Price tries to get McNeill to connect Dillon and Devlin with the Rising:

Father Francis Farrington, C.C. of Aughrim Street, had an interview with the Archbishop at 3.30 p.m.

It was -

"in reference to a most malignant attempt by Major Price to terrify John McNeill into inculpating John Dillon and Joe Devlin in the Rising. John McNeill told Fr. Farrington either yesterday or this morning that, while he was exercising in Arbour Hill Prison earlier in the week,

he had to pass at regular intervals soldiers who fired blank cartridge shots towards him whenever he passed them. Naturally, it unnerved him and, while he was suffering in this way, Major Price came to his cell and offered him his life and good terms if he would give evidence to connect John Dillon and Joe Devlin with the Rising." [John McNeill has given full details of this incident in a lecture delivered in St. Columb's Hall, Derry, in the Autumn of 1917. His account at this lecture exactly corresponds with the facts made known by Father Farrington during his visit to the Archbishop on this day. As soon as John Dillon returned from Westminster, i.e., a week or two later, I called on him at his residence in North Great George's Street to inform him of Price's attempt to involve him and Devlin in the Rising. In discussing the situation, I found him thoroughly sympathetic and filled with indignation over the executions and the militaristic administration of Dublin Castle.]

[I find I have attached at this point in my 1916 diary a newspaper cutting of February, 1917, which reads:-

"Sir John Maxwell told Mr. Dillon [one of the leaders of the Irish Parliamentary Party] when he went to protest violently against the executions that he would put down sedition in Ireland so forcibly and so powerfully that it would never raise its head again in Ireland". (Speech of Joe Devlin in the House of Commons, 26th February, 1917.)]

"I interviewed Sir John O'Connell early this morning [Saturday, 6th May, 1916] and, later on in the day, Charles McNeill on John McNeill's defence."

"Father Paddy Flanagan, Curate of Ringsend, was arrested yesterday and sent to Richmond Barracks. Poor Father Mooney, P.P., was detained a prisoner, under armed guard in his own house, from twelve noon until 6.30, and then only freed on the promise not to leave the place for three days."

[Father Flanagan was released apparently on Tuesday, 9th May, 1916, and he gives a dreadful account of the treatment of the prisoners. Father O'Flanagan is now Parish Priest in Booterstown and should have much to tell.]

Archbishop is asked to seek Reprieve for Mallon:

On Monday, the 8th May, 1916, at one o'clock in the morning I heard pebbles being flung up against the window. I was expecting to be arrested myself and I had actually a bag ready, packed, to take with me. My bedroom was on the upper storey facing the front. If these pebbles had not been flung, I would certainly have got a fright. My entry for that date continues:-

"On looking out, I recognised William [Kelly, the Archbishop's butler] with a group of two or three others. I think there was some sort of a vehicle there. William told me that I was wanted and to come down. I came down. It turned out to be a brother of Seamus Mallon with, I think, a detective - it was not a military man. They came to me to say that Mallon was to be shot at three o'clock and asking was it possible for the Archbishop to obtain a reprieve. Of course, I had to tell him that it was out of the question, owing to the Archbishop's condition."

I remember I asked him who were the others to be shot and his telling me Ned Kent and two others. I knew Ned Kent well. Ned Kent was at school with me. He was a

year younger and belonged to my brother's class. I said Mass for them all that morning.

My diary notes that in the evening of the 9th May I had a visit from Inspector Campbell of the Police, more or less apologising for disturbing me the morning before. Apparently, the visit was at the urgent request of Mr. Mallon.

Under this same date (9th May) I have noted that, when the Military Service Bill (Conscription) was introduced this day into Committee, Lonsdale moved that it be applied to Ireland. Asquith rejected the proposal as inexpedient. There was (he said) no agreement in Ireland. Redmond said, "At the present moment, after recent events in Ireland . . ., it would be well nigh an insane thing to enforce conscription in Ireland". William O'Brien declared that the proposal "would simply have the effect of pouring petroleum on a fire". Churchill said it would not be worth while "to court a serious Irish row". The amendment was withdrawn. On the next day (Wednesday, 10th May, 1916) the "Times" in its leading article declared that the application of the Bill to Ireland would be more trouble than it was worth.

Archbishop subscribes £100 to Relief Fund:

On the 10th May, 1916, I have noted in my diary that the Archbishop subscribed £100 to the Lord Mayor's Relief Fund. This was the first organised public fund. It had no connection with the Volunteers.

Under 11th May, 1916, my diary notes that the Archbishop wrote to the papers in reference to Maxwell's letter of appreciation of the work of the clergy. The letter politely prevents decorations or medals for the

priests.

Protests against Executions:

My diary notes the debate on Martial Law in the House of Commons and John Dillon's vehement speech, reminiscent of the 'eighties. During this debate Asquith announced his intention of going to Ireland. The debate did not appear in the papers until Saturday, the 13th May.

Other newspaper extracts I attached to my diary at this time are the following:-

- (1) Extract from John Redmond's speech in the House of Commons on 3rd May - "This outbreak happily seems to be over. It has been dealt with with firmness which was not only right, but it was the duty of the Government so to deal with it. As the rebellion or outbreak, or call it what you like, has been put down with firmness, I do beg the Government, and I speak from the bottom of my heart and with all earnestness, not to show undue hardship or severity to the great masses of those on whose shoulders there lies a guilt far different from that which lies upon the instigators and promoters of the outbreak."
- (2) On the 9th May the Assistant Bishop of Cork, the Lord Mayor of Cork (T.C. Butterfield), the High Sheriff (Wm. Harte) and four members of the U.I.L., Cork, including John Horgan, solicitor, George Crosbie and James McCahe, telegraphed to the Lord Lieutenant, John Redmond and Asquith protesting against further executions.

- (3) An address by the Bishop of Killaloe (Dr. Fogarty) at Quin on Sunday, 14th May, on the Insurrection.
- (4) A letter dated 16th May from Bishop Cohalan (then Assistant Bishop of Cork) Lord Mayor and High Sheriff of Cork to the Lord Lieutenant, Sir John Maxwell and Asquith protesting against the continuance of arrests and deportations.
- (5) The Bishop of Limerick's famous letter of 17th May to Maxwell was published in the 'Cork Examiner' on 27th May and in the Dublin papers on 30th May.
- (6) A manifesto of the Irish Party issued at the end of May, 1916, to the Irish people from the United Irish League Office, 39 Upper O'Connell Street. It is called an "Appeal to the People" but is in reality a belaboured apologia. This significant manifesto consists of a statement adopted at a meeting of the Irish Party in the House of Commons on Tuesday, 9th May, 1916, with the addition of a resolution against the continuance of military executions, and a further addition consisting of John Dillon's motion in the House of Commons on 19th May on the executions and martial law.

This manifesto is the first indication of the effect of Irish public opinion on the Party and is in very marked contrast to their leader's speech in the Commons on 3rd May.

I have a note that the Party issued a second manifesto on 8th March, 1917.

(7) A cutting from the 'Evening Herald' of 19th May on the King Street murders and Maxwell's statement concerning them published in the 'Daily Mail' of the same date, and Maxwell's so-called military inquiry into them. The 'Evening Herald' published Maxwell's letter. This 'Evening Herald' article is worth recording in full.

My diary for the 12th May, 1916, continues:-

"Asquith arrived in Dublin. The object of his visit gives rise to much speculation. At first, it was thought he came over for first-hand information, with a view to withdrawing or modifying martial law, excessive punishments, arrests, etc., and also to compensate those who lost property in the quelling of the revolt; but it is also thought he is contemplating erecting some kind of a mixed Nationalist and Unionist Irish Council to govern the country during the war."

Archbishop signs Petition for Fair Trial
for Alderman Tom Kelly. Many callers
arrive:

On Saturday, the 13th May, 1916, I note:-

"The Lord Mayor and Mr. Eyre \surd think he was City Treasurer \surd called to obtain the Archbishop's signature to a petition that Alderman Tom Kelly should get a fair and immediate trial. The Archbishop signed the petition.

To-day the Archbishop motored out for the first time and viewed the ruined streets. He came back very tired."

During this and the next few weeks, much of my time was occupied in seeking and arranging for the renting of a country house for the Archbishop's convalescence in accordance with the doctor's recommendation.

I have entered the following in my diary for 15th May, 1916:-

"Mr. Joe Clarke of Bolton Street called at 11.30. He was a box manufacturer. He was a member of the Volunteers. When the division occurred between the two sections, he dropped out but he retained a keen interest in the movement. He also retained his uniform. His views were very well known and evidently he was denounced to the military.7 His house was raided, the uniform discovered, so he was arrested and brought before ~~some~~ military authorities - these Intelligence Officers in Trinity College. He gave me an account of the arrest and all the questions that he was asked."

Quite a number of people called those days at the Archbishop's - some about their private troubles arising out of the circumstances of the time, others to make known what they thought the ecclesiastical authorities

should know.

Inspector Love's influence enlisted on behalf
of Seán T. O'Kelly:

"At half-past one, I went in to the Castle and called on Mr. Quinn in reference to Seán T. O'Kelly's arrest and courtmartial. After a discussion, he gave me a letter of introduction to Inspector Love of the "G" Division, who was at Richmond Barracks. I got a special pass to see Seán T. Saw him. Talked re his defence, etc."

Inspector Love died a few years ago. He was an Inspector of the "G" Division and had much dirty work to do in the way of tracing the Volunteers. I had met him before I got this letter of introduction. I don't know how I came across him but I could see plainly that his heart was not in his job, but he was tied down by his position, particularly by Major Price and the military. His position was all the more uneasy from the fact that there was no love lost between the police and the military. Inspector Love had particular charge of dealing with the evidence to be brought against the prisoners. I explained to him my interest in the courtmartial of Seán T. O'Kelly, that I was already accepted as a witness and was anxious to have a personal interview with Seán T. O'Kelly, who was a prisoner in Richmond Barracks. After a free expression of my views to Inspector Love, he obtained

for me a special pass to see Seán T. O'Kelly.

I interviewed Seán T. O'Kelly alone. My recollection is that it was through barbed wire in an open space. Although people were walking round about, we could speak privately. I had more than one interview with him.

During this interview with Seán T. O'Kelly on the 15th May, 1916, I outlined the evidence I proposed to give on his behalf, that is, that I could testify to having met him casually during the week in the Dublin streets - at Rutland Street and elsewhere - and that, as far as I knew, he never took any part in the military operations of any section of the Volunteers. So I thought at the time. I was satisfied that Inspector Love would also be helpful. Through Inspector Love's influence, all the evidence against Seán T. was held back by him. When the cases came for hearing, he invariably replied, "In this case, the evidence is not yet complete. A further remand will be necessary". It was delayed so long that it ended with Seán's deportation to England without a regular trial.

Under Monday, the 15th May, 1916, I have also entered the following in my diary:-

"Lord Basil Blackwood, Aide de Camp
to the Lord Lieutenant, wrote to the

Archbishop asking him to call on Asquith tomorrow 16th May, 1916 as Asquith was anxious to have an interview with him. The Archbishop replied he was still an invalid and was sorry he could not call to the Vice-Regal."

On May 16th, 1916, I have recorded that, at the office of E. Collins, I outlined with a Mr. Carrick an affidavit for Seán T. O'Kelly's case, on the lines I have indicated, and made it before a Mr. Furlong in the afternoon.

I have a record of an interview with Father Aloysius and Father Augustine, O.F.M. Cap., at Church Street on Tuesday, May 16th. It was in reference to the North King Street murders and on Wednesday, May 17th, 1916, I recorded visits with Father Aloysius to friends of the victims.

Under May 17th, 1916, there is an allusion in my diary to Lorcan Sherlock and Fred Allan. Fred Allan was in the I.R.B. At one time he was quite prominent in it. Later he became a typical Corporation official. I saw him twice that day for one reason or another. I cannot recollect what it was about. I have recorded that I saw Sherlock first, and went with Sherlock to Allan at 12.30 p.m., saw Father Aloysius and went back to Allan at 1.45 p.m. It may possibly have been in connection with Seán T. O'Kelly's courtmartial. I again met Mr. J. Clarke early that day and heard all his news.

I talk with Massingham of the 'Nation' on the Irish situation:

I have recorded in my diary that on Thursday, May

18th, 1916, I met Massingham, the editor of "The Nation", by appointment at the Hibernian Hotel and had a long and frank talk with him on the causes and the effects of the insurrection, on Carson, the Government and on the decay of the Irish Party, and gave him full particulars of the North King Street murders, which I had learned from the Capuchins. (Massingham had an article on the Irish situation in the "Nation" of this same week, May 20th. It should be examined.)

On the 19th May, 1916, Birrell gave his evidence at the Insurrection Inquiry. The report of the Inquiry makes an interesting series of documents. It is among the papers which I am presenting to the Bureau.

Court martial of John McNeill - My Evidence:

On Sunday, May 21st, 1916, I had another interview with Mr. Byrne of Gerald Byrne and Son at 20 Waterloo Road. I met there James McNeill and stated the evidence I would give on behalf of John McNeill.

The court martial of John McNeill opened on the morning of Monday, May 22nd, 1916, in the Gymnasium of Richmond Barracks. I arrived there at 9.20 a.m., met John McNeill and had a long conversation with him. He was in good spirits, though naturally a little nervy as a result of his experiences in Arbour Hill. Alderman McWalter, then in the Army service, in whose charge he was, told me he had been in a very bad state of nerves on yesterday but that he was brought to the King George V. Hospital (St. Bricin's Hospital now) for the night where he had a bed. Alderman McWalter also told me that a prisoner under court martial should not be tried unless a medical certificate were forthcoming, stating that the prisoner was fit, and he (Alderman McWalter), as the responsible officer, could not grant such a certificate

if called upon. I was to make this known in case John McNeill would break down. In that case, counsel were to demand the certificate.

The proceedings started at ten o'clock when the judges were summoned into the Gymnasium, followed immediately by the witnesses. There were about ten or eleven military judges. They sat at a long table at the side opposite the entrance and windows. Facing them to the right of the entrance, with their backs to the window were John McNeill with his counsel on his left and the military prosecutor, Lieutenant J.E. Wylie (now Judge Wylie); with his solicitor on his right. Three shorthand writers sat at a small table between judges and accused. They included one R.I.C. and one 'G' Division detective. (Folan was one of the shorthand writers.)

A senior officer read the papers constituting the court and called the roll. One officer had sent in a medical certificate notifying inability to act, and one of the waiting military officers (judges designate) took his place. The same senior officer then administered the oath, first to the presiding officer separately, and then to the remainder of the judges as a body. It was either at this point or immediately before that John McNeill was asked whether he had any objection to the court. He answered "No". The shorthand writers were also sworn when John McNeill, in answer to a query, said that he had no objection to them.

At this point, the witnesses had to leave the Gymnasium and Wylie commenced the prosecution in a speech of an hour. The speech was a charge of indictment to sedition and was based on articles in the "Irish Volunteer" and on speeches at Volunteer meetings. The witnesses walked up and down immediately outside the Gymnasium and

had a full view of the proceedings but could hear little. The Crown witnesses were R.I.C. men, including a Gaelic-speaking note-taker named Folan.

I sat on a bench against the Gymnasium wall beside one of the windows, really in an attempt to hear what I could of the proceedings inside. After a short while, this Gaelic-speaking note-taker, who was awaiting a call to give evidence, came and sat down beside me. I saw from his opening conversation that he was feeling a little uneasy. He told me who he was and that often he was sent to report speeches at Volunteer meetings because he was an Irish speaker. He was now being summoned to testify to certain statements of John McNeill - that these statements were being represented as seditious and that, taken by themselves, they were damaging, but that he could testify that on other occasions John McNeill's speeches were in no sense pro-German but he would have no opportunity of bringing this out in his evidence, yet if he were asked by the defending counsel, he would be able to testify in a much more favourable way that might help the accused. I told him that, if he were not called into the court before lunch, I would make sure of so informing the counsel for the defence. I did so inform Arthur Cleary, one of the defence counsel, but nothing came of it. As a result of some passage at arms arising out of Folan's translation of speeches, the defence feared to rely on his offer.

The court adjourned for lunch from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. Mrs. McNeill arrived at one o'clock and was allowed to remain with John during the hour of lunch.

Some time after lunch, there was an adjournment for twenty minutes to decide whether certain evidence should be admitted (perhaps concerning the Alderman Tom Kelly

document). While this was under discussion, John McNeill and his counsel had to retire. By 4.15 p.m. all the witnesses for the prosecution had been heard and the court was adjourned until the following day.

Next day, Tuesday, May 23rd, 1916, the case for the defence was opened. The opening witnesses were Creed-Meredith, Captain Tom Kettle, M.P., and Colonel Moore, who gave evidence on the formation and history of the Volunteer movement. George Moonan gave evidence on a note of Pearse acknowledging on Easter Sunday the receipt of John McNeill's countermanding orders, saying he did his best to have them obeyed and that he had added his own (Pearse's) name without which the leading men in the country would not have acted. This was the first definite evidence outsiders had of the existence of an inner I.R.B. circle independent of John McNeill. Even the well-informed and high officers among the Volunteers never suspected that the arrangements had gone so far that no orders of John McNeill were to be obeyed unless countersigned by Pearse.

I was the next witness and it was my part to show that John McNeill had sent out these countermanding orders, that they were obeyed, and to narrate the visits of James McNeill on Easter Sunday. I had sent to Arthur Cleary, John McNeill's junior counsel, a statement of my evidence and on this I was to be examined. In this statement I showed that John McNeill's actions and speeches were no more unconstitutional than Carson's. This I was asked to leave out as Chambers, the senior counsel, advised that it would prejudice some of the judges. (Chambers was an out-and-out Unionist and had himself delivered notoriously "rebellious" anti-Home Rule speeches. It was for this reason he was selected

as counsel for the defence.) I much regretted I had to scrap my choice selection of extracts from speeches of Carson and other Unionist M.P's. But it was specially arranged that I was to get in as much as I could of the famous Alderman T. Kelly document, though I was warned that it would be objected to.

Accordingly, I was sworn on a Douai version which I had in my pocket, after ostentatiously putting aside the Protestant version that was handed to me. I was asked who I was, etc., and then stated I did not believe that John McNeill was a revolutionary or that he had any communication with Germany or with the I.R.B., or with any other secret societies, that he was opposed to insurrection other than in the event of the disarmament of the Volunteers. When Arthur Cleary began to examine me on the "Alderman T. Kelly" document, objection, as counsel anticipated, was at once raised and all examination on the document disallowed on the ground that the document was officially condemned as bogus and that its genuineness must be proved by the prisoner. I was then taken on to Good Friday, to James McNeill's visit. But here again, Wylie objected on the grounds that James McNeill had already described what had taken place between us. I was next examined on the Easter Sunday visit of Miss McNeill. I mentioned the "Sunday Independent" notice and described my visits to the mobilisation centres conveying the countermanding order brought to Archbishop's house by Miss McNeill. I furthermore testified of my knowledge of the distressed state of mind of John McNeill at the prospect of bloodshed.

Wylie then cross-examined me and fastened on my statement that John McNeill was against insurrection, that he was only opposed to disarmament and that he was

distressed at the prospect of bloodshed. He rang all the changes on these points, quoting fiery statements of John McNeill, and challenging me whether I thought that this was mere resistance to disarmament or distress of mind at the prospect of bloodshed.

I deprecated the statements but said it was the ordinary platform oratory employed since 1910, that it was only a strong way of plainly intimating to the authorities that disarmament meant bloodshed, that these statements of John McNeill were only his answers to speeches made on the opposite side, equally violent in tone. I repeated I knew personally that John McNeill was distressed since the discovery of the famous document of threatened disarmament, and went into its history as far as I knew, and declared that John McNeill was seeking in every direction for an informal guarantee to be given to a person of responsibility that no disarmament was intended. In this way, I thought I had now obtained the opening we were looking for. As I spoke at some length on these points, Wylie and the Judge-Advocate grew plainly uneasy, so that, in the end, the latter said to Mr. Chambers - very nicely I must admit - "Perhaps, Mr. Chambers, you would advise your witness not to make speeches and to answer the question direct". Chambers shrugged his shoulders and muttered something about my being in Mr. Cleary's hands. Wylie concluded by asking whether the letter written on Good Friday (sic) was addressed to several people (sic). (That must refer to Eoin McNeill's letter, which was not written on the Friday. It may be an error - "Good Friday" instead of "Saturday". I wrote that in my diary the next day. Possibly what I meant was this: Wylie lastly asked me (1) was the letter written on Good Friday; and (2) was it sent to several people. I am

not now clear as to the meaning of my diary version of Wylie's question.)

The Judge-Advocate then took me in hands and wanted to know why I considered Miss McNeill's paper as grave as I said. Dragging in once more the famous document, I replied that it and the notice in that morning's "Sunday Independent" and the news of the attempt to land arms in Kerry all indicated a very serious and critical situation and, going perhaps unduly beyond my proper limits, I said that I had formed the opinion that it was this same news caused John McNeill to suspect for the first time the true nature of the conspiracy and thereupon courageously stop the whole Easter mobilisation or parades to avoid all danger of bloodshed. (Having read Desmond Ryan's book, "The Rising", I see that there was another aspect, that is, that John McNeill may have called it off for Easter Sunday but that, when matters were readjusted, he would have re-arranged it. That never occurred to me until I read that book.) The Judge-Advocate then put a few questions as to my part in circulating McNeill's letters and why I had not told the military authorities. I replied that I had told Dr. Cox, a privy-councillor, and that my only object was to help to prevent bloodshed. With that, my evidence concluded. (The courtmartial ended the following forenoon, May 24th, 1916. His life sentence was only published on Tuesday, May 30th, 1916.)

Archbishop agrees to act as Chairman of Irish
Distress Fund:

It was on Tuesday, May 23rd, 1916 - same day as the John McNeill courtmartial - that Archbishop Walsh telegraphed a reply to the U.S.A. agreeing to act as Chairman of the Executive Committee of Cardinal Farley's Irish Distress Fund (later known as the National Aid Fund).

In view of the widespread hysteria among many classes in England and Ireland and their conceptions of the obligation of Irish bishops to denounce murders, sedition and rebellion, it was significant to note that the only letters written by Archbishop Walsh during all this period were (1) that of 24th/25th April, 1916, warning the people of the city not to frequent the streets and (2), a second letter of the 24th May, 1916, instructing, in view of prevailing uncertainty, that public Masses be held according to new time, and (3), a third letter on the 28th May, 1916, regarding the Cathedral site. (I mention this, as the negative side of the Archbishop's attitude is important in judging his attitude. There were sweeping and unending denunciations in Anglican circles and, needless to say, among our scandalised Irish Unionists, West-British, Catholic or Protestant. In nationalist circles there was criticism of Cardinal Logue's telegram to the Pope. It was surely right for him to telegraph, giving this information. People read into it something that was not justifiable in view of his position. First of all, it was the only way he had of informing the Pope that the insurrection was over, and we must remember that he did not know at the time of Count Plunkett's audience with the Pope. The telegram in itself was above criticism. There was nothing really wrong in it. It was despatched at a time when nine-tenths of Ireland were opposed to the Rising and, for many months at any rate, did not declare adhesion to it. The silence of Archbishop Walsh, I think, is a fact of enormous importance that ought to be noticed.)

I have the following recorded in my diary for Thursday, May 25th, 1916:-

"During a debate in the House of Commons to-day, Asquith announced that Lloyd George was devoting his attention to a solution of the Home Rule question, but that neither he nor anyone else sought to put the Home Rule Act in operation by coercive methods against any section!"

This was of importance in changing public opinion later on.

Irish Rebellion shows the Continent of Europe that Ireland is not merely a Province of England - Archbishop explains the Causes to the Members of Inquiry:

For Friday, May 26th, 1916, I have recorded the following:-

"Irish ecclesiastics returning from Rome described the effects of the news of the Irish Rising. It produced a profound impression there. For the first time in many quarters, the difference of the two countries was realised and in a way no other method could effect."

Until then nothing could convince most continentals but that Ireland was a kind of province of England. The Rising showed the difference. It could not be explained away.

For Saturday, May 27th, 1916, I have recorded the following in my diary:-

"Mr. Justice Shermann and Sir Mackenzie Chalmers, members of the Rebellion Inquiry Committee, called to-day on the Archbishop. In reply to their queries as to what he considered the cause of the rebellion, the Archbishop ascribed the chief causes of the Rising to the breakdown of the constitutional movement. He mentioned various defects of the Home Rule Bill and its plain

misrepresentation by the Irish Party. He particularly criticised the clause on 'concurrent legislation'. [Clause 31 or 41: Despite any Act the Irish Parliament might pass, the English Parliament could pass an Act wiping it out.] While no intelligent nationalist could be misled as to the meaning and effect of the clause, yet Irish members of Parliament misrepresented the Bill as 'the greatest charter of liberty'. They represented it as equal to the South African, Canadian or Australian constitution, and praised it as a better constitution than that of Grattan. Chalmers could not believe that such a clause was in the Act - that it was bound to break down. They also asked questions on the attitude of the clergy on the famous Alderman Tom Kelly document and on the National Board of Education. The Archbishop told them he did not like to publish his views on Home Rule for fear it might be said that it could destroy any chance of the settlement that was at present being attempted. The commissioners agreed that this would be so."

Dr. Dwyer's Famous Letter to General Maxwell:

"It was on to-day that Dr. O'Dwyer's famous letter to General Maxwell appeared in the 'Cork Examiner' or 'Cork Constitution'."

[It was published in the Dublin 'Evening Mail' on the 30th May, arousing intense interest. In a short time, all copies were sold out.]

Lloyd George's Infamous Letter to Carson:

It is well to remember that it was on May 29th that Lloyd George wrote his infamous letter to Carson -

"We must make it clear that, at the end of the provisional period, Ulster does not, whether she wills it or not, merge in the rest of Ireland."

with its postscript:-

"Will you show it to Craig?"

We know from Miss Digby's Life of Horace Plunkett that Plunkett knew immediately of this letter, viz., in June. The simple Irish Party leaders, we are asked to believe, were quite unaware of this assurance.

On June 6th, 1916, the Archbishop left Dublin for County Wicklow where he remained, recuperating, until September 6th, 1916. I accompanied him and only came to Dublin every third week. For that reason there are few political entries in my diary during that period.

Archbishop Appoints Deputy-Chairman of National Aid Fund - Amalgamation of two Funds:

I have noted in my diary that the Archbishop, who had been elected Chairman of the Executive Committee for the National Aid Fund, had a conference with Father Bowden, Administrator in Marlborough Street, on the matter. As the Archbishop could not carry out the duties of Chairman of this Fund, he appointed Father Bowden as his representative. At first, the monies came from America directly to the Archbishop but Father Bowden acted as Chairman of the Committee.

At that time, there were three Funds and three Committees. One was the Lord Mayor's Fund. A second was one associated with Mrs. Clarke, but I knew nothing of its administration or financial position beyond the fact that it derived its funds chiefly or exclusively from Clan na Gael circles in U.S.A. The third was the National Aid Fund. Every effort was being made to turn the National Aid fund into the genuine channel of assistance for the prisoners' and Volunteers' dependants, for those who suffered for their nationalist opinions.

It was not at all certain that the right people were being assisted by the Lord Mayor's committee which had the name of being cool, if not positively unsympathetic to the Volunteers. Count McCormack had sent it a very substantial subscription. It certainly had no seditious associations. On the other hand, many would keep aloof from Mrs. Clarke's committee, and many even of her own sympathisers feared that only the undoubted "tried and true" were likely to be assisted. If her financial resources were modest, it was certain to be so. I think the Lord Mayor's fund faded out quickly. It did not last a month. Happily, a unified organisation was achieved under the name of The Irish National Aid and Volunteers' Dependants Association, largely through the influence and efforts of two delegates from U.S.A. Relief Fund, Mr. John Gill and Mr. John Archdeacon Murphy. I saw these two men on July 27th and on the next day the Archbishop motored up specially from Annamoe, had a conference with Mr. John Archdeacon Murphy lasting over an hour, and returned immediately afterwards to Annamoe. I had several talks with J. Archdeacon Murphy and was present at a reception given to him on the 17th August by the two bodies he had helped to unite. They presented him with a small gift and an album containing the names of the two committees and other friends. He left Dublin for Liverpool on 18th August to return to the U.S.A.

At this point in my diary, as the pages were almost blank I have inserted "A History of the Irish Rising". It is composed of two elements; first, a list of the speeches and writings of Pearse during the years preceding the Rising and published, though known in regard to some of the items, it must be said, only to

limited circles; second, an account as narrated to me by Seán T. O'Kelly at Christmas, 1916, after his release from gaol.

Like most of the ordinary people interested in the separatist movement, my knowledge of the development of the revolutionary movement was almost entirely derived from the following publications:-

- (1) Pearse's Address at Bodenstown, 22/6/1913, his Addresses in U.S.A. at Brooklyn, 2/9/1914, and New York, 9/3/1914, both reprinted early in 1915 from the "Gaelic-American" to form No. 1 in the Bodenstown Series;
- (2) "The Coming Revolution" written in November, 1913; and
- (3) The articles he wrote from June, 1913, to January, 1914, in "Irish Freedom", "with the deliberate intention", he avowed in June, 1915, "of goading those who shared my political views to commit themselves definitely to an armed movement". These articles of "Irish Freedom" were gathered in June, 1915, into No.2 of the Bodenstown Series under the title "From A Hermitage". "The Murder Machine", first published in the "Irish Review" for February, 1913, was re-published as No.3 of the Bodenstown Series, January, 1916;
- (4) Above all, O'Donovan Rossa's Funeral Oration; and
- (5) The articles forming Nos. 10, 11, 12 and 13 of "Tracts For The Times" from Christmas 1915 to 31st March, 1916, with the significant

conclusion of the Preface to Tract No. 13, 'The Sovereign People', "I have no more to say".

It is noteworthy that, with the exception of "The Coming Revolution" and the Funeral Oration, these addresses, articles and tracts received scant general notice when published, outside limited circles of the cities and bigger towns.

All these articles are also to be found in the "Collected Works of Padraic H. Pearse" (Maunsell & Roberts, 1922).

History of the Rising as narrated by
Seán T. O'Kelly:

"The project of an armed rising was conceived by the signatories of the Republican Proclamation and chiefly by Pearse, Tom Clarke, Seán McDermott and Connolly. Pearse had it early in his mind and spoke of it openly, especially in America, long before the war -

'Ireland will pursue England like a sleuth-hound and will be in for the quarry.'

He frequently preached that blood must be shed to save Ireland. Many of their friends were opposed to it and frequently remonstrated and pointed out the hopelessness of such a fight. Arthur Griffith, who was not in the Volunteer movement [sic] - in fact, was somewhat against the movement - often spoke against a rising and obtained a distinct promise from Clarke and McDermott that they would not move to take practical steps in that direction without telling him and talking it over. They never told him and, like others, he only got an inkling on Holy Saturday. The O'Rahilly was against a rising. So was Bulmer Hobson.

At all events, at an early stage, an inner knot was formed by the signatories without the knowledge of McNeill and the other Volunteer leaders. They arranged everything for a rising when the time was ripe. They regarded John McNeill as a useful and necessary figurehead and used him as a tool - an unconscious tool. McNeill's idea was to keep the Volunteers intact as a great political force after the war.

In the early stages of the war, the American-Irish and the Germans came to an understanding. Kuno Meyer said that the German plan was to capture Calais, that everything was ready for a great invasion of England under big guns at Calais and that the Irish rising should take place after the invasion of England at a time which would be signified to the Irish by code signal dropped from Zeppelins or aeroplanes. The code was actually brought over to Ireland.

On the failure of the second attempt at Calais, that Irish programme was abandoned.

Meanwhile, the signatories were working up their influence among the Volunteers throughout the country. They elaborated their plans and kept them to themselves. It is said that these plans were very well designed, involving a general rising all over the country and bringing forces to Dublin. Artillery and stores were to be seized and Dublin Castle taken. A secret understanding was arrived at between Pearse and the country Commandants, by which only his own orders were to be followed, or John McNeill's provided they were countersigned by Pearse."

[The remainder of this narrative which follows would seem to be my own reflections at the end of 1916.]

"Early in this year, it began to be seen that John

McNeill's influence was becoming weaker and that the more revolutionary wing was in the ascendant. The wilder speakers 'caught on'. The more moderate were received coldly. By the time of the anti-conscription meeting in the Mansion House [Was this the meeting of 29th February or end of March, 1916?], this was particularly evident, and John McNeill endeavoured to keep the Volunteers with him by an unusually violent speech, in which he defied the Government forces if they attempted disarmament. A series of Sinn Féin meetings and anti-recruiting campaigns and parades grew more defiant and violently anti-British, pro-German, etc., though John McNeill lent no countenance openly to these phases. The organ of the Volunteers, the 'Irish Volunteer' [sic] [not the 'National Volunteer'], the Sinn Féin weekly, 'Nationality', edited by Griffith with Seán McDermott as manager [Irish Freedom] and a host of the mosquito press, the 'Spark', etc., still more inflamed popular opinion. The Irish Party was bitterly and properly attacked. They retaliated with all their old catch-cries of factionists, cranks, German gold, etc. Sinn Féin, however, grew in strength, especially as the danger of conscription loomed ahead and as the incurable weakness of the Irish Party on taxation and every other Irish question made it more plain that the young men could only rely on themselves and the Volunteers to make a stand against conscription. They carried the war into the enemy's country by anti-recruiting meetings, seizure of arms, the purchase of rifles [at least 120] from drunken soldiers, etc.

Events finally reached such a point that a loud cry arose from Unionists and anti-Nationalists to disarm and conscript the Volunteers. Matters rapidly reached a climax when the nature of the ciphered document put into

the possession of Mr. P. Little began to be known, first, among the heads of the Volunteers, John McNeill, etc., and people like Little, Dr. Seumus O'Kelly, Alderman Kelly and ourselves."

History of Partition:

An entry in my diary on 10th June, 1916, brings us back to the question of Partition.

In assembling, at your suggestion, into one section my various references to Partition, I would like to make it plain that it is not a full statement on Partition and that it is not an impartial statement inasmuch as my diary, to a large extent, recorded only what I regarded as illustrations of the ineptitude and insincerity of the Irish Parliamentary Party. Denis Gwynn claims that his "History of Partition" (published 1950) is concerned only with the genesis of Partition and certainly is no history of the campaign of Irish nationalists either for or against Partition. His account is largely based upon John Redmond's papers and I regard that history as, in fact, an apology for John Redmond. Being concerned chiefly with the genesis of Partition, he may claim to be excused from dealing with the Irish nationalist reaction, but the fact remains that he omits several vital phases of the history of Partition, particularly many important Irish occurrences in the years, 1915, 1916 and 1917. I shall, therefore, find it necessary to make some reference to this book in the course of my statement.

I am convinced that the Party "leaders" knew that some form of exclusion was settled on by the Liberal Cabinet as early as 1912 and, although they knew so, they kept the people in the dark. They were not only guilty

of silence, of incorrect statements and of misleading implications but they resented all criticism and any reflections on the Liberals; they followed a spineless policy, utterly abandoning the old Nationalist policy of independent opposition and, after a year or two, they abandoned even their own general reassurances on 'Ulster' made in 1912 and 1913; they thwarted and endeavoured to disrupt the Irish Volunteer movement, misjudged the political situation and the influence and skill of their opponents and, whilst regarding the Carsonite campaign as a game of bluff (which was true enough till late 1913 or early 1914), criminally failed to realise the ill effects of the campaign in England.

My entries and comments are largely excerpts from the statements of politicians. On all sides, politicians were playing an opportunist game, often a deceptive game, and, therefore, they did not set out the full facts of the case.

The whole question of partition was for a long time very vague - partition or exclusion. It was vague, firstly, as to whether it was temporary or permanent. It was vague, secondly, as regards the area affected, whether it covered four, five, six or nine counties. It was further confused with the question of separate treatment for Ulster, that is, what was called "Home Rule within Home Rule". Lastly, the proposals were sometimes private and confidential, sometimes public and official or sometimes discussed with a particular Minister with or without the consent or even the knowledge of the Cabinet. Policy shifted according to circumstances and according as the different parties believed they were winning. Denis Gwynn in the chronology at the end of his work enumerates eight different proposals put forward or

supported by Lloyd George.

The question of exclusion - exclusion of four (or five or six) counties - as it was at first called, goes back to the middle of 1912. Even then it was no new problem, for it had arisen in the debates on the earlier Home Rule Bills. It was under the surface since the Home Rule Bill was introduced in April, 1912, but as neither Irish Nationalists nor Irish Unionists wanted it, the matter was soft-pedalled by the politicians of both these parties for as long as possible and as far as was possible in Ireland. Belfast Unionists, against Home Rule in any shape or form, did not wish to confess that they were prepared to abandon the Unionists of Donegal, Cavan and Monaghan. Uneasiness on partition began to be felt in a few Ulster nationalist circles and gradually found expression in a minor key during 1912. More open accusations of weakness on the part of the Liberal Government slowly turned in many quarters into criticism of the Irish Party's attitude towards the Liberals. But the Party leaders and their organ, "The Freeman's Journal", scouted the possibility of partition as a question not worthy of discussion. Long after 'Ulster Day', long after the establishment of a Provisional Government in Ulster, long after Dublin formed the Irish Volunteers, Joe Devlin at Longford declared:-

"I am more convinced now than ever that from beginning to end the Carsonite campaign has been nothing else but a game of bluff."
(8th February, 1914)

Redmond was of the same opinion. William O'Brien, M.P., quoted Devlin as declaring:

"Let the soldiers and the police make a ring and we will wipe the streets of Belfast with these bluffers before twenty-four hours."

But some at least of the victims who were being prepared for the slaughter were not to be reassured. They saw that Orange and religious bigotry were being openly fanned into flame. On 1st February (31st January?) 1912 the Presbyterian body in Belfast condemned Home Rule and were followed by the Methodists on March 14th. A grandiose Anti-Home Rule demonstration at Balmoral, Belfast, on 9th April, 1912, two days before the introduction of the Home Rule Bill, was addressed by Bonar Law, Carson and the great Ulster Unionist magnates and their English political allies. After the Protestant Primate had opened the meeting with a noteworthy prayer, a Protestant hymn or hymns were sung. One week later, the Protestant Synod held in Dublin, presided over by the same Primate, having listened to inflammatory addresses by the Bishop of Down and the Bishop of Ossory (later Archbishop of Dublin), repeated its anathemas of 1886 and 1893. A still more grandiose meeting was staged on 27th July, 1912, at Blenheim at which the elite of the British aristocracy (three dukes, six marquises, fourteen earls, scores of lesser peers and military bigbodies) were addressed by Bonar Law as head of the Conservative Party, by Carson and 'Galloper' Smith (the future Lord Chancellor and Earl of Birkenhead). A series of meetings in preparation for 'Ulster Day' were held from 18th September at Enniskillen, Coleraine, Derry (20th September) etc., concluding with fiery Protestant Unionist sermons in all Ulster churches and meeting houses on September 22nd, the Sunday before 'Ulster Day'. It was no cause of scandal in those days for the Church to interfere in politics. Saturday, 28th September, 1912 was 'Ulster Day' and formed the climax when Carson's Covenant was signed with much of the melodramatic staging we later on associated with Hitler and the Nazis.

As the Ulster demonstrations against Home Rule intensified, the specially provincial motif was more and more emphasised. 'Ulster' would set up its own government; it would defy a Dublin 'Parliament', etc. Every Orange speech implied separation from the rest of Ireland if the Home Rule Bill passed.

The sum-total of the counter campaign of the Irish Parliamentary Party was paltry and unenduring. A monster meeting was held in O'Connell Street (31st March, 1912) at which Pearse, to everybody's surprise, appeared on one of the Parliamentary Party's brakes supporting Home Rule; but he warned all that "if we are cheated once more, there will be red war in Ireland". None heeded him or his warning.

Apart from the torchlight procession in the following July, this was, if I am not mistaken, the last Home Rule demonstration ever held by the leaders of the Irish Parliamentary Party in the streets or open spaces of Dublin. Though they still held mesmerised the majority of the people for a few more years and held a few meetings in the provinces, at least, behind closed doors with admission by ticket, they feared more and more the danger of public heckling by the steadily increasing group of critics - Dominion Home Rulers as much as Sinn Féiners. These could be safely vilified in letters to the Dublin, Belfast and Cork Press which they commanded and in Committee Room speeches. Critics of the Party were impudently and unmercifully assailed as "cranks and factionists", as "traitors", as "stabbers in the back" as "deliberate liars" solely inspired by the motive of wrecking the Party and the Parliamentary movement. Nobody was to criticise any measure of the Liberal Government much less express any doubt of its sincere ^{friendship} /

for Ireland. I shall allude to examples of this later on.

One typical example of this attitude occurred at this time when on September 10th, 1912, the "Freeman's Journal" published a letter of John Dillon fulminating against those who were asking the Irish M.P's. to bring pressure to bear on the Liberal Government to modify their restrictions respecting Foot and Mouth disease in cattle. To threaten the Government, John Dillon declared, would be to kill not only the present Home Rule Bill but the Parliamentary movement for Home Rule for many years to come. "Had it not been for the outrageous character of some of the language used in Ireland during the past three weeks", he continued, "considerable modification of the restrictions might have already been secured". The "Irish Independent" of 28th September (1912) reproduced an article of T.P. O'Connor in "Reynold's Newspaper", stating in reference to these Foot and Mouth restrictions that, "no pressure has been brought to bear on Mr. Runciman (the Minister concerned) and none will be brought to bear on him". If Irish cattle dealers were to be muzzled on petty cattle grievances, what chance had critics of daring to raise such big issues as Partition? The days of the professed policy of "Independent" oppositions were past and gone. A month after the O'Connell Street meeting Churchill in an appeasing speech in the Commons on 30th April was able to assure the Tories, "Never had so little been asked and never before had so many people asked for it". A week previous to Churchill's declaration Redmond had laid it down at the National Convention in the Mansion House that "the leaders must have the power of deciding for themselves on every question of policy and of tactics".

Partition had necessarily to be spoken of in debates in the House of Commons - Devlin had to do so on 13th June, 1912 - but the question was muted or minimised in Ireland.

Asquith paid a seemingly meaningless visit to Dublin and was received with great enthusiasm by a torchlight procession on the evening of 18th July, 1912, addressing with Birrell a great meeting in the Theatre Royal on the 19th, but he said little despite all the impressive display.

A most sinister indication of the approaching danger of partition was given by Winston Churchill during his bye-election campaign in Dundee. On 11th September, 1912, he asked the Unionists to declare their real position with regard to the exclusion of Ulster, and on the 12th he advocated for the British Isles a kind of heptarchy, advocating the establishment in these countries of several legislative bodies to deal with the local affairs of the forty-five millions of its people. These would include, for example, a legislature for Lancashire and another for Yorkshire. Both speeches were obviously made in view of the Ulster Anti-Home Rule campaign and pointed undoubtedly to some kind of exclusion of Ulster from a Dublin parliament. Intelligent people at once asked, "Is this a 'ballon d'essai' inspired by the Liberal Cabinet?" Yet the leaders of the Irish Party made no reply to it and the "Freeman's Journal" no comment.

This speech should have roused misgivings and questions in Ireland. It failed to do so, outside the very limited circle of Sinn Féin. No! Everything was safe in the hands of the "trusted leaders" of the Irish

Party. If they were satisfied, patriotic nationalists should be satisfied.

Note the date of that Dundee speech (11th, 12th September) and note the surprising statement I shall make here. Already on that date the leaders knew that the Liberal Government had decided to exclude Ulster counties! Yet for over twelve months they did not allow the country to become aware of the Government's intention. The Archbishop of Dublin was not aware of it, though he had the gravest misgivings. But what I want you to note is that in the second half of August, 1912, on the day Lloyd George left Marienbad, he informed T.P. O'Connor, M.P., one of the Party leaders, that the Government had decided to exclude Ulster counties. So T.P. informed Dr. Cox that same day when the doctor found him looking the picture of despair as he sat on one of the garden seats at the Marienbad wells. The Archbishop had been sent there for medical treatment by his doctors, and Dr. Cox had kindly arranged that his own holiday would coincide. When we arrived, we learned from Dr. Cox that Lloyd George and T.P. O'Connor were staying at the one hotel and met daily. But Lloyd George left earlier than T.P., who was travelling as a paid guest of a Sir J. Robinson. While Dr. Cox told us of Lloyd George's departure and that T.P. was remaining, he did not tell us the information he had received from T.P. of Lloyd George's disclosure - presumably he was warned not to do so. It was only two or three years later, when the Liberal Government's attitude on Ulster had become public and was being assailed in Ireland, that he told us of the Marienbad incident, and I recalled that I had noticed that Dr. Cox himself was noticeably pre-occupied on that day and how I wondered what could be the cause of it. He did not meet Lloyd George but saw T.P.

daily at the waters. The Archbishop used to go to the wells at an hour he knew he would not meet any of these people.

I mention this Lloyd George-T.P. O'Connor conversation to show the deception practised by the Irish Party "leaders" in regard to the exclusion of Ulster. They feared the reaction such a revelation would have in Ireland against their Liberal allies and against themselves for their spineless tactics in dealing with them. I am prepared, however, to believe that they thought they were themselves capable of defeating the Carsonite campaign!

Churchill's significant speech at Dundee was followed by a scarcely less significant speech by the Chief Secretary, Birrell, to his constituents of Bristol on October 17th or 18th (1912). In it Birrell seemed to angle for a formal statement from Ulster Unionists on their exclusion from the Home Rule Act. It conveyed the impression that the Cabinet desired a compromise with the Unionists on the basis of Ulster's exclusion. These speeches of Churchill and Birrell should have aroused alarm and comment in Irish nationalist circles. They did neither one nor the other.

Before tracing the development of Partition, the acceptance of the Home Rule Bill by a National Convention of the United Irish League must be noted. The Home Rule Bill having been introduced on 11th April, 1912, and the first reading carried by a majority of ninety-four, it was necessary to obtain a popular endorsement. This was obtained at a National Convention held in the Mansion House, Dublin, on 23rd April, 1912. The meeting was an illustration on the one hand of the political fatuity of the people and, on

the other hand, of the decay and chicanery of the Party organisation. The so-called "leaders" of the Party - a wholly new title invented by themselves - Redmond, Dillon, Devlin, T.P. O'Connor - with the help of a few of their closer friends, had secured complete control of the machine through the grip their nominees held on the executive of the United Irish League (U.I.L.), which was the official Party organisation, and, in the case of Devlin, through the Ancient Order of Hibernians (Board of Erin) (A.O.H.). This Ancient Order of Hibernians' Society should be distinguished from the Ancient Order of Hibernians in the U.S.A., which was the true lineal descendant of the original body of that name. The two Orders had no connection with one another and at this time held opposite positions regarding Irish politics. The powerful American Ancient Order of Hibernians was closely associated with the American Clan-na-Gael, which was anti-Parliamentarian and supported the Irish Republican Brotherhood.

The United Irish League and Ancient Order of Hibernians (Board of Erin) formed the more active substantial proportion of the electors at the Constituencies' Conventions that chose the members of Parliament. Where necessary, bogus branches of one or other or both of these organisations would be established before a Parliamentary Election Convention. Sometimes the membership of the two branches would be the same, securing double representation and helping to exclude possible opponents. These bogus branches ceased to function after the election. Only dependable pliant tools were selected as M.P's., though in a few cases the selections of the United Irish League and the Ancient Order of Hibernians were repudiated through the influence of the clergy and representatives of the

elected local councils. The "Freeman's Journal" was completely captured in March, 1912, when the editor, Mr. Thomas Sexton, who, it was known, intended to criticise the Home Rule Bill, was edged out and the Party nominees appointed directors. With the exception of the "Irish Independent", the Party had complete control of the daily Press in Dublin, Belfast and Cork and held most of the Provincial Press for many years. It was this grip on the press that enabled them to deceive the country, to conceal the true situation and hold their power. It took the creation of an army in Ulster, an insurrection in Dublin and the First World War to overthrow them.

The National Convention of the 23rd April, 1912, mustered and staged with incomparable cleverness, accepted the Home Rule Bill with enthusiasm. I was present at it. John Redmond presided. An overflow meeting of a thousand delegates was held in the lawns outside the Mansion House. The old confidence trick was played as successfully as if it were the first time. Reliable figureheads and official tools played their allotted parts. Canon Arthur Ryan of Tipperary, amid applause, told the delegates that, if there was anyone present with an amendment in his pocket, he advised him "to have loyalty and commonsense enough to keep it there". A fine touch was the seconding of Canon Ryan's resolution by the Protestant Rector of Kenmare. The Lord Mayor of Cork and Lorcan Sherlock, Lord Mayor of Dublin and "Boss" of the Dublin Corporation, like good henchmen, dutifully followed up. Tom Kettle, representing a more intelligent group, felt constrained to "submit his proposition in a private memorandum". Canon Murphy of Macroom said they were perfectly right in leaving the details in the hands of those men who had loyally served them and "had grown old in the service

that pledge and will do everything in my power to discountenance any idea that we intend to use this Bill as a leverage to extract more out of England". He treated the demand for control of customs as "nonsense".

In accepting the Bill as a final measure of Home Rule, John Dillon was reiterating what Redmond had declared with much solemnity on behalf of himself and his colleagues on 11th April on the introduction of the Bill. Dillon described Redmond's statement as "a pledge". Nobody considered whether its provisions were worth acceptance. Enough; it was "Home Rule"!

We can now return to the Ulster difficulty. The year 1912 passed without any popular action in nationalist circles against the Ulster menace. When alluded to in Ireland on rare occasions it was with jeers. But Ulster began to form its Volunteers and to drill them.

Early in January, 1913, Carson for the first time formally proposed an amendment to the Home Rule Bill excluding all Ulster, though in doing so he virtually conceded Home Rule to the other three Provinces. The Irish Party, of course, opposed it and the proposal was rejected by the Commons by a majority of ninety-seven, but it now became known that some of the Liberal leaders were willing or anxious to compromise on the basis of separate treatment for Ulster.

The Home Rule Bill passed its third reading in the Commons on 16th January, 1913, and was immediately read formally for the first time in the House of Lords, only to be rejected by them on 30th January.

On 11th February, 1913, Chief Secretary Birrell again addressing his Bristol constituents made renewed

allusions to a compromise with Ulster that could only point to some kind of exclusion. Still no notice seems to have been taken in nationalist quarters.

On June 9th, 1913, the Home Rule Bill was re-introduced, passed the House of Commons on 5th July but was rejected once more by the Lords on July 15th.

An English Lieutenant-General, Sir George Richardson, was appointed Commander in Chief of the Ulster Volunteers. He was selected by Field Marshal Lord Roberts who, much to his own regret and to that of the Ulster leaders, found himself debarred from assuming that post himself. Richardson took up his new duties in July, 1913, and held several much-advertised parades, attended by Carson, Craig and F.E. Smith, now self-nominated "Galloper", Solicitor-General 1915, Attorney-General 1916 and Lord Chancellor of England in 1919.

The "Ulster" army and its military developments were only regarded with ridicule by the A.O.H., the Party and the Nationalist press. Redmond kept up this attitude during his summer speeches in England. Unfortunately, the British were very much concerned.

On 11th September (1913) Lord Loreburn, the former Liberal Lord Chancellor, wrote an important letter to "The Times" urging a conference of all parties. His letter betrayed alarm and indicated a wavering among Government supporters. Both Government and British public were considerably impressed. As is now known but was not known then, T.P. O'Connor wrote on 1st October to Redmond informing him that Lloyd George had sent for him on the previous day on the Prime Minister's behalf to ascertain how the Irish leaders viewed Lord Loreburn's proposed conference.

And nationalists outside A.O.H. and Belfast influences were getting more uneasy and restive. Even such a staunch champion of the Party as the Bishop of Raphoe showed there was apprehension as his letter to Redmond on 9th October betokens (Gwynn, p.63). Carson had announced the formation of an Ulster Provisional Government in Belfast on September 24th and held great meetings in Cookstown on 1st October and at Armagh on 24th October. Ulster Volunteers were parading in ever increasing numbers.

It was evidently T.P. O'Connor's letter of 1st October (1913) that compelled Redmond at last to mention seriously in Ireland the exclusion of Ulster. He declared at Limerick on 12th October:-

A unit Ireland is and must remain
We could never consent to the exclusion
of a portion of Ireland."

But he also added that "there is room for diversities of the treatment of government and of administration" (within the nation).

I refer you to Denis Gwynn's "History of Partition" (pp. 64, 65, etc.) for the reactions in England in October and November, 1913, to Loreburn's proposal for a conference and compromise, including Redmond's memorandum of his interview with Asquith (17th November), with Lloyd George (25th November) and with Chief Secretary Birrell (27th November).

Incidentally, Asquith informed Redmond that "two years ago" (which would be November, 1911) "or at least early in this matter" Mr. Lloyd George had formally proposed the exclusion of Ulster from the Home Rule Bill, but that the Cabinet unanimously rejected the

idea (Gwynn, p.68). This disclosure of Asquith does not seem to have alarmed or disturbed Mr. Redmond.

A noteworthy aspect of Redmond's summary of his interview on 25th November (1913) with Lloyd George is Redmond's remark:-

"The disquieting thing about my interview was the impression which it left upon my mind that Lloyd George thought that, in the last resort, we would agree to anything rather than face the break-up of the Government".

It was plain that Lloyd George knew his troupe.

Of all this the Irish people were kept in ignorance and treated as if they were children. Still Devlin persisted in Ireland that the Carsonite campaign was pure bluff, as doubtless it was till the end of 1913 or beginning of 1914. But in Great Britain on 1st November during the Keighly bye-election he made a covert allusion to these September-October happenings of 1913:-

"An Ireland undivided - that is the minimum of our demand. We will not allow any part of Ireland to be divorced from any other part. We would refuse Home Rule tomorrow if Ulster, or any portion of Ulster, were cut off from the rest of Ireland."

The 'bluff' was not confined to Ulster Unionists.

At last the Irish waters were stirring, and stirring strongly. On 25th November, 1913, Eoin McNeill formed the Irish Volunteers in the same Round Room of the Rotunda in which was held the Convention of Grattan's Volunteers in November, 1783. History was made that night. The error of Charlemont, if repeated,

was to be fought. Friends, foes and doubting sympathisers like myself saw the possibilities. The general story of the Volunteers is well known and well-authenticated and I shall only allude to three points:-

- (1) While its formal object was broadly national and while the secret real design of one section of its founders was the development of an armed insurrection, the instant and enthusiastic response of this large and active section of the people was due to their conviction that strong fighting action had to be taken in face of Carson's Volunteers and their English backers;
- (2) The reaction of the Irish Party and Joe Devlin's A.O.H. was also important. I refer you to The O'Rahilly's "The Secret History Of The Irish Volunteers", published 5th July, 1915, forming No. 3 of "Tracts For The Times". On page 4 O'Rahilly relates the attempts of Redmond and Devlin to thwart and capture the movement. Note O'Rahilly's statement - "I, for instance, was deputed to secure Lord Mayor Sherlock whom I found was unwilling ... It will be remembered that Mr. Sherlock, who refused our invitation to join the Committee when it was a week old became later one of Mr. Redmond's nominees on that body". Mr. Sherlock, a thick and thin Redmondite and would-be M.P., will figure again.
- (3) The third point, never to be forgotten, is that within a week of the formation of the Irish Volunteers the Government issued a Proclamation prohibiting the importation of

arms into Ireland. Even at that time many held the view expressed by The O'Rahilly that this blow at the Irish Volunteers could not have been struck without the knowledge and, presumably, the consent of Redmond. We now know from Gwynn's History (p. 71) that on 27th November, 1913, Redmond had the interview with the Chief Secretary, "on the whole, of a most satisfactory character". Doubtless the Party would have been fully satisfied with Lloyd George's explanation to Redmond on 25th November that the Proclamation was due to the recent discovery of ninety-five thousand rounds of ammunition in Belfast (Gwynn, p.70). Asquith had informed Redmond in his interview on 17th November that the Carsonites had "at least five thousand rifles - probably more" (Gwynn, p. 68). The "Northern Whig" boasted of this (4th June, 1913) and said that everybody in Belfast knew that rifles, machine guns and ammunition were being imported "regularly for more than a year and a half".

That finishes the year 1913. We come now to 1914.

Redmond's memorandum of his interview with Asquith on 2nd February, 1914, following the Prime Minister's secret negotiations with Bonar Law and Carson is to be found in Gwynn (pp. 78-81). "A crisis", writes Gwynn, "had arisen of so secret a character that Redmond could not discuss it with anyone but his own inner cabinet." These secret discussions were scarcely the sign of an unusual crisis. Various proposals and counter-proposals followed (id. 82-101). These

included a report from Devlin written about 20th February, 1914, to the British Cabinet in which Devlin suggested giving Ulster the option of withdrawing from the Irish Parliament after ten years - a proposal which had been made by Sir Horace Plunkett. This solution was rejected in favour of one of Lloyd George's.

Opening the debate on the Home Rule Bill on 9th March, 1914, the Government embodied Lloyd George's latest solution that any Ulster county could vote itself out for six years. To this Redmond agreed. "If these proposals of the Government", he said, "be frankly accepted as a basis of agreement and peace, then we on our side are prepared to accept them in the same spirit."

Only a few days before (5th, 6th March) Devlin had secured the acquiescence of the Six-County Bishops and of the leading Nationalists of the North to a three years exclusion. Under pressure from Birrell, Redmond had agreed (6th, 7th March) to an extension of exclusion to five years. But now, 7th March, Asquith made a most ruinous alteration by insisting that a (second) General Election "must (not only may) intervene before the expiration of the term". "A term of five years would (or might) expire in June, 1920, i.e., before the General Election in the United Kingdom". (Gwynn p. 100). Redmond as usual meekly surrendered and so any Ulster county could exclude itself for an absolute certainty of six years and with a moral certainty that a General Election would oust the Liberals and return a Tory Government which would make its exclusion permanent.

Dillon acknowledged in Westminster this calamitous probability, or rather certainty, during the subsequent debate (19th March, 1913):-

"We recognise", he said, "and accept, though not very happily, that if Ulster - the four counties and the city of Belfast - vote themselves out of the Bill, it will be open to this Parliament if the Tory Party should come into power - not an unlikely contingency in the next six years - by a one clause Bill to make it perpetual ... That is the concession we have made ... and we did it with our eyes open."

In England T.P. O'Connor correctly described the Government scheme as "practical perpetual mutilation" (in Reynolds Newspaper, 6th May, 1914).

But the Party spoke a different language to their dupes in Ireland. In its leading article of 11th March the Party organ minimised the Partition of Ulster and denounced the "Independent" for misrepresenting the proposal. My diary notes that the "Freeman's" article itself misrepresents the Bill's provisions on "reserved" services. The "Independent's" reply on the following day was a telling one while the "Freeman's" leader-writer turned aside to talk of "Irish Industries" and "The Town Planning Association".

Even a year later Dillon was coolly to tell the people of Ireland, "These proposals never contemplated or made possible the permanent division of Ireland" (24th July, 1915).

Devlin's utterances in Ireland and those of his Belfast organ, "The Irish News", were as outright misrepresentations as Dillon's. I shall deal with one of the worst of them (that of 18th June, 1916) later on.

Till its long-delayed and utter extinction the Party continued to throw dust in the eyes of their infatuated worshippers. Listening to their paeans on the sagacity and patriotism of their idols, I often faced them in conversation with this double warning of Asquith that two General Elections must take place before July, 1921, and that at the end of the six years all depended on what the Imperial Parliament would then determine regarding Ulster. To this challenge these hypnotised partisans, however, intelligent, remained dumb or muttered their unshakable trust in the Party. The citation of Asquith's subsequent declaration of 15th September, 1914, was met with the gesture of ostriches.

There was bitter disappointment among Northern nationalists on the disclosure of the Government's scheme of March, 1914, coming as it did only a few days after Devlin's soothing palavers with the Six-County Bishops and Ulster nationalist magnates. On the other side, Bonar Law and Carson repudiated the "six year" or any other time limit proposal. It should be remembered that this Government scheme of March, 1914, did not propose a separate Belfast Parliament. The excluded counties were to remain under Westminster administration.

From March, 1914, onwards Partition swamped the political field. First and foremost came the bewildering so-called "Curragh Mutiny" (20th March), then the landing of arms at Larne (24th April) and the formal transformation of the Ulster Unionist Council into an Ulster Provisional Government (10th-12th July), then the introduction of the Home Rule Amending Act in June permitting exclusion for six years by county option - changed by the Lords into a demand for the permanent exclusion of the entire province of Ulster.

In England and abroad immediate civil war was fully expected. Field Marshal Lord Roberts declared that the British Army would be paralysed if force were employed against Ulster. The War Office itself, through Sir Henry Wilson, was in close alliance with Belfast. War correspondents and an emissary (Kühlmann) of the German Kaiser flocked into Ulster. Devlin's ridicule and toleration of the Carsonite "bluff" appeared very puerile now. New intermediaries with new schemes of conciliation flitted behind the scenes. Over all fell the shadow of the coming war and King George himself intervened, as we now know, at the wobbly Prime Minister's suggestion. The history of these series of conferences, all unknown at that time to the public except the much-advertised Palace one, is now to be read in Denis Gwynn's History of Partition, in his Life of John Redmond, in Asquith's Memoirs and The Life of Lord Carson.

The Buckingham Palace Conference (21st-24th July, 1914) broke down on the question of the area of exclusion before the question of the time limit was considered.

As the Conference was breaking down, all Europe seemed to conspire to confuse still further the hapless problem. The landing of arms at Howth and the outrage of Bachelor's Walk, July 26th, faded before the spectre of War. On July 28th, 1914, Austria declared war against Serbia, Germany against Russia and France followed by England's declaration of war against Germany on August 4th. The Amending Bill and the proclamation of the Ulster Provisional Government were alike postponed.

The House of Lords again rejected the Home Rule

Bill on 15th September, 1914, but this time it was able to receive the royal assent and actually did so on 18th September, 1914, without the Lords' consent because the statutory period had elapsed. Home Rule was at last on the Statute Book but now began its final fiasco. Liberal vacillation, wiles and treachery evolved a Suspensory Bill in place of a new Partition Amending Bill hanging up Home Rule indefinitely but at least for a year after the war. To crown the solemn mockery, Asquith during the debate on the final reading of the Home Rule Bill, 15th September, gave the assurance -

"which would be in spirit and in substance completely fulfilled that the Home Rule Bill will not and cannot come into operation until Parliament has had the fullest opportunity of altering, modifying or qualifying its provisions in such a way as to receive at any rate the general assent both of Ireland and the United Kingdom."

He declared that -

"the employment of force, any kind of force, for what you call the coercion of Ulster is an absolutely unthinkable thing. So far as I am concerned, and so far as my colleagues are concerned - I speak for them, for I know their unanimous feeling - that is a thing we would never countenance or consent to."

This pledge should never be lost sight of when considering the speeches and actions of the Irish Party during the rest of their existence. They simply ignored it and never mentioned it in Ireland as if it

did not concern the country.

The Bill suspending Home Rule passed all its stages in the House of Commons on that same night, 15th September, 1914.

Thereby three days before Home Rule was put on the Statute Book it was suspended indefinitely and an Amending Bill was guaranteed that would exclude an unknown number of Ulster counties for an indefinite time.

In Ireland the revulsion of feeling against this latest tame surrender by the Party to the Liberal Government and resentment at this most ignominious surrender of the Government to the Tories and Orangemen were singularly slow in manifesting themselves among the Party's blind followers. More than half the country still clung to them. The most seriously affected, the North-Eastern nationalists, seemed the slowest to stir and the A.O.H. (Board of Erin) was the last of all.

This was the depressing situation with which Sinn Fein and the revolutionary movements had to contend. Their eventual rapid progress was more due to the blunders and ineptitude of their opponents than to their own virile ideals. Redmond's recruiting campaign for the British, backed by Dillon and Devlin, drove the young men into Eoin McNeill's Irish Volunteers. The break in the Volunteers had occurred on 25th September, 1914, the day Asquith, Redmond, Dillon and Devlin spoke from a recruiting platform in Dublin.

The only spark of public interest evident in Ireland at this period was a popular Dublin demonstration in the Phoenix Park on 2nd May, 1915, against a Beer and Whiskey tax. So low had Irish political life descended!

Even this Whiskey Protest was organised by the publicans. No Irish M.P. would criticise any act of the Liberal Government, but their leaders addressed recruiting meetings. Notable ones were Dublin 25th September, Kilkenny 18th October, Belfast, Pallasgreen, Kerry about 25th October. On 18th November, 1914, in Dublin, Dillon said, "If I were hunted from every platform in Ireland ... I am England's friend in this war because my plighted word is given". Redmond also spoke in Tuam 6th December, 1914.

On April 30th and 1st May, 1915, T.P. O'Connor with the help of Devlin organised without any public authorisation a visit of Irish M.P's. and a few followers to France. The visitors included five other M.P's and J. Gallagher, the Lord Mayor of Dublin, J.D. Nugent, the Secretary of the A.O.H., their secretaries and T.J. Hanna, Secretary to John Redmond who was "detained in London by indisposition".

In their various addresses in Paris they made no reference to Partition, but T.P. O'Connor declared to the President of France, "The century-old quarrel between England and Ireland is happily over". Devlin spoke in his speech to Cardinal Amette of the entente cordiale between Ireland and the British Empire. In his reply the Cardinal said, "Ireland boasts, if I am not mistaken, of having given birth to Field-Marshal French".

Fulsome speech followed fulsome speech. The new friendship with England was compared with the love and sympathy of Ireland for France. The struggle for justice and the rights of small nations were repeatedly referred to.

An account of these nauseating proceedings will be found in the volume I am giving the Bureau, "Irish Pamphlets, Political, 1907-1919".

On 19th May, 1915, Asquith announced the formation of a Coalition Government including Lord Landsdowne, Bonar Law, head of the Tories, Balfour, Lord Kitchener, with Carson as Attorney-General. There were nine Unionists. The proposal to appoint Sir James Campbell (afterwards Lord Glenavy) as Lord Chancellor of Ireland aroused fierce fury in the Party circles, for the chancellorship commanded many fat jobs. If half this agitation had been shown on Home Rule, it would have been on the statute books years before, but it blew over within a month.

The change of government had far-reaching results. It meant the end of the Liberal Party. It ended Liberal engagements to the Irish Party. Even if they were willing, they no longer had the power to implement them. Home Rule was in the melting pot. With nine such Unionists in the Ministry, the Amending Act would drastically "alter, modify or qualify its provisions". A feeling of despondency was immediately evident in nationalist circles and for once the old "Freeman" spluttered with resentment at least for the moment.

Nevertheless the Party and its machine were determined that there would be no public criticism. A special meeting of the Dublin Corporation met on 14th July, 1915, on the requisition of thirty-nine of its members to demand that the Home Rule Act be put in force "for all Ireland on September 17th next". The motion was not only defeated but a vote of confidence in the party was passed by thirty-one votes against sixteen. What had happened? Between the service of the notice

of the resolution, Lorcan Sherlock and all the forces of the U.I.L. and A.O.H. had forced some of the thirty-nine callers of the meeting to remain away and induced others of them to vote against their own motion. This was only one of several successful devices used to obstruct and suppress anti-partition efforts.

Two pamphlets, "A Handbook For Rebels" compiled by Thomas Johnson of the Labour Party in July, 1918, and "The Complete Grammar of Anarchy" compiled by J.J. Horgan, 1919, print vivid extracts of the more extreme revolutionary speeches of the Carsonite campaign. All these extracts were of public notoriety. Only within the past few years are we beginning to hear something of the inner history of Partition from the papers and memoirs of the protagonists.

In contrast to the Carsonite utterances, it is instructive to compare the earlier with the later utterances of the Irish Party when addressing Irish audiences, directly or through their Party organs. Let us put some typical ones on record, bearing in mind the more significant dates of 1st October, 1913, 2nd February and 9th March, 1914. I suggest to the Bureau to place in tabulated forms these earlier and later extracts for the purpose of comparison. I insert here those of the 1914-1915 period:-

1914

January 13th - 'Freeman's Journal': "Apart from the folly of splitting up the country and drawing a boundary line between sections of the people, which would serve only to keep alive old feuds, it was inconceivable that anyone would seriously propose and that

sane statesmen would listen to a proposal which Unionist Ulster itself repudiates and in forceful terms."

January 26th - Devlin at Waterford: "I think it has been made clear that it is to be a constitution for all Ireland and not for a part of Ireland. Ireland is one and indivisible."

February 8th - Devlin at Longford: "No one will ever suggest that there can be any divorce between the North and the South ... the Carsonite campaign has been nothing else but a game of bluff."

February 16th - Devlin's organ, 'The Irish News: "Neither Ulster, nor any county, barony nor parish in Ulster can be excluded from a measure that would not be instantly and irrevocably rejected by the Irish people, South and North. The idea [partition] has never been seriously contemplated by any responsible member of the Home Rule Party."

March 17th - Redmond at St. Patrick's Day Banquet, London: "To agree to Partition would be an outrage upon nature and upon history."

March 9th - in House of Commons Redmond, having agreed first to a county-option exclusion of three years, then of five years,

surrendered to Asquith's proposal of six years, declaring that "the Prime Minister has gone to the very extreme limit of concession" and adding, "If these proposals of the Government be frankly accepted as the basis of peace, then we, on our side, are prepared to accept them in the same spirit".

March 19th - During the continuation of the same House of Commons Debate, John Dillon declared: "We recognise and accept, though not very happily, that if Ulster - the four counties and the City of Belfast - vote themselves out of the Bill, it will be open to this Parliament, if the Tories should come into power - not an unlikely contingency in the next six years - by a one clause Bill to make it perpetual that is the concession we have made and we did it with our eyes open".

May 6th - T.P. O'Connor, writing for an English audience, acknowledges the March proposals of County option for six years as 'practical perpetual mutilation'. He wrote, "How could any one in his senses expect Irishmen to agree to this practical perpetual mutilation of their country and this stereotyping of the abominable theory there are two Irelands, separated by the hideous gulf of sectarian and racial differences". (In Reynold's Newspaper, 6th May, 1914.)

Before going further, let us note how F.E. Smith (Lord Birkenhead) and Sir Edward Carson regarded the situation at this period. On July 4th Smith was able to brag at Fishponds, Bristol:-

"The result of what Ulster had done was that today, by universal admission, part, at any rate, of Ulster was going to be excluded from the operation of the Home Rule Bill and they thought they would get more than that. Did anybody suppose that Ulster would have obtained by argument the degree of exclusion which was universally conceded today to be necessary if they were to avoid civil war?"

July 13th - Carson at Drumbeg, Belfast: "I say to the Government: give us a clean cut for Ulster or come and fight us".

September 15th - John Redmond in Commons, after Asquith's important speech: "The second thing that I most earnestly desire is that no coercion shall be applied to any single county in Ireland to force them against their will to come into the Irish Government."

1915

March 18th - in Belfast, Dillon to Belfast

Volunteers: "I say it here in the face of you, the Volunteers of Belfast, who may yet here have to make good my words, we shall never consent to divide this island or this nation". (Compare this with the Dillon of 19th March, 1914, in Westminster.)

July, 18th or 20th - John Redmond to Town Clerk, Dublin (following meeting Dublin Corporation 14th July): "In my deliberate judgment, any attempt to bring pressure to bear on the Government to bring the Home Rule Act into operation while the war is in its present critical stage would be an act of bad faith on our part. It could not possibly succeed and would, on the contrary, inflict a deadly blow on the National cause and play right into the hands of its enemies. I would regard it as a great calamity if the coercion of any section of the Irish people were to accompany the inauguration of a free Parliament in Ireland."

"I have been ready, and am ready, to make large concessions to win the hearty approval of all sections of Irishmen to a settlement which will bring liberty to all."

(John Redmond's letter to the Town Clerk was described by the Freeman's Journal as "the clear and inspiring declaration. It must give profound satisfaction to Irish Nationalists the world over."

August 17th - Devlin at Letterkenny: "The Irish Party will never be consenting parties to the mutilation of their country".

Easter Week and the reaction in U.S.A. revolutionised the whole situation. Birrell, the Chief Secretary, resigned (May 3rd, 1916). Asquith visited Dublin (12th May 1916) and, on his return, announced in

the Commons (26th May) that Government administration in Ireland had broken down and that Lloyd George "at the unanimous request of his colleagues" had undertaken to study an agreed scheme for the future government of Ireland. As we know now, Carson at once saw Lloyd George, demanded a 'clean cut' for Ulster and as early as 29th May received from him his draft proposals with the nefarious assurance, "We must make it clear that at the end of the provisional period Ulster does not, whether she wills it or not, merge in the rest of Ireland".

Compare Carson's prompt intervention with Redmond's and Dillon's inaction when warned of the serious difficulties being raised by the British Unionist leaders in London.

Although Lloyd George's actual proposals only became generally known on 12th June, 1916, when they were published in the Irish papers, yet their terms began to leak out vaguely during the first week of June in the British press. For instance, "The Glasgow Herald" forecast the exclusion of Ulster or the greater part of Ulster. On 3rd June the leading article of the "Irish Independent", entitled "Irish Negotiations", was a warning note: "In a section of the British Press", it wrote, "there is an unanimity that is both surprising and suspicious", which pointed to the exclusion of Ulster. The "Freeman's Journal", when driven to notice critics, lashed at them with its invariable monotonous formulas, "Once again the wickedness of the lying wreckers", etc., etc. (Freeman's Journal, 10th June). Anxiety thus became more general.

On 1st June, 1916, in Omagh under the presidency of Monsignor O'Doherty, V.F., a Provisional Committee of

of Co. Tyrone Nationalists met to organise a protest against the exclusion of Ulster or any part of it.

On 7th June, 1916, the formal annual meeting of the Monaghan County Council unanimously protested against exclusion of any county or part of Ireland. On the same day (7th June) at Omagh the Conference of Clerical and Nationalist representatives of Co. Tyrone carried out the decision of the Omagh Provisional Committee of 1st June. Besides the Chairman, Monsignor O'Doherty, V.F., and seven other parish priests, there were twenty-one Justices of the Peace (men of standing in those days), many of them County Councillors. In addition, there were four other County Councillors of Tyrone and other prominent nationalists, doctors, solicitors, etc., some of national standing. While professing loyalty to the Irish Party, they called on the M.P.'s. resolutely to oppose any settlement of the Irish question, whether temporary or permanent, which would exclude any part of Ulster from the operation of self-government. Their third resolution read: "That we condemn the proposals of settlement published in the Press which in our opinion would only aggravate the unhappy state of Ireland and further embitter her relations with England. We therefore trust that nationalists throughout the country will take immediate and effective steps to prevent their adoption".

Letters addressed to the meeting were read from four Ulster Bishops, viz., Bishop McHugh of Derry, Bishop McKenna of Clogher, Bishop O'Donnell of Raphoe and Bishop McRory of Down and Connor. Three spoke directly and strongly against exclusion. Bishop O'Donnell sympathised "with the anxiety of your Committee" and suggested "a joint conference of the leading

nationalists of the threatened area" to secure unity of action.

The "Freeman's Journal" reported these proceedings and the Bishops' letters without a word of comment either on the letters or in condemnation of threatened partition. Devlin's organ, the "Irish News", adopted a similar attitude.

On 10th June, 1916, Redmond announced the Lloyd George proposals to the Irish M.P.'s. gathered at the Mansion House but asked them not to give a decision then. They were only to consider them carefully. This meeting and the text of the proposals were published in all the papers on 12th June and in this way became known throughout the country.

The proposals put the Home Rule Act with its miserably limited powers (with none at all over Customs and Excise) into immediate operation for twenty-six counties but subject to an Amending Bill. The Six Counties were to remain under the Imperial Parliament. (There was, therefore, no right of county option as proposed before.) An amending Bill was to be introduced at once and an Imperial Conference would consider ... the question of the government of Ireland and after this Conference "the permanent settlement of all great outstanding problems such as the permanent position of the six exempted counties ... would be proceeded with". (See Gwynn, p. 151, and the Irish papers between 12th and 22nd June, 1916.) The terms appear in the official report of the Nationalist Conference in Belfast of 18th and 23rd June.

The terms of the Lloyd George proposed agreement were announced by Carson to the Ulster Unionist Council

on 9th June. So great was the opposition of the delegates of Monaghan, Cavan and Donegal that he had to meet them separately the next day when they gave a most reluctant agreement to abide by the decision of the Ulster Council. This Council gave its acceptance to the Lloyd George proposals on 12th June. The text of the proposals, as announced by Redmond, Carson and Devlin, were reprinted frequently between 12th and 22nd June, e.g., in the Freeman's Journal of June 12th, 14th, 15th 21st and 22nd, 1916, in prominent leaded type. Everybody, therefore, had full opportunity of stating them.

