From Carnacon to Cape Town: An Interpretive Study of the Transnational Career of Senator Colonel Maurice Moore (1854-1939), Soldier, Diplomat and Politician

Madeline O'Neill

Supervisors: John Cunningham

Laurence Marley

A Thesis Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the National University of Ireland, Galway

January, 2018

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

In this thesis, the contextual, thematic, biography of Senator Colonel Maurice Moore, a Catholic member of the Irish Ascendancy is used as a prism through which to interpret and reflect on a military and political career that conjoined two independence movements in South Africa and Ireland from the late nineteenth century to the early twentieth. This perspective has contributed some significant results in terms of understanding the exchanges between an Irish and Afrikaner elite which were made visible by Moore's experience. By reviving a dormant narrative of the relationship between South Africa and Ireland within discrete and finite periods, from 1879 to 1932, it has illuminated the effects of a transnational career on the later nationalist involvement of a member of a Catholic elite, poised delicately and ambiguously, between tradition, class, empire, and nation.

This South African context is employed within three periods of colonial warfare, and the post-war evolution of national sovereignties within commonwealth. It can be observed that colonial Africa acted as a crucible for change, dislodging Moore from previous imperial and military loyalties much as it did for his fellow ascendancy nationalist and colonial administrator, Roger Casement. This study interprets those influences throughout Moore's career as a soldier, a nationalist activist, and a Senator in the new Irish State.

Three thematic analyses emerge from this perspective; the first of them being the response of a member of an under-researched Catholic elite to the changes that undermined the supremacy of that class, by striving to find a significant role within Irish nationalism and subsequently, the Irish state. Like the Afrikaners, Moore saw language and cultural revivals in both sites as necessary to maintaining a unified, essentialist, nationalist identity.

This identification allowed parallels, rather than hard comparisons to be drawn between the putatively colonial and independence processes in both places during discrete and limited temporalities. These took the form of rhetorical device, affinities, and shared identifications as an oppressed and suffering peoples which found their way into the nationalist discourse of both. The third theme within this thesis deals with the historiographical neglect of both Moore's nationalist career, and the ambiguous nature of the close relationship between Ireland and South Africa in critical periods of their experience as imperially dominated nations.

These questions are explored within a conceptual framework devised within five chapters exploring those parts of Moore's experience that most intersect with the themes in question. A rationale is provided for this biographical study by those links and exchanges and by Moore's political and social prominence which gained him a place in two national governmental and military archives.

DECLARATION

I declare that this is all my own work, and that I have not obtained a degree in this university, or elsewhere, on the basis of this work.

Signature: _____

Madeline O'Neill

Date: _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisors, John Cunningham and Laurence Marley for the abundant reservoirs of patience they demonstrated during the writing of this thesis, and for the experience and skills that they brought to my understanding of both biography and Colonel Moore of Moore Hall. I am indebted also to Clare County Council for the funding and support they provided for this project. There were many others who were generous with their time, expertise and intellectual ability. I would like to thank Dr. Enrico Dal Lago, who stimulated many enriching ideas and gave me an understanding of the broader historical background to my topic. Dr Leo Keohane was interested and interesting over many long conversations on biography. Tony Varley gave me some extremely relevant samples of his own work on the politics of land ownership in Cumann na nGaedheal Ireland. Daithí Ó Corráin, who, with an equal generosity, sent me his article on Moore and discussed the details over coffee. I benefited from Ged Martin's valuable advice on the writing of a military life in empire. There were many others whom, I may have met only briefly but who were kind enough to consider my topic and to offer their opinions. Among them were Donal P.McCracken, the foremost authority on the links between Irish and South African history; Michael Kennedy who directed me to the appropriate Foreign Affairs papers in the National Archives; Jonathan Hyslop, who was helpful on details of the intellectual circles in early Twentieth century Cape Town; Mary Harris who pointed the way to many fruitful sources of material; Christine Kinealy who was supportive and interested. To those names I must add Rodney Constantine of the War Museum of the Boer Republics in Bloemfontein, who was recommended to me by Fransjohan Pretorius as a useful contact and who proved to be a fund of information on the newspapers and Boer records for the North Eastern Cape during the latter stages of the second Anglo-Boer War. I must also mention Damien Quinn who very kindly allowed me to read his M.Phil thesis on the Connaught Rangers at the very beginning of this project.

In Britain, the staff of the Bodleian Library in Oxford were immensely helpful, likewise the staff of the National Army museum, in Chelsea, and most particularly, William Spencer of the National Archives in Kew. I also benefited from the assistance of the Newspaper section of the British Library in London. In Ireland, there were a number of friendly helpful faces at the Manuscript section of the National Library in Dublin, the Archives in University College Dublin and the Berkeley Library at Trinity College Dublin. Thanks also to the National Archives in Dublin. Particular thanks to the staff of the Hardiman Library at the National University of Galway, and to the staff at the library in Castlebar, where librarian Ivor Hamrock was endlessly helpful, knowledgeable and patient.

My thanks to those people in Mayo who were involved in the history of Moore Hall and the Moore family, and showed a helpful interest in my own project. Art Ó Súilleabháin, Seamus Langan (R.I.P) of the Valkenburg Hotel in Ballinrobe where Moore stayed on his visits to Mayo, Fiona White who has recently finished a PhD on the Moores of Moore Hall. Kevin Coyne of Carnacon who has a treasure trove of letters and correspondence with Maurice Moore of Santa Barbra, Moore's surviving son. This interest is testimony to the fond regard and persisting local memory of the Moore family at Moore Hall, for their care of their tenants during the years of the famine.

Thanks to all of my friends who were encouraging and humorous in the darkest times, Marion, Brid, Neil, Una, Maureen, and Noreen, Bernadette, Carmel and Olivia with whom I shared a PhD experience, many conversations and much fun. My brother, Aidan, cannot go without mention for the five year loan of his copy of Mark Bence Jones, *The Twilight of the Ascendancy*.

Thanks also to those individuals in the Fees office, Registration, and Graduate Studies, who have behaved with a kindness and generosity that transcended their administrative role and eased the scholastic rites of passage. Finally, thanks to James O'Neill who provided some timely assistance and to my two children, Jonathan and Lucy for their practical help and advice, and their encouragement, and sense of humour during these years. Their kindness, tact and support during difficult periods was as always, unfailing. I am eternally grateful.

INTRODUCTION: PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS OF MOORE AS A MILITARY, ASCENDANCY, AND NATIONALIST FIGURE

In a roll call of nationalist heroes, the name of Maurice George Moore is unlikely to elicit a response more marked than a quizzically raised eyebrow. Therefore, before embarking on a rationale for a biographical study on a lesser known nationalist activist, this thesis will begin at the end, by examining the obituaries that followed on the death of Senator Colonel Moore, the title by which he preferred to be known, in order to assess the contemporary perceptions of Moore's character and contribution in 1939, the year of his death. This consideration of Moore's public identity is continued by examining his representations in the press in the years immediately preceding and following his death. These will form the basis from which to begin an interpretive, thematic and contextual biographical study of Moore on the understanding that he has remained an undervalued and misrepresented figure in the Irish nationalist narrative. The two principal contexts for this study are Ireland and South Africa between the years 1879 and 1932 linked by Moore's transnational military career and nationalist agitation in Ireland from the time of the Land League to the Fianna Fáil electoral victory in 1932.

On 8 September 1939, a few days after the declaration of WWII, Senator Colonel Maurice Moore, born in 1854 as the second son of landlord parliamentarian, George Henry Moore, died in Donnybrook Dublin at the age of 85. His funeral mass in the Church of the Sacred Heart in Donnybrook, was attended by several government ministers, Sean T. O'Kelly, Sean MacEntee and Frank Aiken, while luminaries such as Professor Eoin MacNeill, Senator Professor Magennis, P.J. Little T.D. and Justice George Gavan Duffy, the son of Young Irelander Charles Gavan Duffy were also present. Little and Duffy were among those who later attended the interment at the Moore family plot in Kiltoom, County Mayo.[1] The announcement of his death generated a number of obituaries in the national and local papers, recording the political significance of his life. R.M.Fox's stands alone as the most thoughtfully interrogative of Moore's life and legacy. Entitled 'Stirring Days Recalled: Colonel Moore and the Irish Volunteers,' Fox's article recalled events that were already a quarter of a century old, but by the time of Moore's death his role in the Volunteer movement from 1913 to 1917 had been effaced by the memoirs and biographical studies of the Volunteer members who took part in the 1916 Rising.[2] Fox observed that Moore's

[1] *The Connaught Telegraph*, 16 September 1939.

[2] R.M. Fox, *The Connaught Telegraph*,10 January 1939; Dan Breen, *My Fight for Irish Freedom* (1924); Ernie O'Malley, *On Another Man's Wound* (1936); Desmond Ryan, *Unique Dictator* (1936); Frank O'Connor, *The Big Fellow* (1937); Dorothy Macardle, *The Irish Republic* (1937); P.S. Hegarty, *Victory of Sinn Féin* (1924); Peadar O'Donnell, *The Gates Flew Open* (1932).

life had 'spanned great events in Ireland (and in Empire) and he had played a worthy part in the independence struggle'. He was, Fox continued, a moderate constitutionalist and not a republican, unlikely to endorse armed revolt'. He could, however, use 'his position and authority to protect civilians who were in danger of attack' at the Bachelors Walk shootings when the British army 'fired' into a crowd'.

Fox described Moore as modest and unassuming, possessed of honesty and courage, chivalrous and impatient at injustice. This lexicon of virtues associated with a gentlemanly ideal provides the lens through which Moore is most usually understood.[3] Twenty - five years after the events surrounding Ireland's political independence and on the cusp of the declaration of a Second World War, this perception of Moore's involvement was anodyne and uncontroversial. He was a familiar sight, white haired with a military mustache and kindly blue eyes, as he walked to the Senate with an upright carriage despite needing the aid of a stick. In their obituary notices the *Irish Times* and the *Connaught Telegraph* chronicled the events of Moore's life, from his ascendancy origins, to his imperial career and his nationalist engagement. The *Connaught Telegraph* observed that 'his passing removes a link with Irish nationalism beyond the great days of Daniel O'Connell and "Repeal"'. These elegiac tributes to Moore's life recalled a disappearing social and political world that was for some, a fading memory, and for others, not within living memory. Nevertheless, it articulated an established nationalist narrative and associated Moore with an early tradition of constitutional nationalism. Fox's more nuanced analysis of Moore's life referred to Moore's correspondence with him eight months before his death, in what Fox thought to be his final public announcement. In it Moore considered, for the last time, the place he and his parliamentarian father occupied in Irish nationalist history.

By this time, as his many obituaries attest, he was a 'public man', entitled to a place in the nationalist pantheon. His consciousness of that status was not newly arrived at: he had already written his own history of the Irish Volunteer years, published in 1936, and serialised in the *Irish Press* in 1938, the year before his death. As he had occupied a role as its military leader and as a member of its executive committee, this work was an authoritative narrativised construction of his own involvement with events. Translated by Liam Ó Rinn and initially published in Irish, it set out to establish Moore's identity in the new state as an Irish Irelander and a cog in the revolutionary wheel, albeit a minor one.[4]

[3] R.M.Fox, *Green Banners: The Story of the Irish Struggle* (London, 1939), p. 204.

[4] Maurice Moore, *Tús agus Fás Óglach na hÉireann, 1913-1917* Liam Ó Rinn (trans.) (Dublin, 1936).

Two reviews of this work published in The *Western People* and in *United Ireland* in 1936, took a somewhat jaundiced view of Moore's account of events. The *Western People* described Moore's leadership of the Volunteers as a 'weakness and a missed opportunity'. Moore had been 'too submissive', and failed to use the power at his command. 'Honourable and unselfish', he was one of the 'chief leaders and an authority on the events that lead to the Treaty'.[5] J.T. in the *United Ireland* pointed out ambiguously that Moore's account was 'mid-way between what might have been written by an observer who was entirely on the outside and what might have been written by a man who was completely on the inside'.[6] Less benignly, the *United Ireland* reviewer dismissed Moore's references to the non-political character of the movement and his definition of Sinn Fein as a mushroom growth of 1914, claiming the 'movement 'could be traced back through the Fenians, Mitchell and Emmet to the United Irishmen'.[7] Both of these reviews made it clear that Moore's involvement in these events was outside what was becoming a normative construction of the nationalist narrative. The *United Ireland* review was the most indicative of a public perception of Moore as a man liminally caught between the position of observer on the outside, and one who was completely 'in the know'.

In 'The Riddle of the Two Casements' Angus Mitchell described Roger Casement's historiographical presence as being consigned to, 'brief paragraph, memoir or secondary source, to buried footnote and more recently to silence and oblivion'. He might just as well have been referring to Moore's historiographical occlusion.[8] Moore is most usually represented as an enthusiastic cultural nationalist, denouncer of the concentration camps in the second Anglo-Boer war, genial military organiser of the Volunteers, and persistent Senate campaigner for the abolition of the land annuities. This is a construction in which Moore played no small part, but it was a superficial historiographical judgement that ignored a complex identity with its roots in an under-researched Irish Catholic landed elite. This lack of 'theoretically sophisticated surveys of elite groups' was due, according to Ciaran O'Neill, who has gone some way to addressing this absence, to the 'conservatism and caution of Irish historians, and the dominance of political history'.[9] Nineteenth century Catholics of wealth and influence have tended to be overlooked by

[5] Review of Maurice Moore, *Tús agus Fás Óglach na hÉireann, 1913-1917*, *The Western People*, 13 June 1936.

[6] Review of Maurice Moore, *Tús agus Fás Óglach na hÉireann, 1913-1917* (trans.), *United Ireland*, 6 June 1936.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Angus Mitchell, 'The Riddle of the Two Casements?' in Mary E. Daly (ed.), *Roger Casement in Irish and World History*. (Dublin, 2005), p. 99.

[9] Ciaran O'Neill, *Catholics Of Consequence: Transnational Education, Social Mobility, and the Irish Catholic Elite, 1850-1900* (Oxford, 2014); Ciaran O'Neill (ed.), *Irish Elites in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin, 2013); idem, 'Power, Wealth and Catholic Identity In Ireland 1850-1900' in Oliver Rafferty, S.J. (ed.), *Irish Catholic Identities* (Manchester, 2013); idem, 'Leaning Towards Empire: Jesuit Education at Clongowes and Tullabeg, 1870-1900,' M.A. Thesis, National University of Ireland Galway, 2005; idem, 'Education, Imperial Careers and the Irish Catholic Elite in the Nineteenth Century' in David Dickson, Justyna Pyz and Christopher

what has become an institutionalised narrative of 'endurance and emergence', or the postcolonial binary of oppressed and oppressors, both of which efface the diversity of class.[10] Moore represented what O'Neill described as 'an existing elite with its own internal normative behaviour', that interfaced with a Protestant elite, and shared many of its interests. From this perspective it can be seen that the Moore family narrative of assertive Catholic equality existed alongside the discourse of 'endurance and emergence' but not within it.[11]

The contemporary perceptions of Moore reveal his exclusion from the post-revolutionary discourse that followed on independence despite the 'worthy part he played in it'. An examination of Moore's role in that series of events makes visible a series of historiographical oversights. These include the part played by members of a landed Catholic elite, or the effect that an imperial career had on a later involvement in Irish nationalism and the performance of an ascendancy member in the new state in 1922. Adding Moore to the nationalist narrative reveals it to be more inclusive, diverse and, furthermore, implicated in the great webs of exchange that connected all of empire.[12] Moore's life and his contribution to the formation of a new state cannot be understood within the normative construction of the nationalist narrative. It removes him from the complex imperial networks that he activated during his lifetime. By taking a transnational perspective from which to interrogate Moore's nationalist identity and imperial career a number of interesting imperial intersections appear in the nationalising processes of Ireland, the Boer Republics, and the independent South Africa that followed on the union in 1910. As a consequence, Moore's experience remains within the national paradigm even while it transgresses national boundaries.

This perspective governs the theoretical approach to this study. Moore's biography is used as a prism, through which to interpret the effects of his colonial military career in two separate and in many ways very different historiographies. This methodological approach is consistent with that used by the contributors to Lambert and Lester's collection of essays on colonial careering. By using biographical approaches to the careers of colonial administrators, missionaries, poets,

Shephard (eds), *Irish Classroom and British Empire: Imperial Contexts in the Origins of Modern Education* (Dublin, 2012); Enda Delaney and Ciaran O'Neill (eds), 'Introduction: Beyond the Nation' *Éire-Ireland* vol.51, nos.1&2 (Spring/Autumn 2016) pp 7-13.

[10] Ciaran O'Neill, ' Power, Wealth and Catholic Identity in Ireland, 1850-1900' p. 259.

[11] Ibid.,p 162.

[12] Tony Ballantyne, 'Empires, Modernisation and Modernities', in *International Journal of History, Culture and Modernity,* vol. 2, no. 1 (2014); Zoe Laidlaw, *Colonial Connections 1815-1845: Patronage, the Information Revolution and Colonial Government* (Cambridge, 2012); Barry Crosbie, *Irish Imperial Networks: Migration, Social Communication and Exchange in Nineteenth Century India* (Cambridge, 2012); idem 'Networks of Empire: Linkage and Reciprocity in Nineteenth-Century Irish and Indian History in *History Compass*, vol. 7, no, 3 (2009); Tony Ballantyne, 'Putting the Nation in its Place?:World History and C.A. Bayley's *The Birth of the Modern World'* in Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake (eds), *Connected Worlds: History in Trans-National Perspective* (Canberra, 2005)

humanitarians and military figures, the connections that link, and in some cases transform, both the policies of colonial administration and individual lives are made visible. However, despite the number of questions raised by the experience of Moore as an individual, it is not paramount in this thesis, as the elision of many of the details of his life make evident. His years in India and his personal family relationships are of secondary importance to the questions raised by his military and political involvements.

These questions are specific. How did the military career and nationalist activism of a member of an Irish Catholic elite throw historiographical light on the process that led to Ireland's independence? What does this say about the position of a landed Catholic ascendancy in the later nineteenth and early twentieth century nationalising processes, or the attempts made by this elite to maintain relevance in the national movements that swept through Europe and Empire during this period?[13] Moore and his class identified during their own time as the natural leaders of a Catholic nation, but they were to find themselves historiographically neglected, eclipsed by rebellion and the rise of a Catholic bourgeoisie. Similarly, the relationship between Ireland and South Africa, which Moore's career draws attention to, was not given prominence within the narrative of nationalist independence and state-building, despite its importance.

This thesis uses 'life-writing', as a means to explore those questions, by foregrounding the geographical, national, and colonial contexts that Moore inhabited in his professional life, while at the same time locating his self-identity within his landed Catholic status, and a family reputation for famine relief and nationalist politics. This approach is not without its difficulties, principally arising from the challenge of maintaining a balance between using the biographical subject to study the confluence of events that bisected his/her life and 'decentering' the subject to the point of individual insignificance. As the previous paragraphs affirm, this difficulty is addressed by using Moore as a focus through which inquiry is mediated. The questions on the relationship between Ireland and South Africa for example, are asked from his experience of two wars, and a diplomatic mission. The questions asked of a Catholic elite are posed by an inter-generational study of Moore's merchant and landowning family, and his own role as a leader of the Volunteers and as a Senator in the new state. This has resulted in a nationalist narrative told from the point of view of a largely under-researched class, whose identity has been obscured by a Catholic middle class and a Protestant ascendancy, the two dominant paradigms from which a nationalist history is usually constructed.

[13] Arno J. Mayer, *The Persistence of the Old Regime: Europe to the Great War* (New York, 1981).

Conceptual Framework

In order to address the historiographical lacuna that existed with regard to an analysis of Moore's role in the 'independence struggle' a conceptual framework has been constructed to analyse his contribution from the perspective of his landed Catholic origins, and his military career in South Africa. This framework takes the form of five chapters, the first of which examines the political and ideological convictions of his family of origin, his educational background and the reasons behind his choice of military career. Each subsequent chapter focuses on a particular period of Moore's experience as it intersects with the 'great events', both national and imperial, that occurred within the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Ireland and South Africa. This approach dislodges Moore from both the perceptions of his obituarists and previous examinations of his contribution, to examine the significance of the ideological inheritance of his landed background and his career in South Africa for its influence, not only on his later political choices but for the possibilities it offers to explore the effects that events in South Africa had on Anglo-Irish politics without employing the synchronic methodology of comparison.

The results of such an analytic framework serve 'to detach', as Kissane puts it, an analysis of Irish nationalism constructed entirely by its own rhetoric by examining the resistances to imperial assimilation and enforced Anglicisation in two cultures.[14] This is where biographical study comes into its own as a useful methodological tool. As a soldier and an Irish nationalist, Moore experienced imperial and dominion politics in a broad context which caused him to draw a number of analogies between Anglo-Irish and Anglo-Afrikaner political relationships. He based these on his experience of imperial domination, rebellion and his later observations of their cultural and linguistic resistances. These analogies were located in both perceived and actual cultural and ethnic difference to the coloniser. These analogies usually remain unexplored in studies of Moore. His military experience in empire is rarely foregrounded but more usually used as a springboard from which to explain a later anti-imperialism in relation to the Irish situation. His awareness of the threats of industrialising capitalism to a pastoral tradition, changes in warfare, and the suffering of a displaced white nation reveals a complex of Irish nationalist sympathy and elite Catholic, paternal landlordism which found a resonance among his fellow English officers in the army. It was testimony not just to nationalist ideologies but the *fin de siècle* nostalgia for, and anxiety at, a fast eroding way of life. At the same time conditions in South Africa offered, as Ellis

[14] Bill Kissane, *The Politics of the Irish Civil War* (Oxford, 2005), p. 14.

has stated, 'ideological affinities', based on memories of previous political independence and national sovereignty that linked the 'colonies of exploitation'.[15]

These have not gone historiographically unnoticed, and current scholarship has a focus on the 'recovery of connections', and ' cultural transfers ... and reception of ideas ... as fundamental to the retrieval of public opinion.[16] The principle difficulty in such a perspective, however rewarding, is maintaining that balance between the subject as an active agent and a prism through which to make a simultaneous analysis of his experience in empire and parallel events in Irish nationalism.

This difficulty has created a perception of biography as 'History's unloved stepchild'. This question has been broached in previous paragraphs, but it is worth teasing out the implications of such a perception and the means to avoid falling into biographical traps. This can be done by deploying the individual in the study of the world outside the individual, without ignoring their 'dialectical relationship' to the 'social, political and cultural worlds they inhabit and give meaning to'.[17] While an individual may be deployed as a lens or a perspective from which to form an analysis of social, cultural, or political events, the particularity of their experiences decides the focus of the perspective and the conceptual framework for the study. This study assumes, while not rejecting current theories of the mutability of identity over time, that a fundamental core formed in childhood and by the social and cultural modalities that influence personality development can remain coherent over a lifetime.[18] This insight is supported by the persistence with which Moore pursued recognition for his father's political legacy.

This was a concern for him from the late 1880s to the months leading to his death, and may be described as one of the defining characteristics of his nationalist career. Moore linked his own campaigns to develop the Volunteers into a territorial army, and his activism in the movement to abolish the land annuity payments by the new state, to his father's earlier 1860 proposals for a Volunteer force and his 1850s activism in the Tenant League campaign. By uniting these essentially disparate and temporally distant activities it can be seen that in Moore's moral

[15] Steven G. Ellis, 'Writing Irish History: Revisionism, Colonialism and the British Isles' in *The Irish Review*, no. 19, (Spring-Summer 1996), p. 10; idem, 'Historiographical Debate: Representations of the Past in Ireland: Whose Past and Whose Present' in *Irish Historical Studies*, vol. 27, no. 108 (November, 1991), p. 292.

[16] Fearghal McGarry, "A Land Beyond the Wave:" Transnational Perspectives on Easter 1916' in Niall Whelehan (ed.), *Transnational Perspectives on Modern Irish History* (Oxon, 2015).

[17] David Nasaw, 'History and Biography,' in *American History Review* (June 2009), pp 573-575.

[18] Lois M. Banner, 'Biography as History,' in *The American Historical Review* vol. 114, no. 3 (June, 2009), pp 579-586.

imaginary the landlord class was still capable of providing leadership post-land transfer, reform, and the emergence of an educated Catholic middle class. Moore's anxiety that his father's career should slip into obscurity was not displaced, as the period that stretched from the famine and the emergence of Parnell was politically fallow apart from the rise of the Fenian movement.[19] As a consequence the parliamentary career of George Henry Moore as one of the leaders of the Irish Independent party in the 1850s has been neglected. Moore attempted to address this lacuna himself as early as 1913 with a political biography of his father. This preoccupation with the political achievements of his father revealed Moore as essentially Victorian in his political outlook, ideologically positioned between the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Moore continued to embody what Owen McGee described as 'an aristocratic ideal,' that persisted due to the ideological overlaps between the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries.[20]

Moore's political thought and language reflected what McDonagh defined as an 'antiquarian juridical appeal', which claimed the illegitimacy of the Act of Union on the basis that the 1783 Renunciation Act had not been repealed.[21] Therefore what might appear to be an individual imperative in Moore's character may be contextualised within what McDonagh identifies as an Irish historical interpretation in terms of law and morals which was derived from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth-centuries' historical debate that employed an ahistorical judgement.[22] This use of a political tradition from the past was not restricted to Moore or his class, Arthur Griffith used the ideal of Grattan's parliament in his political strategies. Moore's and Griffith's political thought cohered around the ideal of 1782 and shared similar reasoning in respect of Grattan's patriotism, the potential for separatism in Gratttan's politics, and what MacDonagh called his 'benevolent paternalism'.[23] Throughout his career, Moore was consistent in his application of this historical understanding. It was expressed in his written memoranda for Smuts, the South African premier, in 1921, and in the pamphlets he composed calling for the abolition of the land annuities in 1928. The political language of morality and legality revealed the ideological foundation of these appeals in the earlier days of Grattan's parliament.

[19] Vincent Comerford, 'Ireland 1850-70: Post Famine and Mid-Victorian,' in W.E. Vaughan (ed.), *A New History of Ireland*, p. 372. Andrew Shields, *The Irish Conservative Party 1852-1868* (Dublin, 2009)

[20] Owen McGee, *Arthur Griffith* (Sallins, 2015), *note 110*, p. 509.

[21] Oliver MacDonagh, *States of Mind: A Study of Anglo-Irish Conflict, 1798-1980* (London, 1983), pp 62-63.

[22] Ibid., p. 7.

[23] Ibid., p. 64.

The political understanding of the superiority of constitutional methods, dichotomised them from the socially destabilising politics of 'physical force'. This polarising of political alternatives underlay the political discourse of the Irish parliamentary party and the interpretive framework for Irish historical discourse in the twentieth century.[24] Irish Catholic professionals tended to look to what they saw as the more stable model of British constitutional monarchy rather than the democratic but less secure European republicanism, even with the ideal of a written constitution as a guarantor of political liberties since 1848, and Moore was no exception to this.[25] Catholic attitudes to monarchy and empire could not, as James McConnel has observed, 'be neatly dichotomised into nationalist and unionist sympathies' as they were 'more layered and ambivalent than was hitherto appreciated'. Moore's elite Catholic background reveals a history of Whig unionism, rebellion, and the ambiguous constitutionalism expressed in his father's parliamentary career, all of which reveal a complex ideological identity that in comparison, can be seen to be shared in varying degrees with other Catholic elite families such as the Esmondes and Redmonds in Wexford. Unsurprisingly, both Moores, father and son, were reluctant to relinquish an ascendancy ideal of a gentry led, independent Irish parliament. Moore was trying to create a continuity between landlord nationalism, both his own and his father's, and by doing so ensure the survival of an adjunctive nationalist narrative. His career makes apparent the significant ideological overlap between late nineteenth century and early twentieth century Ireland with a sense of continuity persisting alongside more radical narratives of change. These narratives of continuity and change are themselves open to question.[26] Clearly Moore was striving for inclusion in the 'new order' but he proved useful to it as well. His military experience was invaluable to the organisation of the Volunteers, while he, and other figures from the older social hierarchy possessed knowledge, skills and networks of relationships that also proved valuable to de Valera's campaign to obtain international support for Irish independence.[27]

Cultural Nationalism

Moore's immersion in the language and cultural nationalist movement in the early 1890s provided him with a cultural leadership role and an elevated public profile, which was not confined to his home county. His appointment to the executive committee of the Gaelic League which Douglas Hyde and Eoin MacNeill had founded, legitimated both his interest and his status within the organisation. Most importantly, it brought a member of a threatened landlord class into

[24] Owen McGee, *Arthur Griffith* (Sallins, 2015), p. 375.

[25] Ibid.

[26] C.A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World 1780-1914: Global Connections and Comparisons* (Oxford, 2004), p. 395.

[27] Ibid., p. 399.

contact with a lower middle class in pursuit of a common cause. His landlord reforming zeal and linguistic commitments reflected some of the anxieties common not just to an Irish elite, but to elites globally. The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries spanned a period when Moore's class faced similar 'economic and social', difficulties to those experienced by their equivalents in Russia and Eastern Europe, many of whom responded in the fashion of elites elsewhere, either by becoming a part of the administration or as soldiers in empire or by falling, according to Bayly into a 'Chekhovian indolence'. [28] The global threat to established elites was averted in Britain where liberal strategies protected the British elite from attacks like those visited upon the landed class elsewhere in Europe during the early twentieth century. In Ireland, this landowning class was threatened by the problems derived from an earlier colonial settler status and a related narrative of the dispossession of an earlier Gaelic aristocracy.

Nonetheless, as Bayly pointed out, the Irish landlords, such as Moore, who were eventually bought out by the tenants did not realise their good fortune in comparison with the landed class of Central Europe and Russia who had even less success surviving a revolutionary period.[29] The British and German elites sought to retain their relevance and consolidate their supremacy through the philanthropical provision of improvement schemes for urban and rural labourers.[30] This practice was echoed in Ireland by Horace Plunkett's co-operative agricultural and economic movement. This movement fell under the rubric of national rejuvenation and a broader European background of elite struggle to maintain their status and influence, while rejecting the aspects of modernisation that threatened the stability of a landed class. In Moore's case, it was accompanied by a strong vein of anti-modernism, or perhaps more accurately, a fear of modernity, which he interpreted as the loss of tradition, certainty and social stability.[31] Margaret O'Callaghan observed the romanticising of the peasant by the literary movement and Moore was given to similar musings about the loss of a traditional character that accompanied the replacement of Gaelic with English as a result of government administered education.[32] By 1910 his willingness to politicise the movement was evident in his comparisons with the Czech/Bohemian cultural revival which like the Gaelic Revival had begun as a movement of national revival and eventually led to

[28] Ibid., p. 426.

[29] Ibid., p. 426.

[30] C.A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World 1780-1914: Global Connections and Comparisons* (Oxford, 2004), p. 425; Marta Petrusewicz, 'The Modernization of the European Periphery: Ireland, Poland, and the Two Sicilies, 1820-1870: Parallel and Connected, Distinct and Comparable' in Deborah Cohen and Maura O'Connor (eds), *Comparisons and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective* (New York and London, 2004).

[31] Perry Anderson, 'Modernity and Revolution' in *New Left Review*, vol. 1, no. 144 (March,-April, 1984).

[32] Margaret O'Callaghan, 'Denis Patrick Moran and the Irish Colonial Condition,' 1891-1921' in D.George Boyce, Robert-Eccleshall, and Vincent Geoghan, (eds), *Political Thought in Ireland Since the 17th Century.* (London, 1993), p. 148.

Bohemia's struggle to free itself from the Austro-Hungarian Empire.[33] His cultural interests may have originated in the desire of a threatened class to maintain its influence, but by the time he had returned from the second Anglo-Boer war in 1902 his focus had altered to a more militant support for Irish cultural identity without surrendering to a socially destabilising modernity, the fear of which his experience in South Africa had intensified.

Literature Review

The scholarship that informs this study and provides the rationale for the conceptual framework designed for a biographical study of Moore is diverse and necessarily includes two historiographical traditions and an emphasis on empire. A full-length study of Moore from which to begin such an inquiry does not exist, apart from his mention in 'memoir and footnote'. Leon Ó O'Broin, who has specialised in telling the revolutionary story from less usual sources, contributed an essay on Moore's leadership of the Volunteers to the *Irish Sword* in the late 1970s.[34] In more recent times Moore's role in the Volunteer movement has had a more thorough assessment by Daithí Ó' Corráin, who defined Moore as a nationalist activist of secondary rank, with a lesser focus on his elite Catholicism, transnational career, and forays into constitutional nationalism.[35] Ciaran Reilly's 2015 article on the 1921 Irish diplomatic mission to South Africa emphasised the importance of Moore's role in influencing Premier Jan Smuts to support the Irish struggle for independence. The earlier foundational studies by Fergus Campbell and Senia Pašeta centred on the importance of emergent middle class elites to Irish nationalism, but paid scant attention to the long established elite Catholic landowners of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[36] They were assumed to be among the smaller less visible landowners and of little influence. Campbell's study on the Irish establishment acknowledged the existence of a Catholic elite existing below the Protestant aristocracy, who nonetheless possessed local political and social influence.[37]

---

[33] *The Connaught Telegraph*, 17 May 1910; John Hutchinson, 'The Irish Revival, Elite Competition and the First World War' in Ciaran O'Neill (ed.), *Irish Elites in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin, 2013).

[34] Leon Ó Broin, 'Maurice Moore and the National Volunteers,' in *The Irish Sword*, vol. xii (1977-1979), pp 316-322.

[35] Daithí Ó Corráin's ' "A Most Public Spirited and Unselfish Man': The Career and Contribution of Colonel Maurice Moore, 1854-1939"' in *Studia Hibernica*, vol. 40, (2004), pp 71-134.

[36] Fergus Campbell, *The Irish Establishment 1879-1914* (Oxford, 2009); Senia Pašeta, *Before the Revolution: Nationalism, Social Change and Ireland's Catholic Elite 1879-1922* (Cork, 1999).

[37] Ciaran O'Neill, *Catholics Of Consequence: Transnational Education, Social Mobility, and the Irish Catholic Elite 1850-1900* (Oxford, 2014), p. 207.

More recent studies by James McConnel, Richard Keogh and Aidan Enright have applied a biographical optic to the nuanced and ambivalent nature of Catholic loyalism.[38] Ciaran O'Neill's focus on the educational experience of Catholic elites in England and Europe, is revelatory of the attitudes, loyalties and national identities of members of Irish Catholic elites when they are exposed to an English Catholic milieu. O'Neill included George Moore, (but not Maurice), his cousin and future President of Sinn Féin, Edward Martyn, (who attended the Jesuit school of Beaumont) and the previously mentioned O'Conor Don, who was schooled in Downside, in his study.[39] English Catholic public schooling was often the basis of an imperial career, as a colonial administrator, diplomat or soldier, and Moore can be seen as typical of this phenomenon.[40]

A study of Moore fits into this growing scholarship on a hitherto under-researched demographic. Common identity markers emerge from these studies providing significant points of comparison on the political activism of Catholic elites. For example, Enright's study of the O'Conor Don, Charles Owen O'Conor, revealed the life-long nature of his Whig-liberal and conservative Catholicism during his political career. Keogh and O'Connel focused on the Esmonde family of County Wexford, who like the O'Conor Don were distinguished by a Gaelic founding myth which the Moore's could not lay claim to. The Moores countered this deficiency by activating a supposed descent from the Catholic martyr Sir Thomas More, which if it did not trounce the legitimacy of Gaelic origin might have been supposed to present an impressively Catholic legitimacy of its own. What the Esmondes did share with the Moores was a revolutionary pedigree in a great-uncle who died in 1798. After that, however, like the Moores they were overwhelmingly constitutional and loyalist at least until the early twentieth century. McConnel's interest in Catholic elites extended to the Catholic loyalism and imperial sympathies of John Redmond whose family liked to look to an Old-Irish or Norman past, when it seems more likely that they, like the Moores owed their economic success and social status to trade. It can be assumed from these studies that the members of the wealthy Catholic elites share a number of identity markers and equally areas of conformity. Jonathan Jeffrey Wright's study of the Belfast Tennent family exists within an inquiry into the influence and identity of a Presbyterian family from the early to mid-nineteenth century.[41] Wright treated his thesis thematically, using individual family members as optics through which to

[38] Aidan Enright, 'The Political Life of Charles Owen O'Conor, 1860-1906', PhD Thesis, Queens University Belfast, 2011; Richard Keogh and James McConnel, 'The Esmonde Family of Co.Wexford and Catholic Loyalty' in Oliver Rafferty, S.J. (ed.), *Irish Catholic Identities* (Manchester, 2013); James McConnel, 'John Redmond and Irish Catholic Loyalism' in *English Historical Review*, vol. CXXV, no. 512 (2010).

[39] Ciaran O'Neill, ' Power, Wealth and Catholic Identity in Ireland, 1850-1900'; idem 'Education, Imperial Careers and the Irish Catholic Elite in the Nineteenth Century.'

[40] Ciaran O'Nell, 'Education, Imperial Careers and the Irish Catholic Elite in the Nineteenth Century.' p. 103.

[41] Jonathan Jeffrey Wright, 'The Natural Leaders': the Tennent Family and the Political and Intellectual Life of Presbyterian Belfast c. 1801-1832.' PhD thesis, Queen's University Belfast, 2009.

examine multiple aspects of Presbyterian mentalité and Belfast civic, intellectual and political life, which challenged historiographical assumptions about the developmental course taken by Presbyterianism after the radicalism of the late eighteenth century. It is the conceptual framework constructed by Wright which used biography as an optic through which to study particular questions which is a useful exemplar for others who find this methodology confers flexibility and an imperial reach. Wright went on to employ it usefully in a study of James Emerson Tennent, a Belfast Episcopalian who married into the family and went on to have a career in empire as the colonial-secretary of Ceylon, later writing a definitive study of Ceylon and donating many natural history samples to the Belfast museum.[42] Wright used this study to examine the links between the metropole, Belfast, and empire and to establish the imperial identity of a middle class, Ulster Episcopalian. A recent essay by Jonathan Jeffrey Wright on James Emerson Tennent's attitudes towards Catholicism reveals the influence that a extended trip to Europe had on his opinions.[43]

While Moore may be assumed to have little in common with Tennent, the question of Irish imperial identity and the transference of ideas, and what might be described as a consciousness of imperial realities have relevance for this thesis and Wright's work has provided a number of points for comparison. Empire was not just a springboard to career advancement or an exotic subject for research (and it was both of those things), but a place beyond a national experience that inevitably formed and changed opinion, and could evoke either, intense sympathy and identification with its subjects or indifference and apathy. By using biography it is possible to make inquiries from the intimacy of individual experience.

Barry Crosbie and Joe Cleary have pointed to lacunae in the study of the Irish in empire which this study has attempted to address through Moore's experience. Crosbie commented in 2009 '…the Irish have never been the subject of a detailed, contextualised study that charts their movements, shifting careers and significance within the numerous global networks forged through the British in Empire'.[44] More recent scholarship in 2016 and 2017 from Paul A. Townend, Michael Nie and Timothy G. McMahon goes some way to addressing that historiographical absence. In Townend's 2016 publication, *The Road to Home Rule:Anti-Imperialism and the Irish National Movement*, he considered the influence of events in empire on

[42] Jonathan Jeffrey Wright, 'The Belfast Chameleon: Ulster, Ceylon and the Imperial Life of Sir James Emerson Tennent' in *Britain and the World*, vol. 62. (2013), pp 192-219.

[43] Jonathan Jeffrey Wright, '"The Perverted Graduates of Oxford": Priestcraft, "Political Popery" and the Transnational Anti-Catholicism of Sir James Emerson Tennent"', in Niall Whelehan (ed.), *Transnational Perspectives on Modern Irish History* (Oxon, 2015).

[44] Barry Crosbie, 'Networks of Empire: Linkage and Reciprocity in Nineteenth Century Irish and Indian History', in *History Compass*, vol. 7, no. 3 (2009) pp 993-1007.

the Home Rule and Land League agitation in Ireland in the latter part of the nineteenth century. During this period, the Irish Parliamentary Party mobilised the protest at imperial warfare in the propaganda of the nationalist press as moral capital from which to mount dissent at imperial policy.[45] Townend examined the imperial conflicts at the end of the nineteenth century from the perspective of their usefulness as propaganda to the anti-imperial and anti-colonial movements. In 2017, along with De Nie, and McMahon, Townend built on this scholarship with an edited collection of essays on *Ireland in the imperial World: Citizenship, Opposition and Subversion.* A number of the essays in this collection examined lives that like Moore's, combined imperial locations with nationalist sentiments [46]. Sean Farrell's essay on Charles Gavan Duffy and Australian Federation show that imperial careering and a continued nationalist involvement were not incompatible. It is interesting to note the interest that the Young Irelander revolutionaries, Duffy and McGee took in colonial federation, showing that they, and Moore at a later date, could contemplate the possibilities of Irish autonomy within a reformed empire. De Nie looked at the reaction of the Irish press to imperial soldiering from 1882-85, while Stephanie Berezewski examined the association of the landed elite with empire. It is worth noting that of the contributors; two were from academic institutions in Scotland, one was from Britain, ten came from the United States, and only one, Úna Ni Bhroiméil, was Irish, signifying that inquiry into a more nuanced understanding of the Irish involvement in empire has not yet established a secure foothold in Irish academic institutions. This study on Moore provides an opportunity to 'reconstruct' as Joe Cleary puts it, 'how particular Irish figures and political movements negotiated issues of national identity, race and empire', and how that thought contributed to the subsequent evolution of Irish nationalist and Unionist thinking'.[47]

The methodological usefulness of biography to study the connections and shifts in political thought that result from globalisation has been considered by McGarry and Whelehan in a study of transnational perspectives in modern Irish history.[48] Apparently gaining in popularity as an optic through which to study the revolutionary period in Ireland, a number of relatively recent prosopographical and biographical studies have emerged. Roy Foster made a collective analysis of the lives and careers of a generational Irish elite swept along by revolutionary events.[49] Foster picked up the theme of an evolutionary process that brought the politically aware from 1890 to 1902, from a more cautious state of constitutional nationalism to radical republicanism. He

[45] Paul A.Townend, *The Road to Home Rule: Anti-Imperialism and the Irish National Movement* (London, 2016)
[46] Timothy G. McMahon, Michael de Nie and Paul A. Townend, (eds.) *Ireland in an Imperial World: Citizenship, Opportunism and Subversion* (London, 2017)
[47] Joe Cleary, 'Amongst Empires: A Short History of Ireland and Empire Studies in International Context' in *Éire-Ireland,* vol. 42, no. 1&2 Earrach/Samhradh/Spring/Summer (2007), pp 11-57.
[48] Fearghal McGarry, ' Land Beyond the Wave.'
[49] R.F. Foster, *Vivid Faces: The Revolutionary Generation in Ireland, 1890-1923* (London, 2014).

asserted the importance of biographies in charting a life experience that illuminated the process of ideological shifts, much as Colin Reid has done in his 2011 biography of Stephen Gwynn.[50] Foster is concerned to trace the social networks, kinships and educational experience of a pre-Revolutionary elite in the 'circles of like-minded people' that were active and intermingled in Dublin during this period.[51] These social networks, described in Foster's study of a generation of elite revolutionaries as areas of influence 'operating through education, through mentoring, through reading, through family, through theatre, through journalistic co-operatives and through love' provide a further context for analysis.[52] The networks identified by Foster were not confined to the local, although global networks may have been more relevant to the generation that preceded the one examined by Foster. This generation belonged to a class and a period of colonial networks that were a part of the 'unprecedented network building', identified globally by Osterhammel in the 'six decades between mid-century and the First World War'.[53] These imperial networks of connection were defined by C.A. Bayly as a 'kind of embryonic international and civil society', making possible the circulation of cross cultural ideas among other elites, particularly within the nodal points created by empire.[54] It is clear that Moore was a part of this matrix of elite imperial networks articulating an Irish Catholic viewpoint.

Frances Flanagan's study looked at four prominent figures from the revolutionary years who escaped inclusion in the revolutionary heroic pantheon, revealing the persistence of a constitutional political culture. The four, George Russell (AE), Eimear O'Duffy, P.S. O'Hegarty and Desmond Ryan attempted to write themselves back into the history of this period. They were described by Flanagan as nationalist intellectuals who were marginalised by subsequent events. She located her study in what she referred to as the 'lost worlds' of constitutional nationalists such as Thomas Kettle and Stephen Gwynn.[55] Flanagan consciously avoided setting her study within the 'revolutionary' or 'anti-revolutionary' paradigms of John M. Regan or F.S. Lyon's analysis of an 'Anglo-Irish, pluralist, secular culture and a Catholic, Gaelic Separatist one'.[56] Nevertheless, she dichotomised her study by sifting and separating by religion, class and political affiliations thereby affirming the classic binaries assumed in Irish historiography. But she also situated her

[50] Ibid., p. xx; Colin Reid, *The Lost Ireland of Stephen Gwynn* (Manchester, 2011).

[51] R.F. Foster, *Vivid Faces* p. xxii.

[52] Ibid., p. xxiii.

[53] Jürgen Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century*, trans. Patrick Camiller, (Princeton, 2009, English Translation 2014), p. 710.

[54] C.A.Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World 1780-1914*, p. 476.

[55] Frances Flanagan, *Remembering the Revolution: Dissent, Culture and Nationalism in the Irish Free State* (Oxford, 2015), p. 5.

[56] Ibid.

study of her subjects' ambivalence and 'dissent' within the European and global frames of reference by which they examine the Irish situation in order to escape a 'set of mentalities which had existed in numerous post-revolutionary contexts in the modern era'.[57] These definitions were porous in the ideologically dense social and cultural worlds of the Irish capital. Were those worlds necessarily 'lost'? There is a popular nationalist perception that the 'physical force' nationalists won, and clearly Flanagan's four intellectuals were pushed to the margins, but traces of an undeniable constitutional political culture remained. Nicholas Mansergh's scholarship, while not recent, remains a vital source for understanding that culture, while Bill Kissane's able political analyses of the period leading to Irish democratic government remain authoritative.[58] More recent scholarship from James McConnel on the Irish Parliamentary Party and McConnel and Matthew Kelly on the federalist proposals for empire that were a vital part of the discourse of the early twentieth century help to shed some light on the political contexts that Moore inhabited during this period.[59]

A study of empire has been augmented by a body of scholarship on transnational biography as well as studies on nineteenth century colonial careering in empire. Several works have emerged from the Australian National University's school of biography and this thesis is indebted to Deacon, Russell and Woollacott's *Transnational Lives: Biographies of Global Modernity* and *Transnational Ties: Australian Lives in the World*, to *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspectives*, edited by Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake. David Lambert and Alan Lester's *Colonial Lives* has also proved invaluable as a source of biographical examples of colonial careerists in nineteenth century empire and the effects that their background and experience had on their administrative duties and the vision they had of empire.[60] David A. Wilson's two volume biography of Thomas D'Arcy McGee's career in the United States and Canada is of inestimable value in charting the ideological twists and turns that the Young Irelander McGee apparently took over the course of his varied career, culminating in his support of Canadian Confederation, revealing the transformative possibilities inherent in a colonial

[57] Ibid. p. 3.

[58] Nicholas Mansergh, *The Irish Question 1840-1921* (London, 1965), first published in 1940; idem Diana Mansergh (ed.), *Nationalism and Independence: Selected Irish Papers* (Cork, 1977); Bill Kissane, *Explaining Irish Democracy* (Dublin, 2002); idem *The Politics of the Irish Civil War* (Oxford, 2005).

[59] James Mc Connel and Matthew Kelly, 'Devolution, Federalism and Imperial Circuitry' in Duncan Tanner, Chris Williams, W.P. Griffiths and Andrew Edwards (eds), *Debating Nationhood and Governance in Britain 1885-1945: Perspectives From the Four Nations* (Manchester, 2006).

[60] Desley Deacon, Penny Russell and Angela Woollacott (eds), *Transnational Lives: Biographies of Global Modernity, 1700-Present* (London, 2010); Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake (eds), *Connected Worlds: History in Trans-National Perspectives* (Canberra, 2005); David Lambert and Alan Lester, (eds), *Colonial Lives Across the British Empire: Imperial Careering in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2006).

career.[61]It is also revelatory of his disappointment in the American Republic that was intolerant of Catholic education unlike the Canadian government.

The relevance of a South African context to this study has necessitated some examination of the history of the South African republics and colonies, up to the Union in 1910. The analogies, connections and identifications made by this thesis between the Zulus, Boer/Afrikaners and the Irish in terms of imperial oppression and linguistic and cultural revival required some scholastic foundation for their authority. This has resulted in an eclectic range of secondary sources. Kate O'Malley and Elleke Boehmer have explored the imperial inter-colonial relationships that made it possible for affinities to be expressed and gave rise to the particular rhetoric in which they were expressed.[62] Paul Townend's 2007 study on the relationship between the nationalist agitation of the land wars in 1879 and the Zulu wars looked at the early years of colonial comparison in the Irish nationalist rhetoric on South Africa.[63] Townend went on to publish a full length study in 2016 which has already been mentioned in this introduction. Bruce Nelson conducted a later, 2014 inquiry into the question of race and Irish independence and explored the relationship between Irish nationalism and South Africa from 1899 to 1922, in order to establish an Irish eagerness at this time to identify with the white races and claim a right to self -governance and independence on that basis.[64] In a more specifically South African context, Herman Giliomee's history *The Afrikaners: Biography of a People* and Stanley Trapido's work on landlords and tenants in a colonial economy inform the context on the Boer/Afrikaner culture, national identity and social hierarchies, underpinning the arguments for Moore's sympathy with the displaced Boers.[65] Lindi Korf's PhD thesis on D.F. Malan provided insight into the religious and linguistic foundations for Afrikaner ethnic identity; likewise Sandra Swart's PhD thesis and accompanying articles on Eugéne Marais, poet and language enthusiast, cultural hero and powerful symbol for Afrikaner identity reveal the importance of the construction of Afrikaner identity as a post-colonial response.[66] Michael Kennedy, Donal Lowry, and most recently Gerard Keown's

[61] David A.Wilson, *Thomas D'Arcy McGee:Passion, Reason and Politics 1825-1857, Vol 1* (Montreal, 2008), *Thomas D'Arcy McGee:The Extreme Moderate 1857-1868 Vol. 2* (Montreal, 2011).

[62] Kate O'Malley, *Ireland, India and Empire: Indo-Irish Radical Connections 1919-64* (Manchester, 2008); Elleke Boehmer, *Empire: The National and the Postcolonial 1890-1920: Resistance in Interaction* (Oxford, 2002).

[63] Paul A.Townend, 'Between Two Worlds: Irish Nationalist and Imperial Crises 1878-1880' in *Past and Present,* no. 194, (February, 2007), pp 139-174.

[64] Bruce Nelson, *Irish Nationalists and the Making of the Irish Race* (Princeton, 2012).

[65] Hermann Giliomee, *The Afrikaners: Biography of a People* (London, 2002).