On 14th June Asquith outlined the Lloyd George proposals at Ladybank.

Meanwhile, Cardinal Logue had somewhere expressed his opinion that "it would be infinitely better to remain as we are for fifty years to come, under English rule, than to accept these proposals".

This view of Cardinal Logue was adopted "without reservation" by all the bishops whose jurisdiction extended over the six counties and was published by Bishop McHugh of Derry in a letter to Alderman McCarron, the labour representative of Derry, and appeared in the "Irish Independent" of 21st June. Unless I am greatly mistaken, this letter of Bishop McHugh and the declaration of the Ulster bishops were suppressed by the Party organ although it reported the General Meeting of the Bishops at Maynooth on the same day and the statement of the Protestant Synod, to which I shall refer.

Dr. McHugh's letter, a particularly strong one, brings out that the proposals were "imperfectly understood by the public" and issued a warning that "it is possible that an effort will be made at the Conference

in Belfast to make the people believe that the exclusion of the six counties is only a temporary arrangement". He recalled that the Unionist Council declared that the exclusion was definite, in which it was backed up by the 'Northern Whig'. "To stand up in defence of them" (the Lloyd George proposals), he concluded, "to suggest the acceptance of them is just as bad as to be branded with the dishonourable reputation of having fathered them". The Party bosses were so persistent and vehement in asserting that the exclusion was only "temporary" and "provisional" that considerable confusion was created in nationalist circles.

Both "Freeman" and "Independent" of the same date (21st June, 1916) published the resolutions of the Protestant General Synod against "the hasty adoption of a policy of dismemberment, with which no Irishman is content".

On 17th June a specially convened meeting of the National Committee of the National Volunteers passed seven rigmorole resolutions. Its seventh concluded, "As there can be no peace in Ireland while they (nationalists imprisoned on account of the Rising) are suffering, we accept this offer on condition of their release". This amnesty bait was constantly put forward, and dishonestly so.

On 18th June Devlin "explained" the Lloyd George proposals to his Belfast followers in St. Mary's Hall in preparation for the Ulster Conference that was to be held there later in the week. "In my judgment the only solution is the exclusion of six counties", he said. Later on I shall speak of Devlin's speech on this occasion.

It was necessary to have these proposals endorsed by Nationalist Ireland as well as by Carson. This task was entrusted to Devlin by the Party "leaders". Their strategy was plain. Having secured a postponement of a decision by the Party, it was essential to exclude the possibility of an all-Ireland Nationalist Convention. A repetition of the anti-Devolution Convention of 1907 was to be prevented at all costs. No "cranks" or "factionists" were to have the opportunity of causing trouble on a public platform. The obvious solution was to obtain an endorsement from the Six Counties - the area most affected - where a favourable verdict could be secured through Devlin's Ancient Order of Hibernians and their placemen. With a Six-County endorsement they would face the National Directory of the United Irish League, "the supreme National authority in Ireland" as they described themselves. The proposals were to be represented as and spoken of as "the temporary and provisional settlement", and there was to be no National Convention nor any public meetings or debates where the true import of the proposals could be exposed.

Devlin's task was not an easy one. He could trust his influence in the Belfast and Armagh area, but he had to reckon with the general opposition of Fermanagh, Tyrone and Derry and the no less dangerous ecclesiastical opposition of the dioceses of Clogher and Derry, particularly among the younger generation of the clergy. He laid his plans elaborately and carefully. First, against all precedent, he changed the constitution by which Conventions were convened by allowing only one clerical representative from each parish. This automatically excluded the curates - perhaps his most influential and active opponents, for naturally the older Parish Priests would be selected if there was to

be only one cleric from each parish. A repetition of his circuit of March, 1914, among the bishops obtained their consent, willingly or unwillingly, to this constitutional change. Next he sent agents to canvas all the delegates appointed for the Convention or "Conference" as it was rather significantly called. They secured their men in Antrim, Down and Armagh, but failed in Derry and signally so in Tyrone and Fermanagh. In the course of the following year (May 1917) I met Father W.B. McFeeley, P.P., Waterside, Derry, (formerly Administrator of the Cathedral) who told me that before the Convention the priests in Derry met three agents of Devlin who had been sent to interview the delegates. Meeting with their opposition, they told the priests it made no difference how they voted in Derry, because anyway they had a majority. They knew beforehand how all would vote.

It was on June 21st, 1914, that the declaration of Cardinal Logue and the four bishops of the excluded area appeared in the press. Although it thus appeared two days before the Ulster Conference of Nationalists, it had no influence on the already machine secured votes, but neither had the declaration of Asquith three weeks later. The class represented by the majority vote of the Conference were beyond conversion.

No exposition of the Parliamentary Party's attitude on Partition would be complete or accurate without an examination of Devlin's speech at the meeting of Belfast Nationalists held on Sunday, 18th June, 1916, in St. Mary's Hall to prepare the ground for the Ulster National Conference held in the same hall five days later. It appeared in full in the Irish press, but I quote and give references from the official publication,

"Ireland's Path To Freedom".

It is a revealing speech in many ways. It protests that the "wild whirling hysterical outpourings of the enemies of the Irish Party and all their talk of dismemberment, or mutilation, of partition and of separation are merely intended to raise a cloud of irrelevant issues" (p. 7 "Ireland's Path To Freedom").

"Irishmen were asked", he indignantly complains, "to discredit and disbelieve the explicit statement of the Irish leader. The precipitate rush to declare that Mr. Redmond was unworthy of credence is but an illustration of the whole spirit of reckless desperation with which the apostles of dissension are bent upon the work of national destruction" ... "The mind of Ireland is being poisoned"; "well-intentioned but ill-informed persons, public boards, are being stampeded into condemnation of supposed schemes which have no more relation to Mr. Lloyd George's proposals for immediate Home Rule than Tenterden Steeple to the Goodwin Sands." (ibid. p. 10).

His allusion on the same page to "some of the apostles of pessimism" is a direct thrust at Cardinal Logue, the author of the offending phrase, "Better wait another fifty years", etc.

"Critics", he declares (id. p. 6) "seem to have lost all sense of the realities of a situation which in its essence is exceedingly simple and betray an utter lack of knowledge of the basic facts that are contained in Lloyd George's suggestions for the immediate inauguration of Home Rule for four-fifths of Ireland ... There is no question of excluding Ulster or any part of Ulster from Home Rule; there is no idea of any

partition; there is not a particle of foundation for the assertion that six counties, or any fraction of Ulster, is to be placed under Sir Edward Carson's Provisional Government. All these suggestions are the invention of the enemy. They are devised for the purpose of throwing dust in the eyes of the Irish people and in that purblind state of leading them on the path of national perdition".

This was the very operation he was engaged in himself. Having blinded his followers, he was able blandly to announce quite accurately Lloyd George's proposals with their provisions for an Amending Act, and Imperial Conference "to consider the future government of Ireland" and "the permanent position of the six exempted counties, the question of finance and other problems".

"As I pointed out", he said, "the extension of Home Rule to the six counties is not defeated but merely delayed". (ibid. p. 11)

The Ulster Nationalist Conference met in St. Mary's Hall, Belfast, on 23rd June, 1916. The basis of representation was:-

- (1) one priest from each parish in the Six Counties;
- (2) the Nationalist M.P's. of the Six Counties;
- (3) officers of the U.I.L., A.O.H. and Irish National Foresters of the Six Counties;
- (4) Nationalist members of the elected public boards of the Six Counties;
- (5) ten additional members elected by the Executives of the U.I.L., A.O.H. and Foresters for the cities of Belfast and Derry.

The number of delegates entitled to attend was approximately 1,077. The number who actually attended was 776. An analysis of the attendance shows that this was made up as follows:-

Public Bodies	464
Political Bodies (U.I.L.- A.O.H.- I.N.F.)	..				176
Priests	130
M.P's.	6
					<hr/> 776 <hr/>

The number who voted was 740.

John Redmond presided. The resolution considering Lloyd George's proposals as "the best means of carrying on the fight for a United self governing Ireland" was proposed by Patrick Dempsey, J.P., T.C., of Belfast and seconded by Canon McCartan, V.F., of Donaghmore, Co. Tyrone. The proposals of Lloyd George were represented to the delegates as a "temporary and provisional settlement of the Irish difficulty".

The resolution was supported by speeches from Canon Quinn, V.F., of Camlough (Armagh), a National Director of the U.I.L., Fr. John Nolan, V.F., of Toombridge (Down and Connor) as well as by John Dillon and Joe Devlin. The resolution was opposed by F.J. O'Connor, Solicitor, Omagh, George Murnaghan, ex M.P., Omagh (father of Mr. Justice Murnaghan), T. McLaughlin, U.D.C., Armagh, Rev. W.B. McFeeley, P.P. of Waterside, Derry, Canon Keown, V.G., Enniskillen (Clogher) (later Monsignor and P.P. of Carrickmacross), John McGlone, Mid-Armagh, Alderman James McCarron, Derry City. The resolution was carried by 475 against 265, a majority of 210 in favour of surrendering the six counties. The official report said that "the news that the proposals

had been accepted by a decisive majority was hailed with ringing cheers by the crowd in the streets and their delightful satisfaction at the outcome was further evidenced in the series of splendid ovations which they extended to the leaders and the principal clergy when they were leaving the hall. The demonstrations were a fitting conclusion to the proceedings of a memorable day in the annals of Ulster nationality". Such are the words of the official report of the U.I.L.

The analysis of the votes by counties shows:-

	For Exclusion	Against Exclusion	Majority
Armagh	67	35	32 (For Exclusion)
Antrim & Belfast	130	8	122 (For Exclusion)
Derry	58	59	1 (Against Exclusion)
Down	116	7	109 (For Exclusion)
Fermanagh	28	51	23 (Against Exclusion)
Tyrone	52	102	50 (Against Exclusion)
Unclassified Votes	24	3	21 (For Exclusion)
TOTALS:	475	265	210 (For Exclusion)

The analysis given by the "Freeman's Journal" and in the official report is as follows:-

	For Exclusion	Against Exclusion	Majority
Armagh	62	32	30 (For Exclusion)
Antrim & Belfast	129	7	122 (For Exclusion)
Derry	67	60	7 (Against Exclusion)
Down	117	13	104 (For Exclusion)
Fermanagh	36	58	22 (Against Exclusion)
Tyrone	64	85	21 (Against Exclusion)
TOTALS:	475	255	

This analysis leaves ten votes unaccounted for. This analysis is described as approximate with official report.

It will be noticed that Fermanagh and Tyrone voted strongly against the surrender and that Derry had a majority of one against it. On the other hand, the influence of Mr. Devlin and the A.O.H. is very evident in the large majorities in Antrim, Down and Armagh in favour of cutting themselves off from the rest of Ireland.

This vote of the Ulster Nationalist Convention was endorsed by the National Directory of the United Irish League on the 3rd July, 1916, with only two dissentients, Father T. O'Doherty, P.P., South Fermanagh, and Mr. John Doris, J.P., East Tyrone. The enthusiastic sanction of Partition by the Belfast Nationalists and this endorsement by the supreme body of the chief political executive in the country probably marks the lowest depths to which Irish national politics descended since the days of Sadlier and Keogh. It shows how low party partisanship can fall and drag the country with it.

A week or two later Mr. David Sheehy, M.P., at a meeting in Skreen of the South Meath Executive of the U.I.L. stated that neither Mr. Redmond nor Mr. Dillon nor any representative of the twenty-six counties would have consented to the exclusion of six counties if Mr. Devlin had objected. On the day after the Convention the Party's organ, the "Freeman's Journal", wrote "that the Nationalists of Ulster have freed the path of Ireland for her leaders for a speedy advance to the realisation of her common ideal and that the decision sent a message to the rest of Ireland that those most concerned in the provisional Home Rule arrangement are convinced that both for what they contain and what they involve the prudent and patriotic course is to accept

the (Lloyd George) proposals".

I may remark that this is precisely what the same newspaper had planned to say on 10th May, 1917, after the South Longford election if the Party had won it.

As Lloyd George was drawing up his proposals and a month before the Conference, T.P. O'Connor wrote in the 'Northern American' (on the 27th May, 1916): "The Nationalists must accept in principle the right of Ulster to exclude herself if she still remains of that mind, but much haggling will occur regarding the size of the excluded area". At the Conference itself John Redmond stated his belief that these proposals were vital to the Irish cause: "As leader, I point the way. It is for you to say whether you will follow me or not. If then this is the last time that I ever can appeal to the people of Ireland, I will have done so in obedience to the dictates of my heart and my conscience."

Mr. John Dillon on the same occasion stated: "The rejection of these proposals will mean the killing of Home Rule". Far different was the attitude of the Unionists. On their side, no grounds for misapprehension or doubt were allowed to remain unsolved. To them the proposals regarding partition were neither temporary nor provisional but definitely permanent without Orange consent.

The actual situation was plainly explained by Asquith in a momentous statement during a debate in the House of Commons on the 10th July, 1916. He explained how the heads of agreement provided that the Amending Bill was to remain in force during the War and for twelve months afterwards -

"but if Parliament has not by that time made a further provision for the Government of Ireland, the period for which the Bill remains in force is to be extended by an Order in Council for such time as may be necessary to enable Parliament to make this provision. In other words, in a sense and in a very true sense, the Bill is a provisional measure; but I see all sorts of possibilities of misapprehension of the use of the term. To relieve any possible doubts on that point, let me say, speaking for those who like myself look forward to and are anxious for a United Ireland, we recognise and agree in the fullest and sincerest sense that such union can never be brought about without the free will and assent of the excluded area."

Instantly Carson clinched this momentous declaration. No sooner had Asquith concluded his speech than Sir Edward Carson asked him two questions: "He (Asquith) talked of the arrangement as a provisional arrangement, I understand. I also understand from what he said that the six counties will be definitely struck out of the Act of 1914. Of course, at any time afterwards they could be included by a Bill". Mr. Asquith's definite reply was, "They could not be included without a Bill". Plainly this final reply was equally of paramount significance.

Declaration and reply were significant in their setting. They were made, not by Lloyd George, but by the Prime Minister in formal debate and after the Ulster Conferences of both sides. Declaration and reply made a clean sweep of the misrepresentations and

pontifical infallibility of the Nationalist leaders. The Prime Minister's declaration and reply were allowed to pass unchallenged in the debate by the Irish Leader or any Irish M.P.

Bishop McHugh of Derry might well say as he did in a public letter dated 13th July, 1916: "The men whom she (Ireland) delegated to voice her sentiments in the great assembly of the United Kingdom to defend her integrity, to secure her independence, have failed to carry out that cause. Can the sham of temporary exclusion be any longer maintained?"

To ensure that no doubt should remain in Mr. Redmond's mind about the nature of the Amending Bill, the following statement was issued through the Press Association by Lord Lansdowne on the 13th July:-

"I observe from a statement that appears in to-day's papers [13th July, 1916] that Mr. Redmond has complained of a speech which I delivered in the House of Lords on Tuesday [11th July] as to the steps which were to be taken in order to deal with the situation upon which the Harding Commission has commented with so much severity.

In making my statement as to the permanent character of certain provisions of the Amending Bill, I did not intend to go - I do not consider that I did go - beyond the declaration made by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons on the 10th instant that the union of the Six Counties with the rest of Ireland could only be brought about with, and never can be brought about without, the free

will and assent of the excluded area.

My statement, with regard to the government of Ireland during the interval which must elapse between the present moment and the passing of the present Bill, represented what I believed to be the views of the Government and were made after consultation with the Prime Minister and others of my colleagues."

It should not pass unnoticed how Denis Gwynn in his History of Partition (pp. 155, 156) superficially and summarily glosses over the events between 12th June and 25th July, 1916. He does not even mention the crucial debate of 10th July and thus suppresses the Prime Minister's exposition of the Amending Bill and all reference to his reply to Carson's questions.

To my mind, this gravely vitiates his history, apart altogether from his exclusion of the anti-partition campaign in Ireland during 1916 and 1917.

Lord Lansdowne, explaining the policy of the Government, stated in regard to the Amending Bill in the House of Lords, "It is a Bill which will make structural alterations in the Act of 1914 and it, therefore, will be permanent and enduring in its character".

In a statement issued on the night of 12th July, 1916, John Redmond stated that Lord Lansdowne's statement of policy was a distinct violation of the agreement between himself and Lloyd George. He was loathe to believe that Lord Lansdowne's policy which envisaged a period of coercion in Ireland represented the "deliberate decision of the Cabinet" and that such

a policy would be repudiated and condemned by the Irish Party. In face of these statements by Asquith and Lansdowne, he still maintained that the provisions, so far as the exclusion of the Ulster counties were concerned, were temporary and provisional.

The Unionists, however, never ceased to point out that Asquith and the Government had given formal assurance that Ulster should not be included without their consent and without a Bill, and never would they consent.

By this time anger had risen high in Ireland and on 24th July, 1916, during a debate in the House of Commons, Redmond announced his repudiation of the Lloyd George proposals. He had been summoned on 22nd July to meet Lloyd George and Samuel at the War Office. His account of the interview, given during the debate, was that "they informed me that the Cabinet had decided to insert in the (Amending) Bill two entirely new provisions. One provided for the permanent exclusion of the six Ulster counties, and the other cut out of the draft Bill, and of the agreement, the provision for the retention of the Irish members in their full force at Westminster during the transitory period".

The permanent exclusion of the six counties was already settled since it depended on the assent of the Orangemen. But the reduction of the Irish representation was new and was the real grievance of the Party.

After July, 1916, the question of partition merged into the general political events of the time and Irish interest centered in the earlier phases of the conscription issue. But Irish discontent with the

Party leaders and their diplomacy was now more openly expressed. The editor of the influential 'Kilkenny People' wrote in September, 1916, "Above all, it (the country) expects that the Party will not again be caught in the meshes of the net skilfully laid for them by Ministers who have been kept in power for years by Irish votes. The Irish people are sick unto death of breakfast-table pourparlers and Downing Street diplomacy which always results in the same thing - the gradual whittling down of our national claims ... We always play a losing game". It is very true that Lloyd George's breakfast-table was responsible for a great part of the debacle.

One of the articles on Ireland published by the well-known American journalist, J.M. Tuohy, in the 'New York World' in November, 1919, lights up the background of these partition manoeuvres of June-July, 1916. They reveal the characteristic twistings of Lloyd George, the tender solicitude of this pretended Home Ruler for Carson, his anti-Irish bias, his indifference, in fact, disdain, for the Irish Nationalist leaders. These articles help to expose how little the Irish leaders counted in Liberal Government circles despite ten years of complete subservience. Only the Partition issue is touched on here.

Tuohy's article appeared in an issue of about 24th November, 1919, and was noticed in the Irish papers.

Discussing the Irish situation with Mr. Tuohy in Downing Street, Lloyd George remarked that Fermanagh and Tyrone were the crux. "I candidly think that both sides are most unreasonable about these two counties".

He had had "these Belfast men around this table". Lloyd George's observations showed that he had pledged himself not to do anything until the Ulster Division returned from the war. "They might say that they were betrayed ... they must come home before a settlement can be pressed". No mention was made of the betrayal of the Munster, Connaught or Leinster regiments. Confessing that he was not confident of a settlement, Lloyd George continued:

"Do you know that when Redmond and Dillon were over in Ireland getting their men to support the then proposed settlement that I wrote them - I have copies of the letters - warning them that there were difficulties and that I should like to see them but neither would come over to discuss these difficulties. They had warning that the settlement proposed was being opposed in the Cabinet, so that they were not taken by surprise when they came back.

Landsdowne and Long were the chief obstacles. Landsdowne was the worse of the two. But Redmond and Dillon would not come over, though Devlin did in the end. He had made a great fight in Ulster and won, but Redmond and Dillon made no fight."

Tuohy noted that this was an utterly baseless statement as regards Redmond and Dillon. It was, Tuohy continues, by the extremest exercise of their influence, backed as they were powerfully by Joseph Devlin, that they had induced the Belfast conference to accept the settlement.

In view of Devlin's pro-partition campaign in Ulster and the Party leaders' previous declarations, it was no wonder they were unwilling to face their Belfast Convention with Lloyd George's tergiversations.

Tuohy's final remark was "that first it was Asquith, next it was Landsdowne and Long, then it was Redmond and Dillon, but never Carson or the Orangemen, and least of all himself, who was responsible for the disgraceful failure of the July negotiations". Thus ends the Tuohy article.

Unfortunately, all these experiences did not prevent the Irish Party from continuing to support the Liberal Government and continuing "to hoodwink and deceive the Irish people", as Bishop O'Dwyer put it, and reviving the exclusion of the six counties within another twelve months. And still their dupes continued in great measure to support them, especially in the North-East.

Arthur Griffith's paper, 'Nationality', in its issue of 2nd February, 1918, gave a very summary and, for that reason, an unsatisfactory sketch, of the history of the partition proposals of 1916. Having alluded to the fear which Redmond, Dillon, T.P. O'Connor and Devlin entertained of the Fermanagh and Tyrone nationalists and to the endorsement by the Belfast Conference on 23rd June of the dismemberment of Ireland, 'Nationality' proceeds: "Three days later Redmond, Dillon and Devlin held a meeting of the Parliamentary Party [They had only heard the proposals at their meeting in the Mansion House, Dublin, on 10th June without making any decision] when some exciting scenes occurred, several of the members protesting. They were threatened with political annihilation by the -

Four Bosses and eventually cowed into passing a resolution with two dissentients - Messrs. P. O'Doherty and P.J. O'Shaughnessy - declaring that "we learn with the deepest gratitude of Ulster's decision to agree to cut itself off from Ireland". The next move was to get the Directory of the U.I.L. - a puppet body - to meet (July 3rd, 1916) and declare that "the supreme national authority in Ireland" agreed to partition. The political prisoners in Wandsworth and other jails discovered that use was being made of their names by Devlin and company to coerce the country into accepting partition. The people were told that, if they rejected the proposals, these prisoners would be incarcerated indefinitely but, if they were accepted, the prisoners would be released. It is scarcely necessary to add that, when intelligence of this rascally device was brought to the prisoners, they sent by Mr. Ginnell a message to their countrymen that they would accept imprisonment for all their lives rather than that any part of Ulster should cease to be Irish land".

"The patriotism and intelligence of the country awakened. The would-be sellers of their native sod attempted a last rascally lie. They told the people that partition was only temporary. That in six years the six counties would be automatically included in Ireland. Sir Edward Carson, to safeguard his own position, thereupon in the British Parliament challenged Mr. Asquith on the subject, and Asquith (July 10th, 1916) declared it was untrue that the partition was temporary. The six counties could never, he said, be restored to Ireland unless the British Parliament agreed."

"The country now discovered it had been duped. A roar of indignation was heard on all sides; and Redmond, Dillon, Devlin and O'Connor, to save themselves, renounced the partition proposals for the time. But in May, 1916 [recte 1917], they were again agreed to accept partition if they had won the Longford election. His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin wrote a letter on the occasion which we reproduce. ..."

The second meeting of the Irish Party (that of 26th June, 1916) is not referred to in the official report in "Ireland's Path To Freedom" though it reports the acceptance of partition by the National Directory of the U.I.L. on 3rd July with only two dissentients, viz., Rev. T. O'Doherty, P.P., of South Fermanagh and John Doris, J.P., of East Tyrone.

Archbishop visits Mrs. Stopford Green in connection with Casement:

On the 18th July, 1916, Archbishop Walsh motored to Courtown Harbour to see Mrs. Stopford Green who had written to the Archbishop in mid-July concerning Sir Roger Casement. I surmise that he could only express his sympathy and confess his inability to achieve anything useful. I was not with the Archbishop on that occasion; it was Monsignor Walsh.

I left Wicklow on Thursday, the 20th July, 1916, for my week's duty at the Archbishop's House in Dublin. One Secretary had to remain in town while the other two stayed with the Archbishop in Co. Wicklow.

My diary for Saturday, 22nd July, 1916, has two items:-

"Mr. Michael Lennon, Longford Terrace,
called concerning the question of the

chaplains in Frongoch. He mentioned the barbarous treatment of the prisoners in Kilmainham. He himself was half-strangled by soldiers with his own necktie."

General Maxwell's Report on the Rising published:

"General Maxwell's report, including his supplementary report of May 26th, was published to-day [22nd July, 1916]. The report proper is a bald account of the military operations. The supplementary report is a scandalous and dishonourable calumny on the Volunteers' fighting conduct, accusing them of murder of police, looting, etc. It is plainly a political apology for the executions, etc."

I have noted that on 23rd July, 1916, I went to view an open-air meeting that was held in the Phoenix Park against partition. A crowd of four or five thousand people were addressed by Mr. Jones, Alderman Corrigan, Maw Coughlan Briscoe.

Archbishop's Letter to Press warns the country
against the Parliamentary Party:

On the 25th July, 1916, the Archbishop wrote a strong letter to the Press warning the country that it was being led to disaster:-

"For years past, I have never had a moment's doubt that the Irish Home Rule cause in Parliament was being led along a line that could only bring it to disaster. But it was impossible to shut one's eyes to the lamentable fact that Nationalist Ireland or, to speak with accuracy, the preponderating

majority of those of our people who still retained faith in the efficacy of constitutional agitation, had become hopelessly possessed of the disastrous idea that the "Party" - or, to use the new-fangled "its leaders" - could do no wrong. Fair criticism was at an end, and anyone ... who ventured to express an opinion at variance with theirs became at once a fair mark for every political adventurer in the country to assail with the easily handled epithets of "factionist", "wrecker" or "traitor".

As the necessary result of the abandonment of the policy of Independent Opposition - the only policy that can be followed with safety by Irish representatives in the British House of Commons - our country is now face to face with a truly awful prospect.

The Home Rule Act is still on the statute book. Will Irish Nationalists be any longer befooled by a repetition of the party cries that this fact makes them masters of the situation; that the Act cannot be modified without Nationalist consent; and that Ireland awaits only the end of the war to find the portals of the Old House in College Green automatically opened for the entry of the members of a Parliament greater than Grattan's?"

In a characteristic postscript the Archbishop expressed his amazement that the country allowed itself to be distracted "by all sorts of side issues" regarding the future Parliament and gave no real

consideration to the question whether this Parliament was in any sense worthy of the name.

Sir Francis Vane defends the Volunteers:

Another newspaper cutting refers to a letter, dated the 27th July, 1916, addressed by Major Sir Francis Vane, defending the Irish Volunteers against Maxwell's accusations. Only the previous day I wrote to Massingham of the "Nation" repudiating the charges against the Volunteers.

It was, I think, on 27th July that the full text of Lloyd George's "Heads for a Bill" was published as a White Paper.

Archbishop interviews American Relief Delegates:

On Thursday, the 27th July, 1916, I have noted in my diary that at 11.30 a.m. I met John Archdeacon Murphy and John Gill in the Gresham Hotel. Tom Dillon and Dónal O'Connor were also present. During lunch we had a talk on Irish conditions and at their request I arranged an interview for them for the following day with the Archbishop, who was in Co. Wicklow. I remember meeting one of the Plunkett girls at the Gresham Hotel. It was news to her when I told her that Murphy and Gill were there and she at once insisted upon seeing them. I learned later she had met them in U.S.A. before the Rising.

On the 28th July, 1916, the Archbishop motored to Dublin and had a long interview with Mr. Murphy from 1 p.m. to 2.10 p.m. Mr. Murphy made a very favourable impression on the Archbishop and put the Archbishop in close touch with the American situation. This was of importance in view of the changed state of affairs.

On Saturday, the 29th July, 1916, I wrote the following in my diary:-

"A Reuter's telegram says that the American Senate passed a motion calling on the British Government to exercise clemency towards the Irish political prisoners."

I have here a newspaper cutting, dated the 29th July, 1916, which reads as follows:-

"On yesterday/28th July, 1916/ Northcliffe's chief exponent of his own views - the 'Daily Mail' - stated:

'It is preposterous that people, who represent nothing but their own personal interests, should be allowed any longer to stand between Ireland and a measure of self-government such as every other portion of the British Empire enjoys.'

I have noted that on the 31st July, 1916, there was a debate in the House of Commons on Dillon's motion on the Government in Ireland.

Irish Party not consulted about Introduction
of Greenwich Time into Ireland:

I have noted that on the 2nd August, 1916, a Bill to introduce Greenwich time into Ireland was passed - "without the Irish Party being informed", said John Dillon. It was stated that the Bill was shown to John Redmond and one of the Irish Party whips. Fifty-four Irish members voted against it. It was commonly believed in Ireland that Government help for the rebuilding of O'Connell Street was made dependant on Ireland's acceptance of this Greenwich time. Otherwise Carson would have opposed a Government grant.

Sir Roger Casement was hanged on 3rd August, 1916.

The letter which I wrote to the 'Nation' on 26th July, 1916, repudiating Maxwell's charges against the Volunteers, was reproduced in a prominent position in the 'Freeman's Journal' on the 5th August, 1916.

On the 7th August, 1916, I noted the following in my diary:-

"Lord Wimborne was re-appointed Lord Lieutenant - an admission that the British Government is at its wit's end concerning Ireland and unable to make up its mind what to do."

On the same day a letter appeared from Dr. O'Dwyer denouncing Mrs. Starkie's pamphlet on Patriotism as a "mere recruiting publication".

I have noted in my diary that on the 14th August, 1916, or on the previous day, Mr. Laurence Ginnell, M.P. - Member for Meath - wrote to the Archbishop that:-

"Prominent people in Dublin and London think that the time has come for the foundation of a new political organisation"; and he wished the Archbishop would "receive a deputation". The Archbishop replied that he did not think the time was ripe for a new organisation until the country generally thoroughly realised how discredited was the policy of the Irish Party.

I have noted in my diary that on Thursday, 17th August, 1916, I attended a reception given by the Irish National Aid and Volunteers' Dependants' Associations to make a presentation of an inscribed cigarette case

and album to John Archdeacon Murphy in token of their appreciation of his work in uniting the two organisations' committees. He left Dublin for Liverpool on Friday, the 18th.

Freeman's Journal is on its last legs:

On 18th August, 1916, my diary notes:-

"Heard to-day that the old 'Freeman', which is nearly played out, is being reconstructed, perhaps as a half-penny paper and financed from London."

The 'Freeman', which was the organ of the Irish Party, was like it, on its last legs. There was talk of it being revived as a half-penny paper and financed from England under conditions. Brayden, the editor of the 'Freeman's Journal', and Meade, the editor of the 'Evening Telegraph', were cashiered. Paddy Hooper normally succeeded Brayden as editor of the 'Freeman' but it is said that Bob Donovan will do the real editorial work. Gaynor, a prominent member of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, became editor of the 'Telegraph'. Governey, Parkinson and Heron became Directors of the Company. My notes for that date continue:-

"There is some talk of John Redmond resigning the leadership of the Party and that he is suffering from a nervous breakdown."

Sydney contributes £150 to Relief Fund:

On the 21st August, 1916, I have noted the following in my diary:-

"The Archbishop received £150 from Sydney for the Relief Fund, with congratulations on

his independent criticism." -

a reference to his letter of July. It indicates a change in imperial Sydney.

I have noted that on Saturday, 26th August, 1916, I listened for some time to the Sheehy-Skeffington Inquiry which was held at the Four Courts.

On the 2nd September, 1916, I have noted the following in my diary:-

"To-day [2nd September, 1916] the 'Freeman' and 'Independent' contain Stephen Gwynn's deplorable speech at Galway on Thursday [31st August] on Home Rule settlement, partition, Sinn Féin. It included a calumnious reference to shooting [unarmed] soldiers."

It was on the 5th September, 1916, that the Archbishop returned to Dublin from convalescence in Co. Wicklow.

Gavan Duffy brings correspondence about Cardinal Bourne's attitude to Casement's Request for Reconciliation to the Catholic Church:

On Sunday, 10th September, 1916, I have the following entry in my diary:-

"Mr. Gavan Duffy called at one o'clock with copies of the correspondence with Cardinal Bourne over his action in refusing faculties for the reconciliation of Casement to the Church unless he signed a statement expressing regret for any scandals he caused by either his private or public life."

As a result of this visit, I made another entry

which I recorded on an earlier blank page (242). It reads as follows:

"Correspondence has passed between Sir Gavan Duffy and Cardinal Bourne's Secretary, Monsignor Bidwell, concerning Cardinal Bourne's refusal to grant faculties to receive Casement into the Catholic Church until he had first signed a special declaration 'expressing sorrow for any scandal he might have caused by his acts public or private'. Sir Roger declined 'in all humility' (to use his own words) to subscribe to the test and Fr. Carey wrote to the Cardinal and prayed that the faculty might be issued without condition. No reply was ever vouchsafed and Sir Roger Casement was reconciled to the church of his baptism on the 2nd August, the eve of his execution in articulo mortis and he was never confirmed. (Casement has obtained the certificate of his baptism at the Catholic Church at Rhyl on the 5th August, 1868, his mother being a Catholic.) Fathers T. Carey and J. McCarroll of Edengrove, Holloway, were the prison chaplains.

Gavan Duffy (I think for Casement's executors) claimed that, while R.C. was quite prepared to make a sworn profession of faith, he was not prepared to brand himself as a man of ill-fame in the public odour of this country, as a public and infamous sinner - a test that would not have been imposed on him in Ireland He could not nor strengthen the scandalous rumours as to his private life that were circulated during his trial &c."

As far as I am aware, there was no formal condemnation of the Cardinal's action by the Holy See but, undoubtedly, it was a distinct opinion among the officials of the Roman Curia that he had acted wrongly and the Cardinal could not but be aware of this. The matter frequently came up for discussion in my earlier years in Rome, invariably so when Cardinal Bourne or the Bishop of Southwark visited Rome and later on when Gavan Duffy himself came to Rome.

On the same date (10th September 1916) I record:-

"A great open-air meeting was held in the Phoenix Park by the Nation League against the partition of Ulster."

The Irish Nation League was mainly a Tyrone body with scattered sympathisers in Dublin and elsewhere.

On the 17th September, 1916, I wrote the following in my diary:-

"J. Bracken called. He told of his part in the fighting in Easter Week. He was mobilised with Company 'B' at Croydon Park. He marched to G.P.O. 4 p.m. Easter Monday. He was stationed with a shotgun in a window facing 'Freeman's Journal'. There was no fighting on that side. He did not fire a shot himself. He did fatigue duty and helped the wounded. There was not more than four hundred in the G.P.O. They were ordered out of the G.P.O. when the fire could not be kept under control. The pressure of water was insufficient. He went out with others by the Colliseum. There was no firing up Henry

Street. The firing was up Moore Street and the laneways off Henry Street and Moore Street. He was one of the stretcher-bearers who carried Connolly, carrying his shotgun in one hand and a portable sling around the stretcher in the other. They went down the laneway at the 'Arch' (Henry Place). They were stopped by rifle fire. They then rolled out a motor car as a barricade and walked past to comparative safety. In the group were Pearse, Willie Pearse, Connolly, J. Plunkett. He slept none that night but got a sleep on Saturday morning. When he woke up, he heard there was a truce."

On Monday, the 18th September, 1916, I made the following note in my diary:-

"I met Arthur Cleary who told me of poor Tom Kettle's death at the front on Saturday, the 9th September, 1916."

I noted on 21st September that there was renewed agitation in the English press to apply conscription to Ireland. It arises from the proposal to raise the age for military service in England from forty-one to forty-five.

I have here a newspaper cutting referring to John Redmond's speech at Waterford on the 6th October, 1916.

Political visit of French Bishops:

On 7th October, 1916, a deputation of French bishops and other prominent ecclesiastics arrived in Dublin on a visit to the Irish bishops on the occasion of their annual general meeting in Maynooth. The deputation included the Bishop of Orleans (Mons. Touchet),

the Bishop of Digne (Mons. L'Enfant), Mons. Batifol and the Abbé Flynn (later Bishop of Nevers). They were all prominent clergymen of the French Church. On Sunday, the 8th October, 1916, I went down to Maynooth, at the request of the Archbishop, to interview Cardinal Logue in order to ascertain the object of the French ecclesiastics' visit to Maynooth. This visit was unexpected and surrounded with much mystery. It was rumoured that John Redmond had prevailed on an Irish Archbishop to invite them to Ireland in the hope of promoting a more friendly feeling with France. As events developed, it was plain that the real object of these French ecclesiastics was to ascertain precisely the attitude of the Irish clergy with regard to the war and, doubtless, to overcome their presumed opposition to the recruiting of Irishmen for the British forces. The mission substantially failed, largely due to the mystery that surrounded it. The attitude of the Irish bishops was so cold that the French ecclesiastics concealed the real object of their visit. Their address to the general body of the Irish bishops at Maynooth on Tuesday, the 10th October, 1916, was highly oratorical but vague. They spoke of the old relations of Ireland and France but, to increase the mystification of the Irish bishops, not one word was said on the international situation. It was obvious that the attitude of the Irish bishops had plainly shown them the futility of any approach to the subject of recruiting. It may be noted that the courtesy visit, which the French ecclesiastics paid to the Archbishop of Dublin, was made on Monday, the 9th October, while His Grace was already in Maynooth for the meeting of the Standing Committee. It was on that Monday evening at a dinner given by the High Sheriff to the Lord

Lieutenant that the latter announced it would not be possible to have conscription for the present. That left the Government still free to introduce it later.

Mons. Batifol published in 'La Croix' on the 20th October, 1916, an account of their Irish visit.

At this time the 'Globe' suggested that "something in the nature of a Foreign Legion" should be enlisted in Ireland to serve in France "and to be in the closest touch with our heroic allies". ... "Such a legion would, without a doubt on the question, be extraordinarily popular in Ireland."

Bishops' discussion on political situation:

On 10th October, 1916, at the semi-annual meeting of bishops in Maynooth the statement drawn up for and passed by the Standing Committee was an appeal for constitutional methods and was of a strong Redmondite tendency. During the discussion by the general meeting on this statement, the Archbishop of Dublin secured the insertion of a demand for amnesty, but opposed the document in general on account of certain additions. He also objected on account of the absence of any reference to conscription, which omission would be noted and misconstrued. Accordingly despite the efforts of the Chairman to force it through and to rule out all amendments, he voted against it. During the discussion which was developing against the statement, the Archbishop of Dublin proposed leaving the whole matter to the Northern bishops who strongly objected to it because it could be construed as favouring partition. As a result of the general lack of agreement, the whole matter was dropped. The Bishop of Limerick (Dr. O'Dwyer) declared that he did

not care whether the statement was passed or not, so long as it was clear that it was not passed unanimously. Relating the incidents of the day to us, the Archbishop remarked with a chuckle on the growing evidence of Dr. O'Dwyer's intransigence. In a private conversation with the Archbishop previous to the meeting, he mocked at the use of constitutional methods and quoted the Duke of Wellington on the necessity of granting Catholic emancipation, and Gladstone on Church Disestablishment. The most effective opponent of the proposed declaration was Dr. McHugh, Bishop of Derry, who was most emphatic that any approval of constitutional agitation would be construed as approval of Redmond's constitutionalism. I have noted in my diary that the 'Independent' and the London Correspondent of the 'Irish Times' published on the 19th October, 1916, a short account of the bishops' meeting.

Arising out of the visit of the French ecclesiastics, I wrote a letter, published in the 'Freeman' and 'Independent' on the 12th October, 1916, signed "C", dealing with the confiscation of the property of the Irish Colleges in France after the Napoleonic wars and with the compensation paid by the French Government to England in respect of the English and Irish Catholic Colleges in France. Having fought for and obtained these Catholic endowments, the British Government was assailed by Protestant scruples and kept the money for its own secular purposes.

I have noted in my diary that on the 18th October, 1916, there was a debate in the House of Commons on the government of Ireland.

First regular American contribution to National
Aid Fund:

The first American contribution of £10,000 arrived

on the 27th October, 1916. The Archbishop, in acknowledging the receipt, paid tribute to the Irish committee who, he said, were working very energetically but that their work must, from its very nature, last for a long time. He informed Mr. Hughes Kelly that the letter had been opened by the censor. The Archbishop's letter was reproduced in facsimile in 'The Irish World' of 18th November, 1916.

Illustrating the altered attitude of the public mind towards the Rising, the Requiem Mass for those who died in Easter Week was given great prominence in the press for the 2nd November, 1916.

On the 10th November, 1916, I have written the following in my diary:-

"General Sir John Maxwell merely left a card before leaving Ireland to take up a command in Northern England."

An article on the Irish political situation by the Bishop of Raphoe, addressed to the United States papers, appeared in the 'Freeman' of the 14th November, 1916.

The Irish question of partition coupled with conscription was an active subject of discussion about this time (e.g., 'Sunday Herald' in England about 19th November, 1916).

Archbishop refuses Invitation to Lord Mayor's Banquet to Lord Lieutenant:

On the 29th November, 1916, I have the following written in my diary:-

"The Lord Lieutenant was entertained for the first time in thirty-seven years to a banquet by the Lord Mayor of Dublin. It

was obviously manoeuvred by the Irish Party for recruiting purposes. A few Town Councillors were present. The company included all seóinín Dublin and officialdom.

The Lord Mayor spoke of the representative nature of the gathering, the army, navy, university, civil service, bar, medicine and other professions, but he carefully abstained from mentioning the church, although the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishop of Canea and Monsignor B. Fitzpatrick, V.G., were amongst those present. All noticed the omission and coupled it with the Archbishop's absence. [A few days before] the Archbishop had written in reply to an invitation that he could not be present, 'as his presence at such a gathering would be seriously misunderstood'. In his first draft of the letter, he had phrased it, 'as his presence would be constructed as approval of the present position of Home Rule and Martial Law'."

Fall of Asquith - Tories dominant in British Cabinet:

From 1st December to 7th December, 1916, the Press was occupied with the English Cabinet crisis. Asquith resigned on the 5th December. Lloyd George was made Prime Minister on the 7th December. The change worsened the position of the Irish Parliamentary Party and was the work of the Tories. The strongly anti-Irish Bonar Law became 'leader' of the House of Commons.

Irish National Volunteers forbidden to drill -
John Redmond's attitude:

About the beginning of December, 1916, Sir Bryan

Mahon, the new Commander of the Forces, wrote to Colonel Moore as head of the National Volunteers notifying him that he would have to suppress the National Volunteers who were practising military drill. This referred to the activities of the Battalion attached to Pembroke Street who were still drilling. Colonel Moore wrote to the Battalion prohibiting drill whereupon they fell back on physical drill. New complaints were made. The police attended the meeting place, noting names. They were invited inside and told they could take the names of everybody they wanted, etc. A new order was then made by the military stating that physical drill came under the prohibition. The Battalion then fell back on physical exercises. In reality, military drill was included in practically all these exercises.

About the same time, this Battalion attached to Pembroke Street placarded several districts in one night with anti-conscription posters, inviting those who wished to oppose conscription to join the National Volunteers. They also held an anti-conscription meeting under the guise of an amnesty meeting. Hence the attention of the military and police.

The 'Independent' of the 13th December, 1916, contains an interesting interview, demonstrating Redmond's attitude towards the National Volunteers and his efforts to reduce them to still greater powerlessness and to obtain the support of their Central Committee to partition.

Release of Prisoners - Conditions in Frongoch:

I have noted in my diary that on the 21st December, 1916, in the House of Commons the Chief Secretary announced that he advised the Prime Minister that the danger of releasing the interned prisoners was

less than the danger of their detention.

I have attached to my diary newspaper cuttings referring to the release of the interned prisoners at Frongoch, Reading and Aylesbury Jails. The first section (146 in number) arrived in Dublin on Saturday and the remainder (over 300 in number) on Sunday, the 23rd and 24th December, 1916. Details and some of the names are given in the 'Independent' of the following week.

A great sensation was caused by the publication in the papers of the 22nd December, 1916, of Wilson's Peace Note, in which he invited the belligerents to declare the terms on which the war might be ended.

On the 25th December, 1916, I have noted the following in my diary:-

"Mr. Begley from Frongoch called with a note for the Archbishop from Father Larry Stafford. Begley recounted to me many incidents showing the petty tyranny of the military in endeavouring to identify those subject to conscription for the Army - roll calls, parcels, letters; the doctor even was prohibited from examining invalids until they had given their numbers and names.

Begley ascribed the suicide of the doctor, if it was suicide, ^{to the worry} which was due to his own weakness of character. The doctor had condemned the food and treatment but would not insist on having his rulings carried out, although in military circles the doctor is absolute. Sir Charles Cameron visited Frongoch recently. He said that the

food should be changed and condemned one of the dormitories. Paritcularly he censured Dr. Peters for refusing to examine prisoners until they had given their names and rightly pointed out that this was no business of a doctor. Complaint too, apparently, was made to the British Medical Council.

Begley's chief complaint was against the food and the tactlessness of the Commandant.

Begley was in Jacobs on Easter Monday and was then drafted on Tuesday to the College of Surgeons. They only lost five killed and three wounded in Stephen's Green and the College of Surgeons. He described the perfunctory examination before the Advisory Appeal Committee, to which he had refused to appeal. He refused to give any information. They said: "Don't you want to get out?" Begley replied: "Yes. Nobody wishes to stay in jail." They complained: "You are not helping us". Previously at Knutsford the military put into the mouths of the interned all kinds of pleas for their appeal forms, chiefly with a view to showing that they were led into the rebellion as dupes, that, once in it, they did not like to desert their comrades, that they never fired a shot, etc., etc. - all intended to vilify the leaders and justify their execution. A number of the more ignorant fell into the trap as they were anxious to be released. The Commandant sarcastically remarked, 'I don't know how three thousand of

our fellows got shot! Who fired the shots?"

On the 26th December, 1916, I have noted that the Archbishop received £5,000 for the National Aid Society from Mr. Hughes Kelly, collected at the church doors in New York. I have also entered the following in my diary:-

"Anti-conscription posters were put up in several districts in the south city. This was done by the National Volunteers. It is now fairly clear that the latest attempt to impose conscription has been abandoned. The Government is now looking to Ireland to supply corn and potatoes."

Later I shall add observations on the remarkable political reactions in the country in the summer and particularly the autumn of 1916.

Unionist Opinion of the Rebellion. They object to teaching of Irish History:

In the annual report of the standing committee of the Ulster Unionist Council for the year 1916, the work of the year was reviewed. Dealing with the Irish rebellion, the report said:-

"It is not proposed in the course of the present report to deal at length with the history and events of these days. It is sufficient to point out that the rebellion was marked by acts of wanton barbarity by the Sinn Féiners and that an utter disregard for life was shown by the rebels towards unarmed soldiers and unoffending loyalist citizens."

This meeting was held on the 5th February, 1917.

A comment upon General Maxwell's statement on the North King Street murders published in the 'Daily Mail' of 18th or 19th May, 1916, will be found in the 'Evening Herald' of 19th May, 1916.

In the months following the Rising, there were many criticisms from the Unionist side attacking the toleration extended by the British Government to what they regarded as seditious movements. Even the National Education Department was held accountable from the mere fact of teaching Irish history. The 'Daily Express' of the 26th December, 1916, reports the criticisms of "Shebna The Scribe" whose "Epistles" form a feature of the current number of the 'Church of Ireland Gazette' on the teaching of Irish history in National Schools. In the course of a long dissertation a strong attack is made particularly on Mrs. Stephen Gwynn's "Stories From Irish History" and the Christian Brothers' "Irish History Reader". Complaint is made, in particular, of the magnifying of Ireland's rebels - Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Wolfe Tone, Emmett and the Fenians. He asks, "Why do our Protestant Commissioners allow these books? Would it not be possible to eliminate Irish history books from the curriculum? There is not time in the school hours to teach the various subjects urgently needed. Irish national schoolteachers have, in general, neither the due historical equipment nor the aloofness for handling the subject".

The discussion of the effect of the teaching of Irish history on the political mentality of the country was very continuous during all this period and at least two "History Readers" were withdrawn. In an interview reported in the 'Irish Independent' on the 27th February, 1917, Dr. Starkie stated that since 1911 and

1912 these history readers were examined much more strictly. Objections to them were found. -

"These objections were made by Protestant Managers following the rebellion and after Dr. Mahaffey, Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, made his charge that the rising was largely inspired in the national schools. That was a very serious charge against the teachers, and I challenge the truth of that statement at once, as far as the staff here was concerned, and the Board had interviews with various people - Church of Ireland, Presbyterian, Methodist and Catholic Managers. The Provost was invited to come here to substantiate his charges but refused to do so. As a result of our inquiry, we ascertained that certain Managers - Presbyterian and Church of Ireland - objected to certain books, three or four. The Board ordered that all the Irish history books that had been sanctioned should be revised to ascertain if they contained sentences likely to excite religious or political bitterness. Two particular 'History Readers' were found objectionable. There were some books not yet pronounced upon, as the Committee has not held its final meeting. Catholic Managers made no objections to any 'History Readers'. Books are not allowed if objected to by even one member of the Board."

I have noted in my diary that in the month of January, 1917, in addition to the courtmartial of James Ryan, Secretary of the Limerick G.A.A., for refusing to tell where he got certain confidential documents,

there was also a courtmartial at Cork against P. Corcoran, a printer, for printing documents with intent of causing disaffection.

On the 3rd January, 1917, the principal film at the Rotunda cinema, called "Ireland A Nation", was ordered to be withdrawn by the military authorities. It had attracted large crowds on the two previous days, and had been previously passed by the Film Censor. This is an illustration of the attempts at suppressing national feeling.

The evening papers of January 12th, 1917, contained the replies of Germany, Austria, and Hungary to President Wilson's Note. The German reply recalls, in connection with the championing of small nationalities, the fate of Irish and Boer nationalities. The Austrian reply mentions the fate of the Irish and Finnish peoples.

The Archbishop received two sums of £5,000 each on the 14th and 15th January, 1917, for the National Aid Fund from America.

Count Plunkett proposed for Roscommon Vacancy at Griffith's Meeting of 14th January, 1917:

Arthur Griffith had a conference on the 14th January, 1917, representing the different sections of national opinion, namely Sinn Féin, Volunteers, National League, etc. Opinion was very divided as to the proper policy to be adopted. Only the younger Irish Volunteers favoured physical force but the others could not agree on a constitutional policy. Arthur Griffith is determined to re-start 'Nationality' as offering a freer policy. A promise of support was received for policies in favour of amnesty of the prisoners and representation at the Peace Conference. At this

meeting it was proposed that Count Plunkett would stand for the Roscommon parliamentary vacancy. Financial considerations made it difficult for him to agree immediately, but he did so a week later.

John Dillon on the 17th January, 1917, at a meeting held at Swinford made what was perhaps the first open attempt on his part to meet the new feeling in the country. He made no reference to John Redmond, boasted he had never stood on a recruiting platform (which was absolutely incorrect) and of all the strenuous efforts of the Party to stop the executions and alleviate the conditions of the interned and prisoners. It was noted that Mr. Dillon had a manuscript which he did not use, and it was stated that his spoken speech was very much modified from that which he had written. He realised he was up against formidable opposition. The 'Freeman' suppressed that part of the Chairman's speech - Dean Connington - that emphasised the need for listening to and welcoming criticism. A letter was read from Bishop Morrisroe of Achonry. At this same meeting John Dillon described the Home Rule Act, as it now stood, as the best constitution that Ireland had ever obtained since the Norman conquest.

Expulsion of Count Plunkett from R.D.S.:

On the 18th January, 1917, the Royal Dublin Society by 236 votes against 58 called upon Count Plunkett to resign his membership on the threat of expulsion. No reason was given. Previously the Royal Irish Academy had expelled John McNeill from its membership.

Larry O'Neill elected Lord Mayor. Archbishop - refuses out-going Lord Mayor's invitation to luncheon for Irish-Canadian Regiment:

I have noted in my diary that on the 23rd January, 1917, Alderman Larry O'Neill was elected Lord Mayor for 1917.

On the 27th January, 1917, I wrote the following in my diary:-

"The Lord Mayor Mr. Gallagher entertained the Irish-Canadian Regiment at luncheon. The Archbishop declined an invitation to be present. The usual officialdom was present and P.J.Brady, M.P., and William Fields, M.P. A remarkable letter was read from John Redmond which should be compared with John Dillon's speech at Swinford. This visit of the Irish-Canadians was purely a recruiting device. It was a fiasco and made no appeal to the popular point of view. Between the icy winds and the growth of Sinn Féin, there was no popular demonstration though the press and official world did their utmost to promote its object. A remarkable but not apparent feature is the arrangement for Mass tomorrow 28th January, 1917. Foreseeing the answer they would receive for a Mass in the Pro-Cathedral, the authorities have actually arranged that the men leave Dublin at seven o'clock tomorrow and arrive in Armagh at 10.20 to attend Mass in the Cathedral there. The whole incident is another illustration of the wily procedure of the Government and its desperate efforts to try and persuade us and persuade the world that we are identical with the Empire and the Colonies and, incidentally, to gather recruits. The imperial card is played for north-east Ulster and the self-government 'Home Rule on the Statute Book' and 'Defender of Small Nationalities' in Dublin.

The Bishop of Cork did not attend the Cork reception."

German Government in a Note to the U.S.A.
criticises England's treatment of Ireland
and India:

My diary of 1st February, 1917, notes the German Government's reply to President Wilson's address to the U.S.A. Senate. It runs:-

"The German Government handed a note to the American Ambassador in Berlin, Mr. Gerard, acknowledging the copy of the President's address to the Senate of the United States on the 22nd January, 1917. The Government states that it agrees to a wide extent with the principles and wishes which Germany professes, and continues: 'Hitherto belongs, in the first place, the right of all nations to self-government and equal rights. In acknowledging this principle, Germany would sincerely rejoice if peoples like those of Ireland and India, who do not enjoy the blessings of political independence, now obtain their freedom'."

Newspaper Criticism of Treatment of Irish
Prisoners in England:

At this time, the treatment of the Irish prisoners in England was very much to the fore. I forget how I entered into communication with Alderman Corrigan on this matter. I called on him. At my persuasion, Alderman Corrigan, writing on the 1st February, 1917, contradicted the claim of Mr. John T. Donovan, M.P., that the Irish Party had secured, among other benefits, that the Irish prisoners were not treated as criminals. Other letters appeared in the press of the 12th March and 28th April, 1917. Questions were asked in the House of Commons by Alderman Byrne on the 13th February, 1917.

Result of Roscommon Election:

The result of the North Roscommon election was declared on the 5th February, 1917. Count Plunkett polled 3,022 against 1,708 for the Irish Party candidate and 687 for Jaspar Tully (Independent). The fighting of this election was largely due to the personal pressure that P.T. Keohane brought on Father O'Flanagan, Count Plunkett, Ginnell and Arthur Griffith. My notes in my diary for the 5th February, 1917, continue as follows:-

"Rarely has there been so much excitement over an election result. Count Plunkett started at the eleventh hour with little local backing. His chief support came from Father O'Flanagan and Larry Ginnell. An official convention of the U.I.L. and A.O.H. unanimously selected a local shopkeeper, T.J. Devine, who was nominated by the Parish Priest of Boyle. All the other Irish Party candidates withdrew in order to support Devine.

Father O'Flanagan, Ginnell, Arthur Griffith, Louis Walsh, Mr. Kenny of Waterford, Alderman Meade of Cork and the Nation Leaguers of Omagh and a score of others campaigned on behalf of the Count who only arrived on the previous Thursday - four days before the election. Though his supporters had hopes of his success, they never for a moment dreamed of such a resounding victory. Up to Saturday, the Irish Party believed that they were winning. The news of the success astounded and delighted the 'man in the street'. The Archbishop remarked that there was nothing like it since Butt's victory in Limerick. Count

Plunkett's success was entirely due to his own banishment, to the memory and execution of his son, Joseph, and the imprisonment of two others. Doubtless too he was helped by his expulsion from the Royal Dublin Society."

As far as I recollect, the issue of the republic as distinct from Irish independence was not raised by this election. An analysis of the vote in North Roscommon shows that of the 5,400 votes polled, there was a majority of 2,000 against the Irish Parliamentary Party candidate.

Early in February, the band of the Irish Guards was sent from London to Ireland in a further attempt at recruiting.

Suspicious Boat off Kerry Coast. - Deportations
of Republicans under D.O.R.A.:

Guards were doubled along the coast as a result of the report that suspicious boats had been seen off the coast of Kerry about the 15th February, 1917.

On Ash Wednesday, the 21st February, 1917, twenty-eight arrests were made under the Defence of the Realm Act. Among those arrested were Seán T. O'Kelly, Herbert Mellows, J.J. O'Kelly (Sceilg), William Pedlar, Michael Foley, Francis McCabe, Terence McSwiney, Thomas McCurtain, Terence Foley, John Nolan (Cork), Peter Hourihan, W.P. Manahan (Limerick), M.P. Colivet, James McInerney, Seán Ó Muirthile, George Nichols, Padraig O'Malley (Lehane), Michael Thornton, Joseph McBride, Darrell Figgis and Dr. Patrick McCartan.

In passing, I should refer to Alderman Larry O'Neill's reference to his ill-treatment following his arrest after the Rising. The reference was made in the speech which he delivered at his election as Lord Mayor on the 23rd January, 1917.

Seán T. O'Kelly, one of the twenty-eight persons arrested on the 21st February, 1917, told me later that on this particular afternoon of the 21st February he had been attending some educational committee meeting of the Corporation. When they were leaving, he was approached by two men, one of whom he recognised as an old acquaintance, a shadower, and the other quite obviously a detective. The senior man beckoned to him and said, "I want to see you for a moment, Mr. Kelly". Seán T. left the others. "What do you want?", he asked. "I am sorry to say I have a warrant here for your arrest", was the reply. Seán T. asked him, "What for?"; and he said they did not know. Seán T. asked him were there many others. He said they had orders to arrest about twenty men. Seán T. instinctively put his hands in his pockets to see if he had any papers. The second detective thought he was drawing a revolver and produced two revolvers. "You damn fool!" said No. 1, "Making a show of us before all the others". He made them put away their revolvers. The friendly detective said, "I think you had better go home and pack some things; you may have to go away for some time". Seán T. went home and packed his things. They were all brought off then to Arbour Hill. Next morning the officer called out all their names and said that, as they were the first to be sent off, they had an option of selecting where to go from a number of places mentioned. Seán T. and some others chose Oxford. When they arrived at Oxford, they were practically destitute, with very limited money at their disposal. They had to find lodgings for themselves. Count Plunkett, hearing of their residence in Oxford, offered them the use of his house there, but up to the 28th February they were not able to take advantage of the offer. When eventually they took possession of it,

they ran the house themselves. So long as they remained within a certain number of miles of Oxford, they could go about. They took french leave and went up to London for the St. Patrick's Day concert. Very shortly after that, the Longford election campaign was beginning and Seán T. O'Kelly and another - probably Ginnell - simply walked off and went over to Longford for the election.

Griffith replies to Devlin's attack on
Gaelic League and Sinn Féin:

I have here an extract from the 'Independent' of the 23rd February, 1917, regarding a meeting on the 18th February to bolster up the Irish Parliamentary Party. The meeting was mainly attended by publicans. Joe Devlin in his usual style made an attack on the Gaelic League and Sinn Féin -

"Wretched creatures throwing mud at us - enough to make our stomachs sick."

Arthur Griffith, writing in 'Nationality' on the 3rd March, 1917, points out the coincidence of the Irish Party's meeting on the 18th February and Mr. Devlin's remarks and the arrests and deportations four days after the meeting - and that while the statement for the Peace Conference was being drawn up by Mr. Darrell Figgis and after the pungent criticism of the Irish Party by 'Sceilg' in the 'Catholic Bulletin'.

Mr. T.P. O'Connor wrote two articles for the New York papers which were equivalent to panegyrics of Mr. Lloyd George. In one paper of then recent date, 'The North American', he mentions, incidentally, that he dined with David Lloyd George the previous week.

For the first time the vote of thanks to the preceding Lord Mayor - Gallagher - was opposed, but it

was carried by twenty-four against nineteen, at the inauguration of Larry O'Neill as Lord Mayor.

On the 26th February, 1917, Dillon protested in the House of Commons on the arrests in Ireland. For some time Dillon was acting leader of the Parliamentary Party in the absence of Redmond. All accounts say Redmond is pessimistic and powerless.

On the 28th February, 1917, I noted in my diary:-

"After the arrests the wildest and vaguest of rumours circulated in the country that arms were being landed in Kerry and Galway from German ships and submarines; that arms were being distributed throughout the country; that the British fleet was patrolling the south and west of Ireland; that Galway town and county were occupied by military and nobody allowed to go about except with a pass; and that several ships bound for Irish ports had been allowed to proceed by German submarines. While all this was devoid of foundation, it was evidently inspired by the scared military and police. It is said, 'There are at least fifty thousand troops held up in this country'; and doubtless Dublin Castle and military Orangemen find such scares useful for their purpose in England. The Galway scare arose out of the funeral of an Irish Volunteer at Kinvara who was buried with an Irish Republican flag on his coffin. At once, the news was wired to Galway city, 'There are thousands of Sinn Féiners marching on Galway'."

Count Plunkett held a meeting in the Mansion House on the 5th March, 1917.

BUREAU OF MILITARY HISTORY 1913-21
BURO STAIRE MILEATA 1913-21

NO. W.S. 687

ROINN  COSANTA.

BUREAU OF MILITARY HISTORY, 1913-21.

STATEMENT BY WITNESS

DOCUMENT NO. W.S. 687 (Section 2).

Witness

Right Rev. Monsignor M. Curran, P.P.,
The Presbytery,
Aughrim St.,
Dublin.

Identity.

Secretary to Archbishop Walsh,
1906-1919;
Vice-Rector Irish College, Rome, 1920;
Later, Rector do.

Subject.

His recollections of Irish national
affairs, 1912-1922.

Conditions, if any, Stipulated by Witness.

Extract from witness' letter of 17th June 1952
attached to statement:

"It is my wish that the statement be accessible
for public reference only after twenty years,
say 1 Jan. 1972. By mutual agreement it may
be accessible to special competent, sympathetic
and responsible investigators that the Bureau
may agree upon with me".

File No. S.1305.

Bonar Law refuses to publish proceedings of
Courtmarshals of Easter Week men:

On the same day - 5th March, 1917 - Bonar Law, on behalf of the Ministry, declared that the proceedings of the courtmarshals of the Easter Week men would not be published despite the promise made last October that they would be published.

On the 6th March, 1917, there was a notable debate in the House of Commons on T.P. O'Connor's resolution calling for the granting of "free institutions" for Ireland. Answering charges of change of attitude, Lloyd George showed that the Liberal Government, the Coalition Government and the present Government repeatedly declared they would not coerce Ulster. There were many interesting comments by the speakers, particularly by Lonsdale, quoting Devlin, by Ginnell and Lloyd George. At the end of the debate Redmond led the Party out of the House of Commons to take counsel.

On the 7th March, 1917, the Senate of Victoria, Australia, passed a resolution in favour of Home Rule for Ireland by twenty-eight votes to two.

Manifesto of Irish Party shows change of attitude:

Following on a meeting held on the 8th March, 1917, the Irish Party published a manifesto, as insincere as it was unconvincing, in an endeavour to alter their own attitude under the guise of attributing a change of attitude on Home Rule to Lloyd George. Lloyd George, like Asquith, had long made it plain that he was in favour of the exclusion of Ulster. The manifesto promulgates no policy and the appeal to the United States and Colonies is plainly forced on the Party by the Sinn Féin determination to appeal both to the United States and the Peace Conference.

A significant comment on this meeting of the Irish Party is provided by the London correspondent of the 'Liverpool Post' who wrote:-

"While their deliberations [on the manifesto] were in progress, the little figure of Mr. Patrick O'Brien, the genial Whip of the Party, was to be seen stealing quietly along the floor of the House to a bench behind the Treasury bench. Safely arrived there, Mr. O'Brien leant over and whispered a communication into the ear of Mr. Bonar Law. What was the effect of his announcement we can only guess, but obviously we have not reached a stage of war á l'outrance."

The 'Irish Independent' during these days [10th to 12th March, 1917], commenting on the manifesto, recalls former statements of the Party leaders, such as, that of Redmond on the 15th September, 1914 (q.v.), and of Mr. Devlin on the 21st June, 1916. It also quoted Dillon's tribute to Lloyd George when he stated that he did not want to attack Mr. Lloyd George as -

"I recognise that he has been a faithful friend of Home Rule during all the years in Parliament."

The manifesto contains a reference to the Irish Pro-German Revolutionary Party (meaning Sinn Féin). Alderman Alfie Byrne told me on the 21st May, 1917, that he moved at the Irish Parliamentary Party meeting that this reference be omitted and he only got seven supporters.

Revolution in Russia began in March, 1917. The Duma secured the abdication of the Tsar on 15th March.

On the 12th March, 1917, Count Plunkett received the freedom of the city of Kilkenny (See papers of the 13th March, 1917).

Military Activity suggests fear of another Rebellion:

On the 14th March, 1917, I have noted the following in my diary:-

"The Government's fear of renewed difficulties in Ireland is reflected by the military demonstrations in the streets of Dublin and elsewhere. The military authorities appear to be suffering from nerves or are pretending to be suffering from a fear of another rebellion and invasion from Germany. Military have been stationed throughout the country in places where soldiers were never seen before. This has given rise to the opinion that the Government means to attempt conscription.

In Dublin city the military seek to impress the people according to the Birrell policy. For some days past, two armoured cars, with guns protruding behind, have been ostentatiously parading through the streets. To-day they came down Dorset Street as far as the North Circular Road and went back. Sandbags and iron sheeting have been placed on the roofs of the Bank of Ireland, Four Courts and Custom House. It is said that machine guns have also been placed there. Companies of troops parade the streets from time to time. About two hundred came down

Dorset Street to-day and went up Whitworth Road. The Government, it is said, believe that another rising was timed for St. Patrick's Day or in connection with an Easter commemoration demonstration."

On the 17th March, 1917, I wrote the following:-

"No rebellion broke out! Many loyalists were much relieved, fearing serious consequences from their felon-setting after Easter Week, 1916.

Count Plunkett received the freedom of Sligo to-day.

Northcliffe made a remarkable speech at the Irish Club, London."

Count Plunkett invites Archbishop to Conference:

On the 27th March, 1917, Archbishop Walsh, replying to an invitation by Count Plunkett to attend a conference he had summoned, said that great, if not irreparable harm had been done by the way in which the proposed conference had been put before the country.

It was on 5th April, 1917, that U.S.A. declared war on Germany.

On the 7th April, 1917 - the eve of Easter - it was announced that the 'Nation', Massingham's paper, could not be sent abroad.

On the 21st April, 1917, McPherson (Under-Secretary), in answer to a question, gave the following figures of cases where circulation abroad had been prohibited: there were seventeen such papers in England and Wales, one in Scotland and ten in Ireland.

On the previous day (20th April, 1917) a

proclamation was issued by the Commander-in-Chief of the forces in Ireland prohibiting the processions within Dublin, except the procession of the Lord Mayor in Dublin and such processions as were authorised.

"A.E.'s" interview with General Smuts. Archbishop refuses permission for War Office Collections at Churches:

On the 23rd April, 1917, "A.E." on his return from London said he had interviewed General Smuts, Asquith, Northcliffe, etc. My diary says of "A.E.'s." report:-

"Northcliffe is in favour of Home Rule. He says that no Englishman could ever understand Ireland. General Smuts is also in favour of Colonial [Dominion] Home Rule and also two other members of the Imperial Conference. There is reason to believe that Smuts will raise the Irish question at the Conference."

On the 27th April, 1917, the Archbishop was asked by Leslie, Lady Powerscourt, for permission to make collections at the church doors in County Wicklow for the Counties War Hospital. The usual refusal was given. He stated that it was not ecclesiastical; therefore, the collection could not be held at church doors.

Lloyd George's hypocritical expression of anxiety for Irish settlement. Garvin's role as intermediary:

On the 27th April, 1917, Lloyd George in his speech at the Guildhall revealed his usual adroit but hypocritical statement of his anxiety to have an Irish settlement. He said that:-

"To have a well-knit and powerful empire, we must convert Ireland from a

suspicious, surly and dangerous neighbour to a secure and friendly Ireland, and because I know from facts brought home to me every hour, an Irish settlement is one of the essentials of victory."

Most of the speech was for the benefit of the colonial representatives.

On the 4th May, 1917, I wrote the following in my diary:-

"Letter received to-day from Seán T. O'Kelly. He mentioned that he had seen Garvin, the editor of the 'Sunday Observer'. This interview took place on Sunday, 29th April. Garvin gave him to understand that he is the intermediary between Joe Devlin and Craig and Lloyd George. He told Seán of the proposal for the exclusion for five years of the four counties. Seán said that such proposals would be rejected. Garvin scouted the idea of colonial Home Rule."

Bishop of Limerick's letter on treatment of Prisoners:

The 30th April, 1917, was the date of the letter of the Bishop of Limerick on the treatment of the Irish prisoners. This letter was suppressed by the censor but was nevertheless circulated through Ireland in typewritten copies. Later, it was circulated during the Longford election.

On the occasion of the anniversary of the Rising numerous Requiem Masses were held in Dublin and throughout the country. The Masses in the various Churches in Dublin were crowded. Republican flags were hoisted at different places throughout the country and hauled down by the military. In one case, the flag

was fired on. Cumann na mBan placed wreaths on the grave of rebellion victims at Glasnevin.

On Sunday, 6th May, 1917, the King's Proclamation enjoining economy in the use of bread and flour was read in all the Protestant Churches in Dublin, all the congregation standing. No reference was made in the Catholic Churches. A priest in Coolock alluded to it in a most sarcastic manner and advised the people of Dublin to keep their own food supplies in Ireland.

Important Manifesto against Partition:

The newspapers of the 8th May, 1917, contained a most important manifesto against partition, permanent or temporary, signed by eighteen Catholic bishops, three Protestant bishops and several Chairmen of the County Councils. It was signed by three of the four Catholic Archbishops; the fourth, Dr. Healy of Tuam, did not sign owing to serious illness. Dr. Coyne of Elphin sent us in his signature during the week. Apart from the invalid Archbishop of Tuam, Dr. Healy, the bishops who did not sign were Dr. O'Donnell of Raphoe, Dr. Foley of Kildare, Dr. Hoare of Ardagh, who had nominated the Party candidate for South Longford, Dr. Cohalan of Cork, Dr. Mangan of Kerry, Dr. O'Kelly of Ross and Dr. O'Dea of Galway. The first three of these were strong supporters of the Irish Parliamentary Party. Dr. O'Kelly of Ross was a close friend of Sir Horace Plunkett. The Protestant bishops who signed were Dr. Plunkett of Tuam, Dr. Gregg of Ossory (later of Dublin and now Armagh) and Dr. T. Stirling of Killaloe. The opening sentence of the manifesto brings out the all-important point that hitherto no organised effort was made to elicit the national expression of the country in general on its dismemberment and, as far as John Redmond and the Irish Parliamentary Party were concerned, no meeting of a national character had been held. This particular move

originated with Dr. McHugh, the Bishop of Derry. While many names were received in the course of the following week in support, the only bishop who sent his was Dr. Coyne, the Bishop of Elphin. The absence of such names as the Bishop of Raphoe, Dr. O'Dea, the Bishop of Galway, show to what a sad extent the national interests were subordinated to those of the Party. It should not be forgotten that only five of the Chairmen of the County Councils and Borough Councils, who formed the majority of the Convention, signed the Bishops' protest against partition and that one of the five withdrew his signature. A reference to this will be found in William O'Brien's (M.P.) pamphlet, "The Party", published in 1917. This is only one of many scores of examples of the "hidden hand" of the Parliamentary Party and A.O.H. machine workers.

A no less important and even more damaging letter by the Archbishop of Dublin (Dr. Walsh) appeared in the papers that same evening, emphasising that anybody who thought that partition did not occupy the leading place in the politics of the day was simply living in a fool's paradise. In a characteristic postscript he wrote:-

"I think it my duty to write this, although from information that has just reached me I am fairly satisfied that the mischief has already been done and the country is practically sold."

The entire Irish press and the Irish correspondents of the leading English papers were unanimous on the enormous significance and influence of this "unique" document.

The Dublin correspondent of the 'Times' wrote:-

"I think the word 'unique', in its strictest sense, may be applied to the fact that eighteen Catholic and three

Protestant Bishops have united publicly in allegiance to the principle of an Ireland, one and undivided."

He speaks of it as the signpost of a revolution in the social position in Ireland. A point to be borne in mind is that, despite all this, the Irish Party refused to consult the country on the question of dismemberment of the country.

The writer in the 'Times' correctly stated that the initiative of this manifesto was due to the Catholic bishops of Ulster. The manifesto appeared in the papers of the 8th May, 1917, the day before the polling in South Longford. The Archbishop's letter on the same date in the evening press was telegraphed to Longford and printed in leaflet form in time for the polling on the next day (9th May, 1917). These two documents were decisive factors in the winning of the election.

The election in South Longford occupies a singularly high place. It ranks with the Clare elections in historical importance. The Irish Party had concentrated all their power on the winning of the election. Dillon, Devlin, Nugent, the secretary of the A.O.H., and a very large contingent of members of Parliament conducted the campaign for McKenna, the Party candidate. They had received the Bishop's nomination. Nugent had got carte blanche to spend all the money necessary to win it and at the final stages he was perfectly confident of victory. So too was the leader writer in the 'Freeman's Journal' - the Party's organ - which stated that on the question of partition the Party had a free hand. This expression revealed the Party tactics. They intended after the election to say that this was one of the issues at the election that the country voted its support of the attitude of the Party

and signified its confidence in the Party and its policy. The result of the election completely upset their strategy. Hence, their rage against Archbishop Walsh and the 'young clergy' of Longford. It was only the happy and last-minute combination of all anti-Party opinions that brought about the defeat of the Party. Vials of wrath were poured especially on the Archbishop whose letter, circulated on the morning of the election, was held responsible for the narrow defeat of their candidate. The election was won by only thirty-seven votes. On the eve of the poll, Nugent had telegraphed to the Party in London that he was certain of a majority of some hundreds. Their marked register of votes also showed this. For the next month the attacks on the Archbishop in the press, 'Freeman' and 'Telegraph', and the organs of the Party through the country were continued.

One week after the election on the evening of the 16th May, 1917, the Government published their proposals for the settlement of the Irish question, which excluded the Six Counties, this exclusion to be subject to review by Parliament at the end of five years unless terminated by action of a consultative body of all Ireland.

The 'Freeman's' reaction on the 17th May, 1917, again insinuated temporary exclusion by rejecting "the plan for permanent partition".

Dr. O'Dwyer comments on Lloyd George's proposal
for Convention to settle Irish question:

A scathing letter appeared from the Bishop of Limerick (Dr. O'Dwyer) on the "confidence tricks" of the Government proposals in the press of the 19th May, 1917. Having said that the British Government had used the Home Rule Act for the last eleven years as their "trump card"

in the hands of their Irish followers to hoodwink and deceive the Irish people, Dr. O'Dwyer now asks "if we are to begin again a new phase of the confidence trick by means of a convention". He asked for plain answers to five questions:-

- "(1) Will the convention be freely elected by the Irish people?
- (2) Will it have statutory powers, or is it a mere consultative body?
- (3) Will it decide questions by a majority, or will unanimity be required?
- (4) If it decides that six counties are to come in, will they be required to come in, or will there still be the axiom that Ulster must not be coerced?

Plain answers are wanted unless we are to be made fools of again and Mr. Redmond and his followers are to do the work of England in Ireland until the end of the war, as they have done since the beginning. The Irish dupes who trusted the Party will be left the thimble but find no pea."

Longford Election's fatal blow to Irish Party.
Criticism by General Council of County Councils:

The Longford election was an almost fatal blow to the Party. Longford town was a west-British garrison town. For long, two regiments were stationed there and, on the departure of the last about 1890, there was much weeping and wailing among the shopkeepers and the military parasites. The militia who took their place were a poor substitute for the artillery and infantry of the 1870's and 1880's. Very many of the district had enlisted in the British Army, and their wives and dependants formed the most prominent and noisiest element

of the Party's supporters in the constituency. In Longford town they flaunted Union Jacks and small green flags - their true colours - at the Party's gatherings. Every report speaks of the abundance of strong drink amongst them. South Longford constituency extended from Castleforbes in the north to the very south of the county and had its full share of planters and families with British Army associations. Outside Ulster and South Dublin there was hardly a constituency in all Ireland with such a pro-British, pro-ally and reactionary outlook. Its loss to the Parliamentary Party proved that they could no longer count on any constituency outside the influence of Joe Devlin.

From April, 1917, onwards public opinion in America, and even in Australia, in favour of Irish claims became a great source of anxiety to the British. On April 28th or 29th, two hundred American Congressmen, including the Speaker, Mr. Champ Clark, sent a telegram to Lloyd George advocating ~~for~~ an early settlement of the Irish problem in accordance with the principles announced by President Wilson in his address to Congress. This appeared in the 'Times' and English press.

Indications of a more independent and critical tone among the popular representatives were first seen at the meeting of the County Councils' General Council held in Dublin on the 13th April, 1917, when a resolution was passed against the partition of the country calling for "a bold scheme of full legislative and fiscal autonomy", while one or two speakers freely criticised the Party.

Irish Party's unscrupulous attempt to wreck Count Plunkett's Convention of 19th April, 1917:

An example of the utterly unscrupulous methods used by the Party and its organs against Sinn Féin appeared in the 'Freeman' and 'Evening Telegraph' about the 16th

April, 1917. A plainly bogus document couched in socialist or communist verbiage appeared as an item on the agenda for Count Plunkett's coming Convention. It had been circulated among many people in Dublin and especially among the clergy. It was marked 'Private and Confidential' and headed 'The Socialist Party of Ireland'. It contained an extract from a notorious article which appeared in Jim Larkin's 'Irish Worker' of the 13th December, 1913, containing a bitter attack on the Irish Church. The document itself set out the resolutions to be proposed by a Labour delegate at Count Plunkett's Convention. The resolutions, amongst others, demanded the abolition of clerical managership of schools and the appointment of Count Plunkett, Countess Markievicz and Larkin as delegates to the Peace Conference. (I wrote a letter to the press headed 'Fair Play' that evening.) The object of this circular was to discredit Count Plunkett and his friends in the eyes of the clergy and the Catholics generally. The 'Freeman's Journal' published the circular on the 16th April, 1917, under four captions, one of which reads, "Socialists' Proposals for the Convention". There was also a sub-leader in the paper dealing with the paper as if it was a genuine document issued by and with the consent of Count Plunkett and his friends.

In an inconspicuous paragraph, the 'Evening Telegraph' published the repudiation by Mr. William O'Brien, a prominent member of the Socialist Party, who said that it was a bogus document.

The 'Independent' of the 18th April, 1917, under the heading of "A Bogus Circular", states that:-

"Mr. Charles Russell, Secretary of the Socialist Party of Ireland, denies that his

Party had any connection whatsoever with the bogus circular going the rounds under the heading of the Socialist Party of Ireland."

Despite the repudiations of the 16th April, 1917, the 'Freeman' and 'Telegraph' of the 17th April published letters assuming that the circular was genuine. These two issues of the 'Telegraph' contained articles bitterly offensive against Plunkett, full of misrepresentations of the Sinn Féin rising, commiserating John McNeill and the dead and imprisoned leaders on the attacks made on them in 1914 by Liberty Hall. This was from the editor of the 'National Volunteer' - Gaynor.

The Convention was held in the Mansion House on the 19th April, 1917. It is difficult for us at present to visualise the circumstances under which this Convention was held. Apart from the decaying and corrupt Irish Parliamentary Party and its followers, the country was like a rudderless ship. There was deep opposition to the policy of the Party but that opposition was entirely unorganised and, as far as it was voiced, came from a score of different groups. The Sinn Féin leaders were in Lewes prison. Arthur Griffith represented a group somewhat removed from the Republicans of Easter Week. William O'Brien's 'All For Ireland League', including Tim Healy, was more so. There had been no elections for either Parliament or Local Government bodies since before the war. Hence, even County Councillors, who were the closest to the people, no longer represented the changed attitude of the people and particularly of the younger generation. The more politically-minded among the commercial circles were highly critical both of partition and of the financial clause of the Home Rule Bill. The more virile section

of the Nationalists in the north of Ireland were enraged at the attitude of the Party on partition and its suppression of public opinion. Only a degree less so were many of the former members of the Volunteers. But all these and the general body of Nationalists had no means of voicing their opinion in public. Again it must be emphasised that the Parliamentary Party obstinately refused to hold a public meeting to elicit national expression on the question of partition. The 'Press Censor' was no more thorough in suppressing Sinn Féin sentiment than the Party organ. Criticism could find no expression in public.

The importance of Count Plunkett's convention, therefore, was that it was the first attempt to voice the new national opinion. However, though many would not go so far as to adopt either his full policy or his leadership, all realised the importance of the expression of national opinion. The opposition of the Irish Party organ and the boycotting of this Convention by their followers showed how much the Party realised its importance. The bogus document was an illustration of the unscrupulous methods they used to sabotage.

The Convention was an enthusiastic one, attended by six hundred delegates. A striking feature was the number of young priests there. Delegates were present from about seventy public Corporations and Councils, as well as from Sinn Féin Clubs and associates. There were also some trade and labour bodies represented. A dramatic scene marked the conclusion of Count Plunkett's address when the entire audience affirmed the declaration, "We proclaim Ireland to be a separate nation" - affirming its freedom from all foreign control, denying the authority of any foreign Parliament to make laws for Ireland, affirming the

right of the Irish people to declare their will is law, maintaining the status of Ireland as a distinct nation, demanding representation at the coming Peace Conference, declaring that Ireland has never yielded to foreign rule and binding themselves to use every means in their power to obtain complete liberty for their country. It should be noted that at this date the formulation of an 'Irish Republic' had not yet been mentioned, though at the Convention there were cries of "Up the Republic!

During the Gift Sale in the Mansion House in the course of the following days, it was easy to pick up the general reaction to the Convention. It was definitely favourable. While Plunkett was not regarded as a suitable leader or director, it was felt that the new organisation would bring the groups together and that the general body of public opinion would follow Arthur Griffith and that Griffith's policy of working with the less advanced Nationalist sections was correct.

Alfie Byrne describes Party's state of mind:

In a conversation with Alfie Byrne on 21st May, 1917, he told me that Devlin and most of the Party were anxious to retire altogether or appeal to the country which they recognised they had lost. "Devlin says he can do nothing in Parliament and that he will go on the Belfast Corporation. Redmond and Dillon are against resignation, Dillon dominating the helpless members. (Stephen) Gwynn and another are in favour of conscription and against resignation."

On the 21st May, 1917, Lloyd George spoke in the House of Commons on the Conference which he had proposed to set up on the 16th May.

Count Plunkett repudiates Lloyd George's
proposed Conference:

On the same date (21st May, 1917) the Mansion House assembly, convened by Count Plunkett, repudiated the proposed Lloyd George Conference and issued its declaration of policy regarding it. They recalled that the English Government had already pledged itself to support a small section of the Irish people, thereby precluding the possibility of any settlement being arrived at through the medium of such a Convention. "Being thus assured of the failure of the Convention beforehand, this will give the English Government the opportunity of declaring to the United States and its allies that England had left the solution of the Irish question to the Irish themselves and that, as the Irish were unable to solve it, England's continued occupation of Ireland was justified. A Convention to have the right of formulating a system of government for Ireland must be freely chosen for that special purpose by the people of Ireland and free, if it so decide, to declare for the complete independence of Ireland." It challenged the British Government to agree to a Convention accepting the principle that all just governments derive their power from the consent of the people. This declaration was signed by William O'Brien (Labour representative), Arthur Griffith, Cathal Brugha, Count Plunkett, Seán Milroy, Stephen O'Meara, Josephine Mary Plunkett, Father Michael O'Flanagan and Thomas Dillon. The statement plainly set out why the Convention was inevitably fore-doomed to failure.

A.E.'s. "Thoughts For A Convention" etc., receives
support of Cardinal and Archbishop:

From the 26th May to the 29th May, 1917, the 'Irish Times' published articles by "A.E." (George Russell), entitled "Thoughts For A Convention - A

Memorandum On The State Of Ireland". It was prepared for the consideration of the Imperial Conference then in London by "A.E.", Colonel Maurice Moore, Edward Lysaght, Dermot Coffey, James Douglas and others. These views obtained the general support of thirty influential persons' names. The Archbishop was sent a copy of the pamphlet, asking his support. The Archbishop was favourably impressed with the views as a whole, while objecting to several particular statements and proposals. It appears that this plan had also been approved of by General Smuts. The Archbishop told me that what largely weighed with him in giving it general support was that, if there was another disappointment and breakdown in the settlement of the Irish question, there might be another rising or grave disturbances and outrages. The scheme was meant to secure the support of the majority of the country and would place the Orangemen in an untenable position if they refused to accept it. An equally important reason that weighed with the Archbishop was that it would make it impossible for the Government to say, "We left the drawing up of a constitution in the hands of Irishmen themselves and promised to legislate on the lines agreed upon by them. They have done nothing. They have no plan. They cannot blame us. Neither can the Party say that their critics were mere wreckers and have no plan of their own." In order to secure the Archbishop's signature, the compilers of the pamphlet suppressed the passage on the solemnisation of marriage.

In an interview with Cardinal Logue during the week, Cardinal Logue told the Archbishop that he was willing to sign the pamphlet but that it had arrived too late.

The Convention is held in Trinity College:

The Convention was held in Trinity College.

Needless to say, it was not an elected Convention. In order to give an appearance of democratic assembly and to assure that it would not be opposed to the Irish Parliamentary Party, the thirty-three chairmen of the County Councils elected before the war were nominated as members.

The "A.E." suggestions received very general support among strong nationalists who still wished to follow constitutional methods and feared the dangers of a new rising. His "Memorandum" might have had greater effect had not the Clare election followed so quickly. Perhaps its chief interest is in showing how Lloyd George was unwilling to accept proposals regarded as suitable by the commonwealth leaders and his settled resolve to utilise the convention to wreck what might have been a possible solution of the problem.

The Lloyd George Convention was to meet early in June, 1917. Cardinal Logue called to the Archbishop to discuss the question of the appointment of episcopal representation. Neither the Cardinal nor the Archbishop would act. (During these days the Archbishop was particularly indignant with Bonar Law's reference to the necessity of "a substantial majority" on the Convention. See the papers of the 25th May, 1917.) It was suggested that one Bishop should be appointed from each Province. Both Cardinal Logue and the Archbishop were against the appointment of Dr. O'Donnell, Bishop of Raphoe, because he had refused to sign the Anti-Partition memorial. The Archbishop strongly held that no Bishop who had refused to sign that declaration should represent the Bishops.

On the same day (4th June, 1917) the Archbishop wrote to James O'Connor to inform the Chief Secretary

that he would have nothing to do with the Convention and took occasion to allude specifically to Bonar Law's reply to Ronald McNeill on a "substantial majority".

On the 13th June, 1917, the Archbishop received a letter from Cardinal Logue suggesting that, as the Convention would not meet until after the General Meeting of the Bishops, the episcopal representation at the Convention should be left to the Bishops themselves. While the Archbishop was much opposed to the Convention as a Government device to save their faces before the world, and to gain time, and failed to see how any anti-partitionist could enter the Convention, yet he thought that the Bishops, as a body, could not declare against participation lest it should be said afterwards that it was the Irish church that killed the chance of a friendly Irish settlement by agreement.

Sinn Féin, Nation League and Gaelic League
refuse to participate in Convention:

Practially all Nationalist opinion regarded the Convention as a dishonest device of Lloyd George. Not only did the Sinn Féin organisation refuse to touch it, but also the Nation League which was representative of north-west Ulster. On June 5th, 1917, the Gaelic League passed a resolution stating that nobody had any right to speak for it and that they would not send any representatives to the Convention "as at present constituted". This resolution was passed, in view of the fact that Douglas Hyde had agreed to enter the Convention.

At the General Meeting of the Bishops on the 19th June, 1917, the Archbishop of Dublin refused to take part in the voting for representation of the Bishops on the Convention. He refused, even when asked by Colonel Moore, to have any part in it even in a merely

consultative capacity on behalf of those who had signed "A.E.'s" pamphlet.

Conversations with Mr. Lardner (M.P., Monaghan) and Sir Walter Nugent at this time again disclosed the grave dissensions that existed in the Party over its present policy. Lardner, whom I met on 14th June, was particularly incensed because the Party machine prevented anybody but the chosen few from speaking in Parliament and seeking redress of grievances. This gave the leaders a grip on the country and enabled them to do what they liked, especially as the majority of the Party "were such slaves that they were delighted to lick their boots". He referred to Dillon's twisting and turning and posing as a strong Nationalist. Nugent said the leaders had not only lost touch with the country but with the M.P.'s. themselves.

The Convention dragged on until April, 1918. "The Real Object of the Convention", a report by Sir Horace Plunkett to the King, reveals its objects and workings in its true light.

Release of Political Prisoners:

On 15th June, 1917, Bonar Law announced in the House of Commons that the Irish political prisoners would be released.

On the 18th June, 1917, Sinn Féin prisoners arrived in Dublin about 8 a.m. They were met by thousands who had been there since 6 a.m. Many had been waiting all night. They received a tremendous ovation. It was noticed that de Valera was apparently the recognised leader. Many showed signs of their late hardships.

On the 23rd June, 1917, I made the following

note in my diary:-

"De Valera and John McNeill have gone to Clare to open the election campaign. Mrs. Clarke's section of the Volunteers are still bitter against John McNeill and have not a few followers. On the other hand, de Valera and the ex-Lewes prisoners (many of whom would have shot Eoin McNeill in Easter Week) have got to esteem him genuinely and support him staunchly. De Valera only agreed to go to Clare on condition that John McNeill would accompany him. A few objected, but finally agreed if John McNeill would declare in favour of an Irish Republic. He did so.

Dr. McCartan has gone to the United States with a statement, signed by de Valera, John McNeill, Seán T. O'Kelly and others. He went to England in disguise. He is to try and get to Stockholm, where St. John Gaffney already is. [St. John Gaffney was United States Consul in Stockholm.]"

"There was an immense and enthusiastic demonstration on Sunday, 1st July, 1917, at Mount Argus on the occasion of a Thanksgiving Mass for the release of the Irish prisoners." (This is a quotation from the Annals of the 'Irish Catholic Directory'.)

All-Ireland Meeting in Phoenix Park protests against Partition:

"A public all-Ireland meeting was held to-day (Sunday, 1st July, 1917) in the Phoenix Park to protest against the partition of Ireland and a nominated Convention. Twenty-four speakers spoke

against the partition proposals of the Convention to a gathering of over thirty thousand people. Four platforms were arranged for the speakers, representative of the Four Provinces, each with its chairman. The resolutions from all four platforms were put simultaneously, on the signal of a trumpet blast, and carried amid prolonged cheers."

This was the only public meeting that was held against partition. Its history reveals the deplorable condition of public life in Ireland at the time and the degradation of the Irish Parliamentary Party. It will be recalled that the signatories of the Anti-Partition Memorial of the 8th May appealed to the national conscience on Ireland's dismemberment. They appealed to Irish of every creed and class and party to support their protest and to send in to Charles O'Neill, Esq., D.L., at the Gresham Hotel, their adhesion to the declaration. Within the following week or fortnight, they received adhesion from many representative and influential quarters; but after another week or two the Committee in charge noticed a decided falling off in the flow of support. Many people from whom they expected support did not reply. It gradually became plain that the hidden influence of the U.I.L. and A.O.H. and Party organisations were actively hindering their friends from joining in the protest. Impressive as was the response, the Committee hesitated to publish the names, as it did not represent their ideal of every creed and class and party. It then occurred to them that the most appropriate ending of their movement would be to hold an all-Ireland meeting in the Mansion House, at which they could publish their report. Accordingly, they approached the Lord

Mayor of Dublin, Alderman Laurence O'Neill, for the use of the Mansion House and to ask him to preside.

Alderman O'Neill agreed to do so. What was their amazement a few days later to receive notice that he had withdrawn his consent and support! Even when I showed him the letter from the Bishop of Derry, he still refused. It then transpired that Councillor Lorcan Sherlock and other Party and Hibernian influences made successful representations to the Lord Mayor that such a meeting would be the gravest reflection on the Irish Party and that it was the work of factionists. The Derry Committee were in utter despair, having no Dublin contacts. As the Mansion House meeting had been published, it was essential that some public meeting should take its place. On being consulted, I expressed the opinion that the only solution was to hold a meeting in the Phoenix Park and that the only people who could organise it in such a short time were the Dublin Trades Unions. After a talk with Seán T. O'Kelly, I saw Alderman Farren, who rose to the occasion and secured the support of the Trades Council, and triumphantly held the meeting despite the Lord Mayor, Sherlock, A.O.H. and the Party. It is unnecessary to comment upon these despicable methods and unnational outlook of the Party and their followers. That was the atmosphere in which the meeting was held on the 1st July. This sabotage was already seen in the absence of the names of seven Catholic bishops from the Anti-Partition Manifesto of 8th May.

South Dublin and East Clare Elections.
Significant Press Comments:

The nominations for the South Dublin election were on the 6th July, 1917.

The East Clare election took place on the 10th July, 1917. Polling was declared the following day. The voting was:-

De Valera	5,010
Lynch	2,035

My notes read as follows:-

"The majority was 2,975. The result was an amazing one, and sounds the death-knell of the Party. Lynch was a very strong candidate and, in addition to the support of the powerful Lynch clan in Clare, received the Unionist vote. Nobody expected anything like this result. The Party was confident of winning and, until yesterday, the Sinn Féin party themselves did not expect to win by more than a small margin. The election was fought openly by Sinn Féin on the issue of an independent Irish Republic; and the policy was described by the Party and their followers as 'red ruin and revolution'.

The result gave rise to tremendous demonstrations throughout the country. The Party and their journal are frankly in a panic. A huge landslide is carrying away all their followers into the Sinn Féin Camp. Sinn Féin flags, now recognised as Republican, are hoisted everywhere in the countryside and Sinn Féin clubs organised, and meetings promoted everywhere.

A remarkable feature of the election was the absence of disorder. Both candidates insisted on this, and the Sinn Féin organisation secured it through the Volunteers,

armed with hurleys and marching in military formation.

Perhaps the chief importance of this election was the open assertion of an Irish Republic as the object of the Sinn Féin organisation."

During the next week my diary notes how the movement spread with enormous rapidity and enthusiasm. Henceforth, meetings were held on every Sunday and the accounts may be seen in every Monday's journals. Friend and foe alike recognised that the future lay with Sinn Féin.

Many of the British papers realised the significance of this election victory. This is an account of the special correspondent of the 'Daily News', then in Dublin:-

"The wave of Sinn Féin enthusiasm which swept over East Clare is now submerging familiar political landmarks in every part of the country.

From Cork to Derry and from Dublin to Galway comes the same story of the constantly growing strength of the new Party. Organised secessions from the A.O.H. and the U.I.L. are reported and there are indications that the National Volunteers may be absorbed by the Irish Volunteers who secede from the original body and who associated with the Sinn Féin movement.

It is important to remember that Ireland now possesses what she has not had for a

century - a generation of young men. The ban on emigration has left in the country probably seventy thousand or eighty thousand young fellows, and from that spirit and enterprise, which would have sent them overseas, is now derived the great impetus of the Sinn Féin movement.

They are tremendously in earnest and it would be foolish, because of incidents which suggest opera bouffe, to under-rate the significance of their drillings and marches. Even their sports, chiefly the game of hurley, are designed to intensify the fervour of national sentiment."

Prohibition of Military Uniforms and Hurleys:

By the end of the month, it was plain that the Government was of the same opinion, for on the 30th July, 1917, a proclamation was issued by Sir Bryan Mahon, Chief Commander of the Forces in Ireland, prohibiting the wearing of uniforms of a military character and the carrying of hurleys in public. The order is principally directed against the wearing of uniforms by the Irish Volunteers or by Pipers' Bands and the carrying of hurleys in processions or in public.

On the 15th July, 1917, a Sinn Féin meeting at Mullingar was addressed by de Valera, L. Ginnell and others.

Discontent within Irish Party:

Sometime in August, 1917, there was another illustration of the break and discontent within the Party. The 'Independent' of the 3rd August made known a letter addressed to John Redmond by six or more of the Irish Party, expressing discontent with their

present policy and calling for a bolder policy. The 'Independent' of the same day had a leading article on the decay of the "obsolete, effete, worthless and utterly discredited Party", reviewing its gradual fall and decay.

Stephen Gwynn was stoned and hooted at a meeting in Galway about that time.

Meeting of Committee of Irish National Volunteers
express desire to negotiate with Irish Volunteers.
Reading of Devlin's letter shows why the arms paid
for were not received:

On the 4th August, 1917, the Irish National Volunteers held their Convention in the Mansion House, presided over by Colonel Maurice Moore. It was attended by representatives of 176 Companies. Resolutions were passed declaring that the National Committee having ceased to exist, the Convention was empowered to represent the National Volunteers in Ireland. They affirmed their allegiance to the original declaration of the Volunteers and appointed a committee to enter into negotiations with the leaders of the Irish Volunteers and to consider the forming of a constitution which would open the organisation to every Irishman willing to pledge himself to the original declaration.

The following is an extract from the 'Independent' of the 6th August, 1917:-

"Among the documents read at yesterday's National Convention was the following letter from Joseph Devlin, marked "Private" and dated 7th July, 1916:-

'My dear Mr. Rooney,

I have your letter of the 1st instant, with enclosure, handed to me by Mr. Redmond, which I return herewith. I would respectfully suggest

that the Westley-Richards people should be distinctly told that we do not want any arms in Ireland and that we will not have them. As law-abiding citizens, we consider them a danger to the State; instead of getting arms into the country, we want to get them out of the country. When this is done, we will see what further action should be taken."

By this time, the Parliamentarians had fallen so utterly low in Irish public opinion that this cynical revelation of treachery and deception of one of its "leaders" could lower them no further. But their dupes who had paid for their rifles on enlisting in the Volunteers were fiercely indignant.

Colonel Moore criticises National Volunteer Committee:

The 'Independent' of the 10th August, 1917, published a letter, dated 9th August, from Colonel Maurice Moore, answering a complaint of Messrs. Donovan and Larry Kettle. It pointed out that all the appeals of the former National Volunteer Committee only brought in twenty-two affiliations in all of last year. He says that their new appeal, issued at the time of the extinction of the old Committee, brought in 175 in three weeks. As an example of the contempt in which his critics were held in the country, he quoted a communication from the Derry Volunteers which, "as a body, distinctly refused to associate itself" with the old National Committee. Colonel Moore personally regarded Redmond's action in nominating the personnel of that Committee as the first blow to his reputation. "The real charges against the (old) Committee were that they split the Volunteer organisation and ruined it,

squandered £700 on a Party newspaper and, while pretending to support the movement, they were privately and surreptitiously sapping its foundations. An inner ring was in secret negotiations with Party leaders for this purpose and when the working members of the Committee wished to carry out the constitution, they whipped up M.P.'s. and others, who rarely attended, to outvote them. There is ample proof of this and worse in our position. Some of it has been published in the last few days and is not answered." He asked, "Why were the hundred Companies not got, as Mr. Devlin promised? Why was there only one Company affiliated in Belfast, and that one favourable to us?" He concluded:-

"Too late, my friends. The Volunteers, like the electors, have left you stranded on a shifting sandbank. The tide has turned and is rising rapidly. Your national demands have been so meagre that you are already outdistanced by such Ulster Unionists as Mr. Sinclair and by an increasing body even of Englishmen. Instead of leading, you are being dragged and struggling along the national road that every Irishman should have been treading long ago. I expect to hear you soon pretending to have been its original explorers."

Seizure by Government Forces of Irish National
Volunteers' Arms:

On the 15th August, 1917, military and police seized rifles, arms and ammunition in many parts of the country, belonging to the Irish National Volunteers, to prevent them falling into undesirable hands. The general opinion and suspicion was that the raid was instigated by the Irish Party as a result of the repudiation of the Party by the Convention of the

National Volunteers, held on the 4th August, 1917. Police and military authorities had accurate information as to where the arms were stored. The information was evidently given by persons who were or had been in the confidence of the Volunteers. In view of the widespread and popular suspicion, the Party made desperate but unavailing protests to disassociate themselves from the raids.

'Nationality' publishes Joe Devlin's and F.D. Ackland's letters re arms for Irish National Volunteers:

'Nationality', in its issue of the 18th August, 1917, in addition to republishing Devlin's letter to Rooney of the 7th July, 1916, also published a letter for the first time, dated the 18th August, 1914 (after the declaration of the war), saying that the Government, the Irish Party and the military were in collusion for the landing of arms in Ireland for the Irish National Volunteers. The letter is one written by F.D. Ackland for the Secretary of State and is addressed to the British Consul in Antwerp. The Government, being asked in the House of Commons about this letter (see 'Independent' of the 21st August, 1917), replied through Lord Cecil that he did not know whether the Consul General in Antwerp was able to effect the charges required of him, that is, to facilitate the shipment of rifles from Belgium to the Irish National Volunteers.

Passports for Labour Conference refused to Irish Delegates. British Socialist Party's Statement of War Aims includes Ireland:

About this time (early in August, 1917) passports were refused to William O'Brien and D.R. Campbell to go as Irish delegates to the Labour Conference in Stockholm.

The British Socialist Party in a Statement of War Aims to be submitted to the Inter-Allied Conference

indignantly and bluntly repudiated Dillon's statement that the Ulster Catholic Bishops agreed to Partition. "Time and circumstances have vindicated the truth of what I often asserted that the interviews with the bishops in 1914 and 1916 were primarily intended to put on their shoulders the blame for actions of a shady nature and to compromise them in the eyes of the public." The Bishop set out at length the details of the interviews.

Dr. O'Dwyer, Bishop of Limerick, died on the 19th August, 1917.

T.P. O'Connor's American Mission on behalf of
Irish Party:

On the 24th August, 1917, the 'Independent' reproduced interviews of T.P. O'Connor with American papers (Boston 'Sunday Globe' and 'Daily Chronicle', New York, of 23rd July, 1917). This was during Mr. O'Connor's American "mission" on behalf of the Irish Party. In his interview of the 23rd July, 1917, he states that he finds the Irish-American feeling quite as violent as in Ireland. He finds that both Irish and Irish-Americans were as suspicious as Irishmen in Ireland of English motives. He states:-

"I regret to say, but I must state the painful truth, never did I find hatred of England so furious, blind, concentrated as it is among the Irish in America to-day."

He confessed that he did not look for immediate results in America. The 'Independent's' comments on his speech brought out his earlier declaration that -

"All Ireland sought was the status of a Canadian province."

The 'Independent's' London correspondent, writing on 13th September, 1917, reports that the insistent call

for Home Rule from across the Atlantic does not come only from the Irish section of the population and on Bonar Law's admission on 12th September the Allies were dependent financially on U.S.A.

Until late in the year T.P. O'Connor was unable to hold a public meeting of Irishmen and had to content himself with addresses to clubs of mixed races or Irishmen of doubtful allegiance. As America got more committed to the war, he felt safer and indulged in the vilification of the supporters of Sinn Féin. Some were inclined to believe that this apparent change of feeling was engineered with the help of the war press censorship and many believed that the money got together for the Party was English money.

Meetings Proclaimed:

In the 'Irish Times' of the 10th September, 1917, it was reported that meetings, which were to have been held in Mitchelstown and Omagh, had been proclaimed as they would give rise to grave disorder and cause undue demands to be made on the police and military forces. The 'Independent' of the 10th September, 1917, reports how two hundred police were drafted into a town and a large force of military. Armoured cars and a motor ambulance paraded the street and machine guns were placed at various points of vantage and military snipers posted on several trees.

The papers of the 19th September, 1917, report Dr. Fogarty's panegyric on Dr. O'Dwyer on the occasion of the Month's Mind - largely political.

On Sunday, the 23rd September, 1917, a political meeting in Cork was addressed by John McNeill, Griffith and Count Plunkett. In Dublin there were demonstrations at Smithfield and Mountjoy Prison.

vast public impression. The death of Ashe and the funeral and inquest created thousands of new supporters for Sinn Féin and, despite the boycott by the English press, gradually produced an effect even in England. Despite the opinions expressed by the medical witnesses at the Ashe inquest on the 28th September, 1917, forcible feeding of the prisoners on hunger strike in Mountjoy continued. Some of the men were in hospital that very week. The Lord Mayor called on Dr. Walsh in respect of the matter on the 29th September.

The Ashe inquest was resumed on the 11th October, 1917. In the course of the inquest on the 11th October, Mr. Hanna, K.C., acting on behalf of the prison authorities, withdrew.

Archdeacon Keown protests to Sir Bryan Mahon re
discrimination against Sinn Féin Meetings:

Correspondence between Archdeacon Keown, P.P., Enniskillen, and Sir Bryan Mahon, Commander of the Forces in Ireland, on the latter's suppression of the Sinn Féin demonstration on the 14th October, 1917, revealed not only the hostility to Sinn Féin as compared with the toleration shown to Carson but also that the request for the prohibition of the meeting came, in the words of Sir Bryan Mahon, "from members of the different parties". The parties included the Irish Parliamentary Party.

The manifesto - issued on the 19th October, 1917 - of the Socialist Peace Conference at Stockholm included a demand for the -

"political independence and economic
equality for Ireland within the
Dominion of Great Britain".

This revealed a significant advance in the inter-national attitude towards the Irish movement.

In the course of an Irish debate in the House of Commons on the 23rd October, 1917, the Chief Secretary (Duke) presented a blood-curdling picture of Irish conspiracy and rebellion, while Lloyd George expressed the intention of the Government to suppress all incitement or organisation of rebellion and declared the sovereign independence of Ireland could not be countenanced by England.

The Sinn Féin Convention of 25th October, 1917:

The all-important Sinn Féin Convention met on the 25th October, 1917. The proceedings will be found in the public press and the agenda was published in pamphlet form. The Convention was an epoch-making one in Irish political life. Its chief resolution stated that the aims of Sinn Féin were to secure international recognition of Ireland as an independent Irish Republic, adding, however, that -

"having achieved that status, the Irish people may, by referendum, freely chose their own form of Government".

It denied the right of the British Parliament and British Crown, or any other foreign Government, to legislate for Ireland and it determined to make use of any and every means available to render impotent the power of England to hold Ireland in subjection by military force or otherwise. Among other resolutions to be proposed to the Convention was one that the equality of men and women in the Sinn Féin organisation be emphasised in all speeches and leaflets.

The Convention was remarkable too for its organisation. It marked the passing away of the old Mansion House Conventions of the hey-day of the Land League and the later Irish Parliamentary Party. Even the non-Nationalist press were staggered and one of

their reporters thus gave his impressions in the press of the following day (26th October, 1917):-

"Among the seventeen hundred delegates almost every interest in Ireland was represented. There were priests by the score. They were, for the most part, the younger clergy with the dust of Maynooth still on their boots; but there were a great many grey-haired clergymen who wield a tremendous influence in the country parishes whose destinies they rule. Well-groomed professional men rubbed shoulders with untrimmed Goliaths, fresh from the fields of the West. They were not all young men; but young men certainly predominated. One could not help noticing a great many public officials among the delegates. There were clerks of unions, town clerks and highly-paid employees of County Councils and other bodies. Every part of the country was represented.

Admission was by ticket and the credentials of the pressmen had to pass half a dozen scrutinies of the most careful kind.

Almost as remarkable as its composition was its businesslike and orderly character. The United Irish League Conventions of olden days (they have now probably passed into the category of the Things That Were) bore a very unfavourable comparison with to-day's gathering. The Leaguers, though they were declared opponents of the doctrine of physical force as applied to John Bull, sometimes applied it to one another at public gatherings of this kind; and their

proceedings were notoriously ruled by a clique.

From to-day's Convention one got the impression that, if there is a Sinn Féin clique, it is able to hide its head on occasion. There was none of the bossing and dragooning that one saw at many of the United Irish League Conventions. The farmer, for once, found that he could rise in opposition to the 'sagart aroon'.

The Round Room was full, quite as full as I have seen it in the halcyon days of Parliamentarianism; and the delegates, I should think, were very much of the same class, though their average age would be very much less. Some of the delegates were mere boys and the grey-beards were almost conspicuous by their absence. The delegates, however, left no doubt on your mind that they were very much in earnest.

The first speeches were in Irish and, judging by the applause which punctuated some of Mr. Seán T. Kelly's observations, his audience understood what he was talking about, a matter in which they had the advantage of me. I did not hear enough to bore me, while this Convention is very businesslike and short speeches are the order of the day. Mr. Arthur Griffith was in the chair and, during the couple of hours that I was there, he had not once to touch the gong.
....."

"What one noticed about this Convention was the absence of the professional class, which is so common in other movements. I mean the K.C. type who made long speeches in the manner of the

professional politicians. The Sinn Féin Convention gave me the impression of being more businesslike. I only saw one division of opinion. A priest wanted to put in an amendment to meet criticism that Sinn Féiners, in pursuing their object, might use indefensible means. This suggestion was endorsed by another priest whose speech apparently impressed the Convention very much. Then Mr. de Valera came forward and smashed the edifice of eloquence with a hammer blow. He would be no party, he said, to incorporating a linguistic safeguard that would be an insult to Irish intelligence. The House cheered vociferously and the priests' amendment was obviously dead. At other conventions I have heard clergy practically ruling the roost. At the Sinn Féin Convention they seemed to be delegates and nothing more. Mr. Griffith, Chairman, made a short address entirely without oratorical flashes, without a single gesture and in almost a conversational manner. It was a speech which a chairman might have delivered at a shareholders' meeting. It is quite different from the old style when the heroes of the occasion almost brought out a rash on themselves with excess of rhetoric. Mr. Griffith sits at the table like a director at a board meeting. The last time I saw Mr. John Redmond at a Convention, he was lying back in a big armchair most of the time, with his hands folded and his eyes directed to the ceiling, strongly reminiscent of someone about to be shaved. The old order has certainly yielded, giving place to the new. I wonder shall I ever see a Convention

which will dethrone Mr. Griffith?"

Yes; truly a new epoch had opened. The machined Conventions of the U.I.L. and the A.O.H. were never to re-appear in the new generation. We felt it even then.

A new Executive was elected. Mr. de Valera was President. Arthur Griffith and Father O'Elanagan, as Vice Presidents, received respectively 1,197 and 780 votes. (Count Plunkett, with 386 votes, failed to be elected as Vice President.) The Treasurers were Liam Cosgrave and Larry Ginnell with 537 and 491 votes. The Secretaries appointed were Austin Stack with 857 votes and Darrell Figgis with 510. Twenty-four members were elected on the Executive, headed by Eoin MacNeill with 888 votes and Cathal Brugha with 685 votes. Among the others elected were Countess Markievicz (617), Count Plunkett (598), Harry Boland (448), Mrs. Tom Clarke (402), Seán T. O'Kelly (367); and the last of the twenty-four - one who was coming into political life for the first time - was Michael Collins with 340 votes. The Convention was marked by a strong anti-English speech by de Valera, asserting Ireland's right to independence and touching on the rising and the Catholic Church.

The 'Irish Independent' advises abandonment of
Sinn Féin Meeting at Newbridge. Ominous
situation in Ireland:

The 'Independent' of the 3rd November, 1917, made a very solemn and significant appeal to the public in the first place to abandon the Sinn Féin meeting fixed for Sunday, 4th November, in Newbridge and already proclaimed by the military authorities. The paper exhorted the public to refrain from attending "under the peculiar circumstances which we are not at liberty to disclose. It is a time for the exercise of restraint and moderation on all sides".

I have written the following in my diary:-

"The situation in Ireland has been ominous of late. The provocative speeches of the Government during the Irish debate on the 23rd October, the numerous daily arrests for drilling and marching, the resentment over the Ashe tragedy with its inquest and verdict, the frequent Sinn Féin meetings and suppression of their processions - especially the Enniskillen meeting - all have roused public feeling. News to-day (3rd November, 1917) and the evening paper openly express the public anxiety."

The 'Daily Mail' correspondent told Professor W. Magennis two or three weeks ago that Carson and Milner, foreseeing a Labour Ministry in England when the Franchise Bill would have become law, conspired to provoke disorders in Ireland before 1st November, in order to show that the Empire was in danger and that a strong imperially-minded Government was necessary. Among the rumours current in Dublin was one to the effect that Irish troops at Portobello had been sent to England and replaced by English troops. Mr. James Douglas called late this evening (3rd November, 1917). He informed Archbishop Walsh that General Hutchinson had just come over in an attempt to smooth down the current dangers. Hutchinson is the officer who protested against many of the acts done at Easter, 1916, and who was promoted to become General of Supplies, in order to remove him from Ireland. He discovered during this week that supplies were being diverted to

John McNeill's comment on John Dillon's reference will be found in his speech at Belleek in the following March.

I have written the following:-

"Returning from Clontarf this morning 4th November, 1917 I noticed, on the one hand, groups of Volunteers going up the Howth and Santry roads in civilian dress, while groups discussed the situation along the streets. Scarcely a policeman was to be seen and the military were kept in Barracks."

About the 5th or 6th November, 1917, sharp divisions, which eventually resulted in a deadlock, began to appear in the Lloyd George Convention.

The Bishop of Raphoe about this time proposed what amounted to a Dominion Home Rule solution. There is no doubt that this also represents the change of view of his intimate friend, John Dillon.

On the 8th November, 1917, the Kerenski Government in Russia was overthrown by Lenin.

On the 10th November, 1917, I wrote the following:-

"The 'Freeman' of to-day had an interesting article on the U.S. Government's publication of the German and Clan na Gael alliance for the 1916 rebellion. This was designed to withdraw the support of the American people from the Irish campaign which was telling."

The Treatment of Political Prisoners:

The following is an excerpt from the report of the Dublin Correspondent of 'The Times', London, dated

18th November, 1917:-

"The last of the Sinn Féin prisoners, who less than a week ago were sent from Mountjoy Jail to Dundalk, is now at liberty.

After the Tomás Ashe inquest the political prisoners were accorded special treatment. Austin Stack says that Sinn Féin intends to fight the matter of special treatment for political prisoners to a finish. The Sinn Féin prisoners in Cork have notified that, if their claims are not granted, they will go on hunger strike from noon on November 19th."

Cardinal Logue comments on the 'Dream' of an
Irish Republic:

On Sunday, November 25, 1917, a letter was read at all the Masses in the Archdiocese of Armagh, arranging for a Novena in preparation for the Feast of the Immaculate Conception. Having spoken of the evils of the war and the desire of the entire world for peace, the Cardinal referred to the unrest in Ireland. He said that -

"An agitation has sprung up and is spreading among our people which, ill-considered and Utopian, cannot fail, if persevered in, to entail present suffering, disorganisation and danger, and is sure to end in future disaster, defeat and collapse.

And all this in pursuit of a dream which no man in his sober senses can hope to see realised; the establishment of an Irish Republic, either by an appeal to the potentates seated at a Peace Conference, or

an appeal to force by hurling an unarmed people against an Empire which has five millions of men under arms, furnished with the most terrible engines of destruction which human ingenuity could devise! The whole thing would be ludicrous if it were not so mischievous and fraught with such danger, when cleverly used as an incentive to fire the imagination of an ardent, generous, patriotic people."

This excerpt will be seen in the 'Irish Independent' of the 26th November, 1917, and the full text may be seen in the Annals of the Irish Catholic Directory for 1918. Much use was made of the sentiments expressed in this letter, particularly by the Party. It figured prominently in the Party's electioneering leaflets in December, 1918. It will be interesting to contrast the tone of this pastoral letter of the Cardinal with his attitude after 1919. There is no doubt that it represented the attitude of the majority, or two-thirds, of the Irish Bishops and a large number of elderly clergy before the general election of December, 1918.

It may be remarked that Cardinal Logue in those years (1917 and 1918), though so independent in his own way, was undoubtedly influenced on particular occasions by Dr. Morrisroe, Bishop of Achonry, an ardent follower of John Dillon, and of very narrow views. Perhaps a third of the Bishops in 1918 sympathised with Sinn Féin, notably the Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. O'Dwyer, who had just then died, Dr. O'Dwyer's successor, Dr. Hallinan, and Dr. Fogarty. Dr. Hallinan was a man well advanced in years, representing a passing generation, yet the expression of his views, as revealed in his letter read

by the Lord Mayor of Limerick at a Sinn Féin meeting on the 17th March, 1918, and his refusal at the very same time to allow a Requiem Mass in St. John's Cathedral for Mr. John Redmond, indicate how far advanced the views of some of the Bishops had become.

Dr. Mannix organises Pro-Irish Demonstration and causes defeat of Conscription in Australia:

Outstanding in Australia, the Archbishop of Melbourne, Dr. Mannix, aroused extraordinary enthusiasm for the Sinn Féin movement among the Irish in Australia, earning the equally intense hatred of the imperial element. A monster meeting was arranged to be held at the Exhibition Building at Melbourne to discuss the Irish question but the 'Exhibition Trustees' cancelled their engagement to let the building, thereby raising a strong feeling of indignation not only amongst the Irish portion of the community but also amongst all people who valued liberty and free speech. The well-known Mr. John Wren granted the use of his racecourse for the meeting which was held at the time originally arranged - on Monday, 5th November, 1917. Fully 90,000 Australians - some reports stated 100,000 - were present. There was a magnificent demonstration and an effective protest against the action of the bigoted and narrowminded coterie at whose behest the spineless and weak-kneed trustees of the Exhibition Building broke their contract with the Irish Demonstration Committee and refused the use of the Exhibition Building. (See the pamphlet, "The Case Of Ireland" by the Most Reverend Dr. Mannix in the Collected Volume of Irish Pamphlets 1907-18).

So great was the effect of Archbishop Mannix's advocacy that Mr. Hughes, the Prime Minister of Australia, made a bitter attack upon the Archbishop.

The 'Independent' of the 27th November, 1917, quoting a manifesto from the Prime Minister to the Australian soldiers serving abroad, accused the Archbishop of preaching sedition in and out of season, asserted that Sinn Féin got German gold to do Germany's dirty work and accused the Archbishop of declaring that Ireland would seize her opportunity and strike for independence. "His disloyal utterances", the Prime Minister continued, "have moved prominent Catholics in Australia to public protest." He quoted Mr. Justice Heydon, Mr. Justice Duffy and Sir Thomas Hughes, all prominent Catholics, as sharing his views in opposition to Dr. Mannix. "Behind Dr. Mannix", he continued, "are arrayed the international workers of the world and the reckless extremists. It is his type of men who are urging you to vote 'No' on this referendum". The referendum was on the application of conscription to Australia. It was on this, or some similar occasion at this time that he asked this question of the soldiers: "Are you going to allow Sinn Féin and pro-Germans to render vain your suffering and your sacrifices?"

It was Archbishop Mannix's series of speeches at this time that resulted in the defeat of the Government proposals for conscription in Australia, and more surprising was the endorsement of this refusal by the separate military vote itself. All the speeches of Dr. Mannix at this period and in the subsequent period are of absorbing interest and can be found in the volume already referred to. Among other notable speeches is that reported in the Sydney 'Freeman's Journal' in December, 1918, or January, 1919. (See 'Independent' of 2nd February, 1918.) It was in this speech that he repeated his former statement:-

"You in Australia are Sinn Féiners.
To you, Australia is first and the Empire
second. Mr. John Redmond had the ball at
his feet and he lost the game. If he had
taken a firm stand, I believe that long before
now England in the time of difficulty would
have seen her way to do justice to Ireland.
That would have prevented the tragedy of
Easter Week."

On the 11th December, 1917, the question of
applying conscription again in Ireland was mooted in the
English press.

During all this time the Sinn Féin organisation
was actively developing. Sinn Féin Clubs and physical
demonstrations of various kinds were enthusiastically
continued.

Before I conclude 1917, I think I should allude
to a partially temporary successful effort of the
British to turn American opinion, even Irish-American
opinion, in favour of the Parliamentary Party and against
Sinn Féin. This campaign can be judged by the despatch
of the 'Times' correspondent from Washington on the 21st
December, 1917. It runs:-

"In Chicago, Illinois, an influential body
of Irish Americans have inaugurated an
American-Irish Constitutional Liberty Committee
to support Mr. Redmond and his policy. An
initial fund of 50,000 dollars (£10,000) has
been raised.

In sending this amount to Mr. Redmond
the Committee pledges itself to raise the fund
to any amount "which you may consider necessary

to the successful prosecution of your long and glorious struggle for self-government for Ireland."

The whole address is a vehement denunciation of Sinn Féin. Under the pretext of supporting the allies, it was an endeavour to detach American opinion from Sinn Féin.

Publication of President Wilson's Fourteen Points.
German and American Comments:

My diary notes on the 9th January, 1918, that -

"The press of to-day published President Wilson's address on the American War Aims to the United States Congress. (These were his famous Fourteen points.) Though there was much talk of the Balkans, Belgium, Poland and small nationalities in Austria, there was not a word about Ireland."

The absence of Ireland in the pious declarations of Wilson and Lloyd George did not pass unnoticed abroad. The German socialist, Herr Scheidemann, according to the 'Vossische Zeitung', asked:

"If he /Lloyd George/ was really in earnest in this, we immediately ask him, 'How then about Ireland and Egypt? What becomes of India?'"

Trotsky on the 10th January, 1918, said:-

"If we were really logical, we would declare war on England now for the sake of India, Egypt and Ireland."

Crisis in Lloyd George's Convention:

About the middle of January, 1918, matters in the Convention came to a head. The Northern Unionists

remained adamant against concessions. The Southern Unionists would only agree to Home Rule, provided that Customs remained under the English Parliament, that a nominated element of about twenty for ten years be added to the Committee and other conditions. The stronger Nationalists are disgusted and wearied out with the procrastination and evasion of real issues. These included the Archbishop of Cashel, the Bishop of Raphoe, the Bishop of Down and Connor, E.E. Lysaght, "AE", William M. Murphy, the Lord Mayor of Dublin, Toal, Chairman of Monaghan County Council and others. Lysaght wrote on the 12th January, 1918, a strong letter to Lloyd George, saying he would resign if there was not forthcoming an assurance that the will of the majority of the Convention would be given effect to.

Redmond found his following among Nationalists gradually diminishing. He was prepared to compromise with the Southern Unionists on the question of Customs and other matters, but on this issue he found himself opposed by Mr. Devlin and the Bishops. On the 15th January, 1918, the Nationalists among the Convention held a meeting at which John Redmond did not attend. That morning he ended his speech with the words:-

"I fear there is no use for me here."

It was thought he might resign.

The following telegram was received on the 17th January, 1918, by John Redmond from Mr. Jerry McVeigh, M.P. (Down), representative of the Members' Party on the Speakers' Committees. (On the re-arrangement of British and Irish Parliamentary constituencies, the Committee was set up for the redistribution of Irish and British seats.):-

which will dethrone Mr. Griffith?"

Yes; truly a new epoch had opened. The machined Conventions of the U.I.L. and the A.O.H. were never to re-appear in the new generation. We felt it even then.

A new Executive was elected. Mr. de Valera was President. Arthur Griffith and Father O'Flanagan, as Vice Presidents, received respectively 1,197 and 780 votes. (Count Plunkett, with 386 votes, failed to be elected as Vice President.) The Treasurers were Liam Cosgrave and Larry Ginnell with 537 and 491 votes. The Secretaries appointed were Austin Stack with 857 votes and Darrell Figgis with 510. Twenty-four members were elected on the Executive, headed by Eoin MacNeill with 888 votes and Cathal Brugha with 685 votes. Among the others elected were Countess Markievicz (617), Count Plunkett (598), Harry Boland (448), Mrs. Tom Clarke (402), Seán T. O'Kelly (367); and the last of the twenty-four - one who was coming into political life for the first time - was Michael Collins with 340 votes. The Convention was marked by a strong anti-English speech by de Valera, asserting Ireland's right to independence and touching on the rising and the Catholic Church.

The 'Irish Independent' advises abandonment of
Sinn Féin Meeting at Newbridge. Ominous
situation in Ireland:

The 'Independent' of the 3rd November, 1917, made a very solemn and significant appeal to the public in the first place to abandon the Sinn Féin meeting fixed for Sunday, 4th November, in Newbridge and already proclaimed by the military authorities. The paper exhorted the public to refrain from attending "under the peculiar circumstances which we are not at liberty to disclose. It is a time for the exercise of restraint and moderation on all sides".

I have written the following in my diary:-

"The situation in Ireland has been ominous of late. The provocative speeches of the Government during the Irish debate on the 23rd October, the numerous daily arrests for drilling and marching, the resentment over the Ashe tragedy with its inquest and verdict, the frequent Sinn Féin meetings and suppression of their processions - especially the Enniskillen meeting - all have roused public feeling. News to-day (3rd November, 1917) and the evening paper openly express the public anxiety.

The 'Daily Mail' correspondent told Professor W. Magennis two or three weeks ago that Carson and Milner, foreseeing a Labour Ministry in England when the Franchise Bill would have become law, conspired to provoke disorders in Ireland before 1st November, in order to show that the Empire was in danger and that a strong imperially-minded Government was necessary. Among the rumours current in Dublin was one to the effect that Irish troops at Portobello had been sent to England and replaced by English troops. Mr. James Douglas called late this evening (3rd November, 1917). He informed Archbishop Walsh that General Hutchinson had just come over in an attempt to smooth down the current dangers. Hutchinson is the officer who protested against many of the acts done at Easter, 1916, and who was promoted to become General of Supplies, in order to remove him from Ireland. He discovered during this week that supplies were being diverted to

Ireland without his knowledge. On making an investigation, he found that it was being done by the Government - which was informed that there was to be a rising in Ireland at the end of this week! Hutchinson expressed the opinion that there would be no rising, for he knew that a section of the Cabinet and their following in political circles were aware of the probability of a Labour revolution in England and that they feared that an Irish rising would arise out of an English one and would be, therefore, doubly dangerous. This section, therefore, determined to provoke an Irish one immediately and have the excuse of imposing military rule and secure their own power. Hutchinson applied for and obtained leave of absence and came over to Dublin yesterday (Friday, the 2nd November, 1917), quartering himself on his old friend, Sir Bryan Mahon, at Kilmainham, much against Mahon's wishes. He interviewed 'AE' and, later on, Mr. Douglas, seeking reassurance that Sinn Féin meant no trouble and would lend no hand to the English game. Hutchinson says that, besides armoured cars, the British Government have sent over gas bombs, two tanks, and that a fleet of aeroplanes are ready to come over and destroy everything.

During the course of the Ashe inquest, Hutchinson was offered by Lloyd George the position of the post of Under-Secretary of Ireland, he becoming a civilian. Hutchinson agreed on condition that Lord Wimborne, General Byrne and Major Price would be dismissed, and that simple drilling and marching without arms would be allowed. Lloyd George agreed but,

having put the offer before the Cabinet, it was rejected.

The most absurd rumours are current in England and Ireland as to the state of affairs in Ireland. In England it was reported during the week that a rebellion had already broken out. In Dublin it was reported that Athlone was seized and that Irish officers and men at the Curragh protested against being employed against their countrymen. There were other wild rumours of a naval engagement off Cork, of a German submarine off Limerick, etc., etc.

On calling to warn Seán T. O'Kelly, I found that many others like Colonel Moore and Gavan Duffy had sent similar warnings."

The Newbridge meeting on Sunday, the 4th November, 1917, was abandoned but the Irish Volunteers, in civil dress and without arms, assembled at their mobilisation points (Cabra, Cloughran, etc.), drilled and carried out their field exercises. The four Battalions averaged from four hundred to five hundred each.

In the following March, John Dillon alluding to the events around about the 1st November, 1917, said:-

"I can tell you from my own knowledge that they (the Sinn Féiners) were within an ace of being thrown against the troops who were armed with trench bombs, and the word was given to take no prisoners. 'We'll have no more of this thing' - to use their own words - 'we'll have no more of this damned nonsense. John Dillon and company will not get the prisoners released. We will take no prisoners. We will let them have the bombs.'"

John McNeill's comment on John Dillon's reference will be found in his speech at Belleek in the following March.

I have written the following:-

"Returning from Clontarf this morning 4th November, 1917 I noticed, on the one hand, groups of Volunteers going up the Howth and Santry roads in civilian dress, while groups discussed the situation along the streets. Scarcely a policeman was to be seen and the military were kept in Barracks."

About the 5th or 6th November, 1917, sharp divisions, which eventually resulted in a deadlock, began to appear in the Lloyd George Convention.

The Bishop of Raphoe about this time proposed what amounted to a Dominion Home Rule solution. There is no doubt that this also represents the change of view of his intimate friend, John Dillon.

On the 8th November, 1917, the Kerenski Government in Russia was overthrown by Lenin.

On the 10th November, 1917, I wrote the following:-

"The 'Freeman' of to-day had an interesting article on the U.S. Government's publication of the German and Clan na Gael alliance for the 1916 rebellion. This was designed to withdraw the support of the American people from the Irish campaign which was telling."

The Treatment of Political Prisoners:

The following is an excerpt from the report of the Dublin Correspondent of 'The Times', London, dated

18th November, 1917:-

"The last of the Sinn Féin prisoners, who less than a week ago were sent from Mountjoy Jail to Dundalk, is now at liberty.

After the Tomás Ashe inquest the political prisoners were accorded special treatment. Austin Stack says that Sinn Féin intends to fight the matter of special treatment for political prisoners to a finish. The Sinn Féin prisoners in Cork have notified that, if their claims are not granted, they will go on hunger strike from noon on November 19th."

Cardinal Logue comments on the 'Dream' of an
Irish Republic:

On Sunday, November 25, 1917, a letter was read at all the Masses in the Archdiocese of Armagh, arranging for a Novena in preparation for the Feast of the Immaculate Conception. Having spoken of the evils of the war and the desire of the entire world for peace, the Cardinal referred to the unrest in Ireland. He said that -

"An agitation has sprung up and is spreading among our people which, ill-considered and Utopian, cannot fail, if persevered in, to entail present suffering, disorganisation and danger, and is sure to end in future disaster, defeat and collapse.

And all this in pursuit of a dream which no man in his sober senses can hope to see realised; the establishment of an Irish Republic, either by an appeal to the potentates seated at a Peace Conference, or

"To John Redmond in Dublin, Secretary of the Convention.

Chairman [that is, the Speaker] wishes make adverse majority North Fermanagh. Have refused to agree. He will wire [you]. [I] suggest [you] reply that if we lose our rights in Belfast, Antrim, South Derry, we should have for compensation East Down, Tyrone, Fermanagh. Agree, moreover, make South Tyrone safe and give up Wicklow."

The following issue of 'Nationality', commenting on this sorry proposal, pointed out the bartering of the 'Nationalists' of South Derry, South Tyrone and all Wicklow and asked how long the people who still lingered in Redmondism would continue to support "their trusted Party".

It was on the next day (18th January, 1918), that Lloyd George, speaking to Labour, defined democracy:-

"Democracy, put into plain terms, is government by the majority of the people."

Growing Evidence of Pro-Irish feeling in America:

About this time there was growing evidence that the feeling in the United States in favour of Ireland was growing and becoming outspoken. I wrote the following:-

"It is stated that the British Government finds itself compelled to draw up a liberal scheme of self-government if it is to rouse enthusiasm for the war in America. Seamus MacManus writes advising us to ignore the American press, that the Irish in the States were never more strongly in favour of sound

Irish opinion and were never better organised."

Irish Labour Deputation wait on Litvinoff:

On 25th January, 1918, the Dublin Correspondent of the 'Times' reported that a deputation of the National Executive of the Irish Trades Congress and Labour Party recently waited in London on Litvinoff, the representative of the Bolshevist Government, and presented a claim to secure the international recognition of the Irish Labour movement. The deputation which included Mr. O'Shannon (Cathal O'Shannon) and William O'Brien interviewed Huysmans, Secretary of the International Socialist Bureau, and Monsieur Jean Longuet of the Socialist Party in the French Chamber. Litvinoff appeared conversant with Irish affairs and said that the leaders of the Bolshevist movement in Russia had been acquainted with the writings of James Connolly for many years. Huysmans was sympathetic and Longuet pledged all the support in his power.

South Armagh Election:

At this time an election was rushed in South Armagh following the death of the M.P. It was recognised that Sinn Féin was unorganised in the district, without clubs, papers or organisation of any description. Sinn Féin, however, began a strenuous campaign, building up from bedrock. A Unionist, named W. Richardson, put himself forward as a candidate but was disowned by the official Unionist organisations. Despite his rejection by a local vote of 221 at a Unionist meeting at Poyntzpass (similar rejections were made by Newtownhamilton Unionists), he determined to stand as an Independent Unionist. Many of those present at the Poyntzpass meeting indicated that they would vote for Mr. Donnelly, the Irish Parliamentary candidate, "to keep

Sinn Féin out of Ulster". As was foreseen by all parties, P. Donnelly defeated Dr. McCartan, the Sinn Féin candidate, by 2,324 against 1,305 votes. The Unionists were true to their declarations, for W. Richardson secured only 40 votes. The press were unanimous in reporting that the Orange vote went largely to the Parliamentary Party. (See the 'Pall Mall Gazette', the 'Westminster Gazette'.) The correspondent of the 'London Daily Express' reported on the day of the poll:-

"I have ascertained from both parties that the Unionist vote has gone for the Nationalist. Mr. T. Richardson led a body of Orangemen to vote for Mr. Donnelly."

The Belfast correspondent of the 'Morning Post' reported:

"The only thing certain is that a number of Unionists voted for the Nationalists. Sinn Féin claims that, if they had another fortnight, they would have equalised matters. As it was, their discipline and organisation made a great impression. Dr. Mulhern, Bishop of Dromore, told me shortly afterwards that many who voted for the Irish Party at the election would, a week later, have voted Sinn Féin."

Carson resigns from Cabinet. F.E. Smith co-operates with T.P. O'Connor in America:

Meanwhile, Lloyd George was making desperate efforts to produce what he called a large measure of self-government for Ireland. It was not easy. It precipitated the resignation of Carson from the Cabinet.

His resignation from the Cabinet was announced on the 22nd January, 1918. After a hurried visit to Ulster, Carson wrote a letter of protest to Lloyd George on the 14th February, 1918, against his Irish proposals. In this he was supported by his Irish colleagues and by the Ulster Council and several meetings which he addressed throughout Ulster.

On the 16th February, 1918, Sir F.E. Smith returned to England from his American mission. In the course of an interview, he stated:-

"One of my principal objects wherever I went was to consolidate all sections of Irish opinion. To this end I co-operated closely with Mr. T.P. O'Connor during my tour in America and Canada."

Sinn Féin Food Controller prohibits Export of Pigs and is arrested:

One of the features of the Sinn Féin organisation was the policy of the conservation of food at home. On the 21st February, 1918, pigs driven for exportation from the cattle market to the North Wall were seized by direction of Diarmuid Lynch, the Sinn Féin Food Director, turned into the Corporation Yard, where they were slaughtered and disposed of to Kehoe and Pakenham for Dublin consumption. This action met with universal support in Dublin. Within a week, the exportation of Irish pigs was forbidden. Diarmuid Lynch was arrested, imprisoned and then deported to the United States. John Dillon delivered a speech at the United Irish League Rooms in O'Connell Street that same evening. From the fact that I have recorded it, it might be worth looking up.

On the 25th February, 1918, County Clare was

declared a special military area. In virtue of this Order made under D.O.R.A., no person could enter the county without the permission of the Military Commandant.

Lloyd George Convention disrupting.
Death of Redmond:

Seeing that the Convention was hopelessly disrupting, Lloyd George addressed to it a letter, urging a settlement which would only be obtained "by concession on all sides". This letter was a new, distinct breach of faith of Lloyd George. In order to ensure that Nationalists went to the Convention, Lloyd George had guaranteed that it would be free to come to any settlement within the Empire. This letter made it plain that provincial matters, such as Customs, should be left over until after the war. The letter was successfully used to induce the more timid Nationalist delegates to what was "practical", as indicated in the letter of Lloyd George.

On the 6th March, 1918, I wrote the following:-

"John Redmond died to-day. Heart failure after operation on Friday last [1st March]. His death is no loss to the cause of nationality. His weak, compromising policy, his repeated surrender of the national position - the latest at the Convention on the 15th January - his attempt to commit Ireland to the war and his attitude on conscription were fatal weights on our neck."

His funeral in Wexford - it dared not take place in Dublin - was a sorry sight for Nationalists. The funeral, on arriving at Dún Laoghaire, was immediately diverted to Wexford. It was deemed advisable not to

have it in Dublin. It was headed by a military band and a large force of R.I.C. took part in the procession. Government and military officials attended. It was worthy of note that the Archbishop of Dublin sent no message of condolence, nor would he have a Requiem as was held in the case of his brother, Willie Redmond. During the week a Requiem was held in Gardiner Street by the Clongowes Wood Union. In Limerick its Bishop, Dr. Hallinan, refused permission for a Requiem in St. John's Cathedral. The Bishop explained his position in a letter which was published in the 'Irish Independent' on the 18th March, 1918.

John Dillon elected Chairman of Irish Party. Asks why are not all united on the Platform of Dominion Home Rule. 'Tulcan's' reply:

On the 12th March, 1918, John Dillon was unanimously elected Chairman of the Irish Parliamentary Party by forty-five M.P's. The others were deliberately absent. It was on this date too that a crucial division took place in the Convention. A full report of the facts can be seen in the appendix to the Convention, reported on page 240. (Dr. O'Donnell's full Home Rule resolutions were beaten by 38-34.)

With his election as Chairman of the Irish Parliamentary Party, it became now more evident that John Dillon was disposed to take a somewhat stronger attitude on Irish political affairs. It was reflected in the action of his friends at the vote at the Convention, in a speech at Enniskillen and on other subsequent occasions -

"I feel my first task will be to tell England before the world that our statesmen must cease to talk of a League of Nations or pretend to carry on this war in defence of

small nationalities unless she sets free the nation which for eight hundred years has groaned under her misgovernment."

The new attitude taken up in this speech was answered by John McNeill in his speech at Belleek during the week.

I wrote a letter, signed 'Tulcan', in the 'Independent', dated St. Patrick's Day, 1918, in answer to John Dillon's question as to why were not all united on the platform of Dominion Home Rule and an undivided Ireland. The object was largely to bring out his previous public pronouncements during the South Waterford election and elsewhere.

On the 22nd March, 1918, John Redmond's son, Captain William Redmond, won his seat by a majority of 479 votes - 1,243 votes against 764 for Dr. White, the Sinn Féin candidate. Little interest was taken in the election, as the result was a foregone conclusion. It was significant of Waterford and Ballybricken and the Party that a man parading about in khaki was their popular hero. One of the first to vote that day was the Protestant Bishop, Dr. O'Hara. Captain Willie Redmond refused to meet de Valera when he called on the Administrator and was informed that de Valera was also in the house and willing to meet him.

The great German offensive began on the 21st March, 1918.

Adjournment - sine die - of Lloyd George Convention:

The Irish Convention adjourned sine die on the 5th April, 1918. Only twenty-two Nationalist members supported a demand for Dominion Home Rule.

Reactions to Proposal for Extension of
Conscription to Ireland:

In view of the successful German offensive, a strong agitation rose in England for the extension of conscription to Ireland as well as for the raising of the military age. Heretofore, the 'Morning Post' and 'Globe' were the only leaders in the press supporting this agitation but at the end of March it was joined by the press in general, including the 'Times' which also advocated the enrolment of clergymen as combatants.

On the 9th April, 1918, the Bishops held their Standing Committee and adopted and published a strong resolution against conscription in Ireland without the consent of the people. It would, the resolution said, be perfectly unwarrantable. Such a course would be a fatal mistake, surpassing the worst blunders and disasters of the past four years. -

"With all the responsibility that attaches to our office, we feel bound to warn the Government against entering upon a policy so disastrous to the public interest and to all order, public or private."

The Bishops designedly omitted all allusion to the enrolment of clergy but arranged privately that, if this step was persevered in, a special general meeting of the Bishops would be summoned at once to consider the question. The design of holding a meeting was not made known.

On the same evening (9th April, 1918) the British Government introduced their second Conscription Bill, raising the military age from forty-two to fifty and, by a new clause, brought ministers of religion within the

Act for non-combatant service. After much wavering it decided that the service Acts should be extended to Ireland under the same conditions as in Great Britain. "As to Ireland", said Lloyd George, "it was not possible any longer to justify her exclusion from the Act." The character of the quarrel, he said, in which they were engaged was as much Irish as English. The Convention had reported by a majority but he feared that it was not such as to justify the Government in saying that it represented a "substantial agreement". (This was an allusion made as late as 25th May, 1917, to his dishonest device of ensuring disagreement and a breakdown in the Convention unless Carson's own terms were conceded.) "That means", said Lloyd George, "that the Government must accept the responsibility of submitting to Parliament such proposals for the establishment of self-government in Ireland as are just and can be carried without violent controversy". The Government proposed, he said, to pass such a measure with the least possible delay. Lloyd George effectively quoted declarations of John Redmond and Dillon in 1914 stating this was Ireland's war as much as England's; it was a war for small nationalities, for France, "our kindred country", for Belgium, Poland, Alsace-Lorraine, etc. Such was his latest crude device to deceive public opinion in America and abroad. The conscription measure was to be applied to Ireland by Order in Council as, owing to the want of machinery, it would take weeks for enrolment arrangements to be made. Only fifty-five Irish members attended to oppose the Bill. (Those that were absent were largely the Redmondite clique. Among them I happened to note Patrick Brady of College Green, John Claney and John Fitzgibbon who, according to the papers, attended a meeting of the Congested Districts Board.)

The first reading was carried by 299 against 80.

The introduction of conscription was a crowning folly of the British Government and an indelible stigma on its statesmanship and exhibited the blind hatred of the English people of almost every degree. Doubtless its introduction was partly due to the universal outcry in England against raising the military age there from forty-one to fifty without applying it to Ireland; but the Government well knew that the raising of the age in England would only bring in seven per cent. of the Britishers fit for military duty. Therefore, this fatal step seemed more like an anti-Home Rule move.

Incidentally, it should always be remembered that Carson carefully avoided advocating conscription whenever he spoke in Ulster, though he advocated conscription for Ireland in Parliament.

The Conscription Bill came as a thunderbolt to the leaderless masses of the Irish people, for, while the majority had by this time lost every remnant of their faith in the Parliamentary Party, many of the older generation were slow to commit themselves to the revolutionary policies of Sinn Féin. Now these erstwhile followers of the Party were momentarily stunned. They had been completely misled by the Party as to the imminent danger of conscription and had refused to believe in its possibility. The brutal shock woke them to political realities. British enmity was unmasked and the utter ineptitude and unreliability of the Party were at last clear to every intelligent Nationalist and its hopeless impotence was finally exposed.

Conscription set Ireland ablaze. The entire country was galvanised into life. Every man, woman and

child, every province, diocese and parish were determined that, whatever the cost, Ireland's manhood would in no circumstances be enslaved to fight England's battles, not to mention fighting a people who had never done us any harm. But the conscription Bill found the country outside the ranks of Sinn Féin absolutely disorganised. All were agreed on resistance but in what form, by what means, under what leaders? Here it was that the declaration of the Bishops' Standing Committee of the 9th April, 1918, proved of outstanding importance. It established the moral basis of resistance, set a headline of national policy and, to a certain degree, provided a leadership, at least for the time being. Of equally fateful importance was a secret decision of the Standing Committee to summon a General Meeting of the Bishops should the Government include the clergy in the Conscription Bill.

It was folly of Lloyd George to think of conscription of the Irish people. It was crass stupidity and blind bigotry to apply it to the clergy. But Parliament included them.

The summons for a general meeting of the bishops to be held on Thursday, the 18th April, 1918, was quietly issued. Not even an inkling of the summons became known either to friend or foe. The Archbishop told me of it that night (9th April, 1918) and of his astonishment at the ardour and almost revolutionary sentiment of some of the bishops who had spoken on that day - but he also spoke of his anxiety over the hesitation and misgivings of Cardinal Logue. The Cardinal was entirely nonplussed at the strong attitude of some of his

usually ultra-prudent colleagues but consoled himself by his own conviction that the clergy would be exempted even if the Conscription Bill were foolishly applied to Ireland. With the clergy exempted, the bishops would not be called to step into the opposition leadership.

On Wednesday, the 10th April, 1918, the second reading of the Conscription Bill was carried. I take the following note from my diary:-

"Asquith voted against the Bill but the Government is madly determined to see it through and will resign if the Bill is not carried. On all sides is evident the equal determination at home to resist conscription - ordinary people by refusing to register, the more extreme by open resistance. Drilling is going on nightly. The number of Volunteers and Sinn Féin bodies is increasing. It is feared that there will be much bloodshed, and it is presumed that there will be massacres of resisting conscripts and of innocent civilians. Feeling in the English press, with a few Liberal exceptions, is very bitter against Ireland."

On the evening of Friday, the 12th April, 1918, Mr. de Valera called to the Archbishop's House and told me of the strong action that Sinn Féin proposed to take on conscription. I cannot recollect whether he saw the Archbishop on that occasion but he discussed the situation at considerable length with me and made it plain to me how deeply troubled he was with the fear that the bishops might paralyse strong action by a weak or vaguely general statement, or give the least excuse to the weak-kneed to adopt a merely passive resistance.

I did not mention to him that evening the proposed general meeting of the bishops, since I did not know at that time whether the summons was issued or on what day the meeting was fixed for; but, learning later that night or next morning that the meeting was summoned and the date fixed, I began to form a plan in my own mind of linking up the action of the bishops with that of the political leaders. In our private conversations the Archbishop talked much of the crisis that was already upon us. He invariably revealed that two points constantly occupied his mind, firstly, the strong attitude and outspoken views of some normally moderate bishops and, secondly, how disturbed he was over the Cardinal's misgivings and by the fact that, at the general meeting of the bishops, the Cardinal might secure support from the more conservative elements of that body.

Seeing that de Valera's acute anxiety that the bishops should not bar or attenuate strong action coincided precisely with the Archbishop's anxiety over Cardinal Logue, I resolved to tell de Valera of the meeting and its purpose, of the strong attitude of the bishops of the Standing Committee and of the possible existence of a less courageous section among the general body who might be disposed to modify or tone down the strong action that would be undoubtedly advocated by the more stalwart. I, therefore, determined to propose to him that the political leaders should meet at once, formulate their strong policy, inform the bishops and ask them to give their adhesion. The bishops would thus be relieved, I thought, of the initiative and would find it easier to follow on in support of the laymen. At the moment I did not inform the Archbishop of my intention, for one of the Archbishop's characteristic features was fear of his own position being entangled

and compromised. About this time I had been advised that Miss Gavan Duffy would transmit any messages that would be necessary to de Valera. I, therefore, called on Miss Gavan Duffy but found that de Valera was absent.

About this time (early in April, 1918) the Protestant Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin issued an appeal that the young Irishmen of the Church of Ireland would cheerfully accept conscription if it were applied to Ireland. -

"We have felt", they said, "that, ever since conscription was applied to England and Scotland, Ireland had much right to complain in that her sons were omitted from the call which we believe might have been readily obeyed two years ago."

Obviously their young men had plenty of time to consider their duty in those two years.

On Sunday, the 14th April, 1918, there was a quarterly meeting of the St. Vincent de Paul Society in the Mansion House. I took the occasion to attend the meeting and to avail of the opportunity to see the Lord Mayor, Larry O'Neill. I informed him of what I had retailed to de Valera and of the extreme urgency of the occasion and that at all costs he should summon an immediate meeting of the recently established Mansion House Conference. He explained the many difficulties of getting all the members together, not excluding the possible arrest of de Valera. The chief difficulty he foresaw was the absence of Dillon and Devlin who were fighting the Conscription Bill in Westminster. On this occasion he told me that Dillon was perfectly confident that the Irish Party would be able to block the passing

of the Bill. We both agreed, from Dillon's attitude, that he wished that all the prestige of defeating conscription would accrue entirely to the action of the Irish Parliamentary Party. All I could do was to impress on the Lord Mayor that no time must be lost and that the laymen should set the headline for action. The bishops, I felt, would certainly follow any strong lead initiated by the laymen. A statement on ^a line of policy originating with them would be drawn up in milder tones.

The press of Monday, the 15th April, 1918, revealed that Ireland was in full blaze. Many big meetings had been held on Sunday (that is, the day before) all over the country. Declarations and letters from Cardinal Logue and several bishops were published. There were very many references from the altars and resolutions from public bodies. My diary notes:-

"Public excitement is thoroughly aroused and, while so far it is restrained, it is very strong and determined. An anti-conscription covenant on the lines of Carson's Ulster covenant has been started in Armagh."

The third reading of the Conscription Bill was passed on Tuesday, the 16th April, 1918, whereupon the Irish M.P's. withdrew in protest.

The Irish press was almost entirely devoted to the anti-conscription campaign. My diary notes:-

"The new development is due to Carson. Whether owing to the Belfast feeling against conscription or to the coupling of Home Rule with conscription, Carson has attacked the Government and accused it of deceiving both Nationalists and Unionists.

Although he intends to support conscription, his attack is damaging and disconcerting to the Government."

The Archbishop of Dublin wrote a letter to the evening papers of the 16th and the morning papers of the 17th April, 1918, pointing out the necessity of giving definite instructions to those who were prepared to oppose conscription, and also on the relation of the question to Home Rule. The Archbishop's letter was really intended as a corrective to Cardinal Logue's vague remedy of "passive resistance".

On Wednesday, the 17th April, 1918, Seán T. O'Kelly called on me on his return from his honeymoon. We discussed the situation and we went over the same ground as I had with de Valera and the Lord Mayor.

Anti-conscription meetings continued to be held every day, at which strong resolutions of resistance were adopted. Meanwhile, the British military were endeavouring to "impress" us. Troops were pouring in on all sides. The Bank of Ireland, Trinity College, the Shelbourne Hotel and other places were all occupied with machine guns. There were troops on Nelson Pillar and apparently in Findlater's Church. The Gurkhas and Bengal Lancers were stated to have left on the Midland and Great Western Railway for Mullingar or Tullamore. I noted in my diary:-

"Great talk about tanks, poison gas and other frightening eventualities, but the people are very alive to the danger and the provocative policy of the military, and are quite calm, though tensely excited."

Arrest of Dowling and Cotter brothers:

On the 12th or 13th April, 1918, the Clare police arrested a man who entered Crabbe Island, in a sheltered inlet of Galway Bay near Doolin, in a collapsible boat. He stated that he had escaped from an American boat that had been sunk by a German submarine; but the ship he mentioned was not sunk. As the mysterious visitor was unable to give a satisfactory account of his presence, he was conveyed by the military authorities to London. The press of 17th April reported that he had got forty-five pounds in silver at an Ennistymon Bank, that he was a man of education and that he stated he was a native of Munster.

Documents relative to the Sinn Féin movement published by the British military authorities on the 8th January, 1921, contain a reference to this landing on pages 40 and 41.

I have noted the following:-

"A cutting from the 'Independent' consisting of a letter from T.V. Honan, Urban Councillor, written in Ennis on the 23rd May, 1918, published in the 'Independent' presumably about the 24th, seems to cast doubt on the published account of the landing of Dowling. By 'published account' I mean what appeared in the press about the 16th or 17th April, 1918. This letter of Honan refers to a letter which he had written on the matter to the 'Independent' but which was suppressed by the military censor.

I saw the editor of the 'Independent' who told me that Honan's suppressed letter related how the man, James O'Brien, alias Dowling, went

to the coastguards and took tea with the police and that he later went to Ennistymon, got drunk, made himself very demonstrative. The letter concluded with a challenge to the military authorities to produce the papers found on the man."

On making other enquiries, perhaps through Dublin detectives, I got further information which I have recorded, unfortunately in such a way that I now have great difficulty in determining the precise information. The following is my note:-

"Arrived 15th March. Left 6th April. Arrived with uncle (whose name is that of the head of our bank) [i.e., the Hibernian Bank, O'Connell Street]. Form of registration. Uncle left the 16th, that is, the day after. The man (James O'Brien) was a careless devil-may-care, about twenty-eight years of age. [He remained] in garden. Uncle returned in about fifteen days (about the 29th/30th) but left after two days."

The following is my attempt at an interpretation of this obscure and purposely disguised note:-

15th March - Dowling (James O'Brien) landed and, on the same day, got into immediate communication with his 'uncle'.

16th March - the 'uncle' left for Dublin or elsewhere, probably conveying message brought by Dowling.

Dowling remains in hiding in garden or farm.

29th or 30th March - the 'uncle' returned.

1st April - the 'uncle' left and did not return.

6th April - Dowling left for unknown destination, possibly to contact German submarines.

12th or 13th April - Dowling was arrested on landing, presumably not for the first time.

The subsequent history of Dowling was revealed by the press. On the 8th August, 1918, Dowling was found guilty by a courtmartial on charges of "aiding the enemy" and sentenced to death by shooting but his sentence was commuted to penal servitude for life. The 'Times' report states that:-

"When the sentence was read at the Tower, Dowling was present under armed escort but he betrayed no emotion on hearing the judgment. He was afterwards conveyed to prison. Dowling was charged at the courtmartial with having, while a prisoner at Limburg-Lahn in Prussia, voluntarily joined the Irish Brigade formed by the German Government and urged other Irish prisoners to join. He was also charged with having sailed in a German submarine and landed in Ireland for some treasonable purpose."