[66] Lindie Korf, 'D.F. Malans: A Political Biography,' Ph.D Thesis, University of Stellenbosch, 2010; Sandra Scott Swart, 'A Ware Afrikaner: An Examination of the Role of Eugéne Marais (1871-1936), in the Making of Afrikaner Identity,' PhD Thesis, University of Oxford, 2001; ideam 'Boer and His Gun and His Wife Are Three Things Always Together:Republican Masculinity and the 1914 Rebellion' in *Journal of South African Studies,* vol. 24, no. 4, Special Issue on Masculinities in South Africa (December, 1998), pp 745; eadem 'Man, Gun and Horse: Hard Right Afrikaner Masculine Identity in Post-Apartheid South Africa' in Robert Morrell, (ed.), *Changing Men in Southern Africa* (Natal, 2001) p. 79; eadem 'The Construction of Eugène Marais as a Afrikaner Hero' in *Journal of South African Studies,* vol. 30, no. 4 Special Issue. Writing in Transition. Fiction, History, Biography (December, 2004), pp 847-867.

contribution to the historiography of Ireland's early foreign policy and embryonic diplomatic corps provide much of the scholarly background to chapter four, while Akenson and McCracken illuminate another under-researched area, that of the identity of the Irish presence in South Africa.[67] McCracken is an obvious addition to this scholarship as there are few who have published so widely or so authoritatively on the Irish in South Africa. More recently, in 2015, Ciaran Reilly published an article on the Irish mission to Africa in 1921, while in the year preceding, Shane Lynn wrote a prize winning essay on a similar mission to Australia and New Zealand undertaken by Kathleen Hughes and Osmond Esmonde, a member of the Wexford Catholic elite.[68] Both articles signify an increased interest in the global missions undertaken by the Irish during this period and represent an acknowledgement of the Catholic elite who were involved in Irish independence. Much of the history of this period reveals the process by which empire transformed into commonwealth. Mansergh, Harkness and McMahon provided analyses of the Irish in commonwealth and empire while Kissane made thoughtful comparisons between the newly formed Irish state and and other emergent post-colonial nationalisms. [69]

The formation of the new state, and the civil war that followed it, have received extensive historiographical attention. The process by which the self-exiled republicans evolved into the constitutional republicanism of Fianna Fáil has also received exhaustive analysis in historiography and political science alike. What have become identified as ideological cleavages in Irish politics and society have been subjected to both analysis and conjecture in a field dominated by Jeffrey Praeger, Tom Garvin, and John M.Regan, the latter two who both supported and challenged aspects of Praeger's thesis, while Regan called for a counter-revolutionary understanding of the new state as a democratic polity struggling to encourage civic

---

[67] Michael Kennedy, "'Civil Servants Cannot be Politicians": The Professionalisation of the Irish Foreign Service, 1919-22' in *Irish Studies in International Affairs*, vol. 8, (1997), pp 95-109; idem, *Ireland and the League of Nations 1919-1946: International Relations, Diplomacy and Politics* (Dublin, 1996); Donal Lowry, 'The Captive Dominion: Imperial Realities behind Irish Diplomacy, 1922-49' in *Irish Historical Studies*, vol. xxxvi, no. 142 (Nov., 2008); idem, 'New Ireland, Old Empire and the Outside World, 1922-49: 'The Strange Evolution of a "Dictionary Republic"' in Mike Cronin and John M. Regan, (eds), *Ireland:The Politics of Independence 1922-49* (New York, 2000); Gerard Keown, *First of the Small Nations: The Beginnings of Irish Foreign Policy in the Inter-War Years, 1919-1932* (Oxford, 2016); Donal P.McCracken 'Imperial Running Dogs or Wild Geese Reporters? Irish Journalists in South Africa,' in *South Africa Historia*, vol.58, no.1 (May/Mei., 2013), pp 122-138; idem, *Forgotten Protest: Ireland and the Anglo-Boer War* (Belfast, 2003); idem, *MacBride's Brigade: Irish Commandos in the Anglo-Boer War*, (Dublin, 1999); idem, *The Irish in South Africa, 795-1910* (Durban, 1992); idem, 'The Imperial British Newspaper, with Special Reference to South Africa, India and the "Irish Model"' in *Critical Arts*, vol. 29, no. 1 (2015), pp 5-25; Donald H. Akenson, *Occasional Papers on the Irish in South Africa*, (Grahamstown, 1991): idem: *God's Peoples: Covenant and Land in South Africa, Israel and Ulster* (London, 1992).

[68] Ciaran Reilly, '"The Magna Hibernia":' Irish Diplomatic Mission to South Africa, 1921', in *South African History Journal*, vol. 67, no. 3 (2015), pp 255-270; Shane Lynn, 'Osmond Esmonde's Dominion Odyssey: Irish Nationalism in the British Empire' in *The Australasian Journal of Irish Studies*, vol. 14, (2014).

[69] Nicholas Mansergh, *The Commonwealth Experience* (London, 1982) : idem, *The Commonwealth and the Nations: Studies in British Commonwealth Relations* (London, 1948) : *The Irish Question, 1840-1921: A Commentary on Anglo-Irish Relations and on Social and Political Forces in Ireland in the Age of Reform and Revolution* (London, 1965): D.W. Harkness, *The Restless Dominion: The Irish Free State and the British Commonwealth of Nations 1921-31* (Dublin, 1969),:Deirdre McMahon, *Republicans and Imperialists: Anglo-Irish Relations in the 1930s* (London, 1984): Bill Kissane, *Explaining Irish Democracy* (Dublin, 2002): idem, *New Beginnings: Constitutionalism and Democracy in Modern Ireland* (Dublin, 2011).

responsibility.[70] The somewhat neglected progress of the first Cumann na nGaedheal government is the subject of more recent empirical rather than theoretical studies by Ciara Meehan and Jason Knirck.[71] Michael Laffan contributed a recent study on W.T. Cosgrave adding to a new body of work that is beginning to accumulate around the years that preceded the Fianna Fáil government, while Diarmaid Ferriter's studies on the revolution and beyond reveal more similarities between the pro-and anti-Treatyites than deep rooted ideological difference, suggesting that ideological propaganda may have obscured the real meaning of events, and equally causative factors.[72] If the ideological divide between Treatyites and anti-Treatyites is expressed in more empirical terms as the dividing line from the north-west to the south-east with the anti-Treatyites to the west of it, it becomes less of an ideological and more of an economic question. Study of the early days of the Senate has languished in the shadows and few serious historiographical attempts have been made to understand its legislative role, or that of those of the previously ruling class that were included in its ranks. Elaine A. Byrne points to this omission in her article on the identity of the members of the new Senate, and Moore's contribution has suffered as a result.[73] This study will focus on Moore's role in the Senate and examine his exchanges with a previously ruling class to gain some insight into the legislative role that this class had in the new state. The years of the establishment of the new Irish state were also those in which the state negotiated the terms of commonwealth inclusion both for itself and its fellow dominions.

As a result of Moore's multiple contexts, which include Irish Catholic elites with nationalist sympathies and European origins, military and diplomatic engagement with South Africa, both in the days of South Africa's colonial status and the union of its states in commonwealth, the pre-revolutionary years of military preparedness, global warfare, and intense speculation at the constitutional means by which Ireland might achieve independence within the integrity of commonwealth, a wide ranging selection of secondary readings was necessary in order to understand them. The themes of nation, empire, and cultural identity are not new, and for the most part with regard to Irish history are furrows that have been well ploughed. The advantage of this is the number of available analyses to draw from, while the disadvantages lie in selecting those

[70] Jeffrey Prager, *State Building and Democracy in Ireland: Political Order and Cultural Integration in a Newly Independent Nation* (Cambridge, 1986); Tom Garvin, *1922: The Birth of Irish Democracy* (Dublin, 1996); John M. Regan, *The Irish Counter-Revolution 1921-1936: Treatyite Politics and Settlement in Independent Ireland* (Dublin, 1996); idem, *Myth and the Irish State* (Dublin, 2013).

[71] Jason Knirck, *Afterimage of the Revolution: Cumann Na nGaedheal and Irish Politics, 1922-1932* (Madison, 2014); idem, *Imagining Irish Independence: The Debate over the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921* (Plymouth, 2006); Ciara Meehan, *The Cosgrave* Party*: A History of Cumann na nGaedheal, 1923-33* (Dublin, 2010).

[72] Diarmaid Ferriter, *The Transformation of Ireland 1900-2000* (London, 2005); idem, *A Nation and Not a Rabble: The Irish Revolution 1913*-1923; Michael Laffan, *Judging W.T. Cosgrave* (Dublin, 2014).

[73] Elaine A. Byrne, 'A Unique Experiment in Idealism: The Irish Senate 1922-28' in Mel Farrell, Jason Knirck and Ciara Meehan, (eds), *A Formative Decade: Ireland in the 1920s* (Sallins, 2015).

most relevant to the questions posed by this biography, to find that there are few works that follow a trajectory similar to Moore's existence and that the question of transnational biography is relatively new to Irish historiography. Indeed, some of the work that has been done has not been done by Irish scholars or necessarily within the discipline of history. In the collection of essays edited by Lambert and Lester, *Colonial Lives Across the British Empire: Imperial Careering in the Long Nineteenth Century*, four of the twelve essays deal with either Irish subjects or a subject in Ireland, as in the case of Lady Aberdeen. None of the authors were in Irish academe and only two were historians. The recent biographical studies of Irish colonial lives by Jonathan Jeffrey Wright has gone some way to redressing that situation, while Ciaran O'Neill's studies have identified the occupations and later experience of the English-educated Irish elite. The body of literature in this review reveals the recent historiographical interest in the biographies of those figures who became involved in revolutionary republican politics, and in what has been described as the 'lost world of the constitutionalists', it becomes clear that Moore exists in a plethora of lost worlds and unredeemed pasts. However, recent work makes it clear that some of those worlds are under investigation, and, as Moore's experience makes evident, many of them intersect: colonial and nationalist; elite and revolutionary politics; Catholic elites and the first government; the military and constitutionalism; analogical cultural revivals distinguished by their geographical remove. It becomes obvious that while the existing literature provides a firm foundation for this study, additional work is needed on the neglected world of Irish Catholic elites. For the most part this study avoids a structural understanding of empire, but uses it as a research context 'offering specific problems or questions'. Moore's perspectives and his movements through a number of specific national and imperial contexts give a view of these contexts, revealing the flow of influences between the two usually structurally defined contexts of empire; and nation.[74]

Primary Sources

The sources which provide the basis for this study reflect its wide ranging cultural, geographical and nationalist background and consequently are grounded in Irish, British and South African records. The narrative is constructed around their chronology, beginning with the textual traces left by Moore's forbears and the British military archival sources for the wars in South Africa. However, the study is grounded primarily on the collection of papers donated by Moore to the National Library of Ireland before his death. This collection includes personal and family correspondence and documentation relating to those stages of his career that this study has focused on. Moore has in a sense, dictated the terms of historiographical engagement with his

[74] Stephen How, 'Afterword: Imperialists, Colonisers Settlers and Revolutionaries' in Timothy G. McMahon, Michael de Nie and Paul A. Townend, (eds.) *Ireland in an Imperial World: Citizenship, Opportunism and Subversion* (London, 2017), p. 290.

career. The most voluminous collection deals with his work with the volunteer force from 1913 to 1917, and includes a correspondence with the major figures of nationalist and parliamentary importance from this period. Roger Casement, Eoin MacNeill, Alice Stopford Green and John Redmond and Joseph Devlin are among them. The witness statements taken by the Bureau of Military History and the National Library collections of the Chenevix Trench, Lawrence Parsons, John Redmond, G.F.H. Berkeley and Art Ó Bríain papers all gave much background material for chapter three. The correspondence or witness accounts of Moore's role in this period were added to by the Eoin MacNeill and Joseph Hone manuscript collections in the UCD archives. Moore's papers were augmented by those of Chief-Secretary Augustine Birrell and Under-Secretary Matthew Nathan in the Bodleian library. These are a rich resource for the events leading up to 1916 and for personal opinion on Moore, both for his political role and as an individual. The papers of Moore's father, the parliamentarian landlord, George Henry Moore and his brother, the novelist George Augustus Moore, are held in the National Library and provided relevant material, particularly the long standing correspondence between Moore and his brother which reflects their personal relationship and provides invaluable background material on the political opinions of a Catholic elite. Their father, George Henry's archive included a correspondence of long duration with Benjamin Disraeli which is now held in Disraeli's papers at the Bodleian library which was consulted in order to examine the Catholic conservatism he shared with many of that Catholic elite. The literary inheritance bequeathed by Moore's historian grandfather and his great-uncle Thomas were consulted for similar reasons, in order to gain an understanding of the complex political opinions and fidelity to Catholicism that that made up the political legacy of this under researched elite. The material that provided the substance for chapter two was derived primarily from Moore's papers; his early letters to his mother from South Africa in 1879 and the articles he composed on his experience of the second Anglo-Boer war, two of them written during the war while the third was composed retrospectively, a few years after the war's end.

Articles in the British and Irish press and the officially sanctioned histories of the war by Grant and Amery provided much of the additional context.[75] The war diaries and photograph collection of H.F.N. Jourdain, who served under Moore's command in South Africa, is held in the Templar Research Centre in the National Army Museum in Chelsea and recorded Jourdain's personal observations on Moore and the Connaught Rangers experience of warfare on the South African veldt. At the end of the South African war Jourdain began work with Moore's support, as his commanding office, on a proposed regimental history. A committee of three was formed in

[75] L.S. Amery, *The Times History: The War in South Africa 1899-1902* (London, 1900-1909); Captain Harold Grant, *History of the War in South Africa 1899-1902* (London, 1912).

1903, composed of Jourdain, Captain Sarsefield and Moore, who acted as the President. Its mandate was to collect any relevant material for the history, including photographs, personal testimony, letters etc. This history was published in 1924 and remains a valuable source for any study of the Connaught Rangers and as a source for South African scholars researching imperial warfare in Africa. Moore's third period in South Africa is recorded in the Early Series Foreign Affairs papers in the National Archives, and in P.J. Little's witness statement to the Bureau of Military History in which he recalled his role as envoy to South Africa. Art Ó Bríain's papers in the National Library provide additional material on that period, particularly in relation to the Irish Republican Association of South Africa which worked closely with the two Irish envoys in 1921. The contextual background for this chapter was found in the collection of South African Anglophone newspapers in the British Library, which gave extensive coverage to the visit of the Irish representatives, Moore and Little, and to the reaction to that visit by the Afrikaner politicians. Handcock's edited version of the Smuts papers gave some of the international political background to the Irish mission.[76] The record of the later years of Moore's career in the Senate is derived primarily from two sources: Moore's papers on the Land Annuities campaign, and selected Senate debates. His correspondence during these years with John Devoy, which indicated the change in his political opinions, and some detail on the policy of Clann Éireann can be found in the Devoy papers in the National Library of Ireland. Peadar O'Donnell's account of the campaign for the abolition of the Land Annuities payment *There Will be Another Day,* provided social and cultural context to the political organisation of the campaign.

It has already been observed that Moore has contributed to the nature of historiographical investigation into his life and career by his selection of the archival material that he donated to the National Library before his death. Much of the subject matter of the material donated to the National Library justified both his nationalist career and the nature of his fractured relationship with his novelist brother, George Moore. Another observation might be made on the ubiquity of Moore's biography of his father as a primary source in subsequent historiography of that middle period from 1850 to 1870 in nineteenth century nationalist politics. This would appear to indicate that a fresh independent analysis of George Henry Moore's contribution to nationalist politics over the two decades from 1850 to 1870 is long overdue. Additional material on the Moores was located in the personal collection of Carnacon resident, Kevin Coyne, who has in his possession a considerable correspondence with the descendants of the Moores; Rory Moore, Santa Barbra resident, and Moore's only surviving son and Kenelm Gow, a descendant of Nina Moore (Moore's only sister) were contributors to this collection of letters. Such a collection is testimony

[76] W.K. Hancock and Jan Van Der Poel (eds), *Selections from the Smuts Papers* (Cambridge, 1966).

to the lively local memory and the esteem in which the Moore's continue to be held locally, both for their nationalist affiliations and their support of their tenants during the famine. While this material is welcome and contributes to a local landlord history, it can also obscure an objective analysis of the Moore's status within the ascendancy, and the meaning of class relationships between landlord and tenant. This thesis has explored Moore's attitudes to the Catholic tenantry, soldiery and the later smaller farmers of the early twentieth century to reveal the enduring relationships of power and inequality within the particular 'emotional intimacy,' of paternal landlordism.[77]

Chapters

The thesis has been structured around five chapters, each one dealing with a significant period in Moore's life that intersected with major transformative events in Ireland, Empire and South Africa. In the first chapter, Moore's landed elite origins in county Mayo are introduced, in order to establish the ideological foundations for an early patriotism that evolved into active nationalism. To demonstrate the variousness and mutability of this ideological inheritance, the study begins with the removal of his great-grandparents from Alicante in Spain to Mayo in Ireland in the late eighteenth century. This is followed by a study of four of his male predecessors who are used as optics through which to examine chronologically: elite Catholic education on the European continent in the latter part of the eighteenth century; the revolutionary ideology of the United Irishmen of 1798; the invocation of Spanish constitutionalism 1812-15; Whig and Catholic conservatism 1815-20; and finally the moderately reforming political career, paternal landlordism, and Catholic conservatism of Moore's father, George Henry Moore, from 1850 to his death in 1870. This background was woven into a family mythology of origin, and became the foundation for an association of the Moores with Catholic equality.

In chapter two, the focus is on two temporal contexts in Ireland and South Africa. Moore's military career in South Africa is introduced with the campaign against the Xhosa and the Zulu, in 1878-9. His second period of military service twenty years later from 1899 to 1902, as a major in the Connaught Rangers in the second Anglo-Boer war, provides the second context for this chapter.; Moore's nascent nationalism is established as a member of an Irish regiment in 1879 which later matures into a political stance as a result of the war in South Africa from 1899 to 1902. Both of these periods of colonial warfare in South Africa acted as rejuvenating forces for

[77] Jonathan Hyslop, 'The Invention of the Concentration Camps: Cuba, Southern Africa and the Philippines, 1892-1907' in *Southern African Historical Journal*, vol. 63, no. 2 (2011), p. 1000, cited in Elizabeth Van Heyningen, 'The South African War as Humanitarian Crisis' in *International Review of the Red Cross*, vol. 97 (2015), pp 999-1028.

nationalism in Ireland, and intersected with the politics of land reform in 1879, and increasingly separatist nationalism in 1899, with its cultural thrust of anti-anglicising Gaeldom. The second Anglo-Boer War was to leave an indelible mark on Moore, in terms of his experience of the suffering of the Boer nation, and the threat to pastoral hierarchical societies threatened by extinction from warfare, expanding capitalism and industrialisation. His sympathy for what was to become known later as the Afrikaner nation influenced his thinking on language and ethnic identity, and the future of small nations in empire.

Chapter three is of greater length than the other chapters, due to the complexity and intersecting nature of Moore's involvement in several, simultaneously active, political movements over a period of six years. Occurring against a background of world war and rebellion, these controversial years marked the beginning of his public career. Heralded a few years previously by an increasing involvement in the language and cultural movements and the political biography of his father in 1913, he had yet to define a suitable role for himself. Committed, but peripheral, Moore was identifiably in support of nationalism, but lacked a definite public persona. The founding of a Volunteer movement to counteract the Ulster Volunteers provided him with the opportunity he was looking for. Undertaking their military training and organisation, he became a public figure active in a variety of social, military and political networks. Involved in constitutional nationalism at more or less the same time, he was active in the Dominion Association and the Irish Convention of 1917-18. With the altered political landscape from 1914 to 1916 which undermined the authority of the Irish Parliamentary Party, Moore attempted to hold the political ground he had gained by publicly joining Sinn Féin. Yet he retained his cautious political stance and escaped serious administrative censure. His complex and ambiguous politics, made him a man for all seasons, principled but adaptable.

That adaptability received full rein in 1921, when the Irish independent assembly established in 1919 activated global networks in order to gain support for Irish political independence. Moore was despatched to South Africa to approach Premier Jan Smuts for support. The issues raised in chapter four range variously from the question of Moore's earlier presence in South Africa; the tension between commonwealth and republican status; the fear of the loss of language and ethnic identity by an identifiable Afrikaner nation which mirrored that in Ireland, and the nature of an Irish presence in South Africa. Moore's interactions with the Afrikaners were on the basis of the discussion on republicanism, language and cultural identity. There are questions raised on the nature of the Irish presence in South Africa reflected in the Irish Republican Association, which proved itself to be a slighter force than portrayed in both historiography and contemporary

accounts. The context for the chapter is the post-war agitation of smaller nationalisms, and Irish and Afrikaner republicanisms within an empire evolving, with some reluctance and dominion pressure, into commonwealth.

In the period covered by the fifth and final chapter, Ireland had become a free state and a dominion member of commonwealth. Moore was a supporter of the 1921 Treaty which led to the setting up the new state, and was elected to the Senate by members of the new government. Moore took his usual idiosyncratic position, not republican, but increasingly critical of the first government of Cumann na nGaedheal on the basis of the Land Acts and a policy of coercion towards dissenters and an eagerness to gain commonwealth advantages that led to the economic neglect of the West of Ireland. His impatience at the government was equalled by his disappointment with his own class who failed to pick up a senatorial gauntlet and make a meaningful contribution to the state. This was the period in which Moore made a vital contribution to Irish political life, and to issues closest to his paternalist landlord understanding. He championed a campaign to end the payment of land annuities which were draining the Irish economy. Unable to make this a legislative issue in the Senate, he formed his own party with Magennis and Ó Máille, and with its failure, he joined the constitutional republicans under de Valera and by making his way onto the executive, he saw his arguments on the annuities made into electoral policy, until their final abolition in 1932. He received passing recognition for this campaign which owed much to his persistence or 'pertinacity', as the former Labour Party leader Senator Thomas Johnson referred, to Moore's commitment. During this period Moore's nationalist identity was interrogated by members of the government on the basis of his imperial past thus ensuring the continuing ambiguous understanding of Moore and his partial acceptance into the narrative of nationalism.

To summarise, and to restate; the objective of this study is to use Moore's biography as a prism, through which to interpret the experience of a colonial military career that linked two separate historiographies of empire in Ireland and South Africa. An observation of their intersection in several temporal periods that were critical to both is mediated through Moore's military presence in South Africa during which time he considered and compared a nationalising process in both. United by imperial domination and republican ideals, the two sites of Ireland and South Africa were each to utilise the other, principally in terms of constructing a rhetoric of opposition, but also in terms of military and political support. The deployment of such a perspective is consistent with the methodologies of transnational inquiry, which in this case remains within a nationalist paradigm, as Moore is always regarded from this point of view while

transgressing national boundaries through his geographical movements and political discourse. It has already been stated that Moore's individual experience, although vital to this study, is secondary to the larger issues it illuminates, in terms of culture, transnational politics and Catholic elites. Consequently, there is some elision of the experiences that do not impinge on those issues. His years in India, and his personal family relationships are all of lesser importance to the questions posed by his political and military involvements. These questions are specific: how did the military career and nationalist activism of a member of an Irish Catholic elite throw historiographical light on the process that lead to Ireland's independence? What does this say about the position of a landed Catholic ascendancy in the later nineteenth and early twentieth century? How does it reveal formerly neglected processes eclipsed by rebellion and the rise of a Catholic bourgeoisie? Why was the relationship between Ireland and South Africa not foregrounded within the narrative of nationalist independence and state building?

CHAPTER ONE: 'MEN RESEMBLE THEIR TIMES MORE THAN THEY DO THEIR OWN FATHERS':[1] THE MOORES OF MOORE HALL.

The above advice from Marc Bloch acts as a salutary warning against the interpretation of origins as a cause, a 'beginning that explains', or a starting point from which a series of chronological consequences ensue.[2] Yet a biographical narrative almost inevitably has a beginning in family. While not denying the importance of socio-political context as a fundamental influence on the biographical subject where identity creation is concerned, it has to be acknowledged that the domestic discourse that maintained the core of a family self-perception was a significant factor, if not the most significant factor in the formation of Moore's character.[3] His sense of identity was derived from his membership of a Catholic elite family who left a singular intellectual and political legacy, and much of his political thought was directed towards legitimating that influence in Irish nationalism. Therein lies the rationale for a detailed analysis of the ideological background of four generations of wealthy Catholic landowners. A further rationale lies in a consideration that the movements of members of this family between Ireland, Europe and Britain made them 'inherently transnational', and not just that their movements provide an opportunity for a transnational perspective.[4] They owed their Catholic identity not only to intermarriage in Ireland, but to the economic and social advantages conferred by such an identity in eighteenth century Catholic Spain. The economic and social ascendancy that resulted from intermarriage with the Athys, one of the prominent Catholic families in Galway, brought not just business opportunities in Spain but conversion to Catholicism as well.[5] They cultivated a Catholic identity that claimed descent from the English High Chancellor and Catholic martyr, Thomas More.[6] Unproven, despite extensive genealogical research, this claim provided the impeccable Catholic lineage necessary to obtain the noble status of Hidalguia which confirmed

[1] Marc Bloch, *The Historian's Craft* (Manchester, 1954), p. 35.

[2] David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 5.

[3] Allen Warren, 'The Twilight of the Ascendancy and the Big House: A View from the Twenty First Century.' Terence Dooley and Christopher Ridgeway (eds), *The Irish Country House: It's Past, Present and Future* (Dublin, 2011), pp 249-252.

[4] Ciaran O'Neill, 'Roundtable Discussion: Teaching Transnational History,' in Michael de Nie, Mo Moulton, Ciaran O'Neill, and Enda Delaney, *Éire-Ireland*, vol. 51, nos. 1&2 (Spring/Summer,2016), pp 266-276.

[5] Joseph Hone, *The Moores of Moore Hall* (London, 1939); George Moore, *Hail and Farewell, Ave, Salve, Vale*, Richard Allen Cave (ed.), (Buckinghamshire, 1911).

[6] Martin J. Blake, 'Sir Thomas More: His Descendants in the Male Line' in *The Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, vol. 36, no. 6 (Fifth Series. Vol.16), (Sept. 30 1906), pp 223-230.

citizenship and access to necessary privileges, such as freedom from taxation, if the Irish were to do business in Spain.[7]

In later years the claim would add a gilded and sanctified aura to their Catholic reputation and a portrait of the English Chancellor would hang at Moore Hall. By the nineteenth century the Moores had consolidated their position as Catholic Mayo landowners due to the wealth and influence accruing from their mercantile interests in Spain. The Catholic Relief Acts of the late eighteenth century allowed the Moores return to their native Mayo, not as a minor Protestant gentry family, as formerly, but as wealthy, influential Catholics with extensive estates that allowed them to transition from trade to an aristocratic landowning class in a primarily, but not exclusively, Protestant ascendancy. The marriage in Spain of Maurice Moore's great-grandfather, George Moore of Alicante, the son of Jane Athy from Galway, to Katherine de Kilikelly of Bilbao, a member of an influential Irish family domiciled in Spain provided them with links to continental military connections and further consolidated their Catholic identity.[8] The marriage of the second son of this union, also named George, to Louisa Brown, who was the cousin of the first Marquis of Sligo, brought local ties and an elevated social position. The Moores had essentially arrived as a family of influence, wealth, power, and a strong Catholic identity which they established as loyal to constitutional monarchy, by taking the oath to George III in 1780.[9] An identity that was formed by trade in Spain and reinforced by a Catholic education in France and Belgium just before the revolution, mutated into Whig Liberal Catholic loyalty after they returned to Ireland, influenced by social and educational exposure to Whig philosophy in London. This negotiated identity regarded itself as entitled to full equality in terms of political representation and access to empire, within the hierarchical social order dictated by Whig liberalism. The Moore's predicated their right to leadership on the basis of being Catholic, elite, propertied and representative of a primarily Catholic population, excluded from political representation by their Protestant peers.

This chapter will examine the processes by which they arrived at the political and philosophical understanding, that would both allow them to take up a local leadership role, and agitate intellectually and politically for Catholic autonomy and self-government within empire.

---

[7] Samuel Fannin, 'Spanish Archives of Primary Source Material: Malaga, Cordoba, Granada and Cadiz ' in *The Irish Geneologist*, vol. 13, no. 3 (2012, p.1; idem, 'Spanish Archives of Primary Source Material: The Basque Country and Coruña' in *The Irish Geneologist*, vol. 13, no. 3 (2012), p. 2

[8] Bilbao in Basque territory provided refuge for many of the dispossessed Irish who arrived there in the eighteenth century looking for residency. Samuel Fannin 'Spanish Archives of Primary Source Material: The Basque Country and Coruña.'

[9] Joseph Hone, *The Moores of Moore Hall*, p. 23.

Economic success, the propagation of a myth of Catholic origin, strategic marriage, and property acquisition were the means by which a formerly minor family propelled themselves into local and eventually national significance. They held firmly to an Irish Catholic cultural identity while becoming a member of an establishment that Colley claimed, had fused with British elites by the nineteenth century.[10] The methodological approach in this chapter is to present a series of short biographical studies of individual members of the Moore family from the late eighteenth century up to and including the birth of Moore in 1854, before considering his education and early career. The meanings attached to concepts of patriotism, loyalty, and liberalism within multiple identities that incorporated being Irish, English, a British subject, a citizen of Alicante, a member of empire and a gentleman, can be studied in self recorded experience and historical study over three generations.[11] No strangers to memoir or self-explanation, all of the Moore's under scrutiny, with the exception of John, left texts which will be examined for an understanding of the contexts in which they were writing. It is hoped, by this means to establish the continuity and stability of an Irish Catholic elite, cultural identity which saw itself as not only entitled but obliged to provide local and national leadership. It did not perceive the terms of this leadership as oppositional to a Protestant elite or intending to replace it, but as an integral part of it.

In 1707 John Moore, of the Protestant gentry in Straide, Countyl Mayo, married the Catholic Jane Athy of Renville, Co. Galway. One of the sons of this union, the previously mentioned George Moore, 1729-1799, left Ireland for Alicante in Spain and established himself, with the help of his mother's family and business influence, in a successful wine trading enterprise.[12] George Moore's marriage to Katherine de Kilikelly of Bilbao produced three children who were educated as Catholics in Spain, Belgium and France. Katherine de Kilikelly's family claimed descent, however improbably, from Daithi MacFiathraigh, King of Ireland, 405-428, and more plausibly, claimed connections with Irish officers in the Spanish and French service. [13] United to George Moore's claims of relationship to St. Thomas More, a lineage was created that sufficiently impressed the authorities in Bilbao, which considered itself a bastion of Catholic purity, and where conferral of the status of Hidalgo rested on evidence of a previous elite status and

[10] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (London, New Haven, 1992), p. 170; G.C. Bolton, 'The Anglo-Irish and the Historians, 1830-1980' in Oliver MacDonagh, W.F. Mandle and Pauric Travers (eds), *Irish Culture and Nationalism, 1750-1950* (London, 1983); D.G.Boyce, 'Brahmins and Carnivores: The Irish Historian in Great Britain,' in Ronan Fanning and David Harkness, (eds), *The Joint Journal of the Irish Historical Society and the Ulster Society for Irish Historical Studies,* vol. xxv, no. 99 (May, 1987).

[11] H.V. Brasted, 'Irish Nationalists and the British Empire in the Nineteenth Century,' in Oliver MacDonagh, W.F. Mandle and Pauric Travers (eds), *Irish Culture and Nationalism, 1750-1950*; W.E.H. Lecky, *A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century,* abridged and with an introduction by L.P. Curtis JR (Chicago, 1972), first published 1892-6.

[12] Martin J. Blake, 'Sir Thomas More: His Descendants in the Male Line.'

[13] Ibid., p. 15.

Catholicism.[14] Confirmation of status was necessary if the Irish were to do business in Spain, and George Moore, prosperous and armed with the necessary genealogical credentials, was presented at the Spanish court with his wife Katherine de Kilikely. He was not singular as an Irish merchant in Spain. By the 1770s, the Catholic merchants in the provision trade were men of 'skill and energy' who, excluded from careers in law, the public service, and politics put their energies to use in commerce.

The history of Irish mercantile contact in Spain had a long provenance reaching back to the 1600s when Ireland exported mainly agricultural produce and imported 'fine cloths - salt, wine and luxury goods.' By 1630, Galway's links with Spain had helped it to develop a sense of independence described by Beckett as an 'attachment to municipal independence'.[15] Irish merchants had businesses in Cadiz, Barcelona, Seville and Corunna. J.G. Simms makes reference to the Moore's business interests in Alicante as wine exporters to Ireland and manufacturers of iodine from kelp shipped from Galway.[16] The scope of Irish trade with Spain is evident in the story of a branch of the Galwey family who developed one of the largest wine importing businesses in Ireland. Based in Malaga with links to the Ormond estates, Anthony Galwey stored wine in the cellars of Carrick-on-Suir Castle, where his kinsman John Galwey was the agent. Like George Moore, John's son became accepted into the Spanish nobility as a hidalgo, or Spanish gentleman. The Moores maintained connections with other Irish wine businesses, notably Randle McDonnell and Byrne of Cartegna, Spain.[17]

With no family memory of dispossessed Gaelic overlordship, the Moore's returned to a late eighteenth century Ireland of increasingly radical politics following the 1782 Act that restored Catholic rights to property ownership.[18] George Moore had already taken the oath of allegiance to George III in 1780, and when he inherited his brother's estate he purchased additional lands in Mayo.[19] As Anthony Cronin commented on the Moores in a 1975 article, they were not singular

---

[14] Ibid., p. 6.

[15] J.C. Beckett, *The Making of Modern Ireland 1603-1923* (London, 1981), pp 28-31.

[16] J.G. Simms, 'The Irish on the Continent, 1691-180 in T.W. Moody and W.E. Vaughan. (eds), *A New History of Ireland IV: Eighteenth Century Ireland 1691-1800* (Oxford, 1986), pp 648-649.

[17] Notes made by Colonel Maurice Moore from letters and papers in the library at Moore Hall, 1898, copies in the possession of Kevin Coyne of Carnacon.

[18] L.M. Cullen, 'Economic Development, 1691-1750 in T.W. Moody and W.E. Vaughan. (eds), *A New History of Ireland IV: Eighteenth Century Ireland 1691-1800* (Oxford, 1986), pp 174-177; Kevin Whelan, 'An Underground Gentry: Catholic Middlemen in Eighteenth-Century Ireland,' in Ian Campbell and Andrew Carpenter. (eds), *Eighteenth Century Ireland Iris an dá Chultúir* vol. 10., (1995), pp 7-68.

[19] Hone, *The Moores of Moore Hall*, p. 23.

for trading in Spain, but they were notable in that they returned.[20] However, it was not unusual for Irish merchants to transform themselves from businessmen to landowners and many of them took the 'first opportunity to abandon business for landed estates,' and the increased social status of gentleman.[21] George returned with his Spanish wife and the sons who had been educated in France, and built an impressive Georgian residence on Muckloon Hill overlooking Lough Carra in Ballyglass County Mayo. The sons of the first George Moore to occupy Moore Hall had attended school in Liége or Douai in France (the sources are in conflict on this point) and then the University of Paris. A tradition of European education dated from 1570 when the 'continental mainland had replaced Oxford and Cambridge as the destination for Roman Catholics'.[22] The years of the younger Moores enrolment at the University of Paris coincided with the revolutionary period in France, and by 1794, the revolution made study in France impossible for those who would not take the revolutionary oath. The Irish College in Paris was under threat, although not obliged to take the oath to the civil constitution those teaching and studying there suffered from anti-clerical persecution and most of the students returned to Ireland.[23] The sons of George Moore and Katherine de Kilikelly had finished their education before these events, and short biographies of these three, John 1767-1799, George 1770-1840, and Thomas, for whom there are no dates but context and circumstance suggests that he was the youngest of the three, provide an initial focus for an analysis of the elite, Catholic identity of the Moores, establishing their background within local, national and international frameworks.[24] They ran the gamut of late eighteenth and nineteenth century ideological convictions and elements of this complex ideological legacy filtered down through a familial discourse leaving elements for absorption into our subject's later complex political and philosophical identity. The complexity of Maurice Moore's political thought found a resonance in the similarly complex evolution of Thomas D'Arcy McGee's ideological convictions that later contradicted a earlier set of revolutionary beliefs.

John Moore: Revolutionary by Default?

Despite Beckett's observation that Irish elite Catholics were conservative and lacking in revolutionary fervour when they saw the threat the French revolution offered to an existing social

---

[20] Anthony Cronin, 'Moores of Moore Hall',' *Irish Times*, 18 April 1975.

[21] Fintan Lane, 'William Thompson, Class and His Irish Context, 1775-1833' in Fintan Lane (ed.), *Politics, Society and the Middle Class in Modern Ireland* (London, 2010), p. 33.

[22] Bernadette Cunningham, 'Irish Historians of Louvain 1607-1650' in Ciaran Brady (ed.), *Ideology and the Historians*, (Dublin, 1991), p.15. John enrolled in the University of Paris under the name Bellew while one of his fellow students from Moun Bellew in Headford, took the name Moore, in a practice that was common during this period in order to obscure Catholic identities before Catholic emancipation. (Notes made by Colonel Maurice Moore after a study of the letters in the Moore Hall library in 1898)

[23] Ibid., p. 651.

[24] There was a fourth son, Peter, who was described by Hone, as 'witless.' It appears likely that he was born with disabilities, and he was cared for outside the family for his lifetime.

and religious order, there were exceptions and revolutionary fervour seems to have lodged in the imagination of John Moore, the eldest son of George.[25] Some ten years previous to the Moore's return to Ireland, in 1783, the year that George Moore inherited his brother's estate, the Genevan Revolutionary Etienne Clavière wrote from Dublin to his friend Jacques-Louis Brissot, explaining how the political culture of Ireland was compatible with their own republican project.[26] Clavière who was to become the minister for finance in the French Republic enthusiastically informed the future Girondist leader, Brissot, that Ireland had all the potential of America. Without embarking on an extended analysis of Clavière's political intentions, his obvious excitement suggests a lively political culture and optimism following the legislative independence and the constitution granted to the Irish parliament, all of which were eventually to disappoint.[27] By 1793 and the Catholic Relief Act which removed restriction on landownership, and opened civil and military employment to Catholics, a sense of change and freedom was in the air. 'Irish Catholics', observed Thomas Bartlett, 'were now indisputably within the "circle' of the constitution" and not just the Irish Catholics - there was an acknowledgement of large Catholic populations elsewhere in empire, from Canada to the Caribbean'.[28]

This shift in imperial ideology met with resistance from Protestant patriot populations in Britain and Ireland. Nonetheless, John Moore, who was studying law in London with his brother George, succumbed to optimism in a 1794 letter to his father. In it he mentioned the parliamentary repeal of the double Land Tax which had disadvantaged Catholic landowners: 'God Almighty has been very good to us in the alteration of people's minds since the year 1780', and pronounced himself happy that 'all that hatred and animosity against Catholics had almost completely vanished so that in England and Ireland we are on the same footing except as to places of trust and emolument'.[29] At some point John Moore abandoned his optimism, probably after the failure in 1795 of the Lord Lieutenant, Earl Fitzwilliam, to institute the reforms in the Irish parliament that would remove the final barriers against Catholic equality.[30] He had studied law at the Temple, and in the company of his younger brother George, had associated with the British Whigs. The

[25] J.C. Beckett, *The Making of Modern Ireland 1603-1923,* p. 170.

[26] James Livesey, 'From the Ancient Constitution to Democracy:' Transformations in Republicanism in the Eighteenth Century,' in Thomas Bartlett, David Dickson, Daíre Keogh, and Kevin Whelan, *1798: A Bicentenary Perspective* (Dublin, 2003), pp 14-15.

[27] Philip Petit, 'The Tree of Liberty: Republicanism, American, French and Irish,' in *Field Day Review*, vol. 1. (2005), pp 29-42.

[28] Thomas Bartlett, 'So Many Wheels within n Wheels': The 1793 Catholic Relief Act Revisited.' in D.W.Hayton and Andrew R. Holmes (eds), *Ourselves Alone? : Religion, Society and Politics in Eighteenth-and Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin, 2016), pp 126-128.

[29] Joseph Hone, *The Moores of Moore Hall,* p. 38; Thomas Bartlett, 'So Many Wheels Within Wheels': The 1793 Catholic Relief Act Revisited.' p.131.

[30] Tomas Bartlett, 'The Catholic Question in the Eighteenth Century' in *History Ireland,* vol. 1, no. 1 (Spring1993), pp 1-15.

Ireland of the 1780s possessed radical Whig Clubs which together with the presence of the Volunteers had applied the pressures that led to a new constitution.[31] John Moore moved to Dublin, where he came into the company of the United Irishmen and joined their ranks. There was a ferment of ideas abroad at the time, which according to Eagleton, included 'classical republicanism, civic humanism, Protestant dissent, the Ulster and Scottish Enlightenments, Freemasonry, Paineism, American revolutionary politics, the Commonwealth men, Patriot Clubs.' All of this, claimed Eagleton, outstripped the Literary Revival in terms of 'intellectual depth, daring and rigour.'[32] Moore was swept into their fields of influence and when the forces of General Humbert landed in Killala in Mayo in 1798, he joined them with comrades of the United Irishmen and was distinguished by being awarded the title of President of Connaught and head of the twelve man council of the provisional government on their initial victories.[33] With the failure of the rebellion in 1798, John Moore was arrested and brought to trial. Pakenham referred to him in *The Year of Liberty* as the Catholic son of one of the richest men in the district, and his father exhausted his funds obtaining legal representation for John in order to prove the accidental nature of his republicanism, and the series of unfortunate incidents that led to his arrest.[34] Subsequent events may have fed into a family and local mythology of revolutionary nationalism, but after his arrest John claimed that he was conscripted by the French armies as a result of his presence in Castlebar, and his ability to speak French. He protested that he had been coerced into joining the United Irishmen.

As a result of his defence, John Moore's initial death sentence was commuted to life imprisonment in New Geneva, but he never made it there, dying in captivity and being buried ignominiously and anonymously in Waterford.[35] There is some controversy over John Moore's involvement in revolution. With an apparent historiographical consensus based on the details of his trial that his republican sympathies remain unproven, Joseph Hone, who wrote a biography of the Moores, wrote that Republicanism and democracy were 'much at variance with the Irish Catholic tradition, as upheld by the Catholic gentry and by the Jacobite exiles of the Penal Laws, as were the notions and interests of the Protestant and Hanoverian ascendancy class'.[36] There is a

[31] The Whigs had contact with United Irishmen members in London. Lord Edward Fitzgerald and O'Connor met with Charles James Fox. Thomas Pakenham, *The Year of the French: The Bloody Story of the Great Irish Rebellion of 1798* (London, 1972), pp 261-262.

[32] Terry Eagleton, *Scholars and Rebels in Nineteenth Century Ireland* (Oxford, 1999), p. 27.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Pakenham, *The Year of the French*, p. 361, George Moore spent £2200 on his son's legal defence.

[35] Guy Beiner, *Remembering The Year of the French: Irish Folk History and Social Memory* (London, 2006).

[36] Hone, *The Moores of Moore Hall*, pp 38-39; Iseult Honahan, 'Putting Irish Republicanism in a Wider Context' in Iseult Honahan (ed.), *Republicans in Ireland: Confronting Theories and Traditions* (Manchester, 2008).

disquieting sense that John did protest too much. The 1789 French Revolution disseminated ideas that appealed to those who found their professional or social mobility blocked by lack of opportunity. The Protestant lawyer, and future rebel, Wolfe Tone, found his career advancement frustrated by a lack of patronage, John Moore may well have found himself equally disadvantaged, and inclined to rebellion. He would not have been the first rebel of wealthy origins to protest his innocence and accidental involvement. Those who had the financial means could procure able legal representation, and John Moore's father as one of the richest men in the county spared no sum to save his son. Genuine rebel or not, Moore was to become a potent Mayo symbol for revolutionary fervour, but his younger landlord brother George, who inherited in his stead was anxious to distance himself from any revolutionary taint, and possibly from the memory of his brother, in the wake of the bitter reprisals and sectarian divisions that followed on the 1798 rebellion.[37] Their mother Katherine de Kilikelly, who had never liked Ireland, did not recover from the arrest and death of her elder son, and lived out the remainder of her life in London and Alicante.

George the 'Historian': Loyalist and Patriot

'All That Men Know Consist in Facts, To Which the Mind Adds Arrangements'[38]

George Moore the younger who, unlike his revolutionary brother, showed that loyalism and patriotism were not antithetical, was known within family circles as the 'historian'. He had absorbed Whig ideology in London as a member of the Holland House set in the 1790s, and the equally exclusive Whig stronghold the 'King of Clubs.' [39] He was described by Joseph Hone as 'the darling of the Holland House set' and the friend of William Godwin and the Whig historian Sir James MacIntosh, and his later work reflected that influence.[40] For the arriviste Moores, Whiggery offered freedom and economic progress in a stable hierarchical society within the Union, which was not to be found in the separatism and social revolution of the 1798 Rebellion. Had his brother not succumbed to revolutionary fervour, George may well have enjoyed a successful intellectual career in London. As it was, he led an unsuccessful and largely unnoticed intellectual life from the sequestration of his library at Moore Hall, where he wrote and published

[37] On 11 Aug. 1961, John Moore's remains were taken from his burial place in Waterford and reinterred in Castlebar Co. Mayo in a ceremony attended by the President, Eamon de Valera, the Taoiseach, Sean Lemass and the ambassadors of Spain and France. Guy Beiner, *Remembering The Year of the French* p. 271.

[38] George Moore, *Treatise on the Art of Reasoning with a Preliminary Chapter on Human Knowledge and a Concluding One on the History of Morals* (London, 1830), p. 3.

[39] The 'Holland House Set' was associated with Henry Richard Fox and his wife Elizabeth Vassell Fox from 1797-1840 who hosted the primary political, literary, intellectual figures of this period in their house in Kensington.

[40] James MacIntosh, *History of the Revolution in England: 1688* (European Library, 1834). Mackintosh was a family friend. Thomas Moore, the third Moore brother, suggested him as a contact that Adams, who also knew MacIntosh, might use to communicate with Moore's mother, Katherine Kilikelly in London.

several works on political theory and what has become known in British history as the 'Glorious Revolution.' Neither his literary career nor his work have received much attention, despite the intriguing opportunities they offer to examine the political thought and historiographical contribution of a Catholic elite landlord in the early nineteenth century.[41] George Moore's history, which had its basis in making a claim for Catholic civil and political liberties, predated James MacIntosh's 1835 history of the 1688 revolution, while another member of the Holland House set, the supporter of Catholic emancipation, Charles James Fox, never completed his history of the revolution, making George Moore one of the earlier published Whig historians in 1817. To further contextualise George's history, it is worth bearing in mind that Thomas Babington Macauley didn't publish his *History of England to the Accession of James II*, until 1848. The entire thrust of George Moore's argument in *History of the British Revolution of 1688-9. Recording of all the events connected with that Transaction in England, Scotland, Ireland, down to the Capitulation of Limerick in 1691 in the last of its Kingdoms, inclusive,* was to advance Whig theories of progress in which the Glorious Revolution of 1688 heralded the beginning of the era of British political exceptionalism which paved the way to empire. As a Catholic in support of the Whig tradition he mounted a challenge to such as Sir Richard Musgrave who published widely post 1798 on the supposed Catholic inability to submit to government.[42]

In George Moore's thesis, British constitutionalism under the Union had the potential to grant full civil liberties and religious and political freedoms on the basis of Catholic loyalty, which was also the basis of Daniel O'Connell's arguments on Catholic emancipation, which resulted in the 1829 Act that removed all barriers to Catholic freedoms some twelve years after the publication of Moore's history.[43] It can be seen from his opinions on the Catholic tenantry of Gaelic descent that George Moore did not identify with the persistent narrative of 'oppressed and oppressors', that was to become a refrain of Irish historiography.[44] The Irish, George claimed, were conquered into 'happiness and freedom,' and voicing a Whig vision of progress and modernity, within a Malthusian argument, Moore saw the solutions to the barbarism of the peasantry and relief from

[41] George Moore, *The History of the British Revolution of 1688-9. Recording of all the events connected with that Transaction in England, Scotland, Ireland, down to the Capitulation of Limerick in 1691 in the last of its Kingdoms, inclusive.* (London, 1817); idem, *Treatise on the Art of Reasoning* (London, 1830); idem, *Lives of Cardinal Alberoni and the Duke of Ripperda. Ministers of the King of Spain. Vol 1.* (London, 1806).

[42] Sir Richard Musgrave, *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions in Ireland* (Dublin, London, 1802).

[43] D.George Boyce, *Nineteenth Century Ireland: The Search for Stability* (Dublin, 1994), p. 38.

[44] Ciaran O'Neill, 'Power, Wealth and Catholic Identity in Ireland, 1850-1900' in Oliver J. Rafferty, S.J., (ed.), *Irish Catholic Identities* (Manchester, 2013), p. 259.

their 'uncontrolled breeding,' due to a diet of potatoes, in the erasure of a Gaelic tradition which contributed to an inferior national character together with a process of agricultural reform.[45]

His outlined his own proposals for agricultural reform in a petition in protest at the Corn Bill, which was presented at the House of Commons, at the request of his Mayo neighbours.[46] In it he discussed the threat to Irish agriculture from foreign imports, and proposed that Ireland might 'become a granary for empire', with supportive manufacturing, in a linen industry, for example.[47] His solutions to the degeneration of the national character lay in divesting Irish Catholicism of any remaining Gaelic culture, and the 'pernicious dialect,' of the Irish language.[48] This process was inhibited by any remaining Gaelic gentry who were attached to the language and old customs, and the attempts, which Moore thought very ill advised, of a Mr Flood to establish a professorship of the Irish language in the College of Dublin in 1791.[49] Henry Flood, patriot and politician endowed a Chair of Gaelic at Trinity. These measures, Moore felt, would pave the way for the adoption of English 'language, manner and custom', as well as laws and government, in order for full assimilation into empire to take place.[50] Moore's views were congruent with those of Macauley, who, at a later date, in 1835, advocated an English education for Indian children, in order to assimilate them more readily into empire.[51] There was, Moore wrote, a growing and successful Catholic elite in the mercantile cities of Dublin, Cork, Limerick and Galway who had become property owners since 1782 and the relaxation of the Penal laws. The Catholics of Ireland, Moore went on, were among the most considerable bodies of men in the empire and were capable of equality with Europeans and therefore worthy contenders for self-government as well.[52]

Moore ascribed Edmund Burke's 'injudicious asperity' in describing the Penal Laws as the results of a 'national hatred and scorn towards a conquered people', and the 'incredible miseries of Ireland' in the seventeenth century and the excesses of the Penal Code of Queen Anne, to the

[45] Bryan Fanning, *Histories of the Irish Future* (London, 2015).

[46] Hone, *The Moores of Moore Hall*, p. 47. The full text of this petition can be found in the appendix to George Moore's *The History of the British Revolution of 1688-9.*

[47] Moore, *The History of the British Revolution.*

[48] Clare O'Halloran, *Golden Ages and Barbarous Naions: Antiquarian Debate and Cultural Poltics in Ireland c. 1750-1800* (Cork, 2004) p. 161. When he was a boy on the continent, George Moore remembered a more cheerful and festive peasantry than the Irish, who had better cottages, 'some domestic utensils,' and a 'brown loaf and a bottle of bad wine'. He contrasted this cheerful peasantry with the misery of the Irish. *The History of the British Revolution*, pp 527-528.

[49] Ibid., pp 522-563.

[50] Ibid., pp 522-563.

[51] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1771-1837* (London, 1992), new edition (2012), p. 259.

[52] Moore, *The History of the British Revolution*, pp 555-556.

'Protestant Party' in Ireland who had a vested interest in subordinating the Catholics.[53] Like Burke, he contested David Hume's account of the 1641 Ulster rebellion, as a massacre of Protestants, describing it as exaggerated and questioning the veracity of his sources.[54] It was not England or Union that Ireland must fear, but the dominance of the Protestant ascendancy. In 1830, he wrote a *Treatise on the Art of Reasoning with a Preliminary Chapter on Human Knowledge and a Concluding One on the History of Morals*, which was a response to what he perceived as the evils of Kantianism, from a supporter of Lockean empiricism. He dedicated the final chapter to his eldest son, as an 'Irishman, and a future Irish proprietor'.

In it, George Moore defined himself as an Englishman and an Irish patriot writing from a 'remote province of empire', thus articulating the flexibility of a multi-identity as Whig empiricist, Englishman, imperialist and a definition of Irish patriotism which fused national identity with landownership, proving that this identity was not confined to Protestants. This was not unusual, claimed Colley, as multiple identities were often held, both consciously and unconsciously by people in the past. The concept of patriotism that George Moore handed down to his son, George Henry, Moore's father, rested on the duty of a patriot or good citizen to maintaining the independence of his country. The ideal of the good citizen is a residuum of classical republicanism which defined the virtues and obligations of disinterested service to one's country, expressed in 'social responsibility and devotion to the common weal'.[55] The country would then, under the stable government of constitutional monarchy protect the landlord and his property. For George Moore patriotism fused with proprietorship and secure government which provided the conditions under which a class of gentlemen would build beautiful houses and public buildings which would contribute to the cultural, social, and economic capital of the country.[56] This sense of patriotism and landlord responsibility was also expressed by landlords of evangelical Protestant background along with liberal, non-sectarian, political loyalties.[57] George Moore exemplified that 'Roman Catholic thought that attached to conservatism and the 'party of order', which, according to José

[53] Ibid., p. 556. Moore and Burke were both critical of the Protestant Ascendancy, and shared a belief that political and civil liberty for Irishmen could be gained through British constitutionalism. Fanning, *Histories of the Irish Future,* (London, 2015), p. 43.

[54] David Hume claimed vast numbers of massacred Protestants in the 1641 rebellion in order to legitimate campaigns in Ireland in his *History of England from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution of 1688.* His claims were contested by Edmund Burke despite their joint admiration of the British constitution. Fanning, *Histories of the Irish Future* (London, 2015), p. 45. See also Conor Cruise O'Brien, *The Great Melody: A Thematic Biography of Edmund Burke* (London, 1992).

[55] Joep T.H. Leersen, 'Anglo-Irish Patriotism and it's European Context: Notes Towards a Reassessment' in (eds), Alan Harrison and Ian Campbell Ross, *Eighteenth Century Ireland, Irish an dá Chultúir,* vol. III (Dublin 1988), p.11; Iseult Honohan, 'Introduction: Putting Irish Republicanism in a Wider Context ' Iseult Honohan (ed.), *Republicanism in Ireland: Confronting Theories and Traditions* (Manchester, 2008); Bryan Fanning, *The Quest For Modern Ireland: The Battle of Ideas: 1912-1986* (Dublin, 2008), p. 24; Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1771-1837,* pp xxvii and 259.

[56] George Moore, *Treatise on the Art of Reasoning,* p. 219.

[57] Jennifer Ridden, 'Making Good Citizens: National Identity, Religion and Liberalism Among the Irish Elite c. 1800-1850' PhD Thesis Kings College, University of London, 1998.

Harris, 'supported that institutional secularism in the nineteenth century along with Free Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists and Quakers' who, similarly disadvantaged, and 'desirous of freedom of worship were happy to support the separation of church and state'.[58] The 'calm sober patriotism', of George Moore expressed without an 'effusion of blood', in order to achieve its aims of 'civil and political liberty' for Catholics, was an expression of the ideology that had grown around the bloodless (In England but not Ireland and Scotland) 'Glorious Revolution'.

George Moore the 'historian', completed a history of the French Revolution before he died leaving funds in his will to publish it post mortem. From his library in Moore Hall he participated in the British liberal project to define and codify the British exceptionalism that explained their resistance to destabilising revolution and the growth of their empire. Despite his isolation in Mayo, Moore's intellectual development paralleled that of his English peers, with whom he shared a similar intellectual engagement, though from an Irish Catholic perspective. However, his work was neglected on both sides of the Irish Sea. His wishes were not carried out and this unpublished history was believed to have been destroyed when Moore Hall was burnt in 1923, robbing the latter day historian of the opportunity to track the development of his political thought. He had defined himself as a landowner, Irishman, patriot, and an Englishman, living in a remote outpost of empire. Like '...many of the Anglo-Irish who came to be a part of the British establishment in the early nineteenth century he did not become an Anglicised 'look-alike' but maintained a dual identity as Irish and British.[59] The variousness of his self-identification suggests some lack of conviction about his entitlement to this identity, as Whig liberalism was constructed around Protestant identities, not Catholic, despite Moore's labours to find that argument that entitled a Catholic gentry to assume fully autonomous government, with full equality and access to empire at a time when constitutional liberty was synonymous with Protestantism.

Thomas Moore: 'Merchant and Provocateur'

Thomas, the third son in the original triumvirate of Moores, who was omitted from Hone's collective biography, also left a record of conservative constitutionalism, not unlike that of his brother George, but under very much more adverse circumstances. Thomas managed the family wine importing business in Alicante in Spain, in partnership with Patrick Strange. He left Spain for England in 1807, the years when Henry Grattan was in parliament working for Catholic relief

[58] José Harris, 'Epilogue' in Gareth Stedman and Gregory Claeys (eds), *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth Century Political Thought.* (Cambridge, 2011), p. 901.

[59] Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation*, p. 165.

and the year before the Peninsular Wars or the War of Independence, as it was known in Spain, and returned to Alicante in 1812, when Spain was in crisis, and Grattan's proposed bills for relief had been defeated. Trade and shipping had been disrupted by the Napoleonic invasion, and the Spanish socio-economic system was in a state of transition: the dissolution of the inquisition had undermined the power of the church and the monarchy was similarly undermined by the establishment of a liberal reforming constitution. The Cortés General had taken refuge in Cádiz in 1810, to compose a constitution allowing for universal male suffrage, national sovereignty within a constitutional monarchy; freedom of the press with support for land reform and free enterprise.[60] This was the most liberal constitution of its time and served as a model for the Mediterranean and Latin American nations and the Norwegian constitution of 1814. The province of Valencia, in which Alicante was located, had a strong anti-seigneurial movement with administration in the hands of the Juntas who were partly electorally selected and partly self-appointed. A recent tension had arisen between absolutism and liberalism with a royal decree that overturned the Cortés Constitution and called for the return of Ferdinand VII. Matters were not helped by the recent slaughter of 150 French merchants, or the presence in Valencia of an occupying army. Merchants and property owners who had been influenced by the spread of liberal ideas, were pushing for power and influence within a background of increasing civil disorder.[61]

Thomas's return after a five year absence and in the middle of the Napoleonic Wars was due to reports that the military were occupying both his business premises and his mother's house. Unlike his business partner, Patrick Strange who had joined the local Volunteers and was accommodating towards billeting, Moore was determined to resist a practice that he saw as having an adverse effect on his trade. Thomas Moore owned three warehouses with residences attached to two of them; one in Baranquet and the other in Plazuela de Ramiro which was described as belonging to Madama Moore; in addition to the original warehouse owned by his father George Moore on the corner of Baranquet road and Baranquet Square in Alicante.[62] The residences were large and well appointed. The house in Ramiro was described as having a view over the bay and was not in use at that time by Thomas Moore's mother who was resident in London.[63]

---

[60] Isabel Burdiel, 'The Liberal Revolution, 1808-1843' in José Alvarez Junco and Adrian Shubert (eds), *Spanish History Since 1808* (London, 2000), pp 17-32.

[61] Ibid. p. 22.

[62] *Thomas Moore V. Adams: Proceedings in a Case Tried in the Court of Kings Bench. Dec 21 1815 for Special Damages in Consequence of an Assault Committed at Alicant, in Spain. Including an Appendix Containing the Brief of Instructions Given by the Plaintiff to his Leading Counsel Mr. Sergent Best* (R.S Kirby, 11 London House. Yard, Paternoster Row, 1816) Digitised by Google Books pp 13,17,19,25.

[63] Ibid.

An account of subsequent events by Thomas Moore, held in the Stanford Law Library, offers an intriguing insight into the identity, social status and autonomy of a member of an Irish mercantile elite in opposition to the Spanish civil and military authorities, and the military authority of Colonel Frederick Adams, who was to become a hero of Waterloo, the Lord High Commission of the Ionian Islands in 1816, and the Governor of Madras in 1846. Thomas Moore was to exploit the freedoms of the press, Spanish constitutional property rights, and local sectarian tensions, in a battle that was eventually settled, and not to his satisfaction, in a British court of law.

Thomas had received reports that his mother's house had been occupied by General Don Felipe Keating Roche, an officer in both the Spanish and English armies, who had, during his occupancy been abusing its contents. In war torn Valencia, civil liberties were uppermost in the minds of the Spanish constitutionalists but not the allied armies that required billeting, and Moore found himself attempting to manoeuvre the return of his properties by alternately offering himself as a language intermediary between the English army and the Spanish authorities, and protesting the occupation of his mother's house by Keating to the military governor of Alicante, Brigadier General Joaquion Caamano. Caamano, who was a supporter of the new constitution, was reminded by Moore of the property rights in Article 4 which stated that a nation was bound to maintain and protect by law not just the civil liberty but the property rights of the individual.[64] In 1812, hoping perhaps to weigh the articles of the constitution in his favour, Moore had issued loans of £5,000 to the Spanish government and £4,513 to the local Spanish military hospital. Hoping to make an ally of the newly appointed British Adjutant, General Frederick Adams, he sent him a translation of the preliminary discourse to the Spanish Constitution and the *Inquisition Unmasked*, accompanied by gifts of books, Claret, and Madeira, and attempted to inform him on the differences between the Juntas and the workings of the Spanish municipal and military authorities. Adams, who had initially been friendly, responded by telling Moore that a Spanish officer learned best by the blow of a stick It transpired later that Adams had a similar attitude towards Irish merchants. It is significant to note that these years of the Napoleonic wars saw parliamentary opposition to Catholic relief due to the fear of invasion, however the question of relief had been much debated since the establishment of revolutionary France.

It is difficult to interpret the battle that ensued between the two men in non-sectarian terms. Moore published articles in the *Diario*, the local news sheet used to circulate government papers

[64] ibid., p. 46

among the public, in which he undermined the military authority and exacerbated sectarian tensions by printing the story of a Catholic priest, who had been carrying the 'sacrament' and had been accosted and ill - treated by an officer in an English uniform. Moore offered an reward for information on this incident and for any information on the assassins of the 150 French merchants, which in itself was a highly controversial action. In an attempt to oust the British soldiers billeted in his residence in the Baranquet without his permission, he wrote to the English General in command, ironically suggesting that they were deserters. This letter was intercepted by Adams who called to Moore with his sergeant in attendance, and despite Moore's defence, Adams had his sergeant attack Moore with a stick, striking him on the head and shoulders. The nature of the attack made it clear that Adams, who was the son of William Adams of Blair Adam, M.P. and Lord Lieutenant of Kinross, did not see Thomas Moore as his social equal. After this attack Moore fled to the convent of Orito near Monforte, outside Alicante. After the war, Moore took a case against Adams who was up for political preferment. Moore won the case but the inadequate damages prompted him to take the case again in 1816 with equally unsatisfactory results. By then the business in Spain had been destroyed, due perhaps to the losses endured by the usurpation of his premises and also by the recession that followed on the end of the Napoleonic wars from 1816-1819, which was responsible for a number of bankruptcies among Irish merchants.[65]

By 1816, a previous ideological radicalism had been neutralized by what Bayly called the 're-emerging state systems of 1815', made it unlikely that Thomas would find the justice he claimed he deserved under the auspices of a liberal constitution.[66] Thomas Moore's written account of the affair and the trials that followed suggest that he met with a distinct lack of sympathy from a British judiciary which took the view that the billeting demands of an army at war superseded those of a merchant, despite Thomas Moore's claims that his trade enriched Great Britain. Was Moore the victim of the Spanish and British authorities? It is clear that he prioritised his business interests, and also that the Spanish civil authorities depended on Moore's supplies to the military hospital in Alicante. This incident raises questions of citizenship, national loyalties and identities, but one is compelled to see that Moore was most loyal to the House of Moore, even while he negotiated multiple identities as a Catholic merchant, citizen of Alicante, and a British subject. His resistance to the billeting of the military was predicated on constitutional understandings of the rights of property owners, in order to prove the forced occupation of his premises without his consent to be unlawful. Like his Irish landlord brother, George, Thomas believed in the sanctity

[65] Cormac Ó Gráda, *Ireland: A New Economic History 1780-1939* (New York, 1995), cited in Fintan Lane, 'William Thompson, Class and His Irish Context, 1775-1833' Fintan Lane (ed.), *Politics, Society and the Middle Class in Modern Ireland* (London, 2010).

[66] C.A., Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World 1780-1914* (Oxford, 2004), p. 139.

of that ownership, even in conditions of warfare, and he questioned a British court that prized liberty but did not extend that value to other jurisdictions. Thomas Moore sent a note to his counsel pointing out English disregard for the civil liberties of others and that the impartiality of British justice did not exist outside Britain.[67] Thomas Moore, was, like his brother, a political agitator in pursuit of mercantile property rights and as a Catholic in opposition to twin pillars of the establishment as represented by a British officer and a son of a member of parliament, who treated the Irish merchant and the Spanish military with contempt. The Spanish military and municipal authorities were amenable to Moore's requests and apparently reliant on his supplies to the hospital and the loans he made to the government, and bound at least partly, by the constitution. The British authorities, in the person of Adams, was not, or refused to be bound by the Spanish constitution. Thomas Moore may have identified himself as a part of the British establishment as a British subject, but despite winning his case, he could garner little support in the wake of Adams's post-war reputation.

George Henry Moore: 'Humanitarian and Good Landlord.'

By the time George Henry Moore, Maurice Moore's father, became the landlord of Moore Hall, Daniel O'Connell had altered the context of the question regarding Catholic loyalty to embrace the entire Catholic population, not just the elite. By this time European education for wealthy Catholics had largely, but not completely, been replaced by an elite Catholic education in English and Irish schools thus ensuring that this class could unselfconsciously adopt the manners and mores of a British landed class, often intermarrying with it, both securing and occasionally obscuring conflicting interests. George Henry, 1810-1870, as the sole surviving child of George Moore the 'Historian' and Louisa Brown (the other two, Augustus and John had died in riding accidents), inherited his father's intelligence and none of his sobriety. His younger son described him as 'short...five feet seven inches in height...with a frame of compacted strength and powerful limbs...straight long nose...but determined jaw, a fine forehead with blue eyes that were generally kind and gentle but if he was put out he would look for just one second with hard severity that makes us tremble'. At a later date his friend Charles Gavan Duffy was to describe him as 'an enchanting companion, full of knowledge, seasoned wit with a fiery impatient temper'.[68] George Henry did not share his father's remote eighteenth century intellectual distance from a Gaelic identity, he was to call the Irish language the 'finest in the world'.[69] In 1827 while a schoolboy at St.Mary's, Oscott, an English Catholic public school in Birmingham, Moore

[67] *Thomas Moore V. Adams: Proceedings in a Case Tried in the Court of Kings Bench. Dec 21 1815,* p. 60.

[68] Moore Papers letter from Duffy to Moore 17 September 1886, Ms. 8489/1

[69] George Henry Moore papers, NLI Ms. 8597 1/2.

composed a poem set in the Cromwellian invasion and featuring one of the Islands in the lake overlooked by his family home. Called the 'Legend of Lough Carra', it was published in the Oscottian school magazine. George Henry's adolescent poetry, derived from a romantic antiquarian discourse, had its origins in local topography and the symbols of ruined castles and silent harps. Topographically, if not by 'jus sanguinis', George Henry situated himself in relation to Gaelic Ireland in a fashion that would have been antithetical to George Moore who aspired to the speedy eradication of Gaelic cultural markers. George Henry Moore's romantic literary conceptualisation of the nation was derived more from antiquarian discourse than the nationalist rhetoric of Thomas Davis (1814 - 45) who together with Charles Gavan Duffy and John Blake Dillon founded *The Nation* newspaper.

Succeeding to his patrimony on the death of his father, George Moore, in 1840, George Henry showed little interest in his estates until the famine of 1845.[70] This event had a transformative effect on a life previously dedicated to sporting interests, travel and society, and led to his later involvement in politics. Between 100,000 and 120,000 died in Mayo between 1845 and 1851, making it the county with the largest number of famine fatalities with a further 26,000 evicted from their homes.[71] The landlords found themselves in financial difficulties, constrained by the tenant's inability to pay rent and the necessity to pay poor law rates in order to provide famine relief. Mayo had five Poor Law Unions, Castlebar, Ballina, Westport, Swinfort and Ballinrobe and the rates were levied by the members of the Board of Guardians.[72] George Henry sat on two relief committees in Partry and Ballinrobe, reduced the rents and set out food on the steps of Moore Hall for those who needed it. He visited stricken houses in the company of the larger tenant farmers on his estate.[73] Along with the Marquis of Sligo,and Robert Blosse, neighbouring Mayo landlords, he chartered a ship from New Orleans to Westport carrying a cargo of flour that was sold at a low price to the tenants, leaving the three landlords considerably out of pocket.[74] In 1846, a large racing win on the Chester Cup enabled George Henry to pay off his considerable debts and to contribute enough money to save his tenants from starvation and eviction and to employ

[70] W.E. Vaughan, *Landlords and Tenants in Mid-Victorian Ireland* (Oxford, 2009); Philip Bull, *Land Politics and Nationalism: A Study of the Irish Question* (Dublin, 1996).

[71] Andrew Shields, 'Serving the Farmer: The Tenant Right Movement in the West, 1848-57' in Carla King and Conor McNamara (eds), *The West of Ireland: New Perspectives on the Nineteenth Century.* (Dublin, 2011), p. 62.

[72] Sean P. McManamon, 'The Famine in County Mayo 1845-1852' M.A Thesis, Hunter College, The City University of New York, 1997. P.17

[73] Moore, *George Henry Moore: An Irish Gentleman* (London, 1913).

[74] Lord Sligo along with Lord Lucan had reputations as evicting landlords. Andrew Shields, 'Serving the Farmer: The Tenant Right Movement in The West, 1848-57,' p .62..

them in famine work that was to their own advantage, thus creating a reputation as a 'good landlord' in consequent famine folklore.[75]

How exceptional was George Henry Moore among the Mayo landlowning families? His efforts were noteworthy, but he was not alone. It was established by Desmond McCabe that by 1838 Mayo had approximately 75 per cent of its landlords in residence on their estates, but few of these were improving, and many of them, the Marquess of Sligo among them, felt overwhelmed by the extent of the famine.[76] Ivor Hamrock compiled a number of contemporary newspaper reports on landlords who attempted to relieve the distress of their tenants, but few went to the extreme efforts made by Moore. Robert Blosse Lynch who has already been mentioned as one of George Henry's partners in the transport of a ship of meal from New Orleans, had his agent Philip O'Reilly 'liberally attend' to the needs of his tenants according to the *Telegraph*, 22 July 1846, while the Earl of Arran's agent, John Symes bought oatmeal for distribution.[77] Charles O'Malley, another landlord within Moore's vicinity also supplied his tenants with meal.[78] The *Tyrawley Herald* of 26 November 1846 carried a report on a landing of Indian meal in Killala which had been purchased in Liverpool. Colonel Kirkwood, Walter J. Bourke, John Knox, Major Gardiner, Oliver C. Jackson and Ernest Knox were all contributors to this scheme. The meal was then distributed among the tenants at cost price. Mrs Maurice Blake of Ballinafad, Maurice Moore's grandmother-to-be, gave an emerald ring worth £20 to be disposed of by lottery by the Reverend Browne of Carnacun and the results to be given for the relief of poor farmers.[79] According to Finlay Dun's, 1881 account of the relationships between tenants and landlords, the landlords in Ballinrobe, Moore Hall's neighbouring town, 'never turned a tenant out, arrears were frequently wiped out, and work was found when called for, and the evicted were made caretakers or help was given with emigration'.[80] Dun's somewhat partial account made it evident that Moore's contemporaries felt some measure of responsibility towards their tenants, but few were in favour of measures that left them at any risk. The Marquess of Sligo for example, was a reluctant evictor but evict he did, driven by the exigencies of his responsibilities to his own estate

George Henry's practice of remitting debts, cutting rents and subdividing land, made him a popular but an economically unsuccessful landlord, popular with his tenants but unpopular with

[75] Ibid., p.104. Moore's reputation as a benign landlord was attested to in the local newspapers by the Rev. Browne who stated that George Henry Moore gave £1000 for the relief of the tenants in the first year of the famine and he remitted 75 per cent of his rents for that year and 50 per cent for the following two years; the results of which led to the non-payment of interest on one of his estates and the property consequently passed into the hands of a receiver. *The Telegraph* 15 February 1854.

[76] Desmond McCabe, 'Social Order and the Ghost of Moral Economy in Pre-Famine Mayo' Raymond Gillespie (ed.) *A Various Country: Essays in Mayo History 1500-1900* (Westport, 1987) cited in Sean P. McManamon, 'The Famine in County Mayo 1845-1852' M.A Thesis, Hunter College, The City University of New York, 1997, pp 81-83.

[77] *Mayo Constitution* 23 July 1848.

[78] *Mayo Constitution*, 15 December 1846

[79] *Mayo Constitution 14 August 1849.*

[80] Finlay Dun, *Landlords and Tenants in Ireland* (London, 1881) p. 238.

his peers. Sligo, who was Moore's kinsman and fellow famine relief landlord, who eventually felt he had no option but to evict, pointed out to George Henry Moore that he endangered the structure of the land tenure system by these measures.[81]. The 'bad' landlord from a tenant's point of view, surrendered to the often ruthless exigencies of laissez faire and attempted to make his estate more profitable which may have included eliminating agricultural practices in order to do so, was ambivalently a good landlord in economic terms. Denis Mahon of Roscommon was considered by his peers to be a 'good landlord' who evicted 3,000 of his tenants, paying for the emigration of 900 of them to Canada. His assassination in 1847 suggest that his tenants, or some of them, did not regard him in the same light as his peers.[82]

However, George Henry's sacrifice of economic advantage to paternalism gave him an electoral advantage in a later political career. Joseph Hone, the Moore's biographer, in conversation with Lady Hemphill, a relative of the Blakes, who became George Henry's in laws on his marriage to Mary Blake, heard that George Henry was in the habit of subdividing to win votes, creating uneconomic tenancies through this practice that led to his social ostracism by his peers. Many of his tenants were not paying him more than £3 yearly, leaving the exigent George Henry to depend on his brother-in-law Martin Blake to pay the expenses when they travelled together.[83] Clearly, the advantages from his point of view were political, but not economic. This expressed an older feudal relationship of obligation and the 'moral economy' that according to Joe Cleary, so few landlords felt bound by during the famine, or at least that is the usual perception fostered by the anti-landlord propaganda of the Land League years.[84] This perception has been challenged recently by James Kelly who suggested that recent work on the nineteenth century landed estates has provided evidence that paternal landlordism persisted into the century, and pre-dated the 1790s.[85] The assumptions of the nationalist narrative and the Marxist interpretive model of the moral economy are, that the paternal landlordism that defined the moral economy did not function in the Irish landlord/tenant relationship. If E.P.Thompson's definition of moral economy is accepted then Moore could be described as fulfilling those terms by acknowledging his obligation to respond to protests by doing what he could for those on the margins, He imported meal into the Westport docks at a time when the 1846 merchants and traders of Newport, County Mayo, were afraid to import or risk their capital without military protection. Millers across the

[81] Bull, *Land, Politics and Nationalism*, p. 19.

[82] Bruce Nelson, *Irish Nationalists and the Making of the Irish Race* (Princeton, 2012), p. 34.

[83] Joseph Maunsell Hone Papers, UCD Archives, Ms. P229/274.

[84] Joe Cleary, 'Republicanism and Aristocracy in Modern Ireland' in *The Field Day Review*, 10, (2014), p. 39.

[85] James Kelly, *Food Rioting in Ireland in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries: The 'Moral Economy' and the Irish Crowd* (Dublin, 2017), pp 213-223.

country expressed a similar anxiety and appealed for military protection to save their goods from appropriation.[86] George Henry perceived a symbiotic relationship between landlord and tenant, in an allegory in which vine like tenants clung to a landlord elm, while the landlords 'lead the people' to political independence. [87] It was with this idea in mind that he launched a political career that was to span the years from 1847 to his death in 1870 with a fallow period from 1857 to 1867 when he lost his parliamentary seat amidst charges of clerical electoral interference.[88]

Not long after the launch of his political career, in 1851, George Henry married Mary Blake of Ballinfad in a ceremony in Baggot Street in Dubin officiated over by Archbishop John MacHale, the nationalist, Irish speaking Archbishop of Tuam.[89] This alliance, while apparently romantically successful, also gave him kinship to the wealthy, landed and Catholic Blakes, whose various branches were landowners in Mayo and Galway. Mary's father, Maurice Blake was descended from Walter Blake and Mary Kirwan from Galway who had been granted substantial lands in Mayo in the seventeenth century. Maurice Blake married his cousin Ann who was a daughter of Mark Lynch of Cloughballymore, and Maria Blake of Towerhill. The Blakes were widely distributed throughout Mayo and Galway in Coorcan, Ballyglunin, and Towerhill, which was relatively close to Moore Hall. Mary had nine siblings. Her sisters married into prominent wealthy families in the West, while her brother Llwellyn was to become a Colonel in the North Mayo Milita and was made a Papal Count in 1905. [90]A number of Moore's more distant Blake relatives were to join the Connaught Rangers. By 1878 the Blakes of Ballinafad had 1209 acres with a valuation of £521. By 1907 Llwellyn, Mary Blake Moore's brother, left the estate to the African fathers.

By 1861, Catholic landownership had risen to about 40 per cent, but those who were substantial Catholic landlords probably represented about 20 per cent of that figure, with most of them in County Galway.[91] George Henry's political career was in many ways, like that of his second son's, a series of missed opportunities, predicated in his case on the failures of Irish politicians in the mid-nineteenth century to achieve a cohesive movement capable of offering the formidable parliamentary resistance that Parnell was to muster later in the century. Some of his difficulties may have been attributable to what his son declared as his impatience at the 'wavering opinion of

[86] Ibid., p.222.
[87] Moore, *George Henry Moore,* p. 324.

[88] Jim Smyth, 'An Entirely Exceptional Case: Ireland and the British Problem,' in *The Historical Journal*, vol. 34, no. 4 (1991), pp 999-1007.

[89] Fr. Martin J. Heaney, *Galway and Mayo Families* (handwritten, in the possession of Mayo County Library)
[90] Ibid.
[91] Aidan Enright, 'The Political Life of Charles Owen O'Conor, 1860-1906.' PhD Thesis, Queens University Belfast, 2011, p.31. Enright derived these percentages from Vaughan and Hoppen.

second class men who adopt ideas and plans without consideration, baulk at every serious obstacle and adopt a different line of conduct at any moment'.[92] George Henry Moore's career was dominated by the issues of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, and the Tenant Right movement of the 1850s. In 1867 Church Disestablishment, and Amnesty for the Fenian political prisoners dominated his policy. All of these were issues that led him into murky territory for one of his class.[93] Comparisons may be drawn between his career and that of Thomas Esmonde who entered parliament in 1852, as a supporter of the Tenant League. He was in favour of church disestablishment and Catholic education, but supported independence within the Union, and accepted the office of Lordship of the Treasury in 1866, leaving him outside the remit of the Irish Independent Party.

The Irish party system during the mid- part of the nineteenth century was dominated by the Irish Conservatives, who were primarily large Protestant landowners opposed to both the land reform and concessions to Catholics, and the Irish Liberal party who had a number of Catholics within its ranks, both gentry and professional. George Henry inclined towards Whig/Liberalism, but his years in parliamentary politics made him consider possible alliances with the British Conservatives. His friendship with Disraeli, which began in the 1850s and continued to his death, revealed through a series of letters from George Henry Moore to Disraeli currently in the Bodleian library the initiatives considered by both in opposition to the Liberals.[94] The possibilities offered by the crisis induced by the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill were exploited by both the British Conservatives, who were not actually opposed to the bill, and the newly formed Irish Independent Party, which was an amalgam of the Tenant League and the Catholic Brigade. Subsequent to Catholic emancipation the papacy had conferred titles upon Catholic dioceses in England and Wales leading to a wave of hostility and anti-Catholicism shared by the British Prime Minister, Lord John Russell. In Ireland, Moore had joined the Catholic Brigade set up in defence of Catholicism, known as the 'Popes' Brass Band', while Charles Gavan Duffy and Frederick Lucas led the Tenant League.[95] With the joining of these two forces, the 48 strong Irish Independent Party was created, and sworn to maintain cohesion until their demands were met. Disraeli capitalised on the controversy and the anti-Catholicism that resulted from the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, by examining the prospect of a 'tactical parliamentary alliance' with the Catholic M.P.s

[92] Moore Papers, Ms. 8489/6.

[93] George Henry Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 8567/1/2 and 8597/3/4.

[94] Disraeli Papers, Bodleian Library, Oxford, dep. Hughenden 137/, fols. 117-61.

[95] Oliver, Rafferty, *The Catholic Church and the Protestant State: Nineteenth-Century Irish Realities* (Dublin, 2008).

which had the potential to topple the government.[96] Not immediately identifiable as sympathetic to either the Catholics or the Irish, Disraeli was in favour of disestablishment, denominational education, compensation for tenant improvement, taxes on absentee landlords and the development of the railway system in Ireland. He was also in communication with Cardinal Manning, who had a particular concern for the poverty of Irish Catholics in Britain, over a proposal for a Catholic university in Dublin.[97]

These possibilities came to naught, and despite George Henry's determined efforts, the party succumbed to British parliamentary tactics to undermine its cohesion when two of its members, John Keogh and William Sadlier accepted government office. This was particularly galling for George Henry who had articulated what Maume called the 'classical republican oppositionist rhetoric of eighteenth century patriots', when he decried the behaviour of those politicians corrupted by 'despotism,' and drawn away from the interests of the nation as they were encouraged to follow their own.[98] An account of these events was written by Charles Gavan Duffy who, disillusioned, left Irish politics to go to Australia where he later became the governor of Victoria. Duffy's account was contested by Maurice Moore in the late 1880s as a partial history in which George Henry's role in events was diminished, as Duffy took sole credit for the principle of independent opposition.[99] George Henry and Duffy remained friends and correspondents after the break-up of the party, but George Henry's career suffered a hiatus when he lost his parliamentary seat in 1857 amid charges of clerical electoral interference. George Henry re-entered the political arena in 1867, at a period when Church disestablishment and amnesty for Fenian prisoners dominated the agenda. In this second efflorescence of his career Moore united with the clergy, striking up a friendship with the radical Partry priest, Father Patrick Lavelle who enjoyed the patronage of Archbishop MacHale, despite his inflammatory anti-landlord politics. Lavelle felt that G.H. Moore was the best bet 'to exact concessions for Ireland in parliament,' and threw himself into campaigning for Moore at election meetings and in the press. Lavelle wrote in the *Mayo Examiner* in 1869, that the 'Irish tenant had no faster friend', than G.H. Moore and 'he illustrated his tenant right principles by the leniency and indulgence which he ever displays

[96] Ibid, p 109. English Catholics were not supportive of their Irish fellow confessionals, considering them 'backward,' and 'ignorant,' see also Patrick Maume, ' Brethren in Christ: Frederick Lucas and Social Catholicism in Ireland' in Oliver Rafferty S.J., (ed.), *Irish Catholic Identities* (Manchester, 2013), p. 232.

[97] Ibid., pp 110-118.

[98] Patrick Maume, 'Unionists and Patriots,' in Allan Blackstock and Frank O'Gorman (eds), *Loyalism and the Formation of the British World 1775-1914* (Suffolk, 2014), p. 147.

[99] George Gavan Duffy, *The League of North and South: An Episode in Irish History, 1850-1854* (London, 1886); idem, *My Life in Two Hemispheres* (London, 1886); León Ó Broin, *Charles Gavan Duffy: Patriot and Statesman* (Dublin, 1967); J.H. Whyte, *The Tenant League and Irish Politics in the Eighteen-Fifties* (Dundalk, 1963).

towards his own tenantry.'[100] Lavelle was referring to Moore's subdivision of his land to accommodate those tenants evicted by the proselytising Bishop Plunkett, a landowner in Tourmakeady.[101] This response incurred the ire of the landlords but it caught votes among the tenants. Moore's electoral base was made clear in an 1868 election meeting in Swinford, County Mayo, where he was introduced by the chairman, with the words, 'If the landlords are to have a member let them choose between Lord Bingham and Mr Blake: and by all means let them have a member. But the tenants and the clergy of Mayo will have George Henry Moore'.[102]

Once elected, Moore took up the cause of the Fenians imprisoned after the shooting of a police officer in an attempted rescue of arrested IRB members. These men became known as the Manchester Martyrs after their execution in 1867. George Henry and Isaac Butt both rejuvenated their careers and Irish parliamentary nationalism by setting up an Amnesty Association to secure their release.[103] Moore wrote to Disraeli, on receipt of a smuggled letter from the imprisoned O'Donavan Rossa complaining of prison conditions, telling him that he was going to bring the matter up in parliament. Moore had met O'Donovan Rossa previously in Moore Hall, which led to an unsuccessful meeting with James Stephens, who wanted to keep the gentry out of the movement. Moore believed that his father had taken the Fenian Oath and learned from Duffy at a later date that George Henry and James Dillon had travelled to Le Havre to meet John Mitchel to discuss the possibility of nationalist movement. This meeting foundered on George Henry's dislike for Mitchel and his mistrust of Dillon.[104] George Henry did not live to realise his political ambitions, dying suddenly on a visit home to Moore Hall at the age of sixty, on 19 April 1870, on the eve of preparing a Repeal Bill for parliament. He was, said Lavelle, his clergyman friend and supporter, 'A good pure man who died for Ireland'. The high esteem that George Henry was held in by the local clergy was evinced in the formation of a committee in Hughes's Hotel in Claremorris to discuss a suitable monument which it was suggested should be placed beside that of the Liberator, Daniel O'Connell, in Glasnevin.[105]

---

[100] *Mayo Examiner*, 19 July 1869.

[101] Gerard Moran, *Father Patrick Lavelle: The Rise and Fall of an Irish Nationalist 1825-86: A Radical Priest in Mayo* (Dublin, 1994) idem, *The Mayo Evictions of 1860* (Dublin, 2007); Theodore Hoppen, *Elections, Politics and Society 1882-1885* (Oxford, 1984).

[102] *Mayo Examiner*, 7 September 1868.

[103] David Thornley, *Isaac Butt and Home Rule* (London, 1963).

[104] Correspondence between Maurice Moore and Charles Gavan Duffy, 1886-1912, Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 8489/1. Letter from Moore to *The Daily Express*, 27 May and 3 June 1899.

[105] O'H, London. *The Telegraph or Connaught Ranger*, 1 June 1870; *The Mayo Examiner*, June 1870.

What if any, was George Henry Moore's legacy? Clearly, his son was of the opinion that it was purloined by Charles Gavan Duffy, who took the credit in his memoirs for the principle of independent opposition that Moore had attributed to his father. These were the heady days of landlord political dominance; by supporting church disestablishment, land reform and repeal, Moore was attacking the three pillars of Protestant ascendancy dominance while remaining a member of the landed establishment. The Conservative Party and therefore the landed classes failed to reinvent themselves, while George Henry Moore as a Catholic landlord was not afraid to create alliances outside his class, a lesson that his second son was to take to heart. Owen McGee described him as 'a former Catholic Whig who, after 1867 described himself as a 'Repealer'. The IRB noted that Moore was the only Westminster supporter of the Amnesty issue, and in 1869, Moore encouraged Kickham and O'Brien to adopt the novel initiative of nominating for parliament imprisoned republicans (knowing that they would be immediately disqualified, if elected) to give maximum publicity to the amnesty cause. This manoeuvre succeeded with O'Donovan Rossa. McGee considered that Moore's influence many have caused the IRB members of the Amnesty Association to adopt the initiative of presenting amnesty petitions to local government officials looking for their support.[106]As regards Moore's Fenian tendencies, McGee is of the opinion that a more radical mid to late century IRB hoped to force elites into becoming supporters of a 'new egalitarian socio-political order', in the name of the 'nation or the people'.[107] This was unlikely to induce Moore to offer his support as he envisaged a scenario where the 'landlords led the people,' and he was not, his son admitted, in any way democratic.[108] Furthermore, McGee interpreted the independence of the Irish Party led by George Henry solely as a means to prioritise the interests of the minority Catholic community in the state, and to pressure the minority party in Westminster, either the Whigs or the Liberals, to 'champion sectional Catholic interests', which was extremely unlikely.[109] George Henry's adoption of land reform and his parlaying with the IRB did not indicate an egalitarian or democratic attitude. He perceived his actions as protecting, in a humanitarian fashion, the interests of a Catholic elite, which he, like his father, felt was best equipped to lead the tenantry and to stabilise a social order threatened by the inadequacies of British government and Protestant ascendancy political dominance. Can this be the final word on George Henry Moore?

[106] Owen McGee, *The IRB: The Irish Republican Brotherhood From the Land League to Sinn Fein*, (Dublin, 2005), p. 43.

[107] Owen McGee, *The IRB: The Irish Republican Brotherhood*, p. 337.

[108] In 1885, Sir Thomas Grattan Esmonde was to run for office as a Parnellite candidate using similar rhetoric to Moore, some twenty years earlier. He denounced landlordism and insisted that the gentry should stand with the people. Richard Keogh and James McConnel 'The Esmonde Family of Co. Wexford and Catholic Loyalty' in Oliver J. Rafferty, S.J. (ed.), *Irish Catholic Identities* (Manchester, 2013), p. 283.

[109] Ibid., p. 335.

A more subtle political understanding emerges from a response he made to Charles Réne Forbes Montalembert in 1859. Montalembert was an historian, journalist, politician, and a supporter of liberal Catholicism who attempted a renewal of Catholicism as a spiritual and political force in Europe.[110]. While an opponent of empire, he was also an Anglophile, who believed in a 'free church in a free state'. The established church had acted in Ireland as both a religious and poltical oppressor thus betraying the ideals of British Liberalism. In favour of Irish freedom, Montalembert met Daniel O'Connell in 1830 and wrote an analysis of the Irish situation in 1831, *Du Catholicisme en Irelande,*which was published in the periodical, *L'Avenir.* In 1854, he wrote *De Angleterre* in which he called on the Irish to convert the world to Catholicism and liberty via British imperial civilisation to which they should necessarily convert: 'They should convert, reconcile or otherwise yield themselves'. The Catholic peer, historian and politician Lord Acton (1834-1902) had a similar understanding of religion and empire and saw the cause of the Pope and the Queen conjoined, although it is likely that the latter would have found this an uneasy partnership. In Moore's response, which is a rejection of Montalembert's proposals and worth printing in full, he says

> It is only on the subject of their gross national insular habits, their stupid insular prejudices, their narrow insular opinions, their exceptional insular institutions and their absurd insular religion that they are arrogant, tyrannical, cruel. They are firmly persuaded that a body of institutions, civil and religious which are but the type and embodiment of their own habits, passions, prejudices and superstitions are fitted to meet all the exigencies of all the human race and ought to be forced upon the conviction of every people in the land.[111]

[110] Seamus Deane, *Foreign Affections: Essays on Edmund Burke* (Cork, 2005), p. 136.
[111] Ibid.,p. 159

This quote reveals an astute analysis of the factors underlying the Whig position of British exceptionalism which provided the ideological justifications for empire while failing to see the sectarian nature of their policies in Ireland. It was also a rejection of Montalembert's proposal to detach religion from the national movement. George Henry Moore had a more finely nuanced understanding of the politics of Empire, Ireland and religion than previous accounts of his political career have accounted for, and he bequeathed a measure of this complexity to his second son.

Maurice Moore: Military Imperial Careerist

This was the familial context and political inheritance that Moore was born into in Mayo in 1854, in the middle of what has become known as the 'long nineteenth century', which 'stretched from the late eighteenth to the early twentieth century' and was 'characterised by imperialism, exploration and economic exploitation'.[112] Ireland had been in union with Britain for 53 years, and a landlord class was still secure but under increasing pressure to reform. Their relative stability was reinforced by a still intact aristocratic social order supported by both Catholic and Protestant elites. This 'pyramidical', social order, as McGee calls it, preserved the integrity of political society in the absence of 'representative political institutions', and did not come under threat until the political agitation of the 1880s and the threat from democratic republicanism.[113] It was also in 1854 that John Henry Newman established the classical and mathematical schools of the new Catholic university in Dublin, while at the same time the papacy announced the dogma of the Immaculate Conception in Rome as a part of an increasingly centralised ultramontanist authoritarianism.[114] Commonly assumed to have reached its apogee in 1851, the year of the Great Exhibition, empire came under attack some 25 years after Moore's birth from Irish politicians in the House of Commons acting as moral watchdogs by protesting at the wars in Zululand in 1879, the annexation of the Transvaal in 1877, events in Egypt in 1882, and the Anglo-Russian war in Afghanistan.[115] Great Britain did not, as Sven Beckert pointed out, function solely as a `lean, liberal state': it was driven by an almost constant state of war, high taxes, government debt, and protectionist tariffs'. This was the socio-political context that Moore was born into in 1854, just a few years after the Irish famine and within a household where politics and racing were the dominant family discourses. He was to achieve maturity in the years when empire was under

[112] Diarmid A. Finnegan, and Jonathan Jeffrey Wright, (eds), 'Placing Global Knowledge in the Nineteenth Century,' in *Spaces of Global Knowledge: Exhibition, Encounter, and Exchange in an Age of Empire* (Surrey, 2015), p. 3.

[113] Owen McGee, *The IRB: The Irish Republican Brotherhood*, p. 335.

[114] Seamus Deane, *Foreign Affections*, p.148.

[115] H.V. Brasted, 'Irish Nationalists and the British Empire in the Nineteenth Century,' in Oliver MacDonagh, W.F. Mandle and Pauric Travers (eds), *Irish Culture and Nationalism 1750-1950* (London, 1982).

attack by Irish members of parliament some of whom, while remaining critical of the means by which empire maintained authority, also wanted a share in the profits.

Moore was the second son of George Henry Moore and Mary Blake, of the Catholic Blake family of neighbouring Ballinafad. He was preceded in 1852 by his older brother George Augustus who was to become a significant nineteenth century novelist, and followed by Augustus in 1856, Nina in 1858, and Julian who was the youngest, in 1867. Through his mother, Mary Blake, Moore claimed kinship with the wealthy, Catholic, landowning Blakes, Brownes, Lynches, Martyn's and O'Connors, all of whom were landed families in the West. These connections consolidated the Moore's position as landed Mayo gentry. The young Moores spent their early childhood at Moore Hall, being educated by governesses and the local clergyman. The rejuvenation of their father's political career in the 1860s, causing him to rent a house in Alfred Square in Kensington, meant that periods of time were spent in London, and in the case of Maurice and his brother George, in boarding school in Birmingham. The status of the landed class was given institutional reinforcement in public schooling. An Irish elite had formed the practice of educating their children in premier Catholic schools in England in order to maintain class status through the transmission of elite cultural values, the acquisition of polish and self-assurance and the markings of manner and speech that promoted inclusion into the British dominant class.[116] By the nineteenth century, an elite ideological dominance had been created by a 'distinctive and characteristic use of the English language'.[117] In the eighteenth century, John Foster, the Irish politician of wealthy but socially humble background was greeted by some amusement when he addressed the parliamentary spokesman as 'Mr Spaker'.[118] British public school education ensured a homogenising among the Irish and English elites, in terms of manners and speech, although the Irish elite Catholics strove to maintain a Catholic identity and a 'distinct culture'.[119] George Henry Moore sent his sons to St Mary's, Oscott, in Birmingham, on the basis of his success at the racetrack, rather than Clongowes Wood, the Jesuit run school in Kildare and alma mater to future Irish Parliamentary Party leader, John Redmond. Significantly, after the death of George Henry Moore in 1870, diminishing funds ensured that Julian, the youngest son, was sent to St Stanislaus College in Tullabeg, County Offaly, founded by the Jesuits in 1818. Oscott and Stonyhurst were

[116] The patina acquired at school in England was not always well received; Maurice C. Hime the headmaster of Foyle College a Derry Grammar school was critical of former students returning from their education abroad who had acquired what he judged a '..vile swaggering manner and a complex mongrel accent.' Ciaran O'Neill 'Education, Imperial Careers and the Irish Catholic Elite in the Nineteenth Century' in David Dickson, Justyna Pyz and Christopher Shephard, (eds), *Irish Classroom and British Empire: Imperial Contexts in the Origins of Modern Education* (Dublin, 2012), p. 100.

[117] Colley, *Britons: Forging The Nation*, p. 170.

[118] A.P.W. Malcolmson, *John Foster: The Politics of the Anglo-Irish Ascendancy* (Oxford, 1978).

[119] Ciaran O' Neill, *Catholics of Consequence: Transnational Education, Social Mobility and the Irish Catholic Elite, 1850-1900* (Oxford, 2014), pp 2 and 19. The cultural differences between Protestant and Catholic elites will be commented on later in the project.

the most prestigious of the English Catholic schools. From 1850 to 1900, 21 per cent of the pupils at Oscott were Irish.[120] On a visit in 1842, Paul Cullen encountered what he described in a letter, as a 'mainly Irish' student body.[121] At Oscott, Maurice Moore came under the influence of the Tractarians in the person of Catholic convert, J. Spencer Northcote, who was prepared for the priesthood by John Henry Newman. Oscott gave Moore an education modelled on that provided by Eton or Winchester and proximity to members of both an Irish, and a powerful English Catholic elite, connections which would become important in later military and colonial networks in his career. George and Maurice Moore proved to be indifferent students, with George emerging quite definitively as the more indifferent of the two. Maurice's educational progress was consistently mediocre but there was a perception among his teachers that if he applied himself he would do very much better. The headmaster J. Spencer Northcote said of Maurice, 'If Maurice returns punctually, and exerts himself in his studies, there is no reason why he should not do well, without accusing him of outright idleness, there is a least a (sic) in the minds of his (backers) that his abilities are beyond his performance'.[122] This poor scholastic performance was at odds with his grandfather's and his father's demonstrable intellectual ability and George and Maurice Moore were painfully aware of their deficiencies. Maurice Moore observed that he and his brother were dull bad learners, averse to application and must have been a disappointment to their father who had a right to expect something more intelligent.[123] George Henry expressed his expectations in an exasperated comment to his wife that he feared that those two 'red headed boys were stupid', and the scholastic careers of both did nothing to contradict that viewpoint.[124] The lives of the children were to change dramatically in 1870 with the sudden death of their father, George Henry, while on a visit home to Mayo. Maurice was in Kensington at the time and did not see his father buried in the family plot at Kiltoom. He confessed later that he did not know his father all that well as he had been away a lot and he and his brother had been in school in England. At the time of George Henry's death in 1870 the Moore's had 12,371 acres in Mayo and a further 110 in Roscommon. In his will he had made provision for all of his children from the estate.

Maurice had left Oscott in 1869, with no definitive plans for the future, however, the sudden death of his father had left him with the age old problem of what to do as a second son.[125] English public schooling was the conduit that expelled the 'younger son' into a waiting imperial career.[126]

[120] Ibid., pp 69-82.

[121] Ibid., p. 12.

[122] A report by J. Spencer Northcote on Moore, Joseph Maunsell Hone Papers, UCD archives, Ms. P229/274.

[123] Moore Papers, NLI. Ms. 8489/6.

[124] Joseph Hone, *The Life of George Moore* (London, 1936), p. 34.

[125] Ciaran O'Neill 'Education, Imperial Careers and the Irish Catholic Elite in the Nineteenth Century,' p. 102.

[126] Ibid., p. 100.

As the eldest son, George Moore left for Paris to attempt a career as an artist funded by his estate rentals. Maurice Moore along with a number of his Oscott companions, decided on an army career. Described by his brother as the refuge of the booby son, it did not appear to be Maurice Moore's first choice but he seemed uncertain of his ability for law and was not disposed towards medicine. His dilemma and eventual fate was shared by younger sons of the Protestant gentry who 'lacked the brains for the church or the law'. Kendal Coghill, the son of minor Protestant gentry in Cork knew that 'army and India', would be his career, and probably in the infantry of the line with plenty of overseas service.[127] A military career was a popular choice for a sons of the gentry, and 34 per cent of the Irish boys at Oscott between 1850 and 1900 joined the army. A rise in recruitment among Irish officers occurred after 1870 with an increase in the size of the army in these turbulent years for empire, with stirring of nationalisms in Europe following on the unification of Italy and Germany. As a result of the Prussian victory in the Franco-Prussian war, the balance of power in Europe was destabilised. The perceived threat from Russia on the North-Eastern border of the Indian Frontier and in Central South Asia induced political and military restiveness in empire, while the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 provided a swifter route to India for the passage of goods and troops, increasing the army's mobility.[128] The Cardwell reforms of the late sixties and seventies had abolished purchase of command which tended to privilege birth and rank over ability, professionalised the army and made promotion possible on merit, not only as previously, through aristocratic rank or influence.[129] Exclusivity in the officer corps was maintained by the necessity of a private income to supplement military pay. The salary in the Indian staff corp was remuneratively attractive; in 1895 a colonel would retire on £900 a year but in the regular army an officer needed to be subsidised by family money in order to cope with the demands not just of the military but an active social life.[130]

The professionalisation of the army, the swifter access between metropole and colonial periphery and the increased threat of combat and therefore opportunity for honours and promotion, added to the attractions of an army career. Despite George's glib observation that the army provided a refuge for booby sons, Maurice Moore did not gain entrance on his initial application by failing the entrance exams. It was an ignoble intellectual beginning which did little to indicate his future abilities. In 1871 he enrolled at Stafford House, a crammer in Tunbridge

[127]Alexander Bubb, 'The Life of the Irish Soldier in India: Representations and Self Representations, 1857-1922' in *Modern Asian Studies*, vol. 46, no. 4 (July, 2012), pp 769-813. Lieutenant Kendal J.W. Coghill, *Mutiny Memoir*, NAM 7207-4/1 p.7.

[128] Heather Streets, '*Martial Races':The Military Race and Masculinity in British Imperial Culture 1857-1914* (Manchester, 2004), p. 89.

[129]Thomas E.Jordan, 'Queen Victoria s Irish Soldiers; Quality of Life and Social Origins of the Thin 'Green" Line' in *Social Indicators Research*, vol. 57, no. 1 (January, 2002), pp 72-88.

[130] Ciaran O'Neill, *Catholics of Consequence*, p. 128.

Wells, run by James Mount Fleming. A series of letters from Moore and James Fleming to Mary Moore, Moore's mother, indicate that if he possessed intellectual ability he was not giving rein to it. During this period Maurice Moore appeared to be lacking in confidence as well as application. Fleming's letters to his mother state that his work in History was especially 'solid and good...I only wish he had a little more life. He is so quiet, so amiable, so kind, and so fond of a little comfort, so happy, so smiling, so fond of just 'a little joke' that sometimes we have the reflection left to us that though we have done much, we might have done better'.[131] He complained that Moore refused to change his habit of reading late into the night. Fleming's correspondence revealed his anxieties about Moore's ability in the Classics which carried a lot of weight in the Sandhurst entrance exams. With a recent change in the exam format and eight hundred candidates in the field, Fleming was concerned at what he described as Maurice Moore's slowness in putting his ideas down on paper, although he was possibly 'the best historian in the field'. In a third letter to Mary Blake in 1873, after Moore's exam failure, Fleming wrote, 'I am surprised he expected to pass'.[132]

Moore left Stafford House for Kensington failing to bring his belongings with him. He wrote to Fleming in defence of his failure pleading that he could have done 'lots more if I had had time but some had written three papers where I had written one'. Fleming scrutinised his papers saying that he felt he could have passed 'provided he had been in good form'. According to Fleming, Moore could work well but that sometimes a 'kind of dullness and stupor used to possess him'...which Fleming attributed to his habit of reading late, but may have indicated some form of depression or anxiety.[133] Fleming's doubts about Moore's ability proved to be unfounded. Moore prepared himself for the Sandhurst exams the following August (1873) and came ninth in a field of three hundred candidates, scoring third overall in English Composition, Literature and History, to the complete surprise of his mother, who had been searching for his name much further down the list. In a letter to his sister Nina, just after the exams, Maurice Moore expressed confidence that he would pass.[134] A second letter to his sister, after he had received his exams results, reveals a more confident and assertive personality, notwithstanding his inauspicious scholastic beginnings. He was of the opinion that he might do well at Sandhurst where he was sent on 15 June 1874. Previous to that, he was appointed sub-lieutenant in the Militia Forces on 29 October 1873, and sub-lieutenant in the Land Forces 13 June 1874.[135] He was told that he could have a

[131] J. Mount Fleming to Mary Blake. 8 January 1872, Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10,566/2.