The Dublin press of the 17th April, 1918, stated that:-

"Early on the morning of the 16th/17th a patrol boat cruising in Dublin Bay noticed a light in the distance. On approaching it, they found it was a boat containing two men

who gave their names as Cotter and stated they were brothers living on the north side of Dublin and were fishing. There was no tackle in the boat and, on being landed, they were subsequently brought to England, charged, it is stated, with attempting to communicate with the enemy."

On the 9th May, 1918, McPherson stated in the House of Commons that the man put ashore on the west of Ireland was to be tried by courtmartial but he declined to state the charges that would be brought against the prisoner, adding that it was most important to the public interest that secrecy should be observed.

The Lord Mayor, Larry O'Neill, communicated with the Archbishop of Dublin on the evening of the 17th April, 1918, in reference to the Mansion House Conference against conscription. The Archbishop spoke of the Bishops' meeting of which the Lord Mayor did not reveal his knowledge and it was arranged that the Lord Mayor would telephone towards lunch the next day for the reception of a delegation from the Conference. The Archbishop's name was to be kept secret. This was vastly better than sending a statement.

At nine o'clock on the morning of Thursday, the 18th April, 1918 (the date of the meeting), Mr. de Valera called to the Archbishop's House to see the Archbishop in case the Archbishop wished to see him and again to request that the bishops would say nothing which would hinder those who were prepared to defend themselves with arms to the last. He was ready to answer any questions the Archbishop might wish to put to him. On my making known to the Archbishop de Valera's visit, the Archbishop considered it safer not to see

him. I conveyed the tenor of de Valera's mission fully to the Archbishop.

At ten o'clock on Thursday morning (18th April, 1918), the Lord Mayor's Conference at the Mansion House began. The Conference consisted of de Valera and Griffith representing Sinn Féin, Dillon and Devlin representing the Irish Parliamentary Party, William O'Brien and Tim Healy representing the Independents, and three Labour representatives, William O'Brien of Dublin, Thomas Johnston of Belfast and M. Egan, T.C., of Cork. The Conference deliberated until one o'clock when they decided unanimously, on the motion of Mr. William O'Brien, M.P., seconded by Arthur Griffith, to send a deputation, consisting of Dillon, de Valera, Healy and William O'Brien, Labour representative, and the Lord Mayor, to Maynooth to wait on the Irish hierarchy. The Conference was to re-assemble at seven o'clock to hear the report of the deputation.

The deputation arrived as the bishops were adjourning to lunch. De Valera and Tim Healy were first to arrive and received a great ovation from the students, among whom the news of the Lord Mayor's telephone message had been circulated like lightning. They were received by the bishops at two o'clock. The Lord Mayor introduced the deputation. All spoke fully, frankly, strongly, putting forward points on which they considered the bishops' help or concurrence needful. There was complete unanimity among them. The bishops received them in a most friendly manner and only modified a few impracticable suggestions. The proposal for the taking of the pledge on bended knee in the church was dropped and it was agreed that it be done outside the church. A collection would be made, not in the church, but it

would be announced inside that a collection would be made outside the church gates. The bishops agreed to the pledge, the celebration of a public Mass and the collection outside the Church gates. The Archbishop of Dublin agreed to act with the Lord Mayor as trustee to the fund. It was decided to hold a general strike for one day. The Maynooth students were to be sent home on Saturday. It was a day of most dramatic effect.

In no time the news of the Maynooth visit was universally known in Dublin. The effect was electrical. The evening papers were grabbed by everyone and universal excitement reigned. Great as the excitement was, the predominant effect plainly noticeable was the feeling of relief and the confidence inspired in all by that day's meeting. Everybody recognised the lead and all were prepared to follow to a man. A few foreseeing men in Dublin Castle fully realised the inevitable consequences of the meeting. Mr. Quinn, Assistant Commissioner of Police, remarked with great relief to me the next day, "That ends conscription in Ireland".

I remember vividly the elation of the Archbishop of Dublin that evening on his return. He related to me every incident of the day and took a certain amount of malicious pleasure in picturing the discomfiture of the Cardinal, how he was led on from point to point before he realised it. He had first advocated "passive resistance" but the Archbishop of Dublin and others made short work of his passive resistance, for nobody could define what passive resistance meant, and passive resistance was the only panacea of the Cardinal. Standing on the steps of the front house after the meeting, awaiting the arrival of their cars, the Cardinal mournfully remarked to the Archbishop, "I think this is

the worst day's business the bishops ever did". On the Archbishop expressing dissent and saying that he thought everything went off very satisfactorily, the Cardinal could only repeat, "I fear this is the worst day's business the bishops ever did".

That evening (18th April, 1918) the Conscription Bill was read for the third time in the House of Lords and received the royal assent. Earlier in the day, Lord French and his staff arrived in Dublin and there were many signs of military and naval activity.

On the 19th April, 1918, my diary notes:-

"The 'Times' is evidently nonplussed. It has no leading article on the passing of the Bill into law but gave a fairly complete summary of the proceedings in Dublin and Maynooth."

Dr. McCartan was elected unopposed as Sinn Féin Member of Parliament for Offaly apparently on the 19th April, 1918.

On the 19th April, 1918, de Valera and Tim Healy called in the evening time on the Archbishop to discuss the anti-conscription fund, the legal aspects involved and to make the arrangements by which the Archbishop and Lord Mayor would act as trustees with a third person to be named by the Mansion House Conference.

On the 20th April, 1918, it was announced:-

- (1) that the Lord Mayor was to go to America to place Ireland's claim before President Wilson;
- (2) that the Archbishop of Dublin and the Lord Mayor would act as Trustees for the Fund

with a third to be named by them.

On the same day a specially convened meeting of the Irish Trades Union Congress and Labour Party, attended by 1,600 delegates, planned their resistance against conscription and ordered a general stoppage of work on Tuesday, 23rd April, as a demonstration of Labour against it. "We believe that our success in resisting the imposition of conscription will be the signal to the workers of all countries now at war to rise against their oppressors." This final sentence was suppressed by the Censor in the 'Evening Herald' but appeared in the 'Evening Telegraph'. The Nationalist Party also resolved on the same day to remain in Ireland to co-operate with their constituents against the enforcement of conscription.

On Sunday, the 21st April, 1918, scenes were witnessed through the length and breadth of Ireland that were never seen before. They were not long-planned elaborately-devised parades worked up with trumpet fanfares or beating drums. No flags were waved. Only three days before, the Bishops on hearing the Mansion House delegation issued their direction and the anti-conscription pledge. It was published in the press on Friday morning, and now on Sunday a million, hitherto divided, unorganised, demoralised, rallied outside their churches as one man and signed the following pledge:-

"Denying the right of the British Government to enforce compulsory service in this country, we pledge ourselves solemnly to one another to resist conscription by the most effective means at our disposal."

There was no oratory; there was neither flag, nor band, nor a trace of mob hysteria. There was, however,

unmistakeable deep tense determination to fight conscription and Britain to the end.

In many cases bishops presided at the meetings in their home towns, for example, Archbishop Harty of Cashel in Thurles, Dr. Fogarty in Ennis, Dr. Finnegan in Cavan and, somewhat surprisingly, Dr. Kelly in Skibbereen. A few Protestants here and there also took the pledge but the vast majority held aloof while prepared gladly to avail of the protection of their Catholic fellow-countrymen. In Dublin the meetings passed off quietly. The proclamations then in force against meetings rendered large meetings inadvisable but many successful parochial meetings were held in the city. Very large sums were collected to form an anti-conscription fund. In Dublin £470 was collected on the first day at the Pro-Cathedral. In Tuam the subscriptions amounted to £1,250. In Drumcondra the people objected to the old gang of Town Councillors and their allies who endeavoured to "run" the proceedings. The people asserted themselves successfully and appointed their own Committee.

The evening papers of the 22nd April, 1918, contained a declaration of adherence to the Bishops' anti-conscription pledge of sixteen King's Counsellors, headed by A.M. Sullivan, Sergeant McSweeney, Carrigan, P. Lynch, T. McCann. It was noted also that N.Sinnott, Manager of the Bank of Ireland, signed the pledge.

The general cessation of work took place on Tuesday, the 23rd April, 1918. There were no trains, trams, cars or papers. All shops without exception were closed. The opening of the courts, banks and post offices made no impression. There were no trains to Punchestown Races and jarveys refused all bribes to go.

In the hotels the guests had to cook and serve their own meals. It was a very effective and powerful warning of the resistance that could be offered on a large scale, if necessary.

About this time the elections in East Cavan was the occasion of considerable anxiety, as Dillon and Devlin strongly resented the nomination of Griffith as candidate. They wanted a neutral. There was grave danger of a split at a critical moment in the new-found unity.

The British Press attacks Irish Bishops for organising Anti-Conscription Pledge:

From about the 24th April, 1918, a rabid anti-Catholic (No-Popery) campaign began in the English press directed chiefly against the Irish bishops and the Vatican. The 'Times' and the 'Globe' especially worked themselves into a frenzy. English so-called Catholics contributed to the campaign by their anti-Irish venom. Many of these letters are worth perusing as a revelation of English mentality towards Ireland and of the uncharitable attitude of leading English Catholics towards Ireland. Particularly invidious was the egregious letter of "Civis Britannicus" (a hopeful combination of Stoneyhurst and Oratory schools) and also one by Bart Kennedy. The campaign continued in unmitigated fury for a fortnight, helped by such representative and patriotic Roman Catholics as Lord Edmond Talbot, Lord Denbigh, James Hope and the Catholic Union of Great Britain. The controversy was not without importance, as it gave rise to some well-informed and many ill-informed statements and articles on the moral right of the Irish people to resist English law and on the attitude of the Irish Bishops and the Vatican. Reference should be made to an article by

Reverend Doctor Coffey, Maynooth, in the June number of the 'Irish Ecclesiastical Record' and to an article by Father Peter Finlay in 'Studies'.

It should be noted that the 'Times' was so non-plussed at the results of the Irish bishops and lay leaders at Maynooth that on the following day, although they had a fairly complete account of the proceedings, they had no leading article either on the passing of the Bill into law or on the significance of the Maynooth meeting.

In the course of the "no-Popery" campaign, much was made of the anti-conscription pledge being associated with religious functions but the 'Star' (an English paper) was not alone in neatly answering the 'Times' by contrasting its indignation at the action of the Irish clergy with its reverent handling of the formal Protestant services on the occasion of the signing of Carson's Ulster covenant.

The Council of the Catholic Union of Great Britain made itself particularly contemptible in its attack upon the action of the Irish bishops. These members, who arrogated to themselves the title of "Catholic Union", in no way represented either the Catholic bishops or the vast majority of English Catholic laymen whom they posed to represent. Within a few years they passed entirely out of public life so that to-day their names are utterly forgotten.

The 'Irish Catholic' of the week ending 4th May, 1918, contains very effective and welcome repudiations by English Catholics of some of their fellow-countrymen's attacks. On the 4th May, 1918, the Archbishop of Dublin received a very understanding letter from Dr. Amigo, Bishop of Southwark, in which he enclosed a reply and

reproof to the Earl of Denbigh on the Union's attack on the Irish bishops.

Attitude of Non-Catholic Irish towards Conscription:

The official attitude on conscription of the non-Catholic churches should be noted. While it was notorious that the general body of the Irish Protestants were very happy to avail of the exemption of Ireland from conscription, the attitude of their official spokesmen was very different, if not hypocritical. I have already referred to their attitude when the Conscription Bill was under discussion. On the passing of the Act, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland at its meeting in Belfast on the 10th May, 1918, felt:-

"it to be its duty, on this crisis in the country's history, to state its strong conviction that conscription should be applied to Ireland at once and that conscription should not be made in any way to depend on Home Rule. As to Home Rule itself, the attitude of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland has always been one of earnest and sincere opposition to it from the conviction that it would be ruinous for Ireland and supremely dangerous for the whole Empire".

Dr. Crozier, Protestant Archbishop of Armagh, presiding at the Annual General Synod of the Church of Ireland held in Dublin on May 14th, 1918, expressed sympathy with those who fell in the war. "These men", he said, "did not stand aloof to save their bodies and lose their souls when the call of duty came. May God in His mercy forgive their misguided fellow-countrymen whose abstinence from service would ever constitute the

darkest blot on the tragic page of Ireland's history".

On the 27th April, 1918, I wrote the following:-

"Lord Decies, as Press Censor, to-day issued a note to the press prohibiting the publication of letters, appeals and advertisements calling for subscriptions to the National Defence Fund to resist conscription as well as the publication of any list of subscriptions to that Fund. It is worthy of note that Lord Decies, on being asked by Lloyd George one of these days whether in his opinion conscription could be enforced, replied "No".

The 'Nation' comments on effect of Conscription in Ireland:

A remarkable leading article of this week (27th April, 1918) in the 'Nation' sums up the conscription and general situation:-

"The country has now before it the immediate results of Mr. George's conduct of Irish affairs. In a single fortnight he has made a united Ireland - against himself. He has knit into a single fabric nationalism which includes the Catholic Church, the Parliamentary Party, the Independents, the Sinn Féiners and the Labour organisations, pledged by a solemn oath and covenant to resist one part of his policy, the rest of Ireland being already bound by a similar covenant to resist the other. Apply this unique strategy to the war and the diplomacy of the war. Mr. George deducts from our fighting force enough British soldiers, it may be, to decide the pending battles in our

favour, while he shuts out Irish recruitment. He tears to fragments the salutary work of two generations of Liberalism and puts in grave jeopardy the American alliance and the cause for which we went to war. This is his defence.

England and Ireland might have settled their quarrel in 1886, 1896 and 1914. Both were then in the mood and atmosphere of reconciliation and, in fact, a long truce was established between them. But Ireland did not get Home Rule and she kept on losing manhood. Now, having presented Ulster with the key which locks her out of Home Rule, Mr. George prepares his forced draught on her dwindling population. She has treated it as an act of war which, as no man can make a nation fight against its will, she has won without firing a shot. Mr. George, having betrayed both Irish parties in turn is left without a friend in either camp; has got the shadow of his Bill and lost the substance, and has dealt the country a worse blow than the Germans struck at St. Quentin."

An example of the unity of the country was to be seen in the anti-conscription meeting held at Ballaghaderreen at which de Valera and John Dillon appeared on the same platform before fifteen thousand people.

The national Novena, recommended by the bishops, concluded on the 11th May, 1918. The press reported that the Dublin churches were thronged to overflowing throughout the week, revealing in a remarkable way the

spiritual unity and exultation of the nation in the face of the gravest crisis in its history. The novena was followed on Sunday morning, said a press report, by a general Communion of all the participants and, again, impressive scenes were witnessed at the early Masses everywhere. The confessional duty on Saturday lasted up to midnight. "It is believed that never before were such throngs of people in the city churches for this duty and reports from the provinces indicate a like fervour in practically every city, town and country district."

It would be difficult to over-state the paramount importance of the fight on conscription. Yet its import has been overshadowed by the later fight, with its still greater victories. Our resorgimento was indeed already well ablaze but conscription fanned the torch into an all-consuming conflagration that instantaneously swept all over the country, destroying former idols, purifying the national spirit and clearing the dross from the finer metal that was emerging. No previous attack on our nation had been so nation-wide, so personal, so sudden or so unexpected. It stabbed the nation's rights, its honour, its liberty. It directly struck the manhood in every family and, hardly less so, its womenfolk. It outraged religion itself in its ministers. Every individual in the nation felt affronted and revolted.

The aggression too was one that owed both its inspiration and execution to the Tory die-hards, the worst and oldest enemies of Ireland. The English military caste, contrary to all military principles, threw themselves into politics and appeared on Carson's platforms and enlisted in his stage army. The titled

magnates and their duchesses, whose hands Lloyd George described ten years earlier as dripping with the fat of sacrifice, now craved for Irish blood. The castles of the Marlboroughs and their kind were the platforms where the anti-Irish campaign was staged. The press emblazoned and embellished the crusade. Non-conformist fanatics, dropping their pacifism, clamoured that the Irish be dragged to the shambles of war. The challenge was one of pure vindictiveness. It was instantly taken up. Never before in Ireland was unity realised so quickly, so solidly, so universally, so wholeheartedly, and never before was an English campaign so instantly defied and so quickly and startlingly overwhelmed. We read of medieval citizens springing to arms at the tocsin's alarm and of a countryside assembled by the signal fire, but on that 21st April a whole nation rose in arms against an empire, three days after the quiet call of the bishops. The feat staggered the empire.

It would be a platitude to say that conscription was not merely a crime but a blunder. But that is just what it was for England. Note these dates. On April the 11th, 1918, the English Commander-in-Chief, threatened with destruction by the German offensive, appealed to his army for a desperate stand "with our backs to the wall". This was the hour that Lloyd George, at the behest of all the Orange faction, launched an anti-Irish campaign and precipitated the storm. It was only on April the 19th that Ludendorf and Prince Rupprecht recognised defeat and agreed to break off the German offensive.

Yet while Germany fought and failed, Ireland defied Britain's unprecedented might and on that same 19th April it was clear that Britain was more utterly

defeated in Ireland than the Germans in the most critical offensive of the whole war.

The climax of British folly and blindness was the attempt to conscript the Irish clergy. One thousand Irish clerics would count mighty little against even one cohort of the Kaiser's legions. But this most stupid of all steps inevitably drove the most conservative of conservative Irish bishops to share the leadership of opposition with Sinn Féin.

Only five months before - on the 1st November, 1917 - Dr. Gilmartin, then Bishop of Clonfert, preaching in his Cathedral, briefly summed up the three conditions which theologially justified resistance by physical force to the de facto established government:-

- (1) The government must be, in the judgment of the large body of the people, tyrannical;
- (2) Constitutional or legal means are not available;
- (3) There is a good hope of success so that resistance to the government by armed force will not entail greater evils than it seeks to remedy.

Now, five months later, thanks to Lloyd George, the most conservative section of the bishops found themselves obliged to resist the established government and the supreme measure of its legislation by the most effective means at the disposal of the Irish people. And the leaders of the Irish people had most definitely made known to the bishops that the most effective means "included physical force and guns".

Lloyd George had swept away the last remaining shreds of support from the moral and ecclesiastical laws and even provided the proof that there did exist a good chance of success in resistance by real or veiled forces, even against the Empire's armed might. The so-called "constitutional" policy was now dead and abandoned. Newly-united Ireland during those days adopted the new policy and cut with Westminster Parliamentarianism forever, and thenceforward we heard little in public from minor theologians of platitudes from theological manuals. In those ten days Lloyd George brought down the so-called "constitutional" movement represented by the Irish Party which Tories, Unionists and Orangemen had failed to do in ten decades.

It may be interesting to note the publication of many leaflets and caricatures of various kinds.

De Valera stated the Irish case in an interview published by the 'Christian Science Monitor', Boston, on May 15th, 1918, and later in a pamphlet edited by Robert Brennan.

The Lord Mayor, deputed to present an Address from the Mansion House Conference, has to abandon his visit:

On the 23rd April, 1918, the Lord Mayor (Larry O'Neill) wrote to Balfour, as Foreign Secretary, asking for passports to proceed to America to place before President Wilson the case against conscription in Ireland. He received the passports on the 14th May, 1918, but, the Lord Mayor reports:-

"I understand that no documents, either written or printed, are allowed to be carried by passengers going to the United States unless such documents are essential for the

purpose of the voyage'.

I would be glad if you would kindly have authority issued to enable me to convey the document which has been drawn up for presentation to President Wilson."

In reply the Lord Mayor received a note from the Foreign Office on the 18th May, stating that Mr. Balfour was advised by the "competent authorities" that the document should be submitted to the Lord Lieutenant. But the Lord Mayor and the Conference decided not to submit it to the Lord Lieutenant, as it was a document dealing with direct communications between the Mansion House Conference and President Wilson. The result of this was that the Lord Mayor's American visit was abandoned. He travelled to London and presented the document to the Acting Chargé d'Affaires, Mr. Irwin Loughlin.

The workings of Orange influence at this time is revealed by the change of attitude and tone of the Protestant Archbishop of Armagh. On May 2nd, 1918, he said he was at one with Cardinal Logue in standing for the unity of Ireland. His "heart's desire was to find some scheme which would gratify the legitimate aspirations of the Irish Party, allay the fears of Southern Unionists and win even the reluctant consent of North-East Ulster". Noble sentiments - but his Archdeacon wrote five days later (May 7th, 1918) that the Lord Primate's position at the Irish Convention and since "has been much misunderstood", that he was authorised by the Archbishop to say that he never was more strongly opposed to Home Rule, that "he looks on any proposal to coerce Ulster as criminal lunacy" and that "to introduce the Home Rule Bill at the present crisis is to court disaster".

Reaction to Conscription Bill among
the Irish abroad:

The reaction to the Conscription Bill among the Irish abroad may be seen from the following:-

The Australian Bishops cabled a declaration to de Valera and Dillon in favour of Dominion Home Rule and against conscription.

On May 2nd, 1918, one of the very largest meetings ever held in Brisbane enthusiastically carried a resolution proposed by the Archbishop of Brisbane, Dr. Duhig, seconded by the Premier of Queensland, that -

"this meeting of Queensland citizens in public meeting assembled emphatically protest against the extension of the Man-Power Act to Ireland and strongly urge the Imperial Government to establish immediately in Ireland such a measure of Home Rule as will be acceptable to the majority of its people".

This communication, by direct instructions of the Premier of Queensland, was communicated to Mr. de Valera.

About this time people began to seriously consider the precise form that a future independent Irish state should take. Naturally, for Sinn Féin sympathisers it was already a settled question that it should take the form of a Republic. The only exception, curiously, was Arthur Griffith himself, who so far from committing himself to the definite acceptance of a republic held that the form of government should be decided only by referendum when independence was won. Very few shared

his opinion and very few others seriously considered the question of selecting an Irish monarch from among the descendants of the "Wild Geese". At the same time among the older and more conservative elements of the national movement there was a prejudice against the word and idea of a republic. This was naturally noticeable in the more elderly ecclesiastical circles. The Archbishop of Dublin, talking about Sinn Féin on Ascension Thursday evening (9th May, 1918), spoke with amused raillery of the idea some people had of republicanism, associating it with the excesses of the French Revolution and forgetting all about the United States of America. He obviously referred to Cardinal Logue and those bishops who spoke against the republican programme of Sinn Féin, for republicanism was now the accepted creed of Sinn Féin and what had begun as a symbol or as a word to define unmistakably what was intended by "independence" and "separation" was now an end in itself. This feeling persisted for many months longer, certainly until the time of the general election.

It should be borne in mind that the Irish Parliamentary Party, like the British Government itself, had completely distorted the meaning of the word "independence". Independence to them simply meant a glorified general county council in College Green and this forced Sinn Féin to adopt republic as an unmistakable definition of a sovereign state.

German Plot Arrests:

On the 16th May, 1918, a proclamation was issued from Dublin Castle stating that drastic measures must be taken to put down a newly discovered conspiracy and German Plot. In accordance with this proclamation, there was a general arrest of Sinn Féin leaders during

the night of 16-17th May. Over eighty leaders were arrested, including de Valera, Arthur Griffith, Count Plunkett, Countess Markievicz, Mrs. Clarke, Madame Gonne McBride, W. Cosgrave, Dr. Hayes, L. Ginnell, D. Figgis, Brian O'Higgins. The full list of the Sinn Féin leaders deported to England and their places of imprisonment appeared in the press of the 28th September, 1918.

There were various theories as to why the Government so acted, apart from a spirit of revenge arising from the defeat of conscription. One impression was that it was a vain attempt of the Government to stop the stampede of the country towards Sinn Féin by cutting off its leaders, particularly in view of the Cavan election campaign which had just begun and for which Arthur Griffith was Sinn Féin candidate. Others naturally held that it was a last resort to make the enforcement of conscription possible or easier. The people generally scouted the idea of a German Plot, though some realised that some sections of the Irish in America might well be in communication with the German authorities.

In a debate that was held in the House of Lords on the 20th June, 1918, Lord Wimborne, the former Lord Lieutenant, stated that neither he nor any member of the Irish Executive had been aware of the existence of that Plot until it was discovered by the British Government. He dwelt upon the unfortunate change in the personnel of the Irish Executive. "That change", he said, "was not confined to the offices of the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary; it included the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice, the Commander of the Forces and other functionaries, great and small". As far as we could see, these changes had removed from the Irish Government all, or nearly all of those who had sympathy with the cause of Irish nationality. The change had been so complete and

dramatic that one was entitled to ask the Government what it might portend. In partial explanation, the Government had alleged the existence of a German Plot. From the fact that the powers, by virtue of which the prisoners were interned and arrested, were conferred on the Chief Secretary at a Privy Council held in London on April 20th, 1918, it would appear that the arrests and bogus plot were directly concerned with the application of conscription to Ireland.

Two of the documents found in de Valera's possession when he was arrested on the 17th May, 1918, were published by the British Government in January, 1921, in the fuller collection of documents relative to the Sinn Féin movement. The second document referred to the activities of St. John Gaffney and Chatterton Hill on the Continent.

It was just at this time that Stephen Gwynn took on himself to make a new recruiting effort in the form of a letter published on the 20th May, 1918, in which he adhered to his calumnies against the Volunteers. His hear-say statement was entirely demolished in the same issue by the editor of the 'Irish Independent' and a prominent member of his staff. An even more overwhelming testimony appeared in the 'Independent' on the following day from F.T. Timoney, L.P.S.I., a Red Cross worker in O'Connell Street area.

It may be interesting to note that Father F. Farrington, the Chaplain of Arbour Hill Military Prison, was refused permission to see the civil prisoners. On his protesting, the Sergeant in charge rang up military headquarters and was told that the chaplain would have to get a permit from Major Price. Father Farrington refused to do so and reported the matter to the

Archbishop. The Archbishop decided that Canon Burke, the Parish Priest, should insist that facilities be obtained.

During all this period the Lord Mayor was in continual communication with the Archbishop, partly, of course, about the Conscription Fund but very largely in connection with the intended visit of the Lord Mayor to America to present the Irish case to President Wilson.

On the 22nd May, 1918, the same day that the Lord Mayor called on the Archbishop, Seán T. O'Kelly visited me late in the evening, doubtless to discuss the situation arising from the arrest of the prisoners.

Devoy disclaims all dealings with Germany since
U.S.A. entered the War:

Under the 24th May, 1918, I have a reference to an interview with the special correspondent of the 'Daily News' in New York when John Devoy characterised the accusation of Sinn Féin complicity in German plots as an outrageous lie. He denied that he had any dealings directly or indirectly with any agency or embassy, official or unofficial, of the German Government since the United States entered the war. He also referred to Chief Flynn's "frame-up" of a few months previously about "the plot to start another rebellion in Ireland last Easter" as an impudent falsehood. All this time we know that the Irish-Americans and the Germans were in communication through Madrid via Mexico. The activities of the Irish-Americans may be gathered from the telegrams that passed between the German Military Attachés in North and Central America.

On the 25th May, 1918, the British Government published its first version of the much boomed German-

Sinn Féin plot. It is an anti-climax and deals chiefly with the 1916 rising and with reports of the preparations of Irish-Americans during early 1916 and early 1917 for another rising, at a time when de Valera, Griffith and the other leaders were in prison. The fuller set of documents were not published until January, 1921.

I have noted in my diary that in a conversation with Alderman Tom Kelly at the Mansion House Conference about the 27th or 28th May, 1918:-

"Tim Healy said that there was the greatest danger that the Government would try de Valera and a few others of the leaders by secret trial, have them convicted by the evidence of the man in the Tower Dowling and shot. Nobody knows who Dowling is. His own solicitor has not been allowed to see him yet. Tim Healy says that James O'Connor Law Officer of the Crown has been much impressed by the gravity of evidence against de Valera. O'Connor had been expressing openly his disbelief in the plot to the Under-Secretary who said, 'Very well, come and see it, and see what you think of it'. O'Connor saw the evidence and is much perturbed."

I think this information came to us through the Lord Mayor. From him or from some other source we also heard that:-

"The Volunteer officers believe that one of their body at their Convention gave away the speeches made by de Valera and others. He is said to be a Munster man but apparently he cannot be identified. John Dillon has been boasting that he had conclusive proofs

of the assistance of spies and it is said that he had a secret service cheque paid to this Volunteer officer in his possession as proof of his assertion and that he is prepared to show it to any responsible person.

Representations against Ireland and the Irish
Bishops in Rome:

In all this campaign against the Irish bishops and the Holy See in connection with conscription, the Holy See and prominent ecclesiastics in Rome were inundated with bitter denunciations of the Irish bishops and Irish clergy in their attitude towards conscription and their disloyalty and opposition to law. Among others so pestered was Cardinal Vincenzo Vantelli who spoke to Monsignor ~~Riordan~~^u, Rector of the Irish College, about it. Monsignor ~~Riordan~~ expressed the opinion that there was no reason whatever for direct interference of the Curia in the matter; that there were bishops in Ireland as in other countries. Having discussed the right of Ireland to resist the Conscription Act and the common contention that the Irish accepted the English Parliament by sending members to Westminster, Monsignor ~~Riordan~~ warned the Cardinal of the long-standing suspicion the Irish people entertained of the Curia, instancing the Veto, the Parnell testimonial and Errington's mission. Monsignor ~~Riordan~~ wrote to Monsignor Ceretti, Assistant Secretary of State, on the conscription question and its reactions. He pointed out that England and its press "will only use the Curia as an instrument to be momentarily used and then thrown aside as so frequently happened in the past". Monsignor ~~Riordan~~'s letter to the Archbishop of Dublin of the 8th June, 1918, and a copy of his letter to

Stat O'
Smc

Monsignor Ceretti are doubtless in the Dublin archives.

Among the English denunciations of the Irish bishops was a document forwarded by the British Government to the Holy See. The Holy See sent forward a copy of this statement of complaints against twenty-six priests for incitement to armed resistance against conscription. No evidence was produced or authority mentioned. From the scrappy nature of the priests' declarations, it was evident that they were reports by policemen. Certainly none of these statements had been reported in the press. Apparently the strongest of these statements was that those who took part in enforcing an oppressive and inhuman law were themselves guilty of grave sin. (This is probably what Lord Curzon had in mind when he declared in the House of Lords on the 20th June, 1918, that the Irish bishops told the people that they would incur eternal damnation if they did not oppose conscription.) The Archbishop of Dublin wished to refer the statement back to the Holy See to ascertain the authority of these statements and to expose Lord Curzon's lie as an example of the unreliability of even an English statesman. The statements, however, were given to each bishop concerned for examination. The matter was discussed at the June meeting of the bishops.

Resolution directed against Dr. Paddy Browne
at the June Meeting of the Bishops:

It was at the same June meeting that the Bishop of Kilmore (Dr. Finnegan) displayed extreme vindictiveness against Dr. Paddy Browne, then Professor in Maynooth. The Bishop, or one of his supporters, proposed a resolution to the bishops that, before any priest should speak in another diocese, he should have the consent both of his own bishop and of the bishop of the diocese in which he spoke. Cardinal Logue was in

favour of the proposal and was very much surprised when, on the vote being taken, not only did the first two (the Archbishop of Dublin and the Bishop of Cashel) vote against it but so did every other bishop down to Dr. Hoare of Ardagh who was the first to vote for it. After the next few immediate votes were all recorded against the proposal, the Cardinal had to admit that the majority were too strong against it. The very persistency of the Bishop of Kilmore turned even the more moderate bishops against him and his proposal. Dr. Hoare, of course, was an extreme follower of the Irish Parliamentary Party, had refused to sign the protest against partition and was sore over the defeat of his nominee in South Longford.

After the arrest of de Valera, Griffith and the leaders in May, 1918, the Sinn Féin organisation had appealed to Dr. Paddy Browne to help in the East Cavan campaign as it was feared that any prominent Sinn Féin leader would be arrested. After a certain amount of hesitation, Dr. Browne consented and roused the indignation of the bishop, a die-hard supporter of the Party.

Lord French promises grants of land to Recruits
joining the British Army:

On the 4th June, 1918, Lord French by proclamation appealed to Irishmen to provide fifty thousand men before the 1st October and thereafter two thousand to three thousand a month "to fight for the liberty of their motherland". "Steps are being taken", says the proclamation, -

"to ensure as far as possible that land shall be available for men who have fought for their country and the necessary legislative measure is now under consideration."

He said:-

"It is not expected that many of the rural population will be available for military purposes and the Government look almost entirely to the young men in the towns."

The allusion to the land that would be available for the recruits naturally aroused considerable criticism and condemnation, and even the London 'People' denounced it as a vulgar political swindle, characterising the proposal as a gross insult to Englishmen and Irishmen alike:-

"It is an outrage upon every patriotic instinct - a dodge worthy only of some pettifogging hucksterer."

A commentary on Lord French's proclamation of the 4th June, 1918, is afforded by Sir John Craig's speech in the House of Commons on the 25th June, three weeks later, when he announced that, if Ulster were excluded, he would have no hesitation in guaranteeing the military authorities fifty thousand men in a fortnight. This speech was uttered at a time when the British Army and its empire hung in the balance as the result of the great German offensives of March, May and June, 1918.

Among the brilliant suggestions of the pro-Britishers in Ireland was a letter from the Rev. Mr. Broughan of Marmullane Rectory, Passage West:-

"The Government should colonise the southern provinces after the war with married British soldiers and their families, and thus Ulsterise all Ireland."

See 'Irish Catholic Bulletin', July, 1918.

Proclamation prohibiting Processions and
Public Meetings in Dublin:

On the 16th June, 1918, the Commander-in-Chief of the military forces issued a proclamation prohibiting indefinitely processions and public meetings in Dublin.

The elections of the Chairmen of the County Councils were taking place about this time. Although the Council membership was unchanged, many former Redmondite adherents had changed their allegiance and become Sinn Féin.

Meanwhile Sinn Féin intelligence was very active. Spies were unearthed. One at this time was a person who arranged to meet the County Inspector on pretence of going fishing in Sligo (Patrick Sheil, Kilaneck National School, Tubbercurry).

It was on the evening of the 20th June, 1918, and in the House of Lords that Lord Curzon announced the dropping of the latest proposals on Home Rule and of conscription.

Result of Cavan Election:

The result of the East Cavan election was announced on the 21st June, 1918. It had been hoped that, as a result of the arrest of Arthur Griffith, de Valera and the other Sinn Féin leaders, the seat would be presented without further opposition to Arthur Griffith and as a mark of the popular indignation; but Mr. Dillon at Bailieboro' on Sunday, the 26th May, 1918, insisted that "the contest must go on". The result was:-

Arthur Griffith	3,795
O'Hanlon	2,581

a majority of 1,214 in favour of Arthur Griffith.

This was another notable victory for Sinn Féin.

won despite the fact that their electoral organisation had been to a large extent upset by the arrest of the Sinn Féin leaders. John Dillon and Joe Devlin had regarded Cavan as one of their strongholds and, for this reason, refused the various suggestions made by public men and public bodies that a contested election should be avoided. Feeling ran high generally for most felt that the newly established unity should not be imperilled by local contests. Griffith had offered to abide by the result of a plebiscite taken after the Sunday Masses, but this and all similar suggestions were turned down by the Party who were confident of victory. The election was furthermore won despite the intimidation of the military who suppressed all attempts of the Volunteers to parade or march in processions. All wearers of Sinn Féin badges were stopped and their badges torn off. Men were searched "for arms". The hurleys were seized and taken from a body of marching Volunteers and haversacks torn off others who were taking no part in any military formations. An attempt was even made to take their leggings off. Mrs. Griffith, while motoring, was held up by soldiers kneeling with rifles cocked on the road, nor were there wanting acts of terrorism by the A.O.H. These, however, chiefly distinguished themselves by the mean and vile stories circulated regarding Arthur Griffith. East Cavan was the eighth[?] contested election in all four provinces since the North Roscommon election, the other six being South Longford, East Clare, Kilkenny, South Armagh, Waterford and East Tyrone. In these eight elections Sinn Féin polled seventeen thousand votes against thirteen thousand for the Party. It was perfectly evident from the spirit in the country that the Irish Parliamentary Party had not the least prospect of success in the post-conscription elections.

On Sunday, the 23rd June, 1918, for some unexplained reason, soldiers at 4.30 lined the outskirts of the city. Ammunition had arrived the previous day from Belfast and was seized at Smithfield. The ammunition was made in Birmingham so that it was suspected that this was a "new military provocative plot".

Lloyd George's Speech in House of Commons on German Plot and Partition Parliament for Ireland:

The debate in the House of Commons on the 25th June, 1918, was remarkable not only for the futile attempts of Shortt and Lloyd George to defend their action with regard to the German Plot in Ireland but more particularly for the light it throws on a scheme of partition devised early in 1917. This scheme, which was accepted by both Sir Edward Carson and Lloyd George, provided for a council composed of a new Irish Parliament for two-thirds of Ireland to whom were to be joined the Ulster representatives in the House of Commons. This was the part of the scheme against which Archbishop Walsh warned the country on the eve of the South Longford election. Lloyd George, in the course of the debate, deeply regretted that the scheme was not accepted. J.L. Garvin, editor of the 'Observer' and an intimate friend of Lloyd George, had also advocated this proposal.

According to a Sinn Féin leaflet (F.3) quoting the 'Freeman's Journal', John Dillon at a meeting in Dublin on the 25th June, 1918, stated:-

"What I should like to see, in the course of the coming autumn, is a national convention to definitely forswear an Irish republic".

The treatment of the Sinn Féin prisoners in Belfast came to the fore from the 19th July, 1918, when a released prisoner, Charles Kenny, sanitary contractor in the North Strand, made a sworn statement before the Lord Mayor and others concerning the treatment of the prisoners. This statement will be found in the report of the Irish-American Commission of Inquiry as well as elsewhere.

Archbishop refuses to hold Memorial Service
for those who died in the War:

On Tuesday, the 25th June, 1918, the Archbishop of Dublin received a letter from the Under-Secretary (Sir William Byrne) requesting him to hold a memorial service for those who died in the war. The Archbishop replied on the 27th June as follows:-

"In reference to the memorial service referred to in your letter, I cannot but think that the holding of such a service at such a time as this would be anything but judicious. It would undoubtedly be regarded by large sections of our Dublin population as partaking of the character of a military demonstration and, in view of many recent events, it would probably be regarded as a directly provocative challenge which, in the least unfavourable view of the situation, might easily lead to unseemly counter-demonstrations in the streets.

We are now nearing the end of the fourth year of the war. It would not be easy - at all events, I should not find it easy if challenged on the point - to give a satisfactory reason for the holding of such a service now at this stage of the war and at a time when so

large a section of public opinion in the city is in an exceptionally excited state.

The main cause of the present state of feeling is, of course, the most significant recent sweeping change in the character of the Irish government, a change which is rightly or wrongly held responsible for proceedings that are causing very much angry excitement.

Yesterday I received a strong letter protesting that the responsible authorities - I have not the slightest idea who they may be - have been guilty of a real outrage in sending off a number of Dublin Catholics, prisoners, not only untried but not even charged with any crime, to prisons in England where they have no possibility of even hearing Mass on Sundays.

It is, of course, not for me to offer a suggestion to His Excellency but I am called upon in answer to your courteous official letter to say that, especially in the circumstances of the present time, I could not make myself responsible in any degree for the holding of the suggested service."

Cardinal Logue meets Lord French at Scribblestown House:

An instance of the extraordinary efficiency of the Sinn Féin Intelligence came to our notice on Thursday, the 27th June, 1918. The previous day the Sinn Féin Intelligence learned that on the following day (Thursday, 27th) an interview was arranged to take place at Dowager Lady Granard's residence at Scribblestown House (a secluded residence under Dunsink) between Cardinal Logue

and Lord French. The Cardinal arrived in a covered car with James McMahon about 3.45 and Lord French arrived about the same time. The household staff were dispensed with and were not even asked to serve tea. The meeting lasted until 5.15. Presumably its object was to induce the Cardinal to help recruiting as conscription was being dropped. The meeting was a failure, the Cardinal leaving in a hurry and in a great huff, to the chagrin of the Dowager Lady Granard. The Cardinal refused even to take a cup of tea. This intelligence, having been passed on to the Archbishop of Dublin before the meeting took place and the result being notified on the following day, naturally much impressed the Archbishop with the efficiency of the Sinn Féin organisation.

Government proclaims Nationalist Organisations:

On Thursday, the 4th July, 1918 (American Independence Day), the British Government issued a proclamation against Sinn Féin, Irish Volunteers, Cumann na mBan and the Gaelic League.

The Anti-Conscription Conference appeal to President Wilson was to have been published in that day's papers but was suppressed. It appeared, however, in the English papers. The 'Daily News' gave it three columns. In consequence, it had to appear in the Irish press on the following day. Comments by the 'Nation' (London) and the 'New Statesman' (London) on this appeal condemned Lloyd George in the strongest terms.

On this same date (Independence Day) Wilson delivered one of his more remarkable speeches on the aims of the war, naturally the antithesis of British principles as applied to Ireland.

Addressing a gathering of Dublin Boy Scouts on

Saturday, the 6th July, 1918, Lord French counselled them amid applause that "they should stamp on every form of rebel as they would on a poisonous insect".

Another French and allied attempt to influence Irish opinion was made at this same time. The Abbé Flynn (Bishop of Nevers since 1932) and Monsieur Richard of the French Department of Agriculture arrived, on the pretence of looking for agricultural migratory labourers to aid in the coming French harvest. Even on this pretended mission, they failed and were plainly told that Ireland could not spare agricultural labourers.

The third and last great German offensive resumed on the 15th July, 1918.

Tim Healy raises the question of the Ill-Treatment
of Prisoners:

The whole story of the ill-treatment of the prisoners in Belfast, including Mr. Kenny's affidavit, Tim Healy's questions in the House of Commons and subsequent correspondence, was published by the Sinn Féin organisation about September, 1918, in leaflets entitled 'Irish Atrocities' - 'What About The Belfast Inquiry?'. See earlier part of my collection entitled, 'Sinn Féin Publications, 1918-1919'.

Tim Healy raised the question in the House of Commons a fortnight after Mr. Kenny's affidavit of 19th July, 1918. On the 17th August Mr. Healy wrote a letter to Mr. Shortt, pressing for the holding of the inquiry promised by Shortt and setting out once more the leading facts revealed by Mr. Kenny and stating, furthermore, that Major Owen Lewis had visited Belfast Jail before Shortt's speech in the House of Commons. This letter was also sent by Mr. Healy to the Irish papers but was suppressed. The letter so stung Mr. Shortt that on the 21st August,

1918, he wrote to Mr. Healy that he proposed an immediate inquiry before Mr. McDermott, one of the prison commissioners - "a public inquiry on oath". Mr. Shortt, however, repented of his rash promise as soon as he discovered that Mr. Healy had accepted a brief for the prisoners. Shortt not only shirked the inquiry but stopped it.

When Tim Healy raised the question in the House of Commons on behalf of the prisoners, the Irish Party refused to give the least support.

The Irish Party's conduct of a debate in the House of Commons (29th July, 1918) on Dillon's motion based on President Wilson's declaration is summed up in my diary:-

"A poor performance."

Sunday, the 4th August, 1918, became known as "Gaelic Sunday" following the holding of football and hurling matches in every parish in Ireland in defiance of D.O.R.A.

Collapse of Irish Parliamentary Party becomes evident:

By the beginning of August, 1918, the collapse of the Irish Party was becoming more and more evident. It was even divided within itself. The 'Independent's' London correspondent writing on the 7th August, 1918, says:-

"A large section of the membership (Irish Party) is impatient regarding the leadership of Mr. Dillon. It is disappointed because his rule has not produced any good results but has, on the contrary, reduced his Party to a worse plight than ever. The complaint against him chiefly is that he insists on going his own

way according to his preconceived ideas. The anti-Dillonites are inclined to turn towards Mr. Devlin for a wider lead because the tendency of his outlook on the position of the Irish Party is to adapt his policy to the exigencies of the changing situation and to make a bid for the support of the younger men. There is a notable cross-current to be observed in the chaotic condition of the Irish Party. The adherents of the late Mr. Redmond are feeling very sore against Mr. Devlin because, as they complain, the member for West Belfast revolted against the leadership of Mr. Redmond in the (Horace Plunkett) Convention and snubbed him - so they say - in the midst of that assemblage by voting in favour of Dominion Home Rule while the then Chairman of the Irish Party had given his support to the half-measure proposal. Mr. Devlin cannot count upon any backing from the late Mr. Redmond's friends. It will be seen that, apart from the immense volume of hostility throughout Ireland towards the Irish Party, it is a house divided against itself."

The speech of Campbell on Home Rule on the 17th August, 1918, appears in papers on 19th August.

The reply of the Ulster Unionists to the Mansion House Conference address to America is published in papers of 23rd August, 1918.

(At this time, consequent on the retreat of the defeated Germans, the British and Americans began to demand dictated peace.)

Sinn Féin publishes Pamphlets in preparation
for General Election:

From about the month of September, 1918, the Sinn Féin organisation published a series of election pamphlets and leaflets in view of the coming election. They are well worth examination. They not only record the then current ideas and policy but also the former history of the Sinn Féin movement and decay of the Irish Parliamentary Party. One on conscription, circulated at the end of September or early in October, deals with the renewed danger of conscription and the measures to be taken in its event. The preparations they recommend are "the strengthening of our military forces by every man of military age joining the Volunteers, "holding the harvest", which contemplated the accumulation of food supplies of all kinds, and measures against the menace of starvation. The leaflet, which was published by the Standing Committee of Sinn Féin, anticipated the imposition of martial law, the arrest of Sinn Féin leaders, establishment of a state of war and even of actual warfare in which case the "Government of Ireland will pass out of the hands of all political organisations like Sinn Féin and beyond the influence of civilians, such as, the Mansion House Committee or Defence Committees, and the only Irish authority with power to deal with all matters, civil and military, will be the Irish military commanders". These leaflets will be found in my collection of pamphlets, 'Sinn Féin Publications, 1918-1919'.

The papers of 5th September, 1918, report the sentence of many arrested for singing "rebel" songs and the seizure of Sinn Féin literature, even of Johnson's 'Handbook for Rebels' which was passed by the censor. Among others, Jack O'Sheehan, proprietor of the P. & C.

Concert Company in Galway, was sentenced to two years' hard labour by a court martial at Renmore for singing "seditious" songs, including "A Soldier's Song" and "The Felons Of Our Land" on 3rd July, 1918.

On the 6th September, 1918, the Labour Congress at Derby passed the usual vague general resolution in favour of Home Rule.

(About this time - 7th September - several members of the Bequest Board resigned. Was this for political motives?)

Lloyd George's hypocritical commiseration of
oppressed Armenians:

The following hypocritical declaration of Lloyd George, Prime Minister, was made in reply to the address presented to him by the Armenian citizens of Manchester on 11th September, 1918:-

"The cry of Armenia is both piteous and compelling, but that which gives her the greatest claim to the unqualified support of those who are fighting for the liberties of mankind is that her sons never falter in their determination to achieve their purpose. In spite of persecution and disasters and of ruthless oppression, Armenia still claims justice in the world and disdains to crave for mercy from her oppressors.

I ask you to believe, gentlemen, that those responsible for the government of this country are not unmindful of their responsibilities to your martyred race."

First negotiations for peace began about this time (16th September, 1918) with the publication of the Austrian Peace Note proposing a meeting to discuss peace and the offer was rejected by the United States on the following day.

Death of Cardinal Farley:

On the 18th September, 1918, Cardinal Farley of New York died. He had been in the past a staunch Nationalist but, from the time of the United States' entry into the war, he incurred considerable odium in Irish circles by his opposition to Sinn Féin organisations and particularly his action in listening to the protests of Anglophiles the previous May against the participation of priests at Irish meetings organised by Sinn Féin. On this occasion he notified that he had informed Fr. Peter McGuinness, O.C.C., that if he presided, as was announced, at the Madison Square Garden meeting he would not be permitted to remain in the Archdiocese. (Fr. McGuinness was elected General of the entire Order in 1920.) It must be said, however, that Cardinal Farley gave his support to the beginnings of the Irish National Aid Fund in U.S.A.

Mr. Gompers and the German Chancellor comment on Irish claims:

Gompers, the President of the American Federation of Labour, at a meeting held at Chandos Hall, London, of the London Trades Council, is reported by the 'Times' of the 23rd September, 1918, to have stated - in answer to the question, "What about the independence of Ireland?" - that "he had never yet heard a member of the Irish National Party suggest that Ireland wanted independence". This is only another illustration of the unfortunate effect abroad of the attitude and policy of the Irish Parliamentary Party. In Ireland it was recognised that

they no longer represented the country but unfortunately abroad they were naturally taken as representing the views of the ordinary people. This was certainly the case also in the Roman Curia.

In a speech the German Chancellor on the 24th September, 1918, as a retort to the Allies' pretences, referred to the -

"century-old sorrows, and the justified grievances of Ireland nowhere find a hearing, not even in America where, after all, they are acquainted with them through numerous Irish emigrants".

On the 25th September, 1918, Dominion journalists in Dublin had interviews with John McNeill, Seán T. O'Kelly and other Sinn Féin leaders. On the same day Shortt stated:-

"he did not see how anybody could be allowed to stand upon a public platform and denounce the movement led by Messrs. Dillon and Devlin".

Wilson's speech delivered on the 27th September, 1918, in New York dealt with the League of Nations and American beliefs "that strong nations shall not be free to worry weak ones and that there shall be a common standard of right for all peoples and nations".

National Executive of Irish Labour issue Manifesto
on Ireland's Right to Self-Determination:

The National Executive of Irish Labour issued a manifesto on 28th September, 1918, asserting before the world the right of self-determination:-

".... We mean thereby that Ireland, no less than Belgium or Serbia, Poland or Finland,

Bohemia or Esthonia, shall have the right to decide its own form of government, to chose its sovereignty, to determine its own destinies without limitations, except such as are voluntarily ceded or are common to all nations. We assert before the world that Ireland is denied this right by the power of armed forces and we call upon the democracies to make good their professions by their actions and set free the Irish nation from this involuntary bondage."

By a unanimous vote they decided that their representatives would refuse to attend the House of Commons, though in altered circumstances they might do so if sanctioned by a special national convention. They re-affirm their opposition to conscription, even to conscription in an Irish Republic.

It is worthy of note to refer to an article by Dr. E.J. Dillon in the 'Fortnightly Review' of October, 1918, on the proposed League of Nations. In a critical examination he points out that this involves a settlement of the Irish question. This was one of the many evidences that arose, showing the importance of placing the Irish question before the Peace Conference.

British set trap for Cardinal Logue:

The usual general meeting of the Irish bishops took place on the 8th October, 1918. It elicited another effort of the ceaseless British propaganda. That morning a telegram arrived, addressed to Cardinal Logue from the British Foreign Office, stating that Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, was anxious that Cardinal Logue should attend his jubilee

at which the Archbishop went on to explain the difference. "Suppose", said the Archbishop, "a Spanish society came to Portugal for Portugese money, would you support it?" "No", said Manoel. "Then", said the Archbishop, "why do you expect us?" "But Spain and Portugal are different nations!" "So are Ireland and England." "But Portugal has a history going back one thousand years!" "Ireland has a history going back two thousand years." "Spain and Portugal have different languages!" "So have Ireland and England, and much more different from one another than Spanish and Portugese". And so the conversation continued until King Manoel did not know where he was.

Job-hunting by Irish Party:

A final illustration of the depths to which the Parliamentary Party and its policy had sunk is afforded in the very last weeks of its existence by the revelation of the job-hunting of the three Limerick Members of Parliament - Lundon, Joyce and O'Shaughnessy. The Clerk of the Crown and Peace for the County and City of Limerick died. At once, frantic wirepulling began. The Party's ruling passion proved strong in death. It had abandoned independent opposition as far back as 1906. Their job-hunting was notorious since the Liberals came into power and was openly and unashamedly practised by Joe Devlin and the A.O.H. (Board of Erin) since the Insurance Act of 1911. This practice utterly debased Irish National politics. The United Irish League and the all-powerful A.O.H. became a replica of Tammany Hall as painted by its enemies. Joe Devlin made no concealment of his object. He, it should be explained, was open and above-board. He was straightforward and made a plausible case for breaking the monopoly of Tories, Orangemen and Freemasons.

Politically and morally, however, the results were deplorable and disastrous. People were all too familiar with bribery, corruption and log-rolling in our Local Government Councils but this scandalous seeking of favour by the Party from Lloyd George, Lord French and Shortt, and other British officials, revolted even their most hidebound followers. The spectacle of three Nationalist M.P's. begging on their knees before Englishmen for miserable crumbs was humiliating enough but to cadge in this way from the Chief Secretary and Lord French, the conscriptionist Lord Lieutenant, while the conscription crisis was not yet over, showed the hollow sham of the Party's fight against the Government and what little confidence could be placed in them as representatives or champions. It was a relief to hear that the British gave these M.P's. the contemptuous kick they courted and well deserved by appointing one of the Unionist candidates. The eleven telegrams clamouring for their friends in England and even ex-Lord Lieutenant Wimborne to intercede with Lloyd George, French and Shortt were published by "Nationality" in its issue of the 12th October, 1918.

Danger of Conscription is revived:

At mid-October, 1918, the danger of conscription again loomed menacingly. My diary remarks under 16th October:-

"Those best in the position to gauge the situation are much concerned. The Government has not yet arrived at a settled decision on the matter, though it looks as if sane views will prevail. Certainly the Government know the facts and what will follow conscription. The military, anti-Irish and rabid Tories and papers

like the 'Spectator' and 'Globe' cry out for conscription.

Apparently Lord French and the military have everything prepared for it; so have the Volunteers, and many fear precipitate action on their part to forestall the military striking the first blow. Apparently the Volunteers have good supplies of arms and ammunition, and explosives are ready; and they are prepared to sacrifice themselves. I know that you are aware of the proposal of Cathal Brugha to go to London and bomb the members of the British Cabinet.7

The situation is again like that of Holy Week, 1916. The least spark may cause an explosion and the mere formality of putting the Conscription Order in Council 'on the table' - even if only for a perfunctory discussion - may cause the blaze. The military have occupied 'strategic positions' in the city and are doubling and trebling the guard on buildings and laying in stores for a fortnight's fighting. It is stated that the calm self-restraint that has so marked the Volunteers for months past is rapidly changing. Precaution has caused them to appoint substitute leaders for fear the present ones will be arrested. I have already alluded to the circulation by the Standing Committee of Sinn Féin of the September leaflet on conscription.7

Even in England the Labour leaders are against conscription for Ireland. They are

anxious to prevent its permanent imposition in England and are sending a deputation to Lloyd George to protest against Irish conscription. All the Liberal ex-Ministers are against it. So also is Sir H. Dalziel and Lloyd George's advisers. The latter (Adams and Jones) say 'nothing is decided yet'."

Mid-October was a decisive period in the world war. It was marked by the retirement, though in good order, of the German Army and by President Wilson's reply to the Austrian Peace Note. During these discussions the cause of a crop of new nations never heard of before was ardently taken up by the Allies but not a word about Ireland.

About this time the new plague - the so-called influenza - reached its height.

On the 27th or 28th October, 1918, Austria sought a separate peace. On the 1st November the Austrian Empire was in full solution and provisional governments were formed in the former Austrian states. Turkey was also out of the war since before the 31st October. On the 4th November, the Allies replied to Wilson's queries and on the 11th November, 1918, the armistice was signed.

Sinn Féin Annual Convention:

On the 30th October, 1918, the Sinn Féin Convention was held and the new Executive elected as follows:-

Eóin McNeill	528
Father Clancy	461
Mrs. Sheehy Skeffington	440
Father Matt. Ryan	435
Piaras Beaslaf	432

Cathal Brugha	419
Seán T. O'Kelly	413
Father Wall	374
Dr. White	365
Father Gaynor	363
Michael Collins	361
Father Burbage	357
David Kent	356
Gavan Duffy	340
Liam de Róiste	319
Con Collins	319
Michael Staines	310
Father Hayes	294
J.J. Walsh	290
George Plunkett	287
Richard Mulcahy	250
John McDonagh	244
Peadar MacMahon	221

The delegates were asked not to vote for the prisoners. Hence the omission of prominent names of those who were elected the previous year, such as, Mrs. Clarke, Madame Markievicz, Dr. Hayes, Mrs. J.M. Plunkett, Joe McDonagh, Seán McEntee, Ernest Blythe, etc.

Home Rule abandoned. House of Commons treats
Irish Party with contempt:

On the 2nd November, 1918, the Prime Minister (Lloyd George) wrote and circulated a letter stating:-

"The situation in regard to Ireland is governed by two fundamental facts; the first, that the Home Rule of 1914 is on the statute book; the second, that in accordance with the pledge which has been given by men in the past, and indeed by all,

Party leaders, I can support no settlement which would involve the forcible coercion of Ulster.

In these circumstances, I claim the right to bring a settlement into effect, based on the first of these alternatives. I recognise, however, that in the present condition of Ireland such an attempt could not succeed and that it must be postponed until the condition of Ireland makes it possible. As to this last point, the Government will be chiefly guided by the advice it may receive from the Lord Lieutenant and the Irish Government."

In this way Lloyd George indefinitely postponed and, in fact, gave up Home Rule.

On the 5th November, 1918, a debate took place in the House of Commons on a motion moved by T.P. O'Connor on the right of Ireland to self-determination. All accounts agree that never in its history was the Irish Party treated with such scorn. The 'Independent' reports:-

"Never in the history of the Nationalist movement in Parliament was a resolution calling for Home Rule treated with such contumely as was Mr. Dillon's motion. ... In the course of Mr. Bonar Law's speech, there was no passage in which more anger was concentrated than the concluding one in which he denied that Home Rule was a matter on which some body or other outside the United Kingdom had a right to speak one single word. He almost hissed out these words as he

finished in a note of rage. In some quarters this speech was regarded as setting the headline for an anti-Irish campaign at the general election.

Mr. Lloyd George, having announced the terms of the Austrian armistice, sat exactly seven minutes on the Treasury Bench while his old friend, Mr. T.P. O'Connor, was speaking on the subject of Home Rule and never returned to the Chamber during the rest of the debate.

Mr. Shortt asked the Irish Party to say what exactly they wanted as an early settlement but not a word was said in reply about Dominion Home Rule."

The English 'National News' commented:-

"It would be difficult to frame a more impudent resolution than that which the discredited Nationalist Party sought to foist on the House of Commons the other night. To claim for Ireland as a condition precedent to the British Government going into the Peace Conference that Home Rule should be brought into operation could mean only one thing - the letting loose of disorder and anarchy in Ireland. What Mr. Dillon and his friends expected to gain by this piece of parliamentary dishonesty, it is difficult to say. But this much was made clear - that, in treating with something approaching scorn these preposterous claims, the Ministers have behind them the support not only of Great Britain but of the Empire. /This was

perfectly true of Great Britain but it was not so true of the Empire.⁷ The mere mention of referring the Irish question to the Peace Conference instantly raised the rage of every English Unionist."

The recruiting returns, published on the 5th November, 1918, show sixty-seven new attestations, fourteen being in Dublin and thirty-seven in Belfast, but the total number since the 1st June was:-

2,361 accepted from the Dublin area.
4,373 accepted from the Belfast area.
4,000 accepted from the rest of Ireland.

The German Kaiser abdicated on the 9th November, 1918, and the armistice was signed on the 11th November, 1918.

Anti-Conscription Conference considers Resolution of
Irish Labour Congress on Self-Determination:

The Trades Congress at the beginning of November, 1918, asked the Lord Mayor to form a -

"national conference which will give expression to Ireland's demand for self-determination".

Accordingly, the Lord Mayor summoned the Anti-Conscription Conference to meet at the Mansion House on the 9th November to consider this resolution. The Lord Mayor presided and there were present:-

Alderman Thomas Kelly
William O'Brien, M.P.
T.M. Healy, K.C.
M. Egan, Cork.
William O'Brien, Dublin (Labour Party).
T. Johnson --

but no representative of the Irish Parliamentary Party. The following official report was issued:-

"The Conference met to-day at the invitation of the Lord Mayor to consider proposals of urgency and special importance. There were laid before it the resolution of the Irish Labour Congress and the draft declaration on the subject of self-determination, prepared by Professor McNeill and Mr. Johnson at the request of the last meeting.

In view, however, of the letter received from Mr. Dillon and his absence, as well as the absence of Mr. Devlin through illness, the Conference felt bound, having regard to the rule governing its proceedings which prescribes unanimity, to adjourn this business.

Alderman Kelly handed in the following notice of motion to be discussed at the next meeting of the Conference:-

'That this Conference now decides to assume the responsibility of having Ireland's claim for self-determination brought before the various governments of the world, and requests from the Irish people their full confidence and support upon this grave and far-reaching decision.'

Already on the day following their debacle in the House of Commons, that is, on November 6th, 1918, Mr. Dillon presided at a meeting of the Irish Parliamentary Party in the House of Commons. The Party considered the situation created by the attitude of the Government towards Home Rule as announced in the previous day's (5th November) parliamentary debate. It was unanimously decided to prepare an appeal to President Wilson to

secure for Ireland the right of self-determination, advocated by him for all subject nations, and to issue an appeal to the Irish race in America and to the Dominions asking them to use their influence with their governments towards the same end. To intrude Ireland's claim for self-determination before the various Governments of the world was too extreme a step for constitutionalists like the Irish Party.

The Lord Mayor called on Archbishop Walsh on the evening of November 11th, 1918, and had a long conference with him on the Irish situation.

On the 14th November, 1918, a general election was announced for the 14th December.

Election Manifesto of Coalition Government refers to Irish Question:

On the 22nd November, 1918, the manifesto of the British Coalition Government was published. It was signed only by Lloyd George and Bonar Law but by no representative of the Labour Party. The manifesto was addressed to the electors of Great Britain and Ireland. Having dealt with armaments and the League of Nations, among other points, the manifesto proceeded:-

"Ireland is unhappily rent by contending forces and the main body of Irish opinion has seldom been more inflamed or less disposed to compromise than it is at present.

So long as the Irish question remains unsettled, there can be no political peace either in the United Kingdom or the Empire and we regard it as one of the first obligations of British statesmanship to

explore all practical paths towards a settlement of this grave and difficult question on the basis of self-government.

There are two paths which are closed - the one leading to a complete severance of Ireland from the British Empire, and the other through the forcible submission of the Six Counties of Ulster to Home Rule Parliament against their will."

Five days after the announcement of the general election, that is, Tuesday, the 19th November, 1918, the British raided, not for the first time, Sinn Féin Headquarters, 6 Harcourt Street, Dublin, and arrested the Sinn Féin Director-General of Elections (Bob Brennan), plainly as a method of disorganising the coming election campaign. Exactly six months before, Mr. Seán Milroy, the first Sinn Féin Director-General of Elections, had been seized, deported without trial and imprisoned in Lincoln Prison. In July his successor, Dan McCarthy, was similarly dealt with. From May on, raids on private houses, local or central Sinn Féin Headquarters, printers and newsagents' shops were of weekly or, in fact, almost daily occurrence. The seizure of Sinn Féin propaganda literature was a prominent feature of these raids. Many papers were suppressed. May I refer to page 6 of the Sinn Féin Pamphlet, 'Two Years Of English Atrocities In Ireland', for the tabulated summary and to page 17 for the list of papers suppressed?

With the announcement of the general election, the question of the division of Nationalists over the Ulster seats now came to a head. Great efforts were made from many different and influential directions to secure compromise and unity, so that the Nationalists of the

Six Counties could present a united front at the general election. Conferences were proposed and various schemes put forward to secure this.

Sinn Féin Proposal to hold a Nationalist Plebiscite in Ulster turned down by Dillon:

It will be recalled that the proposal made by Arthur Griffith to hold a plebiscite on the occasion of the Cavan election was turned down by the Party. Now when the question became one affecting eight Ulster Nationalist constituencies, proposals were renewed by the Sinn Féin election directors of North-East and North-West Tyrone in the press on the 24th October, 1918, and of North and South Fermanagh constituencies on the 18th November to hold a similar plebiscite.

The Sinn Féin Executive published its proposal on the 21st November, 1918, to abide by a Nationalist plebiscite of the Ulster Nationalist Counties, but that same evening John Dillon at the Metropolitan Branch of the United Irish League turned down all suggestions. He said that the Party would not give a clear field but would fight Sinn Féin with all the resources at their disposal. His reply to these suggestions, which he himself had received from many quarters, was that he would go into no conference which did not fulfil two conditions - first, it must be fairly constituted so that the representatives of the Irish Party should not be outnumbered and that there must be an absolutely impartial Chairman, not a partisan of Sinn Féin; the next condition was that it should be called for the genuine purpose of preventing contests throughout and not in one part of Ireland and that no tests such as those in the Sinn Féin statement should be laid down.

The only comment necessary on these naive

conditions and reply was that within less than a fortnight Mr. John Dillon's Parliamentary Party was only able to put thirty-four candidates in the field against Sinn Féin, and of these thirty-four he was only able to return two of the contested seats.

It is worth recording the remainder of Mr. Dillon's speech at this meeting. It is a revelation at once of his character and of the fool's paradise in which he lived. "Those tests", he said, -

"were that the Sinn Féiners would go into no conference unless all agreed to demand the absolute independence of Ireland and the setting up of an Irish Republic; and secondly, that it must be recognised that the first principle of an Irish national party must be to abstain from attendance in Westminster."

"I will take part", he continued, "in no conference at which such tests are to be". He alluded to the proposal for a plebiscite at the chapel doors under the presidency of the local clergy and with, he had no doubt, an adequate bodyguard of Volunteers to determine the opinion of the constituency. He was too old a politician to be caught by those kind of traps. Intimidation, personation and wholesale corruption had been practised in recent elections, some of which the Irish Party won, although they were counted out by false votes, and if that could be done in face of the elaborate legal precautions which surround the polling booths, did they imagine that he was going to allow the rights of the electors to be bartered by open voting under the inspection of "peace patrols" and the work they knew

would go on? No, they would have the issue tried at the polls! Their opponents had rejected every offer he made and he was prepared to make great sacrifices, which many of his supporters might not have approved of, to secure national unity.

Within three weeks, the opinion of the constituencies was obtained, not by open vote but by secret ballot, and in only two of the elections that the Irish Party contested did they get in a candidate. John Dillon himself was heavily defeated by de Valera.

Ulster Bishops propose Conference to arrange the
division of seats between Sinn Féin and Irish
Party:

This intransigent attitude of John Dillon alienated very many of his supporters in Northern Ireland, none more so than those of the Catholic clergy among whom he had hitherto counted his staunchest supporters. At a meeting of the Ulster Bishops held in Armagh on the 26th November, 1918, after the transaction of ecclesiastical business, they requested the Lord Mayor of Dublin, as "the first citizen of our country" and who, they said, had more than once shown how well he could discharge the heavy responsibilities of his office:-

"to take in hand and have settled the greatest difficulty the election presents. That difficulty concerns the representation of Nationalist seats in Ulster which, by reason of a contest between men on the popular side, are likely to pass to the Unionist minority. Be these seats eight or ten in number, we propose the the Lord Mayor, in conjunction with Mr. Dillon and Mr. de Valera or, in his absence, Mr. John McNeill, should divide the representation of those seats. The questions

of a member or two gained to either side should count for little in face of the object in view. We suggest an equal division but the full Nationalist strength should suggest the adopted candidate for each constituency".

Accordingly, they requested the Lord Mayor to have such a conference not later than the following Saturday and to have the letter published in the press. The letter was accordingly published bearing the names of all the bishops of the Province of Armagh except the Bishop of Ardagh who did not sign as not belonging to the civil province of Ulster.

This proposal of the Ulster bishops was accepted by the Sinn Féin Executive whereupon Dr. McHugh, Bishop of Derry, in a letter to the press made the further proposal that the executives of all the national bodies should advise their followers not merely to "stand down" but to loyally co-operate in saving Ireland from corruption and irremediable disasters. These further conditions of the bishop were accepted by the Sinn Féin Executive.

An article in the 'Freeman's Journal', however, spoke of the necessity of further careful consideration and that:-

"it would be folly to ignore the formidable obstacles in the path or to assume that, if there are negotiations, such difficulties will speedily disappear".

This leading article of the 'Freeman' aroused the alarm and annoyance of Cardinal Logue. He protested in a letter to the 'Freeman', dated 28th November, 1918:-

"No one, I think, could suspect me of favouring the Sinn Féin policy. I have never concealed my views of its futility. But now there is no question of rival policies but of saving the country from an inevitable calamity. I, therefore, wish to state clearly that, if there be any pettifogging difficulties raised in opposition to the settlement proposed by the bishops, I shall consider it my duty to advise the people to go straight to work and vote for the Sinn Féin candidate in all the constituencies in which a division would endanger seats."

This letter, supported by a public letter of Archbishop Walsh, settled the question. It was agreed to divide the eight threatened Nationalist seats equally. These were East Donegal, North-East Tyrone, South Armagh and South Down.

The Party at the last moment made desperate efforts to obtain some backing in the country. An indication that they had at long last realised the necessity of a more forward policy was already seen in the press of the 26th September, 1918. At their meeting in Dublin they got as far as declaring that "the only satisfactory and durable solution of the Irish national question on which to found a treaty of peace between the Irish and British peoples is the establishment of national self-government for Ireland, including full and complete executive, legislative and fiscal powers". The response to the Party's eleventh hour effort to rally support was very poor but included some elderly and life-long supporters of the Party, unable, by reason of their

outlook, to appreciate the new movement that was rousing the country. Some of these were prevailed upon to write letters to the local United Irish League candidates for the coming election. The magisterial and reactionary Bishop of Ossory (Dr. Brownrigg) in a letter published on the 27th November, 1918, stated:-

"Having given the policies and claims of the Party the best and fairest consideration I could, I have arrived at the conclusion that the policy which stands for the traditional and constitutional principle is the only safe one for the country, now or in the future. That policy has brought in the past many substantial benefits to the Irish people. I believe that it is capable, if it gets fair play, of bringing us many more benefits, including what is the supreme ambition of Irishmen - a government of our own."

The Bishop of Ferns (Dr. Codd) wrote in similar terms. The West-British Bishop of Kildare (Dr. Foley) in a tone of lofty reserve wrote:-

"I have no faith in Sinn Féinism as a policy nor in abstention from Parliament as a means of political salvation, but my expectations from attendance in Parliament during the next five years are not pitched quite so high as are those of others, and from all that I have read and heard of politics in the recent past I find it difficult to understand how any man can derive any satisfaction from the sort of political polemics in which rival parties have engaged. Such

polemics I have found stale and unprofitable and devoid of all attraction. Hence I feel that the less time and attention I waste on them, the better for myself and for the office which I have been appointed to fill."

Letters of Archbishop Walsh, "Tulcan" and Dr. Fogarty explain why people lost faith in the Irish Parliamentary Party:

All these letters appeared more or less simultaneously in the press. As all three of his suffragans had thus published their views, the Archbishop of Dublin felt constrained to make his own position clear. He addressed the following letter on the 27th November, 1918, to the editor of the evening papers:-

"Though I have made no secret of my views upon the main issues that will be before the country in the coming elections, I had not until to-day intended giving any public expression to those views. I did not feel called upon to do so.

Thirteen or fourteen years ago [1904 or 1905] after having been until then one of the most prominent supporters of the policy of the Irish Parliamentary Party, I ceased to give support of any kind to that Party. I did so, in view of what I could not but consider a disastrous change in their policy, a change which I felt convinced could not fail to bring about the deplorable results that we now see around us in Ireland.

Never having been asked by anyone - bishop, priest or layman - what was the reason of such a total change in my view of the political

situation, I did not feel called upon to volunteer any public statement on the subject. Nor have I until to-day felt called upon to make any public statement in reference to one outcome of the situation - the terribly grave issues that are before us in the elections now so near at hand.

There have now appeared in the public press letters relating to the elections from the respected bishops of the three suffragan dioceses of this ecclesiastical province of Dublin.

I cannot but feel that it might easily lead to a grave misconception if, in the circumstances, I were to continue to keep silence and if, in fact, I were to abstain from stating in the same public manner that my view on the matters thus publicly dealt with, in reference to the momentous issues now before the country, are altogether different from those expressed in the letters of those three venerated prelates.

It cannot be out of place for me to add that I view with deep regret the apparent failure, so far, of the promising effort recently made to bring about, in reference to the coming elections, a practical arrangement between the two parties now claiming the support of Nationalist Ireland. In this I speak, of course, only of a working arrangement between the two parties, having reference only to the elections, an arrangement that would involve no sacrifice of principle at either

side and that would, or at all events might, have the effect of saving our unfortunate country from the disastrous, and otherwise inevitable, result of the handing over of the parliamentary seats to the common enemy.

If leaders prove obstructive in the matter, has the public spirit of the country been so deadened by the leading-string policy of the past, that the people are incapable, even in the present crisis, of acting for themselves?"

The extent to which the people of Ossory and Kildare were affected was seen a fortnight later when Kilkenny returned two Republicans, the Party candidate obtaining only 1,155 votes, while Kildare likewise returned two Republicans, the Party candidate obtaining 4,000 against the Republicans' 13,000. In Carlow County the Republican candidate was returned unopposed.

Among the letters that appeared in the press was one, signed "Tulcan", in reply to a letter of the Bishop of Raphoe, asking how could his lordship expect the people of to-day to support a Party which he acknowledged in his letter to the U.I.L. Convention at Donegal was paralysed, without organisation, torn by dissension within its ranks and without sufficient contact with the electorate, and how they were to elect as a spokesman of their appeal to the Peace Conference in America a leader who had pledged that he would not use the despicable Bill of 1912 as a leverage to extract more out of England, or to support a Party that as late as the 4th October, 1910, declared to the American people that they did not demand Dominion Home Rule and that its mission to America was to

secure a parliament such as a province of Canada enjoyed.

A strong letter by Dr. Fogarty, Bishop of Killaloe, sums up the new Irish view on the political situation. The letter is dated 28th November, 1918, and was addressed to James O'Mara, Sinn Féin Director of Elections:-

"Dear Mr. O'Mara,

Enclosed subscription carries with it my best wishes for the success of the Sinn Féin cause in the coming elections, handicapped though that cause is by the unjust imprisonment of its leaders.

The country is sick of the House of Commons with its plutocratic record of oppression, corruption and chicanery. Ireland, since it came under its influence a hundred years ago, has wasted and withered as Armenia under the Turks.

The policy of 'massaging' Ministers by our 'expert' statesmen has had an ample trial. We know where it had landed us - the national degradation of partition. The authors of that criminal and cowardly surrender will never be forgiven by Ireland.

I am not afraid of abstention. It is not only a logical and long called-for course against the pillage of our national rights, against the infamous union but, in view of the insulting policy expounded by the Prime Minister as to the share reserved for Ireland in his world-wide reconstruction, no other course is open to us if we have a particle of respect. Irish representation in a House of Commons dominated by

Mr. Lloyd George and his anti-Irish coalition is a horrible imposture which it is time to terminate. That Unionist combine will work its shameless will on Ireland whether Irish members are present there or not. Why then send them there to be spat upon as paupers, to come back to us with empty hands or with a few crumbs from the English kitchen, garnished with rhetoric, but as always with the leprosy of anglicisation visibly developed on their person for the ruin of our national spirit? Partition is to be defeated and liberty won not by talking to the dead ears of the House of Commons but, under God, where, and as emancipation was won, landlordism broken and conscription defeated - at home in Ireland by the determined will of the people.

John Mitchell was right when he called for the withdrawal of the Irish members fifty years ago, and time has fully verified the words he then used in speaking of this subject. 'That parliament', he said -

'is a lie, an imposture, an outrage - a game in which our part and lot are injustice and defeat forever; to Ireland it is nothing besides a conduit of corruption, a workshop of coercion, a storehouse of starvation, a machinery of cheating and a memento of slavery.'"

Replying on the 20th November, 1918, to the appeal of John P. Boland, M.P., candidate for the National University, for his vote and support, the Archbishop most definitely refused and clearly told him what he

thought of the Irish Party and their policy and that he held them responsible for the breakdown of the whole constitutional agitation.

On Seán T. O'Kelly introducing Richard Mulcahy, Sinn Féin candidate for the Drumcondra area, on the 24th November, 1918, to the Archbishop, they were received most kindly and, while he did not promise them to vote for him, he assured them that he would not vote against him. I could see they had made a most favourable impression.