[132] Letter from Fleming to Captain Browne. 7 May nd. probably 1872. Moore papers,NLI, Ms. 10,566/2.

[133] Letter from Fleming to Mary Moore. 23 September 1873, Moore papers, Ms. 10,566/2.

[134] Letter from Moore to Nina Moore. 28 April 1874, Moore papers, Ms. 10566/2.

[135] Military Service Papers, Moore Papers, Ms. 10,576.

regiment at once if he agreed to go to India, but he refused this offer in favour of Sandhurst.[136] He spent a year at Sandhurst; where the registers show that he was 20 when he entered and five feet seven.[137]

Graduating in 1875, he was gazetted to the 88th battalion of the Connaught Rangers, an Irish Regiment, as lieutenant, in September 1876. Composed of an Irish ascendancy officer corps, the ranks were drawn from the western counties of Galway, Mayo, Sligo and Roscommon.[138] In a letter to his mother, Moore told her that he 'liked the regiment very much indeed: all the officers are very agreeable and gentlemanlike'.[139] Maurice did a musketry course at Fleetwood in the Spring of 1876, and was posted to Athlone, Ballina, Boyle, Castlebar and Sligo before being despatched to the Cape in 1877.[140] Moore claimed good fellowship and perceived no tension between his Catholic nationalism and the Unionism of his fellow officers. 'I am the only Catholic among the officers, but almost all the men are of this persuasion. I should think that at least 500 out of 600 are from Connaught', Moore confided to his mother.[141] C. Lube Peart, a former student at Castleknock, and like Moore, a new recruit made a similar claim for good fellowship in a letter home saying that 'the Irish are quite as popular here as the English companions'.[142] It is perhaps significant that Moore's best friend was the English Catholic, D.T. Hammond.

This was the beginning of a thirty year long military career spanning the empire, marked by letters home from Mooltan, Dinapore and Bombay, in India, Mauritius, and from Durban, Cape Town and Zululand in what was to become South Africa.[143] His letters bore accounts of bouts of typhoid and cholera, and nights spent on campaign under heavy rainfall, without the covering of a tent, under an intense tropical sun during the day, and surviving on a diet of slaughtered oxen and ships biscuits.[144] 'It is a queer life we live here' the landlord's son wrote to his mother from the Lower Tugela in 1879, but he confessed that he had never felt better.[145] This admission of physical well- being, carries resonances of John Buchan's recollections of his early days in South

[136] Ibid., 15 June 1874.

[137] Sandhurst Register for 1874.

[138] 88th Foot, Maurice George Moore 28 Aug. 1875, but his Commission as lieutenant in the Army to bear date 13 June, 1874. *The London Gazette* Numb. 24367. 5199, 26 September 1876.

[139] Letter to Mary Blake Moore from Fulwood Preston. Moore papers, Ms. 10,566/2.

[140] Army Lists, Templer Research Centre, National Army Museum, Chelsea.

[141] Letter to Mary Blake Moore from Fulwood Preston, Moore papers, Ms. 10,566/2.

[142] Ciaran O'Neill, *Catholics of Consequence*, p. 128.

[143] Imperial careering is examined in David Lambert and Alan Lester, (eds), *Colonial Lives Across the British Empire: Imperial Careering in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2006); Tony Ballantyne, *Webs of Empire: Locating New Zealand's Colonial Past* (2012).

[144]Moore to Mary Blake, Lower Tugela, 7 June 1879 Moore Papers, Ms. 10,566/2.

[145] Ibid.

Africa in which he experienced 'intense exhilaration...clearness of mind...harmony' due he thought, to the long treks which made him fit.[146] Sir William Butler, the Tipperary general, described the land beyond the Drakensburg Ranges as possessing 'rolling plains of veldt with herds of Blesbok, Springbok…and with a …'keen and invigorationg wind…'that gave way to 'blinding dust and torrential rain, snow thunder and lightning'.[147]. The high adventure of being transplanted to the outer perimeters of empire and colony excited the imagination and stimulated Moore's physical being, in the early years at least. Moore's letters, during this first campaign, carried detailed accounts of his surroundings and conditions, he described Machelbourg in Mauritius as a small fishing village inhabited by 'Indians, Chinese and Arabs', where most of the Islanders were of French descent and spoke Creole. The coral reef that encircled the island beyond the smooth shallow water of the bay at St Louis, the principal town gave shelter from the surf.[148] (A couple of years after Moore's time in Mauritius the Irish Catholic Sir John Pope Hennessy was appointed as a controversial and reforming governor, known for his sympathetic understanding of the racial and national difference on the island.) On 13 August 1879, Moore was transferred from Mauritius to Cape Town. His letters home carried details on hunting jackals and the 'lingo' spoken by the indigenous people as 'half dutch and half hottentot'.[149] These enthusiastic accounts were replaced in later years by others showing disappointment at lack of promotion and the dreariness of days spent under an Indian sun. On a trip from Galway to Portsmouth in 1882, he registered his discontent on the black rimmed paper he wrote on, as emblematic of his sorrow at leaving home, describing the march of the regiment to the station in Galway in the darkness of the early hours led by the gloomy beating of the drum, as funereal.[150]

In the 1880s, he wrote to his brother, Julian, that if his 'political faith were not very strong' he would be in danger of falling away due to the distance from home and the difficulty of obtaining recent news of Irish political events in the Irish press, which they received only occasionally, although he had weekly access to the English papers, in which he followed parliamentary debate.[151] In the same letter he wondered at the potential in Parnell's Labour League to form an alliance with the 'working classes of the great towns', in England, which would be stronger and more socialist in its outlook than the Land League. (This was an opinion articulated by Douglas Hyde in 1887; he suggested that the working classes should unite with the Irish people against a common oppressor.[152]) Far from separating him from his nationalist faith, his career in empire

[146] Bill Schwarz, *The White Man's World* (Oxford, 2011), p. 214.

[147] Sir W.F. Butler, *Sir William Butler:An Autobiography* (London,) pp 176-178.

[148] Moore to Mary Blake Moore, 31 January 1879, Mchelbourg Mauritius.Moore Papers, Ms. 10,566//2

[149] Ibid.

[150] Moore to Mary Blake Moore H.M. S Malabar Portsmouth 28 February 1882.

[151] Letter from Moore to Julian Moore, Mooltan, 1880s, Moore Papers, Ms. 10,566/2

[152] Dominic Daly, *The Young Douglas Hyde:The Dawn of the Irish Revolution and Renaissance 1874-1893* (Dublin, 1974), p. 122.

would actually serve to sharpen a critique of imperial rule and provide both him and the nationalist movement in Ireland with analogies to the Irish situation in the Zulu uprising of 1879 and the rebellion of the Boer republics in 1899. Like those members of his family who preceded him, Moore shared a conservative belief in the social hierarchy of class, together with support for non-sectarian nationalist movement that would unite if not efface class difference. His attitude to class, at least as a young man, was made obvious when he was informed by his mother of his younger brother Julian's decision to become a naval engineer.(Julian was not to follow this profession and finally found a career as a bookbinder.) This elicited a negative response from Moore

> …there are few, if any, gentlemen in that branch of the Navy,' he told his mother. 'On board ship, the Naval Engineers eat separately and are on a 'lower footing than the other gentlemen' in the officer class. He hoped that his mother would not think of allowing Julian 'to do anything of the sort.[153]

Moore's objections to the naval engineers reveal at least some of his reasons for choosing a military career. It was socially acceptable to his class. It is less likely that like Laurence Grattan Esmonde, 1863-1943, he saw joining the military as 'confirming', and 'reinforcing', his loyalty to union and empire.[154] However, he was a member of both the military and a landowning class which was hardly a position of dissent, intellectual or otherwise.

Despite what appear to be unusually colourful careers, the Moores were not dissimilar in their Catholic loyalism at this point, to other Catholic landowning families. The Esmonde family of County Wexford have a family history whose details are striking in their similarity to the Moores. Of Anglo-Norman origins, they had undergone conversion and the loss and regaining of their lands.[155] Despite a history of loyalism, the Esmondes also had a son who joined the 1798 rebellion leading rebel forces in Kildare, while his successor, like George Moore, declared himself loyal to

[153] letter from Maurice Moore to Mary Blake Moore, Lower Tugela, 7 June 1879

[154] Richard Keogh and James McConnel 'The Esmonde Family of Co. Wexford and Catholic Loyalty' in Oliver J. Rafferty, S.J. (ed.), *Irish Catholic Identities* (Manchester, 2013), p. 281.

[155] Ibid. p. 275.

the Union and the crown. Like the Moores, the Esmondes were prey to the exigencies acting on Catholic property owners at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century and acquired an identity as unionist, liberal and Catholic, that also like the Moores evolved and changed according to the times. There are in fact so many parallels between their family histories in terms of historical political allegiance that it is tempting to think that members of the Catholic property owning elites manifested similar behaviours in response to national forces throughout the nineteenth century. Charles Owen O'Conor, for example, was a landlord, politician, Whig/Liberal and Catholic conservative whose views were shared by a section of the Catholic landlords. The event of 1798 left a long period of careful conformity in its wake, until the equally destabilising event of 1916. Being Whig patriots with an established role in Catholic leadership they were not the blocked and aspirant group of Castle Catholics, but a class armed by the confidence of social position and economic power which felt itself capable of opposing civil and military authority.

It is into this latter group that the Moore family falls; each individual studied in this chapter, save the ill-fated John Moore, availed of constitutional means to effect equality within the law, and exploited the principles of religious tolerance inherent to British liberalism, which in practice failed its Catholic subjects. Property ownership was a basic requirement for political representation, for example and landowners preferred stable government. This was Maurice Moore's inheritance; reasoned, political and legal negotiation within Liberal philosophy. His grandfather and great-uncles, George, John, and Thomas were all indicative of a Catholic intellectual engagement with late eighteenth and early nineteenth century political culture. Schooled in France, experiencing revolution twice, they exhibited a cross hatching of ideas that embraced the concepts of subject and citizen, revolution and loyalty to constitutional monarchy, and revealed unlikely intellectual links between London and Carnacon. As time progressed, the perceived threat from Catholic France receded, and the need of an expanding empire for military manpower increased, sanctions against Catholics were relaxed. The 1829 Emancipation Act was of most benefit to the Catholic (middle classes) who could now ascend to the judiciary. The example of the Canadian legislature which admitted Catholics for the first time in 1823, acted as an exemplar for the need of reform elsewhere in empire. An expanding empire which included more Catholic subjects was also a factor in increased tolerance for Catholics along with the fading memory of Jacobitism, meant that prejudice against Catholicism was less marked, but not eradicated. The tidal wave of anti-Catholic feeling, led by the British Prime Minister, John Russell, that followed on the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, in 1851 was a reminder that the fear of Roman influence still lurked on the edges of a Protestant psyche. George Moore had bequeathed an intellectual inheritance to his son George Henry, who despite a tendency to become embattled

with the Irish Catholic hierarchy remained staunchly and conservatively Catholic, an outlook which he handed down in turn to his second son. Maurice was born into an age where the symbolism of the Glorious Revolution of 1688 had lost some, but not all of its potency. That persisted into the twentieth century, and the Penal Laws were but a memory.

The army had a large number of Catholics in its ranks, but not its officer class, and despite Moore's early protestations of ease of fellowship and good feeling, in later years, he wondered at his lack of promotion. Nevertheless, he showed no less loyalty to government and military authority than did his father or grandfather, conducting himself with commitment and integrity in the battlefield. In the second stage of the Anglo-Boer war, this loyalty was subjected to strain by Moore's dissent from army tactics and the treatment of civilians, an ambivalence he expressed in anonymous letters to the British press. The following chapter will consider Moore's military career in South Africa his relationship to military and empire as Irish, elite and Catholic, against the growing political awareness that caused him to publicly denounce the war in South Africa from 1899 to 1902. Despite the transnational activities of the Moores over three generations, Moore was the first to engage in empire and colonialism, although he was in the company of significant numbers of Irish men and women from diverse class backgrounds who found themselves dispersed through empire as a part of colonial administration, colonial warfare and in the case of South Africa, business and trade initiatives. Given his Catholic elite educational background, landowning status, and Catholic, nationalist parliamentarian father, was Moore's experience of colonial and war torn South Africa any different to that of his English and Scottish peers?

Before embarking on the chapter which deals with Moore's experience in empire, it is important, as Joe Cleary pointed out, to understand how 'empire studies in Ireland have been shaped in a cultural context' defined by Irish nationalist and Unionist struggles against the backdrop of the eventual splintering and break-up of empire.[156] This study is no exception, for the most part, it follows from Moore's perspective, the path of Irish independence from Union to Dominion in commonwealth. Chapter two, although fitting substantially into this analysis, also deals with the Irish contribution to empire, in a context in which up to the present the Irish contribution to the history and literature of empire is still 'surprisingly thin'although this situation has improved in recent years with the studies of Townend, De Nie, and McMahon. Furthermore, 'Irish Soldiery' in the armies of empire' remains under-researched. During the periods from 1877-

[156] Joe Cleary, 'Amongst Empires: A Short History of Ireland and Empire Studies in International Context' in *Éire- Ireland* , vol. 42, no. 1&2, Earrach/Samhradh/Spring/Summer (2007), pp 11-57.

79 and 1899-1902 in which imperial warfare raged in South Africa, Moore, despite his nationalist consciousness, was professionally engaged in imperial policing for which he receved plaudits and honours. Moore existed within opposition and collusion, as did many others. While this chapter outlines a nationalist context in Irieland in which South Africa was of virtual, symbolic, rhetorical, and political importance, in Moores personal context it was a period in which he experienced outraged objections in relation to his professional status within the army. This next chapter will attempt to explain this context against the backdrop of an Irish and South African experience of empire.

CHAPTER TWO: WARFARE IN SOUTH AFRICA AND THE IRISH NATIONAL MOVEMENT: PERSPECTIVES FROM MOORE'S MILITARY EXPERIENCE IN 1877-1879 AND 1899-1902.

> Into India as peaceable traders, but really as pirates and plunderers; into Burmah to protect the people from an autocratic King, but really to seize the Ruby mines; into Egypt to protect an autocratic king against the constitutional agitation of his subjects for reform, but really to control the Suez canal; into Cape Colony to protect Kaffirs and Hottentots from the Dutch, but really to appropriate to themselves the lands and farms of the natives; into the Boer states to protect the women and children of Johannesburg, but really to grab the diamond fields and gold mines.'[1]

This quote from Moore's *History of the Volunteers*, written in 1918, published in 1936 and serialised in the *Irish Press* in 1938 reveals an established critique of imperialism. The irony inherent in this critique is his own involvement in three of the examples of British imperialist deception that he offers. Moore served in India from 1880 to 1892 and it was in the appropriation of the 'lands and farms of the natives', and the 'grabbing of the diamond fields and gold mines', that he experienced South Africa. However, if this retrospective analysis of imperialism is not one that he employed during these two periods, nonetheless, his experience in South Africa during two colonial wars laid the foundations for the later estrangement expressed in the above quote. The contradictory sentiments and opinions that Moore articulated were identified as early as 1908 by French political commentator Louis Paul-Dubois who observed this duality in the Irish who

[1] Maurice Moore, 'History of the Irish Volunteers' *The Irish Press*, 25 February 1938.

served in empire's administration even while they voiced opposition.[2] More recently, Timothy McMahon observed of the Young Irelander Charles Gavan Duffy, that it was possible to exhibit an 'almost reflexive anti-imperialism with a commitment to the hegemonic tenets of Burkean liberalism'.[3] This observation probably most closely defines the complex relationship that Moore had with empire, like Charles Gavan Duffy he retained his nationalist fervour but still acted within constitutional parameters.

This chapter proposes to examine Moore's experience in South Africa from three perspectives, beginning with his recorded experience and opinion in his letters and articles dating from 1877-92 and 1899-1902 and the years he was in India from 1880-1889. The primary focus, however, remains on South Africa both for the importance it held for Irish nationalist propaganda during two periods of warfare and for the effect that imperial warfare in South Africa had on Moore's developing nationalist thought. The first of the two periods under scrutiny focuses on the expansion of imperial territories from 1878-1881, under the impetus of settler colonisation and capitalist development. The second period of colonial warfare from 1899-1902 played out against the backdrop of a rapidly expanding capitalism, mounted a challenge to an imperial justification of civilisational mastery, a fact much commented on by Moore at the time. The second perspective examines Moore from the official records as an officer in the army of empire, competent, autonomous and reliable, an essential cog in the wheel of imperial military capacity. Under this aegis various accounts of his military performance made their way into the official histories of the second Anglo-Boer War, Arthur Conan Doyle's account of the war, the Connaught Ranger's Regimental History, newspaper reports and official despatches.

The third perspective examines Moore's disaffection from this official story. In this narrative he deplores army tactics, the measures taken against a civilian Boer population, and the destruction of a rural way of life occasioned by Kitchener's implementation of Robert's 'Scorch and Burn' policy on the African veldt and the rapacious capitalism of the mines. From this perspective Moore emerges as a Catholic officer and Irish landowner whose humanitarian instincts were outraged by the treatment of the women and children in the camps. The years in India had a lesser influence on his evolving status as a nationalist but they reveal a persistent dissatisfaction at the military way of life with its slowness of promotion, financial impecunity and the exigencies of army life in empire. The time he spent in India is revelatory of Moore's attitudes

[2] Louis Paul-Dubois, cited in Andries Wessels, 'The Rhetoric of Conflict and Conflict as Rhetoric: Ireland and the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902),' in *Literator*, vol. 20, no. 3 (November, 1999), p. 164.

[3] Timothy G. McMahon,(e.) *Ireland in the Imperial World* p. 7.

towards race, opinions which appear to have been reinforced by his experience in the second of the South African wars against the Boers.

Finally, the chapter considers the effects that imperial wars and colonial comparisons in South Africa had on Moore on his return to Mayo in 1902 at a time when the landlords were beginning to negotiate the terms of land transfer and the consequent social and political change that ensued from this. There are comparisons made throughout between Moore and other more prominent Irish nationalist figures who were engaged in empire, particularly Roger Casement's career in the colonial service, and General Sir William Butler who, like Moore served in India and South Africa and was a public critic of British policy on the Boers. It is expected that this chapter will illuminate the conflicts experienced by an elite Catholic nationalist even according to the records, as he appeared to lead an exemplary military career emerging after 1902, decorated and promoted to Colonel. This chapter reveals an alternative narrative of Moore's military experience to the official records of the war and the manner in which Irish nationalism utilised conflict in empire in two periods in order to publicise and promote it's own needs. Additionally, Moore's articulation of his experience serves to illuminate the relationship of empire to its colonial possessions and a process of global capitalist growth and expansion.

Selected by him for inclusion in his archive, Moore's correspondence and articles reflect his responses to threats to native territories in the Frontier and Zulu wars in the late 1870s, his dismay at the destruction of traditional Boer society and his revulsion at the humanitarian crisis resulting from the concentration camps. His experience of these events and his perception that the Irish regiments were used as 'missile troops' fed into an increasingly alienated Irish nationalist identity that already harboured a number of discontents. The perspective offered by Moore's particular ex perience of colonial warfare allows an opportunity for this chapter to explore the affinities and identifications made by Ireland and South Africa during these two periods. These identifications became absorbed into a developing but not yet fully developed, rhetoric of nationalist resistance to imperial oppression and dispossession in both Ireland and colonial South Africa and have recently received a fresh analysis from Paul Townend.[4] Despite the evidence of his opposition to empire, Moore cannot easily be placed in a heroic mode consistent with nationalist ideals, as for example, the two Irish Brigades formed in Johannesburg at the beginning of the second South African war. Much of his dissent had its roots in his class background and could also be identified among his military peers of the landowning class, who found their status threatened by socio-

[4] Paul A. Townend, , *The Road to Home Rule: Anti-Imperialism and the Irish National Movement* (London, 2016)

economic change at home. Their witness of the destruction of societies based on the traditional values that largely resonated with their own, caused them to question the justice of the war they were engaged upon.[5] While Moore's discontents were further complicated by a simmering resentment at the treatment of the Irish regiments who were subjected to unnecessary and indefensible risk in the major conflicts of the war, at Colenso and Hart's Hill for example.

Nevertheless, when Moore first embarked for South Africa in 1877 he was not a political tabula rasa; he bore the embryonic markers of a nationalism inspired by his family history, his father's political career and his childhood attachments to place. He also incorporated into his identity a tradition of military service in empire that defined his class, and was not incompatible with his religion or his nationalism. A number of his Blake relatives had served in the army for example. The tradition of imperial service included many Irishmen, the previously mentioned Sir William Butler for example, whose meteoric rise took place under the wing of Sir Garnet Wolseley. It also included two ex-Young Irelander revolutionaries turned constitutionalists, Charles Gavan Duffy and Thomas D'Arcy McGee, in Australia and Canada respectively, and the Catholic Home Ruler and Governor of Mauritius, James Pope Hennessey.[6] Each of these careers shared broadly similar themes, religious and nationalist, but they still require a nuanced and complex analysis to explore the differences that accrued from their situation in empire. Despite Moore's background the processes that shaped the development of his nationalist thought were not linear although later narratives on Moore's career tend to assemble the facts in order to serve that impression. However, it can be seen that imperialism in the South African continent acted on Moore very much as it did on Roger Casement, the colonial administrator and Irish nationalist, as the crucible for transformations in their imperial identities. Whereas Duffy and McGee owed their ideological transformations to imperial careers that did not test their loyalties to the same degree, if at all. Pope-Hennessey attempted to change imperial attitudes towards the indigenous peoples under his rule and to introduce reform in both Hong Kong and Mauritius where he served as governor.[7] The transformations, undergone by Moore and Casement, however, had common roots in their Irish identity, but there the resemblance ends. Casement revealed empire as the site for the exploitation of indigenous peoples whereas Moore expressed Social Darwinist opinions in regard to race, and reserved his anti-imperial sympathies for the Boer resistance to empire in 1899. It is significant that both men served out their terms of service and retired with honours and a pension, while Casement was knighted for his services to empire.

---

[5] Keith Surridge, 'All You Soldiers are what we call Pro-Boer:' The Military Critique of the South African War 1899-1902,' in *History*, vol. 28, no. 268 (October, 1997), pp 582-600.

[6] Paul A. Townend, *The Road to Home Rule.*

[7] *New York Times*, 8 October 1891

In 1899, Moore left for Africa for the second time, he was a cultural nationalist, involved in the Gaelic League and Horace Plunkett's co-operative movement and with years of military experience in India behind him. His role as an Irish Catholic officer in an Irish regiment formed almost totally of men from Roscommon, Mayo, Galway, and Sligo, was a primary identification, and his nationalist affiliations were accommodated within this set of identifications and therefore, at this time, they did not necessarily come into conflict with his obligations to empire. Moore effortlessly incorporated an Irish nationalist identity along with the reality of being an imperial subject. Particularly when the 'imperial' was located in the distant African and Asian continents and the Irish/imperial subject was as much concerned with the progress of his career as his Irish nationalism, 'actively exploiting the opportunities offered by empire while maintaining an awareness of the Irish context within empire'. [8] Whatever Moore's private thoughts were on this relationship, the years he spent in empire marked the beginning of an intensifying nationalist campaign to exploit Britain's difficulties in empire in a developing rhetoric of oppression and exploitation that could conveniently be paralleled with the Land Wars, evictions and agrarian disturbance in Ireland during the late 1870s to the early 1880s.

The wars against the Zulus in 1879, the Boers in 1881, and the disturbances in Afghanistan and Egypt culminating in the 1885 war with the Mahdi in the Sudan, provided rich fodder for both the Irish nationalist press and the Irish Parliamentary Party during these periods. There was, what Townend called, a 'rapidly developing Irish critique of imperialism that infused Irish nationalist sensibilities.[9] Moore's second period in South Africa was to destabilise his earlier relationships to empire, as he found his humanitarian instincts offended by the treatment of the Boer populations, particularly the women and children, the army tactics of Lords Roberts and Kitchener, and the deployment of the Irish regiments as missile troops, to the degree that he engaged in insubordinate activities, alienating him from military authority. Crucially, Townend asks if the Irish awareness of an imperial enterprise and its own involvement with this expanding imperial project encouraged a closer relationship with Britain or created further divisions? [10] It can be observed in Moore's case that there had existed an earlier acceptance of imperial rule in Africa and Asia that co-existed with his own nationalist principles which gave way with the experiences of the second Anglo-Boer war to an active rejection of British policies in South Africa.

[8] Paul A. Townend, *The Road to Home*, p. 3
[9] Ibid., p. xv.
[10] Ibid., p. 4.

However, a caveat must be inserted at this point against interpreting Moore as an *enfant terrible* for anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism or radical nationalism. His observations on the indigenous peoples were typical of the nineteenth century ideological representations of nineteenth century racial discourse, and similarly his observations on Jews, adventurers and the colonial corps were widely articulated by a British imperial elite opinion. In 1877, and 1879, he was unable to draw analogies between the expansion of empire that dislodged the Gaika, Galecka and the Zulu from their lands and an Irish history of dispossession and land seizure, despite the beginning of the land wars in Ireland in 1879. Hyslop observed that 'anti-colonial nationalism was not a normative force during the colonial period', pointing out that the political agitation among colonised elites was often for the purposes of a better deal in empire, not overthrowing it.[11] Moreover, the content of Moore's letters home during this period reveal an opinion that was being articulated in a nationalist popular press at home.

In the second Anglo-Boer war against a white foe, he made Cromwellian comparisons at the devastation of the veldt and clearly saw a relationship between the Boers evicted from their farms and a long history of eviction and starvation in Irish history. His position as a member of a landed elite made him particularly uneasy at the fractures caused to traditional social structures and land ownership based on hierarchy and kinship ties. These relationships were already being eroded before the beginning of the war and the Boer notables found their influence diminished, much as Irish landlords found themselves pressured to reform, which raises interesting comparisons in terms of the Irish and colonial elites.

As it has already been stated, his role as an Irish Catholic officer in command of an Irish regiment did not necessarily come in conflict with his imperial obligations. However, the protests levelled against the war by Irish nationalists in 1899 included some strongly worded criticism at the Irish troops sent out to fight on South African soil. There were an estimated thirty thousand Irish soldiers fighting for empire in South Africa. They formed an Irish Brigade which is featured in Pakenham, Conan Doyle, Bartlett, Jeffrey and Spiers, although the historiography on this phenomenon has remained thin on the ground, while the Irish Brigades of Colonel Blake and John McBride who fought on the side of the Boers, have been intensively examined by McCracken.[12]

[11] Jonathan Hyslop, 'Comparative Historical Sociology and Transnational History: A Response to Julian Go's Patterns of Empire' in *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* vol. 34, no. 3 (2014), pp 610-617.
[12] Keith Jeffrey, *An Irish Empire: Aspects of Ireland and the British Empire* (Manchester, 1990); Edward M. Spiers, *Letters from Ladysmith: Eyewitness Accounts from the South African War* (Jeppestown, 2010); idem, *The Late Victorian Army* (Manchester, 1992); Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, *The Great Boer War* (London,1902); Thomas Pakenham, *The Boer War* (New York, 1979); Bill Nasson, *The Boer War: The Struggle For South Africa* (Cape Town, 2010); Thomas Bartlett and Keith Jeffery, 'An Irish Military

‘There is much in the Irish situation that has its analogies in South Africa before the Union.[13]’

The premise supporting the questions asked in this chapter is that events in South Africa in these two temporal periods acted on Irish nationalism, in terms of identification, analogy and rhetorical device, while they served to alienate Moore from imperial authority.[14] However, despite the nationalist identifications made during this period, there are few obvious cultural, religious or colonial analogies between the Irish and the Boers, and even fewer between the Irish, the Xhosa and the Zulu peoples, but it is clear that a shared identity of oppression and dispossession allowed for the borrowing and sharing of 'strategies and idioms’, of imperial resistance.[15] At a later date, Steven Ellis echoed the words of L.S. Amery by pointing out the 'interesting parallels’, between Ireland and South Africa, and by comparing Ireland to the successor states of former British territories,' whose history included two groups of settlers and imposed political boundaries, as the 'closest parallel to a post-colonial state and the least explored’.[16] In Chapter 4 these parallels will be further explored in post-independence South Africa and pre-independence Ireland of 1921.

Nevertheless, there is a historiographical ambivalence that surrounds an analysis of Irish nationalism as a phenomenon of the colonialism that created an Afrikaner/Boer resistance. Sean Ryder teases out the mutable question of Ireland’s colonial status by quoting David Lloyd, who suggests that the designation of colonial status can only be observed in retrospect, the phenomenon that it describes may not available to a contemporary understanding.[17] Therefore, Moore may have made colonial comparisons but would not necessarily have identified them as such. But by using Moore as a lens from which to examine the political triangulation of Britain, Ireland and South Africa in two significant periods of colonial warfare, analogies can be drawn to open up areas of enquiry that might not otherwise achieve historiographical visibility. Such a

Tradition?' in Thomas Bartlett and Keith Jeffrey (eds), *A Military History of Ireland* (Cambridge, 1996); Donal P. McCracken, *The Irish Pro-Boers, 1877-1902* (Johannesburg,1989); idem, *The Irish in Southern Africa 1795-1910* (Durban: Ireland and Southern Africa Project 1992); idem, *MacBrides Brigade: Irish Commandos in the Anglo-Boer War* (Dublin, 1999).

[13] L.S. Amery to Premier Jan Smuts, Keith Hancock and J.Van Der Poel, *Selections From the Smuts Papers 1886-1950. June 1910-November 1921, vol iii* (7 vols. Cambridge, 2007).

[14] Elleke Boehmer, *Empire, the National and the Postcolonial, 1890-1920: Resistance in Interaction* (Oxford, 2002); Kate O'Malley, *Ireland, India and Empire: Indo-Irish Radical Connections, 1919-64* (Manchester, 2008).

[15] Boehmer, *Empire, the National and the Postcolonial,* pp 1-3.

[16] Steven G. Ellis, ‘Historiographical Debate: Representing the Past in Ireland: Whose Past and Whose Present? in *Irish Historical Studies,* vol. 27, no. 108, (November, 1991), pp 291-294.

[17] Sean Ryder, ‘Defining Colony and Empire in Early Nineteenth-Century Irish Nationalism,’ in Terence McDonough (ed.), *Was Ireland a Colony? Economics, Politics and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin, 2005), p.166.

study places in 'tension the forms of sameness and difference, that shape modes of identification and experience', in both comparative and transnational history. [18]

Frontier and Zulu Wars 1877-1880

The first of these military incursions under scrutiny took place in 1877, the year of the British annexation of the Transvaal Republic. The background to the mission lay in the despatch of the Connaught Rangers for the protection of settler colonialism from the threat of the Galeckas and the Gaikas who resisted encroachment on their lands.[19] These encroachments into indigenous lands were under the auspices of the expansionist policies of Sir Bartle Frere, who had been appointed Commissioner of South Africa in 1877.[20] Further encroachments into Zulu territories were caused by the creation of labour and commercial demands as a result of the discovery of diamonds in the Kimberley in 1867.[21] These expansionist policies arose from the desire to extend British control over the diamond industry, to block other European powers in search of colonial territory and riches, and to prevent the movement of Boers into the Cape Colony.[22] There was an expectation that the Republics and the Colonies might eventually unite in a South African Confederation. Sir Bartle Frere saw the removal of the Zulu from their territories as a necessary act to facilitate this active stage of imperial expansion in Southern Africa. [23]

Before 1877, it is unlikely that South Africa loomed large in Moore's imagination. It had never been a significant destination for the Irish diaspora, unlike the settler colonies of Australia Canada or America, and possessed no readily identifiable Irish ethnic community. However, he was to spend the next three years between the Cape, Natal, and Port Louis in Mauritius, and Zululand. Sailing on the troopship Orontes on 23 June 1877 and he landed in Table Bay on 24 July where the Rangers marched to Simonstown and then on to Cape Town for 3 August. Moore did not have tim e for more than superficial observations on the local scenery in Cape Town, the beauty of Table Mountain, the unfriendliness of the Cape Dutch, and the 'extraordinary lingo' spoken by

[18] Glenda Sluga, 'The Nation and the Comparative Imagination,' in *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective* Deborah Cohen and Maura O'Connor, (eds), (New York and London, 2004), p. 109.

[19] Alan Lester, *Imperial Networks: Creating Identities in Nineteenth Century South Africa and Britain* (London, 2001), p. 4. see also James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-World,* (Oxford, 2009).

[20] Damien P.O'Connor, *The Zulu and the Raj: The Life of Sir Bartle Frere* (Herts, 2002), p.103.

[21] Lester, *Imperial Networks.*

[22] John Darwin, 'Imperialism and the Victorians: The Dynamics of Territorial Expansion' in *The English Historical Review*, vol. 112, no. 447 (Jun., 1997), pp 614-642.

[23] Ian R. Smith, *The Origins of the South African War 1899-1902* (Essex, 1996), p. 27. [23] Christopher Saunders, and Ian R. Smith, 'Southern Africa, 1795-1910' in Andrew Porter, (ed.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire Vol. III. The Nineteenth Century* (Oxford, 1999), p. 606.

the ‘blacks’ before he was despatched to East London, by rail to Kabusi, and from there to Fort Conynghame.[24] The Galeka's had crossed the Kai River and the Gaikas in the Cis-Kei also rose in revolt, attacking the Rangers twice at Draaibosch in forces three hundred and seven hundred men strong.[25] Moore was mentioned in despatches for his command of a mixed detachment of fifty men at Pulleins Farm, two and a half miles from Komgha, (where he spent the Christmas of 1877) on 4 January 1878, in which the regiment lost one man. Many of the men had fired wildly and inaccurately at their adversaries, as they were insufficiently trained on a recruit’s course in Athlone before being shipped to the Cape.[26] Nevertheless, they were commended by their commanding officer for their courage if not their accuracy, while for Moore it was his first military engagement as a subaltern and an impressive beginning to his career. The last serious conflict occurred on 7 February before the tribes were affected by drought and starvation. By July 1878 Moore and a company of the Rangers had been despatched to Mauritius.

No sooner had the attack on the Gaika, Galecka and Xhosa been quelled than insurrection stirred among the Zulu due to Frere’s unacceptable ultimatum ordering them to disband. They refused and Lord Chelmsford invaded their territory, and as Frere expected, the Zulus rose in protest. The Zulus were described by Sir Arthur Cunynghame, the Lieutenant Governor, and the commander of the forces in the Cape in 1877, as the Prussians of South Africa, capable of disciplined and efficient military action, and Cetewayo, the Zulu king to be as warlike as his uncle Chaka, who in 1820, had organised them into an efficient military system.[27] To their surprise the British suffered a decisive and humiliating defeat at Isandhlwana. When the news was relayed by a troop ship from Ceylon, (as telegraphic communication had not been established in between South Africa and empire in 1879), it reached Moore at Port Louis in Mauritius. He was despatched, with 'B' company of the Rangers, for Durban, arriving by sailing ship in March 1879, and leaving from there for Fort Pearson, on the Tugela River. In 1879, he was photographed in the company of his friend, Hammond, at Fort Tenedos which was on the opposite side of the Tugela from Fort Pearson in Zululand. In a letter to his mother, dated May 23 1879, he gives his location in the Lower Tugela where he had been moved from King Williams Town. He was ‘now in the land of the savage Zulu, and a more desolate one I have rarely seen’.[28] Zululand was bordered by the Transvaal Republic on one side and Natal on the other, much of central South

[24] Letters from Moore to his mother, Mary Blake, 13 August Moore papers, NLI, MS 10,566/2 , see also C.A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern Word 1780-1914: Global Connections and Comparisons*, (Oxford and Victoria, 2004), p. 437.

[25] H.F.N. Jourdain, and Edward Fraser, *The Connaught Rangers: A Regimental History, Vol I*, (3 vols. London, 1924), p. 283.

[26] Ibid. pp 224-225.

[27] Sir Arthur Augustus Thurlow Cunynghame, *My Command in South Africa 1874-1878:Comprising Experiences of Travel in the Colonies of South Africa and the Independent States* (London, 1879), p. vxii.

[28] Moore to Mary Blake Moore, Zululand, 23 May 1879, Moore Papers, Ms. 10,566/2.

Africa was ‘savannah and grassland of the high veldt’ contributing to Moore's sense of desolation.[29] He described the Zulus as cunning

> One never knows when one is quite safe, they creep up to sentries through the grasses in the dark and stab them before they know what they are doing. They are not afraid to stand up and fight either as we have learned to our cost. As they have numbers on their side and we have incompetent generals on ours they often get the best of the fighting.[30]

Moore went on to say that

> They never spare or take prisoners: every man they get if wounded or not is assegaied, running away is not much good as they run much faster...and would soon make an end to the race. They are fine men with splendid figures and wonderful powers of endurance. They think nothing of walking fifty or sixty miles a day and doing the same thing for four or five consecutive days with little but some Indian corn or 'mealies' as that is called here, to eat.[31]

Back in Ireland, the Zulus were being described variously in the Irish press as ‘naturally cunning, suspicious, cruel avaricious, and treacherous’ at least some of the terms used employed a similar rhetoric to Moores, suggesting that some of his opinions reflected the discourse of the popular

[29] Robert Ross, *A Concise History of South Africa,* (Cambridge, 1999), pp 5-6.

[30] Moore to Mary Blake Moore, 7 June 1879, Moore Papers, Ms. 10,566/

[31] Ibid.

press.[32]. Questioning the legitimacy of the attack on the Zulus, 'I don't know what the people of England think about it but a more unjust war was never undertaken', Moore echoed the words of Irish M.P. O'Connor Power who asked during a debate on Dilke's resolution to endorse British military action in South Africa, if the 'war with the Zulus was a just or unjust war'.[33] Some years later in 1882, when empire was threatening the Egyptians, the *Nation* called the previous English engagement in this 'unjust war' a crime in moral law[34]. For Moore the war was

> An act of pure aggression, it suits badly to hear English people perpetually lecturing other nations on political morality when they carry on such wars as this. I must say they fully deserve the beating they get and I suppose they will be a little more humble in negotiation with European powers in future. A nice figure we would have cut in a war with Russia when it taxes our utmost strength to beat a king with a nation of naked savages not more numerous than the population of Dublin.[35]

The reference to a war with Russia arose from the recent conflict in Afghanistan in which war with Russia provided an admirable excuse to send an expeditionary force to the Afghan border and to establish a British protectorate. Twenty years later, when he recalled the defeat at Isandlwana, he criticised the methods of warfare used in the second Anglo-Boer war, writing, 'we advanced practically the whole in open order against the Zulus ... '[36] The war with the Zulus had been provoked by the British and did nothing for imperial prestige.[37] The defeat of the Zulu, the

---

[32] *Dublin Evening Mail,* 25 February 1879.
[33] Paul A. Townend, *The Road to Home Rule,* p. 54
[k]

[35] Letter from Moore to his mother Mary Blake, 7 June 1879, Moore papers, NLI, Ms.10, 566/2. The threat of war with Russia had loomed ominously in military and political discourse during the 1870s, judiciously encouraged by Frederick Roberts who wished to maintain a heavily fortified military presence in the Indian North West frontier to combat a possible Russian invasion. Heather Streets, *Martial Races: The Military Race and Masculinity in British Imperial culture 1857-1914* (Manchester, 2004).

[36] 'Lessons of the War*,'* Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10,578.

[37] David E. Torrance, *The Strange Death of the Liberal Empire: Lord Selborne in South Africa* (Liverpool, 1996), p. 12.

Gaika, Galecka and Xhosa signified the end of African resistance to European supremacy, while the British government tightened and extended their control.[38]

Moore's admiration for the warlike qualities of the Zulus was dominated by questions of physical prowess, strength, endurance, and resistance. According to David Lloyd in the late nineteenth century, 'Irish nationalism and British imperialism' largely concurred in 'associating self- government and 'manliness' at the level of the individual person as at that of the nation.[39] The poor physical condition of the men from the London slums came to 'symbolise the potential racial degeneracy of Britain as a whole' compared with the 'health and hardiness of the country folk,' that made up the ranks in the Connaught Rangers. This was to become a serious concern to the British authorities during the second Anglo-Boer war.[40] The martial prowess of the Zulu and their 'manliness', was a significant factor in the Irish nationalist self-identification with the Zulu resistance, along with a rhetoric that included describing the Zulus as a 'race of savages' and 'poor hunted savages,' with 'burned homes'. Admiration of Zulu physique and warlike capacities were still mediated through the racial stereotyping of the 'bifocal lens' that divided the world into the civilised and the barbarian.[41] Moore's valorising of the physical properties of Zulus and the Irish opposes both to the British in an unconscious anti-imperial discourse that considers the British deserving of the beating they got at the hands of the Zulus. Despite long marches in the heat on poor rations, Moore declared his health to have never been better. He believed that he shared his health and capacity for endurance and resistance to disease and fatigue with the Connaught Rangers, whose physical condition he declared to be superior to that of the English troops from the 'Tower Hamlets', of the East London slums, who were debilitated by malnutrition.[42] The Irish were envied for their 'superiority in marching and endurance.' The Rangers who had lost only two men, one to drowning and the other to alcohol poisoning showed 'how much stronger and better able to stand fatigue and hardship, Irishmen are than Englishmen'.[43] More prosaically, H.F.N. Jourdain's regimental history stated that the Rangers had been hardened and acclimatised after their earlier campaigns in 'Kaffraria' and did better than the other regiments.[44]

---

[38] Ian R. Smith, *The Origins of the South African War 1899-1902*, p. 28.

[39] David Lloyd, *Ireland after History*, (Cork, 1999), p. 87.

[40] Thomas E. Jordan, 'Queen Victoria's Irish Soldiers: Quality of Life and Social Origins of the Thin "Green" Line,' in *Social Indicators Research*, vol. 57, no.1 (Jan., 2002), pp 73-88.

[41] Duncan Bell, 'Empire and Imperialism,' in Gareth Stedman Jones and Gregory Claeys (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth Century Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2011), p. 867.

[42] Moore to Mary Blake Moore, 7 June 1879, Moore Papers, Ms. 10,566/2. Heather Streets, *Martial Races*, p.105; Joseph Kestner, on 'the military man as a trope of Victorian masculinity,' quoted in Shearer West (ed.), *The Victorians and Race*, (Hants, 1996), p. 5. The ranks were composed of 'boys' according to *The Times*, who referred to the 'extreme youth of the men in the army,' 9 May 1879.

[43] Moore's letter to his mother, Mary Blake, 23 May 1879, Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10,566/2.

[44] H.F.N. Jourdain,and Edward Fraser, *The Connaught Rangers Vol.1* (3 Vols. Cork, 1924) p.229

1879 Land Wars in Ireland and War in Zululand

From one who had barely joined the imperial forces, Moore's ambivalence about the empire he served in and determined to exploit for the possibilities it offered, retained a reflectivity on the relationship of empire to his own 'historical, contemporary conditions', this was borne out by the paradoxical nature of his reflections in his letters home.[45] While berating empire for fighting the Zulu, and professing admiration for their warlike qualities, he delighted in remarking on the physical superiority of the Connaught Rangers, who were no less imperial than their fellow English soldiers. Moore's observations on the Zulu, his critiques on colonial aggression and the superiority of the Irish soldier, all bear an implicit or explicit critique of the British, but he made no comparisons between the colonial acquisition of indigenous lands and their dispossession. Those comparisons were made in Ireland, as the nationalist movement capitalised on both Zulu victory and defeat in an opposition that made opportunistic identifications with the Zulu without employing a coherent anti-imperialist rhetoric. It was based on opportunism and not on an anti-colonial analysis. If colonial affairs were in a ferment in South Africa in the late 1870s, Ireland was undergoing its own period of unrest, when Moore embarked for the Cape in 1877. Economic and political crisis was to endure in Ireland until 1879. Moore's native Mayo, described by T.W. Moody as a 'county of large estates and absentee landlords,' was to play a pivotal role over the following years of poor harvest, and agrarian unrest that culminated in the land wars.[46] Finlay Dun expressed some of the local dissent associated with the wars in empire

> The district of [Westport] is in a state of chronic agitation and disaffection. Any reversal to British arms in Afghanistan or at the Cape provoke unmistakable rejoicing. Able-bodied idlers, even when unable to find work and seeking relief, will not now accept the 'Queens Shilling.[47]

[45] Paul A. Townend, *The Road to Home Rule* p. 3.
[46] T.W. Moody, *Davitt and Irish Revolution 1846-82*, (Oxford, 1982), p. 3.
[47] Finlay Dun, *Landlords and Tenants in Ireland* (London, 1881), p. 229.

A new agrarian and political movement was formed on the basis of uniting constitutional politics with a reorganized Irish Republican Brotherhood, which was supported and funded by John Devoy, the leader of Clan na Gael in the United States. Leadership in Ireland was provided by Charles Stewart Parnell and Michael Davitt, who had been released from Dartmoor on 19 December 1877 thirteen days after the 88th Battalion of the Connaught Rangers had been ordered from Cape Town to the front by Sir Arthur Cunynghame. The co-operation between constitutionalism and radicalism found its first symbolical representation in the Mayo land agitation fostered by James Daly, the proprietor of the *Connaught Telegraph*. A movement was formed under the aegis of Davitt with Parnell at its head, despite clerical opposition, on 21 October 1879, which became known as the Mayo Land League.[48] This 'New Departure,' as the compact between the revolutionaries and the parliamentarians was characterised, was arguably, not new at all, finding a precursor in George Henry Moore's politics earlier in the century, who aimed to restore the land to the people and protect tenants from eviction. Despite the fact that the movement was headed by a landlord, feeling against landlordism ran high and John Devoy, who paid tribute to 'certain members' of the landlord class, said that the 'solution to the land system was the sweeping away of the existing system'.[49] This threatened sweeping away of the existing system left ascendancy members like Moore with an uncertain future and a questionable identity. The experience of the Mayo landlord Captain Boycott, who gave his name to the practice, testified to the efficacy of Land League methods of protest and resistance.

The Zulu defence of its nation at the same time as the Irish farmers claimed ownership of their lands provided a powerful exemplar for Irish nationalism which expressed itself in a number of identifications. According to Paul A. Townend, the 'powerful rhetorical gambit that drew together Irish tenants facing starvation and eviction and Zulus facing Martini Henry rifles and Gatling guns...operated as a medium for local self-identification.'[50] Racial and cultural differences were secondary to the possibility of exploiting the failure of empire's civilising mission, to mount an attack on empire which did not have, as was stated before, an ideological basis.[51] Indignation expressed in the Irish press and at public meetings valorised the Zulus while maintaining racial barriers by describing them as a 'race of savages...who were claiming their right to self-government'. A.M Sullivan, the M.P. for Louth who supported the Zulus said that 'though a man

[48] Ibid.

[49] *New York Herald*, 27 October, 1878.

[50] Paul A. Townend, 'Between Two Worlds: Irish Nationalist and Imperial Crises 1878-1880' in *Past and Present*, no. 194, (Feb., 2007), pp 139-174; Boehmer, *Empire, The National and the Postcolonial*. p.10.

[51] Sean Ryder, 'Defining Colony and Empire in Nineteenth Century Irish Nationalism' in Terence McDonough (ed.), *Was Ireland a Colony?: Economic Change and Culture in Nineteenth Century Ireland* (Dublin, 2006), p.180.

have dusky skin we ought not to deny him his patriotism'.[52] Pro-Zulu chants accompanied John Dillon's address to a Claremorris Land League gathering, in which he called for support for the right of the Zulus to defend their own country. Frank Conway the editor of the *Connaught Telegraph* and Land League organiser made direct comparisons between Britain's policy in South Africa and their treatment of the Irish.[53] The editor of the *Freeman's Journal* claimed affinity with the Zulus as 'poor hunted savages', who endured the destruction of their homes.[54] Michael Davitt drew more sinister analogies between the Pikemen of the 1789 rebellion and the proven effectiveness of the Zulu assegai.[55] Clan na Gael went as far as making contact with the Zulu King Cetewayo to offer their assistance. In short, the Zulu resistance and even their use of weapons was absorbed into a national narrative of oppression and loss. Sean Ryder identified an earlier disruption of racial discourse in an 1847 article in the *Nation* in support of an alliance of South African tribes against British incursion into their lands. The *Nation* had bequeathed a rhetoric of nationalist opposition associated with the chieftain named Krieli in order to make identifications that crossed the boundaries of race, and these same associations enjoyed a renaissance in 1879.[56] The defeat of the Zulus at Ulundi with the help of cannons and Gatling guns brought an end to the independence of the Zulu nation, and to Moore's first campaign in South Africa in which he consolidated, however reluctantly, the process of British colonial expansion. Zululand was integrated into an increasingly imperial dominance which steadily eroded the independence of the remaining territories held by the indigenous people, while it tightened its grip on the Boer territories. On 11 October 1879 Moore and the Connaught Rangers left Zululand on the troop ship Serapis, bound for Bangalore in India, and by December he was in Mooltan, which was on the border with Afghanistan and subject to religious tensions between the Hindus and the Muslims.[57]

India and Ireland: 1880-1899

While this thesis focuses primarily on the connections between South Africa and Ireland, both Moore's long military presence in the Indian sub-continent and the extent to which twenty first century historiography has more fruitfully employed comparisons between Irish and Indian nationalisms warrants some interrogation of the imperial military networks that created links between the two. Comparisons between the oppressive measures exacted upon the Irish and the

---

[52] 'Lessons of the War,' Moore papers, NLI. Ms. 10,578.

[53] *Connaught Telegraph,* 10 November 1879; Paul A Townend, 'Between Two Worlds,' p.152.

[54] *Freeman's Journal*, 3 February 1879.

[55] Townend, 'Between Two Worlds.'

[56] Sean Ryder, 'Defining Colony and Empire in Nineteenth Century Irish Nationalism,' p. 167.

[57] *The Times,* 11 October 1879.

Indians were articulated as early as the late 1780s when Edmund Burke prosecuted the Governor-General of India, Warren Hastings, during his impeachment for corruption.[58] In the years from 1880 to 1892 Moore was a part of the colonial services that maintained administrative and military control over India, his frequent letters home struck no identifying chord with imperial oppression in India, despite the fact that the years from 1881 saw a military campaign against the Boers, the establishment of a British Protectorate in Egypt and the defeat of Arabi in Tel-El-Kebir in 1885. These years were eventful in Ireland as well, with Gladstones's Land Act in 1881, the consolidation of an Irish Parliamentary Party under Charles Stewart Parnell that united the social and the political under the Home Rule and the Land War movements, and the frequent and enduring anti-imperial propaganda in the Irish nationalist press. The bloody murder of Chief-Secretary Freddie Cavendish and his Under-Secretary Thomas Burke in May of 1882, marked out, what Townend had described as an 'unprecedented level of crime and unrest during these years'[59] Moore's brother, the novelist George Moore described the Ireland of 1882 as one of 'murder and assassination', and said that Irish Society was coming to pieces like a 'rotten sponge'.[60] (George Moore was referring to both the Phoenix Park murders and the brutal murder of a family in Maamtrasna to which he referred to as a 'low liquorish cruelty'.[61]) Moore commented on several of these events in his letters home but it has to be said that during these years India was less a political and social entity for him than the geographical backdrop to sporting amusements, social commitments, and military duties in intense heat. His long periods of leave allowed him to return to Ireland during these turbulent times, where he stayed at Renmore Barracks and in Hythe as well as enjoying his customary amusements in Galway, Mayo and Dublin. He was back in Ireland for the Ashford Ball in 1880 and he spent the winter hunting on a new mare that he had bought at the Ballinrobe Fair. By early 1881, he was based again at Renmore and then on to Dublin for the Farrier class staying at the Hibernian United Services Club, which was to become his home from home for the next thirty years. By spring 1882 he was back at Deolali and then on to Mooltan, not returning to Ireland until 1885, the year of Tel-el-Kebir, when he had another long period of leave. He was back in Boyle in April 1886 for the wedding of his friend Hammond and then on to the Hythe School of Musketry in 1887 before returning to India for that winter. India may have been at some distance but Moore's frequent visits home meant that he experienced at least some of the events surrounding the Land Wars and Home Rule agitations.

[58] C.A Bayley, 'Ireland, India and the Empire: 1870-1914' in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* vol. 10 (2000), pp 377-397.
[59] Paul A. Townend p. 134
[60] George Moore, *Parnell and his Island* (London, 1887) pp 240-242.
[61] Ibid., p. 242

Bombay, one of the oldest Presidencies was his usual port of entry and exit, and with the opening of the Suez, the preferred starting point for operations in the Sind. By the 1880s Bombay was the base of two lines of communications running to the North-West Frontier. On the railway North-East of the city were the barracks and military hospital of Deolali [62]. By the 1880s most large troop movements were carried out by train, when the troops arrived in Bombay, they packed up kit in Deolali and set off for Meerut which took 12 days, marching at night and resting by day. In one on his letters to his mother he described a march to Mooltan

> Getting up every morning between three and four and walking from twelve and sixteen miles. Of course the train does not go the whole way, so I have had to march about a hundred miles: this ought to have been got over in about ten days but we were stopped first by a downpour of rain which swept away the bridges on the hill roads and then by snow which lay thick over the high ground and through which the doctors would not allow women and children to travel. Instead of a ten day march it has taken us nearly a month but I hope to arrive now in three days[63]

He described this scene to his mother from his bungalow where he was sitting with the doors open and the punkah in operation to provide cool from the 86 degree heat, however he assured his mother that he was flourishing despite another attack of fever in the army.[64] A serious fever and ague epidemic had struck the Connaught Rangers in 1882.[65] He claimed that he had had a bout earlier but it was not so bad. The threat of cholera was always present, although by the 1880s both Pasteur's microbiological findings and Lister's theories on asepsis were known, however as Butler commented 'when the sewage was let out to the sea and deposited on the shoreline-cholera

[62] Richard Holmes, *Sahib:The British Soldier in India 1750-1914* (London, 2005), p.120
[63] Moore to Mary Blake Moore from India some time in the 1880s Moore Papers,.Ms. 10566/2
[64] Moore to Mary Blake 14 September 1882, ibid.
[65] H.N.F. Jourdain and Edward Fraser, p. 234

followed'.[66]. Writing from Shahjehanpore at the start of the heat, it was 100 degrees in the shade, he told his mother that he planned to ride in some local races, he had some good ponies and hoped to make some money in the following years.[67] He wrote that he hoped for a years leave and that although he was tired of India he was getting used to the

> constant flurry and bother of one's life in the cold weather, all the work and all the amusements of the year are crowded into the few months of reasonable weather in the year…' consequently he was occupied from early in the morning until late at night and there was not one moment when he could throw himself down on a sofa and 'rejoice in the sensation of having to do or nothing to think of'.[68]

As the weather became increasingly hot, plans were made to journey to the hills, where the weather 'remained cool and delicious'. Cashmere or Simla were popular choices, although Simla was Moore's preference, Sir William Butler wrote several accounts of his military experience in which he described

> …the pure fresh air of the hill stations as a welcome release from the intense heat of the plains. In the Nigherry Mountains or Blue Hills at six or seven thousand feet, shrubs from English and Irish shrubberies such as

[66]W.F. Butler, *Sir William Butler: An Autobiography* (London, 1911) p.4.
[67] Moore to Mary Blake Moore, 25 March 1880s, Moore Papers, Ms. 10,566/2
[68] Moore to Mary Blake, 5April 1888, Moore Papers, Ms. 10566/2

> the azalea, magnolia and gardenia grew to tree form.[69]

Army lists confirm his movements, periods of leave and promotions during these years. His letters home indicate that garrison life in India frequently left him in a state of ennui. He wrote to his brother, Julian, who was at school at Tullabeg, that the 'mysterious east' ... resolved itself into a 'hard, dry, flat country with no cedars or vines'. A typical day in India began at sunrise for drill followed by breakfast at 11a.m. Sporting activities engaged the officers after sundown, either tennis or polo. At 8 pm he bathed and then dined at. 8.30, playing billiards or cards until bedtime.

During the years, this ennui along with the slowness of promotion caused him to speculate on other careers. He had completely lost his early optimism as a second subaltern, when a posting to India meant a better salary. In an undated letter to his mother some years earlier, Moore wrote that

> If he stayed for ten more years he would earn less than 120 a year and then with luck he might get promoted. In a further ten years if his luck held he would get a majority or be compulsorily retired on a small pension. 'I will then be useless for anything but to live on this pension in a club in Dublin or London. He found this an unpleasant prospect although he liked his present life well enough he felt that it was hardly sufficient to justify such a conclusion. [70]

[69] W.F. Butler, *Sir William Butler: An Autobiography*,(London, 1911), p. 38. For a description of life in Simla see, Nialll Ferguson, *Empire: How Britain made the Modern World* (London, 2003), p. 183
[70] Moore to Mary Blake, 10 November late 1880s, Moore Paper, Ms. 10566/2

He had given up on a promotion which was a 'delusion he laboured under at one time. He was still trying for an adjutancy and considered that he had powerful interests working in his favour, but he held out little hope. In later years, attracted by a salary of 1000 pounds per annum, he attempted to secure an administrative appointment in Australia with a return to the regiment at the end of five years. [71] It is possible that the intensity of his efforts during this time were due to a desire to marry and start a family. In one of his letters home he had asked his mother to invite Miss Evelyn Handcock of Carantrila, Dunmore, County Galway to Moore Hall for a few days.

> He was sure it would amuse her, as she has been for a long time at Carantrila and does not write very cheerily of her life there, yet she will not go away. It will be a little change for her and besides I would like you to know her. She is not very strong and Carnatrila lies low and damp.'[72]

This was Moore's first mention of the woman he would marry in 1889. Evelyn Handcock was from the Protestant gentry with military and clerical connections, who had previous links to the Barons of Castlemaine. Part of the family estate in Carrantrila, or Carrowntryla had been sold in the Encumbered Estates Courts in 1851. In the 1870s the Handcocks still owned 7,865 acres, but by 1914 the Land Commission was to take possession of the estate [73] Major Gerald Stratford Handcock, Evelyn's brother, bought back the house and a hundred acres in 1928.[74] It was sold eventually to Hector McDonnell, a Galway building contractor. Moore married Evelyn in a Catholic ceremony in the garrison church of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, in Fort Bombay, Dinapore.[75] Many of his subsequent entries concerning Evelyn referred to her poor health or low spirits. In one letter he mentioned having

[71] Moore to Mary Blake Moore, Dinapore, 1889-90, Ms. 10,566/2
[72] Moore to Mary Blake Moore, 5 April 1888, Moore Papers, Ms. 10,566/2.
[73] John Bateman, *The Great Landowners of Great Britain and Ireland* (New York, 1971, first published in 1876) p. 205.
[74] Fr. Martin J. Heaney, *Galway and Mayo Families.* Handwritten manuscript in the possession of the Local History Collection, Mayo County Library.
[75] Seamas Mac Donncha, Letters of George Moore (1852-1933) to his brother Colonel Maurice Moore C.B., (1854-1939), Unpublished PhD Thesis, University College Galway, 1973, p.2

> a go of typhoid fever…a light attack.' He was sent to the hills on sick leave to recover. In the same letter he wrote of Evelyn being ill as well, 'she very unwisely took a long journey across the hills so as to meet me here on my arrival from the plains, the roads had been destroyed by floods and she had many difficulties to overcome. On her arrival she was completely prostrated, and instead of being able to 'nurse me as she expected, I found her at deaths door.[76]

Over the years he made frequent mention of Evelyn's indispositions or unspecified ill health, however, she outlived him by seven years, dying in 1946. Evelyn did not involve herself in religious debates, she did not oppose a Catholic education for her sons or their immersion in Irish cultural nationalism, although it was far from her experience and perhaps her sympathies as well. She and Maurice spent long periods of time apart in their marriage due partly to his military postings and his work in the Irish Volunteers during which time she and the children lived in a house in Holland Park in London. By 1921, she was living with him in Anthony Trollope's old house on Seaview Terrace in Donnybrook, and in that year she accompanied him at the expense of the Irish Assembly on his mission to South Africa, as Moore feared leaving her on her own.[77] Evelyn remains a shadowy figure in Moore's life and the few available sources give little idea of her person or her beliefs. It may, or may not, be significant that she did not attend her husband's removal to Kiltoom graveyard in 1939 due to incapacity and she was buried in Dublin and not in the Moore family graveyard in Kiltoom.

Moore feared a loss of political faith, during the years in India, from the lack of Irish newspapers and the great distance from home and asked his family to send him a copy of the *Freemans* every now and then.[78] In 1882, reading of Gladstone's bombardment of the city of

[76] Moore to Mary Blake, Albion Hotel. N.W.P.17 August 1889-90, Moore Papers, Ms. 10566/2
[77] *Irish Times* 1 November 1935.
[78] Letter to Julian Moore, 23 September from Mooltan, India probably early 1880s, Moore papers, Ms, 10, 566/2.

Alexandria wit h British warships destroying most of the city, Moore was provoked into writing to his mother to complain of the treatment of the Egyptians

> …if it had been the Tories, one could have understood it but by the Liberals, unless one had seen their conduct in Ireland, it would have been intolerable. Gladstone's vanity, I suppose had to be satisfied at the expense of Alexandria.'[79] He complained that there 'isn't the slightest chance of my going to Egypt…, although he would if he could, he felt that matters there 'did not look too good,' but 'Sir Garnet is Irish and doubtless he will put matters straight soon…Araby and the Egyptians have been very badly treated…[80]

The liberal government had sent a military force to Egypt to quell an uprising against the Khedive by the anti-European, Arabi Pasha, who posed a threat to the British who had purchased forty four percent of the shares in the Suez Canal. Dissension eventually spread to the Sudan leading to the war with the Mahdi and the establishment of a British protectorate.[81] The informal administration of Egypt had been replaced by an official administration of territory adding to the imperial authority over large parts of the African continent, but once again Moore reserves his criticism for aggression, without remarking on the expansion of empire as a process. Sir Garnet Wolseley, in whom Moore professed some trust, was Irish and an effective and high profile military arm of empire, who defeated Arabi's forces at Tel-el-Kebir.[82]

Moore's experience of India or his recounting of that experience, dovetails with that of many of his class who developed a professional life in the army. His letters reveal his weariness of the

[79] Letter from Moore to Mary Blake, Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10, 566/2.

[80] Moore Papers, letter to mother form Mooltan in 1882-3, Ms. 10,566/2.

[81] Carla King, 'The Mahdi for an Irish Constituency or at least a Seat in Dublin Town Council: Davitt and Africa' in *18th-19th-Century History*, vol. 14, issue. 4, (July/ August).

[82] Niall Ferguson, *Empire: How Britain Made the Modern World* (London, 2003), pp 232-233.

heat, disease, distance from home and the cycle of military duties and movements that characterised military life in India. His lengthy periods of leave allowed him to remain in touch politically and socially with home, although he admitted the risk to his 'political faith' as a result of the distance from the events at home. Despite his vigorously stated opinions there was no mention of actual political activism which did not became an important part of his life until his return to Ireland in the 1890s. If empire had been a little more beneficial to one of its functionaries or if the appointment to Australia had materialised, how would this have affected the later course of his nationalism?

His apparent lack of interest in the political and nationalist history of India may have had its roots in race. His racial understanding at this point tolerated British imperial dominance of non-white races despite his earlier sympathy for the Zulu and for Arabi Pasha, the leader of Egyptian nationalism. There is no evidence that he resembled the South African veterans who reached the Indin sub-continent brutalised by the racial attitudes towards the indigenous populations of South Africa, but Irish soldiers tended to exhibit the same racial superiority as their English and Scots fellows. Moore referred to the people of India in unmistakably racist terms

> …certainly they are very black. I can only describe the people as Heine described the English after his visit to England. They are the most repulsive race God in his anger ever created.[83]

Allowing for the fact that this remark was made in a private exchange and not a publicly expressed opinion, it reveals Moore's unconsciously held acceptance of white superiority, even if he gave voice to it in curiously inverted terms by using Heine's observation on the English. This was a viewpoint that was to change in later years when he took Indian nationalism seriously, but it was to take another fifty years for him to make this ideological shift. While he was in India in the 1880s, he reflected and articulated many of the ideological underpinnings that justified imperial expansion while at the same time protesting at Gladstone's actions in Alexandria in 1882.

[83] Moore to Jualian Moore 23 September 1882, Moore Papers, Ms. 10,566/2.

He and Evelyn returned home in 1892, three years after their marriage, where he remained until his posting to South Africa in 1899, which gave him ample opportunity to engage in nationalist movements. They sailed from Bombay to Portsmouth on the T.S.S Serapis arriving on December 14. His sons, Maurice and Ulick, known respectively as Rory and Toby were born in 1894 and 1896 when Moore was stationed in Boyle with the Rangers where he made a home in Carigard.[84] He was able to spend much of his time at Moore Hall, where he took an interest in the running of the estate, and involved himself in the language and co-operative movements founded by his fellow ascendancy members, Horace Plunkett and Douglas Hyde. His brother, George wrote to him at this time, 'So long as the place is mine, it is yours in every respect'.[85] Promoted to major in 1893, he presided over a conference in Castlebar with the aim of making the work of co-operatives more efficient, and he set up schemes to improve local agriculture.[86] One of these schemes involved the setting up of an egg industry in Mayo, which he outlined in a letter to the *Irish Homestead*, which was then printed by the *Connaught Telegraph* 17 March 1899. In the same year, he was a trustee of a fund for the restoration of Ballintubber Abbey five miles away from Moore Hall in Mayo.[87] Also in 1899, he continued the epistolary feud he had begun with Charles Gavan Duffy in 1886 over his father's role in parliamentary independent opposition, which Duffy attributed to the policies of the 1850s Tenant League.[88] He was actively involved locally, and nationally, during those middle years of his military career, particularly in the months before he embarked for South Africa in 1899. It was significant that his nationalism was innately practical. He was an activist not an idealist, he did not engage a romantic nationalist imagination by writing poetry on national themes, as the adolescent Casement did in Antrim.[89]

He was sufficiently involved however, to bring his nationalist commitment to war with him in the form of Eugene O'Growney's primary texts in the Irish language, so that he might learn Gaelic while on campaign.[90] This is not as incongruous as it might appear, the Scottish peer Lord Lovatt, who led a company of Scots ghillies and gamekeepers across the veldt, was learning Scots Gaelic on campaign. Lovatt's Scouts and the Connaught Rangers found themselves keeping company

[84] Army Lists, Templer Research Centre, National Army Museum, Chelsea.

[85] in Seamas Mac Donnacha, 'Letters of George Moore to his Brother Colonel Maurice Moore. C.B. (1854-1939), p.22.

[86] According to the Army Lists, Moore had been promoted to Captain on 1 Nov. 1882 and eleven years later to Major on 8 February 1893.

[87] *Connaught Telegraph,* 9 April 1899.

[88] *Connaught Telegraph,* 20 May 1899.

[89] Margaret O'Callaghan, 'Casement, Colonialism and a Remembered Past' in Mary E.Day, *Roger Casement and World History* (Dublin, 2005), p. 62.

[90] Eugene O'Growney's Irish Grammars Ceachta Simplidhe Gaelige, 'Simple Lessons in Irish.' in Seamas Mac Donnacha, 'Letters of George Moore to his Brother Colonel Maurice Moore. C.B. (1854-1939).

throughout the war in South Africa, Moore and Lovatt had ample opportunity to share their thoughts on cultural nationalism while engaged in imperial warfare.

Anglo-Boer War 1899: 'Oligarchy of Farmers.'

With the outbreak of war between empire and the two Boer Republics of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State in the late nineteenth century, South Africa had become the destination for thousands of Irish soldiers and a critical focus for Irish nationalist dissent.[91] The second part of this chapter locates elite Irish nationalism directly within an expanding capitalist economy created by South Africa's gold and diamond fields.'[92] This expansion accelerated a capitalist process that gradually erased more traditional rural hierarchal networks and modes of labour based on kinship and rural relationships with the Africans. The desire of the Boer leadership to maintain traditional ways of life, and to resist the capitalist predations of empire, found a resonance with the Irish. To a lesser extent Boer elites were created by the industrialising changes in the Transvaal as some Boer notables acquired land, wealth and prestige, while the landless class multiplied under the same conditions. This apparently simplistic and reductive analysis of a series of complex dynamics in the metropole and in the Boer republics in 1899 is one that Moore articulated in his articles during this period, and it influenced his understanding of the dramatic shifts that occurred in Boer society during these years. It also cohered with elite anxieties in Britain and more forcefully in Ireland at the changes wrought in traditional landowning hierarchies as land reform transferred ownership from an elite to a class of tenant farmers as traditional social structures were overturned. The Irish elites and the 'oligarchic landed estates system in Ireland' were regarded by nineteenth century political economists as the 'single greatest impediment to 'proper' capitalist development in that country.[93] Committed to land reform but also a traditionalist, Moore's sense of revulsion as he contemplated the military tactics employed to end the war and demoralise the Boer nation, had complex roots in his own situation. The inherent ambiguity in Moore's attitudes to his status within empire are expressed memorably by Alvin Jackson's definition of the Irish in empire, 'as simultaneously a bulwark and a mine within its walls, both as major participants and significant sources of subversion'.[94] Jackson's much quoted observation implies a cruder set of oppositions than Moore's more subtle 'strategies of collaboration and resistance' to oppose military tactics he could not endorse, while his dedicated service in the

[91] Donal P. McCracken, 'Imperial Running Dogs or Wild Geese Reporters: Irish Journalists in South Africa,' in *South Africa Historia*, vol. 58, no. 1(May/Mei, 2013), pp 122-138; Donald H. Akenson, *Occasional Papers on the Irish in South Africa* (Grahamstown, (1991).

[92] Joe Cleary, 'Irish Studies, Colonial Questions: Locating Ireland in a Colonial World' in Seamus Deane and Breandán Mac Suibhne, (eds), *Outrageous Fortune: Capital and Culture in Modern Ireland* (Field Day Series 1, 2007), p. 18.

[93] Ibid., p. 34.

[94] Alvin Jackson, 'Ireland, the Union and the Empire: 1800-1960' in Kevin Kenny (ed.), *Ireland and the British Empire. The Oxford History of the British Empire* (Oxford, 2004), p.123.

second Anglo-Boer war earned him honours. Using Casement as an example once again, it is possible to identify both him and Moore as possessing what Breuilly described as 'cross cutting identities', that obscures any easy cultural, social or religious identifications in any analysis of their political loyalties.[95] It explains Moore's ability to conduct himself with vigour and dedication while on campaign, while he criticised the British government for its war on the republicanism of a relatively small number of Boers. His second experience in South Africa was the crucible for his eventual transformation from an admittedly reluctant agent of imperialism to something of a nationalist provocateur.

When Moore returned to South Africa after a twenty year gap, it was not just colonial expansion that he was facing but a fight for the dominance of a rapidly expanding industrial capitalism subject to a great deal of interest from the European empires, and huge investment from abroad. It was, according to Ian R. Smith, by far the most advanced industrialised economy on the African continent, with the Transvaal as the 'economic focus'.[96] In addition coal deposits were found in Transvaal and Natal.[97] Antoinette Burton defined the second Anglo-Boer war as the product of the intersection of Anglo-German rivalry in Africa motivated by capitalist gains in gold and diamonds and complicated by 'intra-ethnic' rivalry between the Afrikaner English and the Afrikaner African.[98] Racial identities were heightened by the 'competitive whiteness' of an empire determined to protect the 'native races' from the 'less civilised Boers.'[99] It was also the scene of several global encounters as a significant number of interests converged on its outcomes, while troops came from all over the empire to fight in colonial corps. However, Burton's analysis remains cogent, despite a continuing historiographical debate over the causes of the war, control of African gold was the primary impetus behind securing control of the Boer republics against European rivals.[100] The British move to prevent the a rail link to Delagoa Bay, which was outside British jurisdiction as a Portugese possession was driven by their anxiety to prevent the Boer independence of British railways in the Cape.[101] In a series of articles written while Moore was on campaign, he revealed an analysis of the causes for war which made it clear that he understood the war as the outcome of imperial need to control and benefit from the industrialising heartland of Africa.

---

[95] John Breuilly, 'On the Principle of Nationality,' in Gareth Stedman Jones and Gregory claeys (eds.) *The Cambridge Dictionary of Nineteenth-Century Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2011), p.92

[96] Ian R.Smith, *The Origins of the South African War 1899-1902*, pp 44-45.

[97] Ibid. p.45.

[98] Antoinette Burton, *Politics and Empire in Victorian Britain: A Reader* (New York, 2001), p. 261.

[99] Burton, *Politics and Empire in Victorian Britain,* p. 261.

[100] Bayley, *The Birth of the Modern World*, p. 231.

> As usual politicians, journalists and philanthropists are occupying themselves with ceaseless chatter and recrimination about matters of no real account. Do we not all know, that war is rarely, if ever due to the immediate cause of dispute.' The imperial justifications for the war included the protection of the native races, and the rights of the disenfranchised Uitlanders or the 'the stock jobber,' in a protest 'against the oligarchy of farmers, Gold Grabbers and the franchise.' These are 'mere phrases to justify the unjustifiable...self-interest and lust of empire are now as always the real spring on which hang the fate of nations.'[102]

It manifested itself in a battle between 'the civilisation of the towns' against the 'farmer on the open prairie', between the industrialising urban and a pastoral way of life, which expressed the concerns of the Transvaal Boers as they saw themselves being politically marginalised by the influx of English speakers into the Transvaal. Moore expressed the anxiety of his age and class at the creeping dominance of industrialisation and the civilisation of the towns with their 'squalid streets and degenerate children.'[103] He was also articulating the Pro-Boer sentiments of the *United Irishman* and the *Freeman's Journal* although he may not have been doing so consciously.[104] The perception of a battle between the Randlords and the idealised democratic government of the Boers founded on an agricultural economy and a rural way of life had an appeal for Moore, and had some basis in truth, although of course the Boer government had an interest in harnessing the forces of industrialisation to their own ends, and the threats to the indigenous peoples came from the use of their labour by capitalism as much as the exploitation of the Boers. In fact the Boers were not the 'corrupt oligarchy', identified by Leo Amery, but a group of Boer notables, wealthy property owners, with a society in which military, social and political leadership merged, in the role of the veldkornet, not unlike the Irish landlord system but in relationship that was more

[102] 'Lessons of the War,' Moore papers, Ms, 10,578.

[103] Ibid.

„[104] Andries Wessels, 'The Rhetoric of Conflict and Conflict as Rhetoric: Ireland and the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902),' in *Literator,* vol.20, no. 3 (November, 1999), pp 161-174.

paternal, more as 'father figure and protector'. [105] Even before the war this class was under threat as Milner attempted to reduce the power of these older patron client relationships. The old republics relied on local systems of election, based on the commando system, united by friendship and kinship, and based on individual idiosyncratic leadership.[106] A society built on strict hierarchical traditions lacked the flexibility to adapt to the rapid changes induced by industrialising capitalism, or at least not on the time scales demanded by Britain's economic drives.

The imperial justifications for the war given by Leo Amery in the official *Times History* of the war, centred on the recently appointed Cape Commissioner Alfred Milner's landing in South Africa in 1897 to find that 'In the Transvaal an ignorant and corrupt Boer oligarchy, armed to the teeth on the proceeds of British industry, was defiantly asserting its right to treat the British as an inferior race.'[107] *The Times History* portrayed the Boers as a 'fighting race with a fighting history who reduced the civilized Hottentots (KhoiKhoi) to servitude', while the Bushmen (San) were gradually exterminated as noxious vermin'.[108] The official moral justifications of the war, were the protection of the rights of the black population and the sizeable disenfranchised and primarily British Uitlander population, particularly in Johannesburg. Soon after the beginning of the war in 1899, Moore was despatched to the Cape, as one of three majors in the Connaught Rangers, in command of 'B' company. He embarked on the troopship Bavaria for Natal on 28 November. His eldest son, Rory, remembered the battalion leaving Athlone, with his father riding on a black horse alongside Major de Courcy O'Grady while the band played Garryowen.[109] The Rangers, who arrived in Durban on 1 December were a part of Major General Fitzroy Hart's Irish Brigade, which included the Inniskilling Fusiliers, the Dublin Fusiliers and the Border regiment.

The Irish Transvaal Committee and Support for the Boers.

While Moore was leaving Ireland for Durban, an Irish Transvaal Committee was being formed in support of the Boers by Maud Gonne and Arthur Griffith, later the founder of Sinn Fein, who had worked in the Transvaal as a journalist for the *Middleburg Courant* in the late 1890s. Griffith used his journalistic voice in the *United Irishman* to rail against the Irish troops sent out to 'murder the Boers.' In Johannesburg, the resident Irish made comparisons and called for support for

[105] Sandra Swart, 'Men of Influence:' The Ontology of Leadership in the 1914 Rebellion' in *Journal of Historical Sociology*, vol. 17, no. 1, (March, 2004 p 3-4.

[106] Swart, 'Men of Influence,' pp 3-4.

[107] L.S. Amery, *The Times History: The War in South African1899-1902* (London, 1900-1909), p. 171.

[108] Ibid. pp. 48-52.

[109] Joseph Hone, *The Moores Of Moore Hall* (London, 1939), p. 208.

Transvaal independence in an *Irish Manifesto* which they had published in the *S&D News* and the *Star*.[110]The *Manifesto* activated familiar tropes of poverty, nakedness, hunger, misery and opposition in the Irish under British rule. Michael Davitt resigned his parliamentary seat at the declaration of war, and went to South Africa as an independent journalist and observer, where his impressions of the Boers were to feed into a nationalist perception of the Boers which was reflected the 'overtly masculine ideology of most nationalist anti-colonial elites', of this period. These facilitated Irish identifications with the martial masculinity of the Boers, just as in 1879 the 'manliness', of the Zulus was celebrated. Roger Casement, who was gathering intelligence reports on Boer activities in Portuguese East Africa, had little sympathy for the Boers on the basis of their treatment of the Black Africans, a circumstance that either went unnoticed or was ignored in Davitt's reports to the *Freeman's Journal* and the *New York American* despite his defence of indigenous peoples elsewhere in empire. The Black Africans who were active on both sides in the war were similarly overlooked. Irish support in South Africa was manifested in the Irish Transvaal Brigade which was formed by a group of Irishmen living in Johannesburg, under the leadership of Mayo man, John McBride and the Irish American, Colonel Blake.[111] The significance of this brigade lay for the most part in its symbolic value to Irish nationalism, rather than in the field of battle.

The galvanic nationalist response to the war with the Boers far outweighed the lukewarm reception given to the centenary commemorations of 1798 the previous year. The Boers had been subject to a similar imperial stereotyping to the Irish, identifying them as barbarous and uncivilized and therefore unworthy of self-government. This stereotype had been perpetuated for some time. The Cambridge educated *Times* correspondent and *Cape Times* editor in 1895 described them in a series of articles following on an 1890 visit to South Africa, as 'illiterate, fanatically Calvinistic, lazy and bucolically gross'. Randolph Churchill reiterated that opinion in a similar series of observations during his visit to South Africa in 1891, by calling the Boers fanatics, ignorant, selfish, dirty and unintelligent, accusations which the Dutch press responded to angrily. However, by the end of the war, the Boers were being valorised for their manliness and race qualities of 'strength and vigour,' and as one of the 'finest races on the globe' who were fighting for 'hearth and home'. Major Altham of the Royal Scots intelligence division saw them a springing from a similar Teutonic stock to the English and exhibiting a similar 'passion for self-government' Moore came to regard them as an exceptional people, 'What class of people are we

[110] *S&D News,* 28 September 1899; *The Star,* 5 September 1899.

[111] The Irish Brigade under the leadership of John McBride and John Blake fought at Colenso, Vaal Kraantz and Hart's Hill. P.J. Mathews, *Revival: The Abbey Theatre, Sinn Fein, The Gaelic League and the Co-operative Movement* (Cork, 2003), p.187.

fighting?' he asked at one point.[112] This remarkable transformation in the perception of an ethnic minority was prompted by the Boer victories over the British. The Boers became a global symbol of resistance to imperial oppression to many nations, with far reaching effects, in Canada for example, the Boer War protests lead to the formation of the Ligue Nationaliste to promote the nationalist interests of French Canadians. This Ligue lead to the Quebec separatist movement.[113] The Dutch-Americans who constituted an ethnic minority in the United States, found their identity stimulated by the threat to the Boers and considered themselves the enemy of the English, in a spurious set of sympathies based on scant knowledge of Boer ethnicity.[114] But it was the Irish, on both sides of the Atlantic who were particularly aggrieved and who as Douglas Hyde said in his memoir, were given a thrill by this race of farmers holding back the empire. The Irish nationalists constructed the Boers as a 'virile agricultural and deeply religious people in which they reflected their constructs of themselves'.[115]

> The Boer War had already, although nobody noticed it - openly at least-been the first public happening since the foundation of the Gaelic League to give a real impetus to the language movement. It was something so wonderful, so unexpected, so unheard of that the English Empire should be held by a handful of farmers that it gave every Irishman a thrill-in most cases a thrill of joy! It was the first glimmering of a ray of hope that England was not all clotted brass and triple steel, invulnerable and invincible, but like that image in the book of Daniel, might really have feet of clay. For a couple of years the extraordinary courage and prowess of the Boers was steadily pumping hope and self-reliance into Ireland: and it was the language

[112] 'Lessons of the War', Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10578.

[113] Andries Wessels, "A Rich and Rare Land": The Experience and Expression of Nationalism in Poetry Among Reluctant Colonists in Ireland, South Africa and Quebec' in *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies,*vol. 25, no.1/2 (1999) pp 352-371.

[114] Michael James Douma, 'Ethinic Identities in a Transnational Context: The Dutch American Reaction to the Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902', in *The South African Historical Journal* vol. 65, no. 4 (2013), pp 481-503.

[115] Bruce Nelson,' The Military Critique of the South African War 1899-1902',' in *History,* vol. 82, issue. 268 (October, 1997) pp 582-600.

movement which reaped the most benefit from it.[116]

Three Phases of the War: 'Cold blooded and selfish are the instigators of this war.'[117]

The following paragraphs examine Moore's actions as a loyal British officer, committed, adaptable and autonomous. The official histories give no indication of insurgency or dissent, focussing on records of his courage, independence and concern for those under his command. This makes his revelations in his letters to the press concerning British army tactics in regard to the capture of the Boer leaders and exposing the truth about the conflict in South Africa all the more surprising. Beginning with the official record it can be seen that the early stages of the war affirmed the joy in every nationalist breast with 'Black Week', in which the British suffered three humiliating defeats at the hands of the Boers, at Stormberg, Magersfontein and Colenso under the leadership of Sir Redvers Buller. Moore and the Connaught Rangers landed in Durban in October and were immediately catapulted into the third defeat for the army at Colenso as a part of General Hart's Irish Brigade.[118] The Irish soldiers who were disparaged at home before they left, were led to the banks of the Tugela in traditional formations in open ground leaving them completely exposed to Boer fire. Under these conditions Moore led a company of the Rangers into a kraal on a loop on the unnavigable Tugela River to protect them from the heavy Mauser fire from the Boer's who had an elevated and defensible position. *The Times*, recorded the brutality but not the futility of that action saying that 'the Dublins and the Connaughts advanced magnificently against the almost overwhelming fire, men falling at every step', as the casualties mounted up.[119] Moore and the Rangers were involved in Spion Kop, Vaal Kraantz, and the final stages of Buller's attempts to relieve the besieged Ladysmith, on the hill which was known variously as Harts or Iniskilling Hill.[120] It was Hart's Hill in the last stage of Buller's offensive at the Tugela Heights that they were, in John Redmond's words, to 'suffer so terribly.'[121] A Mayo newspaper carried a report of '12 days desperate fighting, in which the Dublin Fusiliers, Connaught Rangers and Inniskilling Fusiliers forming General Hart's Irish Brigade were almost decimated.' In parliament, John Redmond raised the issue of the risk the Irish troops were exposed to claiming

[116] Douglas Hyde, Memoir, Eoin MacNeill papers, UCD Archives, Ms. LAI/G/357.

[117] 'Lessons of the War', Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10,578.

[118] H.F.N. Jourdain and Edward Fraser, *Regimental History of the Connaught Ranger Vol 1* (Cork, 1924); Thomas Pakenham, *The Boer War* (New York 1979); Bill Nasson, *The Boer War: The Struggle For South Africa* (Cape Town, 2011).

[119] *The Times*, 17 January 1900.

[120] The relief of Ladysmith led to scenes of jubilation among the Dublin loyalists who flew the Union Jack at Trinity College, while the nationalists were subdued, according to *The Times* (London) 2 March 1900.

[121] *Hansard* 4 (Commons) vol. 787 .2, 7 February 1900, cols. 824-896.

120 wounded and killed against a figure of 56 for the English troops. Redmond made the point that these men were ' boys from Roscommon and Mayo and other counties, Catholic and Nationalist,'[122] The I.P.P. and the Irish press exhibited its usual ambivalence towards the Irish soldier in empire, applauding their exploits while they criticised imperial policy. They were, claimed de Nie 'quick to protest at perceived ill-treatment of soldiers in the mixture of 'regret and pride that characterised their rhetoric'. [123]

The leadership of Sir Redvers Buller, was replaced by that of Lord Frederick Roberts with Herbert Kitchener as his Chief of Staff, and the second phase of the war began with the capture of Pretoria and Johannesburg in the Transvaal and Bloemfontein in the Orange Free State, which led to the annexation of the Boer republics. The third phase of the war was implemented by Kitchener, who put Robert's 'scorched earth policy' into effect, denuding the veldt of crops and livestock and covering it with a grid of garrisoned blockhouses, heavily guarded railways, and then commenced a sweep of the veldt to flush out the remaining commandos. In the second phase, Moore was placed in support of the Flying Columns of Generals French, Mahon and Hamilton as they swept the veldt, from Kimberley, to the Transvaal through Johannesburg, Hiedelberg and Pr etoria and then North East to Balmoral. By December 1900 he was in Aliwal North in the north Eastern Cape Colony attempting to prevent the still active Boer commandos from entering the North Cape Colony where they might enlist the support of the Cape Afrikaners. Once again *The Times* recorded the movements of the Connaught Rangers who were 'now on the Orange River engaged in frustrating the Boers in their attempts to invade Cape Colony.' [124] In 1901, when he was in the Orange River Colony (Previously the Orange Free State), and Cape Colony, Moore formed and trained a mounted infantry giving the Rangers a more vital role in the war. These steps met with an initial resistance from General Hector MacDonald, the officer in command, when the idea was put to him, despite Roberts' requirement that a company of mounted infantry

was necessary in every battalion given the distances of the veldt and the speed and mobility of the Boer commandos. It was not unheard of to raise a mounted infantry on an ad hoc basis, its function usually confined to scouting duties, and not as a replacement for the cavalry. The Irish General, Sir Garnet Wolseley had trained a mounted infantry at Aldershot in the 1880s with a ten week course. Despite these precedents, Moore met with resistance and a refusal from the depot

[122] Ibid.:

[123] Michael de Nie, 'The Irish Imperial Soldiery 1882-85' in Timothy G. McMahon, Michael de Nie and Paul A. Townend, (eds.) *Ireland in an Imperial World: Citizenship, Opportunism and Subversion* (London, 2017), p. 135.
[124] *The Times,* 17 Jan. 1900.

to supply the necessary mounts.[125] Undeterred, he obtained horses from Aliwal, mostly runaways in poor condition and reconditioned them for use in the infantry. Kitchener was reluctant as always to show support for a scheme developed by an Irish regiment.

The war had taken a heavy toll on horses who broke down under inadequate diet, severe climactic conditions and the long distances of the veldt. Jourdain, who was one of the officers subordinate to Moore, kept diaries for the duration of the war, in one of them, he described the winding road at Burgersdorp which had pretty scenery with 'high drifts on either side' as being spoiled by the 'perpetual presence of dead horses'.[126] Moore trained 440 men in five mounted companies with reconditioned mounts by June 1901 ready for operation in the Cape Colony and Orange Free State. Moore founded the mounted infantry based on his belief that 'extreme slowness of movement has been one of our greatest failings' along with superior Boer tactics, and the 'anachronism of cavalry'.[127] Many of these difficulties he attributed to the poor leadership of the graduates of the Staff College. Leadership, according to Moore required a man of action 'possessed of brain and education'.[128] For eighteen months Moore commanded a partly mounted battalion in the Colony, engaged in the pursuit of the Boer commandos in the Aliwal Burghersdorp district.[129]

Encounters with Fouché

It was during this period that Moore came into contact with General Fouché, a symbolic figure to the Boers, due to his reputation for being one of the more elusive of the Boer leaders. He had successfully resisted capture and arrest for the duration of the war. This incident had an important symbolic value for the British and found inclusion in the official histories of the war as an incident in which Moore and the Rangers mounted a heroic resistance. Moore was ordered to Aliwal to intercept Fouché by following him into the hills at Aliwal North. On 12 July 1901, the Rangers were at Zuurvlakte with Fouché occupying a semi-circle of hills above them, giving him an advantage and the Rangers little cover from attack. *The Times* reported the incident as an 'a small column of Connaught Rangers under Major Moore, unsuccessfully attacked by superior forces under Fouché near Jamestown all day on 14 July', and recorded the casualties, as the loss of thirty

[125] Edward Spiers, *The Late Victorian Army* (Manchester, 1992), p. 66.

[126] H.F.N. Jourdain, War Diary, 20 June 1901, Templar Research Centre, National Army Museum Chelsea, Ms. 5603-10, no. 6; Stephen Badsey, 'The Boer War (1899-1902) and British Cavalry Doctrine: A Re-Evaluation' in *The Journal of Military History* , no. 71 (Jan., 2007), pp 75-94

[127] 'Lessons of the War' Moore papers, Ms. 10578.

[128] Ibid.

[129] Captain Harold Grant, *History of the War in South Africa 1899-1902* (London, 1912), p. 234.

one men.[130] On the same day the *Irish Times* carried a report on severe fighting at Zuurvlakte, twenty four miles from Aliwal North and asked why they heard of it only from casualty lists.[131] According to the official history, Moore, 'had shown the greatest resource, throughout a very critical action, scored the last point by relocating all the wounded by a ruse almost from the very midst of the Boer outposts'. Described by Conan Doyle as 'making a very determined resistance', Moore and the Rangers were congratulated by Colonel Haig and Generals Hart and French.[132] On 26 July almost two weeks later, Moore and Fouché were to meet again. Fouché had captured two of Moore's men and threatened to execute them on the basis that the British had executed Cape rebels and had taken to hanging burgers in the field. Moore replied that 'No burger had been hanged for fighting against the British', and that the Connaught Rangers had treated his people and the Dutch with courtesy and consideration and he expected the same in return. A further letter arrived from Fouché, in which according to Jourdain's diary, Fouché pointed out the danger that the executions would, 'bring about a strong racial hatred', and thanked Moore for his kindness to the injured Field Cornet Olivier who had died in the previous attack.[133]

The execution of Irish rebels by the British in 1916 fulfilled Fouché's prescient words. Both of these incidents found inclusion in Harold Grant's official history, Conan Doyle's account of the war, and the Rangers regimental history, confirming its valency at the time and Moore's effective leadership role, and the military spotlight that was thrown on the Rangers. There was some controversy over a third incident which was reported to the War Office and earned a remonstrance for Moore from the Secretary of State for War, St. John Broderick. Moore had submitted a report that two privates in the 1st Connaught Rangers were taken prisoner at Dordrecht on 16 November and Moore who was not named in the report, received a letter from Fouché stating that he had shot them.[134] Moore wired a corrective message to the General Officer Commanding lines of communication telling him that the men were shot and not captured and shot. The Secretary of State warned Moore to exercise greater caution in his reports of misconduct by the Boers, unless they were fully substantiated.[135] This public remonstrance was a little ironic considering

[130] *The Times*, 20 July 1901. The remains of three of the missing men were found accidentally in 1975, when a farmer uncovered their unmarked grave, containing three bodies and a small bottle with a note inside. The note identified the three men as I.M. Cryan, M. Cullen and B. Hegan or Hogan; all of the 1st battalion Connaught Rangers, 'killed in action on this spot on the 14th day of July 1901.' The remains were exhumed and interred in the Garden of Remembrance in Aliwal, North Eastern Cape Province. The note was sent to the South African National Military Museum in Johannesburg for preservation. Terry Reilly, *Dear Old Ballina*, (Ballina, 1993).

[131] *Irish Times*, 29 July 1901. The London *Times* recorded an attack on the Connaught Rangers under Major Moore, by superior forces led by Fouché, 20 July 1901.

[132] Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, *The Great Boer War* (London, 1902).

[133] *The Times*, 19 July, 1901, printed a report on death sentences of thirty four prisoners being commuted by Kitchener to penal servitude for life in Bermuda.

[134] *The Times*, 29 November 1901.

[135] *The Times*, 4 December 1901.

Kitchener's earlier orders to take no Boer prisoners and even more ironic when it is considered that Moore made these public, and yet he endured an accusation of unnecessary provocation. Moore's behaviour, his determined resistance, recovery of the wounded, care for the wounded Field Cornet, and the respectful and dignified exchange with Fouché that elicited the same in response, are all in keeping with the traditional ideals of gentlemanly warfare. The telling of the Zuurvlakte incident embodied all the markers that a British military identity liked to believe it possessed, dignity, courage and fairplay. For Moore it was important that the reputation of the Irish regiments remained untainted by the stories associated with the war, particularly in relation to the undisciplined behaviour of colonial troops.

Anti-Urban, Anti-Semitic, Anti-Capitalist and 'Boer Colonel'

Given his campaign and his promotion in the field for valour, it makes it all the more surprising that six months previously, a letter written by Moore opposing Kitchener's tactics and exposing the treatment of the civilian population in South Africa appeared in the British, Irish, and South African press to some controversy. The year preceding that revelation saw a report in the press that found its way to the House of Commons stating that an officer from a prominent Mayo family was on his way home to be court martialed because of his protest at the treatment accorded to the Irish regiments.[136] How did this exemplary officer, brave, committed, resourceful, and loyal to his regiment, both promoted and decorated, find himself in either of these situations? At least one of them can be attributed to his Irish identity, but can the other? In fact, Moore's activities during this war might have earned him the modern sobriquet of 'whistle blower'. it was to earn him the title of 'Boer Colonel'.[137] Before examining these unexpectedly insubordinate behaviours, it is helpful to look to his letters and articles for clues to the thinking that led him to take these actions, and give some indication to the internal conflicts that led Moore to behave in ways that can only be considered insubordinate.

His original comments on the reasons for the war, articulated his original anti-modernist, and anti-urban position. He was not exceptional among his fellow officers in objecting to the methods of warfare and the treatment of civilians. Keith Surridge identified an 'anti-urban, anti-capitalist, and anti-semitic' ethos among the English officers, attributing it to the land-owning background from which many of them hailed. For the most part they observed a public silence confining their

[136] *Mayo News*, 10 February 1900.

[137] P.J. Little, Bureau of Military History, W.S. 1769.

objections to diaries or letters home.[138] Surridge made a comprehensive survey of case studies based on the repository of Anglo-Boer war letters and diaries in the National Army Museum in Chelsea for his study of pro-Boer sentiment among an officer class.[139] Moore's letters and articles make it clear that he shared those anti-urban, anti-semitic, and anti-capitalist sentiments, and that they arose from class rather than ethnic or religious difference. Surridge located the dissent of the British officers within the social, economic and political transformations in English society that threatened a landed class. Moore's class had more pressing reasons to feel threatened, in the aftermath of the land wars in Ireland. In Britain an ascendant bourgeoisie created by capitalist industrialisation gave rise to an economic success denied to a class whose professional opportunities were limited to the law, military and the church.[140]

These anxieties at the erasure of traditional class codes, of 'honour, integrity and courage,' expressed themselves in disapproval of the conduct of the colonial corps, Jews, and the physical degeneracy of the British soldiers of urban origin in the ranks. Nevertheless, Moore's objections could be attributed to both his class and his Irish identity. He made comparisons between the Cromwellian despoliation of seventeenth century Ireland and the devastation of the African veldt, and he objected privately and publicly to the treatment of Irish regiments during the war. A more obscure comparison can be drawn between Moore's anxieties and those of the Dutch-Americans who, with scarcely any knowledge of their ethnic Boer cousins exhibited a strong sense of resistance to the 'spread of civilisation, progress and imperialism' across the globe, threatening ethnic distinctiveness as it did so.[141] Experiencing a threat to their own Dutch identity in terms of language and religion and the increasing possibility of assimilation into the culture of their adopted land, they clung to the Boer cause demonstrating a strong vein of anti-Englishness. Moore's Irishness identity can have little in common with that of the Dutch Americans but the threat to cultural identity represented by empire was a particularly global concern.

His military identity was based on his leadership of an Irish Catholic regiment manned by soldiers from the west coast, but it was embodied in a complex of loyalties. These are expressed in the recollections of Seamus MacManus, an old Sinn Féiner, who in recalling the Boer war, described Moore, as calling himself nationalist but favouring England, by recruiting the Connaught Militia regiment to fight the Boers. He 'nationalised' them, claimed MacManus by

[138] Keith Surridge, 'All You Soldiers are what we call Pro-Boer:' The Military Critique of the South African War 1899-1902,' in *History*, vol. 82, no. 268, (October, 1997), pp 582-600.

[139] Ibid.,

[140] Surridge, 'All You Soldiers are what we call Pro-Boer,' p. 585.

[141] Michael James Douma, 'Ethinic Identities in a Transnational Context: The Dutch American Reaction to the Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902', in *The South African Historical Journal* vol. 65, no. 4 (2013), pp 481-503.

'marching them behind green banners and singing rebel songs as they went forth...singing patriotic Irish songs like 'the wearing of the Green,' and 'The Boys from Wexford'. [142] This recollection caught the contradictions within Moore's identity as he 'greened', the Irish militia before they went to fight for empire. He also considered it his duty to maintain the Catholic identity of his regiment by providing spiritual as well as military leadership. He gave the Sunday Catholic service on board the Bavaria on the way to the Cape... and made it a rule that 'his boys' said the rosary every night.[143] He was, according to an old Boer war campaigner, 'beloved by all the men'. He recalled a pre-battle incident for the *Connaught Telegraph* in which Moore addressed the men before dawn to tell them what was expected of them in the coming battle, offering the rosary himself, and getting the men to make a solemn act of contrition, continuing 'many of them gallant lads found a resting place next day under the veldt'.[144] This report is at variance with Fransjohan's Pretorius's that the report of a British War artist claimed that he had never heard any reference to religion in the conversations of either officers or men.[145] There was a perception that there was a 'more easy going' relationship between the officers and men in an Irish regiment, and as the men showed an attachment to their religion, having an Catholic officer was more likely to reinforce a closer relationship between them.[146] Fransjohan Pretorius observed that in the guerrilla phase of the war, in the smaller more mobile patrols, the officers and the men had more contact and social differences became blurred. In circumstances in which everyone endured the same conditions of extreme heat and lying on the hard ground as a bed, leadership rested on the personal qualities of the officers. Those who were strict but just and were concerned with the needs and safety of their men were immensely popular.[147]

Moore was troubled at the lack of recognition for the sacrifice of the Irish regiments and at the 'haphazard manner in which troops have been thrown at almost invulnerable positions without due consideration, without orders or directions, without reasonable prospect of success.'[148] According to Joanna Burke, 'It was widely believed that the Irish were innately combative ... they were acknowledged to be braver than English soldiers, which was why military commanders used them as 'missile troops' they were said to be unsurpassed for courage and ... dash'. A number of the military engagements in this war appeared to bear out Burke's observation. Moore referred to

---

[142] Seamus MacManus, founder of the 'National Council,' otherwise known as Sinn Féin, Bureau of Military History, W.S 283

[143] *Connaught Telegraph*, 16 December 1922; 1 November 1899, H.F.N. Jourdain, Anglo-Boer War Diaries, Templer Research Centre, National Army Museum Chelsea, Ms. 5603-10.

[144] *Connaught Telegraph*, 16 December 1922.

[145] Fransjohan Pretorius,*The Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902* (Cape Town, 1985), pp 37..

[146] Thomas Bartlett and Keith Jeffery, 'An Irish Military Tradition?' in Thomas Bartlett and Keith Jeffrey (eds), *A Military History of Ireland*, (Cambridge, 1996), p.15.

[147] Pretorius,*The Anglo-Boer*, pp 36-37.

[148] 'Lessons of the War,' Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10578.

the fighting at Hart's or Inniskilling Hill during Bullers's attempt to gain control of the Tugela Height, as part of his strategy to relieve the besieged Ladysmith. Moore wrote of acts of conspicuous gallantry by the Irish Brigade in carrying out an offensive that cost many of them their lives. 'Many a Victoria Cross has been granted for less merit, but these have pass un-noticed. Had they been Highlanders or officers of the staff, their pictures would have appeared in every illustrated paper'. [149] His resentment was articulated by John Redmond, the leader of the Irish Parliamentary party who praised the 'record of the heroism of the Irish lads from Mayo and Roscommon who have suffered so terribly in this war', and went on to point out that the press correspondents had paid tributes to the gallantry of Irish regiments while the official reports from the army's commanding officers made no mention of them.[150] A scrutiny of the national identities of those awarded Victoria Crosses in the official histories of the war, bears out Moore's observations. Out of the 75 that were awarded between 1899-1902, the Gordon Highlanders took 6, the Royal Scots Fusiliers,1, the Highland Light Infantry 2, While the Cameron Highlanders, Kings Own Scottish Borderers, and 2nd Scottish Horse took 1 apiece. Only one Victoria Cross was awarded to an Irish Regiment, the Royal Irish Regiment. [151]

Moore's dissent appears to have filtered back to Britain and Ireland. The 10 February 1900 edition of the *Mayo News* printed the rumour that a Major from a distinguished Mayo family was on his way home to be court martialled for 'remonstrating with a superior officer as to the manner in which Irish regiments were unduly exposed to danger during the war'. Moore's name was not mentioned, but there were only three majors in the Connaught Rangers and only one of these was from Mayo. A further article six days later described a refutation made by Wyndham in the House of Commons, of a claim made by Tim Healy of the Irish Parliamentary Party, that a letter had been sent by a Connaught Ranger to the War Office claiming that their major was to be 'court martialed' for remonstrating against the unnecessary exposure of his men. No further proof exists to substantiate this report but a scrutiny of the parliamentary debates of the Commons sitting of 5 February 1900 reveal the details of Tim Healy's exchange with Wyndham, the Under-secretary for War. Healy interrogated Wyndham about this supposed letter and asked 'if there was any truth to this allegation and what is the name of this gallant officer?'[152] The rumour, truthful or not, gave the Irish Parliamentary Party some fodder with which to bait the government over the Boer War. Wyndham disclaimed any knowledge of such a letter, if there was some truth to the story the court martialing of an Irish officer for the defence of his troops would have provided invaluable

[149] Ibid.

[150] *Hansard* 4 (Commons) vol. 787.2 7 February 1900, cols. 824-896.