Lloyd George expresses his opinion that Ireland will achieve complete Independence:

On Sunday, 1st December, 1918, a military officer, called Davis, plainly immensely impressed by information which he thought right to have conveyed immediately to the Archbishop, stated that a fortnight previously his chief, (Major or Colonel) Bath - they were both geological experts - had reported to Lloyd George, a personal friend of Bath, and represented to the Prime Minister the urgency of developing Irish mines with British capital. He proposed that the Arigna mines should be purchased by the government to prevent them falling into American hands. Lloyd George heatedly refused pointblank and said he "would not give a farthing of English money to Ireland". "Why?"; asked Bath. "Because they are looking for complete independence and, what is more, I believe they will succeed", said Lloyd George. This shows the progress of the Irish claim for independence and the difficulties that already faced Lloyd George in view of the coming Peace Conference. How few in Ireland realised that Lloyd George considered it quite possible that the Republican movement could succeed!

It may be worth recalling Lloyd George's account at Hull (9th February, 1925) of his fear during the war and especially in November, 1918, that Great Britain would share the same fate as the other "kingdoms and systems that were toppling down and when here in this land there were rumblings of the earthquake, and you never knew what moment, if there had been a kind of bold and daring leadership, you would not have it here".

Wednesday, the 4th December, 1918, was nomination day for the general election. It opened with a most remarkable victory for Sinn Féin who were returned unopposed for twenty-five constituencies. The English press was amazed. The 'Times' in its objective report states:-

"The full returns of yesterday's nominations reveal the extent of the National Party's collapse. In the four provinces the Party failed to get candidates to contest twenty-five seats, with the result that Sinn Féin was allowed a walk-over to seventeen constituencies in Munster, three in Connacht, three in Leinster and two in Ulster. In thirty-four other remaining constituencies there will be a straight fight between the Nationalists and Sinn Féiners, or between Unionists, Sinn Féiners and Labour men or independent Unionists."

The seats for which the Party failed to find even candidates were:-

17 in Munster - All 7 in Co. Cork, all 4 in Co. Kerry, with West Limerick, Limerick City, both Co. Clare constituencies and 2 of the Co. Tipperary seats.

3 in Connaught - East Galway, South Mayo and
North Roscommon.

3 in Leinster - North Kilkenny, King's County
(as it then was) and Carlow
County.

2 in Ulster - East and West Cavan.

In Ulster following the bishops' appeal, it was agreed to divide equally between Sinn Féin and the Parliamentary Party the eight seats which were in danger of falling to Unionists in the case of a three-cornered election. By this compromise, the Party got East Donegal, North-East Tyrone, South Armagh, South Down - all unopposed by Sinn Féin following this compromise.

But Sinn Féin only got three of the four constituencies envisaged by this compromise, namely, North-West Tyrone, South Fermanagh and Derry City because the followers of A.O.H. refused to abide by the compromise in East Down. As a result of this betrayal, the Unionist won the seat although his vote was two thousand less than the combined Sinn Féin and A.O.H.

Analysis of Election Results:

The results showed that in twenty-four of the thirty-two Counties the vote was entirely Republican.

Only one of the thirty-two Counties showed an entirely Unionist vote.

In each of twenty-seven Counties, there was a Republican majority.

Only in four Counties did the Unionists poll a majority. These would be Derry, Armagh, Down and Antrim. No Irish borough returned an entirely Unionist representation. (Joe Devlin was elected in West

Belfast.) Belfast alone returned a majority of Unionists.

Sinn Féin won the National University of Ireland by more than two to one.

In the province of Leinster every constituency declared for the Republic except Rathmines where the Unionist won by only 54 votes over the combined Nationalist vote.

In the province of Munster every constituency also declared for the Republic except Waterford City where Captain Redmond, son of the former leader of the Irish Party, won by 4,915 against 4,431.

In the province of Connaught every constituency voted Republican.

In the province of Ulster ten constituencies outside Belfast City voted for the Republic. These were both Cavan seats, three of the four Donegal seats (the fourth having been allotted to the Home Ruler by the pact), both Monaghan seats, one seat in Tyrone (a second being awarded to the Home Ruler by the pact), one in Fermanagh and one in Derry City.

Four seats were won for the Home Rule Party in Ulster, outside Belfast, three under the pact; and these were East Donegal, North-East Tyrone, South Armagh and South Down.

Fourteen seats were won by the Unionists in Ulster outside Belfast. The Unionists victories were South Tyrone, North Fermanagh, North Armagh and Mid-Armagh, both County Derry seats, four in County Down (North, West, Mid and East), all four in Antrim, six of

the nine seats in Belfast city were won by Unionists. Two others of the nine Belfast seats were won by Labour (Unionist Labour). One Home Ruler, Joe Devlin, won the Falls Division of Belfast.

Of the nine Ulster Counties (excluding Belfast Borough), the Nationalists polled a majority in five, i.e., Donegal, Cavan, Monaghan and, be it noted, Tyrone and Fermanagh. The Unionists polled a majority only in four - Derry, Antrim, Down and Armagh. The Nationalists obtained representation in eight of the nine Ulster Counties while the Unionists won representation only in six of the nine. Nationalists won the entire representations in three Counties. The Unionists held the entire representation of only one County (Antrim). In Counties Donegal, Tyrone, Cavan, Monaghan and Fermanagh, the Nationalists won eleven seats and the Unionists only two seats.

Outside Antrim and Belfast City, there were fourteen Nationalist representatives to ten Unionist.

In this way the country gave its mandate for an Irish Republic - this despite the repression of the English Army and its allies in the country.

The result was an intense surprise to the English press. They were driven to discover most diverse explanations of this revolution in Ireland. This incredible change was explained on the grounds that it was not to the belief of the Irish people in an independent Ireland but to the fear of conscription and to various causes due to the war. The results, however, of the Irish Municipal elections in January, 1920, and of the County Council and Rural Council elections in June, 1920, held under the new system of proportional

representation, completely swept away these ill-informed explanations. The result was not declared until the 28th December, 1918 (due, I think, to the postal vote of the servicemen overseas).

The general election took place amidst a quiet but enthusiastic atmosphere on the 14th December. Sinn Féin, and Sinn Féin alone, was evident and everywhere. The rest were hardly to be seen. In places not one follower of the Party could be discovered. The enthusiasm, energy and organisation of Sinn Féin were most apparent and impressive. It is interesting to recall that the Archbishop of Dublin voted at a parliamentary election for the first time as Archbishop of Dublin on this occasion. In fact, having two votes, he voted twice, once for Dick Mulcahy here in Drumcondra and then for Lawless, against John Clancy, at Finglas for North Dublin. A great number of the newly elected were prisoners held in jail.

Disconcerted as the English press were over the result, still more so were the former members of the Irish Parliamentary Party. A clean sweep was made of the Party. It practically ceased to exist, for they only returned seven members, four of these thanks to the compromise with Sinn Féin. John Dillon himself was utterly defeated by a huge majority. Few of them were ever heard of again. When in the course of the next decade or two their obituary notices appeared in the paper, the usual comment was, "I thought that man was dead long ago" - from the older generation - and "I never heard of him in my life" - from the younger generation. Some of them sank into poverty. There would be no more job-hunting such as Limerick witnessed the previous month. The amazement and soreness of some

of the members may be gauged from the following letter of Dr. William O'Malley, the defeated candidate for Connemara, addressed to the 'Times' from his address in Cavendish Road, Clapham Park, where he enjoyed a considerable practice but at the expense of losing his touch with his Irish constituents. It is dated 20th January, 1919:-

"Sir,

The Sinn Féin or Republican M.P.'s meet tomorrow in Dublin. They repudiate the British Parliament and everything British. During the recent election (the expenses of which were incurred by the State) they declared their intention and determination to make laws for Ireland in their own self-constituted parliament. The question now arises whether the State should not declare the election of these candidates null and void, and whether the electors who recorded their votes for the constitutional candidates should not be represented in the imperial parliament by the men they voted for."

This naive letter needs to comment.

Swift McNeill, who enjoyed exceptional consideration for many years from his overwhelmingly Catholic constituency in Donegal and from the leaders of the Irish Party, bitterly recalled to a friend the warning of a fellow-Protestant acquaintance when he first took up Home Rule:-

"You will be thrown aside like a sucked lemon when they have used you."

For all this period, and indeed the entire year,

reliable accounts from the Nationalists' point of view are to be found in 'Nationality' (Sinn Féin), the 'Catholic Bulletin' and 'New Ireland'. A useful review of the year's events will be found in the February number of the 'Irish Ecclesiastical Record For 1919'.

Funeral of Richard Coleman:

On the day following the election (Sunday, 15th December, 1918) the public funeral of Richard Coleman took place from Westland Row. He had died of influenza in Usk Prison. Although it poured rain all day, enormous crowds took part in the funeral and as spectators. In defiance of D.O.R.A. and martial law, Volunteers marched in uniform in large numbers. A firing party and officers surrounded the hearse. At the grave volleys were fired and the Last Post sounded. Over 2,500 Volunteers marched, while Cumann na mBan and other bodies made a most impressive demonstration. The funeral, which began at one o'clock, was only over at four.

Lack of Facilities for Mass in English Gaols:

On the 23rd December, 1918, I received a telegram, signed "Arthur Griffith, Thomas Dillon, Robert Brennan", from Gloucester Prison stating that no Mass had been arranged for the prisoners for Christmas Day. The Archbishop immediately telegraphed to Dr. Burton, Bishop of Clifton, asking his help. As a result, the Bishop of Clifton took the matter up very earnestly and made all arrangements for Mass for the internees on Christmas Day. Not so helpful was the attitude of a number of prison chaplains, some of whom showed their hostility by coldly intimating that their official arrangements did not contemplate the presence of political internees.

At Lincoln the prisoners had no Mass for the

first two months and then only on Tuesdays. About November, due to the illness of the chaplain, Canon Crofts, again there was no Mass. -

"Canon Crofts is bitterly anti-Irish and angrily exclaimed, 'I have no time for Irish rebels!'"

Cardinal O'Connell's efforts to secure Presentation of Ireland's Case at the Peace Conference:

With the approach of the Peace Conference in Paris the Irish and sympathisers of Ireland in the United States became very active in their efforts to secure the presentation of the Irish case at the Peace Conference through President Wilson. The 'Independent' of the 25th November, 1918, reports a strong speech on the Irish situation by Cardinal O'Connell. About the same time at a luncheon given to the visiting English and French bishops he asked that Ireland be given the freedom so long denied it.

In my diary of 24th November, 1918, I have noted that Archbishop (later Cardinal) Mundelein of Chicago cabled through Father Fielding to Bishop Fogarty and to the 'Irish Independent' that Ireland should send episcopal delegates to America before President Wilson would leave for the Peace Conference.

The 'Independent' of the 1st December, 1918, quoting the Central News Agency, New York, reports that 1,021 of the Catholic clergy of the diocese of New York signed a petition to President Wilson urging him to advocate the right of Ireland to self-determination. They asked "that the standards of justice for all nations -

"which have been formulated by you and which, appealing alike to friend and foe, have

hastened the successful conclusion of the Great War, should be applied unreservedly to the problems of the Peace Conference and that, therefore, the great principle of self-determination should be made applicable to Ireland as well as to other small nations. We believe that the solution through you of the age-long Irish trouble will add to the lustre of our country's greatness".

Franklin P. Glass of Birmingham, Alabama, United States journalist, speaking at the Shelbourne Hotel on the 9th November, 1918, stated that they were tremendously interested in the Irish question in America:-

"If Americans could be of assistance, they would be delighted to give assistance."

The most remarkable of the many American demonstrations in support of Irish independence was that organised by the Irish Societies, representing twenty-five million Irish-Americans, and held at Madison Square Garden on the 10th December, 1918, at which Cardinal O'Connell of Boston and three Judges of the Supreme Court spoke. The full text of the Cardinal's magnificent address will be found in the Irish press ('Independent'). At this meeting a resolution was passed urging President Wilson to endeavour to obtain at the Peace Conference the promise of a plebiscite of the Irish people as to what form of Government they desired.

From this time forward Cardinal O'Connell, in striking contrast to the attitude of the late Cardinal Farley of New York took a most active and prominent part in pressing the cause of Ireland.

Archbishop opposes Proposal to invite President
Wilson to Ireland:

At this time active steps were taken to prepare the statement of the Irish cause to be presented to the Peace Conference. The Lord Mayor had more than one interview with the Archbishop of Dublin on the proposal that the Lord Mayor should approach President Wilson. In one of these interviews, on the 19th December, 1918, discussing the question of inviting Wilson to come to Ireland, the Archbishop resolutely opposed any such proposal since Wilson refused to acknowledge the receipt of the Mansion House Conference appeal of November, though he acknowledged the receipt of the Ulster counter appeal. My note on this interview concludes:-

"The Archbishop considers Wilson to be Anti-Irish and anti-Catholic and that it would be demeaning for us to invite a man who did not condescend to answer the Mansion House Appeal."

The elected Members meet at Mansion House. Lord
Haldane's Visit to Viceregal Lodge. Official
Opening of Dáil:

On the 7th January, 1919, the members of the Irish Republican Party, elected at the general election in December, met at the Mansion House for the purpose of convoking a Dáil or Constituent Assembly of Irish-elected representatives. The question of the constitution of the Dáil was considered. It was decided to invite the elected members of all Irish constituencies without distinction as to party. They took occasion to call the attention of the free peoples of the world to the fact that -

"Thirty-seven of our members are at present imprisoned in English jails in

Ireland and England, or exiled from their country by England, and thereby debarred from exercising their duties as elected representatives of the Irish people.
On behalf of the people of Ireland who have selected them and ourselves as their representatives by overwhelming majorities, we demand their release."

The names of the thirty-four imprisoned members and the three exiled members are given.

About the 17th January, 1919, Lord Haldane was a guest at the Viceregal Lodge. My diary notes:-

"Obviously on a mission from Lloyd George. He is to interview, among others, James O'Connor, Fr. Peter Finlay, S.J., and, curiously enough, it is said, Fr. Corcoran, S.J."

The Peace Conference opened in Paris on 18th January, 1919, with the usual bragging of the high motives which inspired the allied nations in the war for right and on the task before them to establish a new order of international peace and justice.

Apprehension of intrusion of the Irish skeleton must have embarrassed Lloyd George.

On the 21st January, 1919, the first meeting of the First Dáil was held in the Mansion House. There was much anxiety whether it could be held in public at all. It was feared that the British might endeavour to suppress it. Owing to its historic character, it attracted international notice. Doubtless this, with the opening of the Peace Conference in Paris three days before, was one of the motives that weighed with the

British against its suppression. There were sixty-nine pressmen present from all parts. The foreign press was well represented and full reports appeared in the papers. All the proceedings were in Irish. The great decorum of the whole sitting was extremely impressive. No applause was allowed and one could not help but compare it with the old-time Mansion House political meetings. But what struck me most was the absolute eclipse of the old political idols. They were as dead as Crom Cruach and equally forgotten. It was so long, however, since they had appeared in public in Dublin that they had virtually eclipsed themselves. But now their henchmen and their machine had also disappeared.

Larry O'Neill was unanimously re-elected for the third year as Lord Mayor of Dublin on the 23rd January, 1919.

I have a letter from Arthur Griffith dated January, 1919, Gloucester Jail, expressing the thanks of the prisoners to His Grace the Archbishop for securing Mass for them on Christmas Day. I shall give it to the Bureau.

The Inquiry into the treatment of the Sinn Féin prisoners in June and July of 1918 was opened on the 28th January, 1919, in Belfast Courthouse. As had been intimated the previous month by Mr. E. Duggan, T.D., solicitor for the prisoners, they refused to take any part in the Inquiry in consequence of the refusal of the prison and Government authorities to guarantee that the facts, as given in evidence, would not be censored for publication and of the refusal of the Government to produce all the necessary documents to the Inquiry.

Escape of de Valera, Milroy and McGarry from
Lincoln Jail:

On the 3rd February, 1919, de Valera, Milroy and McGarry escaped from Lincoln jail. The history of the escape has been recounted repeatedly, among others by Frank Kelly, in a broadcast from Athlone on the 8th January, 1936. He took part in it.

In view of the appeal to the Peace Conference, various drafts dealing with all phases of Ireland's claim to independence, were being prepared. Many such drafts had already been prepared by individuals, for instance, Larry Ginnell. I was engaged at that time with Fr. Timothy Corcoran, S.J., and Fr. John McErlane, S.J., preparing the historical section and we had various meetings for that purpose. Our drafts, which were most voluminous, were carefully elaborated and revised - among others by Eamonn de Valera himself - but it ended in nothing. Certainly Fr. McErlane and I - and, I think, Fr. Corcoran - came to the conclusion that the historical case did not help and definitely did not matter. I still have a copy of the record. My section was finished on 6th February, 1919, and I received it back with a few verbal corrections on the 15th February.

Proposal to conceal de Valera in Archbishop's House:

On Tuesday, the 18th February, 1919, I received a telephone message from Mr. Keohane of Gill's that Harry Boland wished to see me at Gill's on the following morning.

I saw Harry Boland in Gill's on Wednesday, the 19th, and again on Thursday, the 20th. This was, to my intense astonishment, a proposal that I should conceal de Valera at the Archbishop's House. He had not yet come to Dublin but was expected at that time. It was thought that the Archbishop's House would be the last

place suspected and it was also feared that all the usual places of refuge were known or under observation. A further attraction was the possibility of exercise in the grounds for the fugitive. I threshed out all the pros and cons with Harry Boland on Wednesday and with himself and Michael Collins on Thursday.

After the two interviews with Harry Boland at Gill's, he and Michael Collins, to my consternation, called in the forenoon of Friday, 21st February, to the Archbishop's House to inspect a place of hiding proposed by me. The first condition that I had laid down was that every possible precaution was to be taken to safeguard the position of the Archbishop. Accordingly, the first step was that he was not to be informed or to know of it. Therefore, I ruled out the House but I suggested either of the two lodges, the garage lodge which was towards the Tolka end of the grounds, or the gate lodge, directly on the Drumcondra Road. The garage lodge was ruled out because it was too much under observation from a neighbouring cottage. It was, therefore, decided to fall back on the gate lodge which was occupied by the Archbishop's valet, William Kelly, and his family. A drawback in this case was the fear that Kelly's two young boys might not be able to keep silent, even though unaware of the identity of the visitor. Having inspected the position, Harry Boland and Michael Collins agreed that it would be suitable and it was finally settled that, as soon as possible after de Valera's arrival, which was expected in the course of the following week, he would stay in the gate lodge. Outside William Kelly's family, not a soul was informed of this except the Archbishop's housekeeper, Miss Julia Corless, whom from the very beginning I had consulted and whose co-operation was essential.

During all this time, largely due to the fact that sessions dealing with the canonical process for the beatification of the Irish martyrs were being held in the House, many connected with the process passed in front of the lodge but none of them knew of the presence of the guest any more than the Archbishop himself.

Late on Monday afternoon, the 24th February, I received a note from Harry Boland to say that I might expect our guest (alluded as "the parcel", "the goods") that evening at ten o'clock instead of Tuesday. Later in the course of the same evening it was arranged that he would arrive at eight o'clock. I hope to give this note and others to the Bureau.

De Valera came, I was informed, from Dr. Farnan's house in Merrion Square, which was considered very unsafe. From there he went to the sports buildings in Croke Park where he remained while the area between Croke Park and the Dublin Whiskey Distillery stores was being explored. As the ground was clear, he left with Harry Boland and, for the first time, I heard the curlew's cry which I knew was the signal that all was clear. A few minutes before eight o'clock I had left the Archbishop's dinner-table and had gone to an unused postern gate which gave access to the eastern side of the Clonliffe premises from the Dublin Whiskey Distiller stores, then situated on the north side of the Tolka.

Punctually at eight o'clock I heard the movement of feet and the opening of doors and then de Valera appeared, accompanied by Harry Boland and the custodian of the distillery premises. De Valera and Harry Boland spent some minutes making last-minute arrangements for their next meeting, and I remember particularly his giving a commission to Harry Boland to get a large-size

fountain pen for use on board the ship when going to America. Bringing him through the deserted grounds and passing the brilliantly-lit windows of the College, de Valera recalled his own personal associations with Clonliffe. I have a vague idea that the name of the custodian of the distillery premises was Mr. P. Lynch.

In the lodge, de Valera resided in the room to the right of the entrance, which was fitted up as a bed-sittingroom. He spent most of his time revising "Ireland's Claim To Independence" which was to be presented at the Peace Conference. Each evening after dinner-time we walked together in the grounds in the dark.

During these days, by the wish of de Valera, I arranged for Fr. Tim Corcoran, S.J., to meet him. On the 28th February, Fr. Corcoran came at 7.30 p.m. to discuss the appeal to the Peace Conference, which he had been revising during the week. I think de Valera also saw Fr. McErlan on the previous day on the same matter. Fr. McErlan was attending the Archbishop's House in connection with the process of the Irish martyrs. Also, when I informed him that Mr. Tom Morrissey of the Records Office was visiting the Archbishop's House on the same business, de Valera asked to see him as an old friend.

On either Friday or Saturday - I think Friday - a meeting of the ministry took place and was held in the Dublin Whiskey Distillery premises.

I think it was on Monday, 3rd March, or else the last thing on Sunday night that de Valera left us. He was certainly there on Sunday, 2nd March. His departure seemed to have been hastened. I had been left under the impression that he would remain with us

for a fortnight or three weeks while arrangements were being completed for his transfer to Liverpool and from Liverpool to New York by steamship, and I remained under that impression until the very eve of his departure. Possibly as a result of the meeting of the ministry, the programme was changed. Quite possibly too, it was due to the proposed visit of the American delegation to the Peace Conference.

Nomination of Dublin Corporation Delegation to President Wilson. Seán T. O'Kelly's encounter with Major Price during the interview for Passports:

The nomination of the Dublin Corporation delegation to President Wilson was the result of a public meeting in the Mansion House held on a Sunday evening, in order that the matter would be publicised. It was following the decision of London and Edinboro to present the freedom of the city to President Wilson that Michael Collins renewed the idea of Dublin doing the same, really with the object of getting a direct approach by some Irish representatives to Wilson. The delegation appointed were:-

The Lord Mayor
Sir Andrew Beatty, D.L.(?)
Alderman Corrigan
P.T. Daly
Seán T. O'Kelly.

Applications for passports were made at once to Dublin Castle. A long delay ensued. Information reached them (through, it is practically certain, James MacMahon) that the delay was due to the military holding up the applications. The Lord Mayor then suggested that he would ask for an interview with the military authorities and thought that it would help matters if the delegation accompanied him. Sir Andrew Beatty, who from the very beginning had made it clear that he could not go to Paris but would lend his name in support of the

proposal in any way the Lord Mayor desired, was unable to attend the interview with the military authorities. It is a little uncertain whether Alderman Corrigan attended it.

The interview with the military authorities took place early in January, 1919, at the military headquarters, Parkgate. The deputation did not see the Commander-in-Chief but was brought into a room where there were three officers who received them courteously. After a few minutes another officer entered who also received them graciously and who turned out to be none other than Major Price. They sat down on opposite sides of a table and the Lord Mayor started to explain the object of their mission. Not many minutes had passed, however, before Major Price made a most hostile attack upon John McNeill, denouncing him in most unmeasured terms for the attack he had made on himself in reference to what took place in Arbour Hill in 1916. Feelings and words ran high, as Seán T. O'Kelly defended McNeill and asserted that Price had no right to use such language. The argument got so heated that Seán T. took up an ink-bottle and flung it at Price, hitting the wall. Price sprang up to attack Seán T. but, at this stage, the officers intervened with both parties. In a few minutes the deputation was hustled out of the room with the case undecided. The Lord Mayor was intensely disappointed and reproached Seán T. for his want of patience. The only argument they had mentioned in support of their application was that the Irish Government could not refuse the Dublin municipality the same facilities as were given to London and Edinboro. To their immense surprise, in the course of a few days they got their passports but it was intimated that it would be necessary

to obtain a military visa in London for passage abroad.

I saw Seán T. O'Kelly at five o'clock on the evening he was to leave Dublin - 4th February, 1919 - to get in touch with President Wilson in Paris. He spent Wednesday, 5th February, in endeavouring to obtain his military visa from the Foreign Office. I must leave it to Mr. O'Kelly himself to describe the rather numerous history of his successful attempt.

To the amazement of the Foreign Office officials, the passport was granted and on February 8th, 1919, Seán T. O'Kelly left London, arrived in Paris that night where he stayed in the Grand Hotel and opened an office.

Seán T. O'Kelly seeks Interview with President Wilson
and inaugurates his Campaign of Propaganda:

Without delay, Seán T. O'Kelly sought an interview on Tuesday, 11th February, 1919, with President Wilson who was staying at the Hotel Murat in Paris. He was unable to see either the President or Mr. Hoover, one of the President's secretaries, but the latter gentleman sent a message to the effect that Mr. O'Kelly should state his wishes in the form of a memorandum which would be handed to the President. Anticipating that he might not be able to see the President, Mr. O'Kelly presented the following statement, signed by him and dated the 11th February, 1919:-

"At the Grand Hotel, Boulevard des Capucines.

As Delegate of the Provisional Government of
the Irish Republic in Paris.

Sir,

I have the honour to inform Your
Excellency that I have been appointed by the
Provisional Government of the Irish Republic
to be their representative in Paris and am

directed to request, in the name of the Irish Republic, that recognition be granted by the Peace Conference and the League of Nations to the Provisional Government of the Irish Republic now established.

I have also the honour to inform Your Excellency that I have been nominated by the Lord Mayor of the Municipal Council of Dublin to wait on you, if Your Excellency so pleases, and to enquire if certain correspondence addressed to you by the Town Clerk of Dublin and despatched by him on different dates in the month of January last has reached Your Excellency.

This correspondence related to a proposal to confer the freedom of the City of Dublin on Your Excellency and to the appointment by the Municipal Council of a delegation - of which I have the honour to be a member - which delegation hopes to have the privilege of waiting upon you here in Paris and of personally inviting you to honour the City of Dublin by permitting the Municipal Council to add your distinguished name to the roll of its honorary freemen.

I now most respectfully ask the privilege of a personal interview with Your Excellency for the purpose of laying before you the documents relating to these matters and also for the purpose of informing Your Excellency officially of the claims of my

Government to have the case of Ireland stated before the Peace Conference and League of Nations."

This news and letter appeared in the Irish press of the 13th February, 1919, and was also reported by the Special Correspondent of the 'Daily Chronicle' in Paris, and was referred to by the press agency of the Exchange Telegraph Company.

President Wilson did not condescend to reply to the request of the Provisional Government of the Irish Republic or to that of the Municipality of Dublin. The special correspondents of both the Irish and English press were able to state, however, that Mr. Wilson:-

"will decline to interfere at all in the matters raised by Mr. O'Kelly" -

and that:-

"it would be impossible for him to interfere in the domestic politics of one of the great nations for which he is acting at the moment".

An official at the Hotel Murat stated that Mr. O'Kelly's letter:-

"owing to pressure of correspondence, might not reach him before he got aboard ship" -

on Saturday, the 15th February.

A colonial delegate, in conversation with the special representative of the 'Irish Independent', "made it clear that he is a thorough sympathiser with the cause of Ireland but stating that he did not see how

Ireland can claim representation at the Peace Conference which was composed of representatives of the belligerent nations that defeated Germany".

Perhaps owing to confusion with the arrival of Mr. O'Kelly in Paris, many rumours circulated there that de Valera, who had escaped from Lincoln the previous week, had already arrived in Paris.

In a letter written to me on the same day (11th February, 1919) Seán T. stated, while reporting his presentation of the memorandum, that up to that date he had not been successful in finding persons who would help him in his work; that day, however, he hoped to see a few press friends.

As a mere matter of chronology, it may be mentioned that Joe Devlin, now the sole leader of the seven-member Irish Party, during a debate on the address in the House of Commons to the King on the 12th February, 1919, demanded that Ireland should be given either representation at the Peace Conference or granted the right to self-determination. No notice whatever was taken by the Government of his demand, although it was strongly backed by Mr. Clynes.

It was on February 22nd, 1919, that Seán T. O'Kelly opened a new phase of his campaign in Paris by sending a letter to Clemenceau as President of the Peace Conference, and to each of the delegates, raising the claims of Ireland to sovereign independence.

Irish Race Convention at Philadelphia:

On February 22nd and 23rd, 1919, a very important Irish Race Convention was held in Philadelphia. It appointed three delegates, namely, Frank P. Walsh, a prominent lawyer in New York, ex-Governor Michael J. Ryan

of Philadelphia and ex-Governor Edward F. Dunne of Chicago, to go to Paris to obtain a hearing at the Peace Conference for de Valera, Griffith and Count Plunkett, the delegates selected by the Irish people. They were to place Ireland's case before the Conference if a hearing of the Irish delegates were refused and to insist on Ireland's right to self-determination and to international recognition of the Republican form of Government established by the Irish people. I shall refer to this matter again.

On Tuesday, March 4th, 1919, President Wilson met in New York a deputation from the Irish Race Convention in Philadelphia on the eve of his return to Europe. He stated his personal agreement with the Irish claim but refused to commit himself officially.

It was on this same day that the United States House of Representatives lined itself on Ireland's side by adopting a resolution in favour of self-government for Ireland by 215 against 41. It was a resounding defeat of British propaganda and a clear warning to President Wilson.

The 'Independent' in its issue of the 6th March, 1919, comments as follows on Mr. Wilson's reply to the Philadelphia deputation:-

"Prior to the speech which we have just epitomised, Mr. Wilson received a delegation from the Convention of the Irish Race held in Philadelphia, which put to him the question:-

'Will you present to the Peace Conference the right of Ireland to determine the form of Government under which it shall live?'

In other words, he who has advocated the

rights of peoples 'everywhere' was asked whether he would say to those statesmen at Paris, alleged to be brimming over with feelings of sympathy for the aspirations of men who want to be free, that the right of self-determination given to other small nations should be accorded to Ireland.

To the categorical question put, he would not say, 'Yes', but why not, we cannot comprehend. It cannot be that the Irish issue is a domestic question. By simply saying 'domestic' oppression and misgovernment in the world represented by Mr. Wilson ought not to be any longer cloaked or condoned.

One report says that, as a representative of the 'Government', he could not give the answer asked for but we thought peoples, and not governments, were representatives at Paris. By an unmistakable vote, the American people, through their representatives, have declared their views. By 216 votes to 41, the House of Representatives has demanded self-determination for Ireland. That is what Mr. Wilson in another context called an 'overwhelming majority'.

The vision of the people should not be obscured. In fact, Mr. Wilson himself impliedly admits that the Irish question is not a mere domestic problem. He declared himself 'in complete accord with the aspirations voiced by Mr. Goff', adding that he had been so for a long time. The situation with regard to Ireland was, he said, delicate and complicated. He must be

allowed 'to meet that situation by methods which seemed best to him and not to use methods which might injure the cause'. Then, the President intends, by methods which seem best to him, to advocate the aspirations of Ireland with which he is to-day and has been for a long time in 'complete accord'.

We welcome this expression of goodwill and hope that the method of giving effect to it, which he has in view, may lead to a satisfactory solution. We do not know whether some assurance of Mr. Lloyd George will satisfy him. Irishmen have already had too much experience of the wiles of that gentleman. Only the other day an American paper said, 'We have great faith in the diplomats who are sitting at the peace table in Paris but, if it were a poker game, we would ask for a new deck every deal'. There is no more artful dodger at the table than Mr. George.

We are, however, satisfied that Mr. Wilson is genuinely anxious to see justice done and we await with interest the unfolding and development of the methods which he has in contemplation. Evidently he is fully acquainted with the nature of the Irish question, and the declaration he has made gives a prominence to the cause of Ireland which ought to be of service. For this Irishmen are greatly indebted to their kith and kin in the States and the American people who have so nobly supported them."

Release of Prisoners Interned in England.

Death of Pierce McCann:

On this same day - 6th March, 1919 - the Chief Secretary announced, in the House of Commons that the political internees would be released. One of them, Pierce McCann, T.D. for Tipperary, has died of influenza at Gloucester. My diary concludes with the comment:-

"The release is largely due to public agitation (which, among other ways, has led to the stopping of hunts), to the escape of de Valera and to the American vote in the House of Representatives."

A Sinn Féin leaflet published about this time, entitled 'The English Murderers' Work', lists six prisoners who died in jail:-

William Partridge	26th July, 1917.
Thomas Ashe	25th September, 1917.
Joe Norton	29th November, 1917.
Frank Cullen	29th May, 1918.
Richard Coleman	9th December, 1918.
Pierce McCann	6th March, 1919.

as well as others released in shattered health. It pointed out that in Belfast Jail prisoners had been in handcuffs, day and night, from the 21st January, 1919, to the middle of February and were still in solitary confinement there, that since the 21st January, 1919, they had not been permitted to attend Mass; that, in Mountjoy Jail, the prisoners had been in handcuffs from the 13th January, 1919, up to the middle of February except on Sundays and some were still in solitary confinement; that in Cork too the prisoners were in handcuffs since the 17th January. Reports from other jails were also distressing.

De Valera's Departure for America:

An entry in my diary under Friday, 7th March, 1919, records that Fr. O'Flanagan told me that:-

"Blank it obviously refers to de Valera has got off safely at 2 a.m. on Wednesday, 5th March."

On the 8th March, 1919, the funeral of Pierce McCann took place from the Pro-Cathedral to Kingsbridge. There were great popular demonstrations of sympathy and respect, particularly at Kingsbridge. Archbishop Harty of Cashel paid a high tribute to him on the occasion of the funeral.

Seán T. O'Kelly succeeds in getting Publicity
in Paris Press:

From the daily press it was evident that Seán T. O'Kelly was becoming active and making progress in press circles in Paris. For the first time as far as I can ascertain, the French press hitherto silent on the Irish claims began to give sympathetic attention to Irish affairs. The Parisian press was severely controlled by the French censor who, in at least one instance, prohibited the circulation of an article on Ireland in 'La Gazette Franco-Britannique' - an article understood to be written or inspired by an influential French Deputy who, I think, was the proprietor of the paper. This Deputy, whose name was , was a radical and stood very high in his party. However, the Gazette took the risk of suppression and published the article in the second or third week of March. This article of the French Deputy, which was telegraphed to the 'Irish Independent' on the 8th March, began by alluding to the position of 'La Gazette Franco-Britannique:-

"It is an extremely delicate matter to deal with the Irish question in this newspaper which for four years prides and flatters itself with having collaborated in the establishment of a definite and cordial, intimate and indissoluble Franco-British alliance. However, the silence of the principal press organs, trained by the chancelleries which are imbued with the principles and prejudices of a diplomacy, whose crying and cruel failure has cost us so dear, imposes on us the duty of persisting in an attitude which is dictated by the highest moral consideration. We are fully determined to bring about a debate - that is, moreover, inevitable - the outcome of which will deliver England of an obsession which can hardly be said to contribute to her greatness and security. We have come to a pass in the history of the world which places us face to face with realities. The world is modified and modernised by convulsions which must be tempered by energetic remedies and by reciprocal acts of goodwill.

Now is the moment for concessions and for manly resolutions. It must not be said of England that she persists, in this world cataclysm, in showing herself impracticable, haughty and incorrigible. Our more important contemporaries might well keep silent but silence is no argument, and it can serve no useful purpose to scoff - as did the 'Daily Mail' a few days ago - at the modest abode of Mr. O'Kelly, M.P., representative of the Irish

Republic, in a Paris hotel. On the contrary, the proud modesty of this ambassador of an oppressed people inspires us with a respect and sympathy which we take good care not to conceal. Passionately faithful to her ideals and traditions, Ireland has proclaimed her sufferings for the past seven hundred and fifty years and, while to-day complacent echoes record the legitimate re-vindications of all the oppressed peoples of the world, the aspiring lamentations of a nation, oppressed in the name of certain principles, the flimsiness, danger and emptiness of which have just been demonstrated, are met with a dead silence. Who will give us the key to this mystery? In the magnificent speech delivered at Boston on his return to his country, President Wilson referred to the serf nations aspiring to independence but not a word of consolation in favour of Ireland, vibrating with hope, fell from the lips of the authorised master of the hour! This was a painful surprise to the twenty-five millions of Irishmen who are counted amongst the best citizens of the U.S.A., and a bitter disappointment to their brothers numbering about four millions who under British domination remain attached to the soil of their fathers.

Sooner or later it will be necessary to broach this question and have it settled in the most honourable manner by arbitration unanimously accepted by the parties concerned.

English friends, reflect! Honour and

interest advise you to revise your constitution which, in defiance of justice and reason, binds Ireland to Great Britain.

In a few brief, cool, indifferent or scornful lines, some of our contemporaries have at last decided to mention the presence in Paris of Mr. O'Kelly and the object of his mission. The trial is about to take place. It can no longer be a question of utilising misrepresented, fraudulent and mutilated 'scraps of paper' as historical documents.

The Conference - Supreme Court - must decide the matter on its merits. An end must be put to the greatest drama in the world. Silence is no longer possible unless President Wilson and M. Clemenceau edit once again the terrible and famous recommendation, 'Silence, gentlemen! You see that Ireland is dying out. Don't disturb her agony'."

This article appeared despite the fact that at the same time a popular Parisian daily paper was suppressed for eight days for having the hardihood to defy the censor in the same way as 'La Gazette Franco-Britannique' published this article and the editor arraigned before a court martial. The special representative of the 'Independent' in Paris made further comment that:-

"If a similar course should be taken in regard to the 'Gazette Franco-Britannique', it would probably have the effect of stimulating a desire for an Irish debate in the French Chamber - a possibility to which I referred in a previous despatch. Another

matter of importance is that the widely read Parisian journal, 'L'Internationale', has published practically in full the text of the appeal of Ireland to the nations of the world, as sent to each delegate to the Peace Conference by Mr. O'Kelly."

The Deputy pressed Seán T. O'Kelly very strongly that he should speak to Viviani without whom, the Deputy said, nothing practical could be done as he alone could move the party. An interview was accordingly arranged at Viviani's residence and they were received both courteously and sympathetically. In the course of the interview Viviani expressed his personal sympathy with the Irish cause. In any event, he said, he would have to do anything that his friend asked him. Seán T. found him very well-informed upon the older stages of the Irish national movement. He said he knew Messrs. T.P. O'Connor, Redmond and other leaders of the Parliamentary Party. It was evident, however, that he knew little or nothing of recent developments but was most anxious to be informed. Seán T. explained the history of the movement, the results of the general election, the declaration of independence and the claim to be heard at the Peace Conference. Viviani asked who represented the Dáil in Paris. On learning that there were Gavan Duffy, who had not yet arrived, and Seán T. himself, he enquired had they any Freemasons among them in Paris. Seán T. naturally said they had not, whereupon Viviani insisted very strongly on the absolute necessity of bringing over some Freemason of high standing from Ireland who would speak to the Brethren in Paris. He assured him that, if this were done, there would be little trouble in obtaining all he wanted. I must only leave it to Mr. O'Kelly to describe the

details.

The Lord Mayor, Larry O'Neill, called on the Archbishop on the 15th March, 1919, to discuss the question of the treatment of the political prisoners.

During the night of 16/17th March, 1919, Bob Barton escaped from Mountjoy.

American Support for Ireland's Claim gathers momentum.
Mr. Philip Gibbs impressed by the Pro-Irish
Demonstrations:

Meanwhile the support for Ireland's claim gathered greater momentum both among the Irish in America and American citizens generally.

The 'Irish Independent' in its report on the Irish Race Conventions at Philadelphia on the 22nd and 23rd February, 1919, to which I have already referred, and in Albany about the same time - "in every sense historic gatherings" - reports the speeches of Cardinal Gibbons and others, advocating the Irish claim:-

"There were over five thousand delegates present. At the close it was announced that the appeal for funds had resulted in the collection of one million, five hundred thousand dollars.

Cardinal Gibbons' speech is described as a clear pronouncement of Ireland's claim to share in the liberty of small nations, to attain which America entered the war.

Moving the chief resolution, the Cardinal urged the fulfilment of President Wilson's announced policy of self-determination for smaller nations and asked that the nation's chief executive (that is, the President) use his influence, as the man of the hour, to give

Ireland a place in the sun. He said that questions 'dear to our hearts' now arose, questions which during the war they had waived patriotically to gain the chief issue. Among them, he said, amidst loud cheers, was the problem of Ireland's future. When President Wilson in his wisdom and foresight asked for the liberties of small nations and the self-determination of peoples, Ireland naturally came uppermost in the minds of American citizens. 'It is thus to-day that Ireland, under the plan proposed by our President, is entitled to self-determination. President Wilson spoke at Mount Vernon on July 4th, 1918. I will quote his words on that memorable occasion. He said:-

The settlement of every question, whether of territory, sovereignty, economic arrangement or political relationship, rests upon the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the people immediately concerned, and not upon the basis of a material interest of any other nation, or people, which may desire a different settlement for the sake of its own exterior influence or mastery.'

Amidst increasing cheers, the Cardinal continued:-

'President Wilson cannot leave Ireland out of his reckoning. He had asked for self-determination and gained his point in practically every demand for nations outside the British Empire. He surely will not refuse to lift his voice on behalf of Ireland.'

Concluding in passionate accents he said:-

'I would appeal to all America to recognise her just claims for self-rule for Ireland, and I would urge all America to stand firm for Ireland and her inalienable right to self-determine her own destiny. We urge this claim in the name of justice, recognising and insisting on the truth set forth by the

founders of our own country that a government derives its powers from the consent of the people.'"

The speakers who followed included Rev. Norman Thomas, a distinguished Presbyterian Minister, Archbishop Messnier, Milwaukee, Rev. James Grattan Depew, a well-known Episcopalian leader, and Joseph Krauskoff, the most popular Rabbi that ever officiated in Philadelphia.

Following the example of the Massachusetts Senate, the New York legislature, on the motion of Mr. Morgan T. Donnelly of Brooklyn, supported by the minority leaders of both Houses, Senator James Foley and Assemblyman Charles Donohoe, passed the resolution:-

"That it is the sense and sentiment of the State of New York that a request be made to the Commissioners plenipotentiary of the United States at the International Peace Conference to present the right of Ireland for freedom, independence and self-determination."

The 'Daily News' special correspondent in New York speaks of the many demands made on Wilson and the United States Peace delegates to bring Ireland's claim before the Conference. At the beginning of February he declares, according to Washington correspondents, that:-

"The Irish question cannot any longer be postponed. For months every Congressman has been bombarded with demands from every part of the country, demanding the introduction of Bills, calling on England to grant Ireland freedom, independence or self-determination."

Appearing at a large audience in New York on the 9th March, 1919, for American support of the League of Nations and, incidentally, commenting on the necessity for self-determination for the Baltic Provinces and the Balkans, ex-President Taft was interrupted by a cry of "Ireland!". The cry was taken up by all parts of the hall but Taft stilled the clamour by pointing out that, while Ireland's status "has our sympathy for the wrongs she has suffered, her future is not a question for settlement now".

Among the legislatures supporting Irish claims was one adopted by the Lower House of the Colorado legislature, reported in a cablegram from Denver on 18th March, 1919.

The Irish agitation may be said to have come to a climax when on the 6th June, 1919, during a debate in the Senate on the Treaty, Senator Borah resolved:-

"That the Senate earnestly requests the American Peace Commission at Versailles to endeavour to secure for Mr. de Valera, Mr. Arthur Griffith and Count Plunkett a hearing before the Peace Conference in order that they may present the case of Ireland."

- resolved further:-

"That the Senate of the United States expresses its sympathy with the aspirations of the Irish people for the government of its own choice."

The resolution was adopted by sixty votes to one. The only dissentient was a Mr. John Williams of Mississippi. The New York correspondent of the 'Times' writes that the resolution illustrates the extraordinary efficiency of Irish propaganda in America which, he says, "has been

poisoning the wells of Anglo-American relations". "They are attacking", he said, "the League of Nations as a British scheme to secure American support of the integrity of the British Empire, threatened in its present form by Irish aspirations." "Many American newspapers", he says, "'feature' the report made to Mr. Wilson by the Irish-American delegation on British atrocities in Ireland."

Among other articles on the Irish question appearing about the same time (8th June, 1919) is one by Mr. George Creel, until recently Director of the American Bureau of Information, who declares that the Irish question is an American question. "Fifteen million people of Irish birth or descent in the United States", he says, "stand implacably to-day between this country and England, crying out against any alliance, agreement or even amity until the case of Ireland has been fairly considered and justly settled."

Naturally, the Senate's resolution of June 6th made a great stir in Ireland.

Mr. Philip Gibbs in a special cablegram to the London 'Daily Chronicle', dated 19th March, 1919, from New York dealt at some length with the adverse effect of the Irish situation on the relations between Great Britain and America:-

"In Washington I had conversations which were disquieting. They were about the state of Ireland and the renascence of a great strain of emotion among Irish-Americans on behalf of Ireland's liberty and independence.

For a time popular sentiment swung away from Ireland because of her attitude in the war and her hostility to England in her hour

of need. But now that the war is over and many little nations are pleading for self-government, the position of Ireland is again foremost in the thoughts of those out here who belong to her blood and faith.

The movement for Irish independence is growing and on Monday in New York I saw outward and visible signs of its strength.

It was St. Patrick's Day, and the city of New York was held for a parade of Irish-Americans who marched down Fifth Avenue with bands and banners. It was miles long and all about were hundreds of thousands of people in the crowds, wearing shamrock and green flags. One banner, led on by priests, bore the words, 'We stand for Free and Independent Ireland', and another carried by women and girls said, 'England, damn your concessions! We want our country'.

In the crowds I overheard many conversations which convinced me utterly that there will be no absolute friendship between England and America until Ireland's desires have been granted, and I pray to God that this may happen, to safeguard the peace of the world which depends upon American goodwill.

Conversations continue among the intellectuals, the leaders of society, the big businessmen, the women of the drawingroom; and outside there are other conversations among the masses which I would like to hear, because they will decide the world's destiny. They are conversations, I am told, not without menace and dangerous emotion, happening while the

statesmen of the world are busy with this League of Nations."

French and Spanish Press Comments on Irish Situation:

The special correspondent of the 'Irish Independent' in Paris, telegraphing on Tuesday, 18th March, 1919, states:-

"The Paris daily press is gradually getting into line with the provincial journals in commenting on the absurdity of a situation which excludes Ireland from being heard at the Peace Conference. The latest daily papers published here include 'L'Action', 'Ordre Publique', 'Le Siecle', 'Paris-Midi', 'La Libre Parole', the last of which gets in a slashing blow at those who may be combining to keep Ireland out of the picture.

'The Bankruptcy Of Great Principles' is the heading which 'La Libre Parole' gives to some comments strongly animadverting on the fact that, while hearings have been granted to Yugo-Slavs, Poles, Armenians and other small nationalities, silence is still maintained on the question of Ireland, the case of which Mr. Seán T. O'Kelly is prepared to present at a moment's notice.

'La Libre Parole' also condemns the action of the British Government in arresting and deporting men, duly elected as representatives of the Irish people - by the Government, as it says, of one of the great nations which is supposed to be at the Conference for the purpose of working out a

scheme of self-determination for all nations."

"Comments such as these", continues the 'Irish Independent' correspondent:-

"are bound to have their effect and, whether it be a week or a month, the principle for which President Wilson declared that America had entered the war is almost certain of ultimate recognition by the Peace Conference and the League of Nations. Such, roughly, is the trend of opinion in Paris to-day, outside, of course, the official circle where the Lloyd George-cum-Milner hold sway".

The 'Irish Independent' of the following day (19th March, 1919) reports that the:-

"Spanish press is now beginning to discuss the Irish claim to independence, as is shown in the following extracts from powerful organs in Madrid and Barcelona.

The 'Figaro', a very influential paper of Madrid, under large typeheading, "The Irish Question", extending across four columns, devotes a considerable amount of space to the doings of Dáil Éireann in Dublin and of Mr. O'Kelly, M.P., in Paris. Its tone is strongly sympathetic, although it describes Mr. O'Kelly as "Deputy for Green's College, Dublin!".

It prints in full his letter to all the delegates of the Peace Conference, also

the Manifesto to the Nations of the World, and the Declaration of Independence issued by Dáil Éireann which, the paper says, 'we regard as an historical document of the highest interest'.

The 'Figaro' adds:-

'This is the situation. Since January Ireland has been in open revolt against London and considers itself an independent republic, demanding consideration as such in international relations. It is difficult to give a final judgement on this question which is well worth the attention and examination of all who study international life and the great questions which agitate nations and produce tragic or glorious events.'

The 'Publicidad' of Barcelona (which has been strongly pro-ally during the war) prints a long article by Senor A. Rovina y Virgili, entitled 'The Irish Republic', in which, while commending the example of tolerance displayed by England in dealing with Sinn Féin, he expresses lively admiration for the 'invincible tenacity and the heroic spirit of the Irish', declaring that 'there is no doubt that the ideal of the Republic lives in the conscience and will of the majority of the Irish people'. He details the activities of Dáil Éireann from its formation to the present. He adds:-

'All the deeds of these Irish separatists have a fine audacity. There is no theatricality in them.'

They are ready to undergo any sufferings for their ideal.'

'Their alliance with the Germans', he adds, however, 'is difficult to pardon'. He describes Lord French as 'continuing his insistent efforts to find a formula which will render possible the early establishment in Ireland of a regime of autonomy'."

Further evidence of the growing interest and sympathy abroad for the Irish cause may be seen in the collection of extracts from the French press gathered together by Gavan Duffy and published in November, 1919, under the title, "La Republique d'Irlande et La Presse Francaise". It consists of extracts and articles from a number of French journals from the 18th February to the end of September, 1919, embracing the French press in France and in Switzerland. This will be found in the volume entitled "Sinn Féin Publications, 1918-1919", which I am presenting to the Bureau.

Raid for Arms on Collinstown Aerodrome:

On the 20th March, 1919, an immense sensation was caused in Dublin by the biggest and most daring raid for arms when 75 rifles and 1,800 rounds of ammunition were seized at Collinstown Aerodrome by the Volunteers. The military guard of eleven were overpowered, gagged and bound. In a short time all this military equipment was carried off and the military motor cars in the aerodrome were put out of action. Everything was carried off in silence. Not a drop of blood was spilled. A motor car of the Volunteers broke down near Balbriggan and it was said to be Alderman Corrigan's. The leader of this action was a young man, called Paddy Houlihan, who, being employed at the aerodrome, was well acquainted

with the position of the arms.

English League of Nations Union and Irish Claims:

The hypocrisy surrounding the attitude of the English authorities to the League of Nations is shown by a meeting of the Executive Committee of the English League of Nations Union, largely composed of the most lofty Liberal intellectuals, reported by the London correspondent of the 'Irish Independent' on Friday, 21st March, 1919. This Union had as President, Viscount Gray, and the meeting of the Executive was presided over by Professor Gilbert Murray. Amendments desired by the Irish Branch of the Union were put forward by Professor Trench of Trinity College. The London correspondent thus describes the outcome:-

"Yet so far have Englishmen of even the most 'liberal' reputations travelled from their vaunted principle of justice and fair-play that the Irish delegates appear to have retired from the Conference in a state of mixed despair and exasperation. As one of them said to me, 'It would almost seem that these platitudinous Progressives would like to see us throwing bombs so that Ireland may be heard by the League of Nations, if and when it arrives'.

But I learn that, having exhausted the possibilities of gaining the active support of the English Union, the Irish delegates have now decided to take independent action to have their proposed amendments considered at Paris - and, in doing so, they are confident of having the personal support of influential Englishmen who are prevented

from rendering help as members of the English society."

"I understand indeed", concludes the 'Independent' correspondent:-

"that application has already been made for passports to enable the Irish delegates to visit Paris."

Nothing further came of this move.

It may be mentioned that after some delay Father O'Flanagan was notified on March 21st that the Foreign Office had refused his application for a passport to visit the U.S.A.

Cancellation of Reception to De Valera:

It was announced that de Valera would return to Dublin on Wednesday, 26th March, 1919. Proclamations were issued on the evening of Monday, 24th March, by Lieutenant-General Sir Frederick Shaw, Commander-in-Chief of the Forces in Ireland, forbidding any meetings or processions in the city or county of Dublin. A second proclamation of the same date prohibited any meeting in the city or county of Dublin unless authorised by the police. The order was to remain in force up to April 8th. On the same date (Monday, 24th March) the military in the city were reinforced by a detachment of armoured cars and tanks which had arrived from England. I am giving to the Bureau a copy of the counter-proclamation issued by Larry O'Neill as Lord Mayor, dated 25th March, cancelling the reception that was to be given to de Valera on his return from internment.

The uneasiness of some influential Englishmen may be seen in the letter that Lord Brassy addressed to the 'Times' about this time (25th March, 1919). "We have

not", he contends .-

"a government in Ireland and we have refused to allow Irishmen to govern themselves. The past thirteen years form the most deplorable, if not the most discreditable chapter in the history of the connection between Great Britain and Ireland. The Irish question cannot be allowed to stand where it is and the failure of British statesmanship in Ireland tends to weaken the position of the mother-country in the overseas dominions and is rapidly embittering our relations with the United States."

On his return de Valera paid a visit to the Lord Mayor on the 27th March, 1919.

On Saturday, 29th March, 1919, a new sensation was caused by the escape of twenty Sinn Féin prisoners from Mountjoy.

Ian McPherson appointed Chief Secretary:

About this time Ian McPherson was appointed Chief Secretary of Ireland. During the debate on the Irish question on the 3rd April, 1919, he delivered a typically reactionary speech on the Irish question, which he began by stating, amidst the cheers of the members, that -

"it was quite clear in his judgment from the feeling of the House that no outside authority could interfere with us by intervention or otherwise in the solution of our own Irish problems."

This was a clear allusion to the efforts that had been made in the States and in Europe to have the Irish question placed before the League of Nations.

On April 10th, 1919, there took place the Second Session of the Dáil, and Eamonn de Valera was elected President of the Government.

On April 6th, 1919, Robert Byrne was fatally shot by the police in Limerick Hospital. Arising out of this, Limerick was declared a military area on the 9th April.

On April 14th, 1919, the Labour organisation in Limerick proclaimed a strike and absolutely prevented all business in Limerick that day. They refused to apply to the police or military for permits to go to their work.

The Delegation from the Irish Race Convention
arrives in Paris:

On 10th April, 1919, the three American delegates arrived in Paris. The Honourable Frank P. Walsh, New York, was late Joint Chairman with former President Taft of the National War Labour Board. The Honourable Edward F. Dunne was former Mayor of Chicago and Governor of Illinois. The Honourable Michael J. Ryan was former Corporation Counsel of Philadelphia and a member of the Public Service Commission of the State of Pennsylvania. They were accompanied by Mr. Patrick J. Lee as Secretary to the Commission. The special correspondent of the 'Irish Independent' had notes on their arrival ('Irish Independent', 12th and 14th April, 1919).

On the 16th April they formally announced to President Wilson their arrival and their commission to obtain a hearing at the Peace Conference for de Valera, Griffith and Count Plunkett. On the following afternoon (17th April) they were received by President Wilson.

Following this interview, Colonel House made a

formal request to Lloyd George for the safe conduct of the Irish representatives to the Peace Conference and on April 18th, 1919, he conveyed the information to the American delegates that Lloyd George was willing to comply with the request but desired an interview with the American delegates before doing so and asked that arrangements for the interview be made through Mr. Philip Kerr, the private secretary of Lloyd George.

Mr. Gavan Duffy, a member of the Dáil (South Dublin), arrived in Paris also at this time (about 10th April, 1919.)

Two tentative dates were set by Mr. Kerr but, for some unknown reason, this meeting did not take place. A decision was arrived at by the Irish-American delegates, at whose inspiration it does not appear, that they should visit Ireland. In their letter to Lloyd George, dated 6th June, they assert that the invitation to visit Ireland was made by Lloyd George himself through Sir William Wiseman. In their subsequent letter to Lansing (dated 17th May, 1919) referring to this visit, they say:-

"As you know, the British Government assented to our going to Ireland. We went there for the purpose of conferring with representatives of the Irish people and ascertaining for ourselves at first hand the conditions prevailing in that country."

Ex-Governor E.F. Dunne of Illinois asserts in his article in the 'Extension Magazine' for September, 1919:-

"Before receiving these passports we stated explicitly that we intended to confer with the duly elected representatives of the Irish people, and we were requested

by Sir William Wiseman, the representative of Premier Lloyd George, to visit Ulster and Belfast. On the following day, Monday 7th May, responding to the request of Sir William Wiseman, we went to Belfast, sending word to the Mayor of Belfast and to the leaders of commercial life in that great city that we would be pleased to be accorded conferences. These notices failed us in securing interviews, and we called at the City Hall, leaving our cards for the Mayor and requesting the courtesy of a meeting. We were informed by the Mayor's secretary or representative that the Mayor was engaged in some important official business that would prevent his making an appointment. We left our cards and I, personally, recorded my name in the official record of visitors.

Upon our return to Paris, Mr. Ryan, one member of the commission, it was agreed, should return to America and report progress to the Committee of Twenty-five appointed by the Irish Race Convention."

The Irish-American Delegates in Ireland:

They arrived in Dublin on May 3rd. The 'Freeman's Journal' in its leading article that day (May 3rd, 1919) said:-

"The Irish American delegates in Paris arrived in Ireland to-day and are sure of a national welcome. They represent the great and united uprising of Irish America in the crisis of the motherland's fate and in themselves are typical for the fidelity that, through good report and ill report,

in sunshine and in storm, has striven to sustain the secular struggle for Irish rights. Since their arrival in Paris, the prospects of the Irish cause have become perceptibly brighter, even though not assured. They have done something to penetrate, for Ireland, the cynicism and the selfishness that have converted the pseudo-democratic Peace Conference into a replica of the congress of the autocrats at Vienna and threaten to sow as fruitful a crop of strife, bloodshed and death. To accomplish even that is a great achievement. Their passports suggest that they come to Ireland on weightier business than sightseeing or parading. Their advent should be helpful. They will be able to give an authentic account of Irish-American opinion and should also be able to give a measure of what is feasible and practicable in Paris."

The Lord Mayor wrote to the Archbishop requesting an interview for the delegates. Unfortunately, some time previously (22nd April, 1919) the Archbishop had got a very critical attack, so serious that he received the Last Sacraments and public prayers were asked for his recovery. I wrote to the Lord Mayor to say that, if the doctors would permit it, an interview would be arranged. I went down to the Mansion House to see Larry O'Neill and met Governor Dunne, M.J. Ryan and their Secretary, Patrick Lee, there. Their Chairman, Walsh, had had to go on a brief visit to England. Messrs. Walsh and Lee were regarded as the strong men of the delegation. At the Mansion House the delegates were receiving the prominent members of the Sinn Féin organisation. I met there de Valera, Griffith and Fr. O'Flanagan.

The Lord Mayor's public reception of the American delegates which was held on Friday, the 9th May, was a great success. The chief feature was a militaristic display from 5 p.m. until 8 p.m., when some hundreds of soldiers and Dublin Metropolitan Police held up the approaches to the Mansion House with an armoured car, guns and helmets, to arrest Barton, "Dr." Kelly and J.J. Walsh. They had to march off at eight o'clock, amid the jeers of the people, without their quarry, two at least of whom turned up at the reception. I arranged with de Valera and R. Mulcahy for a short visit of the delegates to the Archbishop on the next day.

About 11.30 a.m. the next day (10th May, 1919) the delegates arrived. Mr. de Valera arrived before them at 11 a.m. The delegation were accompanied by the Lord Mayor who, earlier that morning, had accompanied them to Mountjoy Prison. On their arrival at the Archbishop's House they were shown into the study. The Archbishop received them in the drawingroom. They were introduced by de Valera and the Lord Mayor. The Archbishop thanked the delegation for their visit to Ireland and for their interest in the Irish cause and asked them to convey to Cardinal Gibbons his appreciation of his action at the Philadelphia Convention. He expressed his regret that his serious illness had prevented his receiving them properly when they attended the Pro-Cathedral for Mass on the preceding Sunday and remarked that the delegates had an experience on the previous evening "of the kind of Government under which we are living in Ireland".

The delegation remained in Dublin until Monday (12th May, 1919) or Tuesday (13th May) when they returned to Paris. Ryan then went back to the United States, leaving Walsh and Dunne in Paris.

Back in Paris the Delegates renew their Efforts
to obtain Safe Conducts for the Irish
Representatives:

On their return to Paris, the delegates still had failed to see Lloyd George or to obtain the safe conducts for the Irish representatives, Messrs. de Valera, Arthur Griffith and Count Plunkett.

Accordingly on the advice of Colonel House they repeated their request on the 17th May, 1919, to Robert Lansing, the Secretary of State, referring to their visit to Ireland and stating that, as a result, they were more than ever desirous that the authorised representatives of Ireland should be given an opportunity to appear and present Ireland's case to the representatives of the assembled nations.

On May 20th, 1919, the Irish-American delegation learned from Lansing's secretary that their request had been referred to Wilson. The Irish delegation, therefore, once more, on the 20th May, repeated their request to Wilson that the Irish representatives would be heard.

On May 22nd, 1919, Seán T. O'Kelly handed to Clemenceau's secretary at the French Foreign Office a letter from de Valera, Griffith and Plunkett addressed to Clemenceau, dated at the Mansion House, 17th May. Copies of this letter were handed by the Irish-American delegation to President Wilson, Colonel House, Lansing, Mr. Henry White and General Bliss, the members of the American commission to negotiate peace. The letter will be found in the official correspondence submitted to the Senate of the United States by the Irish-American delegates. It repudiates the claim of the British Government to act for Ireland and declares that:-

"No treaty or agreement entered into
by the British Government to speak in

virtue of that claim is or can be binding
on the people of Ireland.

The only signatures by which the
Irish Nation will be bound are those of
its own delegates deliberately chosen."

On May 24th, 1919, acknowledging the letter of the
17th (referred to by Lansing as written on the 16th), he
(Lansing) replied to the Irish-American delegates as
follows:-

"I am informed that when the question of
approaching the British authorities with a
view to procuring the safe conducts in
question was first considered, every effort
was made in an informal way to bring you
into friendly touch with the British
representatives here, although, owing to the
nature of the case, it was not possible to
treat the matter officially. The British
authorities having consented that you and
your colleagues should visit England and
Ireland, although your passports were only
good for France, every facility was given to
you to make the journey.

Before your return to Paris, however,
reports were received of certain utterances
made by you and your colleagues during your
visit to Ireland. These utterances, whatever
they may have been, gave, as I am informed,
the deepest offence to those persons with whom
you were seeking to deal and, consequently, it
seemed useless to make any further effort in
connection with the request which you desire
to make.

In view of the situation thus created, I regret to inform you that the American representatives feel that any further efforts on their part connected with this matter would be futile and, therefore, unwise."

This letter was addressed to Honourable Frank Walsh, their Chairman.

In a letter to Lansing of May 27th, 1919, the Irish-American delegation denied that any person was authorised by them to make any effort to bring them into friendly touch with the British representatives:-

"We also beg to further advise you that at no time, in Paris or elsewhere, have we sought to deal, privately or unofficially, with any persons relative to the purposes of our mission."

Repeating the history of their appointment as delegates, of the issue of their passports, of their earlier correspondence on their arrival in Paris and of the interview of 17th April between President Wilson and the Chairman of the delegation, they added:-

"The implications of your letter that any person was acting unofficially, privately or secretly is, therefore, erroneous."

They asked, "for the verity of the record", that he would be good enough to give them "the names of the persons to whom we gave deep offence by our utterances in Ireland and with whom, you have been informed, we "were seeking to deal", as well as "the name or names of any person or persons who assumed to negotiate or promote any such secret or unofficial dealings upon our behalf".

They concluded by saying:-

"We likewise deem it proper to call your attention at this time to the fact that we scrupulously refrained from any public utterances in England and that our statements to the people in Ireland, as to the objects of our mission, were in strict conformity with the purposes stated to you in our written application for passports and cherished and advocated by American citizens since the foundation of the American Republic. We are confident that, if your information is correct to the effect that our utterances gave deep offence, such offence was not given to the Irish people or to their duly elected representatives in whose presence the utterances were made."

This letter was never answered. They received assurances from Henry White, Commissioner Plenipotentiary of U.S.A., that he did not associate himself in any way with efforts to bring the Irish-American delegates into touch with the British Government in Paris or elsewhere, nor had he until the last few days any knowledge of those efforts.

On May 28th, 1919, the Irish-American delegates wrote to President Wilson and to Colonel House, White, Bliss and Lansing, the other members of the American Commission, transmitting a large number of cablegrams from different parts of the United States, insisting upon the securing of an opportunity to present Ireland's case to the Peace Conference and protesting against Article X of the Covenant of the League of Nations. They pointed out the evil effects which would follow if this article

was implemented in its present form; it would prevent the redress "of nations and peoples claiming integration of their age-old territories that are now under the enforced government of any other nations"; and that signatories like America "will be bound to prevent the giving of aid to such oppressed nations". -

"In view of the refusal to give to the Irish representatives a hearing in Paris, they suggest that a full and open hearing by 'The Committee of Four of the Great Powers at the Peace Conference' be accorded to any nation or people, in order that they may present their case for territorial integrity or to dispute the claim of any nation claiming territory to which it is not entitled'. They also suggest an amendment to Article X which includes the following clause:-

'provided, however, that the territorial boundaries of no country, at the signing of the Covenant, shall be deemed to include any other country or nation, the boundaries of which are natural ones, or clearly defined, inhabited by a homogeneous people, a majority of whom, by a vote of its electorate, has determined the form of government under which they desire to live and whose efforts to establish the same and function thereunder are, at the time of the signing hereof, prevented by an army of occupation or other form of forcible oppression.'

Mr. Ryan had left Paris for America before May 29th. On that date Messrs. Walsh and Dunne wrote to Mr. J.C. Grew, Secretary to the American Commission to

Negotiate Peace, asking to be received by the members of that Commission. In a letter of the same date (May 29th, 1919) addressed to the President and his four fellow-commissioners, they state that they were informed by Colonel House that:

"the Commission met daily and he was good enough to say he would be glad to attend any time an opportunity was given us for a hearing.

We called at the headquarters of the Commission at their regular meeting hour this morning (May 29th) but their meeting had adjourned. Mr. Lansing therefore suggested that we make this request through the Secretary of the Commission."

On May 31st, 1919, Messrs. Walsh and Dunne wrote to President Wilson stating that, as they were informed that Great Britain had definitely denied safe conducts to the Irish representatives and therefore in accordance with the instructions of the Philadelphia Irish Race Convention, they themselves would "present Ireland's case, her insistence upon the right of self-determination and to the international recognition of the Republican form of government established by her people". They therefore asked President Wilson to secure a hearing for them before the Special Committee of the Four Great Powers.

On the same day (May 31st, 1919) Grew, the Secretary-General of the American Commission to negotiate peace, turned down the request to appear before the American Commission:-

"The Commission is led to believe that your object in requesting to be received

is to ask its good offices to obtain a hearing before the Peace Conference of representatives of the so-called 'Irish Republic'."

The reason for the refusal is stated to be:-

"that it is not within the province of the American delegation to request the Peace Conference to receive a delegation composed of citizens of a country other than our own when that country is officially represented at the Conference in regard to a matter having no relation whatever to the making of peace with Germany and Austria."

On June 2nd, 1919, the Irish-American delegates wrote to Mr. Grew correcting what they conceived to be a misapprehension of their object in seeking an interview with the Commission. They renewed their request for an interview with the Commission to carry out the instructions of the 5,132 delegates of the Philadelphia Irish Race Convention, representing every State in the American Union.

The Irish-American Delegates send Copies of their Report on Conditions in Ireland to President Wilson and others:

On June 6th, 1919, they sent to the President their report on the conditions in Ireland with a demand for investigation by the Peace Conference. A copy was also sent to Lloyd George, with the following letter also dated June 6th:-

"Sir,
Complying with your request of May 1st, 1919, made through Sir William Wiseman and assented to by Messrs. Seán T. Ó Ceallaigh and George Gavan Duffy, the representatives

at Paris of the Irish Republican Government, that we visit every part of Ireland, and especially Belfast, to ascertain the actual conditions existing in that country.

We have the honour to inform you that we have, except where prevented by the use of military forces of the English army of occupation, visited the four provinces of Ireland, including Belfast, as well as the other principal cities and towns.

We have prepared a report covering the facts with certain recommendations.

In order that the Government of Great Britain may be informed, we herewith hand you a copy of this report which, in addition to the presentation of facts, contains a demand for an investigation under the authority of the Peace Conference.

We also wish to advise your Government that the original of this document has, this day, been handed to the President of the United States and that copies are being transmitted to the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States through the Secretary of State.

(Signed) Frank Walsh
E.F. Dunne. "

On June 8th, 1919, they sent copies of the report on conditions in Ireland to the 'Times' and all leading English journals, to King George V, to Lord Birkenhead (Lord Chancellor), Bonar Law as Leader of the House of Commons.

BUREAU OF MILITARY HISTORY 1913-21
BURO STAIRE MILEATA 1913-21
NO. W.S. 687

ROINN  COSANTA.

BUREAU OF MILITARY HISTORY, 1913-21.

STATEMENT BY WITNESS

DOCUMENT NO. W.S. 687 (Section 3)

Witness

Right Rev. Monsignor M. Curran, P.P.,
The Presbytery,
Aughrim St.,
Dublin.

Identity.

Secretary to Archbishop Walsh,
1906-1919;
Vice-Rector Irish College, Rome, 1920;
Later Rector do.

Subject.

His recollections of Irish national
affairs, 1912-1922.

Conditions, if any, Stipulated by Witness.

Extract from witness' letter of 17th June 1952
attached to statement:

"It is my wish that the statement be accessible
for public reference only after twenty years,
say 1 Jan. 1972. By mutual agreement it may
be accessible to special competent, sympathetic
and responsible investigators that the Bureau
may agree upon with me
File No. S.1305

The Delegates obtain an Interview with
President Wilson:

Mr. Walsh and Governor Dunne had an interview by appointment with President Wilson on the afternoon of the 11th June, 1919. They stated that they had come to ask him if he would not secure a hearing for them before the "Big Four", or whatever other committee that would be delegated to hear the case of Ireland, that they had made a formal request of Mr. Lansing for safe conducts for Messrs. de Valera, Griffith and Plunkett, and that they had received a communication to the effect that it would be futile to make the request. Assuming that the Irish delegates would not be received, they wished to inform the President of the conditions in Ireland.

During the course of the interview the President remarked:-

"Of course, you should understand that no small nation of any kind has yet appeared before the committee of four and there is an agreement among the committee of four that none can come unless unanimous consent is given by the whole committee."

Having quoted the President's own speeches on the rights of small nations, Mr. Walsh continued:

"Now, Mr. President, Mr. de Valera asked me to say to you that, inasmuch as you stated that these are the issues, that there must be no arrangement or compromise, and that they must be settled definitely and once for all, to ask you now where is the place to settle them definitely, once for all, and how shall his people do it. Now that he is to be denied the right to come here by England and you tell us now that we cannot appear, in effect, before

the Peace Conference, he asks this question and I ask you: Where will he go? Where shall his people go? Where is it to be settled definitely and once for all?"

The President said:-

"Mr. Walsh, do you think that any considerable number of people, when they read my declarations, thought that these settlements were to be made at some particular place, automatically, immediately?"

Mr. Walsh replied:-

"Mr. President, I can speak first for myself. When I read it, I believed you meant Ireland. I believe that practically all the people in Ireland believed that, and all I have met of our own people believed it."

Hot exchanges ensued in the course of which the President said:-

"Of course, I do not claim to know the local and specific matters referred to."

Mr. Walsh said:-

"I believe you received an invitation to go to Ireland. I think it would be a fine thing for yourself and for the peace of the world if you accepted that invitation. The people would be delighted if you went to Ireland and got an understanding of the situation at first-hand."

The President answered:-

"Now, Walsh, if it is your intention to

go back to America and try to put me in bad, I am going to say when I got back that we were well on the way of getting Mr. de Valera and his associates over here; we were well on the way when you made it so difficult by your speeches in Ireland that we could not do it; that it was you gentlemen who kicked over the applecart."

Mr. Walsh replied, asking had he seen:-
"the statements of the Lord Chancellor in the House of Lords and of Bonar Law in the House of Commons, both officially speaking for Mr. Lloyd George, in which they stated that it was not his intention, and never had been, to grant safe conducts to these men and that it was his purpose, in having an interview with us after we came back from Ireland, to state the 'English case' to the American press representatives and serve England, and not serve the people whom we were representing over here. Did you read that?"

Mr. Walsh remarked to the President that he had written a letter to Mr. Lansing, to which he had received no reply, asking what were the utterances that offended these gentlemen. Of course, the President was unable to mention them. Beyond stating that they had offended the whole British Government, he refused to discuss Lloyd George's attitude. He stated the position of the American Commission as this:-

"that we are dealing officially with these Governments. You would not want us to made representations or engage in an effort that might involve the sending of troops

into Europe, and I know that our people would not want that. What I am saying to you is this: that we cannot and, under no circumstances, could we have, at any time since we have been here, do anything in this matter of an official nature; but I want to say to you that I have the deepest sympathy for Ireland and for her people and her cause. I know I speak for the others when I say that all we could do unofficially, we have been doing and will do."

Mr. Walsh asked him what action he proposed to take on the request of the Senate that the American delegates be heard.

The President replied:-

"That is a matter that has not yet been taken up with our conference."

Mr. Walsh then asked:-

"Now, then, we should direct our efforts, as I understand it, to the other representatives on the committee of four and see whether or not we are going to get this hearing, inasmuch as it is to be unanimous? If we are not allowed to meet you, how would you suggest that this, or any similar matter, could get before your committee of four?"

"Well", said the President, "I know of no way except to take it up with them individually".

Again quoting the President's statements of the rights of small nations to self-determination, Mr. Walsh said that, in doing so, he voiced the aspirations of:-

"countless of millions of people. When they

were uttered by the head of the most powerful nation of the world and received the assent of representatives of all the nations, it became a fact, Mr. President. These people are imbued with the principle. They can no longer be kept in subjection by the action of governments."

The President said:-

"You have touched on the great metaphysical tragedy of to-day. My words have raised hope in the hearts of millions of people. It is my wish that they have that; but could you imagine that you could revolutionise the world at once? Could you imagine that those peoples would come into that at once?"

Mr. Walsh replied:-

"I could imagine them, if anyone denied it, struggling to come into it at once, if it were denied in the place where they expected they were to have it come and to have it settled definitely once and for all."

The President said:-

"When I gave utterance to those words, I said them without the knowledge that nationalities existed which are coming to us day after day. Of course, Ireland's case, from the point of view of population, from the point of view of the struggle it has made, from one point of interest that it has excited in the world, and especially among our own people whom I am anxious to serve, is the outstanding case of a small nationality.

You do not know and can not appreciate the anxieties that I have experienced as a result of these many millions of people having their hopes raised by what I have said.

For instance, time after time I raise a question here, in accordance with these principles, and I am met with a statement that Great Britain or France, or some of the other countries, have entered into a solemn treaty obligation. I tell them: 'But it was not in accord with justice and humanity'; and then they tell me that the breaking of treaties is what has brought on the greater part of the wars that have been waged in the world. No one knows the feelings that are inside of me while I am meeting with these people and discussing these things and, as these things that have been said here go over and over in my mind, I feel most profoundly. It distresses me. But I believe, as you gentlemen do, in divine providence and I am in His hands, and I don't care what happens to me individually. I believe these things and I know that countless millions of others believe them."

Towards the conclusion of the interview the President said:-

"I wish that you would bear in mind that I came here with very high hopes of carrying out the principles as they were laid down. I did not succeed in getting all I came after. There were a lot of things that I hoped for but did not get."

The details of this interview were not published

at the time. It was not revealed until the publication of the report to the United States Foreign Relations Committee towards the end of September, 1919. For the official statement, see the pamphlet embodied in the bound volume, entitled "U.S.A. And Irish Independence", which I have presented to the Bureau.

In a letter of the 13th June, 1919, the Irish-American delegation formally drew the attention of the American Commission to the momentous resolution of the United States Senate (6th June). Having alluded to Mr. Lansing's letter of the 24th May conveying the opinion of the American Commission that any further effort would be futile and unwise, they stated that, despite Mr. Lansing's letter of the 24th May, they would ask the Commission to take early and favourable action upon the Senate resolution of the 6th June.

On the 17th June, they repeated their request inasmuch as the peace terms were about to be signed and on account of the constantly increasing and urgent inquiries the delegates received from America, and expressing the opinion that, unless action was taken very shortly, "the delay itself will amount to a denial of the request".

On the 17th June, Mr. Grew, the Secretary-General of the American Commission, acknowledged the receipt of their letter of the 17th and their correspondence regarding the Senate resolution and in reply informed the Irish delegation that the Commission "will not fail to comply with their request".

On the same day (17th June, 1919) the Irish-American delegation urged President Wilson to grant without delay an investigation by the Peace Conference into the conditions in Ireland. Copies were sent to

the other members of the Commission and they asked Lansing to send copies to the Senate and House of Representatives.

On the 19th June, the Irish delegation protested to Lloyd George against the arrest and treatment of Countess Markievicz.

On the 20th June the Irish delegation informed the American Peace Commission of the resolution of the American Federation of Labour at their national annual session at Atlantic City, New Jersey. This resolution urged the Peace Conference to hear de Valera, Griffith and Plunkett on the case of Ireland and urged "international recognition of the republican form of government now existing in Ireland". This Federation had three million men and women on its rolls. Recalling the request of the United States Senate to the same effect, the Irish-American delegation asked the American Peace Conference had they conveyed this request to the general Peace Conference.

On the 21st June, Mr. Grew, the Secretary-General, replied that a copy of the Senate resolution had been sent to M. Clemenceau, President of the Peace Conference:

"M. Clemenceau alone is competent to bring this whole question to the attention of the Conference. Beyond this, of course, - as you very readily will appreciate - neither the American Commission as a whole nor any of its individual members can take any further steps in the premises."

On the 25th June, the Irish delegation telegraphed to McPherson, Chief Secretary of Ireland, protesting against his attempts to suppress the reply of the delegation to McPherson's answers to their report and his representations regarding the report. No answer

was received from McPherson.

On the 27th June the Irish delegation addressed a letter to Clemenceau as they had received "formal notification from the Secretary-General of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace that the whole Irish question is now referable to you alone". Having submitted previous documents bearing on the appeal to the Peace Conference, they urged upon him the "urgent necessity of the early creation of an impartial commission of inquiry to investigate upon the actual state of war now existing between the Irish people and the English army of occupation, with a special reference to the atrocities and acts of barbarism still being perpetrated". The letter will be found in the volume already mentioned.

A growing sympathetic impression among the more liberal minded people in England can be seen from the various extracts published in the English press which may be found in the Sinn Féin publication, entitled "English Fair Words And - Ireland". A leading article in the 'Times' of the 16th June, 1919, caused a considerable impression in the English press and plainly indicated the intensity of feeling in favour of Ireland in America and the growing success of the Irish-American campaign there. Further evidence of this will be found in the 'Times American Supplement' of the 4th July. A series of articles began in the 'Times' on the 28th June urging a "generous settlement of the Irish question". Other English papers, especially the Liberal press, also advocated an immediate settlement. All clearly point to the effect of American influence.

Shortly after this, Messrs. Frank Walsh and Edward Dunne returned to America. They handed over the papers to John Archdeacon Murphy and left him as

Commissioner in Charge.

On 22nd July, 1919, as Commissioner in Charge, John Archdeacon Murphy addressed a letter to M. Clemenceau:-

"We are in receipt of information from sources of high authority that, as President of the Peace Conference, you have notified American peace plenipotentiaries that, so far as further consideration of the Irish question is concerned, the matter is one in which you will take no action."

He pointed out that, in ignoring the resolution of the American Senate, he thereby showed an entire disregard of American public opinion as expressed by the resolution of its highest legislative body:-

"The knowledge of your decision in these matters has been up to now withheld from the American public. The results of the publication of this information will doubtless have very material weight at this time, while the attention of the United States Senate is occupied in matters of international importance, in which we feel France has a material interest. Arrangements have already been made for giving widespread publicity in America to this decision on your part but, before taking this step, we respectfully suggest that an audience may be granted by you to the writer to present the importance of the situation."

This letter, to which no reply was received, closes the printed correspondence in the case of Ireland's claim for independence put before the Senate Commission on

Foreign Relations on the 30th August, 1919.

Back in America the Delegates agitate against
Wilson and the Peace Treaty:

Returning to America the delegates were in a position to fortify Irish-American agitation on behalf of Ireland. Their exposure of Wilson's weakness, hypocrisy and hostility helped to crystallise the campaign against Wilson and the peace treaty. An immense campaign, embracing all the States of America, was immediately begun and when in turn Wilson began his campaign in favour of the treaty, he found himself preceded, dogged and followed up by Irish-American associations through every step of his journey. It is not too much to say that the decision of the Senate to refuse ratification to the Peace Treaty was largely due to the Irish agitation and one of the most decisive elements in that agitation was the treatment the Irish case received at Wilson's hands in Paris. The agitation ruined Wilson politically and physically.

The proceedings of the session of Dáil Eireann I from June 17-19th, 1919, will be found in my bound volume, "Sinn Féin Publications, 1918-19". It is important inasmuch as it shows the decisions of the Dáil in various government matters and, in particular, the growing development of the functions of an Irish Government.

The Irish Bishops protest against military government
and thank America for espousing the cause of
Ireland:

An important statement on the Irish situation was published by the Irish Bishops at their meeting on 24th June, 1919. It was a strong protest against the military government in the country. It asserted the right of Ireland to be mistress of her own destiny and thanked the Senate, the House of Representatives, also

the Hierarchy, clergy and people of every denomination in America for so nobly espousing the cause of our people.

The effect of U.S.A. opinion was made very evident by the increasing call in the English Press for a solution of Irish claims. They advocated an immediate settlement. Some of the Liberal papers proposed what they called "Dominion Home Rule" but without defence forces. A series of articles on Ireland began in the 'Times' on 28th June. Its 'American Supplement' of 4th July contained an article on Ireland and Irish political influence in U.S.A. and on the necessity of granting autonomy to Ireland.

In the House of Commons on the 29th July, 1919, Bonar Law, in reply to Major Sir Keith Fraser said that the Government were not prepared to consider the suggestion that Australia, Canada, New Zealand and South Africa should be asked to delegate representatives to a Royal Commission to report on the best form of the future government in Ireland. The 'Times' in an editorial article, headed "Evasion", says:-

"In regard to Ireland, the Government seem determined to file their petition in political bankruptcy to play for time, to postpone, to avoid a decision, to confess impotence, to let things drift on the chance of something turning up would seem to be the last word in British statesmanship.

'Ireland - What is Ireland? Not even a nation!', the Prime Minister would say. 'Let Ireland wait.' The question will not wait."

On the 5th August, 1919, in answer to a question of Lieutenant-Commander Kenworthy, the Secretary of State for War declared the cost per month of the

British Army of Occupation in Ireland was £900,000.

A little incident shows the spirit of the times. At the Commission in Green Street on the 5th August before Mr. Justice Dodd a young man called as a city petty juror got up and said that he was a Republican and did not recognise the Court. Justice Dodd ordered him to be put in the dock and Mr. Lorcan Sherlock, being called to the witness box, was asked by the Judge if he heard the name of the man. Mr. Sherlock replied that he did not and that he did not know him. When there was no evidence as to the young man's name, apparently the Court could not cross-examine him on this point or ask him to incriminate himself. The Judge, therefore, was obliged to order his release from custody. He replaced his hat on his head before he got out, though stentorian tones called after him to remove it. He thus escaped a fine of £50.

The Bankruptcy and Extinction of the 'Freeman's Journal:

A crowning proof of the triumphant success of the new political movement was the bankruptcy and, after a short interval, the utter extinction of the 'Freeman's Journal', so long the organ and mainstay of the Irish Parliamentary Party. On August 21st, 1919, its cheque for wages was dishonoured by the bank; and on August 26th the directors passed a resolution deciding that, in regard to the financial position of the company, it was impossible to continue trading. On August 28th a receiver and manager was appointed by the Court, at the instance of some of the debenture shareholders, with a view to disposing of the paper. The Chancery Court on 17th September, 1919, ordered the compulsory winding-up of the company.

It was put up for sale and bought for £32,500 on 27th October, 1919, by a syndicate represented by

Martin Fitzgerald. It was carried on for a few years more by the new proprietors as a non-party concern with no public influence and faded out, ^{19th December, 1924,} unwept and unsung except by a few rather pitiable ghosts of what already seemed another world. It was an ignominious collapse of what had been the life-blood of the Land War, the herald and strong right-arm of the early Parnell movement. The time was when one could not think of that movement without its mouthpiece, 'The Freeman's Journal'.

De Valera opens his triumphal campaign in U.S.A.
Its effect on Wilson's struggle for Ratification
of Peace Treaty:

In mid-July, 1919, Mr. de Valera began his spectacular and triumphal campaign in the United States which substantially and perhaps decisively determined the rejection by U.S.A. of the ratification of the Peace Treaty and the League of Nations. In the course of the campaign he covered the entire territory of the Union. Especially notable in the earlier stages (July) were his receptions in New York, Boston, Chicago, San Francisco, Butte and other western cities. These receptions were elaborately reported in the American Press. In Chicago the freedom of the city was conferred upon him by Mayor Thompson and the City Council, and the degree of Doctor of Laws and Literature by the Chicago University. This campaign was utterly unlike those of the old Irish Party in the U.S.A. It put Ireland on an international level; it rocked American opinion from East to West and thereby shook British prestige and policy to its foundations. Ireland was the Achilles heel of Britain and month by month that bitter fact was now being driven home. It made easy the Dáil Loan of December which was in good time to exceed the most optimistic expectations.

In July, referring to De Valera's meetings, the

'New York American' made this comment:-

"Peace treaty or no treaty, the aid of American will be extended to the Irish people."

"Some day", says the 'Washington Herald':-

"Washington, the supposed shrine of freedom, will celebrate another Fourth of July and some day Ireland will be officially accorded a high place of honour in the celebration. If not, the world war, from which we have just emerged, was all in vain."

On the 1st August, 1919, de Valera addressed the Montana legislature. He returned to New York early in August only to commence another ten weeks tour of the great cities. Hundreds of thousands attended these meetings which received great prominence in the American press. He was specially invited to Philadelphia by its Mayor, T.B. Smith, by letter dated 22nd September. When he spoke there on 3rd October, fifty bands escorted him to the meeting. Mayor Kiel and the Board of Aldermen invited and welcomed him to St. Louis. Mayor J. P. Mahony and the Board of Aldermen similarly did so at Newark, N.J. The Irish and their sympathisers in Buenos Ayres cabled to Mr. de Valera from a mass meeting conveying their support. Reference to these and other meetings will be found in the 'Irish Independent' of 6th October, 1919.

Meanwhile President Wilson found himself in the gravest difficulties in obtaining the ratification by the Senate of the Peace Treaty which he had already signed in Paris. The chief source of his difficulties were seen in a short time to arise from the Irish-American campaign in favour of Irish self-determination and

independence. Everywhere he went, he was preceded and followed by Irish sympathisers who persistently heckled him on the effects of Articles X and XI of the Treaty which seemed to pledge American support to uphold the English occupation of Irish territory. On all occasions the claims of Ireland to self-determination and the recognition of the Irish Republic were strenuously advocated.

When I visited San Francisco in the autumn of 1926, Monsignor Rogers, the Pastor of St. Patrick's Church, night after night gave me vivid accounts of the unparalleled, even mystical, spirit that animated all classes of Irishmen and Irish-Americans in those days. However divided they were before, they united solidly in the new campaign for Irish freedom. It was these men that formed the brains and the power of the campaign against the Treaty. Nor were their efforts confined to mere protests against the Treaty. On a particular morning, the offices of the English fire insurance companies were informed that all their ecclesiastical policies in the Catholic dioceses of San Francisco and the other Californian dioceses were not being renewed. In this and many others ways, they were able to inflict severe losses on English interests in America and bring home to English diplomats and statesmen the massed organised power of Irish-America and the depth of feeling inspiring it.

On August 23rd, 1919, the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate voted in favour of hearing representatives of a number of small nations to present their case for self-determination. They included Ireland, Egypt, Greece, Lithuania, Ukraine, Esthonia and Lettland.

On the 30th August, 1919, the Irish Delegation of

the Friends of Irish Freedom and the Irish Race Congress put the case of Ireland before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. The delegation was led by Mr. Justice Cohalan of the Supreme Court of Justice of New York and with him, among others, were the famous orator, Mr. Bourke Cockran, Mr. Michael Ryan, Mr. Frank P. Walsh and ex-Governor E.F. Dunne of Illinois. These latter presented a printed report on their observations in Ireland. According to the 'Times' correspondent in New York, the speakers demanded the complete rejection of the Treaty as destructive of American political and commercial independence and because it would prevent Ireland and other subject nations from obtaining independence. The hearing of the Irish delegation lasted five hours. The records of these proceedings before the Foreign Relations Committee included the publication for the first time of the President's interview with the Irish-American delegation in Paris in the previous June.

This discussion was resumed on the 12th September and takes up 278 pages (755-933) of the official Report entitled "Treaty of Peace With Germany".

On the 18th September, 1919, President Wilson was finally obliged to take notice of Ireland, following questions directed to him by the San Francisco Labour Council.

In the course of his replies, President Wilson stated that, while it was impossible for the Peace Conference to act in regard to the self-determination of any territories except those which had belonged to the defeated empires, yet under the Covenant of the League of Nations in Article XI there was a means by which all claims of self-determination likely to disturb the

peace of the world and the good understanding between nations could be brought. The reason why the case of Ireland was not heard at the Peace Conference was that the Conference had no jurisdiction over any question of that sort which did not affect the territory which belonged to the defeated empires. His own position with regard to the subject of self-determination for Ireland is expressed in Article XI of the Covenant.

In reply to Wilson's references at Columbus and Indianapolis on the rights of subject peoples, Mr. de Valera stated that it was the duty of America to make explicit reservations in the case of Ireland before signing the Treaty; otherwise later on it would be declared that the Irish question was a domestic one between England and Ireland. He declared that he had no doubt whatever that, while Ireland's claims would have the support of American representatives, these efforts would be ineffective once the Covenant was ratified.

In September and early October, 1919, the campaign against the ratification of the Treaty by America reached its climax. It should be noted that until the Irish-American campaign began, the efforts of the American opponents to the Treaty, headed by Senators Borah and Johnson, seemed to have failed to rouse American opinion in general against the Treaty. But the persistent, highly-organised and ruthless campaign of Irish-Americans, now freed from wartime handicaps, soon told. It so irritated the unnerved President Wilson that he could no longer ignore it or suppress his chagrin. The special correspondent of the 'Times' thus reports it from Denver on 25th September, 1919:-

"The President has come to the most critical stage of his tour on behalf of

the League of Nations. Hitherto he has been handling his opponents lightly but in his speeches in Utah and Wyoming Mr. Wilson came out openly, asserting that the opposition to the League which had developed in America was composed largely of pro-German and other 'hyphenated citizens' who had tended towards disloyalty during the war. The plain inference from his speeches is that Irish-Americans and German-Americans are seeking to make America desert the Allies and make a separate peace with Germany.

Mr. Wilson has served notice that he would regard certain reservations proposed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as a rejection of the Treaty. He did not refer to all reservations but singled out the most vital of all by which it is proposed to exempt America from all obligations and responsibility in connection with Article X, except in such cases as Congress may direct."

A Reuter cablegram of 24th September, 1919, from Salt Lake City stated that President Wilson told a large audience at the Mormon Tabernacle that "the re-opening of any part of the Treaty will be the opening of negotiations with Germany". Reuter went on: "To write the Senate's reservations into the Treaty, he said, would be to cut the heart out of the League of Nations. Germany was praying that the United States would stay out of the League".

Reuter continued: "The United States' Senate, in its first roll call on the Peace Treaty, adopted by 43 to 40 Senator Lodge's motion postponing the consideration of the Republican amendment to the Treaty until next

Tuesday 30th September⁷. This is considered the first test of strength between the opposing forces".

By the beginning of October, 1919, it was realised that the Treaty might be defeated in the Senate. This was so much realised in Paris that the European countries were preparing to begin the League without the United States. By this time it was estimated that there were between fifteen and twenty senators opposed to the Treaty.

On October 18th, 1919, the question of Ireland was once more brought up in the Senate. The hostile Washington correspondent of the 'Times' reporting it on October 19th said:-

"It was brought up in the form of the crystallisation into a resolution of the hints let fall by the President during his recent trip that he considered the League competent to interfere with the Irish question, if that question is not out of the way by the time it comes into force.

The resolution was moved by Mr. Walsh of Massachusetts. It was based upon Article XI and asked the United States Government to bring Ireland before the League when the League Covenant starts."

"It is unlikely", continues the correspondent:-

"in view of the Republican opposition that the new resolution will come to anything. Not that the defeat of the resolution will shelve the Irish question in American politics. Nothing can do that while the question exists, especially in present circumstances."

The 'Times' correspondent in Washington on October 25th, 1919, reports that the possibility of the

non-ratification of the Treaty by the Senate was seriously discussed. The defeat might come by the vote of the President's own followers. A new reservation was proposed on October 24th and the opposition largely centres on the statement of the President just before his health broke down that he would accept no reservations, particularly in regard to Article X.

It was just before this date that President Wilson's grave illness began.

The opposition to the Peace Treaty and League of Nations Covenant had a sensational ending - 15th-20th November, 1919 - when a special session of the Senate refused to ratify the Treaty.

I am conscious that all this is a very disjointed and inadequate account of de Valera's vitally important and triumphant campaign of July-October, 1919, as well as that of the Irish-American delegates' earlier one, but the general nature of these Irish campaigns in 1919 and 1920, including the motion to provide for diplomatic relations with the Irish Republic, will be found in the volumes:-

"Ireland And U.S.A., Volume I, 1917-1919".

"Ireland And U.S.A., Volume II, 1920-1923".

These I have presented to the Bureau.

Irish Dominion League is formed:

One of the last moves of a "constitutional" character was the formation of the Irish Dominion League which on 28th June, 1919, issued a manifesto stating its policy and demanding Dominion Home Rule for Ireland. It was hardly heard of afterwards.

Dáil Loan Campaign is launched in Ireland:

Sinn Féin launched its campaign in favour of the new Dáil Loan in the last week of August, 1919.

Suppression of Advanced Nationalist Bodies
including Dáil Éireann:

On the 10th September, 1919, the city and county of Cork was included with many other areas (Dublin, Tipperary, Limerick, Clare) in a proclamation in which Sinn Féin, Irish Volunteers, Gaelic League and Cumann na mBan were banned. A supplement to the Dublin 'Gazette' of 12th September, 1919 (referring to the Proclamation of 3rd July, 1918), contained a proclamation dated 10th September, 1919, suppressing "the association known by the name of Dáil Éireann" which "appears to us to be a dangerous association and to have been after the date of the said special proclamation (3rd day of July, 1918) formed and first employed for all the purposes of the associations known by the names of the Sinn Féin organisation, Sinn Féin clubs, the Irish Volunteers and the Cumann na mBan".

Simultaneously with this proclamation of 10th September, Lord French announced his decision to take the most drastic measures for the suppression of "crime". On the night of the 12th numerous raids were made upon Sinn Féin premises in Dublin and throughout the country. Two members of the Dáil were arrested.

De Valera, speaking at Providence, Rhode Island, regarding the suppression, said:-

"The suppression by armed force of the congress of freely elected representatives of the Irish people is a commentary on England's desire to make the world safe for democracy."

Arthur Griffith, speaking on the evening of the proclamation, said that proceedings like what had happened there that day only helped their cause. He mentioned that they had decided to organise an Irish

consular service and already agents had been appointed in France, Italy, United States and the Argentine. Dealing with the Irish question as it then figured on the Continent, he stated that it was receiving much prominence in France, whilst Italy was becoming more sympathetic and that in Switzerland the great majority of the press was in their favour. In Spain practically the entire press was in their favour. Northcliffe had spent £30,000 of English money in the United States in anti-Irish propoganda but it merely had the effect of opening the eyes of many people in the States to the real situation in Ireland by their enquiries. The Anglo-American alliance would never be ratified in the States whilst the Irish question remained unsettled.

These suppressions roused the indignation of many liberal minded Britishers. Thomas Sinclair of Roslyn, Lisburn, telegraphed to Lord French that these raids and police interference would turn every Home Ruler in Ireland into a Sinn Féiner.

The Trades Union Congress at Glasgow at its concluding session on 13th September, 1919, unanimously passed the following resolution:-

"This Congress views with alarm the situation in Ireland where every demand of the people for freedom is met by military rule. Congress once again reaffirms its belief that the only solution is self-determination and calls upon the Government to substitute military rule by self-determination as the only means whereby the Irish people can work out their own emancipation. Congress further expresses its profound sympathy with their Irish brethren in their hour of repression."

Far different was the sentiment of the 'Globe' which, under the heading, "Let Them Shoot!", expressed the hope that Lord French and his colleagues would not:-

"shrink from adopting the most drastic measures. We shall soon find demonstrated the real worth of the bluster of the cowardly rebels who slaughter Irish policemen and British soldiers in cold blood".

On the 19th September, 1919, the 'Times' reports that the County Tipperary Council had accepted the War Office offer of two German field-guns, on condition that they were "in good order and that a supply of shells be included".

On the 21st September, 1919, armed constabulary and soldiers with an armoured car surrounded the ball alley at Laffan's Bridge, Co. Tipperary, and prohibited the handball games to be played there.

On the 23rd September the suppression of three Limerick newspapers brought the number of Irish journals suspended in the last three years up to thirty-eight.

It was brought out by "Diarist" in the Tory 'Evening Standard' of 23rd September, 1919, that the Irish police were being served with hand-grenades, presumably of the Mills pattern. To put them in the hands of the Irish Constabulary, he says, suggests that the authorities in Dublin Castle have entirely lost their heads.

A Reuter telegram of 24th September, 1919, stated that the Canadian Labour Congress had adopted the resolution favouring Dominion Home Rule for Ireland by a "small majority" but the 'Times' telegram states that the resolution was carried by a decisive majority. The opposition came from the Orange delegates of Toronto.

About this time (25th September, 1919) a Rome message of the Exchange Company to the 'Echo de Paris' reveals the British efforts made to obtain condemnation of the Irish movement by Vatican authorities.

Carson resumes his Anti-Home Rule Campaign:

With the cessation of war the anti-Home Rule campaign in England was revived by Sir Edward Carson and his followers. In his July 12th speech near Belfast he demanded the repeal of the Home Rule Act which he laughed to scorn:-

"I tell the British people that if there is any attempt made to take away one jot or tittle of your rights as British citizens and the advantages which have been won in this war of freedom - I tell them that, with all consequences, once more I will call out the Ulster Volunteers."

Repeating his threats to England, he continued:-

"I gave you this pledge in the Ulster Hall, and I repeat it now once more, that if the attempts to revive it are put into force, I will once more summon the Provisional Government and I will move that we repeal the Home Rule Bill if nobody else does."

Alluding to American criticism of England's attitude towards Ireland, he said amid cheers:-

"I to-day seriously say to America, 'You attend to your own affairs and we will attend to ours; you look after your own questions at home and we will look after ours'. We will not brook interference in our affairs by any country, however powerful. It was not for that that we waged the great war of independence which has just concluded."

At the end of September and beginning of October, 1919, Carson continued his autumn anti-Home Rule campaign in Ulster, holding special religious services in Ulster Hall (Sunday, 28th September) and assisted by members of the British aristocracy, such as, the Marquess of Londonderry, the Marquess of Dufferin and Ava. Despite the demand of many that the Government should prosecute Carson for his treasonable speeches, the Attorney-General declared that Carson could not be prosecuted for his July 12th speech.

The address of Lord Justice O'Connor at a trial in Cork in the same month, in which he defined the crime of treason-felony, shows the hypocrisy of the attitude of the Government to "treason" in Ireland and England. He said:

"Let me read for you the words of the Treason-Felony Act, 1848. This Act makes it treason-felony to compass, imagine, invent, devise or intend to levy war against His Majesty within any part of the United Kingdom, in order by force or constraint to compel him to change his measures or councils, or in order to put any force or constraint upon, or in order to intimidate or overawe both Houses or either House of Parliament."

On July 21st, 1919, Lloyd George during a debate on the Peace Treaty, upheld that "Ireland is not a nation" and refused to apply Wilson's principles to Ireland.

In Australia, the New South Wales Legislative Assembly carried a motion, by 29 to 28 votes, on September 17th, 1919, in favour of self-determination for Ireland.

A letter from Lord Dunraven to the 'Times' quoted in the 'Independent' on the 22nd September sets out the views of the more liberal Irishmen of his class. In it he pressed the necessity of some remedial act. Referring to what he calls "moderate" men in Ireland, he asked the Government what answer can they (the moderates) give to extremists who argue that "Ireland has been deceived over and over again, that Great Britain never acts from affection and a sense of justice but yields only to violence".

Sinn Féin Majority elected to Senate of
National University:

On 7th October, 1919, the elections to the Senate of the National University revealed that Sinn Féin made a clean sweep of the older generation, replacing them by definite Republican members. The eight newly elected Senators polled from 679 to 777 votes. They were substantially those recommended by the MacNeill selection committee. John MacNeill headed the poll by 777 votes. The votes for the outgoing Senators ranged from 76 to 209. Even Dr. Douglas Hyde obtained only 153 votes, Dr. Sigerson 146 and Miss Agnes O'Farrelly 129. Alderman Dr. J.C. McWalter, M.D., M.A., LL.D., in a letter to the 'Evening Herald' on the same evening (October 7th) voices the surprise and intense disappointment of some of those who were only beginning to learn that a new day in Irish politics had arrived. He wrote:-

"Sir, Isn't it a bleeding shame to hoot out Dr. Douglas Hyde, Professor Sigerson and Fr. Finlay from the Senate of the National University? As in Jerusalem of old, we stone our prophets.

If any man strives to be sane, reasonable, practical, level headed, really serviceable to

his country, he is contemptuously cast aside
in favour of some Bolshevik bosthoon!"

The "Bolshevik bosthoons" were headed by:-

John MacNeill	777
Rev. Dr. Dalton of Maynooth	758
Professor A.J. O'Rahilly	741
Patrick McGilligan	710
Miss L. Gavan Duffy	703
Professor T. Walsh	697
Professor Elizabeth M. O'Sullivan	686
W.D. O'Kelly, M.D.	679

The 1919 Convention of Sinn Féin is held:

Despite the proclamation of Sinn Féin in the city and county of Dublin, its annual Convention was held from midnight to 3 a.m. on October 16th, 1919, in anticipation of action by police and military, and was attended by about two hundred delegates. Arthur Griffith presided and reported that Mr. de Valera's campaign in America was most successful, that the general feeling there was on the side of Ireland, that the Treaty would not be ratified, or only in such a way as would leave the cause of Ireland free to be dealt with, that a Chief Consul to the United States had been appointed, that a Committee of Inquiry into Irish Resources had produced good results, that the proclamations of Sinn Féin, Dáil Éireann, etc., had furnished the United States with an object lesson in what was occurring in Ireland and that the Home Rule proposals then under consideration were merely put forward to help Lord Gray in America and to get the Senate to ratify the League of Nations. He asked delegates to impress on the people that, no matter what proposals the Government put forward, they would not discuss them or bother themselves about them.

In the course of the morning - at eight o'clock - police took up positions outside the Mansion House where

the meeting was to have taken place at ten o'clock and surrounded it. At ten o'clock the police were reinforced by armed soldiers in motor cars. The delegates who arrived from time to time were turned away. Only those who had private business with the Lord Mayor were allowed to enter the Mansion House. The police remained on duty throughout the day but the military were withdrawn at one o'clock. Police were also stationed at the Sinn Féin headquarters in Harcourt Street.

About this time the representatives of the foreign press became frequent visitors. Among those who were present at this time was the correspondent of the 'Corriere d'Italia' and other Italian newspapers, bearing letters of introduction from Bob Brennan.

Bishops refrain from issuing a Statement
condemning the murder of policemen:

At the general meeting of the Irish Bishops on the 21st October, 1919, a proposal to issue a statement, denouncing the murder of the policemen, found the general body against publication, on the ground that political capital would be made out of it by enemies of Ireland. As a result, nothing was done. This is a most significant sign of the time and a most significant result of the temper of the people. The annual meeting of the Catholic Truth Society began on October 22nd. Political pronouncements were carefully avoided by Cardinal Logue who had come to realise that priests and laymen resented his unfortunate political animadversions.

The 'Times' Dublin correspondent, writing on the 22nd October, speaks of the indifference of the Irish people to the opening of the British Parliament. He goes on to say that the chief difficulty (of the British

Government):-

"will be that of convincing the Irish people that this scheme will not involve any danger of permanent partition. No Irish party except perhaps the Ulster Unionists would entertain such a proposal for a moment. There are increasing signs that Southern Unionists will assert themselves at an early date. The Church of Ireland is much concerned at the threat which partition offers to its prestige, organisation and influence, and would give strong opposition to any plan for the indefinite exclusion of North East Ulster. Moderate men of all parties, however, agree that some solution, whether by different Government or by firmer Government, must be found for a situation which threatens the country with political chaos and moral ruin. The keenest disappointment is expressed openly [ex-Irish Parliamentary Party relics] circles at the fact that the hierarchy, having assembled at Maynooth yesterday, separated without making any formal condemnation of the present campaign of murder and outrage. They are unwilling to believe that the bishops intend to give the country no lead on the matter. Many of the bishops are in Dublin to-day and it is hoped that, before the end of the week, they will make some pronouncement on the state of Ireland."

The correspondent's pious hope was not realised.

Escape of Sinn Féin Prisoners from Strangeways,
Manchester:

On the night of October 25th, Piaras Beaslá, Austin Stack and four other prisoners escaped from Strangeways Prison, Manchester. The warder was gagged and handcuffed and shut in one of their own cells.

Helpers were at hand outside. This brought the total number of escapes from prison up to 39. These dramatic escapes, even in England, much enhanced the prestige of Sinn Féin in Ireland and correspondingly lowered that of the British Government.

Sir H. Plunkett advocates the grant of Dominion Home Rule to Ireland:

Sir Horace Plunkett spoke at the National Liberal Club on the 29th October, 1919, making a trenchant denunciation of military government in Ireland and advocating the grant of Dominion Home Rule to Ireland though with reservations in respect of defence.

A few years earlier the mere suggestion of Dominion Home Rule was scoffed at as "rainbow chasing" by Irish Nationalist M.P's. Now it was being advocated by recent Irish Unionists and found not a few supporters in England.

The 'Times', commenting on Sir Horace Plunkett's speech, commended a letter which appeared in its columns on the 30th October, 1919. Lord Southborough (formerly Sir Francis Hopwood), who had been secretary to the 1917 Irish Convention, ^{dealing} ~~dealt~~ with a letter of Mr. Lysaght of the 29th October ~~in which he~~ offered himself as an intermediary to arrange an unofficial conference between Sinn Féin and the Government. It is interesting to note that, according to this letter of Lord Southborough:-

"One section of the Nationalist representatives in the Convention asked for more than they were prepared to accept because they thought that His Majesty's Government would play poker with them. That is not business and it brought disaster on the Convention. Surely the great thing is to have an honest, practical and

conservative policy. That was the policy of the great and influential and moderate party in India. What a pity it is that the Sinn Féin members absent themselves from Parliament!

Because a section demanded a Dominion Home Rule, this would-be intermediary accused them of demanding more than they were prepared to accept and that they were playing poker."

Mr. Lysaght turned down Lord Southborough's idea as not practicable.

Australia supports Ireland's Claims:

A great Irish Race Convention was held in Melbourne on the 3rd November, 1919, under the Presidency of the Honourable Mr. T.J. Ryan, Premier of Queensland. Archbishop Mannix, having read messages which had been exchanged between himself and Arthur Griffith, delivered a most impressive address in support of Ireland's claim as expressed at the general election in December of last year. Archbishop Redwood of Wellington, New Zealand, an Englishman, proposed the principal resolution. One thousand delegates, including most of the hierarchy, attended. The meeting was one of the most enthusiastic and most representative meetings ever held in Australia.

An article by an Australian correspondent published in the 'Times' of the 17th November, 1919, arising out of this Convention, vividly sets out the blighting influence of the Irish question on Australian public life. His opening words sum up his contention:-

"The Empire could have no worthier memorial of victory than an Irish settlement, nor could Great Britain in token of her imperial leadership in the war make any greater or more

acceptable gift to the Dominions. That the people of the Dominions are longing for a settlement is beyond question."

He states that the Irish question dislocates Australian politics. It is becoming clear to Dominion leaders that a settlement is essential to the unity of the Empire.

"The position in Australia may be taken as typical. It is closely paralleled in New Zealand where at this moment Sir Joseph Ward has rallied the Irish party as a block vote to his standard. In Canada and South Africa the question may be a degree or two less important but in no part of the British Empire can it be said that the Anglo-Irish quarrel is less than a seriously disturbing factor. In every Dominion the sentimental tie with Great Britain weakens with each generation of native born.

Irishism is allowed to make itself a rallying ground for local discontents for all anti-British feelings and feuds for that section of ardent nationalism which, lacking other means of expression, joins under Irish leaders in demand for change and disruption. In Australia it is also solely the Irish influence which tends to give to national aspirations, unnecessarily and wrongfully, a separatist aim.

This block vote (Irish) is so substantial as to be almost dominant. It defeated the conscription referenda and has been used by many aspirant party leaders in Australia to gain power. It is estimated by party leaders as twenty-three per cent. of the electorate."

Fuller reports of this Convention appeared in the Irish papers of the 5th January, 1920, on the receipt of Australian exchanges. It will also be seen in the section dealing with Archbishop Mannix in the printed volumes that I have given to the Bureau.

Discussion on the reservations proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee of the American Senate started in that body on the 7th November, 1919. The resolution on the Committee's preamble to the act of ratification was strongly anti-Wilson and was carried by forty-eight votes to forty. It was a sure sign that the Committee's reservations would be attached to the act of ratification.

Archbishop subscribes £105 to Dáil Loan:

Following another visit of Dick Mulcahy, the Archbishop of Dublin agreed to support the Loan. It was at my suggestion he wrote a letter to Cardinal O'Connell on the 10th November, 1919, recommending the Dáil Loan and subscribing £105. It was posted on the 11th November.

Raid on Dáil Éireann Offices:

On Tuesday, 11th November, 1919, a police raid was made on the offices of Dáil Éireann, 76 Harcourt Street, and nine arrests were made. They were sentenced to two months' imprisonment and a further month in default of bail of twenty pounds in the Dublin Southern Police Court on the 12th November. The charges against them were:-

- (1) Taking part in proceedings of Dáil Éireann, a suppressed association.
- (2) Participating in the proceedings of Sinn Féin, also suppressed.
- (3) Unlawful assembly.

The accused denied the authority of the Court.

Senate of U.S.A. adopt proposed Reservation
to Article X of Peace Treaty:

The reservation by the Senate of the United States limiting the obligations of the United States under Article X was adopted on the 14th November, 1919. This reservation was expressed in language which President Wilson in his pro-Treaty campaign declared:-

"cut the heart out of the Covenant and would mean the rejection of the Treaty".

Nevertheless it was carried despite the strenuous efforts of the administration. This marked the victory of the Irish campaign in America against Wilson and the Treaty.

Volunteers attack British Launch in Bantry Harbour:

On the night of the 16-17th November, 1919, a daring raid on a naval launch in Bantry Harbour shocked British Government and press as much as the Navy. An armed body of Volunteers boarded the launch, surprised the crew whom they locked in their quarters. Eight rifles and three revolvers were seized and successfully carried away. Another raid had been carried out on the steamship, "Minnahorn", in Cork Harbour on the night of Saturday, the 15th.

Alleged Understanding between Lloyd George and
President Wilson re Settlement of Irish
Question:

Reference to an alleged understanding between President Wilson and Lloyd George on the presentation of the Irish case in Paris appeared in the press about this time. On June 28th, 1919, the 'Irish Statesman' in its first number had said:-

"We do not speak wholly without knowledge when we hazard the opinion that, while the case of Ireland has been excluded from the Peace Conference, it has been excluded upon

terms. We believe that an understanding exists between Mr. Wilson and Mr. Lloyd George whereby, in consideration of the fact that the case of Ireland was not raised directly in Paris, the British Prime Minister undertook to deal with it immediately after the signing of peace."

On the 21st November, 1919, in a leading article the 'Morning Post' stated:-

"Our political correspondent yesterday (20th November) gave some account of a very disturbing report which is being repeated on both sides of the Atlantic with singular persistence. It is said that Mr. Lloyd George has given President Wilson a pledge as to the settlement of the Irish question. The account of the matter given by the 'Irish Press' of Philadelphia is equally dishonouring to both statesmen:-

'It is said that an understanding was reached some time ago between Mr. Wilson and Premier Lloyd George which was to the effect that Ireland's case should not be allowed to come before the Peace Conference but that, as soon as possible after the signature of peace with Germany, Great Britain was to settle the Irish issue on the basis of Home Rule.'

That is, in effect, a charge that the President blackmailed his colleague by threatening him with hostile Irish demonstration in Paris and that the Prime Minister allowed himself to be blackmailed.

Surely we may assume that such a dishonouring charge is untrue."

Answering on 27th November, 1919, a question by Mr. Hogge, M.P., who enquired whether he gave any undertaking to President Wilson at the Peace Conference that he would endeavour to settle the Irish question, Mr. Lloyd George replied:-

"The answer is in the negative."

Prisons Board abrogate political status of Prisoners:

A notice was issued on 22nd November, 1919, by the General Prisons Board, Dublin Castle, practically abrogating the political status of prisoners and making known that those who go on hunger-strike to retain political status will do so at their risk and will not be released. The notice is stated to be a decision of the British Government. The London 'Daily Express' commenting on this notice writes:-

"This clear and drastic announcement of the Government's intention to checkmate defiance will be approved by all who value the vindication of the law.

Much else remains to be done in Ireland and the right of the policeman to do his duty and to live has to be made secure. The system of trial by jury, which has become a farce, has to be replaced by some other form of tribunal. These things must be the preface to any attempt to solve the problem of Irish Government. The King's writ must run again."

Rewards offered for information re Deaths of
Policemen:

On the 1st December, 1919, a reward of £5,000 was offered for information that would lead to the conviction of any of the persons who murdered four

policemen in Dublin during the past few months, and a further reward of £500 for such secret information as would lead to the same result, and a free pardon and the special protection of the crown in any part of his majesty's dominions. The policemen who were shot were:-

Detective-Sergeant Patrick Smyth,
on the 30th July, 1919, at Millmount Avenue,
Drumcondra.

Detective-Constable Daniel Hoey,
on the 13th September, 1919, at Townsend
Street.

Constable Michael Downing,
on the 19th October, 1917, at High Street.

Detective-Sergeant John Barton,
on the 29th November, 1919, at College
Street.

These shootings had the most decided effect of upsetting the morale of the Dublin police. Actual instances of this came under my personal observation at this time.

Addressing a meeting of his constituents on the 30th November, 1919, in Derry, Mr. John McNeill describes the administration of law in Ireland as organised violence and said it was the duty of every decent member of society to put down organised violence. The people of Ireland were absolutely determined that the police of Ireland would be the servants of Ireland and that, if there was any attempt to make them masters of the people, responsibility for what followed was on the heads of those making it.

Proclamation of 3rd July, 1918, extended
to all Ireland:

On the 25th November, 1919, a special proclamation issued against Sinn Féin and kindred organisations extended the earlier proclamation of 3rd July, 1918, to cover the whole of Ireland.

Ulster Unionists send Deputation to U.S.A.:

On the same day (25th November, 1919) a deputation was sent by the Ulster Unionist Council to

the United States to counteract Sinn Féin propaganda. It was sometimes referred to as the "Ulster Protestant Churches' Deputation", as it was entirely a clerical one, with the one exception of William Coote, M.P. The deputation consisted of Anglicans, Wesleyans and Presbyterians who were to make a special appeal, as representatives of their respective denominations in Ireland, to their fellow-Protestants in America. They were described as first-class speakers:-

"The Wesleyan deputation is especially strong by reason of the number of Methodists in the States but the orator of the party is the Rev. Wylie Blue of May Street Presbyterian Church, Belfast, a Scotsman by birth but called to May Street in 1916. The Rev. William Corkey is Minister of Townsend Street Presbyterian Church, Belfast.

A meeting of Belfast Methodists was held to bid God speed to the delegates of the Methodist churches of Belfast, the Revs. E. Hazelton, F.E. Harte and C.W. Maguire. It was presided over by the City High Sheriff, Alderman Mercier. The Rev. William Maguire said they did not want self-determination for Ireland as the enemies of liberty understood it. Alderman J.S. Shaw, J.P., declared that the question was a religious one in which was wrapped up the very existence of their church. A son of one of their Ministers, just returned from across the Atlantic, had told them that they were too late in taking action, that the mission should have been sent years ago."

This is a tribute to the success of the Sinn Féin campaign in America.

Earl Grey, the English Ambassador in Washington, at this very same time declared that the English Loan in the United States was going slowly on account of Irish propaganda.

Sir Horace Plunkett, in a statement to the New York 'Herald' in the beginning of December, 1919, said:-

"The law of the land has set up a scheme of self-government as a concession to a majority of Irish representatives in Parliament after nearly half a century of constitutional struggle. But the Irish Parliament is interned in the Statute Book and the country is under martial law. I do not use the term in any technical sense - the situation defies terminological exactitude. It is sufficient to say that a popular vote has demanded a Republic, the law of the land recognises Home Rule and an army of occupation exists as a mockery of both."

De Valera announces Issue of Two Million Worth of Republican Bonds:

It was on the 1st December that Mr. de Valera announced in New York the forthcoming issue of two million pounds worth of bonds of the Irish Republic. He had returned to New York from his campaign through the States and made his announcement to the press representatives at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. The issue of bonds was to be publicly launched in the middle of January, 1920, "in the same manner as the Liberty Loan drives started", said Mr. de Valera. "But", he added, "we want to emphasise this would be a sentimental appeal, not an appeal to investors". The bonds were to be repaid only "when the Irish Republic is recognised as an independent nation":-

"The bonds will be non-negotiable and will bear no interest but, one month after the day when the Irish Republic has received international recognition and the British forces are withdrawn from the Republic, the certificate will be exchangeable at the Republic's treasury for gold bond bearing five per cent. interest. Fenian bonds issued in the United States in 1866 could be exchanged for the new issue."

The terms of the Loan were unique. A call for two million pounds for an Irish Republic addressed to Americans seemed inconceivable. Yet it was a deadly serious one and carried out scrupulously on business lines. True the subscribers never expected to see their money repaid but they responded instantly and generously to the call. They were all repaid - even the Fenian bonds held as patriotic curiosities.

The letter of the Archbishop of Dublin to Cardinal O'Connell on the loan, containing a subscription of one hundred guineas to the Irish fund, was published in the American press and telegraphed and printed by the 'Westminster Gazette' on the 4th December, 1919. The letter was a strong indictment of the British Government in Ireland and created an immense impression. The 'Westminster Gazette' published it under the following headings:-

"Irish Ferment".

"Dr. Walsh's Letter To American Cardinal".

"Rampant Disaffection".

The full text of the letter will be found in the volume, 'Sinn Féin Publications, 1918-1919', which I have presented to the Bureau. It also appears in the public press.

James O'Connor suggests impeachment of Carson
for Treason-Felony:

On the 7th December, 1919, James O'Connor and James McMahon had a long interview with the Archbishop. James O'Connor's view was that sworn information should be made against Carson before a magistrate for his 12th July speech which was treason-felony inasmuch as he was making preparations for treason, that is, that he had armed forces and was keeping them in readiness and that, in certain events, he would use them for treasonable acts. The magistrate would have to issue a writ for the apprehension of Carson. It would be served on the local District Inspector who, O'Connor said, "would get a fit". The District Inspector would send it to the Law Officer of Dublin Castle, "who would also get a fit". If the Law Officer refused, "a mandamus" would be applied for before the Lord Chief Justice and two other Judges and they could not refuse to act upon it. The apprehension and trial of Carson would destroy his halo and Carsonism. James O'Connor was told by Masterman, who was at the time in Asquith's Cabinet, that Asquith was anxious to proceed against Carson after the landing of arms at Larne but Redmond and Dillon would not let him go on.

The Standing Committee of the Irish Bishops, at which the Archbishop of Dublin was not present, adopted on the 9th December, 1919, a strong statement against McPherson's proposed Irish Education Bill which contains some indirect political comments. They declared that the only education department the vast majority of the Irish people will tolerate is one set up by its own Government. McPherson's scheme "means Irish education in foreign fetters".

It was about this time (16th December, 1919) that I left the Archbishop's House and, therefore, had not the same opportunity of following the Archbishop's

personal relations with public events. My formal appointment as Vice Rector of the Irish College, Rome, was made on 31st December, 1919, though not published until the end of January.

On the 13th December, 1919, the case of Ireland was heard before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and on a Bill to finance a Minister and Consuls to the Irish Republic, that is, to give virtual recognition by the United States to the Irish popular claim. These interesting proceedings occupy 361 pages of the Senate's Publication H.R. 3404, one of the volumes which I have already given to the Bureau. The record contains an immense array of documents and statistics.

Attack on Lord French:

On the afternoon of the 19th December, 1919, an attempt was made on the life of Lord French at Ashtown cross-road. The Archbishop's letter on the attempted assassination of Lord French was read at all the Masses on the 21st December. In view of the various comments I have heard on this letter, I would like to point out that, while it condemns this attempt as murder, the least examination of it shows that the Archbishop was very careful that it would not be used as an opportunity for denouncing the popular movement.

On the 22nd December, 1919, the Government of Ireland Bill was introduced by Lloyd George.

I would like to mention that the 'Irish Catholic Directory', which is an annual publication, has a useful summary of Irish events, particularly in relation to documents of an ecclesiastical character and to meetings and resolutions of bishops, etc. A useful summary of events for the year 1920 will be found in the 'Freeman's Journal' of the 1st January, 1921.

Municipal Elections:

My diary notes that the municipal elections took place on the 15th January, 1920. A full analysis of the results will be found in the volume, 'Sinn Féin Publications, 1920-1921 - Vol. I', in the first pamphlet from page 57 onwards, and in the pamphlet, 'Irish Councils For Irish Freedom'.

The Archbishop of Dublin telegraphed to Alderman Tom Kelly at Wormwood Scrubbs Prison on his appointment as Lord Mayor of Dublin.

On the 22nd January, 1920, I have noted in my diary that:-

"To-day's papers contain an account of the wreckage in Thurles by the R.I.C. when they ran amok over the shooting of a policeman. They were from the North. The visit of the English Labour Delegation coincided with this display and was a vivid example of the present-day government and of 'law and order' in Ireland."

Marsillac of 'Le Journal' interviews Lord French:

Jacques Marsillac, writing from Dublin on the 20th January, 1920, as special reporter for 'Le Journal', publishes an interview he had with Lord French which appeared in that paper on the 23rd January:-

Having remarked to Lord French that, although he was an Irishman, he did not seem to have much favour with his compatriots, Marsillac received the reply: "Not yet, but it is necessary to distinguish individuals such as those who have attempted to kill me. All these assassins, these propagandists, who make a fresh assault, are not true Irish". He went on to explain that these were like

the anarchists and extremists who were to be found in every country in Europe.

"But", said Marsillac, "does there not seem to be in Ireland a real desire for independence?"

French replied that he was not a politician; that was McPherson's job. His duty was to keep order, but he did not conceal his regret that Lloyd George's project of Home Rule did not receive the support hoped for. "It is possible", he said, "that, on reflection, opinion may be more favourable."

"But", said Marsillac, "to judge by the recent popular elections, almost all-Ireland claims complete independence. Was there ever such unanimity?"

"The situation is grave, but we must not confine ourselves to appearances", said Lord French. "All serious people, all those who have a material interest in the prosperity of the country are with us. The principal cause of the trouble is that for the last five years emigration has been practically stopped. There are here one hundred thousand or two hundred thousand young men from fifteen to twenty-five years of age who normally would have emigrated."

"Then", said Marsillac, "there can be no peace until emigration begins again?"

Lord French answered, "Yes. Order will be quickly established if we proclaim martial law. We will begin by taking action against the promoters of violence".

Bishops at General Meeting condemn Government
by force:

A general meeting of the Bishops held in Maynooth on 27th January, 1920, having protested against the proposed Government scheme of education, made a strong pronouncement against government by force and demanded that Ireland be granted "the right of every civilised nation to chose her own government". Paragraph (4) of the resolution on the Education Bill stated that, if this Bill set up "an education department controlled by British Ministers, no matter what their religion might be, it will be our duty to issue instructions to Catholic parents in reference to the education of their children in such a deplorable crisis".

Arrest of Prominent Volunteers:

My diary, referring to the attempted general arrests of leading Volunteers on the morning of January 31st, 1920, says that it had been expected for some weeks:-

"Information was received last night at eleven o'clock by Sinn Féin circles that the police were being mobilised and most of the leaders had been warned by midnight. Thus Seán McGarry and Dick Mulcahy escaped. Unfortunately, Barton was re-captured by accident."

De Valera's Reception by the State Government
of New Jersey:

In an extract from an Irish-American paper, a message from Trenton, New Jersey, on the 2nd February, 1920, describing the reception in the State House of de Valera by the Governor, Edward I. Edwards, states that the Governor assured Mr. de Valera that he had the support of every true American. "Later in the evening", continues this account:-

"the assembly declared a recess of half-an-hour and officially received the Irish President on the floor of the House. President de Valera spoke for about fifteen minutes. He said the Irish people are fighting for the same principle for which America fought in the war. The assembly passed a unanimous resolution calling upon the Government of the United States to recognise the independence of the Irish Republic".

Seán T. O'Kelly arrives in Rome:

On the 7th February, 1920, my diary notes that:-

"Sean T. O'Kelly leaves Paris for Rome to-day."

It was found on his arrival in the Irish College to which he immediately went when he arrived in Rome that he was suffering from rheumatic fever. The doctor, who was just then attending the Rector, Dr. Hagan, considered his condition so serious that he would not allow him to be removed even to a hospital but insisted upon his being nursed where he was. He remained there until the following May, attended by the same nurse as was attending to the Rector.

Dr. McHugh of Derry condemns proposed Partition of Ireland:

A letter written by Dr. McHugh, the Bishop of Derry, dated 14th February, 1920, was published in the 'Independent'. In it the Bishop trenchantly exposes and condemns the Government plan to partition Ireland. He described the proposals as "camouflage, intended chiefly for America".

The military curfew order was condemned by the Trades Council who instructed their members that they should not apply for permits. This was reported in the press of the 23rd February, 1920. The curfew order was

made on the 21st and was to come into operation on Monday, 23rd.

On Saturday, 20th March, I took part in the farewell dinner given by the President of Maynooth College to the first group of missionaries to China. That same evening military and police raided the west of Ireland mail train at the Broadstone, Dublin. Every carriage and compartment was examined and a thorough search made from one end to the other. Twelve or thirteen wooden cases, belonging to the missionaries to China, were seized with other baggage and carried off in military lorries to an unknown destination. A nun's bag was also searched.

Michael Staines informs Archbishop of circumstances of Lord Mayor MacCurtain's Murder:

On the eve of my departure for Rome, Alderman Michael Staines called to inform me of the circumstances of the murder of Lord Mayor MacCurtain. He said that the Volunteers had discovered the instigators of the crime and would deal with them. While no name was mentioned, my recollection is that it was ascribed to an officer of the police. His object in coming to me on the eve of my departure was that Dr. (later Monsignor) Hagan and, through him, the authorities in Rome would know precisely the situation in Ireland.

My Departure for Rome:

I left Ireland on the 22nd March, 1920, and arrived in Rome on 27th March, having formally received, following the usual canonical process, the relics of Oliver Plunkett at Downside Abbey, England, and conveyed them to Rome for the coming beatification. When I arrived at the Irish College, Rome, I found Seán T. O'Kelly still in bed, recovering from rheumatic fever and looking very pale and cut-up.

On the night of Saturday, 3rd April, 1920, what was described in the 'Independent' as "an amazing series of raids" were made in Dublin and many parts of Ireland by the I.R.A. on income tax offices and the residences of income tax officials. All papers dealing with taxes were destroyed. With one exception, all the raids were successful. -

"In Galway alone, where the collection will be paralysed for months to come, it is estimated that a loss of £300,000 will fall upon the British Government. Raids were carried out in Belfast and Cork, where both the Pensions and Inland Revenue offices were completely destroyed."

Installation of Cardinal Protector of the Irish
College gives opportunity for Pro-Ireland

Demonstration:

I shall have occasion henceforward to speak of the progress and position of the Irish cause in Rome.

A revolutionary change took place in Rome which had a reaction of paramount importance in ecclesiastical circles in Ireland. The ceremony of the installation of Cardinal Sbaretti as Cardinal Protector of the Irish College, which took place on Easter Sunday, 4th April, 1920, was the occasion of an enthusiastic and very moving demonstration of the new Irish national movement in the Eternal City. Hitherto, little had been heard of it in Rome, except the calumnies and misrepresentations circulated by the English news agencies and uncritically accepted by all sections of the press. Even more dangerous was the propaganda carried on by the various British citizens in Rome, civil and ecclesiastical. These included not only the Embassy officials to the Quirinal, those of the Consulate (with one exception), those of the Legation to the Holy See with their numerous

staffs, clients and friends in the social life of Rome. They included Cardinal Gasquet and his eminently able secretary, Dom Philip Langdon, O.S.B., later (1945) titular Abbot of Abingdon, who was the Procurator of the English Benedictines in Rome for many years and who died in London in the opening days of 1952. They included the many Anglophile lights of the social life of Rome, as well as the many half-foreign, half-English notabilities like Cardinal Merry del Val.

The Italian press, like the press in France and elsewhere on the Continent, was, according to our standards, very venal and open to what we would call bribes but which under the continental system were regarded as subsidies of various governments, industries, commercial enterprises, cultural and other organisations which used particular papers to voice their interests. Ireland had none of these supports outside the purely ecclesiastical Irish colony, numerous but relatively uninfluential. Hitherto, the new Irish movement was regarded as revolutionary, almost anarchical, anti-clerical and irreligious. By one stroke, Dr. Hagan, Rector of the Irish College, boldly carried the war into the enemy's country, putting an end once for all to the idea that the movement was irreligious and effectively extinguishing the few embers that remained of West-Britishism among the Irish in Rome. Dr. Hagan conceived the idea of using the ceremony of installation indirectly to counteract the anti-Sinn Féin feeling and to place the new movement as the accepted policy of Catholic Ireland.

In the eloquent and strikingly able address which Dr. Hagan prepared for presentation to Cardinal Sbaretti on behalf of the College, he dwelt on the history of the former Cardinals whom Sbaretti succeeded, emphasising particularly those who had supported the Irish efforts

against England from the days of James Fitzmaurice and the Cardinal of Como, through the time of the Confederation of Kilkenny till the temporary suppression of the College following the French invasion of Rome in 1798. In those days the Cardinal Protectors of Ireland were ex-officio Cardinal Protectors of the Irish College. The conclusion of his address was an eloquent appeal to Cardinal Sbaretti, as Cardinal Protector of the Irish College, to give that same support to Ireland which the Cardinal Protectors of Ireland formerly extended to the College.

The address was delivered in the Kirby Hall of the Irish College in the presence of about two hundred ecclesiastics, representing not only the secular clergy but all the Irish religious congregations in Rome. Among those present were the Archbishop of Sydney (Dr. Kelly), the Bishops of Sandhurst, Rockhampton, and several ecclesiastical dignitaries from Australia, Fr. Magennis, General of the Carmelites, Dr. O'Gorman, then Commissary-General of the Augustinians, and all the superiors of the Irish houses in Rome. The Cardinal sat on a raised throne, over which was suspended the new Tricolour, its first appearance in Rome. The flag was Seán T. O'Kelly's contribution to the occasion.

The effect of the address on the audience was thrilling. It was the first time since the opening of the war in 1914 that the followers of the new Irish movement had an opportunity of voicing and showing their true feelings. Enthusiasm mounted to fever point as I, in Dr. Hagan's name, read his story of papal aid to the Irish cause against England in the days of James Fitzmaurice and the Desmond war and of the "Wine from the Royal Pope" to more modern times. The following is the most important part of the enthralling address:-

"Your Eminence: In welcoming Your Eminence on behalf of the Rector and the College as Cardinal Protector of this venerable institution, now fast approaching the tercentenary of its existence, we desire first of all to express the allegiance we owe and the obedience we are ready and willing, both head and members, to extend to the Protector and Superior whom the Holy Father has graciously deigned to assign us. We do so all the more heartily since we have in Your Eminence one who has come into contact with our countrymen in many lands and particularly in the greater Ireland beyond the Atlantic. And in the second place we avail of the occasion to relate how, in cordially accepting the title and honour, Your Eminence is succeeding to no mean inheritance.

Prior to the Protestant Reformation the protectorate of our country was usually entrusted to the Cardinal who looked after English interests and who, English as he usually was, naturally took a one-sided view of the duties attached to his office. What sort of view that was hardly needs to be set forth in detail.

But the progress of the Protestant Reformation, and particularly the advent of Elizabeth of undying memory, for the first time perhaps in the history of Europe gave Ireland a place on the geographical maps that decorated the walls of the Roman Curia. And one of the results of the appearance of a hitherto ignored island was a Protector of the Kingdom of Ireland.

The Cardinal Protectors of Ireland in those days were churchmen of long foresight and broad views. They recognised the cause of Ireland was

the cause of Catholicity and the Vatican Archives can yet testify that they ceaselessly impressed on Spain that to help the Irish struggle for faith and fatherland was to cripple a heresy and its protagonist, Protestant England, by cutting off English supplies of men and money as was actually accomplished from French Huguenots and Dutch Calvinists. Under God we firmly believe that the Irish fight for faith and fatherland, seconded by Popes and Protectors, saved northwestern Europe from Protestantism.

The first Protector was Cardinal Moroni whose name is written in letters of gold in the Annals of the Council of Trent. He held that office and devoted much attention to his protectorate till 1575, when owing to the failure on the part of the vacillating and compromising Irish chiefs to carry out certain schemes he had planned for their uprising against Elizabeth, he resigned his protectorate.

To him succeeded Cardinal Alciati who doubtless had much to do with providing the arms and men that were sent from Civita Vecchia to help the Irish chiefs in their efforts against the Virgin Queen of England - help euphemistically described by the poets of those days as 'Wine From The Royal Pope', and remembered and sung by our countrymen of to-day in their patriotic songs. He too it was who probably promoted the issuing of those Papal Bulls of Gregory XIII, conceding to the Irish in arms against the Queen of England the same indulgences as were granted to the Crusaders who volunteered to drive the Turk out of Europe. He died in 1580 and appears to have been succeeded by Cardinal

Pelluno who evidently gave every help and encouragement to the great O'Neill and Red Hugh, including a renewal of the indulgences of Gregory XIII by Clement VIII, till his protectorate came to an end in 1605.

After his death the protectorate of the Kingdom of Ireland passed into the hands of the two Cardinals Barberini who held it from 1632 to 1671 and to whose lot it fell to revive the practice inaugurated by Gregory XIII and Clement VIII of furnishing the Irish with arms, and a panoply of war as well as with letters of encouragement from Urban VIII and Innocent X in the brave old days of the Confederation of Kilkenny.

[Sections omitted here.]

Gathered here to-day, Irishmen of every degree - seculars like ourselves, Franciscans, Carmelites, Dominicans, Augustinians, Trappists, Jesuits - we venture to hope that Your Eminence will act not only as a kindly father to this college but also as the chivalrous champion of an ancient land known even 1,000 years ago as the Isle of Saints, whose sons to-day are building up the Church in every land from the rising to the setting sun."

A pin could be heard fall, so tense was the emotion as the address proceeded. The Cardinal's reply was no less enthusiastically received, especially his statement that the great principles of justice and liberty should be applied to the Irish nation and that these great principles, notwithstanding the gravest opposition to them, were bound to prevail.

At the conclusion the entire assembly jumped to

their feet and all sang the "Soldier's Song" amid a scene of the most intense enthusiasm. This was only the first spark of the fire that swept through the Irish in Rome, reaching its climax in the celebrations of the beatification of Oliver Plunkett which were attended by the greater part of the Irish hierarchy. The revelation that such a Sinn Féin manifesto and such demonstrations could take place in Rome, initiated by Irish ecclesiastics with the toleration or approval of the highest ecclesiastics in Rome, was at once an inspiration and encouragement to the people at home and a vindication of the movement.

Dr. Hagan's address was previously submitted by me to the Cardinal for his approval. I found him extremely courteous and helpful, and the only passages which he asked to have eliminated were a reference to "the enemies of Ireland of high degree in Rome" and the wish that he, the Cardinal, would see that no detriment to Ireland would be allowed and that he would see that the Pope's letter to Poland was applied also to Ireland.

Dr. Hagan has the 'Osservatore Romano' taken to task for its Attitude towards Ireland:

It was the following week that a typical instance occurred, illustrating the monopoly that England enjoyed in journalistic circles and through which they were able to set out their own propaganda at will and suppress at the same time anything unfavourable. No calumny was too low to be utilised and fabrications without the shadow of foundation were employed against the Irish movement. The 'Osservatore Romano' of the 7th April, 1920, published the following notice which I give textually:-

"London, 5 (April). S. (Stefani News Agency).

The 'Star', an evening journal, reports that a fire took place on Sunday evening in

a Protestant School at Milltown and that acts of vandalism occurred the same evening in the temple (sic) of Glin. The window panes were broken and the organ damaged. All this is a new aspect of the Irish agitation."

Seizing the opportunity of reading a lesson to the 'Osservatore', Dr. Hagan at once reported the matter to the Bishop of Limerick (Dr. Hallinan). In his reply the Bishop of Limerick said:-

"The statements in question are both false."

At the Rector's suggestion the Bishop at once protested to the Secretariat of State in Rome. Count dalla Torre was instructed to call and make an explanation to the Irish College. It was the practice, the editor explained, only to publish news coming from a reputable news agency and that was done in this case, the extract from the 'Star' having been supplied by Stefani. The Rector did not fail to make a very spirited protest against the injustice of such a practice. All these press agencies were under British influence and, through lack of an Irish agency, the Irish case was neglected inasmuch as the 'Osservatore' would refuse to publish the Irish case supplied even by recognised Irish authorities, such as himself. Despite Dr. Hagan's persistent and repeated protests on such occasions, even the 'Osservatore' relapsed after a time into its old practices.

Archbishop Walsh protests against the Treatment of Political Prisoners as Criminals:

The 'Independent' of the 13th April, 1920, contains a statement from Most Rev. Dr. Walsh given to their representative on the previous day, in which he states that:-

"It is appalling to think of what we may

be on the verge of in Ireland as a result of the abominable obstinacy of the Government in treating men as criminals, who are neither convicted nor charged with any crime."

In the course of the statement the 'Independent' representative remarked:-

"The Irish side of this protest will hardly be understood in England?"

to which the Archbishop replied:-

"I have long since ceased to trouble myself about what they do or think or say about us in England."

In a letter of the 13th April, 1920, deprecating the assembling of crowds in the neighbourhood of Mountjoy Prison, Archbishop Walsh stated that he feared deplorable results would follow:-

"Enough, surely, has already been done to testify to the widespread and deeply felt sympathy of our city and its citizens with the sorely tried victims of the present unjustifiably cruel system of prison treatment in Ireland."

He suggested that they would assemble at the last Mass next day in each church in the city and suburbs where, after Mass, the Rosary could be recited by one of the priests for the welfare and protection of the prisoners.

D'Annunzio's Followers offer to join Irish Volunteers and carry on Guerilla War:

The reaction in Italy to the British atrocities, which began to develop acutely at this time, will be referred to towards the end of the year.

In mid-April, 1920, I had an interview, in the Rector's absence through indisposition, with a

delegation from D'Annunzio's Volunteers in Fiume. They were in uniform and wanted action to be taken there and then on a decision reached by their fellow Volunteers in Fiume, with the sanction of D'Annunzio, to join the Volunteers and carry on guerilla warfare with the Irish Volunteers in Ireland. I found them so enthusiastic as to be unreasonable. I could not confess to them that, as ecclesiastics, the Irish College could not organise a revolutionary invasion, even to help the duly elected government in Ireland; but I pointed out to them the obstacles which made their proposition impossible, dwelling particularly on the impossibility of their carrying on effective warfare in present circumstances owing to difficulties of language ~~of language~~ and the impossibility of foreigners like them passing undetected from place to place in Ireland, as would be essential. After almost an hour's discussion, they regretfully departed, most disappointed and deploring their inability of showing their sympathy with the cause of Irish independence. Naturally I referred them to Seán T. O'Kelly, with whom I found they had been in contact previously, perhaps through Paris. I now present to the Bureau the declaration received from the "Commando" and National Council of Fiume against the British Empire, particularly for its oppression of Ireland, and joining in the declaration of the Irish Republic.

On the 28th April, 1920, I called by direction of Dr. Hagan on Cardinal O'Connell of Boston who had arrived in Rome the day before. Naturally the Irish position in Rome was explained to his Eminence.

Seán T. O'Kelly prepares Memorandum on Irish Situation for the Pope:

It was on this same date that Seán T. O'Kelly was able to appear out after his illness, taking a walk in the garden. At this time he was much occupied in

drawing up a memorandum on the Irish national movement for presentation to His Holiness. He had consulted Dr. Hagan who, more suo, took over the entire memorandum and produced such an intransigent statement that Seán T. had positively to refuse to use it. After a stormy interview the Rector tore it up and threw it into the wastepaper basket, telling him to do with it what he liked, and abruptly leaving the room. On his departure Seán T. recovered the fragments from the wastepaper basket and he and I spent the next week re-drafting it. When we thought it was satisfactory, we had it typed and showed it to the Rector who read it through but made no remark whatsoever, merely shaking his head. It was on May 3rd that both the Rector and Seán T. left the College for the first time since their illness, to call on Cardinal O'Connell and discuss the Irish situation.

Preparations for the Beatification of Oliver Plunkett
bring Irish Bishops to Rome:

On the 29th April, 1920, I was appointed Additional Vice-Postulator in the Cause of Oliver Plunkett, in order to facilitate the making of arrangements for the beatification, in the absence of the Rector who was at that time still unable to leave the College. The first Irish Bishops to arrive in Rome for the beatification were the Bishops of Clogher and Dromore on May 5th. On May 6th Cardinal O'Connell paid a return visit to the College.

On May 10th, 1920, having completed most of the official preparations in the Secretariat of Briefs and Congregation of Rites, I officially handed over the relics of Oliver Plunkett that I had received at Downside. They were verified by the Secretary and the Under-Secretary of the Congregation. From this on, the Irish Bishops gradually continued to arrive.

Unsettled Conditions in Italy brought to
Cardinal Logue's Attention:

It should be mentioned that at this time Italy was plunging into general chaos. Communist aggressions of various kinds disturbed the country from north to south. What affected people most were the constant strikes, local or general, which were breaking out every other day. Just at this time the latest strikes were those of the bank officials, the scavengers and the drivers of hackney cars and wagon-lits attendants. One of the reasons why I mention this is that it served to bring before the Irish bishops that civil disturbances were not confined to Ireland. Within a few days of the arrival of the Cardinal and the Irish bishops, practically all of whom were staying in the College, the morning papers reported the shooting of some policemen in Ireland. At breakfast Cardinal Logue began to bemoan the condition of affairs in Ireland and the difficulties in which the Irish bishops were placed by government atrocities on one side and the shooting of policemen on the other, on which Dr. Hagan quietly remarked that crimes and shootings on a far more extensive scale were taking place every other day in Italy, from north to south, and pointed to that morning's Roman papers showing that only the very day before three men - one of whom, if I am not mistaken, was a member of the police force - were killed in a street demonstration in the Via Milano, that is, only one block away from the College. "And", said Dr. Hagan, "there has not been a word of condemnation or notice of it taken by the Cardinal-Vicar or any other ecclesiastic in Rome!" With that, the matter dropped.

This was only a small local example of the serious widespread unsettlement in Italy at the time. It was plainly on the verge of political chaos and revolution. Not only the King, but the Army itself

was exposed to daily insult, and the revolutionary demonstrations went so far as the throwing of bombs into a crowded theatre and among the crowded meetings of their adversaries in the Piazzas.

The Irish bishops who arrived in Rome for the beatification ceremonies were:-

Cardinal Logue
Dr. Harty of Cashel
Dr. O'Donnell of Raphoe
Dr. McKenna of Clogher
Dr. Mulhern of Dromore
Dr. Cohalan of Cork
Dr. Fogarty of Killaloe
Dr. O'Sullivan of Kerry
Dr. Hallinan of Limerick
Dr. Codd of Ferns
Dr. Naughton of Killala
Dr. McRory of Down and Conor
Dr. Hoare of Ardagh
Dr. Hackett of Waterford
Dr. O'Doherty of Clonfert
Dr. Morrisroe of Achonry

Dr. Hagan determines to frustrate England's efforts to obtain Holy See's condemnation of Irish

Movement:

At this time the continuous and determined effort of the English Government to obtain a condemnation of the Irish movement was coming to a head. In this they were all too well supported by those prominent English Catholics who usurped the role of spokesmen for the English laity, of whom nine-tenths were really pro-Irish, being descendants of Irish. Not even ten per cent. of the English born, as Cardinal Manning used to point out, shared the political views of these English Tories. The Rector constantly received information, not only from the highest and most reliable authorities but all through the lesser ranks of ecclesiastics in touch with English circles, and even from Irish governesses in aristocratic or diplomatic families resident in or visiting Rome. The Rector had friends in direct contact with Cardinal Peitro Gasparri, Secretary of State. Monsignor (afterwards Cardinal) Cerretti, Under-Secretary of State, was a regular welcome visitor to the

College. So too was Monsignor Ciriaci, then in the Secretariate of State (afterwards Nuncio in Prague and now Nuncio in Lisbon). Ireland had friends in most of the religious orders and often, through Italian superiors, we learned of the conversations in ecclesiastical and social circles in Rome. One of our best friends was our own banker, Commendatore Attilio Reali, who was one of the financial advisers to the Vatican. He visited the Secretariate of State every day and was a close personal friend of Cardinal Gasparri. A last source of information was not a few friendly Italian civil servants who, without any bribery on our part, through pure friendship for the country, supplied us with useful information at crucial times. Just at this very time, an official in the Telegraph Office warned us that the English Embassy, or Consulate, had on their payroll certain officials in the Central Post Office to ensure that the text of all telegrams sent by prominent Irishmen should be forwarded to the British Embassy or Consulate. He confirmed what we had long suspected, that our correspondence was closely watched. At his suggestion, we thenceforward sent all our telegrams and letters, not through the ordinary Post Offices but through the Post Office at the Central Railway Station, and so escaped their passage through the General Post Office.

In view of this anti-Irish effort by the British, Dr. Hagan determined to ensure that the official Sinn Féin viewpoint would be heard at the Vatican through the Irish bishops. While he, of course, knew that none of the bishops would support the English view, he was apprehensive that the more conservative among them would give a very limited support to the new Irish movement or would not make sufficient opposition to any suggestions

that the more violent actions of the Irish Volunteers should be condemned by the Irish episcopate. Any division of opinion among the bishops, under the circumstances, would be ruinous. At all costs a united front had to be built up and the same representations should be made by all.

It had already struck Dr. Hagan who was a very farseeing man that the first essential step was to gather the Irish bishops together in the Irish College during their visit to Rome. There, he realised, they would not be exposed to the skilled wiles and subtle anti-Irish propaganda of the Anglophiles of Rome. There they could be informed of the actual state of Irish affairs in the Roman Curia. There they all could be conveniently visited on their own ground, so to speak, by sympathetic Cardinals and curial officials and learn first hand curial views and not British versions of these views. There they could consult one another freely and arrive at decisions instantly and take common action. The great difficulty was that the College had only one guest-room. Extensive alterations and provisions had to be made to transfer the students from one whole corridor, house them elsewhere and prepared their rooms for the reception of the bishops. It involved a double set of meals in the refectory and much domestic and collegiate organisation.

Even after Easter it seemed as if the number of Irish bishops attending the beatification ceremonies would be few. Post-war conditions abroad as well as in Ireland rendered absence from Ireland or travelling difficult. At first too it seemed as if the episcopal representations would be largely of the more conservative or uncertain element. Dr. Hagan earnestly begged Dr. Fogarty, Bishop of Killaloe, who had definitely notified

him that he found it impossible to travel, to overcome his difficulties to ensure that the Sinn Féin case was properly upheld and to act as a counterpoise to Cardinal Logue. While we counted upon the support of about six other Irish bishops, we were uncertain of what degree of support or opposition might be met from another six. Moreover, a leader was needed, and this was secured by the presence of the Bishop of Killaloe. At that time we had no idea that the Bishop of Raphoe, Dr. O'Donnell, would prove so staunch.

It was extremely interesting to note the gradual warming up of the bishops from day to day. First of all, they escaped from the West-British atmosphere of Ireland, but more important was at once the combined effect of the freedom of a neutral or even friendly country and the indignation that every Irishman abroad experiences on being faced with pro-British, anti-Irish propaganda. As almost invariably happens, the Irish spirit was roused and solidified in the face of opposition. During the week preceding the beatification Seán T. O'Kelly as representative of the Dáil entertained two or more of the Irish bishops each day at lunch in his hotel with two or more of the superiors of Irish Houses in Rome.

Mr. Arthur Balfour's Audience with the Pope
fails in its object:

On 20th May, just one week after the arrival in Rome of Cardinal Logue, Mr. Arthur Balfour, then Secretary of State, was received in private audience by the Pope and afterwards by Cardinal Gasparri. All diplomatic Rome and the English press knew that the Irish question would be raised and an attempt made to secure a condemnation of the Irish movement by the Holy See. Allusions to this may be seen in the "Rome Correspondent's" despatch of the continental edition of the 'Daily Mail'

dated 26th May and in the 'Times' editorial. The 'Nation' of June, 1920, reports:-

"In spite of all denials, it can hardly be questioned that Mr. Balfour's attempt at Rome to get a papal pronouncement against Sinn Féin, or perhaps we should say against the Republican movement in Ireland, completely failed. Mr. Balfour wanted that and also wanted a voice in the appointment of the Irish bishops. He failed in both quests. The Pope thanked him for his call but there was nothing doing."

The despatch of the Rome correspondent of the continental edition of the 'Daily Mail', dated 26th May, 1920, referring to the Balfour visit, concluded:-

"The Pope has recently discussed Irish politics with Mr. Balfour and it was agreed that government by tank was no longer possible and little more praiseworthy than government by midnight assassins."

In this way the correspondent covered the chagrin of the British element at the English failure to obtain condemnation of Sinn Féin and at the warm reception accorded throughout this period by His Holiness to the Irish bishops and the "Irish Sinn Féin pilgrims" and "delegates of the Irish Republic".

It was providential that this visit of the English Secretary of State coincided with the beatification of Blessed Oliver Plunkett which brought a strong representation of Irish bishops. The mere fact of the presence of the ex-Chief Secretary of Ireland of such notorious ill-fame was, in itself, an incentive in arousing the national feeling of the Irish bishops.

Perhaps too the beatification of Joan of Arc, which occurred on the 16th May, 1920, and in which the

Irish bishops took part, had its inspiration for our Irish bishops. The week following the beatification of Joan of Arc was a week of festivities by the French and their friends in Rome. It was not merely an ecclesiastical celebration but was shared by the French Government itself which took part officially in the glorification of the great French patriot. Although diplomatic relations with France had been broken off in the opening years of the century, the French Government sent a special envoy to Rome to attend the celebrations. It may be mentioned that this was the first step towards the re-establishment of diplomatic relations between the Holy See and France, culminating in the appointment of Monsignor Cerretti as first Nuncio. We could do no less than emulate the French in their respect for the beatification of their great patriot.

Cardinal O'Connell's impassioned Address at San Clemente
in support of the Claims of Ireland;

Another influence was the address of Cardinal O'Connell in his titular church at San Clemente where on the 22nd May, 1920, he was entertained by the Irish Dominicans who have charge of that historic church. All the Irish and Australian bishops, the Abbots of Mount Melleray and Roscrea, Fr. Magennis, General of O.C.C., and the superiors of the Irish houses were among the guests. Replying to his toast, which was proposed by the Archbishop of Cashel and warmly supported by Dr. Fogarty, the Cardinal made an impassioned address in support of the claims of the Irish people to nationhood and in singularly direct words directed the Irish bishops to avoid the danger of the decay of the church in Ireland, as had happened in France, by standing by their people. He trusted that it would not be necessary for a peasant to arise and lead Ireland in driving out the invader. These straight words of the Cardinal, speaking so

outspokenly in Rome itself in such impassioned tones, made a deep impression on all his hearers. It gave courage to all friends to speak as frankly and closed the mouths of many of our ecclesiastical critics. It is unnecessary to say that the discourse which became widely circulated created an immense sensation in Irish and, as it proved, in English circles.

The next day - 23rd May, 1920 - was the beatification of Blessed Oliver. It was attended not only by the Irish bishops but by Seán T. O'Kelly, the Lord Mayor of Dublin (Laurence O'Neill) and his wife, Count and Countess Plunkett and other specially appointed delegates from the Dáil and municipal bodies. These included Dr. Bradley of Drogheda, the town so closely associated with Blessed Oliver Plunkett. Among the Dáil representatives were Art O'Brien and Count and Countess O'Byrne. Other Irish present in Rome for the celebration were Charlie McNeill, Dr. Gogarty and Mr. and Mrs. Hughes-Kelly of New York. Sir Thomas Esmonde was on duty as chamberlain for the ceremony and in the Vatican during the week.