[151] Captain Harold Grant, *History of the War*

[152] *Hansard* 4 (Commons) 5 February 1900, vol. 178, cols. 562-584.

propaganda for the nationalists, and further negative publicity for the army. If Moore had made such a protest, and it appears likely given the objections he expressed in his papers for this period, that he did, it must have occurred in response to the battle at Colenso in one of the early and devastating defeats of the British army, in which the Irish Brigade suffered heavy losses. That it had little effect is borne out by the carnage that followed at Harts Hill in the attempt to relieve Ladysmith. The eventual relief of Ladysmith brought recognition of the bravery of the Irish soldiers in South Africa. To honour their sacrifice, Queen Victoria formed a new regiment of Irish Guards and officially sanctioned the wearing of shamrock on St Patricks Day by all Irish regiments.[153]

A Letter from the Front: A British Officer's Revelations

As we have seen, Moore's disaffection was not confined to the treatment of the Irish troops. It was to find a considerably more controversial outlet during the third phase of the war, when Kitchener implemented the 'scorched earth' policies of Lord Roberts. Kitchener imposed a grid of manned blockhouses across to the veldt and embarked on a systematic destruction of farmlands and houses in order to prevent the still active commandos from finding shelter and support. Women and children, and Black Africans were rounded up and placed in concentration camps which were inadequately managed and rife with disease and distress, causing such a high death rate that Boer society was threatened with destruction. A similarly ruthless policy was adopted in regard to the capture of leading Boer commandos by giving orders to army officers that they were to take no prisoners in the pursuit of Christian de Wet. Moore witnessed Kitchener giving these orders and noted that they prompted no form of protest from the senior officers present. 'What their opinions were, I do not know, but I heard no word of condemnation'.[154] Moore wrote to his novelist brother George Moore in London, exposing Kitchener's policies. George Moore brought the letter to W.T. Stead, who had published earlier letters from Moore in his pro-Boer broadsheets. With Stead's refusal to publish without knowing the identity of the officer who had written them, George Moore took the mail boat to Dublin where he dictated the letter to the editor of the *Freeman's Journal*, who published it on 1 January 1900. Causing an uproar, it was taken up by *The Times* and the *Cape South African News*, causing reverberations throughout Britain, Ireland and South Africa. The article headings were guaranteed to cause controversy; *No Quarter - A Letter From the Front - A British Officers Revelations - Orders From Lord Kitchener against taking prisoners - The Rule is the Despoiling of Boer's Farms - A Boer Farmer and the Word of the English - The British in Cape Colony.*

[153] David Fitzpatrick, 'Militarism in Ireland, 1900-1921,' in Bartlett and Jeffrey (eds), *A Military History of Ireland.*

[154] *Hansard* 4 (Commons) 5 February 1900, vol. 178, cols. 562-584.

The letter revealed Kitchener's shoot to kill policy and the lack of protest from senior officers, and exposed instances of dishonourable behaviour towards vulnerable and trusting Boers. During the time that Moore spent in the Aliwal district he had close contact with the farmers and questioned them about their opinions of the English. These 'old and respectable Dutchmen', explained their reactions to the army policy which instead of forcing them to surrender actually inflamed Boer resistance. An elderly farmer who had lost his stock despite the possession of a protection order issued by Roberts found that it had lost its relevance under Kitchener's command. The farmer told Moore that he had relied on the 'good faith of the English government' and concluded that there was 'no such thing as honour among the English'. The appearance of older Boers in British courts where they took oaths that they barely understood, reinforced this statement and leads to inevitable judicial comparisons with Ireland. The values on which empire maintained itself, and the rationalisations given for the war in South Africa were undermined by these flagrant miscarriages of justice.

Charles Dilke, the Liberal M.P., articulated this position when he said that the 'power of English laws and English principles of government is not merely an English question-its contrivance is essential to the freedom of mankind'. This weighty aspiration of Dilke's lost authority on the British treatment of the Boers. The publicity generated by this letter was to have far reaching consequences in Cape Colony where Kitchener had the editors of *The South African Times* and the Cape publication, *Ons Lands,* Edward Cartwright and F.S Malan, imprisoned for publishing the letter. De Wet, who inspired Kitchener's policies, read the letter in The *South African Times*, and was inclined to take its contents seriously. Moore's revelations stimulated a sensitive liberal conscience and its accompanying Christian humanitarianism back in Britain. *Blackwood's Magazine* raised a clamour in order to identify the 'officer in the field', and Lord Roberts mounted an enquiry, but little came of the incident. Once again it was more politically sage to give the incident as low a profile as possible. Moore was aware of the risk of exposure as the author of the letter. He referred to the consequences suffered by W.Burdett Coutts M.P. when he exposed the conditions of the field hospital in Bloemfontein. Coutts, who was no novice reporter, having been sent by the *London Times* to the Russo-Turkish war, wrote about the harsh conditions endured by hundreds of soldiers in the 'later stages of typhoid with only a blanket and a waterproof sheet between their aching limbs and the ground…no milk, hardly any medicine, no beds, sheets, mattress or pillows…and lying on the freezing ground'.[155] Coutt's article caused a

[155] Captain Harold Grant, *Official History of the War* p. 524.

sensation leading to the formation of a Royal Commission in 1900 to investigate the matter. Moore wrote that

> …no man wishes to face the furious invective that has been poured on Mr Burdett Coutts. Money and labour and influence from all the high places would be used for all they are worth to prove him a liar and libel and persecution are all the rewards he can ever hope to receive.[156]

The letter was to achieve some political consequence twenty one years later when Moore went to South Africa as Irish envoy and made his identity known to the Afrikaner government that was in place by then. Moore claimed that he nearly fainted when he saw the letter in print, yet he had a further article published a few months later in April 1901, in the Catholic publication *The Tablet*, revealing the existence of the concentration camps, which prompted his brother George to write in response, 'all that you write is noble, a noble soul ... even in those few lines, and at the end I felt proud that you were my brother'.[157]

Gender and Race in Empire: 'Former Conventions, Customs of Civilized War, Respect for Women, Tenderness for Children...'[158]

The herding and confinement of the women and children into the camps also occasioned protest from Moore. He wrote that 'degrading the wives and daughters of the Boers is surely a barbarity that no European nation except the Turks would be guilty of.'[159] This strongly worded comment arose from the treatment of the Boer women and children in the camps. He was outraged and conscience stricken at his own involvement and it was this series of events that most engaged his active opposition to the tactics employed by Kitchener. The letter to the press was not just inspired by his horror at Kitchener's decision to shoot Boer prisoners. In 1900, a year before his

[156] Moore Paper, Ms. 10, 578.
[157] George Moore's letters to his brother, Maurice Moore, 1887-1907 vol. 1, George Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 2646.
[158] 'Lessons of the War,' Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10578.
[159] 'One of the Greatest Calamities...' Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10,578. Moore was referring to the slaughter of Armenians by the Ottoman Empire in 1894-1896 in which no distinctions were made in regard to age or gender. It was condemned internationally as a humanitarian outrage.

letters to the press, Moore had been stationed in Pienaarspoort some fifteen miles east of Pretoria in a relatively settled district. His commanding officer considered it his duty to protect the women and children under his care preventing the looting of their farms, by 'Jews and adventurers', who left the women to starve after they had sold the produce of their farms for their own profit.[160] Twelve miles from Moore's camp a group of women and children who had been removed from their farms were left in a small church with insufficient supplies and it was not long before they were starving, but Moore was forbidden to supply them. In the same year, Lieutenant Jourdain, the officer under Moore's command, described a 'piteous' scene at a spruit (stream) on the Caledon river of the

> Boer women in open wagons, being drenched, with crying children all around them...it was one of many ghastly nights I had to spend through the absolute incompetence of a man, who to his shame, was called a British officer. One of the Boer women was dying in one of the wagons, but no notice was taken of her.[161]

Moore responded by preventing, wherever possible, the incarceration of the women and children under his control by not officially accounting for their missing menfolk who were on commando, the principal cause for imprisonment of the remaining family, and an attempt to control the commandos through the women. To his embarrassment the women would often proudly confirm that their menfolk were at war, but he would pretend not to understand.[162] He was never called to account for his behaviour, but as Pretorius noted in regard to the burning of homesteads, 'the execution of such orders, whether with aggression or with reluctance, varied from one patrol to the next'.[163] His concern for the women was heightened by stories of attacks made upon them by

[160] According to Diana Cammack there was a perspective that Russian Jews sold illicit alcohol to the Black population. With the onset of war the Johannesburg Jews decided not form a military unit, but an ambulance corps. Diana Cammack, *The Rand at War 1899-1902: The Witwatersrand & the Anglo-Boer War* (London, 1990), pp 56-64.

[161] 21. March 1900, War Diary, H.F.N. Jourdain, Templer Research Centre, National Army Museum Chelsea, Ms. 5603-10. No. 5.

[162] P.J. Little, W.S. 1769.

[163] Pretorius, *The Anglo-Boer War*, p. 38.

the black population, who took the opportunity to regain their former lands, often looting and confiscating livestock as they did so.[164]

There was anxiety among white males at the exposure of white women to the 'passions and lust of the natives,' stories were told of a woman found with her hands tied behind her back, 'left half dead from ill treatment' while another escaped from her home which had been occupied by former servants and was found 'without clothing', as Moore reticently put it, 'in the bed of a stream'.[165] The Smuts papers carried similar details on a march in the district of Potchefstroom in the Transvaal in which the 'kaffirs' removed the women's clothing. Racial anxieties were expressed in the details of these attacks, but as Moore affirmed sexual favours were exchanged in concentration camps as a result of necessity, the women having limited resources with which to negotiate.[166] Gender and race intersected in Moore's reports of the suffering endured by the women in this war at the hands of both white and black men, in an attempt to influence the Boer men to accept defeat. Both the British and the Boer men were willing to accept the 'hypersexuality', of the Black races which were believed to have contributed to these attacks. It also obscured the perception that the Boers were not protecting the women, while the British were actually ill-treating them

Conclusion: 'A Festering Grievance ...'[167]

It can be seen that Moore's experience of the war existed in two narratives, one of military dedication, duty and loyalty, while the other nationalist narrative spoke of subversion, insubordination, and lack of commitment to the imperial project of subduing the Boers.(It has to be said that he took some responsibility for both narratives in the articles he donated to the Irish Archives before his death, and in his presidency of a committee formed in 1903 to oversee the writing and publication of a history of the Connaught Rangers.) Can it be laid at the feet of some 'incorrigible' Irishness? Did he look at empire, as Casement claimed to do, with the eyes of a hunted race?[168] His anger at the lack of recognition for the Irish regiments and what he perceived as their use as 'missile' troops did not necessarily have its origin in nationalism's antagonisms, but in military pride in the Irish identity of a regiment within empire. His disaffection also originated

[164] Stanley Trapido, 'Landlord and Tenant in a Colonial Economy: The Transvaal 1880-1910,' in *Journal of Southern African Studies*, vol. 5, no. 1 Special Issue on Themes in Agrarian History and Society (Oct., 1978), pp. 26-58.

[165] 'One of the Greatest Calamities... 'Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10578.

[166] Lorimer quotes Catherine Hall on 'racial dominance as an expression of masculine virtue,' Douglas A. Lorimer, 'Race, Science and Culture: Historical Continuities and Discontinuities, 1850-1914' in Shearer West (ed.), *The Victorians and Race* (Hants., 1996), p. 28.

[167] Letter from Augustine Birrell to Sir Matthew Nathan. 8 February 1915. Nathan Papers, Bodleian Library, Ms. 449.

[168] Margaret O'Callaghan, 'With the Eyes of Another Race, of a People Once Hunted Themselves: Casement, Colonialism and a Remembered Past.' in Mary E. Daly (ed.), *Roger Casement and World History*, (Dublin, 2005), p. 49. Also see Séamas Ó Síocháin, 'Casement's Vision of Freedom' passim.

in his elite background as it shared many of the markers of the dissent of his fellow English officers at the threats offered to their position by industrialisation, capitalism and modernity. As Surridge pointed out, 'when the war broke out in South Africa, many officers carried their intellectual and cultural baggage with them and found congenial circumstances in which to develop them.'[169] It was the *cri de coeur* of the traditionalist, and not the nationalist that lay at the heart of much of Moore's thought during these few years. Since the discovery of gold at Witwatersrand, South Africa offered a unique amphitheatre for a series of issues that would dominate later twentieth century thinking. Moore's exposure of the concentration camps for example, prompted an enquiry which gained a great deal of publicity placing a global focus on the inhumane treatment of women, children and Black Africans during the war. The series of events that accompanied these disclosures of human rights abuses, the revelations in the press, which led to an official inspection in the person of Emily Hobhouse, the public outrage which followed, prompting the government to take action, occurred not just on the basis of domestic pressures but moral internationalism, setting a precedent for later expressions of global humanitarian action.[170]

Roger Casement followed a similar course a few years later with his 1903 report on the colonial abuses in the Congo.[171] In this situation Britain was the moral arbiter acting within a humanitarian precedent set in the earlier anti-slavery movement and the imperial injunction to take care of the needs of indigenous peoples. Despite Britain's actions in defence of indigenous peoples it was the imperial expansion, and industrial capitalism which characterised South Africa in the later years of the nineteenth century which intensified racial tensions that had their ideological basis in an earlier period. The prejudice against Jews, for example, which was once based on religious differences became a racial difference.[172] Anti-Jewish prejudice in South Africa owed something to the Jewish presence in the mining industries. An influx of Jewish immigrants from Russia and Europe intensified these tensions, it was thought that the Jews were selling alcohol to Black Africans, which raised the hackles of the mine owners, and fed into the perceptions that caused Moore to make a series of anti-semitic remarks. He continued to perpetuate the imperial discourse on race that maintained white superiority on the basis of a civilising project. South Africa, according to Moore, was a place where scattered white families were,' living in the midst 'of a

[169] Surridge, 'All You Soldiers are what we call Pro-Boer,' p. 587.

[170] Anne Orford, 'Moral Internationalism and the Responsibility to Protect,' in *The European Journal of International Law,* vol. 24, no. 1 (2013) pp 83-108

[171] Anthony Bradley, 'Hearts of Darkness: Conrad, Casement and the Congo,' in *Ariel: A Review of International Literature,* vol. 34, nos. 2-3 (2003), pp 197-214.

[172] Helen Scott, 'Capitalist Modernity and the Origins of Racism,' in Crystal Bartolovich and Neil Lazarus, *Marxism, Modernity and Post-Colonial Studies,* (Cambridge, 2007), p.174.

vast and barbarous negro population, kept within the bounds of semi-civilised conduct only by stern laws and constant watchfulness.'[173] The Black population was as invisible to Moore as it was to other prominent Irish nationalists, Davitt for example, despite the brief and partial identifications with Black Nationalism in 1879.[174]

His observations on gender were based on his belief that the 'sex instinct was the basis of decency', and he observed the late Victorian separate spheres ideology that divided the sexes into the men whose ... masculine stability of purpose that governs the world and the feminine grace and sympathy that adorns it'.[175] This ideological basis for understanding gender roles came under severe attack in South Africa where normal social and cultural rules were abandoned in the near starvation of the women and children, and pushed Moore as it did many of his fellow officers into protest. The death tolls of the camps signified the near destruction of the Boer nation, and may have contributed to some of Moore's opposition to armed resistance to empire in his later nationalist career. Moore wrote a further and final critique of the war, written two years after his return home and subjected to the scrutiny of army command.

The terms of this article are at variance with those he wrote while on campaign. His wartime articles were framed within the rhetoric of humanitarian outrage and a sense of the betrayal of military values. In this report Moore identified with 'our policy', on South Africa while he criticised it on the basis of its ineffectiveness with regard to imperial interests, by pointing out the huge bill that the empire picked up for the reconstruction of South Africa. This language was consistent with the 'instrumental rationality' that Hyslop identified as a 'core value' of the professional army.[176] Moore pointed out that in disregard of army practice the civilian population and property had not been treated with respect during the war. The concentration camps had been badly managed with 'consequent mortalities' in which 'thousands of children died', which provoked 'adverse reaction all over the world,' and the 'furious resentment of the Boer women', leaving the British open to international opprobrium.[177] Moore laid the responsibility for much of Boer resistance to the behaviour of the colonial corps which deflected some of his criticism of the professional army. The behaviour of the Colonial Corps lent itself readily to such imperial scapegoating. This opinion was diplomatically and opportunistically echoed by the officer of the

[173] 'One of the Greatest Calamities,' Ms. 10,578.

[174] Bruce Nelson, *Irish Nationalists and the Making of the Irish Race,* (Princeton, 2012), p.123.

[175] Three copy books with an article on George Moore, Moore papers, NLI, MS. 10,565.

[176] Jonathan Hyslop, 'The Invention of the Concentration Camps :Cuba, Southern Africa and the Philippines, 1892-1907' in *Southern African Historical Journal,* vol. 63, no. 2 (2011), p. 1000, cited in Elizabeth Van Heyningen, 'The South African War as Humanitarian Crisis' in *International Review of the Red Cross,* vol. 97 (2015), pp 999-1028.

[177] 'Personal Experience and Private Opinions,' 2 December 1904, Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10,578.

Ninth division in Belfast, who signed off Moore's article adding an addendum that stated that while Moore's views may not have been shared by his commanders, he agreed that the behaviour of the colonials, many of whom needlessly damaged property and farm lands, alienated public opinion. It has been observed in this chapter that many of Moore's ideas were commonplace for his class and time, with some variations as a result of an elite Irish cultural sensibility, but this does not make them less interesting. Michael Hunter observed that a 'mediocre intellect', (clearly Moore was not a mediocre thinker, but he was reflective of his age and class) was often as interesting as an original one. Such an intellect provided a more reliable conduit for the ideological hegemonies of a particular age, which an original mind might be more resistant to, and therefore less representative of that age.[178] An ideological confluence met in Moore making his opinions a valuable insight into the particular identity of his age, class and religion. This article laid the basis for many such articles to come, as he encoded moral argument in practical, rational and legal terms.

His return to Ireland in 1902 after the signing of the Vereeniging Peace Treaty on 31 May 1902, which signified the Boers defeat and negotiation of terms, illuminated the subtle social and cultural currents that maintained the relationship between landlord and tenants. They were manifested in two articles in the *Ballinrobe Chronicle* on 31 July 1902. The first announced that Moore was on his way home and that his health had suffered under the constant strain, and he had been advised to take leave to recover. The second described his arrival when he was met at Claremorris railway station in a traditional display of support by the tenantry and escorted back to Moore Hall in a procession accompanied by music, torchlight and bonfires, affirming the ties that still existed between a rural tenantry and the landed elite.[179]

Moore's experience in the second Anglo-Boer war left him in an ambiguous situation on his return. Officially one of the British soldiers sent out to 'murder' the Boers, his experience served to alienate him from the army he served in and later helped to secure a position for him in the nationalist movement. Later with the founding of a new state, his service in the Boer War gave him a particularly ambiguous position as a politician and a Senator in the new state, serving to undermine him at critical moments. Jennifer Ridden's contention that settler and indigenous elites pursued policies that ensured the maintenance of their leadership... 'in strategies of collaboration and resistance', has a unique application in Moore's case.[180] Ridden might have emphasised the

[178] Stefan Collini, Michael Biddess, David Hollinger, Quentin Skinner, J.G. Pocock, Bruce Kuklick, Michael Hunter, 'What is Intellectual History,' in *History Today*, vol. 35, issue 10 (1985), ref. from Michael Hunter 5603-10. No. 5.

h[179] *The Ballinrobe Chronicle*, 11 September 1902.

[180] Ibid., p.302.

ambiguous perceptions of such strategies. On an examination of the social structures of the Boers which had been threatened by the British before the war and almost destroyed by its effects, it can be seen that, the devastation and near genocide of the Boer or Afrikaner nation as they came to identify themselves became fused with 'ideological forms from agrarian society' which continued to persist and were subsumed into the Afrikaner identity and government in a way the Irish dominant elites were not. This was partly due to the pragmatism of Lord Selborne, who facilitated the South African Union in 1910 and consolidated relationships with Boer notables which in turn facilitated industrialisation. [181] The reputation that Moore acquired in the war, as a Boer sympathiser would have an effect on his relationship to Irish republicanism in 1921 when these networks and associations were reactivated as Ireland continued to find some resonance with the South African experience in terms of exchange and practical assistance that affected the course of Irish independence.

This argument returns to Jackson's analogy on the Irish in empire, as simultaneously mine and bulwark, Casement is an obvious example of the truth of this statement. Although historiography does not agree on his formation of a systematic anti-imperial analysis.[182] Moore, however, was a more subtly cloaked collaborative and resistant figure at this time, although his letters to the press acted as an incendiary device. This chapter has focused on the complex factors on which Moore's resistance was founded. Some of these factors were identified by McConnel and Keogh within the loyalty and later individualistic nationalism of the elite Catholic Esmonde family, which had a complex family tradition of Whiggish patriotism, as well as a gentlemanly ideal of duty, service and honour that did not necessarily object to empire, merely to Ireland's exclusion from its benefits.[183] Moore's conflicts lay in the challenge offered to this nationalism by Kitchener's ruthlessness. The festering grievance identified by Birrell at a later date had its roots in the disregard shown to the Irish troops as the Highlanders won the honours despite the gestures made by Queen Victoria and what he perceived as his lack of advancement in the military on the basis of his Irish Catholic identity. In addition, he belonged to a class threatened like the Boers with dispossession, signified in the year after his return in the introduction of the 1903 Wyndham Act which facilitated the buying out of the landlords on favourable terms. This identification raises questions in relation to comparisons between and Irish and a colonial elite which are not fully answered in this thesis merely explored through Moore's experience, leaving more to be

[181] Stanley Trapido, 'Landlord and Tenant in a Colonial Economy: The Transvaal 1880-1910,' in *Journal of Southern African Studies*, vol. 5, no. 1 Special Issue on Themes in Agrarian History and Society (October, 1978), pp 26-58.

[182] Margaret O'Callaghan, 'With the Eyes of Another Race, of a People Once Hunted Themselves: Casement, Colonialism and a Remembered Past.' ; Andrew Porter, 'Sir Roger Casement and the International Humanitarian Movement,' in *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, vol. 29, no 2 (2001), pp 59-74

[183] Richard Keogh, and James McConnel, 'The Esmonde family of Co. Wexford and Catholic Loyalty,' in Oliver P. Rafferty, (ed.), *Irish Catholic Identities* (Manchester, 2013), p. 275-284.

explained. As Ridden pointed out absorption into the nationalist movement was a possible means of preserving those traditional class relationships that were being threatened by industrialisation and capitalism. Furthermore, 'many of the social and cultural factors that shaped the relationship between elites and nationalist groups were common to both European and colonial contexts.'[184]

Moore's ambivalence can be seen in a letter he wrote to the *Western People* in response to a request from the Ballinrobe Board of Guardian's query to local landlords regarding their willingness to sell. The response was mixed, many declined to reply, while most replied in the negative, apart from the owner of Tower Hill, Moore's neighbour, and kinsman, M.C.J. Blake who had already discussed terms of sale with his tenants. In Moore's reply, which he made on behalf of his absent brother, he expressed both of their support for the Land Purchase Bill and hoped that it might improve relationships between landlords and tenants. Despite this expression of support, Moore advised waiting. He said that the prospect of a 'union of all classes in this country, which seemed so near at hand and which would have made any national demand quite irresistible, seems to be rapidly disappearing and may not occur again in the present generation. The responsibility lies with those who urge the tenants to make impossible demands and abuse owners who will not sacrifice their property.'[185] The mention of a union is not an appeal to democracy, rather Moore saw a combining of interests while maintaining class difference. The Boer war made Moore see that change was afoot, and a newly peripheralised landed class, which was almost destroyed by Britain in South Africa might suffer the same fate in Ireland. Moore's strategies gradually underwent a change and the following years would see his nationalism politicised although he had to wait until the formation of the Irish Volunteers in 1913 for this to come to pass. A final word on Moore's reactions to the second Anglo-Boer war; Wessels concluded that Irish support for the Boers was at 'one remove,' as a 'displaced struggle', which served as material for nationalist rhetoric and propaganda even among the combatants.[186] The records Moore kept of his experience show that his witness and complicity in the suffering of the Boer nation was deeply felt and moved him to take action both to alleviate it and to challenge British imperial authority.

[184] Jennifer Ridden, 'Making Good Citizens: National Identity, Religion and Liberalism Among the Irish Elite, c 1800-1850' PhD Thesis, King's College, University of London, 1998, p. 307.

[185] *Western People,* 28 November 1903.

[186]Andries Wessels, 'The Rhetoric of Conflict and Conflict as Rhetoric: Ireland and the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902),' in *Literator,* vol. 20, no. 3 (November, 1999), p. 173.

CHAPTER THREE: 'A NEW ERA WAS AT HAND'...THE MARTIAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL YEARS FROM 1912-1918.

The previous chapter looked at Moore's military service in South Africa and at the gradual transition, but not outright rejection, of his military and imperial loyalties. What was it in the intervening years between his return from South Africa in 1902 to his assumption of a role in the martial and constitutional nationalist movements in the period from 1913 to 1918 that either prepared or provoked him into aligning himself publicly and politically with the nationalist movement?

As late as 1904 he wrote a formal report on his experience of the war in South Africa, dwelling on the ill treatment of the Boer civilians, the destruction of the veldt and the poor behaviour of the colonial troops. Although the report indicated the measure of Moore's dissent from the military, it did not prevent him from fulfilling the terms of his military service and retiring on a pension to the family estate in Mayo, where he acted as a local landlord. Nor did it stand in the way of the formation of a historical research committee by Moore, Jourdain and Captain W.S. Sarsefield in Mullingar in 1903 for the purposes of collecting material, photographs, documents, books, medals, official records, and information not in official records, in order to write a regimental history of the Connaught Rangers.[1] Moore was the President of this committee, and oversaw both the methods of collection and the variety of the material drawn from the previously mentioned sources. The history was intended, according to Jourdain, who became its author, as being something more enduring and

> …better than monuments of stone and bronze to the future generations, the history will hand down to future generations to come the glorious tradition of the Rangers from the early days down to the disbandment in 1922.[2]

It was also characteristic of Moore's desire to leave a paper trail for the future, chronicling his own activities in the military and in the nationalist movement. Part of this desire was predicated on his resentment that Irish regiments were not honoured in the manner of the Scots Highland

[1] H.F.N. Jourdain and Edward Fraser, *The Connaught Rangers Vol. 111* (first published London, 1928, Cork, 1999), p, 573.
[2] Ibid., p. 577

regiments. He felt that the performance of the Irish regiments at Inniskilling Hill were deserving of the Victoria Cross, althought none had been forthcoming. In the words of Sir William Butler .

> The men who build the big house of Empire for England usually get the attic or the underground storey in it for their own lodgement.[3]

The observations of both Moore and Butler throw a great deal of light on the ambiguity of the Irish military experience in the latter days of the British Empire.

On his retirement, Moore acquired a public profile locally, with mention in the press for his trusteeship and contribution to the Mayo Feis, and his organisation of classes in Irish language and history. In later years he made a national impact with his contribution to the campaign for Irish as a matriculation subject for university entrance. These activities marked him out as an elite figure with a keen interest in Irish culture, which was not surprising for one of his nationalist family background, although his military career as one of the defenders of empire somewhat undermined his nationalist persona. In the event of the promised passage of the Home Rule bill in 1912, Moore may well have sought a role as a minor functionary in the new administration as a result of his work for cultural nationalism, and the reputation of his family. The events that followed on the attempted enactment of the bill caused a national crisis, as Ulster mounted an armed resistance. The crisis was temporarily averted by the declaration of war two years later which meant that the bill failed to be enacted.

In 1913, as a result of the nationalist resistance to these events, Moore emerged from his retirement and a three year sojourn in Brussels, during which time he was working on a biography of his father. He was to embark on a second career as an activist for Irish nationalism which would cause him to move between several contexts, some of them apparently contradictory, as he threw himself into the cause of Irish independence, which for Moore, during this period, lay within imperial citizenship.

---

[3] W.F. Butler, *Sir William Butler: An Autobiography* p. 348.

This chapter will examine the development of Moore's nationalist convictions which led him by degrees, to adopt a more radical stance in 1918 than the one he began with in 1913. This will be done in four sections within a loosely chronological framework, due to the overlapping nature of some of his activities in both temporal and ideological terms. The martial and constitutional movements active within this period were not regarded by Moore as being in opposition to each other and he was involved in both at the same time, at one point becoming a member of Sinn Féin, without abandoning his interests in either of the former, testifying to the fluid nature of nationalist movements at this time. In addition, Moore's background and experience gave him ready access to a number of social and political contexts not available to more prominent and controversial Irish nationalist figures. In order to examine these contexts, the chapter will begin by looking at Moore's work for the language and cultural movement in order to discern the nature of his interest as an elite figure. Was it that of the cultural dilettante, or did it have, unlike Douglas Hyde's plans for the Gaelic League, a distinctly political impetus? It will be seen that Moore, a keen advocate for Irish, was interested in the socially unifying inclusivity of a shared national language. However, his understanding of that shared identity was moderated by a resistance to change that threatened traditional social relationships. The phenomenon of elite involvement in nationalist projects was hardly novel. The Swedish speaking elite in Finland aligned themselves comfortably with the aims of Finnish nationalism, hoping to create a unity between the elite and the peasant class that would ward off the threat of socialism.[4]

The martial movement expressed by the formation of a volunteer force in order to counter the Ulster Volunteers founded in 1912, provides the second context, as Moore became the inspector-general of the Volunteers, responsible for much of their organisation and training. While the history of the Volunteers is well known and historiographically documented, this chapter will examine Moore's intentions for what was essentially an Irish army, which diverged considerably from those of the IRB-influenced Volunteer leadership. The military crisis of WW1, the eroding influence of the Irish Parliamentary Party, Moore's vain attempts to obtain a wartime command, and his ambivalent relationship with the Dublin Castle administration, are all considered in this section which reveals Moore's status as both an insider and outsider, and consequently not quite available for assimilation to any of the conflicting interests.

The third context explores the impact of the constitutional movement that laboured during the same period to find solutions to the conflicting reactions prompted by the demand for Irish

[4] Comparisons were made between Ireland and Finland during the debates on home rule in the 1880s. Richard Mc Mahon and Andrew G. Newby, 'Introduction-Ireland and Finland, 1860-1930: Comparative and Transnational Histories' in *Irish Historical Studies* vol. 41, no. 160 (2017), p. 174.

independence. It is in his work for this movement that Moore's political thought is most obviously revealed, as he explored and developed federal and dominion schemes for a solution to the Irish Question, allowing it to be regarded on a wider geographical and political stage as papers were prepared for the scrutiny of dominion leaders at the Imperial War Conference in 1917. Moore's experience in South Africa and his keen interest in the factors leading to its unification within empire influenced the solutions he formulated for Irish independence. The South African Convention in 1908-9 had played a vital role in the road to unification, and it was envisaged that a similar policy might be effective in the Irish case. These 'comparisons of Afrikaner and Irish nationalisms were commonplace in the first decades of the twentieth century' according to Guelke.[5] Consequently, the political lobbying of the constitutional movement led to an Irish convention being called by Lloyd George, also in 1917, which would eventually falter under the threat of wartime conscription and the rise of Sinn Féin in 1918. Moore's social, military and political networks allowed him access to an increasingly influential South African leadership, as the imperial core depended on dominion manpower for the war effort. The fourth section of this chapter looks at this development from Moore's point of view, as his political rhetoric altered from one that was mainly conciliatory, willing to accept imperial solutions, to a more forceful opinion which rejected the parliamentary party and called for Ireland's case to be scrutinised at the 1919 Peace Conference along with the other nations calling for self-determination.

These four sections define the process whereby the ex-military figure of Moore became disillusioned and radicalised by his treatment at the hands of the Irish Parliamentary party, the War Office, and the British government, and his ultimate disappointment at the failure of the 1917 Irish Convention, which sounded a death knell for the interests of his class. Moore's attempts to retain the influence of that class by proclaiming his loyalty to Sinn Féin mirrored similar attempts by a landlord class threatened globally by the First World War, who made concerted attempts to retain both influence and privilege

> It was not difficult for a person like myself who had known something of Fenianism in my youth, who had seen the rise of Butt, the progress of the Land League, and who had taken part in the movement for co-operation

[5] Adrian. Guelke, 'Ireland and South Africa: A very Special Relationship' in *Irish Studies in International Affairs,* vol. II (2000), pp 137-146.

> and the language to perceive that a new era was at hand.[6]

So said Moore in his serialised account of the history of the volunteer years in 1938. From a global perspective these years from 1912 to 1919 reveal the sweeping away of an *ancien régime*, even if Arno J. Mayer has made a good case for its persistence.[7] The disintegration of empires into nationalisms, began with the Balkan war in 1912-13, and the Greek, Serbian and Bulgarian secession from the Ottoman Empire.[8] Post WW1, the Austro-Hungarian, Russian and German empires were to follow suit. A New Democratic order affirmed itself in Europe as a result of nineteenth century middle class demands for reform and constitutional government.[9] Poland, the Baltic States and Czechoslovakia developed democracies enshrined by laws that made provision for social and political life. Hannah Arendt defined the period from 1913-18 as the end of imperialism placing the birth of the twentieth century in 1914.[10] In truth imperialism did not end quite so neatly, rather it mutated into what John Darwin defined as the third British Empire constructed on the 'Dominion Idea'.[11] According to Darwin, the years between 1917 and 1926 were a 'dynamic phase,' for imperial politics as imperial authority mutated into 'cohesion based on dominion status', in order to maintain its influence and events in Ireland during this period were reflective of this process as much as they were of war and revolution.[12] The years from 1912 to 1926 were both disruptive and transformative, not just in Ireland but throughout Europe and its colonial possessions. When the war that began in 1914 ended in 1918, the Poles were no longer ruled by the Germans, Warsaw was no longer a part of the Tsarist Empire and Trieste no longer belonged to the Hapsburgs, but Ireland remained under British rule.[13]

Activism, Language, Tradition

On his retirement from the army in 1906, four years after his return from South Africa, he and his family moved back into the family home in Mayo. From here he took up his former interests

---

[6] Maurice Moore, 'History of the Irish Volunteers' *The Irish Press,* 13 January, 1938.

[7] Arno J. Mayer, *The Persistence of the Old Regime: Europe to the Great War* (New York, 1981).

[8] Mark Mazower *Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century* (London, 1998), p. 52.

[9] Ibid., p.4.

[10] Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (London, 1967), p. 123.

[11] John Darwin, 'A Third British Empire? The Dominion Idea in Imperial Politics' in Judith M. Brown and W.M Louis (eds), *The Oxford History of the British Empire: The Twentieth Century* (Oxford, 1999), p. 64.

[12] John Darwin, 'A Third British Empire?' p. 66.

[13] Mark Mazower *Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century* (London, 1998), p. 7.

in agricultural reform and the promotion of the language movement. A 1906 article in the *Connaught Telegraph* announced his 'long and brilliant career ... in three continents,' and claimed that he had refused a generalship 'with its tempting emoluments'. It went on to say that Moore with his ' genial presence and his sterling qualities as an Irish resident gentleman', was needed not just at Moore Hall but throughout Mayo.[14] Moore was generally regarded by those who knew him as a 'plain kindly man and very good company', who was popular with most classes.[15] He fulfilled the *Telegraph's* aspirations by serving on the county committee of the Gaelic League and committing his opinions to the public sphere in a large number of articles to the local and national press.[16] Moore showed his support for the Gaelic League project by becoming an agitator for matriculation in Irish for university entrance and was happy to harness a cultural nationalist identity to a future state. An article in the Irish issue of the *British Medical Journal*, mentioned the support of public bodies for the 'crusade' to establish Irish for university matriculation and credited Moore as one of the 'most emphatic letter writers' in this regard. According to Moore

> We want, and we are determined to get, a university for Irishmen above all things, and for the Irish language. If the new university is not that, whether it is Catholic or Protestant, it is not for us, it is for the foreigner, and these demands are made not by any clique or league but by the Irish people.[17]

That Moore was prepared to politicise the issue was evident in a 1910 article he submitted to the *Connaught Telegraph* on the survival of the Irish language. This took the form of a dialogue between his brother George and the Bohemian Count Lützow, historian, critic, language revivalist and supporter of Bohemian independence from the Austro-Hungarian Empire.[18] By the first half of the nineteenth century Czech cultural nationalism was one of the largest of such movements in

[14] *Connaught Telegraph,* 23 June 1906.

[15] Geraldine Dillon 'Irish Republican Brotherhood' in *University Review,* vol. 2, no. 9 (1960), pp 23-36.

[16] *Connaught Telegraph,* 20 January 1906.

[17] *The British Medical Journal* (Ireland), vol. 1, no. 2506. (January, 1909), p. 116.

[18] *The Connaught Telegraph,* 17 May 1910. Count František Lützow 1849-1916 was a Bohemian historian, critic and language revivalist, active in politics, he was a supporter of Bohemian independence from the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

the Habsburg Empire.[19] The count attributed the success of the revival of Bohemian to making it a political issue. However, Moore's objections to anglicised education are worth a closer examination. A 1903 letter from Moore to the editor of the *Freeman's Journal* is revelatory of his resistance to modernity, as a 'cultural sensibility', or perhaps more accurately, resistance to an educational process that threatened to disrupt class relations.[20] He voiced his objections in a long battle with the board of education over evening classes in Irish language and history at Moore Hall. Moore had given a room at Moore Hall for this purpose, supplying heat and light and procuring a teacher. Such was their success that he started eight more schools in the area with a total of seven hundred pupils, three of which were located in Balla, Balluntubber and Clogher. Despite the popularity and attendance at the classes, the board of education would not sanction his efforts or pay the teachers on the basis that the schools did not observe the board's curriculum which emphasised literacy skills. Moore attacked the board for turning, 'the quickest and most intelligent people in Europe into the most helpless and the most useless'. He claimed that fifty years before, rural Ireland could boast of capable 'intelligent masons, carpenters and workmen of all sorts who could be trusted to do any ordinary skilled work thoroughly and solidly', with great artistic skill. He described the room in which he was writing as decorated by oak carved by local craftsmen, who were no longer to be found, and praised the skills of previous craftsmen who had decorated the interior of Dublin houses, many of whom were illiterate but they 'were educated far beyond the aptest scholar in any Irish school today'.

Moore located the causes of this loss in an education system which emphasised the teaching of English in the schools in order that the people might read and write in English. These trades, according to Moore were sacrificed for literacy. He brought up the example of a boatmaker he had known in Athlone, skilled, intelligent and understanding, but illiterate, while his son who was educated, could write, add up and read the daily papers, was a very bad boatbuilder. He was intelligent, 'in his way,' but had 'no thoughts of his own, and no skills'.[21] MacDonagh has remarked on similar tendencies in Yeats and Hyde to reject modernity in favour of the 'Peasant's elemental nobility, stoicism and realism ... which were to be preserved against the threat of materialism and mass values'.[22] The fact that Moore was writing in the year of the Wyndham Act is significant as it heralded the steady erosion of landlord power. Moore, like his father before him, believed in the non-sectarian, constitutional, political solutions of paternal landlordism to effect economic reforms that would lead to separate government, but not destabilisation of the

[19] John Hutchinson, 'Cultural Nationalism and Moral Regeneration' in John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith (eds), *Nationalism* (Oxford, 2015), Reprinted 2012 p.125.

[20] Tony Ballantyne, 'Empires, Modernisation and Modernities' *International Journal for History, Culture and Modernity*, vol.2, no. 1 (2014), p.25.

[21] Moore's letter to the editor, *Freeman's Journal*, 4 February 1903.

[22] Oliver MacDonagh, *Ireland:The Union and its Aftermath* (Dublin, 1977), p.78.

existing social order.[23] Petrusewicz identified similar patterns in parallel studies of Polish, Irish and Sicilian reforming landlordism from 1820 to 1870.[24] Moore still believed that it was possible for the 'landlords to lead the people,' but the political and social climate had changed with the transfers in landownership that established peasant proprietorship. Despite what looks like a retrogressive attitude with regard to comprehensive education, Moore took a keen interest in the economics and politics of small nations and Finland's success in the 1870s with a sawmill industry that created a rural capitalist class, showed the potential of rural industry. (In Finland's case the social problems caused by inequality between the rural classes led to civil war in 1917-18.[25]) Moore attempted such an initiative with his scheme for an egg industry, but the infrastructural supports that might have made it successful did not exist. Moore's plans for further agricultural development came to an end over a serious quarrel with his brother George. The brothers' formerly amiable relationship had deteriorated with the years and foundered over the question of religion. George abandoned Catholicism for Anglicanism and threatened to disinherit his nephews if they did not do the same. Moore, who despite being firm in his Catholicism, was not sectarian, being married to the Protestant Evelyn Handcock, was largely untroubled by doctrinal matters, but could not agree to his brother's terms. He left Moore Hall initially for Bruges and then Brussels, where after consultation with Pearse, he put his younger son Toby, into the Jesuit school.[26] During this time much of Moore Hall estate had been sold to the Congested Districts Board.The years in Brussels were spent working on the biography of his father he had begun so many years before and he published it in 1913, the year that he entered public life, it was also the year that Belgium had a general strike led by the Belgian Workers Party in pursuit of electoral reform.[27] Based in Europe during a time of growing democratisation and increasing enfranchisement, nationalism and militarism, Moore could not have been unaware of a wave of social unrest that mirrored the events occurring in Ireland at the same time.

He spent the years from 1911 to 1913 working on his biography of his father. He consulted regularly with his novelist brother George, despite their recent quarrels, over the form the work

[23] Tony Ballantyne, 'Empires, Modernisation and Modernities', p. 2; George Moore, *Hail and Farewell*, (ed.), Richard Cave (Buckinghamshire, 1911), p. 25.

[24] Marta Petrusewicz, 'The Modernization of the European Periphery: Ireland, Poland, and the Two Sicilies, 1820-1870: Parallel and Connected, Distinct and Comparable' in Deborah Cohen and Maura O'Connor (eds), *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective* (New York and London), pp 145-146.

[25] Bill Kissane, *Explaining Irish Democracy*, (Dublin, 2002), p.71; Barrington Moore, *The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World* (Harmondsworth, 1996); Jonathan M. Wiener, 'The Barrington Moore Thesis and its Critics'*Theory and Society*, vol.2, issue. 1 (January, 1975), pp 301-330. Richard McMahon and Andrew G. Newby, 'Introduction-Ireland and Finalnd, 1860-1939: Comparative and Transnational Histories' in *Irish Historical Studies*, vol. 41, no. 160 (2017), pp 166-179.

[26] Séamas O'Buachalla, (ed.), *The Letters of P.H. Pearse* (Garrard Cross, 1980), p. 245; Daithí Ó Corráin, 'A Most Public Spirited and Unselfish Man': The Career and Contribution of Colonel Maurice Moore, 1854-1939' *Studia Hibernica*, no. 40 (2014), p. 21.

[27] Correspondence between George and Maurice Moore, 1908-13, George Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 2647.

might take and the material that was worthy of inclusion. Moore intended a study of his father's career while George favoured a narrative expunged of political history and emphasising his father's colourful personal life. The two brothers met frequently in either Brussels or London in order to discuss the work. Moore offered George, Rory's room at the 36 Rue de Balli initially and then at 169 Rue Washington.[28] These meetings generally culminated in dispute as they could not agree on a common approach to their father's life. On the whole George had been supportive of his brother, he thought that the Home Rule question 'may create the demand for historical work making a biography of their parliamentarian father a relevant endeavour[29]. Moore experienced structural difficulties with his project causing his brother to write an exasperated letter saying '…biography and history do not mix and you propose to separate them'? [30] George advised Maurice to drop the parliamentary history, remove the historical documents, truncate the correspondence between their father and Archbishop MacHale, giving their father's opinions instead and including his correspondence with their mother, which Moore wanted to suppress and concentrate on the life, telling him that he preferred history to character, but Moore insisted on concentrating on the history. They argued over the proposed length of the study, structure and chronology, Moore felt that he could run to 160,000 words and two volumes, wishing to write something of political relevance. It is clear from the exchanges between the brothers that Moore intended a serious historical study of their father's political career based on original documents and voluminous political correspondence written in a Carlyean style that made George Henry Moore a significant figure in Irish nationalist history.

He proposed his father as the precursor of Charles Stewart Parnell in his advocacy of a policy of parliamentary opposition, and also as a land reformer and Repealer.[31] The reviews that followed the publication of the biography were generally positive and most of them admitted to a previous lack of focus on this period in Irish history, as it was eclipsed by the Parnell years, which had thrown George Henry Moore's remarkable career into obscurity.[32] Moore found several aspects of his father's career significant in relation to current politics and was not slow to utilise these comparisons whenever the opportunity presented itself. In 1861, in response to Italian nationalism, his father had proposed a national volunteer force of 'free citizenry', which might absorb the Fenian movement under elite control and combine constitutionalism and physical force

[28] George Moore to Maurice Moore, 29.8 1912, George Moore papers, Ms. 2647

[29] George Moore to Maurice Moore, 6 July 1912, George Moore papers, Ms. 2647

[30] Ibid.

[31] *Connaught Telegraph* 20 May 1899. As early as 1899, Moore wrote an article disputing Charles Gavan Duffy's claims for the origins of the policy of 'independent opposition'. Moore asserted that the policy had its origins in the 1846 when his father, George Henry Moore, who was not then in parliament was involved in a countrywide campaign to unite all the Irish Parties, 'Tory and Liberal, Catholic and Protestant, Landlord and Tenant'.

[32] Moore kept a scrapbook of book reviews, Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 8,489/6.

nationalism in what was potentially, a standing army.[33] George Henry had pointed out the perseverance, sacrifice, and lack of corruption among the Italian conspiracy that had penetrated their entire social system, which was in marked contrast to his own experience of the Irish politicians during the mid-nineteenth century days of the Tenant League. He also suggested a governing body of councils that would communicate with 'Irishmen in America, (and) Australia ... not for the purposes of sedition but in furthering the general objects of the organisation.'[34] This proposal was not dissimilar to de Valera's later work in establishing republican associations throughout the dominions in order to marshal support for Irish self-determination. It is not difficult to see why Moore reacted with immediate enthusiasm to a proposal made in 1913 for a force of Irish Volunteers and almost 60, he threw himself into a controversial and active role in Irish public life.

In 1913, a year described by Nicholas Mansergh as one of 'manoeuvre', which preceded the year of the proposed enactment of Home Rule in 1914, and the declaration of war in August of the same year, Ireland was subject to the social and political upheaval that was being experienced elsewhere in Europe.[35] The Irish Transport and General Workers Union's dispute with the employers, led first to a strike and then to a lockout, remembered as the 'Great-Lockout' for the punitive measures taken by the employers in September 1913. James Connolly and ex-British army officer Captain Jack White organised a Citizen's Army to protect the striking workers from police attack.[36] The country was simultaneously divided on the question of Home Rule which was resisted by the Ulster Unionists whose resistance became a parliamentary weapon by which the Conservative Party, by supporting Ulster could block Home Rule altogether. However, the declaration of war in August suspended its operation.[37] Prior to the introduction of the bill, an Ulster Covenant was drawn up by Edward Carson, and signed by almost half a million Ulster Unionists to demonstrate Ulster's antipathy to Home Rule and its fears of cultural assimilation and threats to religious freedom if it should take place. In order to demonstrate this resistance to the passing of the Third Home Rule Bill in 1912 the Ulster Unionists had formed a force of volunteers, armed and trained by veteran British officers, and determined to resist by arms, if necessary, any coercion to accept a Home Rule bill whose terms conferred self-government, no matter how restricted. As the Ulster force gathered numbers, drilled and armed itself, it was regarded with some alarm by the nationalists as a threat not just to Home Rule but to civil order.

[33] *The Irish Review,* vol. 4, no. 38 (April 1914), pp 93-103.

[34] Maurice Moore, *George Henry Moore: An Irish Gentleman* (London, 1913), pp 276-279.

[35] Nicholas Mansergh, *Nationalism and Independence: Selected Irish Papers,* Diana Mansergh (ed.), (Cork, 1977), p. 28.

[36] Leo Keohane, *Captain Jack White: Imperialism, Anarchism and the Irish Citizen Army,* (Dublin, 2014).

[37] Nicholas Mansergh, *The Irish Question 1840-1921* (London, 1965), p. 205.

The historian and Gaelic Leaguer, Eoin MacNeill was persuaded by The O'Rahilly to write an article for *An Claidheamh Soluis,* the organ of the Gaelic League as a response to the Ulster movement. This article, entitled 'The North Began', encouraged the formation of a national force committed to Home Rule and, with the persuasion of Ulster Quaker and IRB man Bulmer Hobson, it emerged under the leadership of Eoin MacNeill.[38] The Volunteer identity was defined as non-sectarian and inclusive of all the political and religious affiliations within the nation. The ranks of this citizen army would be open 'to all able-bodied Irishmen without distinction of creed, politics or social grade'.[39] Moore, who had been staying in his London club, noticed the article in the *Freeman's Journal* announcing the formation of a volunteer force with an initial meeting in the Rotunda on 13 November 1913. He later recalled that 'without hesitation or consultation I wired my adherence to the movement'. He left a few days later, meeting Roger Casement in London before they both left with the same intent. Both were former functionaries of empire, both harboured similar nationalist ideals and both of them determined to sign up to a potentially subversive organisation as they prepared for a public leadership role in Irish nationalist politics.[40]

You can take it from me that the Irish people ardently desire to see the Irish gentry ... declaring themselves to the service of their country.'[41]

Yet the facility with which he describes his immediate affiliation to the Irish Volunteers belies some of the facts of his previous career. Moore was a high ranking ex-officer with thirty years of imperial service behind him, who retired with honours as the commander-in-chief of his regiment. He had had a distinguished if controversial career, the details of which were not at that time in the public domain. Despite his faultless service in the second Anglo-Boer war, in which he was decorated and finally promoted, he had demonstrated another, almost insubordinate character in his dealings with the Boer civilians. Potentially, he was a dangerous man to head an Irish paramilitary organisation. Moreover, as Chief-Secretary Augustine Birrell was to remark, he was an 'old soldier with a military grievance festering'.[42] In fact Moore harboured several grievances towards army authority, not just the weight of his anger at the treatment of civilians in South Africa, but for the way in which the Irish regiments were sent out to be slaughtered in the same war. His failure to achieve promotion over a long period also rankled with him. Moore's service records are unobtainable so it is difficult to know if the army authority harboured a similarly

[38] Eoin MacNeill, *An Claidheamh Soluis,* I November 1913; 'Manifesto of Irish Volunteers, 25 November 1913' in F.X. Martin (ed.), *The Irish Volunteers 1913 - 1916,* p.104.

[39] Owen Mc Gee, *Arthur Griffith* (Kildare, 2015), p.105.

[40] Brian Inglis, *Roger Casement* (London, 1973), p. 251.

[41] John Redmond, *Freeman's Journal,* 31 March 1911; James McConnel, *The Irish Parliamentary Party and the Third Home Rule Crisis* (Dublin, 2013), p. 235.

[42] Letter from Birrell to Nathan, 8 February 1915, Sir Matthew Nathan papers, Bodleian Library, Oxford, Ms. 449 63 fol.117.

ambivalent attitude towards him. His secretary in the volunteers, Diarmuid Coffey, remarked on his reputation for going his own way, to the admiration of his fellow officers, but not perhaps that of his superiors.[43] It distinguished him from that other ex-army office, Colonel Cotter who served as Chief-of Staff of the Volunteers. Diarmuid Coffey who became Moore's secretary in 1914 observed the temperamental differences between the two that made it difficult for them to work together. Moore's complete indifference to forms and regulations, precedents or red tape sat uneasily with Cotter's 'reverence for procedure'. [44]

As an ex-army officer he was regarded with suspicion in many quarters. In 1914, in a meeting in the Shelbourne hotel with George F.H. Berkeley, a training officer with the Volunteers from an ascendancy background, he confided that he felt he was not first choice as commanding officer. 'I, myself, he said half joking, do not always feel as if I were the most popular candidate.'[45] He was not alone in that opinion, according to ex-Volunteer Thomas MacCarthy, the 'Liberty Hall people were deadly antagonistic to Colonel Moore'.[46] His receipt of an English army pension while he held the leadership of a rebel organisation made many a Volunteer feel uncomfortable. When he was questioned on the pension, he made no apology or excuse and said that he had earned it, but it did not make him feel that 'he was bound in loyalty to England'. It was a question along with his wartime experiences in South Africa that was to dog his nationalist career, reappearing at inopportune moments to demand an explanation. Berkeley pointed out his status as the son of one of the best known Irish landlords, a leading sportsman who had given up his previous life to dedicate himself to his famine stricken peasants. He also observed that Moore 'was of a type,' which he knew among the Catholic families in Ireland ... ' of rather aquiline features and a military moustache, now greying; and I felt at once that he was easy to talk to'.[47] Berkeley's observations identified some now indefinable difference in the Catholic landlord class that distinguished it from its Protestant peers and the Catholic bourgeoisie, which may have been an additional alienating factor in the volunteer organisation

Moreover, Moore was no hothead; his service in colonial warfare made him cautious of promoting armed conflict. His nationalism was essentially pragmatic and not idealistic. He shared this characteristic with Eoin MacNeill with whom he enjoyed a long friendship dating from their days in the Gaelic League. MacNeill felt that Pearse allowed himself to be carried away with the

[43] Diamuid Coffey, Bureau of Military History, W.S.1248.

[44] Coffey, W.S. 1248.

[45] George F.H. Berkeley, Bureau of Military History, W.S 994.

[46] Thomas McCarthy, Bureau of Military History, W.S. 307.

[47] Ibid.

ideal of heroism in the Cuchulain model which he promoted to his pupils in St Enda's, many of whom were drawn to heroic sacrifice in the Rising and in the war in Europe. According to MacNeill, the dangers inherent in this way of thinking is that it encouraged youth not to see their country in terms of service, but as a 'stage upon which they might expect to play a part in the drama of heroism.' The 'Nation...became disembodied in ardent minds and became reduced to a mystical abstraction.'[48] Moore's second son Toby, who had been a pupil at St Enda's, had evidently absorbed Pearse's rhetoric of heroism, joined up and perished in St Émilie in 1918, at the age of 22.

Moore's role in the organisation was nominally as the inspector-general, but as a member of the early provisional committee and the later governing body along with Casement, Hobson and MacNeill, he formed the official leadership. According to Coffey, the 'general Volunteer policy was in Moore's hands and he had considerable influence on the governing committee[49]. As Denis Gwynn was to point out a later date, the choice of Moore as military organiser received little interrogation, but Moore was anxious to take the role and there was no other suitable choice at that time. The British military command held an equally ambivalent view of Moore's leadership. According to General Neville MaCready's memoirs, the military command saw Moore's involvement in the volunteers as a threat. MaCready noted that the ' ... activities of the Volunteers increased (May 1914) under the guidance of two ex-officers of the regular army, Colonel M. Moore and Captain White, 'I reported to the government that the presence of these men was a greater menace than that of the U.V.F'.'[50] MaCready was to display a considerable animus against Moore whom he regarded as betraying his uniform, while White had already been involved in the training of the Citizen Army. White's membership of the Volunteers was short lived, to Moore's relief: after an amiable introduction, Moore considered White egocentric and unstable. [51]

However, a number of prominent ascendancy figures were involved at this juncture, more than fifty names are listed in a copybook in Moore's papers of ex-army and other ascendancy figures who were willing to act as inspectors of the Volunteers, including some of the aristocracy, such as Viscount Gormanstown and Lord Fingal.[52] An ascendancy primacy was maintained in the office with Moore as the inspector-general, Erskine Childers as his assistant with his wife Molly and his cousin Robert Barton in attendance. Alice Stopford Green was the propagandist, the

[48] Eoin MacNeill memoirs, MacNeill paper UCD Archives, Ms. LAI/G371.

[49] Coffey, W.S. 1248.

[50] comment in a letter to Moore. Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10,560/7.

[51] Moore Papers, Ms.10,555

[52] Moore Papers, Ms.9707.

previously mentioned Diarmuid Coffey, one of Foster's revolutionary generation, and future secretary of the 1917 Convention joined as Moore's secretary.[53] Captain Fitzroy Hemphill who was related to Moore through his mother's family, the Blakes, provided him with accommodation and transport. Major James Crean who was in charge of the Dublin area was to eventually take over from Moore by 1916. This ascendancy cadre was completed by Colonel Cotter, who, as a retired army engineer, technically outranked Moore, much to Moore's annoyance, and found himself largely excluded from the decision making.[54] This organisational nationalist elite belied what Bulmer Hobson claimed as a formidably subversive core. The provisional committee decided upon, on 11 September 1913, represented what would eventually become divisive elements, with Eoin MacNeill as its head and Moore as military commander. He was also a member of the governing body which gave him a dual authority in the organisation.[55] According to a 12 August 1914 entry in Elsie Henry's Dublin wartime diaries, the organisation of the Volunteers office in Dawson Street was very chaotic with too many people involved in the organising.[56]

The rapid expansion of numbers was an organisational headache for the governing body, who, constrained by a lack of adequate funding, formed the recruits into companies, battalions and brigades with few resources which left them chronically short of uniforms, equipment, and most importantly, arms.[57] The instructors were, like Moore, veterans of the South African war and regarded with awe by the men, according to Denis Gwynn, ex-volunteer and the son of party member Stephen.[58] Some of them were ex-Connaught Rangers and veterans of South Africa, India and Egypt, and all accustomed to drill.[59] The rapid increase of volunteer numbers caused the Irish Parliamentary Party, which had been dismissive initially, to become anxious to assert its authority. With the consent of MacNeill, and as a member of the governing body, Moore went to London to negotiate with John Redmond, John Dillon, Joseph Devlin and T.P. O'Connor of the Party

[53] Roy Foster, *Vivid Faces: The Revolutionary Generation in Ireland 1890 - 1923* (London, 2014), p. 203.

[54] Bulmer Hobson, Bureau of Military History, W.S 50 ; Eoin MacNeill's Memoir, MacNeill papers, UCD Archives, MS.LAI/G/371)

[55] Bulmer Hobson, Piaras Béaslaí, Con Colbert, Éamonn Ceannt, Michael Lonergan, Seán MacDermott, Peadar Macken, Éamonn Martin, Liam Mellows, Séamus O'Connor, and Pádraig Ó Riain, all of whom were members of the Irish Republican Brotherhood. Eoin MacNeill, Roger Casement, Seán Fitzgibbon, Liam Gogán, John Gore, Tom and Laurence Kettle, James Lenehan, Thomas MacDonagh, Maurice Moore, Colm Ó Lochlainn, The O'Rahilly, Peter O'Reilly, Pádraig Pearse, Joseph Plunkett, George Walsh, and Peadar White were non IRB but of assorted (and radical)political loyalties. Moore, Gore, and both Kettless were members of the United Irish League.

[56] Elsie Henry, *The World Upturning: Elsie Henry's' Irish War Time Diaries, 1913-1919*, Clara Cullen (ed.), (Dublin, 2013), p. 53. Elsie Henry 1881-1956, was a niece of the historian and nationalist Alice Stopford Green. She was married to Augustine Henry 1857-1930, the Professor of Forestry at the Royal College of Science for Ireland. Augustine and Elsie set up home in Dublin in 1913 and she kept diaries of from then until 1919. Their Dublin home was a social centre for many prominent Irish nationalists during this period, many of them were friends of Augustine Henry.

[57] Diarmuid Coffey, Bureau of Military History, W.S. 248.

[58] Denis Gwynn, 'Now and Then' in *Cork Examiner* 6 January 1960.

[59] National Volunteer list of instructors, Moore Papers, NLI, Ms. 9707.

leadership. The Irish Parliamentary Party, which Foster described as a 'curious blend of Trollopian fixers, political journalists, respectable ex-Fenians and closet imperialists', welcomed him cautiously as he explained the objectives of the Volunteers and made the case for their acceptance as a Territorial Army under the terms of the 1907 Territorial and Reserve Forces Act.[60]

Moore's vision for the Volunteers as a loyal territorial army sufficiently strong to influence the course of Irish legislative independence as a similar volunteer force did in 1782, diverged considerably from those held by the more subversive elements in the Volunteers, or indeed from the Irish Party who resented any attempts to usurp their authority, and were unlikely to endorse the 'creation of a nationalist militia,' at a critical time for Home Rule.[61] The military authority had already witnessed a breach in the chain of command with the Curragh Mutiny in March 1914 when a group of officers under the leadership of Hubert de la Poer Gough threatened to resign rather than take up arms against Ulster Loyalists.[62] Moore's meeting with the party resulted in the imposition of twenty five party members to the Volunteer executive. Bulmer Hobson, Roger Casement, Eoin MacNeill and Moore, all four representing the Volunteer leadership at this point, met at Buswell's Hotel in Dublin on 15 June 1914 to discuss this development. All four were resistant to Redmond's interference, Moore was particularly reluctant, but eventually agreed to co-operate.[63]

A month later it became clear the leadership of the Volunteers was undermined by independent factions working within it. There was, in Coffey's words a 'sharp and bitter division on the Volunteer committee, despite an 'outward seeming amity and unity'.[64] Coffey owed this perception to Moore, who kept him informed of what was going on behind the scenes. In July 1914, a month before the British declaration of war, arms were landed at Howth. Orchestrated and financed by a more revolutionary element in the Volunteers which included Roger Casement and Alice Stopford Green, the gun -running was carried out by Erskine Childers, his wife Molly and Mary Spring Rice, the nationalist daughter of the moderate Unionist Lord Monteagle. Moore, who had stayed in the same hotel as Childers and Casement before the landing was not included in the scheme or informed of it.[65] When he found out he was critical, not of the landing but of the antiquity and limited use of the weaponry. He considered the arms 'old fashioned…not

[60] Roy Foster, *Paddy and Mr Punch: Connections in Irish and English History* (London, 1993), p. 27.

[61] James McConnel, *The Irish Parliamentary Party and the Home Rule Crisis* (Dublin, 2013), p. 278.

[62] Sir James Fergusson, *The Curragh Incident* (London, 1964), p.63.

[63] Bulmer Hobson, Bureau of Military History, W.S. 50.

[64] Coffey, W.S. 1248.

[65] F.X. Martin, *The Howth Gun Running 1914* (Dublin, 1964), pp 4-9.

reliable…200 yards range…not much more accurate than the old Brown Bess of Peninsular days'.[66] An attempt by him the following year to buy arms in London was blocked by the National Committee, and a second attempt to procure arms in Belgium was similarly blocked. Moore had planned on buying up to date Mausers abandoned by the Germans on the battlefield and then in the possession of the Russians, but found that his expert military opinion was ignored for that of 'journalists and economists, who failed consistently to buy either up to date weaponry or weaponry in sufficient numbers.'[67]

Moore thought to overcome these problems by getting the War Office to train and arm the Volunteers for home defence. Alert to the value of the Volunteers as conscripts, General Paget hatched a scheme in consultation with Moore to drill battalions of the Volunteers in batches over twelve week periods and to equip, arm and train them at government expense. This was rejected by both the Volunteer committee and the Irish Party, which showed itself amenable to an amended scheme which would have assured Irish authority. However, the Volunteers feared conscription if there was any military authority, and Kitchener was reluctant to train and arm Irish soldiers under Irish leadership.[68] According to MacNeill, who with Moore, was invited to discuss the scheme with Colonels Webb and Williams, Moore did not appear to see any manipulative or coercive forces at work in the proposal. Meetings were arranged with the Irish Parliamentary Party leaders, Redmond, Dillon, and Devlin as well as J.D. Nugent, Laurence Kettle, J. Creed Meredith of the Redmond committee, who assembled to meet General Bryan Mahon, at the Gresham Hotel. Mahon was the new leader of the Irish military command, a Galway man and Moore's friend from their days in South Africa.[69] Moore greeted Mahon jovially, apparently unaware, according to MacNeill, who subsequently had more cause than most to be sensitive to a lack of knowledge of events, of any risk or threat.[70] MacNeill described Moore as the first intermediary in the War Office scheme, which he referred to as 'Moore's Plan', but when he realised 'the feeling of restlessness,' generated by the scheme he went 'specially to London to warn Redmond against launching out on any proposal or policy involving enlistment of the Volunteers as an imperial war force'.[71] He prevailed upon Willie Redmond, Redmond's brother to speak to him, and was advised by Willie to write to Redmond, but the letter and the warning went unseen as Redmond travelled to Wicklow. Moore attempted to see him at his home in

[66] Moore Papers, Ms. 10,566
[67] Moore, 'A History of the Volunteers' in *Irish Press*, 15 February 1938.

[68] Eoin MacNeill's memoirs. MacNeill papers, UCD Archives, Ms. LAI/G/371.

[69] During the second Anglo-Boer war at Maribogo Pan the Connaught Rangers were joined by the Mafeking Relief column with Lieutenant-General Bryan Mahon at its head. Moore and several other Galway officers joined Mahon for a moonlight dinner and in the absence of alcohol they toasted Galway in tea. H.F.N. Jourdain, *Ranging Memories* (Oxford, 1934), p. 105.

[70] MacNeill Memoirs, Ms. LAI/G/371.

[71] Ibid.

Wicklow, but failed to do so in time.[72] In an emotional speech in the Commons Redmond had already pledged the Volunteers to home defence with the outbreak of war in August.

In September at a speech at Woodenbridge in Wicklow he called on them to enlist. Woodenbridge made visible the divide between patriotic imperialism and radical Irish nationalism in the breakaway of the radical section of the Volunteers to form their force which continued to be known as the Irish Volunteers. According to Niall Whelehan, WW1 was the 'catalyst' for Irish revolution with the war providing the key context for the 1916 Rising, and a post-war opportunity for the demands of Irish self-determination to be heard.[73] For the Volunteers, war presented a threat and an opportunity. The flouting of Redmond's authority in this critical period in British wartime politics gave a clear indication of trouble ahead.

Moore decided to accept Redmond's authority over the Volunteers and those who stayed were renamed as the National Volunteers while the smaller radical faction remained the Irish Volunteers. Moore justified his decision by stating that 'all thoughtful men will acknowledge that the Irish Volunteers must come under the control of the Irish Government once it is established and this being so, what is the nearest approach we can now find for such an authority? … those who are the representatives of Ireland, must wield the armed force of the country'. According to Moore, 'civil government and an independent army cannot exist together in any country'. His father's plan for a volunteer force of free citizenry incorporating the Fenian movement was within his grasp, however in the intervening years the IRB/Fenian organisation saw itself as the only possible leadership. If there had ever been a chance that Moore would take a more radical role or command an independent Irish army it had slipped away, and he found himself on the side of the conservatives, the Home Rulers, and the patriotic imperialists.[74] His stated policy had always been that of being judiciously non-partisan, a link between the 'extremists, the parliamentarians and the Unionists'.[75] It is unclear how much he knew of the subversive activities of an 'inner ring' in the Volunteers, 'determined to carry out secret plans outside the official knowledge of the committee,' but he confessed that he knew of an arms landing in August 1914 that had ended up in Count Plunkett's house and chose to turn a blind eye.[76] When he complained to the O'Rahilly of obstruction he was asked why he didn't join them. According to Moore, if he had done so he

[72] Ibid.

[73] Niall Whelehan, 'The Irish Revolution 1912-23' in Alvin Jackson (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Irish History* (Oxford, 2014), p. 624.

[74] Moore 'History of the Irish Volunteers' in *Irish Press*, 11 February 1938; John M. Regan, *Myth and the Irish State: Historical Problems and Other Essays* (Sallins, 2013), p.164.

[75] Moore, 'History of the Irish Volunteers' in the *Irish Press*, 3 February 1938.

[76]Rough draft of the 'History of the Volunteers', Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 8,489/1.

would have been in the embarrassing position of knowing plans of which he might not approve.[77] Officially, in his history of the Volunteers he claimed that such an action would have been contrary to his position as a military leader who stood aside from 'sectional divisions'.[78] In a rough draft in his private papers, he said that it was not always easy to know the best line of conduct, but he thought that the 'wisest and most eloquent of advocates could have done nothing to make matters any better'. Diarmuid Coffey remembered Moore and MacNeill, who led the breakaway faction, meeting at HQ and parting as friends but definitely on opposing sides.[79]

He continued to build up the strength of the Volunteers and to present them publicly as a serious, drilled army, but he was frustrated by the continuing obstruction of the Irish Party. Nevertheless, he persisted with a plan for an Easter review of the Volunteers in a parade in the Phoenix Park. Both Moore's secretary, Diarmuid Coffey, and Captain Hemphill feared that he might resign from the Volunteers because of the obstructive behaviours of the Redmondites on the committee towards his plans. Moore confessed laughingly to Coffey that he though the committee an 'incompetent bunch of fools', but Coffey felt that he was really very upset over Redmond's behaviour.[80] The review went ahead and 25,000 Volunteers marched through Dublin attracting crowds, according to Coffey, of 100,000. The *Freeman's Journal* devoted several pages to the review with photographs of Redmond inspecting the parade and Moore on horseback and in full uniform, looking as Coffey admiringly remarked, 'splendid on the day'.[81] The *Freeman* reported that the parade and the crowds it attracted made 'a picture which in terms of either military parade or immensity of concourse had never been remotely approached in the Phoenix Park'.[82] The photographs of Moore on horseback and wearing his Volunteer uniform are revelatory of the role he wished for himself, as the leader of an Irish army. However, in Coffey's terms, the event in the Park was the 'swan song', of the Volunteers.[83]

This became clear a few months later at the funeral procession of the Fenian Jeremiah O'Donovan Rossa. O'Donovan Rossa's funeral provided an opportunity for the Irish Volunteers to fire some oracular shots in the funeral address by Padraig Pearse. Moore remembered the attractively tragic figure of Mrs O'Donovan Rossa from her visits to Moore Hall decades earlier.

---

[77] Ibid.,

[78] Moore ' History of the Irish Volunteers,' *Irish Press*, 1 February 1938.

[79] Diarmuid Coffey, Bureau of Military History, W.S. 1248.

[80] Diarmuid Coffey, Diaries, 4 February 13, 22 March 1915, Coffey and Chenevix Trench Papers, NLI, Ms. 46,008/4.

[81] Diarmuid Coffey, Bureau of Military History, W.S.1248.

[82] *The Freeman's Journal*, 5 April 1915.

[83] Coffey, W.S 1248.

He wrote to her telling her that the 'Volunteers would be glad to honour her husband's memory', in the funeral procession.[84] He mustered 800 National Volunteers but he was disappointed at the falling away of the Volunteer spirit. The Under-Secretary, Sir Matthew Nathan, remarked on Moore's presence to Chief-Secretary, Augustine Birrell, adding that the funeral procession demonstrated the loss of ground suffered from the National Volunteers to the Sinn Feiners.[85]' According to Novick, the National Volunteers were more concerned with showing a public face of autonomy and disciplined moral masculinity than with actively threatening to overthrow the British government.[86]

Finding his every move stymied by the presence of Redmond's representatives on the Volunteer committee, Moore lost some of his enthusiasm, but he had not yet given up hope that Redmond might persuade Kitchener to recognise the Volunteers. In a letter to Redmond just before he was to see Kitchener to bargain over territorial status for the Volunteers, Moore said, 'nothing could be done with the Volunteers ... they can not be trained, disciplined or armed; moreover the enthusiasm has gone and they cannot be kept going'.[87] In Moore's opinion training them as a territorial army was the only way they could survive. Moore's disappointment was reflected in his pursuit of a wartime military command. Initially confident of his success, he knew General Friend, of the Irish High Command, who was a 'quiet efficient, cautious man in his early sixties, who like Moore, was a veteran of South Africa. Friend had a reserve battalion of the 16th Division in mind.[88] When the command did not materialise Nathan and Birrell were approached by Moore to exert their influence at the War Office. Nathan made enquires to find that the 'War Office were not anxious to give him employment'. Birrell, who had an interview with Kitchener, promised to bring up the subject of Moore, but anticipated difficulty as 'a bad word in the War Office had made an indelible mark'.[89]' Moore was aware that a clique in the War Office, which he identified as General Henry Sclater and Colonel Robb, who were both 'Orange supporters', had decided that 'no senior command should be given to an Irish nationalist'. ' Sclater', Moore told John Redmond, was a 'notorious orange man, who will not have me if he can help it'.[90] Sir Lawrence Parsons, the Protestant Unionist commander of the 16th Division who was friendly

[84] Letter from Moore to Mrs O'Donovan Rossa, 30 July 1915, Mrs O'Donovan Rossa to Moore, Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10, 562.

[85] Leon Ó Bróin, *Dublin Castle and the Rising: The Story of Sir Matthew Nathan* (Dublin, 1966), p. 53.

[86] Ben Novick, 'The Arming of Ireland: Gun-Running and the Great War,' in Senia Pašeta and Adrian Gregory (eds), *Ireland and the Great War: 'A War to Unite us All?'* (Manchester, 2002), p. 102; David Lloyd, *Irish Culture and Colonial Modernity 1800-2000* (Cambridge, 2011), p. 100; Joseph Valente, *The Myth of Manliness in Irish National Culture, 1880 - 1922* (Illinois, 2011), p.169.

[87] Letter from Moore to Redmond, 24 September 1915, Redmond papers, NLI, Ms. 15,206/7.

[88] Nathan to Friend, 4 September 1915, Sir Matthew Nathan Papers, Bodleian, Ms. 468: Sir James Fergusson, *The Curragh Incident* (London, 1964), p. 60.

[89] Birrell to Nathan, 24 September 1915, Sir Matthew Nathan papers, Bodleian, Ms. 449. fols. 256 - 257.

[90] Nathan interview with Moore, 1 November 1915, Nathan papers, Bodleian, Ms. 469 fols. 69-70; Moore to Redmond, 6 October 1915, John Redmond Papers, NLI, Ms. 15,225.

with General Sclater and Kitchener may well have been a factor in information being relayed to the W.O. regarding Moore.[91]

Despite the opinion of Birrell, Nathan and Friend that Kitchener should have given senior commands to Irish nationalist officers, none of the brigades or regiments of the 10th or 16th divisions had Irish commanders, and most of the Volunteers who had joined up expecting a commission were disappointed. William Archer Redmond, John Redmond's son, Tom Kettle and Stephen Gwynn had all been refused immediate commissions.[92] Moore wrote to John Redmond remonstrating bitterly at being overlooked. 'I am being passed over for political reasons though some other reason will be [given]...though Englishmen are always sympathetic when they want something of Ireland. It is an old story but they sacrifice nothing'. His humiliation was compounded when he heard that his life-long friend and English Catholic, Colonel Hammond was given the post he had been promised. Hammond's name crops up in Lawrence Parson's diaries with some frequency and with none of the ambivalence with which he refers to Moore. Moore wrote to Redmond outlining the reasons why he outranked Hammond, 'they are planning to appoint Hammond who is all right, and a great friend of mine, but there is really no comparison between us in a military or civil sense'.[93] Moore included a list of the reasons for his superiority for Redmond's perusal; Moore had commanded his line battalion for two years in South Africa and had been mentioned in despatches, being promoted to Brevet-Colonel and awarded a C.B while Hammond had command of a militia. Moore concluded by reminding Redmond that he was known all over the country, 'better than any other soldier in the army...while Hammond was English', which may well have been a factor in the slight towards Moore.[94] His public profile as a British officer leading a Nationalist army could hardly have been acceptable to the Covenant signatory, Parsons.

Nathan's attitude to Moore reflected some of the distrust with which the parliamentary party regarded him. It was not unusual for Nathan to be on amicable terms with the nationalists, he had close relationships with the Irish Parliamentary leaders, John Dillon, in particular (Arthur Norway the chief at the post office said that Nathan couldn't make a move without Dillon's approval[95]) and he discussed Moore's situation with Dillon and Joe Devlin. Both men doubted that 'the colonel

[91] David Murphy, 'Sir Lawrence Worthington Parsons' in James McGuire and James Quinn (eds.), *Dictionary of Irish Biography*, Oates-Patten (vol. 7, Cambridge, 2009).

[92] Diary Entry, 8 February 1915, Lawrence Parson papers, NLI, Ms. 32,634/2.

[93] Letter from Moore to Redmond, 6 October 1915, Redmond papers, NLI, Ms. 15,205/7.

[94] Moore to Redmond, 7 October 1915, Redmond papers, NLI, Ms. 15,206/7.

[95] Mary Louisa Hamilton Norway, *The Sinn Fein Rebellion as They Saw It,* Arthur Hamilton Norway, *Irish Experience in War,* (ed.), Keith Jeffery (Dublin, 1999), p.111.

was wholeheartedly with the Parliamentary Party'.[96] According to Novick, Moore was disliked and distrusted by Birrell, Nathan and the Parliamentary Party.[97] It is probably more accurate to state that he was regarded with exasperation and irritation by Birrell and Nathan while Dillon who was one of 'the three of the great prickly personalities of the Party' almost certainly regarded him with dislike whether from his innate distrust of landlords or the political past shared by their fathers, John Blake Dillon and George Henry Moore, it is difficult to tell.[98] It is clear that the opinion was that Moore could not be put aside at that time as he wielded too much influence, as the 'self-appointed general officer commanding the Volunteers'.[99] Their suspicions concerning Moore had been raised by the theft of National Volunteer arms in late November 1914. A regular visitor to Dillon's house, Nathan reported to Dillon, Redmond and Devlin on the theft, suggesting that Moore had not taken measures to secure the arms, and he was asked for a report on the security of the locations where arms were stored. Birrell, who had no animus where Moore was concerned, described him as a 'soldier with some old military grievance festering...' but doubted 'whether the colonel was in anyone's confidence', however, he and Nathan discussed Moore's situation with a view to getting him a command, as a means of removing him from the Irish political scene. [100] There had been an attempt to find him a 'good strong staff officer', who would be sympathetic to the authorities, but Moore, as Coffey remarked, had a reputation for going his own way despite opposition.[101]

Angry and humiliated at his rejection, Moore informed Nathan that he would publicly advise Irish nationalists not to enlist as the government had not given them higher commands in the army. Nathan retorted with some severity, that he would be acting from 'private pique', and not 'public zeal',[102] Moore had refused to attend a recruitment rally at the Mansion House in September 1914, despite the presence of Asquith, Redmond, Dillon, Devlin and the Earl of Meath, and approached by Sir Lawrence Parsons commander of the 16th Division to support the recruitment drive he declined. Frustrated, Parsons said 'If you had said one word, we would have got thousands of men'. In his response Moore said that his 'business was to arm the Irish people,

[96] Interview with Joseph Devlin, 19 February 1915, Nathan Papers, Bodleian, Ms. 467 fol 155.

[97] Ben Novick, 'The Arming of Ireland: Gun Running and the Great War, 1914 - 16.' p. 103.

[98] Letter from Charles Gavan Duffy to Moore, Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 8,489/1; Paul Bew, *John Redmond*, Historical Association of Ireland Life and Times Series, no. 8, (Dundalk, 1996), p. 24.

[99] Nathan to Redmond, Nathan Papers, Bodleian, Ms. 467, fol. 155.

[100]. Birrell to Nathan, 8 February 1915, Nathan Papers, Bodleian, Ms. 449. Also see interview with John Dillon, 26 November 1914, MS. 467 fols 36-7.

[101] Diarmuid Coffey, Bureau of Military History, W.S1248.

[102] Nathan to Moore, 1 November 1915, Nathan Papers, Ms. 469 fols. 67-70.

not to supply the British army with recruits'.[103] Parsons entered into his diary, with his usual asperity, 'Colonel Maurice Moore came on Sunday (8 November 1914) he is no use'. [104]

Finally, he was offered the wartime command of Bere Island in Cork, which he accepted with some reluctance, but as he wrote to Redmond, by taking the 'Bere Island affair' he could then try and get what he really wanted, rather than holding out indefinitely.[105] He informed the Volunteer committee of his decision, and assured them he was not leaving from dissatisfaction but because he had duties more urgent than those he relinquished.[106] His chief assistant, Fitzroy Hemphill resigned at the same time. In a letter to Moore he told him, 'you founded and created the National Volunteers and by your energy, tact and power of organisation brought in from every quarter powerful support for the movement', although this was not an opinion held by later historiography. He told Moore how pleasant and agreeable it had been to work with him, 'I would never desire a more satisfactory chief to serve under'.[107] Moore's leave taking was further complicated by his loyalties, and at the last meeting he attended, he called for a vote of condolence for the fallen Willie Redmond, the brother of John. He added his sympathy to all the Volunteers who had died for Ireland at home and abroad but no one would support the second resolution. Almost two thousand men from his own regiment had died in the war, and many of those would have believed that they were working to obtain Home Rule as John Redmond had called upon them to do.[108] Moore left the room, saying that he would not 'consent to sit in the same room with Irishmen who called themselves nationalists and refused sympathy to those who had died for the liberty of their country'.[109]

[103] Hone, *The Moores of Moore Hall*, p. 249.

[104] Sir Lawrence Parsons Papers, NLI, Ms. 32,634/6. Parsons was close friends with General Sclater of the War Office, and may well have been responsible for the 'bad word,' in regard to Moore. Parsons worked closely with Hammond during this period judging by the frequency with which Hammond's name appeared in his diaries.

[105] Letter from Moore to Redmond, 10 February 1915 Redmond papers, NLI, Ms.15,206/7.

[106] Letter from Moore to Committee, 1 March 1916, letter from Moore to Kettle, 24 March 1916, Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10,546/1.

[107] Letter from Hemphill to Moore, nd., Moore Papers, NLI, Ms. 10,546/1.

[108] John Morrissey, 'A Lost Heritage: The Connaught Rangers and Multivocal Irishness' in M. McCarthy (ed.), *Ireland's Heritages: Critical Perspectives on Memory and Identity* (Aldershot, 2005), p. 81; Terence Denman, *Ireland's Unknown Soldiers: The 16th (Irish) Division in The Great War 1914-1918* (Dublin, 1992).

[109] Moore, 'History of the Volunteers' in the *Irish Press*, 1 March 1938.

1916: 'A Few Unknown Men Shot in a Barrack Yard.'

By the time the rebellion of the Irish Volunteers occurred in 1916, Moore was in England, and heard the news at second hand. [110] He resigned his commission after the executions that followed. He had attempted to prevent the executions by writing to Birrell and Redmond, and composed a statement for the commission of inquiry into the rebellion which it declined to hear formally. Undeterred, Moore had it published in the *Freeman's Journal*, referring to the men of the rebellion as idealists and poets.[111] In his letters to Redmond and Birrell he made comparisons between the capture of the Jameson Raiders by the Transvaalers in 1895 and the Queen's plea to Kruger for clemency.[112] Moore drew on another South African analogy in the 1914 rebellion led by several famed generals of the Anglo-Boer war and attributed to insurgent Afrikaaner nationalism. Described by Nasson as a 'warm weather version of the 1916 rising', it lasted for six months and was eventually defeated by the government forces.[113] Louis Botha treated the rebels with magnanimity, executing only one of them, Jopie Fourie, a serving army officer who defected to the rebels.[114] Moore stated that 'one generous act saved South Africa for the empire ... a few unknown men shot in a barrack yard has embittered a whole nation and raised a host of enemies in America'.[115]

A short time later he quoted a Sinn Fein friend who said, 'it is sad that those poor fellows have been shot; but after all ... if they had been set free Ireland would have been an English province in six months'.[116] There were further analogies to be drawn between Ireland and South Africa. For Sir Matthew Nathan the rebellion was a realisation of his worst administrative fears. His most recent appointment had been in Natal where he came into conflict with a colonial administration which resented British interference and, chastened by his experience, was loath to repeat its more humiliating aspects in his Irish posting.[117] Faced with a Zulu uprising and a native policy of the settler government that was repugnant to him, Nathan found his every move regarded as unwelcome interference by this government. Like other imperial administrators, Augustine

[110] Moore's second son Ulick or Toby as he was known, was in hospital in Worcestershire recovering from a wound he had received at Ginchy. Moore published a letter that Toby had written to him telling of that the 'Regiment (Connaught Rangers) had been 'pretty cut up since it went to the Somme'. The *Western People* 23 September 1916.

[111] *Freeman's Journal*, 3 June 1916; *Irish Times*, 30 May. 1916. Evidence for the Commission, Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10,572; Moore's evidence at MacNeill's trial, MacNeill papers, UCD Archives, Ms. LAI/G/126.

[112] Moore 'History of the Volunteers' in *The Irish Press*, 24 February, 1938.

[113] Nasson quoted in Keith Jeffery, *1916: A Global History* (London, 2015), p. 218 ;Sandra Swart, 'Desperate Men:' The 1914 Rebellion and the Politics of Poverty' *South African Historical Journal*, vol. 4, no. 1, (2000), pp. 161-175; eadem 'Men of Influence:' The Ontology of Leadership in the 1914 Rebellion' *Journal of Historical Sociology*, vol. 17, no.1, (2004), pp 1-30.

[114] Monica Wilson and Leonard Thompson, (eds), *Oxford History of South Africa 1870-1966. Vol 111.* (Oxford, 1971), p. 379.

[115] 'The Picture in the Stream' undated article, Moore Papers, NLI, Ms. 10,578/4.

[116] Ibid.

[117] Anthony P. Haydon, 'Sir Matthew Nathan: Ireland and Before,' *Studia Hibernica*, no. 15, (1975), pp 162 - 176.

Birrell, remarked on the parallels between the Irish political scene and that in South Africa in a report on *The State of Ireland* to the British cabinet, in which he stated Nathan found in the 'Ireland that he has come to and the South Africa that he has left'. Nathan even found counterparts for Botha and Smuts in the Irish Parliamentary Party. Birrell admitted that 'analogies of this kind can be pushed too hard, but they are more fruitful and informing ... than any other analogue'.[118] Where rebellions were concerned, the South African analogy failed, as Botha's reaction to the South African rebellion ensured that it blew over, while the British government's reaction to rebellion in Ireland led to years of insurrection and dissent and the beginning of the dissolution of British authority in Ireland. While in South Africa the defeat of the rebellion cemented the supremacy of the Union within empire.

Eschewing personal safety and reputation, Moore campaigned for a reprieve of Roger Casement's execution and read a statement at Eoin MacNeill's trial that later led to a indignant response from MacNeill's son-in-law and biographer, Michael Tierney. Moore defined MacNeill as a scholar, 'a philosopher but not a man of action and he would be a bad leader in this field or in active politics.'[119] When Tom Kettle gave testimony at the trial he was asked if Moore 'stood out of extremist groups,' Kettle refused to answer for Moore, but the question suggests some doubts at Moore's involvement.[120] Escaping execution, MacNeill's imprisonment ironically restored the loss of reputation he suffered by not taking part in the rebellion. Moore had less success with Roger Casement despite an organised campaign alongside Agnes O'Farrelly, Alice Stopford Green, Monsignor Ryan, Douglas Hyde and Lorcan Sherlock. Moore's petition was signed by 18 archbishops and 250 university staff members and forwarded to Asquith.[121] In an unsigned and undated note in Moore's papers it is stated 'that nobody in Ireland minds the execution that even the Sinn Féiners say that after their own idealist leaders were shot, why should they discriminate in favour of a man of affairs like Casement.[122]

When the news of the diaries implicating Casement in 'acts of gross indecency', were made public, Moore, according to Bulmer Hobson, wrote to the papers saying that 'no one who had ever known Casement could possibly believe a word of it.' Moore's public protest was the first that

[118] Gearóid O' Tuathaigh, 'Exemplar, Outlier, imposter,' in Roísín Healy and Enrico Dal Lago, (eds.), *The Shadow of Colonialism on Europe's Modern Past* (London, 2014), p. 47. O'Tuathaigh cautions against the use of 'strained analogies' or 'extravagant generalisations.'; 'State of Ireland' Nov. 1914, Augustine Birrell papers, Bodleian Oxford, M.S Eng. C. 7035. fols. 365-367.

[119] Moore's Statement, MacNeill Papers, UCD Archives, Ms. LAI/G/126, LAI/G/122.

[120] Tom Kettle's evidence at MacNeill's trial, MacNeill papers, UCD Archives, Ms. LAI/G/126.

[121] Letters and documents related to the reprieve of Roger Casement, Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10,564/1/4.

[122] The note cannot be conclusively attributed to Moore's authorship. It may have been in Agnes Farrelly's hand. O'Farrelly 1874 - 1951, was a lecturer in modern Irish at UCD and a campaigner for equal access for women to university education. Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10,564/1/4.

Hobson remembered.[123] Some of the sense of betrayal that greeted Casement's actions was reflected in a letter to Moore from a 'Southern Protestant,' which opened with the presumption that Moore was a Fenian and a Roman Catholic, who might have come 'to the determination that Ireland was a nation before receiving the king of England's commission and money: 'You are a low blackguard ... how would you protect the 'nation' or your shores from say Russia or Germany? Could England afford to lose Ireland as a naval base'?[124] Casement who had been neither Fenian or Catholic, but converted to Catholicism just before his death, made the ultimate sacrifice that Moore, the military man would not, his years of training impelling him to serve in the war against, not for, the Germans. He was intent on unified consent to national independence and hoped that serving with the Unionist Protestants might have gone some way to achieving that, or as John Redmond seemed to think, expediting the granting of Home Rule by obeying the call to arms. Moore had seen the Volunteers as primarily a territorial force for Ireland's defence and a show of martial force after the war. For Moore, the Volunteers appeared as the culmination of his father's 'First Ideas for Irish Volunteers', a moment when several personal and political ideas coalesced.[125] This was made clear in 1914, when he gave a series of lectures derived from his biography of his father in support of those ideals. Alice Milligan the Ulster nationalist, President of the Irish Women's Association in Belfast and editor of *Shan Van Vocht* from 1896 to 1899 attended one of them at the National Literary Society and was sufficiently impressed to write a letter to the *Freeman's Journal,* in which she stated 'after the lapse of a generation, the son stood there in the father's place, ready and willing to take up the proposed project, and in the face of a great national crisis to revive the name and fame of the Irish Volunteer'.[126] Subsequent events proved that the Volunteer movement rejected landlord leadership for that of the Irish Revolutionary Brotherhood, and Moore, unlike his father, did not feel himself capable of joining the latter's ranks.

Moore's role in the Volunteers has escaped serious historiographical attention until relatively recently. He was not alone in this historiographical elision from the nationalist narrative. According to Flanagan, in 1966, Bulmer Hobson was omitted from the official commemoratons for 1916 and had to wait until 2009 for a biographical study.[127]. In the original foreword to *The Irish Volunteers 1913-1915: Recollections and Documents* published in 1963, FX. Martin called the 'founding the Gaelic League and the Volunteers, the Uprising of Easter Week, the

[123] Bulmer Hobson, *Ireland Yesterday and Tomorrow* (Tralee, 1968), p. 83.

[124] Letter addressed to Moore Hall from the Piccadilly Hotel, 1 July 1914, Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10,569.

[125] Maurice Moore, *George Henry Moore: An Irish Gentleman* (London, 1913).

[126] Alice Milligan, letter to the *Freeman's Journal,* 7 May 1914. Maurice Moore lecture to the National Literary Society in Stephens Green. 'George Henry Moore and his Times' *Freeman's Journal,* 3 March 1914; Catherine Morris, *Alice Milligan and the Irish Cultural Revival* (Dublin, 2012). George Sigerson M.D. attended the lecture and remembered meeting George Henry Moore in earlier times. *Connaught Telegraph* 7 March 1914.

[127] Frances Flanagan, *Remembering the Revolution: Dissent, Culture and Nationalism in the Irish Free State* (Oxford, 2015), p.1.

establishment of Dáil Éireann and the Declaration of Independence among the great events of our time'.[128] In the new foreword to the same publication in 2013, Eamon Ó Cuív, the grandson of Eamonn de Valera, reiterated Martin's words when he claimed the founding of the Irish Volunteers to be one of the most important events in the achievement of Irish Independence and the template for the modern Irish army, yet Moore is rarely credited as one of its founders, despite the fact, that like Casement, he had been 'closely concerned' with their formation.[129] Charles Hannon's study of the Volunteers from their inception in 1913 to the foundation of the state, examines Moore's role in the organisation of the Volunteers, but does not consider his origins, background or motivation.[130] James McConnel's recent study of Redmond's attempts to have the Volunteers recognised as a territorial army necessarily considers Moore's involvement in this regard, but again he remains in the shade in terms of his identity.[131] Daithí Ó Corráin's comprehensively detailed study covers Moore's career in nationalism with a focus on the volunteers, and examines Moore's background as the wellspring of his nationalism but does not subject his motivations to a closer analysis.[132] In this chapter the history of the Volunteers is scrutinised from the neglected perspective of a single individual, whose involvement with the volunteers was at variance with his ex-military, elite status as he negotiated with Dublin Castle, the military command, and the Irish nationalist leadership. His vision for the Volunteers encapsulated an earlier elite nationalist perspective. Similarly, he will provide another neglected perspective in an examination of the constitutional efforts to secure independent government in the years just after the Rising and before the victory of Sinn Féin.

Federalism Revived: Constitution and Convention

The events of 1916 did not bring an abrupt end to constitutionalism leading directly to a Sinn Féin victory in 1918. Constitutional attempts at resolving the Irish Question had a brief efflorescence in the years of 1917 and 1918, often overlapping with the radical movement as moderate nationalists and unionists attempted to effect a settlement with Britain on federalist or dominion terms.'[133] Proposals for a 'devolved' or federal United Kingdom had been a part of the British political discourse since 1913, when Lord Selborne, the South African High

[128] F.X Martin, (ed.), *The Irish Volunteers 1913-1915: Recollections and Documents* (Dublin, 2013), p. 9.

[129] Ibid., p. 7 also see, Stephen Gwynn, *The History of Ireland* (Dublin, 1923), p. 512.

[130] Charles Hannon, 'The Irish Volunteers and the Concepts of military Service and Defence 1913-1924' PhD Thesis, University College Dublin, 1989.

[131]James McConnel, 'Après la Guerre', John Redmond, the Irish Volunteers and Armed Constitutionalism 1913-1915' in *English Historical Review*, vol. cxxxi, no. 553 (2017), pp 1445-1470.

[132]Daithí Ó Corráin, 'A Most Public Spirited and Unselfish Man': The Career and Contribution of Colonel Maurice Moore, 1854-1939' in *Studia Hibernica*, no. 40, (2014), pp 71-134.

[133] Alvin Jackson, *Home Rule:An Irish History 1880 - 2000* (London, 2003), p. 5.

Commissioner and the architect of the South African Union promoted the idea of Irish, Welsh, Scottish and English self - government.[134]

This idea was not entirely new to Irish politics. Isaac Butt had expressed an interest in a federalist solution in the 1860s and the Cape politician Cecil Rhodes approached Charles Stewart Parnell in 1887 with a £10,000 donation to party funds to support imperial federation.[135] This discussion activated a number of Irish, British and colonial networks as several alternatives were examined and the example of the successful 1910 unification of South Africa within empire that followed on the South Africa convention of 1907 to 1908 provided another possible model for an Irish settlement. Moore, who had fallen away from the Irish Parliamentary Party after 1916 wrote a letter somewhere between 1916 and 1918 which expressed his disillusionment with the party's

> …lack of integrity and foresight, their impractical ideals, and their susceptibility to both the reactionary Tory hostility to Irish aspiration, and the mask of benevolent intentions, worn by the Liberal party, as they placated and cajoled with favours while they failed to implement legislation.[136]

The networks and associations that Moore involved himself in during these years tended to bypass the Irish Party and the government, for Dominion leaders, influential moderate Unionists, such as Monteagle, and F.S. Oliver, the apostle of federalism, and Sir John Simon, the Attorney-General and Home Secretary from 1915 to 1916, as he and his fellow moderates explored federal and dominion alternatives to Home Rule. The Federal Idea which gained some attention in 1916 in the House of Commons in the Tory, Labour and Liberal parties was a way to unify the white dominions and decentralise imperial administration.[137] The members of 'Milner's kindergarten,'

---

[134] David E. Torrance, *The Strange Death of the Liberal Empire: Lord Selborne in South Africa* (Canada, 1996), p. 184.

[135] James McConnel and Matthew Kelly, 'Devolution, Federalism and Imperial Circuitry' and Deirdre McMahon, 'Irish Home Rule as Devolutionary Paradigm, 1914-39,' in Duncan Tanner, Chris Williams, Wil Griffiths and Andrew Edwards (eds), *Debating Nationhood and Governance in Britain 1885-1945: Perspectives From the Four Nations* (Manchester, 2006), pp 173-174, and pp 71-73.

[136] Letter from Moore to Coffey, Coffey and Chenevix Trench papers, NLI, Ms. 46,310/23.

[137] Michael Pollard, 'Sunset or Dawn? F.S. Oliver's *Endless Adventure* in History and Politics, 1921 - 1934' in *History, The Historical Association* and Blackwell Publishing (Oxford 2005), pp 387-410; G.R. Searle, 'The Revolt of the Right in Edwardian Britain' in P

the 'imperial think tank,' drew up a federalist programme of action inspired by an immensely popular publication by the businessman turned author, F.S Oliver, *The Life of Alexander Hamilton: An Essay in American Union* which was published in 1906.[138] Relegated to historiographical obscurity until the 1970s, Oliver, of the 'radical right', and one of the 'most influential publicists of his day', published a series of articles in the *Irish Times* in 1910, under the pseudonym *Pacifus*, in which he proposed a solution to the Irish Question, in which federalism, the union and Home Rule could be accommodated.[139] Together with Selborne, Oliver devised a joint manifesto in 1917, outlining a set of proposals that were, according to Alvin Jackson, considerably more generous than Home Rule. He proposed a gathering of dominion leaders to debate the Irish question in his 1917 publication *Ireland and the Imperial Conference: Is there a Way to a Settlement?* Influenced by these federal ideas, Moore suggested

> A Constitution somewhat similar to that of South Africa or Canada would give peace, happiness and we believe prosperity to Ireland. Ireland is a separate nation but Irishmen will welcome a Commonwealth of the empire, governed by a Council representing the Dominions as well as the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; they would enter and give their loyalty to such a scheme, and contribute to the best of their power to the defence of such a commonwealth of free nations [140]

.Kennedy and A. Nicholls, (eds.), *Nationalist and Racialist Movements in Britain and Germany before 1914* (1981); D.G. Boyce and J.O. Stubbs, 'F.S. Oliver, Lord Selborne and Federalism' in *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History,* V (1976), pp 53-81; Martin Kolinsky, 'Federation and Partition in the Transformation of Empire' in Cornelia Navari (ed.), *British Politics and the Spirit of the Age: Political Concepts in Action* (Keele, 1996); James McConnel and Matthew Kelly, 'Devolution, Federalism and Imperial Circuitry: Ireland, South Africa and India' in Tanner, Williams, Griffiths and Edwards (eds.), *Debating Nationhood and Governance in Britain, 1885 - 1945.*

[138] F.S. Oliver, *The Life of Alexander Hamilton: An Essay on American Union* (London, 1931).

[139] Mansergh, *Nationalism and Independence,* pp 7-8.

[140] 'Memorandum Concerning the Present and Future Relations of Great Britain and Ireland in the Empire', Moore papers, Ms. 10,574/5. In an article in the *Western People,* 9 September 1916, Moore suggested that 'Ireland would be content to form part of an Empire, standing on an equal footing with the colonies, and able to foster her own ideals, manufacture and government'.

However, Ireland and South Africa were equally reluctant to participate in a sense of shared Anglo-Saxon origins. South Africa was not claimed by the defenders of 'Saxondom', and was politically the 'least friendly of the dominions', and moreover was unified but not federated.[141] Despite being considered a part of Britain's domestic history rather than imperial territory, Ireland did not wish to subordinate its national identity within imperial citizenship.

Under the leadership of Lord Selborne, the convention in South Africa from 1907 to 1908 led to unification, becoming a powerful exemplar for Ireland in the process. A Constitution Association was formed which mutated into a Conference Committee and incarnated finally as the Dominion Association. Moore was a vital member of all three, and involved in the drawing up of a documents to be presented to the Dominion leaders at the Imperial War Conference in 1917 as a set of solutions proposed by a non-party group.[142] The association was composed of a judicious blend of Ulster Protestant, elite Catholic, and Quaker while one of its members, Edward MacLysaght, or Lysaght as he was then known, was the English educated, Irish speaking son of a Cork man and an English mother. Moore, George Russell, James G. Douglas Joseph Johnston, Alec Wilson and Diarmuid Coffey were all members who claimed neither nationalist nor unionist status and no party affiliation, which of course was not quite true.[143] Described by Lord Monteagle as a 'study group,' much to MacLysaght's disgust, they laboured to discuss ideas for a convention and drew up a memorandum on plans for dominion status in the months leading up to the July convention. The memorandum, which was principally the work of Russell, Moore and Douglas, asserted Ireland's moral, historical, and economic right to self-determination on the basis of its antiquity as a European nation, its historical resistance to English government and the pre-union Renunciation Act of 1783 that proclaimed Ireland a separate Kingdom, not that any of those arguments were new.[144]

'Old Unionist Adam'...and Moore's Green Imperialism

Moore submitted this memorandum to the moderate unionist peer Lord Monteagle for his approval and his signature, Monteagle's reply is revelatory of the southern unionist position: loyal but willing to negotiate the terms of that loyalty. It also revealed the growing gulf between

[141] Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, (New York, 1966) pp 188, 191, 231; John Darwin, 'A Third British Empire? The Dominion Idea in Imperial Politics' in Judith M. Brown and W.M Louis (eds), *The Oxford History of the British Empire: The Twentieth Century* (Oxford, 1999), p. 70; David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 3.

[142] Imperial War Conference, 21 March-27 April 1917 and 12 June-26 July 1918. It was during this conference that the word commonwealth had its first official use. A resolution was passed to hold a conference after the war based on a 'full recognition of the Dominions as autonomous nations of an imperial commonwealth' and giving them a voice in foreign policy.

[143] J.Anthony Gaughan, (ed.), *Memoirs of Senator James G. Douglas (1887 - 1954)* (Dublin, 1998), p. 54.

[144] 'Memorandum Concerning the Present and Future Relations of Great Britain and Ireland in the Empire' Moore papers, Ms. 10,574/5.

Moore's political opinions and those of his class, a point that Monteagle was not slow to point out. He objected to much of the 'historical argument in the rhetorics', which he said might 'be calculated to fortify the nationalists conviction of most of Moore's association, but they were unlikely to appeal to the moderates within unionism'. Monteagle went on to make several points on the changes wrought in the Anglo-Irish relationship by dominion status and a possible loss of influence for the Irish, the difficulty of obtaining the support of Ulster Unionists when there was no mention of safeguarding their interests, insufficient mention of economics, and the impossibility of a territorial army. Monteagle outlined the Unionist position on Anglo-Irish relationships in his objection to dominion status being sought as a right rather than a responsibility, and its accompanying self-reliance as an agreement between Sinn Féin and the Unionists, thus placing Britain on the side-lines. Monteagle assumed a relationship between Ireland and Britain that differed 'by nature', from the relationship between Britain and the other dominions or colonies which meant a unique space in which existed 'British-Islands' affairs. Ireland was not situated in a colonial ideology but 'within the paradigm of composite monarchy ... juridically a kingdom ... though treated as a colony'.[145]

Dominion status would dilute the intimacy of this relationship by removing Irish representation from parliament and ameliorating Ireland's influence in matters that might influence it. The retention of Irish seats at Westminster in the event of dominion status would be a significant change from national to imperial representation.[146] He would not sign the proposals however, although he agreed that dominion status was the only possible settlement, as a unionist he could not support all the statements in the memorandum, and he feared complete separation. Moore forwarded the memorandum to F.S. Oliver who firmly quashed the aspirations held by Moore and his co-signatories as 'impracticable' with the break-up of the United Kingdom as a unit for 'naval, military or tariff purposes,' as an act of 'national suicide ... that England, Scotland and Wales would not consent to'.[147] However, it is significant that Oliver agreed that the Home Rule Bill lacked trust in the government it proposed to set up and denied it the means to function autonomously.[148]

The association cast the net wider in order to promote its objectives. The upcoming Imperial War Conference in London would be attended by the darling of the British cabinet, South African

[145] David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*, p. 25.