The description of the beatification and of the ceremonies that followed in Rome during the week will be found in the 'Irish Catholic', the 'Annals' of the 'Irish Catholic Directory' as well as in the daily press.

An interesting incident that marked the ceremony in the afternoon when His Holiness descended to St. Peter's to venerate the relics of the new Beatus was the presentation of the traditional gifts. Dr. Hagan as Postulator having presented the reliquary, which was a replica of the shrine of St. Patrick's Bell; to His Holiness, the Life and picture of the new Beatus was presented by myself and finally the third traditional gift of a bouquet of flowers was presented by Dr. Patrick

O'Neill, now Bishop of Limerick. The bouquet was specially made up under my direction exclusively in the Irish national colours of green, white and yellow. I had no hope that anybody outside our Irish ecclesiastics would recognise the symbolism. What was my surprise when, immediately on the departure of the Pope as the Cardinals and diplomats began to disperse, one of the papal chamberlains on duty in full costume approached me from across the choir with a member of the Diplomatic Corps, obviously of British connection! "Are not these Sinn Féin colours?", the chamberlain asked. On my replying in the affirmative, he turned with a malicious laugh to his companion and said, "Didn't I tell you so!". So the significance of the colours of the bouquet was not lost even on the diplomats! This was the first occasion on which the Irish national colours appeared in St. Peter's.

The Joan of Arc triduum in the Gesu was attended by the Cardinal, the Irish Archbishops and the students.

The Irish Celebrations. Seán T. O'Kelly's Reception:

Our Irish celebrations arising out of the Oliver Plunkett beatification opened with a High Mass celebrated by the Bishop of Clonfert, Most Rev. Dr. O'Doherty, in the Church of San Pietro in Montorio on the Janiculum Hill where lie the bodies of O'Neill and O'Donnell. Their tombs were decorated with leaves of white and green wreathed in gold braid. A tapestry bearing the Arms of Ulster hung from a lectern and four candles burned at each corner. In a reserved space on the epistle side corresponding to the graves were pews for the Cardinal, Archbishops, Bishops, Seán T. O'Kelly, the Lord Mayor, Count Plunkett, etc. On the gospel side were the representatives of the Dáil and municipalities. The gathering, besides the Irish colony in Rome, included

Mr. and Mrs. Hughes Kelly of New York. Several representatives of the press were present. After the High Mass all passed from the Church into the Cortile of Bramante's Tempietto which was lined with seats taken from the Church. From the steps of the Tempietto, which the students had adorned with the Irish tricolour, the Bishop of Raphoe delivered a noble discourse on the Northern princes and what they stood for. I am very glad to be able to present to the Bureau a press photograph snapped on the occasion. The address itself and the personality of the orator combined with the associations of the surroundings, all made the deepest impression. It set the keynote of religious and patriotic enthusiasms which were to increase from day to day culminating in the reception given by Seán T. O'Kelly in the Grand Hotel.

The text of Seán T. O'Kelly's invitation, written in French, was of definite significance:-

"Mr. Seán O'Kelly, the Diplomatic Delegate Extraordinary of the Government of the Irish Republic, requests your presence to meet Cardinal Logue, the Bishops of Ireland and the Special Representatives of Dáil Éireann and of the Mayoral Bodies."

This reception, of which much was to be heard later, included, in addition to the Irish colony in Rome, the Archbishop of San Francisco, Most Rev. Dr. Hanna, and Monsignor Ahern, Director of the American College. The only non-Irish invited was Monsignor (afterwards Cardinal) Salotti who was prominently identified with the preparation of the Cause of Oliver Plunkett and writer of the official biography.

Naturally there were other celebrations in the Irish College itself attended by prominent Cardinals in

Curia and officials of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. The ecclesiastical celebrations in the Irish College attracted a considerable amount of attention of ecclesiastical Rome. The Church of St. Agatha, then containing the monument to Daniel O'Connell, was decorated with the immense pictures that had hung in St. Peter's on the occasion of the beatification. The facades of the Church and College were illuminated with electric lights in the then unfamiliar national colours, and tapestries with the coats-of-arms of the Irish provinces and dioceses hung from the windows.

Towards the close of the week Dr. Hagan was received in private audience by His Holiness who congratulated him on the work he had done for the cause of the beatification and for the success of the ceremonies.

English Chagrin at Success of "Irish Week in Rome":

But it was not only in Rome that the functions of the week attracted attention. The English press and politicians were keenly mortified by these Irish national celebrations in the Eternal City and in St. Peter's itself at the very time that they confidently expected a condemnation of the Sinn Féin movement by the Roman Curia. The celebrations were described as "Irish Week In Rome", "Sinn Féin Week In Rome". It was something of an anti-climax that the continental edition of the 'Daily Mail' reported on May 26th, 1920:-

"Sinn Féin Week in Rome has been full of incidents. While it would be wrong to say that the Pope has departed from his policy of non-interference with the national affairs of Europe, I am informed that His Holiness has expressed pain at and displeasure with the continuance of Irish crime. The Pope is

keenly desirous of peace everywhere and if he can in any way bring his moral support into play, he will do it. This is what he has been actually doing, both in meeting the twelve Irish bishops, giving each a private audience, and also in receiving the Irish Sinn Féin pilgrims this morning (26th May, 1920), the latter not as delegates of the Irish Republic but as private individuals."

As I have already noted, the correspondent concluded:-

"The Pope has recently discussed Irish politics with Mr. Balfour and it was agreed that government by tank was no longer possible and little more praiseworthy than government by midnight assassins."

What the Pope really said to the Irish bishops, pace the continental 'Daily Mail', will appear from the bishops' own statements to their diocesans on their returning to Ireland. I leave it to Mr. Seán T. O'Kelly to describe the purport of the conversation during his audience with His Holiness.

The bishops began to depart from Rome on the 1st June, 1920. All went home profoundly relieved that the English machinations, Catholic as well as non-Catholic, had utterly failed. Not only so, but they had realised that His Holiness perfectly understood the general Irish claim and that, so far from condemning the Sinn Féin movement, he positively sympathised with the Irish people in their claims for independence and simple justice. The one point on which His Holiness expressed anxiety was that of the frequent shooting of the police, but even this gave his visitors the opportunity of pointing out, while in no wise defending the shootings, that the Irish police were very different from the police whom His

Holiness had in mind, that every individual policeman was armed with a rifle and military weapons and were in many ways far from being guardians of the peace and people. So they left Rome much enlightened and in far different dispositions from those on their arrival. The contrast between the open display of Sinn Féin principles and of the new tricolour publicly in Rome and their suppression in Ireland could not but have given them much reason to think.

The 'Morning Post' in its issue of the 2nd June, 1920, accused the Vatican of "throwing its great weight on the side of our enemies". Canada, Ireland and Australia suffered from their activities. "Despite the lessons of the war, the Vatican still apparently persists in adding political activities to its spiritual duties".

Celebrations in honour of Oliver Plunkett were also held on the 12th June, 1920, in the Gregorian University where, as they mentioned in their letter of invitation, he had been a student of their college from 1647 to 1654. These were held in the Church of St. Ignatius.

A similar function was held in the chapel attached to Propaganda University at which a discourse was given by Monsignor, afterwards Cardinal, Laurenti.

But Irish Week in Rome had its reverberations. The Special Correspondent of the 'Irish Independent' writing from Rome on Sunday, 20th June, 1920, alludes to these reactions in the British press and parliament:-

"The debate in the Commons on the Irish reception here and the evident chagrin of the English press on the event have aroused considerable interest in this city and, most of all, among the gratified Irish.

Two remarkable comments appeared last

night in the Catholic journals. The first, in the official note of the 'Osservatore Romano' which, printed prominently on the front page in leaded type, refers to some papers which have not concealed their surprise that the Vatican did not prevent the reception by Mr. O'Kelly. Commenting on this characteristic exhibition of English impertinence the 'Osservatore' says:-

'Now, to speak plainly, we also must express our surprise that neither in the House of Commons nor in the press was any notice taken of the Rome note of Reuter's Agency which was published on the 11th instant in important foreign journals and which stated that it had it from reliable sources that the Vatican had nothing to do with the reception and that invitations to the O'Kelly reception were sent only to the Irish present in Rome and to persons of well known Irish origin and sympathies, and not to any person of other nationality and, therefore, to no Italian.

This definitely fixes the character of the gathering, which was absolutely a domestic one of Irish citizens, and explains how the Vatican not only had nothing to do with it but had no notice whatever of it. It is, therefore, somewhat curious and utterly absurd to claim that the Vatican should, in these circumstances, prevent a reception which in no way concerned it and of which it was, in fact, ignorant, and which, moreover, was held by a person with whom it had no

relations.'

So ends the quotation from the 'Osservatore'. The Catholic 'Corriere d'Italia' is more pointed and outspoken in its obviously inspired correspondent. Having alluded to the 'Times', its errors and unsoundness regarding the recent papal encyclical, he comments as follows on the O'Kelly reception:-

'We protest against this mode of considering these matters as absolutely unjust. Only those who are ignorant of Catholic practice can deliberately attempt to fix on the Pope the responsibility of particular acts which Catholics, not excluding ecclesiastical dignitaries, of different countries can participate in as individuals or as citizens. Too often in the minds of the Protestant world, there is displayed the habit of demanding from the Pope himself explanations of proceedings which Catholics, in their individual capacity, may do, or even in matters remote from his knowledge or influence. This mode of judging events is an absolute contradiction to the spirit of Catholic life and action. While it is true that Catholics bow to the authority of the Pope in the exercise of his supreme pastorate, it is equally true that their individual responsibility is not thereby suppressed. The Pope, therefore, cannot claim and never has claimed that Catholics must renounce their activity in civil and political life.

As regards the reception in question which had been honoured by a discussion in the British House of Commons, it is well to remember three things, that the Vatican was not invited at all to participate therein, that it was not previously informed of the event, and that only Irish ecclesiastics took part in it and that not even one of the many prelates of the Roman Curia was present.'

The 'Corriere' significantly concludes by remarking:-

'This evening the 'Osservatore' publishes a similar statement to the above.'

Our Special Correspondent adds that, since his arrival in Rome, Mr. O'Kelly has sought no recognition at the hands of the Vatican in any official capacity whatever."

I may mention that the above Special Correspondent was myself.

The American press of the 24th June, 1920, contains letters of Frank P. Walsh, quoting letters of Senator Warren G. Harding, Republican presidential nominee expressing sympathy for the independence of Ireland. Doubt having been cast on the authenticity of the letter, on the publication of the letter by Frank Walsh, the Senator acknowledged its authenticity.

At this time - June, 1920 - Mrs. McWhorter, President of the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, was visiting Rome and showed all along the keenest interest in affairs of Ireland in Rome. Occupying the position that she did, she was of the highest value to the Irish cause in America.

Seán T. O'Kelly has a Private Audience with the Pope:
On June 26th Seán T. O'Kelly had a private

audience with His Holiness, the result, if I am not greatly mistaken, of a message from the Holy Father that he desired to speak to him. He was received most courteously and, after sitting for a short time in the usual chair beside the Holy Father's study table, he was invited to sit with him in the central chairs in the middle of the room as was the custom in more intimate audiences in the time of Benedict XV. His Holiness asked all about himself and his illness, the beatification ceremonies, the official visitors from Ireland and the scene outside St. Peter's at which Seán had spoken and which he had witnessed from his room. He asked particularly about the reception, who were there, how many, etc., and commented on the number of the Irish colony in Rome. He asked was not Seán a deputy, which gave Seán the opportunity of explaining that he was not only a deputy for the City of Dublin but also speaker of the parliament. His Holiness spoke of Ireland and his keen sympathy and said he prayed that Ireland would obtain justice and liberty. Seán thanked His Holiness for the neutral attitude he had adopted and said that that was all they expected of His Holiness; with that neutral attitude they were sure that their cause would win.

While the attitude of the Pope throughout the conversation was most sympathetic, he remarked that, if he might make a suggestion, he hoped that the methods that Ireland would use in her struggle would be prudent and commendable to the world. As Seán was in the happy position of knowing the various points raised by His Holiness in his interviews with the Bishops, he had no difficulty in recognising what the Pope had in mind by this remark. Asking His Holiness directly what he had in mind, His Holiness alluded to the shooting of

police. Seán T. was at once able to point out the military nature of the R.I.C. who carried rifles and revolvers and were practically a military body. His Holiness spoke on the question of the ambushes of police. Again Seán emphasised the military character and tactics of the police force, their raids, etc., and that in war an elementary object was the use of surprise tactics, that the I.R.A. were a weak body, poorly equipped, and had to fight the military power of an immense Empire, and that these ambushes were a well-known ruse de guerre.

Seán T. was immensely pleased with the general result of the interview which, as I have already stated, came on the initiative of His Holiness, the Pope, who wished to be reassured by direct evidence that the complaints in the English press and House of Commons were devoid of foundation as far as the Holy See was concerned. The interview formed a fitting finale to Seán T.'s Roman visit and convinced him more than ever that he could leave Rome feeling that the Irish cause was safe as far as the Pope was concerned.

Immediately after his interview with His Holiness, Seán T. O'Kelly had another interview with Monsignor (later Cardinal) Cerretti, Secretary for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, a great friend of Monsignor Mannix and one of the most sympathetic and influential friends Ireland had in Rome.

Irish Bishops make Statements to their People on
the Pope's Attitude towards Ireland:

The Irish press both Dublin and provincial at this same period contained many statements of the Irish Bishops on their return to Ireland from the beatification ceremonies, for instance, among others, the Archbishop of Cashel, the Bishop of Clonfert, the Bishop of Waterford and Lismore. Dr. Hackett (Bishop of

Waterford and Lismore), speaking in Dungarvan on his return from Rome, was reported as follows by the 'Irish Catholic' on the 25th September, 1920:-

"His Lordship said:-

'No matter what calumnies have been uttered or stated against us, or no matter what influences have been brought to bear against the fair name of Ireland, the Holy Father's affection for us is as keen as of old and, in connection with the long-cherished aspirations of Ireland, they have not only his sympathy but his paternal blessing.'

Repudiating the false assertions that the Irish Bishops were summoned to Rome to receive a rebuke, he asserted that the whole concern of the Holy Father was 'the trying phase through which our country is passing -

that the people would be ever true as they were in the past, that the traditions of the Irish people in the love of God's law would be observed, and that no provocation, such as they were receiving at present, will make them forget that they were Irish Catholics with grand traditions.

I wish you clearly to understand that, no matter what statement you may hear made or from any quarters, they are by biassed authorities, that the Irish cause - and the Irish nation - is kept sacred, and that there is no more sympathy anywhere in our provocations than in the heart of Benedict.

Ireland is going through a phase such as we never saw before. On the one hand, there is a system of tyranny - I call it nothing else - that is driving our people to desperation. I have no sympathy with crime in any shape or form. The law that you and I are bound by is God's law and that law will justify nothing against it. By reason of the position which I occupy, I am bound to denounce crime whenever it is committed.

No matter what a man's politics may be, each man has a right to his opinions. We cannot close our eyes to this fact that Ireland as a nation has spoken and her voice will be heard, with God's help, and when she was spoken, no Irishman worthy of the name should oppose that onward march."

The 'Independent' of the 1st July, 1920, contains a summary of the reply of Most Rev. Dr. O'Doherty to an address of the people of Loughrea:-

"The cause of Ireland is appreciated in Rome because Rome knows what real justice is - not the justice and right of which English statesmen have prated so much and practised so little, but the justice founded on the eternal law of God - justice for nations as well as for individuals."

The 'Independent' summary continues:-

"Speaking of a reference in the address to attempts to blacken the Irish cause at the Vatican, Dr. O'Doherty said:-

'They tried to do more than that

but I can tell you the Irish situation is known in Rome and, if there was any shadow of doubt about it amongst the authorities there, we did not keep our mouths closed regarding the rights and wrongs of Ireland. Wily and experienced as the English diplomatists are, our people have their ambassadors there - priests and laymen - working unceasingly for the Irish cause without any thought of self. The visit of the Irish bishops was calculated to strengthen the efforts of our representatives."

Among the many visitors in Rome at this period was the Archbishop of Manilla and his brother, the Rector of the Irish College at Salamanca. The Archbishop too contributed his part in emphasising the justice of the Irish cause.

Result of Local Government Elections:

Meantime another important phase of the Irish situation had developed. The Local Government elections had taken place in June, 1920, resulting, as everybody in Ireland anticipated, in a complete victory for Sinn Féin. A clear analysis of the results will be seen in the pamphlet, "Irish Councils For Irish Freedom" - see my volume, "Sinn Féin Publications, 1920-1921" - and pages 58-66 of de Valera's "Ireland's Claim To The Government Of The U.S.A., 27th October, 1920". The analysis gives a very complete account of the returns and of the significance of the results. These not only confirmed the general election of December, 1918, but also the Municipal elections of January, 1920. In the municipal elections three-fourths of the contests had been won by Sinn Féin; in the County Council nine-tenths were won. The results of the election were a complete

answer to the misrepresentation of the English press that the Parliamentary elections of December, 1918, did not for one reason or another represent the true feeling of the country, whether on the ground that the register was not up to date or that it was fought on momentary issues such as conscription. Of course, the Irish Parliamentary Party was unheard of at any election held afterwards.

The Washington correspondent of the 'Times' in a despatch from Chicago on the 22nd June, 1920, represents from an English point of view the attitudes of Americans and Irish-Americans at a time when the Republican Convention in Chicago and the Democratic Convention in San Francisco were being held. It appeared in the 'Times' on the 24th June.

Dr. Mannix en route for Ireland is honoured
in America:

On the 19th July, 1920, Dr. Mannix received the Freedom of the City of New York from the Mayor at the City Hall.

On the same day - 19th July, 1920 - questions were asked in the British House of Commons as to whether the Government would allow Dr. Mannix to land in Ireland. The Catholic Colonel Archer-Shee refers to the Archbishop as "this man" and asks Bonar Law if he knew that:-

"Loyal Catholics resent this man's statement as much as anyone else, and will the Right Honourable Gentleman see that he is deported from this country."

Sir W. Davidson indignantly enquired, if no representation was being made by the British representative in the Vatican, why he was being retained in the position.

The Irish papers of the 20th July, 1920, give a report of the reception and the address to Archbishop

Mannix and the wild indignation of English opinion.

Archbishop Mannix was received with immense enthusiasm in most of the great centres of the United States. On the 25th July he was received and entertained at Washington and Mr. de Valera was present. According to a report on his speech on this occasion, de Valera declared that:-

"British troops in Ireland are being used to hold down the Republican that he may be beaten by the Unionists. The infamous designs of those who would divide Ireland to conquer it are again being worked out."

He declared that peace between England and Ireland would be established only when the last British troops were withdrawn from Ireland.

The 'Corriere d'Italia' of the 29th July, 1920, contains a long article (a column and a half) written by a well-known Roman layman, Signor Cancani, on the "Latest Developments of the Struggle in Ireland". Signor Cancani was a very staunch friend of the Irish cause in Catholic circles in Rome.

Cardinal Gasquet's activity in Rome on behalf
of England:

At the Sixth National Congress of England opened at Liverpool on the 30th July, 1920, at which Cardinal Bourne presided, His Eminence, Cardinal Gasquet, painted in glowing colours his work in the Roman Curia on behalf of the Empire, despite the efforts of Austrian, Bavarian and Prussian representatives there. He said it fell to him constantly to be seeing the Holy Father in order that he might counteract the influences which he felt were detrimental to his country. The Irish in Rome had abundant evidence of the activities of His Eminence and his secretary, Dom Philip Langdon, O.S.B., against

the Irish cause. At another meeting of this Sixth National Congress of England, Cardinal Gasquet incidentally revealed his close relations with the leading English politicians, stating, "The other day, I lunched with Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Bonar Law", etc.

Illustrating the constant calumnies disseminated about Ireland in the press was one circulated by Reuter on the 29th July, 1920, saying that the Vatican considered Dr. Mannix's action blameworthy. Receiving a cablegram from the Melbourne 'Advocate' on the matter, I interviewed Monsignor Tedeschini who informed me that no Vatican official had made any such statement and that the Vatican in no wise entered into the matter. He referred to the manner in which the press were continually endeavouring to elicit declarations from the Pope on their respective sides and authorised me to say that the statement was false and without foundation. This denial was also published in the 'Catholic Bulletin'.

The Arrest of Dr. Mannix causes Consternation:

The arrest of Dr. Mannix on the 10th August, 1920, created an immense sensation both in Ireland and England and made a very painful impression in the Roman Curia. The protests in Ireland and Great Britain as well as that of the Australian Hierarchy were published and raised much comment in the Italian press.

Following a request for an audience, I was received by His Holiness on August 18th. His Holiness at once asked about Monsignor Mannix of whom he had learned all the details from Monsignor Cerretti. I took the occasion to show him a telegram I had received the previous day from Melbourne, sent by the Secretary of a monster meeting of sixty thousand Melbourne citizens, held on Sunday, 15th August, emphatically

protesting against the British Government's unwarranted interference with the Archbishop's personal liberty. His Holiness showed the greatest anxiety for the Archbishop and expressed his opinion that the British Government had acted wrongly in prohibiting his landing in Ireland. He asked me was there any way in which he could intervene in favour of Dr. Mannix at the moment. He was genuinely distressed as regards Dr. Mannix personally, the unhappy results that were bound to follow and the condition of affairs that it revealed. I had no suggestions to make but naturally I reported the interview to Dr. Hagan who was then in Ireland for any action he might wish to take.

Amid all this excitement and indignation, the arrest of Terence MacSwiney, Lord Mayor of Cork, on the 12th August, 1920, was hardly noticed.

Carl Ackermann explores the Possibility of a Settlement of the Irish Question:

An article by Carl W. Ackermann in the issue of the 'Atlantic Monthly' for April, 1922, published in America, would be well worth noting. It refers to negotiations for a settlement of the Irish question in 1920 on the basis of mediation by Colonel House. Ackermann came to London to organise foreign news for a syndicate of American newspapers. About June, 1920, Colonel House arrived in London where he received an urgent letter from Sir Horace Plunkett, pleading with him to assume the role of mediator between England and Ireland. At the joint request of Colonel House and Sir Basil Thomson Mr. Ackermann went to Dublin to explore the possibilities of the peace.

Towards the end of August, 1920, after a course of treatment in some Baths near Lucca, Seán T. O'Kelly left Italy, arrived in France on the 28th and, after a few days in Angers, was to arrive in Paris on the 10th

"The agonising martyrdom of Lord Mayor MacSwiney in Cork is having an echo in France. The French press for many days past has devoted a good deal of space to the British Government's policy regarding the dying Mayor and the whole Irish situation. Severe and bitter criticism of Premier Lloyd George is to-day expressed for the first time by the Parisian newspapers which point out that daily they have been hoping that MacSwiney's liberation would be decreed by Lloyd George's Cabinet and that, therefore, they had no right to comment on the Mayor's and the Government's action.

Now, under the heading, 'Appeal to England', 'Le Matin' opens the fire of criticism of Lloyd George's Cabinet:-

'Is it possible the British Government will allow this slow sacrifice to reach its end? Till now, we had refrained, in order not to injure our British friends, from expressing an opinion concerning their attitude with regard to Ireland. But we should show great lack of interest in their good name if we did not place hope in their clemency.

It would be unloyal of us not to warn them of the peril they risk in letting the struggle between England and Ireland turn into a moral conflict between England and civilisation.

Everywhere the same anxious question is asked, 'Have they saved him?', and

magistrates, ministers and the king himself reply, 'We cannot'. This refusal serves only to ennoble the victim. The Lord Mayor, yesterday unknown, dying, is known by the immense British Empire. His death will propagate Ireland's religion, convince the world England is implacable, that she does not chose between her enemies and confounds criminals and saints.

It is an act of sincere amity to say to our allies, if there is yet time, 'Don't make any martyrs!'.'

Equally severe is the comment of 'Le Rappel', while 'L'Oeuvre' warns Lloyd George of the danger he is exposing himself to, and 'La Liberté' parallels his Russian and Irish policies. 'Le Rappel' says:-

'MacSwiney's death is murder and it is unnecessary.'

'L'Oeuvre' says:-

'Uncle George's political fortune is endangered. ...'."

The Lord Mayor of Cork had been deported to England from Cork on the 17th August, 1920, on a destroyer. He was sentenced to two years' imprisonment.

Gavan Duffy's Expulsion from Paris:

A report of the Havas Agency of September 4th, 1920, published in the Italian papers, stated that some journals had announced that Gavan Duffy's expulsion from Paris at this time was due to a protest from the British Government. Havas declared, however, that:-

"It is due to the insistence of the French

Government who had set out the inconveniences it suffered by tolerating a pro-Irish agitation in France and that the Irish representatives

September, 1920.

In the beginning of September the Irish Hierarchy published a strong protest against the action of the British Government in preventing Dr. Mannix visiting Ireland. In the course of the protest they wrote:-

"The Archbishop has used his right as a citizen to criticise the conduct of the Government and to set forth fearlessly in plain and dignified language the claims to democracy in Australia and the rights of his own people in Ireland to freedom, on the principle of self-determination. And for this exercise of citizen-right he, an Archbishop of the Catholic Church, has been treated by the British Government as an outlawed criminal who was not allowed to set a foot on his native soil.

We all augured for him at the hands of the sovereign Pontiff when we recently had the honour and privilege of enjoying ourselves on the occasion of the beatification of Blessed Oliver Plunkett, the affectionate reception of a loyal son by a loving Father."

The indignation against the treatment of Dr. Mannix grew from day to day, not only in Ireland but Europe and America. The analogy with Cardinal Mer was a frequent theme.

The Case of Terence McSwiney attracts Attention Abroad:

From the end of August, 1920, the case of MacSwiney began to attract attention in America and Europe. A Paris despatch to the New York 'World' Wednesday, August 25th (or Wednesday, September 1st) says:-

Colonel Johnson in his letter of the 27th May, 1920, says:-

'I am directed by the Government to inform you there is no foundation for your report that notepaper or any writing paper was removed from 76 Harcourt Street.'

During Republican raids on posts, reports written on Dáil Éireann papers were discovered:-

- A. - Report by Inspector McFeely of G-Division, D.M.P., dated 15th January, 1920, on Professor Paul Chauviré, N.U.I., initialled by Assistant Commissioner W.C.F. Redmond, dated 16th January, who sent it to the Inspector-General of the R.I.C.
- B. - A private letter of Lieutenant P. Attwood, Royal Sussex Regiment, General Staff (Intelligence), dated 8th April, 1920, to a demobilised friend, Ward.
- C. - Report of Captain F. Harper Shove, General Staff (Intelligence), Dublin District, dated 24th April, 1920, to Chief Commissioner, D.M.P.

One other letter is of importance, written by Captain F. Harper Shove at St. Andrew's Hotel, 2nd March, 1920, from which it is plain he had "been given a free hand to carry on".

The 'Irish Catholic' of the 11th September, 1920, answering one of the misrepresentations of the attitude of the Holy See on Ireland, quotes the following reference from the 'Osservatore Romano':-

"We are authorised to declare that this last part of the information of the London

journal is altogether arbitrary and rests on no foundation whatever."

This refers to an account by the Rome Correspondent of the 'Universe' of an interview with Cardinal Gasparri which seemed to reflect on the bishops and priests of Ireland.

English Efforts to induce the Pope to condemn
Hunger-striking:

Just at this time - the beginning of September 1920 - the question of the ethics of hunger-striking became one of intense agitation. One remarkable feature all through the Anglo-Irish struggle was the bitter antagonism and persistent efforts of the aristocratic element among the English lay Catholics against the Irish movement and its leaders. In this unfortunately they were backed up by a section of the English Catholic press and by a number of the more prominent of the highly-placed English-born ecclesiastics, notably by Cardinal Bourne in Westminster, by Cardinal Gasquet in Rome and by a few - a very few - bishops, and these of English birth. I may mention Dr. Vaughan, Titular Bishop of Sebastopolis.

On the other hand, we should always remember the outstanding and invaluable assistance of Dr. Amigo, Bishop of Southwark, and the restraining effects of most, or all of the Irish-born bishops. The friendly feeling too of English-born bishops, like Dr. Burton, the Bishop of Clifton, must have had a valuable restraining effect.

Some of the more prominent members of the religious orders, so far from being friendly, made themselves prominent, either in private or in public, in their denunciation of the Sinn Féin movement and in their pitiful attempts to prove their loyalty as British

subjects. This anti-Irish streak was also noticeable among the prison chaplains. The forced sojourn of Monsignor Mannix in England demonstrated in many ways the unchivalrous attitude of the majority of the English-born ecclesiastics. So far from showing any sympathy, they boycotted him and many did not hesitate to join in the general attitude of Englishmen in denunciation against him.

The hunger strike of the Lord Mayor of Cork and the universal sympathy that it elicited abroad sorely irritated English sentiment. At once it was made a political question in which the English Catholics I have referred to fully participated. Naturally they had to bear the full brunt of the scandal taken by their English, Anglican and Puritan fellow-citizens, but it is to be feared they were all only too naturally inclined to take up the same attitude themselves. As always, they vehemently declared that the attitude of Irish Catholics in politics was keeping back the conversion of England and that, only for the Irish, England was on the highroad to Catholicism, or would have been Catholic long ago. Without delay they set out with characteristically secret and astute English intrigue to procure a condemnation of hunger-striking by the Holy See. At once this question became in their eyes a matter of supreme importance and urgency. The season helped them for at this time - August - most ecclesiastics were out of Rome and the Congregations only half-staffed. Availing of this favourable state of affairs, they had the question formally brought before the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, the supreme authority on faith and morals. It was the Congregation, above all others, whose proceedings were closely guarded by secrecy. Its Cardinal-Secretary was Cardinal Merry

del Val who, though belonging to a Spanish family of Irish origin, was entirely English by education and outlook. It was a question which could equally have been brought before the Sacred Penitentiary. The matter was kept in such extreme secrecy that it was only at the very last moment - in the first week of September - that the first inkling of it reached my ears and I think I was the first Irishman in Rome to hear of it. It was the indiscreet remark of an English member of a religious order, unable to restrain his anti-Irish indignation, that made me make enquiries. Monsignor Cerretti too, at the same time, sent urgently to me for a statement on the Irish view on the hunger-strike of the Lord Mayor but, unfortunately, I was in Tivoli and absent for some hours from the College. I went into Rome the next day, to find that the matter had become so urgent that Monsignor Cerretti had sent for Fr. Magennis, O.C.C., who fortunately was in Rome and dealt with the immediate situation.

One outcome of the move was to make all concerned alive to the dangerous issues involved and that these issues were very much more difficult and complex than appeared to the English prosecutors or to the first reactions of some of the Roman ecclesiastics when the question was broached.

The history of what followed, while very interesting, would take volumes to detail and resulted in the matter being shelved for the time being. It will be of interest, however, to record two or three incidents which demonstrate that theologians of the highest order and dignity were very strongly of opinion that the hunger-strike of the Lord Mayor of Cork was justifiable. Naturally, the more general reaction among ecclesiastics in Rome in the first instance was against

the morality of the hunger-strike, though it is remarkable that no one outside the English ranks cast any doubt on the sincerity of the attitude of the Lord Mayor of Cork.

The question became one of very general and very lively discussion in the beginning of September, both in private conversations and in the public press, not only in Ireland and England but on the Continent and in America. Two articles were widely quoted at the time, one in 'L'Ami Du Clergé' of the 30th September, 1920, and the other written by M.F. Girerd, a Belgian, in 'La Revue Du Clergé Français', 1st-15th October, 1920.

Victor Bucaille in the 'Semaine Religieuse' of Nice (5th November, 1920) noting the division of opinion among theologians and himself, defends the morality of the hunger-strike. He refers to an unnamed "eminent theologian" with whom he had discussed the matter in Paris.

Fr. P.J. Gannon, S.J., wrote sustaining the morality of the hunger-strike in an article in the September number of 'Studies'. Other Irish articles appeared later when the question was shelved by the Holy Office at the end of the year.

A reference should be made to a letter of protest by Fr. W.H. Kent, O.S.C., addressed to the 'Tablet' (11th September, 1920) defending the morality of the hunger-strike.

Partly arising out of an adverse criticism on hunger-striking by Fr. Bernard Vaughan, S.J., the editor of the Jesuit organ of the U.S.A., 'America', defended its morality.

Long before that - in fact, in 1918 - Canon (later Monsignor) Waters, then Chaplain in Mountjoy Prison, has declared as his opinion:-

"The hunger-strike is immoral on every test that can be applied to a human act."

This was quoted with great satisfaction by the Bishop of Sebastopolis. In the end their opinion was not upheld by the Holy See.

The lively discussions in Rome disclosed some interesting facts. It was not long before we discovered that the Cardinal Penitentiary, Cardinal Giorgi, with the support of his officials, was not only of the opinion of the morality of the hunger-strike but was, in fact, anxious that the case would be referred to the Sacred Penitentiary rather than to the Holy Office, in order that he might have the opportunity of expressing his opinion when dealing with the question. In fact, as we learned afterwards, he had a long and detailed report drawn up on the question and available for use in case the matter was referred to him. As far as I know, Cardinal Giorgi's attitude has never appeared in print.

It was even more satisfactory to learn that the Assessors of the Holy Office itself, its chief theologian and executive officer, Monsignor Lottini (not the Dominican of that name), very strongly upheld the morality of the Lord Mayor's hunger-strike. His attitude made it almost certain that a condemnation of the hunger-strike by the Holy Office would not take place.

I find the events of these days referred to in my diary of the 18th May, 1920, when, as Rector of the Irish College in Rome, I entertained the Archbishop of Sydney, Archbishop Kelly, to dinner. It was more or less an Australian function. Among those also present were Cardinal Cerretti, the Bishop of Bathurst, Dr. Norton, Fr. Magennis, O.C.C., Fr. Sylvester, O.F.M.Cap., Dr. McGrath, O.S.A., Dr. Canice O'Gorman, O.S.A., Fr.

Garde, O.P., Fr. Brown, O.P., Fr. Pacificus, O.F.M., Fr. Edmund Power, S.J., Fr. Denis McNerney, S.J., and others. The conversation turned on Terence MacSwiney's hunger-strike. Cardinal Cerretti said that Benedict XV. suffered ~~due~~ much anxiety over the matter and was determined to do all he could to avoid a decision at that time. He was particularly anxious to keep the matter from the Holy Office. He wished to leave the matter between Terence MacSwiney and his confessor. Cardinal Cerretti then went on to allude to the position of Cardinal Giorgi (Cardinal Penitentiary) who had prepared all the materials for a decision justifying Terence MacSwiney's hunger-strike in case the matter was referred to him. Cardinal Cerretti on the same occasion referred to his own efforts in the case. This table conversation took place mainly between the Cardinal, Fr. Magennis and myself with the Archbishop of Sydney, who sat immediately opposite, silent and, I am sure, disapproving. The Bishop of Bathurst was on the Archbishop's right, and Fr. Sylvester, with ears uncomfortably cocked, on my left.

In June, 1921, Cardinal Sili, a cousin of Cardinal Gasparri (Secretary of State), spoke of the anti-Irish feeling of Cardinal Gasquet. He illustrated his point by saying that Cardinal Gasquet had written from London in 1920 to the Cardinal Secretary of State, stating that the hunger-strike of the Lord Mayor of Cork should be condemned by the Holy See as it was causing much injury to religious feeling in England.

In the midst of all this agitation over the Lord Mayor of Cork, the National Council of the Partito Popolare passed a resolution about September, 20th, 1920, advocating an immediate settlement of the Irish question on the principles of liberty and justice.

I alluded before to the action of Monsignor

Cerretti in sending urgently for a statement on the Irish view of the hunger strike. I find that it was on September 21st that I spoke to Monsignor Cerretti for the first time with reference to the hunger-strike and pleaded very strongly against any declaration being made on the subject until the views of the Irish bishops and all the circumstances of the case could be ascertained from Ireland. It was on the 26th or 27th September, Monsignor Cerretti asked me for any information or papers that would give the Irish view on the hunger-strike of the Lord Mayor. As I was paying a visit to the English villa over the Alban Lake, I failed to get Monsignor Cerretti's message. When he ascertained I was absent, recognising the urgency of the case, he at once sent for Fr. Magennis who furnished him with whatever information and papers he could. During the following week we were in touch with one another and with Monsignor Cerretti on the matter.

The banquet given by the Irish and English priests to Dr. Mannix in London took place on the 30th September, 1920. The Bishops of Southwark, Portsmouth and Cloyne and three hundred Irish and English priests attended.

Archbishop Walsh refuses to support M.J. O'Connor's Proposed Settlement:

The 'Independent' of the 16th September, 1920, quotes extracts from a letter of Dr. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin, absolutely refusing even to consider a proposed settlement scheme propounded by M.J. O'Connor, solicitor, Wexford. In it the Archbishop refers to the Ministry's most insolent conduct towards Ireland and he cannot but regard the putting forward of any plan of settlement as "tending to give them most material help and furnishing them with a means of throwing dust into the eyes of the public by opening up a discussion on the points in detail". He asked three questions:-

"Are they prepared to give Ireland the independence in favour of which the electorate declared so clearly and so emphatically at the general election? Are they prepared to put it in the form of a Parliamentary Bill? Let them stand or fall by the reception of that Bill in the two Houses of Parliament? For myself, I can only say that until all three questions are answered in the affirmative, I do not see my way to spending one minute of my time in what I regard as the unprofitable and even dangerous work of supplying the Ministry with subject for dissection."

The Italian press reported a speech of Lloyd George at Carnarvon on the 9th October, 1920, seeking to justify the reprisals in Ireland and rejecting the idea of giving Ireland Dominion Home Rule because it would then possess its own army and the control of the ports:-

"We cannot put the fate of a great country in jeopardy through the mad acts of any Irish group."

He endeavoured to confuse the issue by stating that the attitude of the Irish people was full of uncertainty. In 1914 they had adhered to the war; in 1917 they had conspired with the German submarines; in 1918 they were ready to raise an army and strike Great Britain in the back.

Dr. Hagan and others receive copy of Dr. P. McCartan's Protest against British Atrocities in Ireland:

On the 14th October, 1920, Patrick McCartan, Envoy of the Republic of Ireland, addressed a formal protest to the Government of the United States against the British atrocities in Ireland. On October 26th a copy of this note was sent to each of the Foreign Legations

in Washington. He forwarded a copy on the same day to Dr. Hagan for presentation to the Cardinal of State. These atrocities were in full blast at this period. The 'Times' (London) published a letter, dated 16th October, from the Archbishop of Tuam protesting against these reprisals. It is a good illustration of the barbarities of the newly arrived Black and Tans.

Important Declaration of Irish Bishops in favour
of Self-Determination for Ireland:

The Irish Bishops at their general meeting in Maynooth in October (19th) drew up a very important declaration on the Irish situation, described by the 'Independent' as "possibly one of the weightiest ever made in the age-long struggle for Irish freedom" in which they declared unreservedly for self-determination. The 'Independent' goes on:-

"Declaring that Ireland has been reduced to a state of anarchism by terrorism, partiality and the Government failure to apply in Ireland the principles which they have proclaimed as characteristics of government, they say that the position has been rendered practically impossible. They denounce the palliation of outrages of all descriptions by Crown forces, these outrages being more than half-denied and less than half-rebuked by a Cabinet Minister and equivalently condoned by his superior in the British Government. They lay the blame for the frightfulness, not on the instruments of terrorism but on their masters who are designated as the 'architects of anarchy'."

The Bishops sum up the position regarding Ulster by saying that Ulster must not suffer the contamination

of a Dublin parliament but all Ireland must be coerced for the sake of the North-East, and even Tyrone and Fermanagh must be put under a Belfast Government against their wills. The Hierarchy demand a full enquiry into the recent atrocities by a tribunal, while they denounce the exclusion of the Most Rev. Dr. Mannix from Ireland and the continued imprisonment of Lord Mayor MacSwiney and the other hunger-strikers. Cardinal Logue and twenty-eight Bishops signed the declaration.

On the 25th October, 1920, the news of the death of the Lord Mayor of Cork was brought by Commendatore Cortese to whom I have referred previously.

A statement of Ireland's claim for recognition as a sovereign state was presented to Wilson by de Valera and was dated 27th October.

Terence MacSwiney's Death arouses Sympathy
for Ireland Abroad:

The death of the Lord Mayor of Cork created immense repercussions abroad. His fight was one of the greatest factors in fostering public opinion in favour of Ireland and utterly alienating any respect for Great Britain. Everywhere it was a subject of everyday conversation. Day by day the journals reported the various reactions. All spoke in the most feeling terms of sympathy and admiration for the Lord Mayor's struggle. His death and funeral were one of the few Irish events reported at great length in the continental papers.

Then followed the execution of Kevin Barry. In Italy, at least, this too excited much sympathy and horrified, more especially, the more intelligent and cultured peoples.

Italian Deputy plans Demonstrations of Sympathy
for Ireland:

In view of the rising tide of sympathy for Ireland.

immediately following the death of Terence MacSwiney, Lord Mayor of Cork, and the execution of Kevin Barry, and particularly in view of the declaration of the Irish Bishops, the Catholic leaders in Italy thought that they could no longer postpone a public expression of their sympathy with Ireland and of protest against English atrocities there. Our leading champion was the Onorevole Angelo Mauri, Professor of the Catholic University of Milan, an elected Deputy of the Parliament and one of the chief leaders and orators of the Partito Popolare. (Under the Fascist regime he had to retire into private life but retained his chair in the University.) He got into touch with Dr. Hagan and made known his anxiety that some public steps should be taken and discussed with him what was in his mind. Taking the declaration of the Irish Bishops of the 19th October as the basis of his action, he proposed to have it published in the press, particularly in that of the Partito, certain that its publication would call a general response in its ranks. Then it would be easy to organise public demonstrations in the principal cities of Italy. These views fell in with those of Dr. Hagan. The ways and means were discussed and particularly the means necessary to foresee and overcome the inevitable obstacles. Several meetings were held at the Irish College. For the proposed Roman demonstration, it was agreed to accept the proffered services of the Circolo Cattolico of the University students who, on the occasion of the execution of Kevin Barry, had intimated their ~~their~~ intense indignation to the Rector.

Accordingly, the Bishops' declaration of October, 1920, was translated into Italian, the translation being done by Monsignor Sinibaldi of the Roman Vicariate who was confessor to the Irish College. Five thousand copies of the Italian translation, with five thousand

copies of the French translation received from Paris, were printed for Dr. Hagan. One thousand of these were posted to the press, to the diplomatic corps, to the parliamentary deputies, to prominent ecclesiastics and to others in Rome and elsewhere. The Circolo (the Catholic University Students' Union) distributed the remaining copies by post and otherwise. To the best of my recollection, the expenses of printing and publication of the translation of the Bishop's letter were largely met by a very generous subscription from Miss Hayden, the former proprietress of the Pension Hayden, who gave it for any purpose Dr. Hagan thought it would help.

Mauri's letter, dated 5th November, obtained wide circulation in the Italian press. He said:-

"The anguished appeal of the Irish bishops cannot but have a profound echo in the hearts of the Italian people. Italy, which has always thrilled with a noble sense of solidarity with peoples who fight and suffer in the supreme effort for liberty, cannot remain indifferent to the cry of martyred Ireland at the rending of its sons and of its lands by the inhuman violence of the present British Government. The time has come when the horror of the cruelty of the English troops must be made known and expressed in our country."

Having alluded to the magnificent outburst of indignation of the entire world on the invasion of Belgium by the German troops and the burning of Louvain, he averred that:-

"The bloody English repressions in her sister island are no less inhuman.

It is to be all the more reprobated since it is inspired and commanded, despite the generous repudiation on the part of a select section of public opinion in England itself, by a Government which loves to parade itself as the champion of liberty of other peoples, and this, in an historic period in which the brotherhood of peoples and the respect of nationalities have been reasserted as the very basis of human society. "

He concluded by saying:-

"What I call for to-day is that the truth be made known in the press and in public meetings and that Italy should not be an accessory by its inert silence in the ruin of this noble country."

The editor of the 'Corriere d'Italia' in publishing this letter expressed the willingness with which he published it and to which he gave his fervent adherence. The same issue of the 'Corriere d'Italia' contained an article, entitled "Two Words", the first on the Lord Mayor of Cork and the second, at great length, a most moving comment on the execution of the eighteen-year-old student, Kevin Barry.

I interrupt the story to note that on the 6th November, 1920, the Feast of All the Saints of Ireland, all the Masses in the College and by the Irish priests in Rome were celebrated for the intentions of the Bishops, that is, peace, freedom and spiritual and temporal blessings for Ireland. The High Mass of the day, celebrated by the Very Rev. Canice O'Gorman, O.S.A., was sung by the combined choirs of the Irish College, Irish Franciscans and the Irish Augustinians. It was attended by Fr. Magennis, O.C.C., by the Redemptorist

General, Fr. Patrick Murray, by the Superiors and students of all the Irish Colleges and by the Marquis MacSwiney.

The 'Osservatore Romano' bearing the date, 11th November, 1920, published the full text of the Bishops' October declaration, together with an admirable commentary. It is important to note that this commentary was written by Monsignor Cerretti, Secretary for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, afterwards Cardinal and Nuncio in Paris. The publication of the declaration with the 'Osservatore's' commentary naturally resulted in the widespread circulation of the declaration in Italy and throughout the Catholic world. We made a summary of the article and telegraphed it to the 'Irish Independent' which published it on the 12th November. The deluge of press extracts which we received in the course of the month testified to the effect of the article in Italy.

Speaking at Harrogate on Armistice Day, 1920, Dr. Mannix said that he did not rescind or withdraw a single word; the Irish were being butchered, their houses burned over their heads and their sons and husbands shot before their eyes; and that was Armistice Day when they were rejoicing that the Great War had ended all wars and that there was to be peace everlasting.

In the same group of notes made for reference in my diary under the date, 12th November, 1920, I find the following extracts - I give it verbatim as I wrote it:-

"Hugh Martin in 'Daily News': As I leave the theatre for a little while ... what else can I, as an Englishman, do except bow my head in shame.. The people of England would share in the shame if they had lived through this three months on Irish soil. It is an abiding

disgrace to the Press of England - a crime against truth and liberty - that so few of them do know."

[I cannot at present link this extract with its occasion.]

A signed Report of the British Section of the Women's League for Peace and Freedom issued on the 12th November speaks of the spies and informers, debasing methods of espionage, lawless intimidation and revenge. The Report states:-

"The war waged by the English authorities is waged largely on women and children and generally on unarmed men
fasten upon Sinn Féiners the responsibility for outrages, of which the Government forces were guilty
English papers, for the most part, do not record these (murders by Crown forces)."

In replies to questions in the House of Commons on the 11th November the Chief Secretary who had previously denied all responsibility on the part of the Crown forces for the destruction of creameries admitted that he had received some evidence of their responsibility. In another reply he said:-

"He would not initiate prosecutions for perjury against Irishmen who had sworn affidavits that they had seen outrages deliberately committed by officers of the Crown."

But to return to Rome, on November 13th, 1920, Mauri called to inform the Rector that he had that day given notice to move an expression of sympathy in the Italian Chamber of Deputies in favour of Ireland. The

motion read:-

"The Italian Parliament expresses its deep sympathy for Ireland in its struggle for the right of self-determination for the cause of national independence and wishes the noble Irish people a future fruitful in prosperity and peace."

On the same day he left for Paris, arranging to address on his return meetings in Milan in favour of the Irish cause. It was these meetings that set the headline for many "Pro-Irlanda" demonstrations in the principal cities throughout Italy.

From the middle of November onwards, many enthusiastic meetings or demonstrations were organised in sympathy with Dr. Mannix and which he addressed. Among the more notable ones were Leeds (reported in the press of November 17th) and others in Rochdale, Newcastle-on-Tyne, etc. In his Leeds speech the Archbishop referred to a statement in the 'Times' in which Cardinal Bourne talked of the organisation of assassination and hoped that upon this and other matters "the Cardinal will clear things up as far as possible". The press report continues:-

"He would not call England hypocritical but he would use the words of Mr. Asquith who was not a 'wild Irishman', who stated that England stood at the bar of nations as a criminal for not having the courage to practice in Ireland what she preached to other nations."

The 'Independent' of November 17th, 1920, contains extracts from the 'Weekly Summary', a paper which was published by Dublin Castle. It gives abundant evidence of the venom that inspired the British police and their

incitement of further outrages and misrepresentation against the Irish.

The assassination of Fr. Griffin, C.C., at this time caused a most painful impression and did an immense amount to alienate what little respect there was for the British Government, even among West-British Catholics. Dr. O'Doherty, Bishop of Clonfert, preaching in Loughrea Cathedral on Sunday, 28th November, paid a glowing tribute to the memory of Fr. Griffin.

The 'Independent' of 17th or 20th November, 1920, contains a very realistic account of the ordeal undergone by the Rev. J. Kennedy, C.C., of Killanena, at the hands of armed British forces.

The Bishops' October Declaration evokes a Letter of Sympathy from Cardinal Mercier and others:

Naturally it was among the Catholics abroad that the first and chief reactions to the October declaration of the Irish bishops were most noticeable. The first and most prominent of these was that headed by Cardinal Mercier and the Belgian bishops. Their letter was published early in November, 1920. Having referred to the Irish missionaries and to the long calvary of persecution in Ireland, Cardinal Mercier continues:-

"Your people has our sympathies, it has a right to our respect, and that people it is you who have made, for nowhere in the world is seen, as among you, the pastor sharing the lot of his flock, coming to them in their sufferings, participating in their poverty, protecting their national traditions, asserting with them their independence.

We range ourselves by your sides in the demand that a tribunal of inquiry, of unquestioned impartiality, be instituted for

the purpose of reassuring the public
conscience.

We shall ask our priests and our
faithful to remember at the altar and in
their prayers their brethren in Ireland.
They owe that charity. They owe it to you
from gratitude. . . . "

The Cardinal concluded:-

"in the name of the Belgian Catholics,
begging the Irish Bishops to accept the
homage of our ardent sympathy and the
assurance of our fraternal devotion."

The full text of this letter is to be found in the 'Irish
Independent' and doubtless in the 'Annals' of the 'Irish
Catholic Directory (1921)' for 1920.

The soreness of the 'Morning Post' is reflected
in an article entitled, "A Word To Cardinal Mercier", in
which it said that the Vatican and the Catholic
Hierarchy in the British Isles "are primarily
responsible for the stupid blunders of Cardinal Mercier
and his friends":-

"Cardinal Mercier, one would have thought,
is the last man in the world to have associated
himself with a movement which, despite Cardinal
Logue and his bishops, is inspired by antichrist."

A comment by Monsieur Van Hoegaerden criticising
Cardinal Mercier's intervention was howled down by the
Chamber. Over the din of protests demanding its
withdrawal, Monsieur Van Hoegaerden was heard to say,
amid laughter:-

"It was better I left that subject
untouched."

On the 18th November, 1920, the Archbishop of Auch addressed a letter to Cardinal Logue associating himself with the declaration of the Bishops.

Among the many adhesions of the foreign episcopate was that of the Bishop of Bobbio, written on the Feast of St. Columbanus, 23rd November, 1920, addressed to the people of his own diocese sympathising with the Irish bishops and their flock. He ordered that in the crypt of St. Columbanus a Solemn Triduum with the Rosary, Litany of the Saints and Benediction be held and that in all the parish churches in the city and diocese the Rosary and the singing of the Miserere and the Benediction be likewise held.

Following, I believe, the declaration of the Irish bishops, a memorial of reconciliation between Great Britain and Ireland was addressed by a number of British Catholics to the English Prime Minister and to the Irish bishops. Dr. O'Doherty, Bishop of Clonfert, Secretary to the Bishops, in the course of a reply emphasises that:-

"We in Ireland have our elected representatives just as you have in England. With these alone, and not with individuals who can make no claim to represent the mind of a nation, can negotiations be opened on terms of mutual equality. We are quite sick of abortive attempts at a settlement made by men who, it is true, are sincere and honest but who cannot be regarded in any sense as representative of the passionate and natural desire for freedom and equality."

For an egregious protest by Lord Walter Kerr, as President of the Catholic Union of Great Britain, see the 'Tablet' of the 18th December which contains the full

correspondence in the matter.

Remarkable pro-Ireland Demonstrations in Milan
and in the Italian Chamber of Deputies:

About the third week of November, 1920, a densely crowded pro-Irlanda meeting in Milan of the Catholic Young Men of Milan was addressed by the Honourable A. Mauri. Amid great applause, the orator appealed to them to throw aside political opportunism and to proclaim, boldly and enthusiastically, the justice of the Irish cause. Telegrams were despatched to Mr. Sean T. O'Kelly, wishing success to the Irish fight for liberty and justice, and to Cardinal Logue pledging support. After the meeting a vast body of young men paraded the principal streets and, having sung Italian national songs, dispersed in the Piazza del Duomo amid cries of "Long Live Ireland!". An account of this appeared in the 'Irish Independent'. A fuller account is to be found in the 'Irish Catholic' of the end of November.

One of the most remarkable demonstrations of sympathy with the Irish cause was that which took place in the Italian Chamber of Deputies on Saturday, the 27th of November, during the debate on the ratification of the Treaty with Yugo-Slavia. After a number of thoroughly insincere speeches by the leaders of the different parties and a protestation from the Socialists that there should be equal liberty for all, including Russia, Angelo Mauri, speaking on behalf of the Partito Popolare, the Catholic party, referred to the lip service to rights of peoples, many of whom had never been heard of before. In the course of a long peroration he said that there was one country that had not been mentioned, a country that for centuries had fought for its liberties, a country that had been outstanding in its contribution to civilisation. Without mentioning the name of Ireland until the last moment of his discourse, he enlarged on

the merits of Ireland's claims upon European peoples. As his meaning became clearer, mounting enthusiastic applause greeted sentence after sentence and, finally, on mentioning that that country was Ireland, the entire Chamber, with the sole exception of the front Government seats, rose to its feet and for minutes cheered and applauded in what Senor Cortesi described as "one of the most enthusiastic and spontaneous demonstrations" he had seen in his whole journalistic career of thirty-five years.

Anglican Bishops condemn Military Regime in Ireland:

The 'Irish Independent' of the 19th November, 1920, under the heading of "The Voice of the Churches", published declarations from the seventeen Anglican bishops associating themselves with a previous strong declaration of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York against reprisals and asking that "military terrorism may cease and that a truce be arranged on both sides so that in an atmosphere of peace negotiations for a settlement may be carried on. The declaration of the Anglican bishops was signed by the Bishops of Chester, Hereford, Lichfield, Liverpool, Oxford, Peterborough, Rochester, Southwark, Truro and eight others. Other protests from Britain included that of the Bermondsey Borough Council and Mr. Masterman in the 'Daily News'.

It was just at this time that Mr. McVeigh interrogated the Chief Secretary in the House of Commons concerning a faked photograph entitled, "Grim Reality from the Kerry Front - After the Fight of Tralee", the photograph in reality having been taken at the corner of Victoria and Vico Roads, Dalkey, in which figured a Government armoured car and soldiers.

On the 26th November, 1920, Cardinal Bourne held a requiem for the Catholic officers assassinated in

Dublin on the morning of the Croke Park murders. Lloyd George wrote an appreciative letter to the Cardinal conveying to him and the Roman Catholic community in Great Britain the very grateful thanks of His Majesty's Government. "The manner of the death of these officers", said Lloyd George -

"has filled the hearts of Catholics, no less than Protestants, with horror and I feel sure that that expression of public feeling will serve to assist in putting an end to the reign of terror which is hindering the free development of the life and prosperity of Ireland".

A letter of John Sweetman, dated 27th November, 1920, published in the 'Independent' of the 29th, throws a light on the feeling in England:-

"A gentleman just returning from London said that Sir H. Greenwood is the man of the hour. The funeral of the English officers has stirred London to a point of frenzy. Any known Sinn Féiner would have been torn to pieces."

Cardinal Logue's Advent pastoral of the 28th November refers to the tragedies of Sunday, the 21st.

On the 27th November Arthur Griffith, Eoin McNeill and Eamon Duggan were arrested and imprisoned in Mountjoy. On the following day I read in a continental paper that preparations were complete for the opening of several camps for the internment of the Sinn Féin army. Of these Ballykinlar was to be the first and, among others, two in County Dublin were mentioned.

On the 25th November Liberty Hall had been raided and Labour leaders arrested.

It was on this date (25th November 1920) that the mutiny of the Connaught Rangers in India took place. Fourteen were sentenced to death but only one executed.

A full list of the British atrocities will be found in the 'Irish Bulletin' and in the various pamphlets for 1920 and 1921 that I am presenting to the Bureau. A useful calendar of the events of 1920 will also be found in the 'Freeman's Journal' of the 1st January, 1921.

The 1st December, 1920, was the opening of negotiations between Lloyd George and Sinn Féin. In connection with these negotiations, see the 'Irish Bulletin' of the 15th February, 1921 (Volume IV).

The Lombardy Provincial Committee of the Partito Popolare at a meeting in Milan about 1st December, 1920, approved a vote of sympathy with the Irish people.

Dónal McHales and Seán O'Shea visit Rome to buy
Arms from the Ministry of War:

It was on Saturday, 20th November, 1920, that we had a visit from Dónal McHales of Genoa and Seán O'Shea of Drumcondra (President of the Dublin Industrial Development Association, 12 Molesworth Street). After tea the Rector asked me to bring them to see Commendatore Reali (our banker) to introduce them to some shipping directors and to discuss the question of direct trading on behalf of the Dublin Industrial Development Association. This visit was for the direct purpose of buying arms from the Italian Ministry of War. We knew that they had come on the commission of Michael Collins and the I.R.A. Although we were fully aware of the nature of the mission and keenly interested in it, our formal attitude was one of non-interference. I brought them that evening to Reali, introduced them and left them to discuss their affairs. Being very

anxious to ascertain, at least indirectly, how they had progressed, I called on Reali the next day (Sunday morning) and ascertained that they had had a very friendly conversation. Reali assured me that he was recommending the Irish Industrial Development Association to friends in Genoa.

It was on this same Sunday (21st November, 1920) that McHales and O'Shea had an interview with a high official in the Ministry of War, or perhaps the Minister himself. The interview was very satisfactory and the two left Rome, highly pleased with the success of their mission. Although we made some few discreet enquiries now and again, no further information of the transaction reached our ears. After the Treaty debate of December, 1921, reading the statement that one of the reasons inducing a number of prominent I.R.A. officers to vote for the Treaty was the shortage of arms, I asked McHales the next time I saw him how this statement could be reconciled with the successful negotiations that he had had with the Italian Ministry of War, resulting in the allocation of a cargo of arms and ammunition. He flushed and in reply broke into various indignant statements that Michael Collins had cancelled the whole transaction at the last moment. He was reluctant to give me any further information except to convey his own indignation in the matter.

Italian Journalist complains of Reuter's
Suppression of Irish News:

In the beginning of December, 1920, on the occasion of a visit to the College, Cortesi, when discussing the policy of suppression and misrepresentation of Irish news by Reuter and other agencies, mentioned that on several occasions the friendly accounts that he sent on Irish matters in Rome were suppressed. He mentioned that, in particular, when he sent the account

of Seán T. O'Kelly's reception to the Irish bishops in the Grand Hotel in the previous May, he received a letter from Reuter's London office saying that nobody in England took any interest in these things. On this occasion too he showed us a telegram he had received from Esmonde in America relating the cheering for Italy during an Irish parade at Washington, in reference to the pro-Irish demonstration on the 27th November in the Camera dei Deputati, already referred to.

Cardinal Logue's letter appeared in the 'Corriere d'Italia' of the 4th December, 1920. An article written by me on the 'Osservatore's' treatment of Cardinal Logue's pastoral was published in the 'Irish Independent' on the 7th December and a second on the 10th. As a result of the second communication in the 'Independent' (10th December), Cardinal Logue wrote a very severe letter to the 'Osservatore'.

The continental press of the 7th December began to publish accounts of Lloyd George's negotiations with Sinn Féin for a settlement.

Archbishop Clune's Account of his Interviews
with Lloyd George:

On his visit in the following month to Rome, Archbishop Clune gave us an account of his visit to Lloyd George for the second time, stating that Lloyd George's attitude had changed somewhat during the week, in consequence of the action of the remnant of the Galway County Council and Fr. O'Flanagan's telegram. Lloyd George asked Archbishop Clune to return to Ireland, which he did and interviewed Griffith, Collins, etc., on December 12th, 13th and 14th.

The Italian press of these dates (8th or 9th December) contains accounts of the Irish situation and of the opening of negotiations but based principally on

British newspaper agencies.

The official report of the British Labour Commission of Inquiry into conditions in Ireland was published at this time.

The burning of Cork city occurred on the 11th December.

The 'Corriere d'Italia', dated 15th December, publishes the resolution of the general meeting of the Partito Popolare sending its heartfelt sympathy to the Irish nation and episcopate, whose firmness in their sublime sacrifice radiates the light of Christian thought in the world and desiring the directory of the Party and of the Parliamentary group to develop a strong action in Parliament and in the country in defence of the martyred people against the tyrannical repression of England. As a result of this, various meetings were held throughout the country but, before much effective action could be taken in Parliament, it was dissolved.

On the 14th December the English Cabinet agreed to a month's truce on general terms which had already been discussed.

It was in the afternoon of the 16th December, 1920, that Mr. and Mrs. Gavan Duffy arrived from Brussels with their son and daughter (Colm and Máire). The purpose of their coming to Rome was to take up propaganda work at once.

Cardinal Logue's Protest to 'Osservatore Romano':

On December 17th I brought at Dr. Hagan's request to Monsignor Cerretti Cardinal Logue's letter addressed to the 'Osservatore Romano', protesting against the treatment of his pastoral, particularly the Stefani press agency telegram and "A's" article. Monsignor Cerretti was obviously unwilling to publish the full

text of the pastoral or even the passage marked for publication by the Cardinal. He suggested a mild, general reference with the double nature of the pastoral's condemnation but I pressed for the carrying out of the Cardinal's express wish and pointed out the unfairness of printing Stefani and other London agency press telegrams, maintaining that the 'Osservatore' should take Irish and Catholic news from Irish and Catholic sources.

The 'Osservatore Romano' under the date 18th December, 1920, published the following ^{was} as news from Stefani agency:-

"Dublin, 18th. The Bishop of Cork, who had threatened to excommunicate those who were guilty of attempts on the police and troops, has received the following cablegram from the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic in New York:-

'We protest against the use which you have made of your spiritual authority in British interests. The Irish priests should not support the disarmament of the Irish people. The statement that to kill British soldiers is murder is a challenge to the patriots of 1776. - Signed, Major Kelly, Secretary.'

The Bishop replied as follows:-

'I wish as much as you do the independence of Ireland. It is scandalous on your part to align yourself with those who ambush, who are useless politically and who expose human life

without any protection to the dangers of reprisals and injury. The ruins of Cork are the result of your policy.

Why do you not obtain from the United States the recognition of the Irish Republic?"

Following this notice is the following editorial comment:-

"In our number of the 1st December commenting on the news transmitted by the Stefani agency relating to a pastoral of Cardinal Logue, Archbishop of Armagh, in which it was stated that the Cardinal had condemned the assassins of British officers on the previous Sunday, we placed in its true light the noble and courageous act of justice, recalling at the same time his tenacious work in vindicating and favouring the defence of the Irish people. We have now received the text of the pastoral to which the telegram of the Stefani agency refers and, since it is right that the mind of Cardinal Logue should appear clear and complete, we hasten to supplement the news of the telegram, knowing that the Archbishop of Armagh not only condemns the assassins of the British officers but also all violence committed by the English troops against the Irish population."

This was drawn up by Cardinal Gasparri and Monsignor Cerretti and telephoned personally to the 'Osservatore' by Monsignor Cerretti. This was all we could do at the moment but it brought out that the officials in the 'Osservatore' had little or nothing to say to those comments. I shall refer to this matter again.

The 'Independent' of the 20th December, 1920, contains an important notice to the Crown forces issued by General Macready warning them against offences against the persons and property of the places under martial law. A comment on Macready's order is furnished by the proclamation of Brigadier-General H. Cumming, commanding the Kerry Infantry Brigade, stating that from the same date (20th December) military and police convoys would have I.R.A. officers or leaders sent as hostages with all transport moving armed forces of the Crown.

The special correspondent of the 'Daily Mail' telegraphing from Dublin on the 27th December, 1920, on the courtmartial of the directors of the 'Freeman's Journal' mentions that a second attempt was made on Christmas morning to set the offices on fire by three armed men.

On the 26th December I sent a summary to the 'Independent' of an article on hunger-striking in the current issue of the 'Civiltà Cattolica'. The article in the 'Civiltà Cattolica' was written by a well known Jesuit, Professor of Theology. At this date I cannot say whether it was Fr. Capello or another Jesuit professor. This article, it was well known, was intended to closure the controversy on the morality of hunger-striking. The Holy See had determined to make no official pronouncement on the matter at the time and the arguments for and against were marshalled together in this article.

The 'Independent' of the 28th December, 1920, contains a remarkable article by Professor Alfred O'Rahilly in reply to the Bishop of Cork.

We asked Gavan Duffy to have the 'Messaggero's' article on the English Labour Party's commission of inquiry brought to the notice of the 'Corriere' and

'Osservatore' for comment.

Italian Press publishes Resolution of British Labour Party on Irish Question:

The Italian press published a report from London on the 29th December re-producing the resolution of the British Labour Party on the Irish question, in which it demanded the withdrawal of the armed forces from Ireland and proposed the constitution of an Irish Parliament elected by proportional representation which would protect the minority and would prevent Ireland becoming a military or naval menace to Great Britain.

The military raid on the Convent of Marie Reparatrice in Dublin between midnight and 1 a.m. on the 29th December was brought to the notice of the Vatican Secretariat of State.

Accounts of raids and various reprisals appeared from time to time in the Italian press.

For the events of 1920 it would be well to consult also the 'Annals' of the 'Irish Catholic Directory'.

During the last months of 1920 the dissensions amongst the Irish-Americans in the Clan-na-Gael and the Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic over de Valera's mission and attitude became more and more marked. On October 22nd Harry Boland, on the direction of de Valera, cut off the Clan-na-Gael from affiliation with the I.R.B. in Ireland. On November 17th de Valera established at Washington a new association in opposition to the Devoy-Cohalan, Friends of Irish Freedom. This was the charge made against de Valera by the Devoy-Cohalan section of the National Council of the Friends of Irish Freedom on the 28th March, 1922.

British Pressure on Vatican for Condemnation of Sinn Féin increases and is countered by American Influence:

From the period of the beatification of Oliver

Plunkett, the British pressure on the Vatican to obtain the condemnation of Sinn Féin grew more intense and more evident every day. A tribute is due to Benedict XV for his staunch resistance to the intense pressure. It is difficult for people outside the Roman curia to form an idea of the widespread influence of the British in Rome, both of Catholic and non-Catholic origin. Every anti-Irish item that appeared in the English press was duly transmitted to the Secretariat of State. Every British visitor to Rome, Catholic or non-Catholic, poured their anti-Irish stories directly or indirectly into the ears of the Roman prelates. Ireland was painted as the one great obstacle to the conversion of England. Only the corresponding counter pressure by Irish Catholics in America formed an effective breakwater. Day by day individuals and Irish corporate bodies besieged the apostolic delegation in Washington with counter propaganda. The value of this counter action was of supreme importance and played an essential part in the steadying the resistance by the Holy See to the pressure of England.

Probably as a result of the London negotiations for an Irish settlement with Archbishop Clune, Cardinal Sbaretti, Protector of the College and, therefore, with a certain Irish understanding, called on Monday, 3rd January, 1921, and had a full hour's talk with Dr. Hagan on the Irish question. The subject of the discussion was chiefly on the possibility or convenience of an intervention by the Holy See on the Irish question. No direct immediate action followed.

The London 'Times' of the 5th January, 1921, in a leading article on Dr. Cohalan's excommunication of those who in his diocese were guilty of murder or attempted murder made a strong attack on what they call

the "impossible and incredible neutrality of the general body of the Irish bishops". It called upon the Irish bishops to openly array themselves as a body against the "forces of evil". A similar article appeared in the 'Morning Post' in February following the Pastoral of Cardinal Bourne.

Cardinal Bourne's Hostile Attitude towards Ireland expressed in his Lenten Pastoral:

The attitude of Cardinal Bourne was consistently hostile to the Irish cause, based partly on pure political bias and partly on sheer ignorance of the Irish situation. From some fifteen years' acquaintance with his views as observed from the Archbishop's House, Dublin, I can vouch that never once did he communicate with the Archbishop of Dublin on ecclesiastical matters of mutual concern. Naturally on matters of national interest he would communicate with Cardinal Logue but I doubt whether this communication was ever very close or adequate. An extract from the 'Westminster Cathedral Chronicle', a periodical edited from the Archbishop's House, of January, 1921, illustrates at once his bias and ignorance:-

"Few, so far, seem to have understood that Ireland is bound and gagged by the bloody hands of men who have been themselves bound and sworn to the immoral principles of Bolshivism, in the desecrated name of nationalism." (Page 11, Westminster Cathedral Chronicle, January, 1921).

While these are not Cardinal Bourne's own words, this editorial comment undoubtedly reflects his mind. His pastoral letter, dated 13th February, 1921, was purely a political attack on the whole Sinn Féin movement and the Irish people. Ingeniously covering himself under the venerated name of Cardinal Manning and blandly ignoring

all that happened between 1867 and December 1918, he caused to be read in all the churches of his diocese Cardinal Manning's condemnation of Fenianism. In his own covering letter he professes to fear that some of his own flock have allowed themselves -

"to become implicated by act of sympathy or even actual co-operation in societies and organisations which are in opposition to the law of God and to the Catholic Church."

"The name Fenianism", he says:-

"is no longer in use but the activity that it connoted is still alive.

It may be known unerringly by its principles, by its teachings and by its fruits".

This pastoral and the republication of Cardinal Manning's letter of 1867 were greedily seized on by the 'Morning Post' and similar English papers. The Agenzia Stefani at once telegraphed it to the Italian press where it received considerable but unfavourable attention. The 'Osservatore Romano' had a very short comment on the Stefani version which, according to a remark of Count Dalla Torre, its editor, to one of our friends, had been inserted, he claimed, in favour of Ireland. This note was a poor attempt to water down the unfavourable impression conveyed by Cardinal Bourne's political intervention and to throw the entire blame on Cardinal Manning. The pastoral, the note added, was not to be confused with Cardinal Manning's letter. Cardinal Bourne's pastoral was only a brief esordio introducing Cardinal Manning's letter.

Cardinal Bourne and the 'Osservatore' were taken to task by the 'Tempo' in its issue of the 22nd February, 1921. The 'Tempo', which was one of the leading

journals of Rome, alludes to the pastoral as a document purely political and polemical, couched in unrestrained language, and commented on the poor attempt of the 'Osservatore' to attenuate the action of Cardinal Bourne. "The Cardinal's letter", it says:-

"is something more than an innocuous exhumation of an old writing of Manning. It is an open intervention against the movement for independence, in which all Ireland is united, and is especially an unfortunate approval and unjustified apology for the policy of Lloyd George and the Coalition which in Ireland is synonymous with repression and destruction. While he invites the faithful of his diocese to trust to the House of Commons to solve the Irish problem and alludes in general terms to the tragedy of Ireland, he, with ill-concealed bitterness, admonishes that they should not become implicated ... that they are sympathising and co-operating with societies and organisations in open conflict with the law of God and the Church."

"Once again", the 'Tempo' continues:-

"the highest representative of that English hierarchy, which would not exist to-day only that O'Connell had raised it from its ashes, takes up a position against the political aspirations of the island of St. Patrick."

We can understand how this arch-episcopal intervention has aroused a violent reaction amongst the Irish Catholics resident in Westminster who, according to the London newspapers, loudly interrupted in the churches the reading of the letter and are preparing to

organise protest meetings."

This note which appeared in the 'Tempo' under the heading, "Vatican Notes", was too important to be ignored and so, in its issue of the 24th February, 1921, the 'Osservatore' had to make a further lame explanation of its own attempt to attenuate the words of the Archbishop of Westminster. It is hardly necessary to note that this article in the 'Tempo' was written by an Italian friend of Dr. Hagan and at his suggestion.

There was an excellent and telling answer written by Jerry McVeigh, ex M.P., dated 14th February, 1921, and published in the 'Times' on the 15th, in which incidentally he stated that the pastoral was handed to the press before it was delivered to his congregation.

Following the publication of the pastoral, Lord Denbigh, while attempting a defence of Cardinal Bourne, deprecated the violence of the Government forces in Ireland. This letter of Lord Denbigh elicited an able and forceful reply by Art O'Briain, the Irish representative in London, in a letter published in the 'Irish Independent' on the 21st February, 1921.

A protest meeting of London Catholics was held in Kingsway Hall on the 18th March, 1921, protesting against the denunciation by Cardinal Bourne in his Lenten pastoral. A copy of the resolution was sent to the Holy Father, accompanied by an expression of their devotion to the Holy See.

A letter by Lord Hugh Cecil, dated 11th February and published in the 'Times' on the 14th, reflects the views of many English Conservatives at the time. He began by branding the Rising, or the Rebellion of 1916 as unjustifiable, "though some rebellions have been justified":-

"It was begun with a detestable disloyalty in the midst of a war to which, on any hypothesis of nationality, the Irish were both morally and legally committed. ... In April, 1916, the Irish were as free as the English.

....

The present situation was a recurrence of a moral disease prevailing in Ireland for the past one hundred and sixty years."

He deplores the courtmartial trials and the creation of new offences. The letter winds up with a long attack on the Irish bishops. This and the articles in the 'Times' and 'Morning Post' show the use they were prepared to make of the Irish Church - "Heads I win; tails you lose!"

I may allude to the article in the 'Morning Post' on the 14th February, 1921. In the course of praising Cardinal Bourne's "testimony against revolution", it asserted that:-

"Our soldiers and police fighting heroically in Ireland against the secret organisation of murder are fighting a holy war. ... In this desperate fight the churches in Ireland will be the next victims."

In the course of the article it acknowledges that the rebels have destroyed courts, barracks, murdered or intimidated magistrates, so that law had ceased to reign over great parts of Ireland. -

"When law and order are dethroned there (Ireland), there is nothing with which to enforce obedience to the State save the bullet and the sword. ...

These secret organisations ... have Ireland in their grip; every department of

State in Ireland is honeycombed with their spies and agents."

I break the sequence to allude to the notices in the press.

The press, both Irish and English, of January, 1921, contain the text of official notifications of the burning of houses, notably in Cork, in reprisal for the ambushing of police and armed forces and also that "hostages will be carried in all motor vehicles in the city and county of Dublin and in the county of Meath", in consequence of the repeated attempts on the forces of the crown. See the 'Daily Mail' (3rd January, 1921), the 'Times' (21st) and the 'Nation'. The official communication in the 'Daily Mail' of April 3rd, 1921, publishes the details of the houses destroyed by the crown forces in Midleton and neighbourhood.

Condemnation of Government Policy in Ireland
by various British Leaders:

The English press from January to March or April, 1921, contain some remarkable expressions of opinions by prominent English leaders of various classes condemning the Government policy in Ireland. Now that he was out of office, Asquith was able to recognise and denounce to a Conference of University Liberal Societies the shortsightedness and coldbloodedness of the Government tyranny. He professed to believe that the policy of reprisals was dead - a strange belief in view of the official orders to commit reprisals issued in that same month of January! He referred to the "interlude of barbarism" which recalled the worst achievements both of the ancient and the modern Hun:-

"But it has taken the best part of two months of constant and unremitting exposure in the face, mind you, of every kind of

concealment, official assurance and official denial - to which no impartial observer, either in this country or in any other part of the world, any longer attaches the least authority or credence - it has taken us three months to get at last, at any rate, to something in the nature of a tacit repudiation of the crudest forms and methods of government by competitive crime." (See 'The Times' of 8th January, 1921)

Viscount Grey of Fallodon made a similar speech in the Lords on 8th February repeating what he had already said elsewhere.

Another remarkable statement was the report by Lieutenant-General Sir Henry Lawson who had visited Ireland in December, 1920, on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Peace for Ireland Council. The latter is referred to in the 'Times' of the 7th January, 1921.

The 'Times' of March 1st, 1921, publishes the condemnation by Bishop Gore of the Government which was, he wrote:-

"engaged in the perpetuation of crime in Ireland against justice and the foundations of civil liberty and order. ... If we had any regard for our traditions and our reputation in other countries, we must put an end to reprisals in Ireland. There must no longer be power in the hands of the military to execute a man for no other reason than the possession of a revolver".

The Government reprisals were also condemned by

the Anglican Bishop of Birmingham as reported in the April number of the 'Birmingham Diocesan Magazine'. Another outspoken criticism is contained in the letter issued about the 2nd April, 1921, by Dr. Cyril Garbette, Anglican Bishop of Southwark and now Archbishop of York. A similar letter of the Bishop of Chelmsford, six other Anglican Bishops and thirteen other Protestant religious leaders in Great Britain was published in the 'Times' of April 6th, to which Lloyd George was obliged to make an answer which he did in a letter to the 'Times' occupying three full columns of the 'Times' on the 20th April.

The appeal of the bishops and heads of Non-Conformist Churches published on the 6th April, 1921, was supported by a remarkable article in the 'Times' of the same date. By this time (6th April) there was a full crusade in England against the Government's Irish policy. As already indicated, the English Catholic Hierarchy made a statement at this time.

A strongly worded protest by twenty-seven professors and lecturers in the University of Wales was addressed by them to their Parliamentary representative, Mr. Herbert Lewis, against the actions of the British Government and its agents in Ireland. They extended to Ireland their genuine sympathy "in this, her supreme agony", and expressed "execration of the diabolic cruelty which has brought her to this pass":-

"There is vigorous unanimity among University students on this question. Their grief is only second to that of Ireland herself."

They declared:-

"absolute dissociation from the Government of this country which has, with an

incredible cynicism, covered the name of Britain with ignominy."

They hoped:-

"even at this last hour to save Britain from undying infamy."

Judges prohibited from dealing with Claims involving Allegations against Crown Forces:

Despite this crusade against the Government, proclamation after proclamation poured out from Dublin Castle and murders by the military and police were frequent. Threats and terrorism of various natures were continually issued. The 'Limerick Leader' was obliged to publish such a threat on Friday, the 15th April, 1921. On the same day Judge Bodkin, County Court Judge, sitting at Ennis, received a letter also dated 15th April from the County Inspector of County Clare:-

"prohibiting him from dealing with any claims for compensation involving allegations against Crown forces or police in this area".

A small body of military fully armed occupied one of the rooms of the Court during the sitting to enforce this prohibition. Nevertheless, Judge Bodkin made a strong protest against the action of the County Inspector. On the same day, at the Tralee Quarter Sessions, County Court Judge Cusack informed the bar that he had received a similar letter from the County Inspector stating that an order had been made by the competent military authority prohibiting the hearing of these cases against the Crown forces in martial law area. A discussion ensued in court on the effects of martial law. Barristers in court protested. The Judge declared that they were obliged to obey it, although "martial law or military law means the

abnegation of all law". Claims by the Crown forces were heard and determined in the court but Judge Cusack decided to postpone all the cases objected to by the military. These incidents were reported by the correspondents of the 'Manchester Guardian'.

Finally I may allude to the declaration of the Catholic hierarchy on the occasion of their Low Week meeting on April 6th, sent to Lloyd George on their behalf by Cardinal Bourne. In it they suggested that the Auxiliary troops be withdrawn without delay from Ireland. Thus at long last the Cardinal, doubtless under the pressure of his episcopal brethren, was forced to take some step to stop "organised murder" by government.

Renewal of Campaign against Irish Movement
in Roman Curia:

From the previous winter and all through the spring of 1921 a renewed campaign against the Irish movement, more bitter and more intense than any other, even more so than that of the spring of 1920, was carried on in the Roman Curia. It was unrestrained in tone, loaded with downright calumnies and permeated all circles.

Over the signature "A", I sent a report dated 26th January, 1921, to the 'Irish Independent' which appeared in its issue of the 29th. The report which was given considerable prominence brought out the gravity of the situation which only the providential advent of the Archbishop of Perth and the powerful influence of the ever just and generous Bishop of Southwark saved from disaster. It mentioned the efforts made by the Catholic wife of a British Ambassador at one of the Embassies to induce the Pope, in an audience she had with him, to condemn the Sinn Féin movement, which, however, had no success. This

was Lady Howard, the wife of the British Ambassador in Madrid. Our informant was the Irish governess in the family of an Italian duke who was present at the conversation. The report concluded with a reference to the encouraging sympathy displayed in the Italian press and periodicals and the support given by the Catholic Popular Party and Socialists and by the Republican National Congress at Terni.

Early in January, 1921, on the British Government's publication of "Documents Relative to the Sinn Féin Movement", a reference inspired by the British Government appeared in the 'Messaggero'. We passed it on to Gavan Duffy who forthwith protested to the editor of the 'Messaggero'. The 'Tempo' made some sarcastic remarks about reports referring to the blowing up of the principal buildings in London.

Visits of Dr. Amigo and Dr. Clune to Rome:

Dr. Amigo, Bishop of Southwark, arrived in Rome about this time and dined in the College on the 15th January. As usual he proved himself during his Roman visit a staunch friend of Ireland who was able to contradict the more notorious calumnies against the Irish movement and to place Irish affairs in their proper perspective. Incidentally, he humorously alluded to Cardinal Bourne's latest argument for the amalgamation of the Borough of Southwark with Westminster, based on the diversity of policy of himself and the Cardinal when a Requiem was held for the Lord Mayor of Cork in Southwark and for the Black and Tan cadets in Westminster.

Dr. Clune, the Archbishop of Perth, arrived in Rome on Monday, 17th January, 1921, thus following closely in the footsteps of Dr. Amigo. He saw Monsignor Cerretti on Wednesday, the 19th, and gave

him a detailed history of his negotiations with Lloyd George. Monsignor Cerretti, knowing but revealing only in part the danger threatening the Irish cause, insisted on his immediately seeing the Pope. The Archbishop was reluctant, having paid his ad limina visit some few months before, but Monsignor Cerretti decided then and there that he would arrange the audience. On the following day (January 20th) Archbishop Clune dined at the Irish College with Dr. McSherry, Vicar-Apostolic of Port Elizabeth, and he informed us that he would have his audience with the Pope the next day. After dinner Gavan Duffy called.

The Archbishop's account of the situation in Ireland was intensely interesting. He was full of admiration for the Sinn Féin movement, its leaders and for the Volunteers. He told us the full history of his negotiations with Lloyd George who asked him to see the Sinn Féin leaders to arrange a truce. The Archbishop consented and saw Michael Collins three times in a most fashionable house in the most central part of Dublin, doubtless Dr. Farnan's. Before he had left London, he had seen Dr. Mannix and, by arrangement, sent a telegram to Dr. Fogarty to meet him in the Gresham hotel. Dr. Fogarty found it difficult to leave and sent a telegram with prepaid reply to Dr. Clune saying he could not come. Dr. Clune, providentially, did not see the green reply form and put the telegram in his pocket until the afternoon to consider what was best to be done. At two o'clock he referred again to the telegram and found the green form for the reply. Meanwhile, Dr. Fogarty, getting no reply and judging that a telegram from London meant business, got the local doctor to motor him to Limerick, since no trains were running. This saved Dr. Fogarty's life. Dr.

Clune saw Arthur Griffith, John McNeill and Duggan in Mountjoy and, during the interview, got on a sheet of paper Arthur Griffith's terms as his reply to the negotiations. This he brought, by Arthur Griffith's direction, to Miss Gavan Duffy's school in order to show them to Desmond Fitzgerald, Blythe and Hegarty. Miss Gavan Duffy went in the Archbishop's motor-car for Desmond Fitzgerald who had gone to the Shelbourne hotel with Henderson.

During the day (Thursday, 20th January) after he had left the College, Archbishop Clune got a letter from Monsignor Cerretti which concluded with the advice that he should see Cardinal Merry del Val. To our minds this was highly significant, indicating the danger centre that was to be encountered. The Archbishop was unwilling to call upon the Cardinal with whom he said he had no personal business, but Dr. Hagan insisted and reminded him of the letter he had brought to Rome from the Bishop of Clonfert, the secretary of the Bishops, in reference to the suppression of Cardinal Logue's pastoral by the 'Osservatore Romano'.

On Friday, January 21st, Archbishop Clune had an audience with the Pope. Monsignor Cerretti was present, ostensibly as interpreter. The audience lasted a full hour and dealt solely with the Irish situation. To his dismay, Archbishop Clune found that everything was arranged for an early condemnation of murder on both sides. Dr. Clune, an Irishman, knew very well that the Black and Tans or Lloyd George were not going to be affected by a papal condemnation but that it would be an extremely serious matter for Ireland. His Holiness listened to the Archbishop's account of the negotiations and was distinctly impressed by the statement that the Sinn Féin leaders were prepared at Christmas to make the truce but that,

on the Archbishop's return to London with the written undertaking of Sinn Féin, Lloyd George faced him with the demand for the surrender of their arms; this broke up the whole arrangement. The Archbishop brought out the violation of the original understanding by Lloyd George and his unreliability. The chief point on which Lloyd George broke the agreement was on the question of the insistence of the surrender of arms. Dr. Clune narrated the current British atrocities and the attack on Dr. Fogarty's home.

His Holiness asked the Archbishop, "Have you seen Cardinal Merry del Val?"

The Archbishop replied that he had not but that he had called on him the day before and that the Cardinal, although at home, had said he would not see him.

The Pope pursed his lips and then the Archbishop said he intended to call on the Cardinal again after his audience.

"E molto Inglese! Molto Inglese!" - meaning, "He is very English!. Very English!"

The Pope concluded that all this altered the state of affairs, and subsequent events and conversations with Monsignor Cerretti showed how considerably the situation was altered as a result of Dr. Clune's visit to the Pope.

On the same evening (21st January) Dr. Clune called on us and gave us an account of the interview. Dr. Amigo, knowing the audience had taken place, also called the same evening to hear all about it.

The next day, 22nd January, 1921, I sent a letter reporting on the situation to Seán T. O'Kelly through the 'Independent' office.

Later that evening (22nd January) Dr. Amigo

called and had a long discussion with the Rector on the Irish situation. He had already interviewed Cardinal Vico, Cardinal Bisleti and Cardinal Valfre di Bonzo. He left us to see Cardinal Granito de Belmonte.

At the Rector's wishes I called on Cardinal Vanutelli and presented him with a memorial from the Rector setting out the dangers of a pronouncement which would be a virtual condemnation of Sinn Féin. The Cardinal said he could not believe that any such pronouncement was in contemplation. Cardinal Vanutelli was Dean of the Sacred College of Cardinals and had been Cardinal Legate in Ireland in 1904 for the opening of the Armagh Cathedral. As a result of his unwillingness to interfere on behalf of Terence MacSwiney, he was never asked again by the Rector to any function in the Irish College, an omission which, the Cardinal later told me, he felt very deeply.

On the 24th January, 1921, I called on Monsignor Cerretti to acquaint him with the steps we were taking and in the hope of hearing further news from himself. While waiting for him, the Bishop of Southwark arrived and we were actually discussing the situation when Monsignor Cerretti returned. On the same evening Mr. Hughes Kelly of New York called to see me, in the absence of the Rector. He had been Treasurer of the National Aid Fund. He was an intimate friend of Monsignor Cerretti with whom he had unbounded influence. His arrival at this time was of considerable help as he was able to give a first-hand account of the feelings of Irish-American Catholics on the Irish situation in general and, particularly, on the reaction of Irish-Americans to relations with the Holy See.

I wrote a second letter to Seán T. O'Kelly on the 25th January, 1921.

By arrangement with the Rector I had an audience with His Holiness on Thursday, the 27th January, but it was of the usual routine character. He expressed his sympathy for the Rector's illness and made enquiries about prospects of an improvement of the Irish situation, expressing the hope that such an improvement would take place.

A Liberal journal, 'Umanita Nuova', to have a jibe at the Partito Popolare, while professing no intention of injuring the Irish struggle, posed the question: was the revolution only generous, holy and honest when it was accomplished by a Catholic people? The 'Italia', a paper circulated chiefly among diplomatic circles, had a rather weak reply. The incident showed, however, in many ways the public interest that was aroused by the Irish struggle at this time.

Gavan Duffy leaves Rome to visit other Capitals
of Europe:

It was about this time that Gavan Duffy left Rome on an extended tour of the capitals of Europe on behalf of the cause.

On the 29th January, 1921, I sent a registered letter from the Rector to Mr. Hamilton, Berlin, on the Irish crisis in Rome. I cannot remember who Mr. Hamilton was or how we were put in contact with him.

On the 29th January the Bishop of Southwark had an audience with His Holiness, at which he intended to refer to the Irish question. He left Rome on the 3rd February.

De Valera's important statement on the Sinn Féin attitude towards a solution which was published in 'L'Oeuvre' on the 27th January was republished in full in the 'Manchester Guardian' in its issue of the 29th.

A speech of Carson on the 29th January states his view on the passing of the Government of Ireland Act. It may be seen in the 'Times' of the 31st. In a speech at Belfast on the 2nd February, Carson outlined his attitude to the Government of Ireland Bill and his advice to the Ulster Orange party to use it.

On the 8th February, 1921, I brought over to the Secretariat of State the copies of the letter of the Bishop of Clonfert, Secretary of the Irish Bishops, protesting on their behalf at the suppression by the 'Osservatore Romano' of the passages in Cardinal Logue's pastoral which he had asked them to publish. That same afternoon the editor, Count dalla Torre, was sent by Monsignor Tedeschini to discuss the complaint of the Irish Bishops and explain the position of the paper. On February 14th, to bring the matter to a satisfactory conclusion, I brought, by Dr. Hagan's direction, a translation of Cardinal Logue's Pastoral.

Copies of Sinn Féin Pamphlet distributed to Cardinals:

It so happened at this very time we had just completed the translation and printing of the Sinn Féin pamphlet, "The First Of Small Nations" (on the depopulation of Ireland).

At the request of Monsignor Hagan I brought copies of the translation of the pamphlet, together with the Bishop of Clonfert's letter, to all the prominent Cardinals in the Roman Curia. Copies were given to Cardinal Vanutelli, Cardinal Granito de Belmonte, Cardinal Vico, Cardinal Scapanelli, Cardinal Valfre di Bonzo and Cardinal Sbaretta. We asked Fr. Crofts, O.P., Prior of St. Clement's, to bring copies to the Dominican Cardinal Fruhwirth. Without exception we found these Cardinals, all of whom had been Nuncios in various countries, thoroughly friendly.

While with Cardinal Vico, the conversation turned to English Catholics, to the Bishop of Southwark and finally to Cardinal Bourne, of whom he said that he was informed that he was weak and anxious to keep on good terms with the British Government. I enlarged on this point, referring particularly to the indignation of the French-Canadian Bishops at Cardinal Bourne's visit to Canada when, immediately after the war, he conducted himself as a kind of imperial patriarch in the Near East as well as Canada.

I found Cardinal Scapanelli most affable and we had a particularly frank and illuminating conversation on Irish affairs. He had been Papal Nuncio, I think, in Poland and Austria. I found him quite anti-English, pro-Polish. He waxed so eloquent on the victory of the Poles on the 15th August and the miraculous nature of the event that it was with some difficulty I brought back the conversation to Ireland. He spoke of the capital that England was making out of our violent methods. It opened the larger question of our independence to which he acknowledged our complete right. He acknowledged too that the English methods explained but hardly justified the Irish methods and said that the clergy should try and moderate the excitement, inculcate patience, with all the usual good advice which impartial outsiders are so ready to give us. I said that this was being done, that it was anything but easy so to convince a people who knew by experience that Catholic emancipation, disestablishment of the Irish Church, land reform were all won by violent methods. Altogether, we had a very frank and illuminating talk. He mentioned to me, as did Cardinal Vico, that he was getting and reading the French version of the 'Irish Bulletin' and showed me the "Depopulation" postcard.

As Cardinal Valfre di Bonzo was out, I had not an opportunity of speaking to him.

The discussion with Cardinal Sbaretti on the depopulation pamphlet led on to a discussion on the various phases of the Irish question. I took care to explicitly draw a conclusion that the survival of the Irish race depended on its absolute independence and separation from England. He also received the French version of the 'Irish Bulletin'.

Fr. Crofts, O.P., on bringing the Bishop of Clonfert's letter to Cardinal Fruhwirth, found that he was heart and soul with us, that he made no secret of it and would do all he could for us.

Meeting Monsignor Salotti on the 14th March, he told us of the acclamation with which his reference to Ireland was greeted on the previous day at a weekly conference of the association of the artist workmen or craftsmen. It shows how general was the sympathy with the Irish cause at this time.

At this time we had a letter from Gavan Duffy who was still in Berlin on the 6th February, 1921, but was to move about the 8th or 9th February to Paris where he was to remain for a few days. He was then to proceed to Salamanca in Spain. In this letter of the 6th February he suggested that he should be formally sent to Rome by the Dáil to formally ask the Pope's recognition of the Irish Republic as an old Catholic nation.

During this period the Irish group in Rome had many conferences regarding the proper policy to adopt in Rome on Irish political matters. There was complete agreement in substance. All acknowledged the general sympathy from the Pope downwards but distrusted their courage and the consequences of their

fear of England and their proneness to make concessions to her. All our members agreed on the necessity of strong action and on the open advocacy of the Irish claim to absolute independence. We had many interesting discussions on the proper replies to make to political and theological objections to the Irish position. Throughout all this period (1920-1921) there was solid unity among the Irish in Rome, most of all among the superiors of the Irish houses. It generated a great spirit of confidence and courage. This was mainly due to the strong personality of Dr. Hagan and, from the time of his arrival in Rome, of Fr. Magennis, General of the O.C.C.

The English Parliament re-opened on the 15th February on which occasion Lloyd George made a statement on the truce negotiations of the previous December conducted by Archbishop Clune.

A few days earlier the 'Times' in its issue of the 11th February, 1921, had an article on the Irish situation under the title, "The Irish Deadlock". It is of some importance as it shows that even the 'Times' was beginning to learn its lesson. "While, as we have repeatedly insisted", it wrote:-

"the solution of that problem (Irish problem) concerns the United Kingdom alone, we have realised that it is, in a very real sense, a world problem".

The 'Times' of the 19th February, 1921, has a telegram under the same date giving a summary of the speech of Dr. Clune, Archbishop of Perth, on his return there on the 18th.

The 'Times' about this time (20th February, 1921) gives a chronological record of the Tudor-Crozier-Hamar Greenwood Auxiliary raid at Trim and elsewhere which

concluded with the resignation of General Crozier on February 19th.

Arthur Henderson upholds Ireland's Right to a Republic:

There was strong criticism of the Government during a debate in the British House of Commons on Monday, 21st February. In the course of the same debate, in response to an interjection of a Conservative member, Arthur Henderson, the Labour Leader, said:-

"If the majority of the Irish people were to declare in favour of and demand in a constitutional way an Irish Republic, then nothing should stand in their way, so long as they took steps to safeguard Ireland from becoming a danger to the safety of the Empire."

On the 23rd February Goblet (Treguez) reported in a letter to the Rector that the second French edition of his "L'Irlande Dans La Crise Universelle" was ready, indicating the changes in it. He is one of the principal authorities on the Barony Maps of Sir William Petty's Survey, which are in the Bibliotheque Nationale of Paris, on which he has written a critical study, and more latterly for the Irish Manuscripts Commission, a Topographical (1932) Index of these Maps.

Cardinal Bourne visits Rome:

Cardinal Bourne arrived in Rome on the evening of the 28th February, having been robbed of five of his bags near Chiasso, a robbery which, it goes without saying, was publicly attributed to Sinn Féin.

Gavan Duffy writing on the 24th February, 1921, reported that he would be back in Rome on the 26th March very satisfied with his mission.

I received a letter from de Valera, dated 11th

1921, and sent through Seán T. O'Kelly. From it, it appeared that the President was very perturbed over the Irish situation in Rome. The President had seen the Archbishop of Dublin who regretted that he had not received more details from us. He also told the President that it was impossible to get a strong positive action from the bishops at the moment.

You have an example of British propaganda in the account which was published in the New York 'Herald' (continental edition) on the 9th March, 1921, giving the news of the assassination of the Mayor of Limerick (George Clancy), the ex-Mayor (Michael O'Callaghan) and a resident (O'Donoghue). Under the heading in heavy type, "Mayor of Limerick Murdered by Rebels", it publishes the following:-

"London, Tuesday. The Mayor of Limerick, the ex-Mayor and a prominent merchant were shot dead in Limerick on Sunday night in the most appalling circumstances. The Mayor was found dead in the backyard, where he had crept after having been attacked in his home by rebel assailants. The Mayor was a great Irish speaker and a well-known pacifist. He took no part in the Sinn Féin organisation."

There was all the less excuse for this, as a more objective account had already appeared in the New York papers.

On the occasion of the creation of six Cardinals on 7th March, 1921, including the Archbishops of Munich, Cologne and Philadelphia, His Holiness made an important allocution. It aroused world-wide interest on account of his reference to the "fratricidal struggles" in Italy, Europe, and one pointed reference to Ireland. His words were:-

"We actually witness the sad spectacle of the fratricidal struggles of citizens of the one country, between peoples born and bred almost on the same territory which they now dispute, inch by inch, raising between themselves a wall of hates and dislikes."

The 'Irish Independent' and the 'Irish Catholic' of that week contain an account of the allocution and its repercussions in Italy. Two issues of the 'Corriere della Sera' - one on the 9th and the other on the 10th March, 1921 - deal with the Pope's allocution, the Irish question and Cardinal Bourne. It concludes its article, published on the 10th, with the words:-

"But the quarrel cannot be prolonged indefinitely. In the interests of Great Britain and the 'Green Island', some way of adjustment must be found."

This Milan paper, which was a most influential and notoriously Anglophile journal, enjoyed the highest circulation of any paper in Italy.

Gavan Duffy returned to Rome on the 8th March after a tour of the chief western capitals, by order of the Irish Government, to report on the state of continental feeling on the Irish question and on the steps that should be taken to organise Irish propaganda there. He visited Berlin and, passing through Paris, visited Salamanca where he was joined by the Rector of the Irish College there, Dr. O'Doherty, who went with him to Madrid and then to Barcelona. Certainly in Barcelona and, I believe in Madrid he addressed a large and enthusiastic demonstration in one of the theatres of the city. While in Berlin he was tracked everywhere by two English secret servicemen but, as he

was going about and transacting his affairs quite openly, it made no difference whatever.

In a letter that I wrote to de Valera on the 10th March, 1921, I set out the precise situation in Rome at the moment and suggested to him to organise a protest in England against Cardinal Bourne and to make him the "whipping-boy" for others at home and abroad and that a protest should be addressed by the Dáil to Cardinal Gasparri against Cardinal Bourne and his statements on Ireland. The letter was sent that same evening to Seán T. O'Kelly in Paris for conveyance to London and Dublin.

Pro-Irelanda Demonstration in Rome:

On the forenoon of Passion Sunday, 13th March, 1921, a great Pro-Irelanda demonstration was held in the Teatro Eliseo in the Via Nazionale, opposite the Bank of Italy. It was organised nominally by the Circolo Universitario Cattolico but, in fact, by the heads of the Partito Popolare, the Hons. Angelo Mauri, Martire and Borromeo. Mauri, a few months later, was elected one of the Vice Presidents of the Italian Chamber and became Minister of Agriculture. He was one of the leading orators of the Chamber. Martire was a well-known journalist and a very prominent figure in Roman and Catholic life. He is still a member of the Chamber. Borromeo was a well-known physician and a leader of the Catholic Party in the Roman municipality and was President of the Roman Section of the Partito Popolare.

The organisation of this demonstration was, owing to Italian relations with England, a matter of great delicacy. We all realised that it would be bitterly resented by the British and that they would leave no stone unturned to block it but, even since the pastoral of the Irish bishops of the previous October, the

conscience of the Partito Popolare would not allow them to keep silent any longer on the Irish question. They were, therefore, determined, cost what it would, that a public expression would be given by the Catholics of Italy in general of their sympathy for the Irish cause. It was hoped that a great demonstration in Rome, in which the heads of the Partito Popolare would take part, would set the headline for numerous meetings in all the chief cities of Italy.

The Hons. Mauri and Martire had several consultations with Dr. Hagan as to the best procedure. It was at Mauri's own suggestion that the sponsoring of the Roman meeting was entrusted to the young men of the University. Their indignation at the execution of Kevin Barry was the immediate occasion.

The organisation of the meeting could become public in so many ways that the necessity for secrecy demanded that everything should be left in the hands of a small and unsuspected body. Otherwise, it would immediately become known to the British agents and bring on us the attention of the Italian police. This largely explained the delay. In Italy permission of the police has to be obtained for public meetings and at once, when this permission was sought and the intention to hold the meeting became known, British agents became active. Lurid pictures were presented to the police of the grave political consequences that would follow connivance at this toleration of Irish revolutionaries.

Cardinal Gasquet became active in the ecclesiastical world. The Secretariat of State was approached but declared that, being a local ecclesiastical matter, it fell under the jurisdiction of the Cardinal Vicar of Rome. Cardinal Gasquet,

therefore, applied very hopefully to the Cardinal Vicar, Cardinal Pompili, with whom his relations were very friendly and to whom he expatiated on the iniquity of the official Catholic organisation in Rome, the Circolo di San Pietro, mixing itself up in political and even revolutionary affairs. The Circolo Universitario, it should be mentioned, was affiliated to the Circolo di San Pietro and in this way the name of the Circolo di San Pietro had been involved. Accordingly the President of the San Pietro Circolo was summoned but he blandly explained to the Cardinal Vicar that their connection with the Circolo Universitario was very nominal and that it would be against all their principles to interfere in any way with these excellent young men. This reply was conveyed to Cardinal Gasquet and that ended the attempt to block the meeting on the ecclesiastical side.

Meanwhile the scruples of the police were even more easily overcome following an interview with the leaders of the Partito Popolare. Thus at last, the road was cleared and the University students became active.

While the heads of the Partito Popolare worked in the background with Monsignor Hagan, the young men of the University began to occupy the limelight. The organisation of the meeting was financed through Dr. Hagan who, at a consultation with Martire at which Gavan Duffy was present on the 17th January gave one thousand lire to Gavan Duffy to hand to Martire.

By the 3rd February the University students had matters well advanced and on that date we handed to their President, Signor Romano Montini, all the papers, booklets and photographs that they required. It was Signor Montini who was to take the chair at the opening

of the demonstration. He was a brother of the Monsignor Montini who is to-day (1951) the Under Secretary for Ecclesiastical Affairs.

The demonstration was an unqualified success. The theatre was crowded in every part. On the stage were the Hons. Mauri, Borromeo, Miglioli, Salvatore Ursi and the Hon. de Gasperi (to-day the Prime Minister of Italy). Others included Commendatore Paolo Pericoli, several of the heads of lay Catholic organisations, councillors of the Roman municipality and the provincial councils, Avv. Guerra, representing Don Sturzo, the distinguished leader of the Partito Popolare, representatives of the Co-operative Confederation and of the Confederation of Workers, Professors Ermmi and Aquilanti of the Royal University of Rome and Count Pecci (a nephew or grand-nephew of Pope Leo XIII). The students did the honours of the occasion and distributed a special booklet prepared for the demonstration, largely composed of the pastoral of the Irish bishops and the report of the inquiry of the British Labour Party.

The meeting was formally opened with a short statement by Romano Montini who read letters of support from His Excellency, the Minister Bertone, from Don Sturzo on behalf of the Partito Popolare, from the Hon. Gronchi on behalf of the Italian Confederation of Workers and from other deputies. These letters were received with great applause.

Signor Montini vacated the chair and the Hon. Borromeo was called on to preside. His address chiefly dwelt on the significance of the participation of the University students in promoting this manifestation and in sending their "fraternal solidarity to Ireland, for which the justice of history and days of liberty and

peace could not long be delayed". He ended his discourse by introducing Mr. Gavan Duffy, "the Republican Deputy of Dublin".

Gavan Duffy was received with a great ovation and, speaking in choice French, conveyed the gratitude of the Irish people towards Italy. In an impressive discourse he expressed the ardent aspirations of his fatherland for full liberty and independence. He spoke of life in Ireland to-day and of the fierce struggle that raged there and, having alluded to the heroism of the Irish clergy, he re-asserted the determination of all the Irish to fight for their great cause to its inevitable victory.

Mauri then, as the official orator, spoke in eloquent and vibrant tones that stirred the hearts of all present. He traced an outline of the age-long history of the efforts and sufferings of martyred Ireland to break the chains of political oppression and economic spoliation. He was proud to see that this manifestation of sympathy for Ireland was organised by young University students who were the flower of the new forces in Italy and, in the generosity of their unsullied youth, they sprang into the front line wherever it was a question of asserting the ideal of a healthy and holy liberty and of defending a true and just cause. He was equally proud to see how this appeal of the youth had elicited this reply, with its imposing and magnificent assembly, of Rome, the eternal lighthouse of Christian civilisation in the world, the synthesis and symbol of our most enlightened and dearest national values.

The speaker was loudly applauded as he showed the right the Italian people had, despite their financial obligations to England, to express their noble sentiments, their humane ideals and spiritual

fraternity with the Irish people. He illustrated the historic beginnings of English aggression in Ireland, the denial of political representation to Catholics, the O'Connell movement and the more impressive manifestations of the Sinn Féin movement following Wilson's declaration of the right of the peoples to the selection of their own government. Concluding with a reference to the figure of the martyred Oliver Plunkett, beatified the previous May, he outlined in an inspired summing-up how the beauty of the Catholic faith elevated and sanctified the love of fatherland. He tendered to Gavan Duffy, -

"the representative of oppressed Ireland, in the great name of Rome, the spiritual embrace of redeemed Italy".

Loud and long acclamations echoed through the theatre and, while the meeting broke up amid the greatest enthusiasm, the students chanting the hymns of Catholic youth formed, despite police regulations, a procession through the Via Nazionale, the main thoroughfare of Rome, and wended their way to the nearby Irish College at St. Agatha's. A prolonged and rousing demonstration was held in front of the College. Anticipating an embarrassing situation, Dr. Hagan had sent the students out of the city. The College was shuttered and silent but the demonstration, far from showing signs of ending, grew in intensity. It was too much for an emotional visitor accidentally present in the Cardinal's reception room and who, opening the shutter, displayed the Irish tricolour preserved there. More clamorous grew the demonstration as crowds, returning home for their mid-day meal along the Via Nazionale, poured into the Via Mazzarino to join in the demonstration. Such was the situation when Gavan

Duffy and I appeared around the other end of the block. With his usual resource, the Rector solved the situation, growing in difficulty and inviting the attention of the police, by having the College doors opened and conveying an invitation to the demonstrators to pass through the hall into the Church of St. Agatha to pay a tribute to the heart of Daniel O'Connell. Gradually the crowds quietened as they passed through the church and were shepherded out in groups by a side entrance into the Via Panisperna.

Altogether, it was a unique demonstration of fraternal sympathy and affection. We all felt very elated over its success, particularly the young men of the Circolo, conscious of having struck an effective blow in a noble cause and doubtless for the prestige it brought themselves. Mauri and ourselves, looking to the future, built strong hopes on the example it set the rest of Italy, nor did we overlook the repercussion it would have in the Roman Curia, demonstrating our influence and helping to strengthen the attitude of the Vatican in the face of our enemies.

A photograph in the Irish College records the names of the students of the Circolo. With Gavan Duffy and Mauri, they were Montini, Carrimini, Lepri, Andreoli, Costa and Pettacci.

Immediately we began to re-double and hasten the preparations for Gavan Duffy's proposed appeal to the Deputies of the Italian Chamber as well as to the organisations of the Partito Popolare and the public press.

All the Rome papers gave the demonstration widespread publicity. Doubtless a full account of the meeting appeared in the 'Irish Catholic' and the 'Catholic Bulletin' from the Rome correspondents.

At this time the war in Ireland was at its height. The month was marred by further executions, notably by six in Cork and of Patrick Moran and five others in Dublin on the 14th March. The Dublin executions followed an unfortunate judgment in the King's Bench supporting General Macready's assertion about powers of life and death under martial law. The executions on the 14th March were the occasions of unparalleled scenes and demonstrations in Dublin. Cardinal Logue, Archbishop Walsh of Dublin and the Lord Mayor had used their utmost influence in appeals for mercy but in vain. Hopes had run high that reprieves would have been granted. The ruthless denial of mercy infuriated public indignation which was still further inflamed by the heroic and religious bearing of the martyrs. A very moving account of their end is to be found in the 'Irish Catholic' of that week and in the 'Freeman's Journal'.

Speaking of the High Court judgment, a Dublin newspaper ('Irish Independent'?) said two of the victims were convicted on evidence which no civilian jury would regard as sufficient.

Archbishop Walsh protests against Conviction of Patrick Moran. Archbishop's Death:

In a letter to Patrick Moran's solicitor the Archbishop of Dublin wrote:-

"I have always understood from that great jurist, the late Chief Baron Pallas, as a result of several serious conversations with him that, when the evidence on which a charge is based fails to sustain it, not merely in the case of a capital charge but in the case of any charge, great or small, the only result consistent with justice is withdrawal of the charge and acquittal. I apply this without

hesitation to the case of your client."

This was the last public intervention of the Archbishop in political affairs. The week after the executions the announcement of his serious illness was published. He died on the 9th April. I have been informed by his entourage that, so deeply was he affected by the execution of Kevin Barry, he never again recovered his good spirits.

These executions are the best commentary on the sincerity of Lloyd George's protestations for peace in Ireland.

Further English Protests against Administration
in Ireland:

On St. Patrick's Day (17th March, 1921) a leading article in the 'Times' revealed the uneasiness of English public opinion on Lloyd George's administration in Ireland. Having alluded to the call of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York for the restoration of peace in Ireland, the article went on:-

"Whatever their diversity of political opinion, Christians can only contemplate with horror the internecine warfare that rends Ireland, and long and pray for its cessation. Recent events have gone far to strengthen the public feeling that something is fundamentally wrong. The imagination of the country has been stirred and serious people are asking themselves how, and to what extent, England is at fault."

The 'Manchester Guardian' published at some length an account of the long series of outrages against the Catholic priesthood in Ireland, particularly that on Fr. Denis O'Hara of Kiltimagh, arising out of events of the 22nd March, 1921.

On the 17th March Gavan Duffy entertained Mauri and the Circolo Universitario to tea at his house.

Archbishop Mannix arrives in Rome:

Dr. Mannix arrived from Paris in Rome on the 24th March. He was received by the Irish and Australian colonies and by the representatives of the Circolo Universitario. He stayed at the Irish College. This visit had long been the occasion of much curiosity in many English circles who were not without the fantastic hope that the Irish movement would be condemned and that the Archbishop's reception by His Holiness would be a very cool one.

On the following day (25th March) Monsignor Cerretti called on the Archbishop and remained in private conversation with him for a full hour.

A general account of the Archbishop's visit to Rome, which extended from the 24th March to the 12th April, will be found in the 'Independent' of the 8th April, 1921. Its "Special Correspondent" was myself.

Dr. Hagan's reception to the Archbishop on Easter Sunday (March 27th) was the occasion of an important address by the Archbishop. He said that the spirit in Ireland was indomitable and that his only claim was for justice for Ireland, for her absolute and complete independence.

Archbishop Mannix induces the Pope to give a
Contribution to Irish White Cross:

The Archbishop had his audience with the Pope on Easter Tuesday (March 29th). Nothing could exceed the kindness and undisguised sympathy of the Holy Father. It lasted a full fifty-five minutes and Monsignor Cerretti was present as interpreter. The conversation turned almost entirely on the Irish question. Dr. Mannix spoke very plainly and openly on the situation.

The Pope was anxious to find a solution and an intermediary. He stated that Cardinal Bourne had told him that Lloyd George was anxious for a settlement and was ready to concede Dominion Home Rule. Dr. Mannix replied that Lloyd George was not to be trusted and that, moreover, Lloyd George was powerless, that the English people did not really want any settlement that could be accepted and that the struggle had to go on, that the Irish people would not accept any solution that would not give them independence. He repeated what he said at the Irish College, that the women would carry on if the men failed, and the children, if the adults failed. He spoke of the concern in Ireland lest any condemnation of the Irish movement should proceed from the Pope. His Holiness protested that no such condemnation was ever contemplated and would not be made. Dr. Mannix said that unfortunately that feeling existed and should be removed, especially as there was disappointment that no expression of sympathy had been forthcoming from the Pope. The Pope asked what could be done and Dr. Mannix suggested a subscription to the White Cross (Irish Relief) Fund, accompanied by a letter. The Pope took this up warmly and it was arranged that Dr. Mannix should draft the letter in conjunction with Monsignor Cerretti and the Rector, Dr. Hagan. It was also arranged that the treatment of Dr. Mannix by the British Government should not be allowed to pass without protest and that by the time of his arrival in Australia a letter should be sent to him by His Holiness, praising his work for Newman College and protesting against his treatment by the British.

The next day (30th March) Dr. Mannix and Dr. Hagan were received by the Secretary of State, Cardinal Gasparri. Monsignor Cerretti was again present. The

entire discussion was on the proposed letter of the Pope, subscribing to the Relief Fund in Ireland and how far the Pope's principles, as expressed in his Peace Note, might be taken as a basis. It would be pointed out that the treatment of Ireland was a violation of these principles and that an impartial inquiry should be established.

At the conclusion of the interview, as they were passing through the ante-camera, the Cardinal noticed de Salis, the English Minister, waiting for an interview. The Cardinal asked Dr. Mannix had he any objection to be introduced to de Salis. The Archbishop said he had none. De Salis was obviously confused when the Cardinal signed to him to come forward and, when introduced, remarked that he was glad that they met there as it was not likely that they would meet elsewhere!

Among those who entertained the Archbishop was Prince Borghese.

On the following day (31st March) the Archbishop drafted the proposed letter to the White Cross Fund for the Pope's approval. The draft was shown in the afternoon to Gavan Duffy and in the evening to Monsignor Cerretti who took supper with us. Monsignor Cerretti intimated that for his part he would recommend the adoption of the draft as it stood. It was a plea for peace, referring to the different phases of English tyranny in Ireland and suggesting the calling of a constituent assembly of elected representatives of the people. The letter terminated with His sending a subscription and His Blessing to the people and the promoters of the Fund.

We were somewhat intrigued that Count de Salis called on Dr. Mannix on the 1st April.

On the 9th April Monsignor Cerretti called on Dr. Mannix, remained for supper and discussed the Pope's letter in its Latin form, the draft of which had been substantially adopted. The letter was to be issued very soon. Monsignor Cerretti sounded the Archbishop once more on the Pope's proposal to intervene with the British Government to obtain the removal of the ban against his going to Ireland. The Archbishop gathered from Monsignor Cerretti that de Salis (that is, the British Government) was most anxious to get any excuse for raising the ban and of allowing the Archbishop to visit Ireland. Again the Archbishop refused.

The Archbishop had his final audience with His Holiness on the 12th April, Monsignor Cerretti again being present. The Archbishop saw the final form of the Latin version of the Pope's proposed subscription to the White Cross. The letter was to be held back until the expected arrival of the text of the English Bishops' letter.

Monsignor Cerretti, during the week after the Archbishop's departure, referred to the immense impression made by the Archbishop everywhere.

On May 11th, 1921, on the eve of his departure for Australia, the Archbishop was presented in London with a farewell address from the Irish Hierarchy. On the following day he was entertained to a farewell dinner by the English clergy under the presidency of the Bishop of Portsmouth. The address of the Irish Bishops, signed by all of them, will doubtless be found in the 'Annals' of the 'Irish Ecclesiastical Directory'.

The Pope's letter and the subscription to the White Cross was published on the 22nd May, 1921. The letter was dealt with by the Irish and Italian press of 23rd May and received the full recognition of the most

formal documents of the Holy See by being published in the official Acti Apostolicae Sedis, Vol. XIII, No. 7, of 1st June, 1921. The official summary describes it as:

"Letter to Cardinal Logue, Primate of Ireland, exhorting Irish and English to settle their strife peacefully and enclosing a subscription of 200,000 lire for the White Cross to assist the victims of the reprisals."

A question arose regarding the English translation of an important passage of the letter. Unfortunately I cannot recollect the particular passage but, on Dr. Hagan making representations to Monsignor Cerretti on the matter, the latter agreed with the Rector's view that the translation was inadequate and accepted the form drawn up by the Rector. Accordingly it was sent to Mr. McNerney, the London correspondent of the 'Irish Independent', for publication in Ireland and to Commendatore Cortesi for publication in the American press.

The 'Irish Bulletin' of the 4th April, 1921, Volume IV, No. 60, contains the full text of the interview given by de Valera to the 'International News' and the 'Universal Service' on the 30th March. It deals with the moral position of the Republican movement and discusses fundamental questions, the recognition of the Republic by the electorate in 1918, the I.R.A., its military arms, etc.

On the 23rd April, 1921, Dr. Fogarty, Bishop of Killaloe, issued a statement regarding the attempt to burn his residence on the night of the 20th.

'Irish Bulletin's' Comments on Cardinal Logue's Reference to "Campaign of Assassination" are shown to the Pope by Dr. Hagan:

The 'Irish Bulletin' of the 3rd May, 1921, adversely commented upon an address made by Cardinal

Logue on April 28th in an out-of-the-way parish called Clonoe in Co. Tyrone, and also on another by the Archbishop of Tuam, Dr. Gilmartin. It stated that the Irish people understood the Cardinal's position and did not take his statements seriously. The 'Irish Bulletin' said it dwelt on the matter inasmuch as the statements were being utilised by British propagandists as an evidence of a weakening of the determination of the Irish people to achieve their independence. Both these statements were true. In the course of his speech Cardinal Logue had stated that, if Ireland renounced the campaign of assassination, it could obtain all that was necessary for Ireland and that they would never achieve an Irish Republic as long as England had a single soldier. It was stated in the public press that the Cardinal's talk immediately followed a visit paid to him by Lord Derby. The 'Irish Bulletin' charitably ascribed the Cardinal's attitude to his great age. We found the Cardinal's talk to the children of Clonoe solemnly cabled to the Roman journals two days later (30th April).

About this time Lord Edmond Talbot (Fitzalan?), a leading English Catholic layman, was appointed Viceroy in the fantastic belief that it would make a favourable impression on the Irish people, or perhaps deceive the British and continental peoples. This was the occasion when Cardinal Logue, on being asked his view on the appointment, grimly retorted:-

"Ireland would as soon have a Catholic hangman!"

Fitzalan took up office on the 19th May. He was the first and last Catholic Viceroy since "Fighting" Dick Talbot, the Duke of Tirconaill, in the time of James the Second.

At the end of April and for most of May, 1921, I was absent in Sicily on vacation.

On the 6th May Dr. Hagan had an audience with His Holiness. His Holiness at once introduced the subject of Cardinal Logue's declaration of April 28th. Anticipating this, the Rector had prepared and now produced a dossier, drawn up on the same lines as the comment of the 'Irish Bulletin' of May 3rd. It included the unanimous declaration of the Irish bishops of the previous October to which he claimed greater weight was to be attached than that of two ecclesiastics out of touch with their people. The dossier also included the comment itself of the 'Irish Bulletin' and the letter of the Bishop of Clonfert (Dr. O'Doherty) to the 'Corriere della Sera', of which unfortunately I have not a copy. The dossier produced a visible impression on His Holiness who listened to the Rector making ridicule of the idea of surrender which he described as "moonshine"; he seemed to accept the Rector's verdict that Lord Edmond Talbot was a fool to accept the position of Viceroy and did not seem to be surprised when the Rector expressed the fear that Talbot would be shot before long if the "terror" in Ireland continued. His Holiness concluded by saying that he had sent to Cardinal Logue his letter to the White Cross with a subscription of two hundred thousand lire for the victims of the reprisals.

Renewed Peace Efforts:

Renewed efforts at peace began again in the opening week of May, 1921. This time the efforts led to more definite results. There is considerable confusion as to the precise beginning. The London correspondent of the 'Irish Independent', writing on the 11th May to show the muddled state of the "Irish

settlement" situation, says:-

"I may mention that I hear of no less than ten self-constituted missionaries of peace on this side, who have each claimed the sole credit for having brought Mr. de Valera and Sir James Craig of Belfast together."

From the public press the following is definite:-

On May 3rd, 1921, Mr. Martin H. Glynn, who had been a well-known Governor of New York State, 1913-1914, and a prominent figure of the Democratic Party in the U.S.A. and who at this time was editor and proprietor of 'The Times-Union' of Albany, had an interview with Lloyd George in the Prime Minister's room in the House of Commons. According to the 'Freeman's Journal' (and the extracts and comments of the London 'Times' on the 'Freeman's Journal') the following definite offer was made by Lloyd George, through Mr. Glynn:-

"I will meet Mr. de Valera, or any of the Irish leaders, without condition on my part and without exacting promises from them. It is the only way a conclusion can be reached. The conference will lead to an exchange of opinions, out of which we may find common ground upon which we can refer to our respective people for a settlement."

According to Mr. Glynn, it was Mr. Lloyd George who first mentioned Ireland. According to the 'Times' of 17th May, Mr. Glynn asked the London correspondent of the 'New York Herald'

to see Mr. de Valera and lay the offer before him, as Mr. Glynn had to return immediately to Albany. De Valera's reply will be found in the 'Times' account of the 17th May:-

"If Mr. Lloyd George makes this statement in public, I shall give him a public reply. The fundamental question at issue between the two countries is the question of Ireland's right to choose freely and independently her own government and political institutions at home, and her relationships with foreign nations as well."

On the appearance of this article in the 'Times, an enquiry was at once made whether the Prime Minister wished to make any reply to the announcement by the 'Freeman's Journal' whereupon the following statement was issued on the same day (17th May) from 10 Downing Street:-

"Mr. Lloyd George made no statement on the subject of Mr. de Valera beyond what he has already stated in the House of Commons."

I have noted in my diary that at this time (about 6th May) Lord Derby paid several visits to Ireland at the instigation of Lloyd George:-

"He has seen prominent leaders on the Sinn Féin side and also Cardinal Logue."

I had no indication as to what was likely to result.

On the 12th May, 1921, the 'Times' published a "Memorial of Certain Irishmen" addressed to the

Prime Minister, containing a new Irish peace proposal. The memorial was signed by Lords Athlumney, Fingal, French, Kilmaine, Monteagle, Lieutenant-General Sir Hubert Gough, Major-General Hickie, General Lawson, Lieutenant-General Sir Bryan-Mahon, the two Protestant Bishops of Killaloe and Meath, Sir Horace Plunkett, Professor Adams, Professor Graham-Wallas, Mr. Harold Laski, Dr. W.F. Trench, Lady Aberdeen, Mr. Stephen Gwynn, Mr. Bernard Shaw, W.B. Yeats, Sir Charles Russell, Sir Thomas Esmonde, The McDermot, The Mahony, The O'Connor Don, Sir John Keane, Sir Thomas Myles, Sir T.C. O'Brien, Sir John R. O'Connell, Sir Alec Shaw, Katherine Tynan, Miss Margaret Cunningham (Warden of Trinity Hall), Captain Harrison and Mr. St. John Irvine.

The 'Times' of the same date, 12th May, contains a report of Asquith's speech to a meeting of Women Liberals at the Central Hall, Westminster, on the previous night. The ex-Prime Minister, blandly ignoring all his own past responsibilities, spoke on the condition of Ireland. He first moved a resolution that:-

"This meeting declares its abhorrence at the British Government's policy and methods of coercion in Ireland. It calls for an immediate truce and amnesty and for the withdrawal of the Auxiliary forces from Ireland and urges the Government to enter into immediate negotiations with the elected representatives of the Irish people."

Referring to the recent conversations between Sir James Craig and Mr. de Valera, he said:-

"The time has come when we must frankly give to Ireland the status of one of our self-governing dominions.

There must be given to the freely-elected representatives of the Irish people met together the fullest constituent power to accept without reservation or narrowing and irritating conditions the same status of nationhood and self-governing Dominion autonomy which has been in every quarter of the globe the nexus of our Imperial unity."

The resolution was received with cheers, supported by Sir John Simon, and carried with acclamation.

Lord Lieutenant announces Elections for the Southern and Northern Parliaments:

On the 4th May, 1921, proclamations were issued by the Lord Lieutenant calling the Southern Irish Parliament for June 28th and the Northern Parliament for June 7th.

A session of Dáil Éireann held during the second week of May (see 'Young Ireland' of 4th June, 1921) decided that:-

"The Parliamentary elections which are taking place this month are to be regarded as elections to Dáil Éireann and that the existing Dáil automatically dissolves as soon as the new body has been summoned."

On May 13th nominations for these two Parliaments were made. In "Southern Ireland" 124 Sinn Féin candidates were returned unopposed. Only four anti-Republicans were returned, those for the T.C.D. citadel.

For 52 seats in N.E. Ulster, 40 Unionists, 20 Sinn Féin, 13 Nationalist and 5 unofficial Labour candidates were nominated.

These elections were Ireland's answer to Lloyd George and his military terrorism. They could no longer be misrepresented or explained away. They should too have conveyed a complete repudiation of the implied claims of the West-British busybodies of this country who arrogated to themselves the role of spokesmen and they should too have conveyed a lesson to the graying survivors of the days of the vanished Irish Parliamentary Party.

The first number of the 'Bolletino Ufficiale Irlandese d'Informazione' was published on the 23rd May, 1921, in neat printed quarto leaf.

Premises for the Irish Legation were acquired by Mr. Gavan Duffy about this time and he transferred his residence from the Flora Hotel to this new Legation at 70 Via Veneto on June 15th. The building, however, disappeared in the course of the Roman town-planning scheme under Mussolini and its site is now occupied by the Hotel of the Ambassadors - Albergo de Ambasciatori - opposite the Palazzo Buoncompagni. Dr. Hagan was of considerable assistance in facilitating the acquisition of the premises.

5
Copy of Dáil Appeal by the Italian Deputies
is presented to the Pope:

At this same period much time and care were given to the preparation by Gavan Duffy and the more prominent ecclesiastics in Rome of the translation and editing of an appeal by the Dáil to the Italian Deputies. The translation was made by Monsignor Augusto Fidecicchi (now a member of the Tribunal of the Rota), a Roman ecclesiastic who at all times gave us invaluable guidance and assistance. At the time he was one of the senior officials of one of the Roman congregations. The work was printed by the middle of June, 1921. The circulation of the address was

interrupted by the Truce and other events in Ireland but the occasion was not lost to present a specially edited copy of its contents to His Holiness. This was presented towards the end of June. A copy of this address will be found in the volume, 'Irish Bulletin, 1916-1921', which I hope to present to the Bureau.

I may mention that it was at this period too (13th June, 1921) that the Honorable Angelo Mauri, who had addressed the pro-Irlanda meeting in February, was elected one of the four Vice-Presidents of the Chamber of Deputies.

On the 25th May, 1921, the Custom House was burned. The 'Irish Bulletin' of May 27th sets out the motives that inspired its destruction. It was the seat of nine departments of the Government and the destruction of the records, especially those of the Local Government Board, the Customs and the Inland Revenue, reduced the British Government in Ireland to virtual impotence. The 'Bulletin' dealt with the hypocritical outburst in the West-British press in Ireland at the destruction by Irishmen of an historic and beautiful edifice. Its destruction, though most regrettable, was inevitable. It was this same press:-

"which remained callously silent while fifteen city and town halls were being destroyed in various parts of Ireland and whole streets of shops and hundreds of residences and farmsteads were being wiped out of existence by British soldiers and police".

I pass over now the critical events that occurred in Ireland, beginning with the arrest (22nd June, 1921) and release (23rd June, 1921) of de Valera, the correspondence between Lloyd George and de Valera and the meeting between Craig and de Valera.

On Cardinal Logue learning from the 'Freeman's Journal' of the opening of the overtures with Lloyd George, he wisely remarked that he would regard such overtures with extreme caution and reserve. He did not believe, he said, and could not see how a mere personal meeting between Mr. de Valera and Sir James Craig would do much good:-

"The ministry must be directly and completely involved and, as this is now evidently the procedure, I see some hope in the situation."

In conclusion, the 'Freeman' added:-

"Cardinal Logue strongly advocated the attendance of Mr. Arthur Griffith whose views indeed he thought of great value in such negotiations."

This new admiration of Arthur Griffith on the part of the Cardinal marked how far his conversion had advanced from 1916. It is very doubtful whether his deep antipathy to and suspicion of Mr. Eamon de Valera were ever overcome.

Arthur Griffith, John McNeill, Staines and Duggan were released from Mountjoy on the 1st July, 1921.

Smuts arrived in Dún Laoghaire on the 5th July. On the pier to meet him were Arthur Griffith and R.C. Barton, who had also been released. They drove directly to the Mansion House and met de Valera, and the Republican leaders that evening.

From this time onwards the press gives a fairly full account of the negotiations and talks.

De Valera was nominated as Chancellor of the National University on the 1st July in succession to Archbishop Walsh - a significant indication of the

new trend in Irish life in academic as well as in political circles. As was foreseen, there was no opposition to de Valera's nomination, so his formal appointment will date from July 20th.

By letter dated 8th July to Lloyd George, Eamon de Valera agreed to meet him to discuss the basis of a peace conference. On the same evening it was officially announced in Downing Street:-

"In accordance with the Prime Minister's offer and Mr. de Valera's reply, arrangements are being made for hostilities to cease from Monday next, July the 11th, at noon."

Sir James Craig visited Buckingham Palace on the 8th July.

Mr. Hambro exposes in the 'Times' the systematic Circulation of "doped" News on Ireland from the British Foreign Office to the Foreign Press:

The 'Times' of the 23rd July publishes a telegram of Reuter, dated Christiania, July 21st, in which Mr. Hambro, one of the members in the Storting and editor-in-chief of the 'Morgenbladet' from 1913 to 1921, exposed the systematic circulation of "doped" news from the British Foreign Office to the foreign press. It goes without saying that Ireland was one of the chief sufferers.

Issue of Writs of Attachment against General Macready and Others:

The press reports of the 29th July state that the Master of the Rolls directed the issue of writs of attachment against General Sir N. Macready, General Strickland and other officers who had disregarded an order of the court to produce two men who had been sentenced to death by the military courts. The judgment in this case was a most important statement on the illegal powers exercised by the military

authorities through courts martial. The 'Daily News' concludes its report on the matter:-

"The responsibility rests with the civil power which resigned its functions into their hands (the military), the Chief Secretary for Ireland and the Prime Minister behind him, and a subservient parliament behind both."

The Rector at this time was in Lucerne where he had gone to meet Mr. and Mrs. Seán T. O'Kelly. They left Lucerne on the 30th July for Paris to meet Mr. Frank Walsh.

Mr. Gavan Duffy left Rome on the 6th August for France.

In a debate in the House of Lords on the 10th August the Lord Chancellor acknowledged that the progress of the coercive attempts made by the Government had, as was well known, proved in a high degree disappointing, and some weeks previously there appeared no hope of a solution of the difficulty except by a further and intensified military effort.

It was announced on the 12th August that the Irish representatives abroad had been summoned home to attend a meeting of Dáil Éireann to be held on the 16th August.

The Dublin correspondent of the 'Times' writing on the 14th September, 1921, pictures the situation in Dublin on the visit of Messrs. Boland and McGrath to Lloyd George at Gairloch and on the private session of Dáil Éireann held the same day (14th September) on Lloyd George's statement to the envoys. An official report of the private session of Dáil Éireann was published on the same day (14th September) announcing for the first time the appointment of the five delegates to a possible conference with representatives

of the British Government. The absence of de Valera's name from the list of delegates caused some surprise. Personally I thought it very wise and foreseeing. It reminded me at once of the practice of the Landowners at the Land Conference (of 1903?). They never made any final decision on any day's agreement until their representatives had reported it to a Committee and its legal adviser (Mr. Askwith) each evening. Many were uneasy that Arthur Griffith might not be sufficiently uncompromising on the "Crown" issue but few doubted that Collins would fail to safeguard the Republicans' position.

On the 15th, 16th, 17th and 19th September telegrams were interchanged between de Valera and Lloyd George on the conditions upon which the conference would meet.

American Hierarchy send Good Wishes to Cardinal Logue for Success of Peace Conference:

On the 23rd September Cardinal Logue received a very touching telegram addressed by the American hierarchy on the occasion of their annual conference, assuring them of their sympathy, prayers and united good wishes:-

"for the happy outcome of the conference on which the representatives of your people are now engaged. Particularly during recent years, with anxious and expectant hearts they have watched the trend of events and ever hopeful that Providence in its wisdom might ordain that at last Ireland was to take its place among the nations of the earth.

And, indeed, during these later weeks their hearts were filled with pride when they saw the representatives of their race

conduct themselves with a statesmanship that has challenged the admiration of the world."

They concluded by praying for:-

"the fulfilment of their (Irish) national aspirations".

On the 29th September a fresh invitation to the conference was telegraphed by Lloyd George to de Valera. On the following day (September 30th), de Valera accepted the unconditional invitation.

At mid-October, 1921, I was busy winding up the villeggiatura accounts and affairs in Tivoli while Dr. Hagan was in Rome closely following the news of the Anglo-Irish negotiations which were on the very verge of a breakdown. British public opinion seemed to us to be more disturbed and alarmed than Irish opinion. Matters hung in the balance. Many forces, Irish and English, were positively anxious for a break-up. Every day we were expecting to hear an announcement of the failure of the conference.

Genesis of the Pope's Telegram to King George:

In the midst of these uneasy uncertainties the Pope's telegram to King George on Sunday, 16th October, 1921, came as a bolt from the blue. His Holiness had received that morning Bishop Cowgill of the Diocese of Leeds in private audience. That same afternoon, Cardinal Gasparri, the Secretary of State, informed the English Catholic Association pilgrims, led by Bishop Cowgill, that the Pope had sent a telegram to King George expressing his pleasure at the resumption of the Irish negotiations and hoping that they would be successful. It was clear that the Secretariat of State was greatly pleased with itself over its intervention. It genuinely believed that it was coming.

to the rescue of the shaky negotiations for peace and was certain that their action would be welcomed by both sides.

Dr. Hagan heard from some of the pilgrims in a general way that evening (Sunday, the 16th October) of Cardinal Gasparri's announcement of the dispatch of the telegram and at once suspected that Bishop Cowgill and probably Cardinal Gasquet, then in England, were concerned in the matter. These coups are invariably elaborately contrived and he had no doubt that this catch had been a well-angled one. The British are past masters in that science. The next few days confirmed his suspicion, though it needed no great verification.

The next day, Monday, the 17th October, Monsignor (now Cardinal) Pizzardo, then Under-Secretary of State, sent for the Rector and, by direction of His Holiness, informed him of the action the Pope had taken. He asked the Rector for his view of the matter.

On seeing the text of the telegram for the first time, the Rector enquired whether any telegram had been sent to the Irish side; no, no telegram was sent to the Irish.

The Rector said this would certainly cause discontent and furthermore that the telegram would be taken as implying that there was a duty of allegiance owed by the Irish to the King. Monsignor Pizzardo was taken aback. He asked the Rector what he considered should be done. The Rector could only suggest that steps be taken to secure the release of the internees in the interests of peace.

Later when we saw the King's reply, where he spoke of "my people", we saw that the Rector's forecast of Lloyd George's subtle stroke was fully borne out.

Two days later came the first of many illuminating incidents. On Wednesday, the 19th October, the Rector was informed by an English friend, a Mr. W----- of C-----, that Lord Beaverbrook's special newspaper correspondent was in Rome and that he had asked the heads of the Catholic Association Pilgrimage to endeavour to obtain from the Pope his good wishes for the success of the Peace Conference. It had all the appearance of a very natural, innocent and useful request. It is hardly necessary to remark that few Irishmen would have taken that view; it was obviously a device to bring pressure to bear on the Irish Catholic negotiators; Lloyd George, "Galloper" Smith and the rest were not very likely to be influenced by the affable auguri (good wishes) of Benedict XV. In accordance with his instructions, Lord Beaverbrook's agent got busy and rang up Bishop Cowgill at the address given to him. By a most extraordinary stroke of good luck, our sedate and gentlemanly English informant as the chief official on the spot answered the 'phone and, before any explanations could be made, he received in its entirety the amateur diplomat's interesting and significant message. Presumably, Beaverbrook's agent was under the impression that he was speaking to Bishop Cowgill in person. If you knew the dignified and grave Mr. W-----, you would not be in the least surprised.

Meanwhile, following his interview with Monsignor Pizzardo, Dr. Hagan had applied for an audience with His Holiness. It took place on Thursday, the 20th October, the same day as de Valera sent his telegram to the Pope and, incidentally, the same day that we returned from the summer vacation at Tivoli. At the audience the Pope spoke of the telegram he had sent and

explained his motives. The Rector repeated his impressions, though in a milder form than he had conveyed them to Monsignor Pizzardo, but took care to leave a typewritten copy of the telephonic message Mr. W----- had received from Lord Beaverbrook's agent, remarking that the message was well known in Irish circles.

De Valera's telegram of that same day to the Pope was heartily approved of by Dr. Hagan, Fr. Magennis, O.C.C., and, as far as I recollect, by everyone of the Irish frequenters of the Irish College. Possibly one or two were mildly surprised at its undiplomatic form and later on expressed their misgivings in that particular respect as the furore in the British press exploded and as they began to hear of the concern and even scandal among some of the more timorous or ill-disposed of the greyhaired elders of the Irish clergy at home. But the Irish in Rome recognised the crafty hand of Lloyd George pulling the strings and were pleased to see that de Valera had unmasked Lloyd George's tricks and called his bluff. To us Lloyd George seemed to be hoist on his own petard and the assertion of Ireland's claim to independence was the more effectually "reiterated in its extremest form", as the parliamentary correspondent of the 'Times' (24th October, 1921) described it.

The whole English press worked itself for most of the next week into one of its, to us, familiar paroxysms of fury against de Valera and the Irish claim. The 'Daily Herald' seemed to be the only exception. It is doubtful whether all this outraged distress of the English Protestant press for the respect due to the Pope or the pain inflicted on its gentlemanly sentiments by de Valera's bad manners had the least

effect on foreign opinion. It certainly had no other effect on Irish circles than to stiffen their stand. This complete Irish indifference was a phenomenon the British press could not understand. One of their representatives writing from Dublin on the 27th October, 1921, reporting the Sinn Féin Convention held there that day, stated that:-

"Dublin is very tranquil, in fact, possibly a little too tranquil, in the sense that the effect of Mr. de Valera's recent statement upon the British public is insufficiently realised. The matter is being represented here to the Irish public as mere newspaper agitation. Whatever else may be the case, the Irish people are not given by their informants an exact picture of the state of opinion in England and this is unfortunate at a moment of such tension. They do not understand the feeling of the British people for the crown and the anger which has been aroused by Mr. de Valera's contemptuous brushing aside of the king's signature."

The Irish people may not have understood English opinion but certainly they now cared not one rap either for John Bull's feelings or for what he thought - no more than John had for ours.

The 'Times' excelled itself. In the leading article, entitled "Wreckers", in its issue of the 21st October, 1921, the day after de Valera's telegram, it thus pontificated:-

"Mr. de Valera has sent a telegram to the Pope, which, we imagine, will fill His Holiness with dismay as it will certainly

arouse indignation among the people in this country and in the British Dominions. Towards the Pope himself it is an act of impertinence; and towards the King, whose solicitude for the Irish people needs no proof, it is unmannerly to the point of churlishness."

We knew the simple people in Ireland, including many of the most intelligent, would rush to the conclusion that the Pope's telegram was spontaneous and inspired by no other motive than his anxiety for peace and for an honourable settlement. Therefore, by arrangement with Dr. Hagan, I wrote a note on the situation to Mr. McNerney of the London office of the 'Independent'. His column in its issue of the 24th October, 1921, embodies the warning note that the Pope's telegram:-

"was a response to a request made for, or on behalf of, the British Government for a message from His Holiness with respect to the Conference. The British Government in seeking for a communication from the Pope was proceeding in pursuance of its propagandist activities in furtherance of its Irish policy."

On Cardinal Gasquet's return from England, we began to hear still more of the genesis of the telegrams. A note that I wrote to the 'Independent' under the title, "Special Correspondent", published in its issue of the 22nd November, 1921, completes the history of these famous telegrams. The note reads:-

"The inner history of the origin of the telegrams was early known in Rome. What, however, does not seem to be known in Ireland is the remarkable part played in

the affair by the King and Cardinal Gasquet. Since His Eminence has spoken freely about his share in the matter and as he is apparently quite satisfied with the part he played, there can be no indiscretion in a newspaper correspondent simply relating what I am told is in everybody's mouth in Rome. I am thus enabled correctly to supplement the inner history of the telegram as set out in your issues of the 24th and 25th ultimo.

His Eminence who has never concealed his diplomatic achievements under a bushel is unwilling to allow all the honour of the coup to Lord Beaverbrook. He has made it known that, before his departure from England to this country, he was requested by the King to obtain a message of peace from the Pope. His Eminence is a loyal subject and presumably discharged his delicate mission. The Irish people will recognise in this double-baiting the artful angler, practised in coaxing the wily trout from Gairloch streams. They can accurately estimate the spontaneous tumult of the entire English press against the Irish leader's telegram. Do they, however, fully appreciate the more hidden game of which Rome is the centre? The incident, trifling as it is, is more than an illustration of the craft of English diplomacy. It is another example of the pliability of a certain type of English ecclesiastic to do the behests of their Protestant Government."

The article points out the unwarranted interference of both Cardinal Bourne and Gasquet in Ecclesiastical

affairs outside their province. It recalled the statement of Cardinal Gasquet at the Liverpool Congress, July 13th, 1920:-

"It fell to my lot constantly to see the Holy Father in order that I might counteract the influence I felt was detrimental to my country."

The beginnings of the British climb-down were to be seen in the 'Times' of the 25th October, 1921, when the Parliamentary Correspondent reported:-

"The Conference on Ireland was yesterday (24th October) considering its *raison d'etre* and whether, in view of the unalterable mind of the British people with regard to the separatist claim and Mr. de Valera's telegram to the Pope reiterating that claim in its extremest form, there was a reason for its continued existence. There is at the time of writing no reason to abandon hope that that Conference will go on to pursue with a clear aim the purpose for which it was called."

The note went on to state that neither of the parties:-

"waived anything nor made conditions but both went into the Conference as on to neutral ground."

As the London Correspondent of the 'Irish Independent' (Mr. McNerney) telegraphed on 24th October:-

"Mr. Lloyd George recognised the necessity of extreme caution because he realised that, if the movement for Irish peace failed, he might say goodbye to the hopes he has been so eagerly indulging in of going to Washington and for the success of the

conference on armaments."

Washington! U.S.A.! These were the British stumbling blocks and could not be ignored. I have often thought since that, if Arthur Griffith had been in U.S.A. for a few months in the 1919-1921 period, the history of the Treaty would have been quite different. He was never there.

About this time (I believe October 25th) Dr. Hagan heard in confidence from Gavan Duffy, one of the five Peace Delegates, that the:-

"Conference would scarcely come to an agreement but that the points on which they do come to agreement are likely to be embodied in an Act and imposed on the country".

The 'Irish Bulletin' of the 26th October, 1921, should be consulted on the Sinn Féin reply to the uproar of the British press on de Valera's telegram to the Pope.

See the 'Irish Bulletin' of the 1st November, 1921, Volume VI, No. 9, for comments on Lloyd George's speech during the debate on the Irish Peace Conference in the British House of Commons.

Seán T. O'Kelly warns that Griffith and Collins are surrendering on many points. De Valera does not accept Warning:

On the 7th November we had what I described in my diary as "a serious letter" from Seán T. O'Kelly, dated Paris, 4th November. My diary reads:-

"Through the dominating influence of Arthur Griffith and Michael Collins, the delegation are not only surrendering the status of sovereignty but also have made large surrenders on financial, defence and trade sections."

My diary goes on:-

"Sean's information is that these concessions have been embodied in a letter to Lloyd George by Arthur Griffith, to be shown to Craig so as to endeavour to procure Craig's surrender to the unity of Ireland - in other words, an actual, vital surrender by us for the prospect of obtaining national unity. Seán is much worried and is considering going home and speaking publicly on the imminent surrender. He is praying that Craig may not agree and thus save the situation." (So concludes this entry of my diary.)

Seán T. O'Kelly did go home and denounced the trend of the Conference to de Valera. De Valera took him coolly, almost coldly, and told him everything was safe inasmuch as the delegates could not sign anything without first submitting it to the Cabinet and getting their approval. He wound up by telling Seán that he should not have left Paris without permission and told him to return there at once.

Dr. Gilmartin in his Audience with the Pope makes Good Statement on Irish Question:

The Archbishop of Tuam, Dr. Gilmartin, who was in Rome at this juncture, paid a number of very useful visits to the more prominent Cardinals (Cardinal Gasparri, Cardinal De Lai) and other prominent personages of the Curia. He had an audience with His Holiness on November 9th, 1921, followed immediately afterwards by an interview with Cardinal Gasparri. At this latter interview Irish political questions were discussed very freely. The Archbishop, though unsound on the Republican status, was now a full convert to the

lawfulness of the Irish Republican Army movement in general and, of course, was particularly outspoken against anything involving the partition of Ireland. In his audience with His Holiness the Archbishop took the occasion to make a very good statement on the Irish question, one that greatly pleased Dr. Hagan.

Our friend Monsignor Ciriaci of the Secretariate of State fully agreed with the Irish view of the Pope's telegram to the King. On his advice, Dr. Gilmartin had a second interview with Cardinal Gasparri on the 16th November. The interview, entirely on the Irish situation, proved to be a very lively one, in particular on the question of the Pope's telegram to the King and on the delay in appointing the Rector, Dr. Hagan, to a Domestic Prelacy.

Cardinal Gasparri pretended not to see how they could send a telegram to anybody else but the King. It was the King, he said, who would have to give concessions.

"Concessions!", said the Archbishop. "We don't want concessions! We want our rights!"

The Cardinal said they they believed that the Conference was about to break down.

The Archbishop said the Cardinal was wrongly informed and that they should consult Irish advisers.

"We consulted the Rector", said the Cardinal.

"Yes", said the Archbishop, "after the telegram was sent."

"Why doesn't he come here?", said the Cardinal repeating the old complaint.

"He will come when he is treated like anybody else", said the Archbishop.

"Why doesn't he protest?", said the Cardinal.

"He did", said the Archbishop and reminded him of the Rector's written protest; but Cardinal Gasparri said he could not remember it.

So the interview went on, the Archbishop reading his Latin statement, interrupted now and again by Cardinal Gasparri, sometimes in good humour, sometimes in bad.. The Archbishop, however, was greatly pleased with his campaign. The Archbishop having mentioned the discontent at home over the telegrams, the Cardinal said that the Bishops should try to quieten this uneasiness. "We have no information", said the Archbishop. It was this remark that brought about the above conversation about the Rector.

It should be mentioned that the Bishops at their October meeting forwarded a protest to the Holy See on the treatment of Dr. Hagan.

Doubts and Uncertainties in regard to Peace Terms:

The notorious Secret Circular of 9th November, 1921, issued by Colonel Wickham, the Belfast Divisional Commissioner of the Constabulary, directing the enrolment of the Orange "Special Constabulary" as regular army units nearly wrecked the Peace Conference when it became public. In view of the actual circumstances and of Craig's visit to London at that time, it was a revealing and sinister document. Public indignation was such that Sir James Craig, the Belfast Minister for Home Affairs, had to withdraw it though he had approved of it. This event and other reports from home and the English papers of 24th November gave us the impression that the Peace Conference would break down. On the same day (26th November, 1921) the Rector received a copy of Arthur Griffith's letter of 2nd November to Lloyd George

offering recognition of the Crown and "defence" facilities for the British Navy, etc., in return for "the substantial unity of Ireland". The Irish papers of 23rd November reported the Downing Street Conference with Griffith, Collins and Barton and the letter of the Ulster Council to Lloyd George refusing the cession of any "Ulster" territory. Further reports received by the newly arrived Irish Republican agent on 29th November forecast a breakdown of the Conference.

The 'Irish Independent' of 30th November quotes the Lobby Correspondent of the 'Daily Express':-

"Whether the negotiations break down or not, all parties are agreed about the continuance of the truce in order that further efforts in the direction of peace may be possible. Sinn Féin is not disposed so far to accept the form of allegiance which would satisfy the Government. Sinn Féin wants to draw a distinction between recognition of the Sovereign as Head of Empire and King of Ireland."

The Political Correspondent of the 'Westminster Gazette' of the same date wrote:-

"No settlement has yet been arrived at on the allegiance question. The Irish will join us in a free association of nations but they shy at words 'Empire' and 'King'. They are willing to recognise the fact that the king is head of the British Commonwealth, as they prefer to call it. He must not, however, demand an oath of allegiance from the Irish. However, I think that all will

be well and that a formula will be found which, while respecting scruples strange to us, will satisfy the British people."

Uncertainty and uneasiness grew among us and, worst of all, anxiety when we realised that there were differences of opinion among the Irish leaders over the Peace terms. We had learned from those returning from Ireland that there was fear here and there in Ireland that the morale of people and I.R.A. alike had suffered during the months of the Truce. We felt, however, it was not for us, living one thousand miles away, to judge those at home but in our heart of hearts we would have welcomed a breakdown of the negotiations.

In succession to G. Gavan Duffy, Count Paddy O'Byrne, T.D., of Roscrea arrived in Rome on Sunday, 20th November with his wife (formerly Boland and sister of John P. Boland, ex M.P.) and their second daughter, Úna. The Count at once resumed the intimate relations of his predecessors with the Irish College. Mrs. Gavan Duffy, Colm and Máire left Rome on 26th November to rejoin George. The Archbishop of Tuam had left for Ireland on 22nd November.

I stop here at the 30th November, 1921. I thought of alluding to the highly successful British press propaganda which deluged the entire world on the publication of the peace terms but, as it would touch on controversial matters, I prefer to break off at this point.

SIGNED: _____

M. J. Curran

DATE: _____

5 June 1952

(M.J. Curran)

5 June 1952.

WITNESS: _____

S. Ni Chiosain

(S. Ni Chiosain).

BUREAU OF MILITARY HISTORY 1913-21

BURO STAIRE MILEATA 1913-21

NO. W.S. 687

proposed:-

"Belgium's independence absolutely re-established; Alsace-Lorraine, Armenia, India, Egypt, Ireland and Algiers to be arbiters of their own destinies."

The 'Freeman's Journal', the Party organ, in reporting this (27th August, 1917) mentioned only Belgium and Alsace-Lorraine to conceal the fact that Irish independence had already become an international question without any help from the Party.

Kilkenny election:

The Kilkenny election took place on the 10th August, 1917. W.T. Cosgrave, Sinn Féin, was elected by 772 against 392, Magennis, Nationalist, that is to say, by a two-to-one majority.

At a meeting held on the 15th August, 1917, in Armagh, John Dillon attempted to defend the attitude of the Irish Party. Again he had the audacity to state that every Catholic Bishop in Ulster had directed the Party to accept Partition conditions.

Arrest of Prominent Volunteers:

The 'Independent' of the 16th August, 1917, and onwards published details of arrests of prominent Sinn Féiners from the 14th August for wearing Volunteer uniforms. Austin Stack was arrested on Sunday, 12th August, in Dublin. Thomas Ashe was arrested on the 18th August and charged with drilling Volunteers and making seditious speeches. It was reported that warrants had been issued for the arrest of 160 Irish Volunteers, including de Valera.

In a letter dated 18th August, 1917, Dr. McHugh

John Dillon spoke at Bailieboro'.

Death of Ashe:

On the afternoon of the 25th September, 1917, Tom's Ashe was removed from Mountjoy to the Mater Hospital. He died that evening. He and others went on hunger strike for treatment as political prisoners. At the subsequent inquest the Castle and prison authorities refused to give evidence and documents asked for by the jury. The jury found that his death was caused by the punishment of taking away from his cell the bed, bedding and boots and being left to lie on the cold floor for fifty hours and then subjected to forcible feeding in his weak condition after a hunger strike of five or six days.

They censured the Deputy Governor for violating the prison rules and inflicting punishment he had no right to do, but -

"we infer he was acting under instructions from the Prison Board at the Castle, which refused to give evidence and documents asked for."

The inquest ended on the 1st November, 1917.

The funeral of Tom's Ashe on Sunday, the 30th September, 1917, was one of the largest since Parnell's and was undoubtedly the most impressive by reason of the dignity and gravity of those who took part in it. Over one hundred and fifty priests headed the procession. The Volunteers, despite the Defence of the Realm Act, marched in uniform with military precision, while an armed guard and firing party escorted the hearse. The scene at the graveside was particularly impressive, reminding one of the O'Donovan Rossa funeral. Between fifty and seventy thousand people took part. It was a great triumph of organisation for Sinn Féin and made a