[146] McConnel and Kelly, 'Devolution, Federalism and Imperial Circuitry', p. 186.

[147] Letter from F.S Oliver to Moore, 11 April 1917, Moore papers, Ms. 10, 568/4.

[148] Oliver proposed the development of Western Irish ports by means of 'ferry trains,' running through tunnels beneath the Irish Sea connecting it with the United Kingdom.

Premier, Jan Smuts, who was supportive of the Irish cause. Alice Stopford Green was the ideal contact to set in motion a plan to involve Smuts. Green's impeccable Boer war credentials included a month in St Helena during wartime to visit Boer prisoners and her hospitality to Generals Botha, De La Rey and de Wet when they called on her on their first post-war trip to London to show their appreciation. Green had a long friendship with African explorer Mary Kingsley and her association with Roger Casement placed her in a lively group that included E.D. Morel (Secretary of the Congo Reform Society) and Stephen Gwynn who was to be Mary Kingsley's biographer.[149] After Kingsley's death in Cape Town where she had gone to nurse the wounded during the second Anglo-Boer war, Green was involved in the setting up of the African Society in Kingsley's memory. According to J.D. Fage the society which became the Royal African Society, could not be described as anti-colonial but it was opposed to colonial policy during this period. It was generally critical of Conservative policies towards smaller nations such as the Irish and the Afrikaners.[150]

By 1906, its members included not just Casement, Morel, and Gwynn but Sir Matthew Nathan, the ex-colonial governor of Natal. It was an interesting admixture of Irish nationalists and colonial administrators, merchants, soldiers and academics. Green was one of four women members out of a total of thirty nine who achieved life membership.[151] When Green wrote to Smuts in March 1917 introducing herself and asking him to visit her in London and meet with Moore, he replied with courtesy, accepting her invitation to discuss old times.[152] In her reply, Green informed him that Moore would be accompanied by a couple of Irish friends who were concerned in the present movement to attempt an Irish settlement. Cautiously, Smuts agreed to meet with Moore, Douglas and Russell on an unofficial basis.[153] The situation was not without irony as Moore had been in one of the flying columns deployed to prevent Smuts' commando from entering Cape Colony in the third stage of the war. Smuts made no subsequent reference to Moore but in a letter to M.C. Gillet a few days after his meeting with the Dominion Association he said that Douglas had given him a lot of information on the current state of affairs in Ireland. Douglas and Russell had meetings with Lloyd George and H.H. Asquith while all three met with Sir John Simon, the ex-Home Secretary, Attorney-General and by his first marriage, Green's nephew-in-law. Moore's forthrightness antagonised Simon when he denounced the Home Rule Bill as 'a British effort to

[149] J.D. Fage, 'When the African Society was Founded, Who Were the Africanists?' *African Affairs*, vol. 94. no. 376 (July, 1995), p.378.

[150] Ibid., p. 381.

[151] Ibid., pp 370-378.

[152] Letter from Green to Smuts, 30 March 1917, W.K. Hancock and Jan Van Der Poel (eds.), *Selections from the Smuts Papers. Vol. 111 June 1910-November 1918* (7 vols Cambridge, 1966).

[153] Ibid.

trick the Irish people and bolster up the nationalist party'.[154] Moore had a point; British constitutionalism failed to address Ireland's unceasingly urgent demands for separate government according the terms of an evolving democratic idea. This failure was accompanied by delaying tactics that added to the frustrations of Irish nationalists.[155] Moore returned to Ireland with the impression that the visit had been successful. He told Coffey at the Volunteer H.Q. that he had met Smuts and Lord Northcliffe, and Coffey remembers Douglas coming to discuss the visit.[156] The meeting did not yield immediate results, but it did pave the way to a series of meetings between Moore and Smuts in 1921 at a critical time for Irish independence. Meanwhile, the association had sent a copy of their convention proposal to Chief Secretary Duke on 20 March 1917.

In order to engage more moderate unionist and nationalist support for their proposals, Russell was instructed to redraft the memorandum and the final result was an objective outline of the ideas of all three Irish parties with an analysis and appeal to each. Russell proposed a '... brotherhood of dominions ... inspired as much by the fresh life and wide democratic outlook of Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Canada (in) a federal union of independent nations to protect national liberties ... and to eventually form a league of nations governed by international law'. The memorandum was renamed *Thoughts for a Convention* and submitted under Russell's name to the *Irish Times* and published in three instalments on 26, 28, and 29 May 1917.[157] Monteagle, who had refused to sign Moore's draft, Alice Stopford Green, Gavan Duffy and Archbishop Walsh all became public signatories. The first part of the document was undeniably Russell's own but the argument and the conclusion were taken almost verbatim from a previous document that was as much Moore's as Russell's but Moore received no acknowledgement of this in the *Irish Times.* The reasons for this are obscure, but the editor of the *Times* insisted on naming Russell as the author. Russell's nationalist persona may have been more acceptable to the *Times* readership than Moore's. Moore was understandably indignant, and accused Russell of committing an 'illegal and dishonourable act' by publishing under his own name causing a row between himself and Russell that severely compromised the memorandum's 'urgings' that 'peace and goodwill' should exist between intolerant Irishmen.[158] The storm blew over and both men

[154] Gaughan, *Memoirs of Senator James G. Douglas.* p. 55.

[155] John M. Regan, *Myth and the Irish State* (Sallins, 2013), p. 99.

[156] Entry in Coffey's diary, 21 April 1917, Coffey and Chenevix Trench papers, NLI, Ms. 46, 308/6).

[157] George Russell, *Thoughts for a Convention: Memorandum on the State Ireland* (Dublin, 1917), see also, James S .Ashe *The Work Before the Irish Convention: A Final Plea for Lasting Conciliation* (Dublin, 1917); 'Memoranda prepared for the 1917 Convention. Moore papers', NLI, Ms 10,574/5; idem, 'Proposed Treaty of Association Between Ireland and the British Commonwealth', Moore papers, Ms. 10,574/6; idem, 'Irish Self Government Headings for Consideration, Concerning the Present and Future Relations of Great Britain in Ireland in the Empire', Moore papers, Ms; 10,574/7.

[158] Edward MacLysaght, Memoir, 'Master of None.' VI, MacLysaght papers, NLI, Ms.750.

were conciliatory, Moore accepted the acknowledgement Russell gave to his co-authorship and it was generally agreed that publication was necessary to their project, however Russell's name has become permanently associated with the memorandum to the exclusion of Moore. Lloyd George supported the idea of a national convention of representative Irishmen to discuss various possible forms of self-government and gave the Irish parliamentary leader a choice, a national convention or the immediate enactment of a twenty six county Home Rule package. Given the memorandum published by the Dominion Association the following paragraphs will focus on the questions of dominion status that were addressed in the convention but tended to be disregarded by McDowell.[159]

War of Frogs and Mice in the Peloponnese' : 1917-1918 Convention[160]

The convention that followed has been represented by the author of the most authoritative opinion on its proceedings as a 'striking failure', and a 'rhetorical irrelevance' on the margins of Irish history.[161] However, it hardly qualified for the sobriquet bestowed upon it by Michael Tierney as the 'war of frogs and mice in the Peloponnese'. Its subsequent failure had little bearing on the seriousness of the issues discussed, or the fact that many of them were to emerge again in the settlement of the 1921 Treaty, and in the land settlements of the first independent government.[162] Historical opinion is agreed that Lloyd George either wanted it to fail, or merely thought that it had little chance of success, making the convention appear 'trivial or parochial', unless one considers the broader implications that the Irish Question had on the United States whose support for the war effort the British urgently need to acquire.[163] In order to engage that support Britain had to be seen to be actively pursuing a solution to Irish self-government. Therefore the convention was, in the words of Brian Farrell, a 'poultice applied to the infection of Irish discontent'.[164] The perception of its failure is largely founded on the intransigence of the Ulster Unionists, the resistance of the Catholic Bishops and the refusal of Sinn Féin to attend. Its obvious failure was the lack of agreement achieved on its proposals and the submission of a report that included little in the way of consensus by the participating interests. There was little conciliation and even less compromise. The convention that Moore and the association had laboured so assiduously to bring to pass could be interpreted as a useful postponement of events

[159] Nicholas Mansergh, Review of R.B. McDowell's, *The Irish Convention 1917 - 18 Irish Historical Studies*, vol. 17, no. 67 (March, 1971), pp 417-419

[160] A parody of the *Illiad*, known as the *Batrachomyomachia* or silly altercation.

[161] R.B. McDowell, *The Irish Convention 1917-18* (London, 1970), p. 214

[162] Michael Tierney, 'A Review of R.B. McDowell, *The Irish Convention, 1917-18* in *Studia Hibernica*, no. 10 (1970), pp, 148-150.

[163] Bernadette Whelan, 'The Irish Convention and Wilsonian America' paper delivered at The Irish Convention 1917-1918: A Centenary Symposium. 25-26 July 2017, Regent House and Trinity Long Room Hub, Trinity College Dublin.

[164] Brian Farrell, A review of R.B. McDowell, *The Irish Convention of 1917* in *An Irish Quarterly Review*, vol. 59, no. 234 (Summer, 1970), pp. 206-208.

for a British cabinet more troubled by wartime crisis than finding a solution to the Irish Question. Lloyd George may have manipulated Redmond and Plunkett to what he saw as more critical ends and the exclusion of Sinn Féin may have been a part of that policy, in order as MacLysaght said to 'throw dust in the eyes of the United States?' [165] They were invited to attend by Chief-Secretary Duke who used Moore as a contact for the more extreme factions. Just how extreme those factions were at this period is a moot point. De Valera did not become the leader of a more cohesive Sinn Féin movement until October 1918 when the convention had ended. Released from gaol just before the convention began, there was little time for him to organise the resistance that is generally perceived to emanate from Sinn Féin which at that time was divided between the constitutionally moderate Griffithites and a republican faction. Duke told Plunkett that if he could find five independent nationalists in sympathy with Sinn Féin, he would nominate them.[166] Sinn Féin gave tacit acceptance to the nomination of George Russell, James MacNeill, Alice Stopford Green, James Douglas and Edward MacLysaght as replacements but not representatives. Moore's name was put forward but refused, as was that of William Magennis, one of the future founders of Clann Éireann who was also suggested and rejected.[167] The above named were all regarded as 'unofficial nationalists.' MacLysaght, whose radicalism was to increase with the years, reported back to Sinn Féin every day, which somewhat undermines the perception of their refusal to participate.

The government appointed Sir Francis Hopwood, a civil Lord of the Admiralty, as secretary to the convention. Hopwood had been a member of the committee determining the constitutions of the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony during the unification of South Africa.[168] There was some hope that the success of the convention in South Africa might be repeated in Ireland. Sir Horace Plunkett, who had been nominated as the convention chairman, activated that hope by concluding an address to the convention with a quote from Sir Henry de Villiers, 1842-1914, the Chief Justice of South Africa and the president the South African Convention of 1908.[169] Lloyd George expressed the hope, in a letter to Plunkett in February 1918 that a 'federal reorganisation of the United Kingdom', might bring about similar concessions to those made by the participants in the South African Convention with a devolution of power between Belfast and Dublin.[170]

---

[165] Edward MacLysaght, Memoir, VIII, MacLysaght papers, NLI, Ms. 750; Euan O'Halpin, 'Lloyd George and Ireland, 1916-1918' Michael Laffan, 'The Empty Chair? Sinn Féin and the Irish Convention' papers delivered at The Irish Convention 1917-1918: A Centenary Symposium, 25-26 July 2017, Regent House and Trinity Long Room Hub, Trinity College Dublin.

[166] Gaughan, *Memoirs of Senator James Douglas*, p. 57.

[167] R.B. McDowell, *The Irish Convention 1917 - 18* (London, 1970), p. 84.

[168] Ibid., p. 101.

[169] Coffey's notes on the South African Convention, Coffey and Chenevix Trench papers, NLI, Ms. 46,310/16.

[170] Letter from Lloyd George to Sir Horace Plunkett, 25 February 1918, Moore papers,, Ms.10,573/6.

Whatever Lloyd George's private opinions on the matter, it is clear from Coffey's convention notes that South Africa was taken seriously as an exemplar. Notes on the constitutions of Switzerland, New Zealand, Newfoundland and the government of Canada suggest that a number of solutions were considered but South Africa was the most active point of identification and comparison for politicians between 1910 and 1917.[171] Lacking the cohesion of white racial unity that the Union of South Africa was based upon, the Irish Convention, according to McDowell, 'conspicuously failed' to find consensus, but the failure deserves some attention and not only for the 'force, eloquence, and passionate controversy of its discussions', that finally ended a Home Rule debate that had dominated Irish politics for forty years.[172] Despite the analogies drawn between Ireland and South Africa the fundamental difference of the predication of South African independence on race dominance was missing in Irish affairs. 'The fundamental right of a white people' to autonomy, which contributed to the cohesion between white interest groups in South Africa could not be called upon with the same urgency. According to Lord Selborne, the South African nation was unprecedented in having a society based on race.[173] The fact that the indigenous peoples were excluded from any stake in the Union was not considered by the convention. (Although, the Trinity Provost, John Pentland Mahaffy did bring up the subject of a displaced indigenous (people) by making comparisons between Ireland and the former colony of Australia in which there were no traditions to create alien sentiments except among the Aborigines whose political importance is quite negligible'.[174])

However, the Irish did activate the question of race as a political subtext; in the margins of a conference paper, Coffey had handwritten, 'as in the cases of Poland, Finland, Hungary, and the Balkan States, English government in Ireland is but an example of the fact that the white race will not submit to government by another'.[175] Evidence that this argument animated earlier discussions can be found in some typewritten documents in Coffey's possession that relate to the earlier Constitution Association in which objections to British governance were based on 'the denial of the fundamental right of a white people'. Even 'good government' is no substitute for self-government.'[176] It is unclear whether these references to race were intended to efface other cleavages that had become entrenched since the early twentieth century debates on Home Rule or whether they reflected the racial attitudes, codified by the union of South Africa that contributed

[171] Coffey and Chenevix Trench papers, Ms. 46, 310/17.

[172] McDowell, *The Irish Convention 1917-18*, p. 217.

[173] Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* pp 191 and 213. Arendt drew this observation from C.W. de Kiewet, *A History of South Africa, Social and Economic* (Oxford, 1941), p. 113.

[174] 'Proposals of the Provost of Trinity,' 4 September 1917, Coffey and Chenevix Trench papers, NLI, Ms. 46,310/7.

[175] Ibid., note by Coffey.

[176] Coffey and Chenevix Trench Papers, Ms. 46,310/22.

to the formation of a commonwealth based on white supremacy. In his review of Lake and Reynolds historical study of global racial politics at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth, Jonathan Hyslop draws attention to the ideological racism of the 'construction of white settler democracies,' during this period.[177] It seems clear that in the quest for independence, Irish nationalism was not loath to borrow from the contemporary racial ideologies of anti-colonial movements. The question of race was effaced in the divide that opened between Northern and Southern unionists with Lord Midleton's willingness to accept Home Rule with suitable protections provided for their minority. Paul Bew argued that the convention had the potential for reconciliation as the unionists and nationalists experienced the other as less objectionable than they feared, as they met with each other in the major cities with meals and socialising providing plenty of opportunity for informal negotiation among all the parties.[178] Eventually, the reaction of unionist to unionist, north and south, caused the conference to founder, and the conscription crisis that occurred towards the end of the convention proceedings accelerated the dwindling support for the Irish Party. In April 1918 the *Evening Telegraph* carried extensive coverage of both convention and conscription; detailing the proposals for conscription and the dismayed response of Irish opinion.[179] The sense of panic induced by events militated against a reasoned settlement being reached by the convention. In response to the urgings of Convention member and parliamentarian Stephen Gwynn to the Irish to fight in the war, Moore stated in the *Connaught Telegraph* that 'Every day that passes makes the thought of conscription more hateful'.[180]

McDowell may have considered the convention 'a striking failure', but the events that preceded it suggested that it was part of a serious attempt to find a settlement to the Irish Question. Comparisons with other colonial situations were a major part of the proceedings. The carefully crafted memoranda defining federal, colonial and dominion rule provided detailed examples of each. The emphasis given to the convention in this chapter results from the study of Moore's political milieu during this period. His activity in the constitutional movements which clearly identified as pressure groups working towards a national convention, indicates his political affiliations at this point even as he identified as a nationalist, albeit a cloaked one. However, the arguments put forth by Monteagle reveal the extent of Moore's distance from the Southern Unionist interests, while his political thought contained similar resolutions for settlement. Moore represented a middle way between radical nationalist and moderate unionist opinion, making him

[177] Jonathan Hyslop, Review of Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Cambridge, 2008) in *Journal of Global History* vol. 4, (2009), pp 175-189.
[178] Paul Bew, *John Redmond* (Dundalk, 1996), p. 43.

[179] *Evening Telegraph*, 12 April 1918.

[180] *Connaught Telegraph*, 25 May 1918.

a useful go-between. The importance of the convention as a barometer for the diversity of interest and political activism in these years was effaced by the greater importance Britain attached to its wartime difficulty. A lack of military manpower and the need to attract American support for a failing war effort made the convention more important as a public relations affair than a serious attempt at reconciliation. The Irish Question had acquired an urgency outside its own need for settlement. McDowell's work is generally considered as definitive on the subject of the convention, however the reviews that followed the publication of his study in 1970 pointed out some deficiencies or questions left unexplored, and Moore's name appeared several times as questions were asked of his involvement. Farrell pointed out that McDowell had not consulted Moore's papers which contained several letters relating to the convention, consequently Moore's involvement went almost unnoticed.[181] Moore's public outing as a Sinn Féiner occurred after the apparent failure of constitutionalism, but his support for and fidelity to, nationalist independence retained its particular landlord identity markers, and usually bore a marked caution at the interpretation of his actions by the British authorities. By late 1918 this was to change

Sinn Féin

Moore's committee found their months of preparatory work coming to naught, yet the networks founded by their organisation, and the political contacts formed during this period were pressed into the service of Sinn Féin a few years later. With the failure of the convention, he severed any remaining ties with the Irish Parliamentary Party and threw his lot in with Sinn Féin, who had derived some political benefit from the conscription crisis. In fact, he had been seeking Sinn Féin candidature for South Mayo at the upcoming elections in February 1917, while at the same time serving as the inspector-general of the National Volunteers, and working towards a political solution with the Dominion Association. He had joined the party in the spring of 1917, according to Special Branch reports monitoring his activities during this time, and there was a general awareness that he intended to run for parliament.[182] Moore made a series of visits to Mayo during 1917, ostensibly as a Party representative but secretly visiting Sinn Féin clubs in the area which were managing Sinn Féin's political organisation.[183] The organisational skills developed by the Volunteers in terms of recruiting, and holding meetings etc. were put to use in the formation of these clubs. A special meeting was called in his honour in the newly established Ballinrobe Club

[181] Brian Farrell, A review of R.B. McDowell, *The Irish Convention of 1917* in *An Irish Quarterly Review*, vol. 59, no. 234 (Summer, 1970), pp 206-208.

[182] Personality Files, 5 November 1918 Moore, Colonel M., 310, TNA Kew, CO. 904/210/310.

[183] Membership of the Sinn Féin Clubs conferred advantages in terms of securing acquired land. Tony Varley, 'A Region of Sturdy Smallholders? Western Nationalists and Agrarian Politics during the First World War' in *Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society*, vol. 55, (2003), p. 137.

which had a membership of 326 and was actively seeking affiliation and increased membership to which Moore contributed ten shillings.

The local clergy had shown some interest in naming Moore as an Irish Party candidate, and let it be known that if he ran they would support him. The victory of Count Plunkett in the North Roscommon by-election on 3 February 1917 had induced a crisis in the Party ranks and it was obvious that some changes were necessary.[184] Moore had several exchanges with Dillon and Devlin who agreed that this was the case and announced the Party intention of ridding itself of 'practically illiterate men.'[185] The Mayo clergy who were dissatisfied with their Party representative John Fitzgibbon informed Moore that they wanted a representative with ability and preferably a university education who would 'not be a laughing stock'. Fitzgibbon's background was solidly middle class and financially comfortable as a result of his father's success in business, however he was a Fenian, according to F.S. L.Lyons, which may explain the clerical disapproval. The Irish/Ireland ideology on which Sinn Féin was largely based on was less threatening to the Catholic Church. Griffith's refusal, for example to unequivocally endorse a republican constitution at the October Sinn Féin Ard Fheis, reveals some vestiges of ambivalence towards republican separation. Moore, who was alienated from the Irish Parliamentary Party, by this time, declined an opportunity to represent them, electing to stay with Sinn Féin despite the failure of his candidacy as their representative.

Special Branch reports from Dublin Castle show some interest in Moore's movements at this time but the final report to the Under-Secretary dismissed Moore as a serious threat and stated that he was acting from self-interest, an accusation that was hurled at Moore some years later when he was in the Senate. However, a report a year later suggests that they were maintaining a watch on him. An article written by Moore and published on 2 November 1918 in the *Irish Independent* was brought to the attention of the Under-Secretary with the inflammatory sections underlined heavily in red. The Special Branch report bore the heading 'Moore's Extreme View' while the letter to the press was titled 'Ireland and the Election: Prisoner Members Suggested'. Moore stated that he had intended running for the Mayo seat in the forthcoming election but had stood aside in order that Sinn Féin prisoners might be elected, which was a slight distortion of the facts.[186] Although in an article in the Mayo press in 1922, it was stated that 'it was a matter of

[184] Sinn Féin had become associated with land redistribution in the early months of 1918 in North Roscommon and South Sligo. Tony Varley, 'A Region of Sturdy Smallholders? Western Nationalists and Agrarian Politics during the First World War,' p. 137.

[185] Ibid.

[186] In 1869, George Henry Moore had encouraged Kickham and O'Brien to nominate imprisoned republicans for parliament to give publicity to the amnesty cause and it is likely that Maurice had his father's example in mind.

common knowledge that the Mayo electorate had selected Moore as their parliamentary candidate in the 1918 election, but he had not allowed himself to be nominated'.[187] He called on the Irish Parliamentary Party to stand aside as 'Sinn Féin', now held the field and 'there could be no unity under the old Party leaders'. He called John Dillon 'a fossil Home Ruler'. Moore's own longevity allowed him to recall Dillon's previous rejection of the constitutionalism of Isaac Butt while he now clung to outworn constitutionalism himself.[188] Tierney attributed Dillon's resistance to change to his age, he was 67 at this time, Moore who at 64 was just three years younger appeared to have made a political transformation that Dillon, despite his earlier Fenian roots now seemed incapable of making.[189] Moore had warned Dillon that if changes were not forthcoming and 'something decisive be not done the revolution may go to the extreme of changing the whole party leaders and all'.[190] Dillon's reply that he would not desert party politics in the name of courting popularity insinuated that Moore had done both.[191]

Despite the apparent radicalism of Moore's comments about the Irish Party, in 1917, the origins of the criticisms he expressed in the *Independent* can be seen in an earlier letter to the *Connaught Telegraph* in 1907, in which he described the Irish Parliamentary Party as 'old warriors shouting worn out watch words', while the 'best and most enthusiastic of our people are now looking to Sinn Féin'.The context for these statements lay in the divisions Moore perceived in Irish society following on the dismantling of the landlord order. 'The Party', declared Moore, thought of nothing but the 'peasantry', while Ireland was becoming a place where no one might own more than 20 acres of land, while Irish society was characterised by 'undiluted materialism and unending mediocrity'.[192] By 1917, the political climate had changed but the Irish Parliamentary Party still uttered the old shibboleths according to Moore, although his opinions on the mediocrity of a peasant dominated society would gave gained him little support at this time, however the societal divisions that he deplored continued to dominate his political thought into the foundation of a new state.

In his final statement which the authorities had heavily underlined, he said that 'if that appeal is refused, it may be necessary to take measures to impress the congress not only with the justice

[187] *Connaught Telegraph*, 16 December 1922.
[188] Conor Mulvagh, ' A Souring of Friendships' Internal Divisions of the Irish Parliamentary Party in the Aftermath of the Easter Rising' in Diarmaid Ferritier and Susannah Riordan, (eds), *Years of Turbulence: The Irish Revolution and its Aftermath* (Dublin, 2015), p. 95.

[189] Michael Tierney, 'John Dillon and the Home Rule Movement' in *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, vol. 58. no.229 (Spring, 1969), pp 63-73; James McConnel, 'Fenians at Westminster: The Edwardian Irish Parliamentary Party and the Legacy of the New Departure' in *Irish Historical Studies*, vol. 34, no. 133 (May 2004), p. 42-64.

[190] Moore to Dillon, 4 March 1917, Moore PapersI, Ms. 10,561/9.

[191] Michael Laffan, *The Resurrection of Ireland: The Sinn Féin Party, 1916 -1923* (Cambridge, 1999), p. 85.

[192] *Connaught Telegraph* 24 August 1907.

but the urgency of the cause'.[193] According to Kissane, the steady growth of the Sinn Féin movement at this time indicated a process in Irish nationalism which had been identified by Fanon as 'classically anti-colonial in its rejection of legal reforms, the gestation of a determined revolutionary elite and the mobilisation of the periphery against the standards of the centre'.[194] However, the election in 1918 essentially created Ireland as a nation, permitting a democratic solidarity that now had an electoral authority. Moore pointed out that Sinn Féin had not abdicated from constitutionalism, as Ireland had been constitutionally independent in 1783 and called for unity under Sinn Féin now that it was clear that both the party and the convention had failed to deliver, in order to appeal to the 1919 Paris Peace Conference for self-determination and equal justice with the Czech-Slovaks and the Poles. All of his political efforts over the previous years, with the Volunteers, the various committees to promote a new constitution or federal and dominion alternatives and now his membership of Sinn Féin had a single end: the unity of class, and religion in a single national movement that represented all interests. Sinn Féin's emphasis on 'moral force, civic organisation, and the legitimation of radical causes by popular sanctions at the polls,' contained all the political markers that were acceptable to Moore.[195] In a sense, Moore did not radicalise, Sinn Féin constitutionalised.

He was aware that a 'new era' was at hand and that the survival of his class depended on an alliance with the national movement. His military leadership of the Volunteers had allowed him a prominent public role and he continued to use the press to make public his political opinions from this position of authority. During this period he also forged alliances with the intellectual, middle class leaders of Irish nationalist opinion and the moderate unionism of the Protestant landlords in order to gain a constitutional consensus of representative Irishmen and women on the question of Irish independent government by examining schemes for federal or dominion membership of empire. With the failure of these schemes and the loss of power of the Irish Parliamentary Party, Moore joined Sinn Féin and modified his rhetoric to articulate popular Sinn Féin policy. These years of turmoil bore little in the way of discernible personal success for Moore. The Volunteers, the Dominion Association and the 1917 Irish Convention all failed in some measure, but if there were successes they lay in the networks formed as a result of all these involvements and these were to bear fruit in the years to come. His activation of South African networks though his meeting with Smuts was to have a critical importance for Irish independence in 1921.These networks provided a broader global framework into which Moore's involvement

[193] *Irish Independent,* 2 November 1918.

[194] Bill Kissane, *The Politics of the Irish Civil War* (Oxford, 2005), p. 16.

[195] Oliver MacDonagh, *Ireland: The Union and its Aftermath* (Dublin, 1977), p. 93.

in the Convention and Dominion committees might be placed. The years between 1917 and 1919 were, as Darwin puts it, a dynamic phase for imperial politics as empire slowly transformed into commonwealth, and eventually, Ireland was to accept dominion status under the terms of the Treaty of 1921. This suggests that the constitutional movements that have been historiographically eclipsed by revolution had a considerable bearing on Ireland's status as an independent nation in empire. As Harkness observed, the work of Plunkett's Irish Dominion League had some part in informing the understanding of the republicans who formed an Assembly in 1916. Michael Collin's vision, prompted perhaps by A.D. Lindsay's publication, incorporated the idea of co-operation between Britain, the colonies and a sovereign Irish state.[196] This 'third way,' in Irish nationalist politics became a subsidiary narrative in what has become the primary narrative of Irish nationalism, but it remains a significant consideration in a study of these years and it was to gain a pressing urgency in 1921 which will be dealt with in the next chapter.

[196] D.W. Harkness, *The Restless Dominion: The Irish Free State and the British Commonwealth of Nations* (Dublin, 1969),p. 16.

CHAPTER FOUR: FROM CARNACON TO CAPE TOWN: MOORE'S MISSION TO SOUTH AFRICA IN 1921

It was in 1921 that Moore's experience in South Africa was to become of acute importance to the political mission of the Irish Assembly that formed in 1919. In the post WW1 reassignment of national borders due to Woodrow Wilson's doctrine of self-determination for small nations, Ireland's quest for independent government took on a fresh urgency. The guerrilla warfare that raged from 1919 to 1921 was not sustainable for a longer period and a political solution that was internationally recognized became critical. As a consequence of the redrawing of national borders and the increasing autonomy achieved by the dominions during the war, Britain was experiencing pressing demands from their former colonies for a commonwealth of nations based on dominion equality with the metropole. This confluence of factors gave Irish republicans a unique opportunity to press their case for independent government, and the opportunity was effectively exploited by the president of the assembly, Eamonn de Valera, who despatched global emissaries to marshal dominion aid. As a South African veteran, Moore was asked by de Valera to open a dialogue with Premier Jan Smuts and engage his support for a resolution to the Irish Question, which Smuts had already expressed verbally at the Versailles negotiations, for a resolution to the Irish Question. The timing was critical, the 1921 Imperial conference was to be held in London in June, and it would be attended by all the dominion premiers. Moore's South African mission took place against a background of global and imperial transition in which, according to Gerwarth and Manela, the British Empire faced its most serious crisis from 1919 to 1922, with the Egyptians and the Irish agitating for independence, a war in Afghanistan and the challenges from the dominions.[1] These challenges arose from the changing world order, which was rapidly democratising, even if many of the previous elites continued to wield influence and authority.

The 1921 Irish diplomatic mission to South Africa will be examined under several rubrics, all of them intersecting in the career of Moore, an elite, Catholic, ex-military, national activist with a controversial experience of the last Anglo-Boer War. The additional criteria for their selection lies in their significance to the events that led up to the Imperial Conference of 1921 in both Ireland and South Africa. The mission, which was kept secret from the Irish public, attracted public attention in the South African press coverage which generated discussion among several interest groups, Irish, Afrikaner and Cape English. This interest reveals the importance that a settlement of the Irish question had in a number of quarters; an interest which justified the importance of the Irish mission on South African soil. Having established the criteria for the

[1] Robert Gerwarth and Erez Manela, 'The Great War as a Global War: Imperial Conflict and the Reconfiguration of World Order, 1911-1923' in *Diplomatic History*, vol. 38, no.4 (2014).

questions to be asked in this chapter, it is timely to examine the means by which these interests were exploited by the Irish emissaries, and the political, social and economic part played by a remarkably diverse Irish presence in South Africa at this time. Looking firstly at Moore's experience which was recorded in his letters, P.J. Little's reports, and in the South African press, it is possible to explore the relationships between arguably colonial elites and also at the exchanges between the Irish and the South Africans on the basis of ethnic identity and language revival. It is also possible to discern an older elite discourse in Moore's appeal to Smuts. The series of memoranda he prepared in which to make his case are revelatory of the persistence of liberal ideas subject to the forces of democracy and republican nationalism, while they also activated the historically sanctified rhetoric of oppression and suffering. The irony inherent in a deployment of the language of the subordinate by one who hailed from the ascendancy class may have gone unremarked by another who had exchanged his ideologically convinced republicanism for an equally convinced imperialism. The peregrinations of P.J. Little, as one of the two emissaries despatched to the Cape, in the South African Union make visible the diversity in composition in terms of class, occupation and religion of the Irish presence in South Africa, and the nature and character of the support offered by the republican Afrikaners. The formation of the Irish Republican Association under the leadership of the Irish Protestant Sinn Féiner, Ben Farrington, opens up a debate on the actual influence of these organisations of diasporic populations and exposes a more complex composition and set of objectives than has hitherto been investigated. These inquiries are all revelatory of the transnational nature of the Irish campaign for independence as it intersected with dominion interests. Finally, all of these question are embedded in a larger struggle in which empire metamorphosed, although not entirely of its own volition, into commonwealth. This final question is the first to be considered in the next paragraph as the relationship between Ireland and South Africa is examined within a broader international context.

At an initial glance, South Africa and Ireland seem to be more divergent than convergent in terms of identity, colonial status and resistance to empire but, as the lawyer and academic, Sir Ivor Jennings pointed out, Ireland and South Africa were two of the drivers for a dominion movement to 'develop a commonwealth of equal and autonomous states', which would become a vast political and economic structure based on the supremacy of the white nations.[2] According to Jennings, the notion of a 'commonwealth of equal and autonomous states', was owed not to

[2] Cited in Andries Wessels, '"A Rich and Rare Land:' 'The Experience and Expression of Nationalism in Poetry among Colonists in Ireland, South Africa and Québec, in '*The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies,* vol.25, no.1/2 (Jul.,- Dec., 1999), pp 352-371; Donal Lowry, 'New Ireland, Old Empire and the Outside World, 1922-49: The Strange Evolution of a "Dictionary Republic," in Mike Cronin and John M. Regan (eds), *Ireland: The Politics of Independence 1922-49* (New York, 2000), p.168.

Britain but the combined interests of Ireland, South Africa and French Canada who variously resisted imperial domination in the pursuit of their own interests.[3] Ireland and South Africa shared a relationship in empire, which was not shared by the other dominions. The ideological basis of shared Saxon origins, which Australia, New Zealand, and some parts of Canada were happy to subscribe to, was resisted by Ireland and South Africa who were united by an anti-British sentiment. The South Africans were the 'least friendly of the dominions', and the republicans among them were prepared to support the Irish claims in order to further their own separatist interests in a return to the old republics.[4] The nationalisms of Canada and South Africa led away from empire: they were more self-sufficient, more republican and grounded in a sense of cultural difference.[5]

As Wessels pointed out, what was unique about these nations was their dominance as European populations by other Europeans, and all three were subject to similar pressures to adopt English culture at the expense of their own distinctive cultural differences. The chapter will have a focus on the relationship between Ireland and South Africa as Ireland struggled to establish a republic, but, for the moment at least, like South Africa, accepted dominion status in empire. This chapter will examine these relationships from the perspective of an imperial soldier turned Irish diplomat as he negotiated with the South African leadership in order to secure their support. This mission has been resurrected by some historiographical interest in recent years. In 2016, Gerald Keown, the former Irish ambassador to Poland, published a study of the early years of Ireland's foreign policy in which he discussed the significance of this early foray into diplomacy and, in 2015, Ciaran Reilly's article on the mission to South Africa focused on Irish politics and the nature and function of the South African Irish Republican Association.[6] Shane Lynn's 2014 prizewinning essay on a sister mission to Australia, New Zealand, and Canada throws more light on the proliferation of supportive republican organisations within the dominions.[7] By focusing on a trip taken by Kathleen Hughes and Osmond Esmonde, who like Moore, was representative of the Irish Catholic elite, an altogether different perspective is offered on the origins and functions of such organisations. The findings of both Lynn and Reilly provoke fresh examination of de Valera's foreign policy and deployment of counter propaganda forces. However, this chapter will cast a

[3] Ibid., p. 352.

[4] Monica Wilson, and Leonard Thompson (eds), *Oxford History of South Africa 11, 1870-1966* (Oxford, 1971), pp 381-391.

[5] Robert Gerwith and Erez Manela, 'The Great War as a Global War,' p. 795.

[6] Gerard, Keown, *First of the Small Nations: The Beginnings of Irish Foreign Policy in the Inter-War Years, 1919-1932* (Oxford, 2016); Ciaran Reilly, 'The Magna Hibernia: Irish Diplomatic Missions to South Africa, 1921' in *South African Historical Journal,* vol.67, no. 3 (2015), pp 255-270.

[7] Shane Lynn, 'Osmond Esmonde's Dominion Odyssey: Irish Nationalism in the British Empire' in *The Australasian Journal of Irish Studies,* vol. 14, (2014), pp 69-90.

more probing and critical eye on the efficacy of the role of the Irish Republican Association of South Africa and challenge some of O'Reilly's assumption about the strength and coherence of the IRASA.

The brainchild of de Valera, the republican associations or self-determination leagues were set up throughout empire. They were composed of members of communities of immigrant and colonial Irish who either valued their continuing links to the motherland or found the creation of political lobbies advantageous to their present situation. They were set up under de Valera's guidance in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, which despite a puny Irish presence was Ireland's strongest advocate among the dominion governments. A recent union of colony and former republics, the South African leadership was ardently nationalist with a republican Afrikaner element. In some ways the least likely of political allies, the Afrikaner leadership played a vital role in the events leading to an Anglo-Irish truce in 1921. Moore's role on this mission was in some ways a natural outgrowth of his earlier constitutional activities in 1917 when he and others of his class formed a Dominion Association in order to investigate a possible dominion status for Ireland which they had discussed with Smuts as early as 1917.

Dáil Éireann failed to secure recognition at the 1919 Peace Conference at Versailles. Ireland, like South Africa and Egypt had been ignored by President Woodrow Wilson whose liberal internationalist doctrines on the self-determination for small nations was selective in its application.[8] It is clear from Bernadette Whelan's recent lecture on the topic that the influence of the Irish-American political lobby in the United States was a significant factor in Wilson's willingness to provide support to the Allies in the war.[9] In the talks that followed on the peace, the changed dynamic in the Anglo-American relationship made Wilson reluctant to to interfere in imperial affairs. The Sean O'Kelly-led Irish delegation had been spurned by all by all but the official South African delegation led by the ex-Anglo-Boer war generals, Jan Smuts and Louis Botha.[10] The Irish, the South African National Party which had sent its own delegation, and the Egyptians were, as D.F Malan, one of the National Party delegates, wryly observed 'political beggars at the table of the rich.'[11]

[8] Lindie Korf, 'D.F. Malan: A Political Biography,' PhD Thesis, University of Stellenobosch, 2010, p. 214.

[9] Bernadette Whelan, 'The Irish Convention and Wilsonian America, ' The Irish Convention, 1917-1918: A Centenary Symposium, 15-26 July 2017, Regent House and Trinity Long Room Hub, Trinity College Dublin.

[10] P.J.Little, Bureau of Military History, W.S 1767.

[11] Korf, 'D.F. Malan,' p. 213.

'...the existence of the empire as a whole...and the existence of the dominions themselves depends on singleness of policy before the - World'[12]

Smuts believed that South African and dominion interests would be best served by a resolution of the Irish question, and voiced that belief at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, calling the situation in Ireland a 'chronic wound the septic effects of which are spreading to our whole system'. However he was adamantly opposed to a republican solution, knowing that 'republicanism did not form a part of the 'mental framework or constitutional furniture' of British government, and he had relinquished a republican ideal for South Africa.[13] The National Party and the Republicans led by Hertzog and Malans wanted a return to republican status. This division within the South African ranks was one which the Irish were to exploit in 1921, although their own version of such a divide was to open in 1922. James Barry Munnik Hertzog, the leader of the National Party was to express this internal conflict in interest as 'two streams,' running parallel to each other.[14] The first of these represented those of English descent, while the second was that of the Afrikaners whose identity had been unified and reinforced by war and enforced Anglicisation. The ideological intensity that resulted from these fears of cultural absorption led to a revival of Afrikaner history, tradition, culture and language that closely mirrored the Gaelic Revival. A close identification of nation with religion revealed further parallels with Irish nationalism, although the Calvinist creed that allowed the Afrikaners to identify themselves itself as a chosen people, their exceptionalism forged in adversity, resonated much more closely with the Protestantism of the Ulster Unionists, a fact which the Irish Catholics were not unaware, but tactfully avoided in their negotiations.[15] Despite the necessary ambiguities created by clumsy polarisations in cultural, religious and language differences, it was possible for the Irish and the South Africans to draw useful analogies and largely untested affinities between their nations, which might not survive the test of time but adequately served the interests of their present.

---

[12] *Pretoria News*, 5 May 1921.

[13] 'Smuts Wants Ireland Treated like Bohemia' in *New York Times*, 18 July 1921; Donal Lowry, 'New Ireland, Old Empire and the Outside World, 1922-49: The Strange Evolution of a "Dictionary Republic," p.168.

[14] James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-Word, 1783-1939* (Oxford, 2009), p. 381; J. Lee Thompson, *A Wider Patriotism: Alfred Milner and the British Empire* (London, 2007).

[15] Adrian Guelke, 'The Flexibility of Northern Ireland Unionists and Afrikaner Nationalists in Comparative Perspective' IBIS Working Paper, no. 99 (2000).

Ireland: 'A New Reign of Terror Compared with Which Bolshevism is mild and Equable…'[16]

For the Irish in 1921, time was running out, a guerrilla war was raging with atrocities on both sides. The introduction of an adjunctive police force known as the auxiliaries, reinforced by the infamous 'Black and Tans' led to deaths and destruction of property. The 1920 Government Act which had imposed partition and set up two parliaments was resisted by the setting up of an independent Dáil in 1919, composed of the Sinn Féin politicians who had refused to take their seats in Westminster. Under the leadership of Eamonn de Valera, this assembly, hastily formed a department of Foreign Affairs from which to send diplomatic envoys to dominion leaders in search of their recognition and support.

Moore's mandate was to approach the South African leadership of both the pro-empire and republican factions and to canvass support for Irish independence. With an acute understanding of the political realities in both South Africa and Ireland, and an authority rarely dispensed to a diplomatic envoy, he tailored his approach accordingly by writing a series of memoranda to acquaint Jan Smuts, leader of the National Party, and South African premier, with the historical background of the Anglo-Irish conflict, the realities of the present situation in Ireland and the electoral mandate held by the newly formed Irish assembly.[17] The nature of his approach was legally, morally and historically persuasive. The tactics he used in regard to the Republican Party who received him with warmth and hospitality exploited the common ground between their projects of cultural and language rejuvenation and their joint resistance to enforced Anglicisation. In a sense this bifurcated approach was a reflection of Moore's own political thought, constitutionally pragmatic, reluctantly republican, but strongly protective of the identity of small nations. His previous years in South Africa had given him knowledge and insights into Boer culture and society and he held the Boers in high esteem. The sobriquet of Boer Colonel, ambiguously bestowed upon him as both the traitor of imperial interests and the saviour of the Boer women and children from the camps, made him, as he stated himself, persona grata among the Afrikaners.[18] He was, as P.J. Little, his fellow Irish emissary remarked, 'well got with the Afrikaanders'.[19] It was also an incongruous moment when an ex-imperial soldier of Irish planter status, met with the ex-republican, ex-military leaders of the government of the recent union of

[16] Maurice Moore article in *The Republic*, 22 Oct 1921. Moore was writing to General Neville McCready, the Commander-in-Chief of the army in Ireland.

[17] Seven memoranda composed by Moore for the attention of General Smuts dating from 1 May 1921 to 14 May 1921, with a Final Report to the Republican Government of Ireland, 12 May 1921, Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10,581.

[18] Maurice Moore, 'S. Africa and Ireland: Senator Colonel Moore's Story of his Secret Mission,' *The Freeman's Journal*, 30 June 1924.

[19] P.J. Little, Bureau of Military History, W.S. 1767.

African states, now formally within empire, in order to plead for the recognition of an Irish republican state. The Irish and the South Africans had everything and nothing in common. Culturally and religiously distant, they participated in both pro-and anti-imperial political discourse and ideological resistance to Anglicisation which had made Ireland a primarily Anglophone nation.[20] The parallels and analogies that were drawn between Ireland and South Africa during these years were briefly active in the equally briefly intersecting national histories. This history is rarely considered nowadays, as the brutal regime of apartheid and the institution of racial equality in South Africa has effaced an earlier Afrikaner history.

This chapter will explore these issues, and the reasons for the near historiographical eclipse of this particular mission. The reasons are as obvious as a later desire to detach from policies of apartheid and as complex as de Valera's reactions to South African premier Jan Smuts involvement in the truce leading to the Anglo-Irish Treaty in 1921, which fell short of the republic that de Valera had worked for. The nature of Irish settlement in Africa which differed markedly from diasporic populations elsewhere in empire is similarly a factor in this all but forgotten relationship. The brief success of this short lived organisation is a part of the story of this mission along with the biographical details of its leaders. South Africa, more so than any of the other dominions, under the leadership of Smuts, but with the support of the republican parties, worked to negotiate an Anglo-Irish settlement. This is the story of the brief flowering of a mutually supportive political relationship within commonwealth told from the perspective of one who was both imperial and nationalist, insider and outsider.

Approached by St John Gogarty on de Valera's behalf, Moore was initially reluctant to accept the mission that de Valera outlined to him. The operations of the Dáil were not sanctioned by Westminster, and de Valera was a hunted figure with an international reputation as something of a fugitive president.[21] Accepting such a mission was an irrevocable step into separatism during a time of guerrilla warfare in Ireland. It was however, also a means by which a member of the elite could find a meaningful role in the new order that was forming in Ireland. The last chapter explored Moore's attempts to set up a territorial army, his forays into dominion or federal government and his eventual alliance with Sinn Féin. In this chapter his imperial past intersected positively with a possible political future in a new state. If Moore's role is regarded in this light then the potential for political and social reinvention for a member of a hated elite can be seen as

[20] Bruce Nelson, *Irish Nationalists and the Making of the Irish Race* (Oxford, 2011), p. 52; Bill Schwarz, *The White Man's World* (Oxford, 2011).

[21] *Pretoria News*, 9 May 1921.

promising. His initial reluctance was compounded by fears that his pension might be suspended as a result of his public support for republican activities. These fears were not without foundation. Earlier in the year he had incurred the ire of the Commander-in-Chief Neville MaCready for possessing 'seditious literature'. He was arrested and carried around Dublin in an armoured car, looking 'sad and grey.'[22] Leaving his wife was also a source of anxiety to him as she suffered from an unspecified 'delicacy of health'.

However, he agreed to a meeting with de Valera in Madam O'Rahilly's house in Herbert Park, where he was given a briefing and told that his task was to appeal to Smuts to push the Irish question at the Imperial Conference. According to Moore, in an account given some years later, he wondered at the 'length of his tether', and the nature of the arguments he might put to Smuts who had abandoned republicanism to pursue increased dominion status in empire.[23] Moore was also worried about questions of exceeding his brief as well as the likely interception of communications by British intelligence and the possible consequences of that. Advised to approach Smuts without identifying his links with Sinn Féin, or drawing too much attention to himself, appealed to Moore's caution while on his own admission his vanity was served by the broad mandate extended to him. His adaptability, resourcefulness and familiarity with the social, cultural, and geographical terrain was an obvious reason for his choice as envoy, and very often as Kennedy points out, the success of these mission rested on those qualities and the personal abilities of the candidates. His pension safeguarded by the secrecy and anonymity with which his mission was surrounded and with an agreement that his wife would accompany him, Moore agreed to go to South Africa as an 'interested, private, Irish Citizen'.[24]. His return could not have been a morally neutral experience and his accounts of his trip bear witness to the effect that the visit had on him. He had suffered in 'mind and conscience', for doing what he knew was wrong twenty years ago and he felt that he owed some 'small reparation', for the actions he was forced to undertake.[25]

Moore and Little.

It was into this political, cultural and 'racially-charged' milieu that Moore and Little were despatched by the de Valera led government in the spring of 1921, barely two months shy of the

[22] George Berkeley, Bureau of Military History, W.S 994.

[23] Moore, *The Freeman's Journal*, 30 June 1924.

[24] Letter from Foreign Affairs to President, 21 March 1921 saying that Moore agreed to go to South Africa and was taking his wife; Letter from Robert Brennan, Under-Secretary of Foreign Affairs to President, 10 February 1922, Brennan promised Moore an indemnity if his pension was interfered with as a result of the mission. Letter to President 18 March 1921, NAI, DFA, ES, Box 32, 223.

[25] Letter from Moore to Smuts, 20 August 1921, UCDA, P., 150/1897.

imperial conference. Moore wrote to his friend George Berkeley in order to create an alibi to explain his absence, telling him that he was going to Madeira for some months to rest and recover his health. 'He hoped that the warm climate would do him some good'.[26] With just a few days to prepare he left for South Africa on 1 April 1921 going by rail from Dublin to London and then on to Southampton and the Cape. Travelling first class, with a bursary from Foreign Affairs of £500. He used the seventeen day journey to get to know his fellow passengers. He identified them as Irish but 'colonial born'. Venturing some discussion on the Irish Question without, as he said, being 'esmonded', he found them sympathetic but pro-Smuts. There are two points here in need of discussion. Firstly Moore's reference to being 'esmonded', was in relation to the arrest and detention of Osmonde Esmonde the envoy to Australia and New Zealand as a result of an inebriated indiscretion aboard ship.[27] The onus was now on the more mature figure of Moore to prove the efficacy of employing the elite in political negotiations of a sensitive nature. Secondly, Moore's description of his fellow Irish passengers as both 'colonial', and pro-Smuts raises questions about the identity of the South African 'Irish'. This is a demographic that has not received a lot of historiographical investigation apart from the sterling work of Donal P.McCracken and Donald Akenson.[28] Akenson has established the somewhat enigmatic presence of the Irish in South African archives. Unlike the settler dominions of Australia, Canada and New Zealand, South Africa they did not have a sizeable, ethnically identifiable disaporic population. Those who were there were described as 'economically and educationally privileged and markedly different to the global relocation due to the famine'. Numerically inferior to the diasporas elsewhere, they were both Catholic and Protestant and tended to relocate for commercial reasons. With their superior education and skills they were disposed to become absorbed into the English and Afrikaner populations and were less likely to form discernible communities. This 'small, but influential population', has until recently been 'largely airbrushed out of Irish historiography'. As Moore pointed out many of them were pro-Smuts and therefore pro-empire. The Irish Republican Association of South Africa which had been founded just six months prior to his arrival faced a more challenging task in uniting this population than the Self-Determination Leagues set up in more easily definable diasporic communities elsewhere in empire.

[26] Letter from Moore to Berkeley, George F.H. Berkeley Papers NLI, Ms. 10,929.

[27] Michael Kennedy, *Ireland and the League of Nations 1919-1946: International Relations, Diplomacy and Politics* (Dublin, 1996), p. 37. Esmonde's unfortunate early experience of diplomacy did not inhibit the development of his career in international politics. He was one of the Irish delegates to the Assembly of the National League of Nation when Ireland secured admission to that body in 1923.

[28] Donal P. McCracken, *The Irish in South Africa, 1795-1910* (Durban, 1992); idem, 'Imperial Running Dogs or Wild Geese Reporters: Irish journalists in South Africa' in *South Africa Historia*, vol. 58, no. 1 (May/Mei, 2013); idem, 'A Minority of a Minority of a Minority, The Irish in South Africa,' in Matjaz Klemencic and Mary N. Harris (eds), *European Migrations, Diasporas and Indigenous Ethnic Minorities* (Pisa, 2009); Donal Akenson, *Occasional Papers on the Irish in South Africa* (Grahamstown, 1991);Andy Bielenberg, *The Irish Diaspora* (Edinburgh, 2000).

P.J. Little, Moore's fellow envoy would have more contact with the Irish throughout the Union than Moore. Little, (1884-1963), the Clongowes Wood educated son of Canadian parents (his father had been the first premier of Newfoundland), and the editor of *New Ireland* a Sinn Féin weekly publication, was the official Irish emissary. He was given a clearer mandate to create a public image of Ireland by holding public meetings and interviews which were consistent with the Sinn Féin policy of hand-in-glove diplomacy and propaganda. Little had been instructed that the Daíl wished to create a situation whereby Lloyd George could call a truce without losing face, and it was also necessary the Irish could call a halt to the war without surrendering. Little, like Moore, travelled incognito, on the 'Kenilworth Castle', on 24 March with a first class ticket from Southampton to the Cape. In the company of the British upper and military classes he was anxious that his accent might give him away, and to allay suspicion he claimed an interest in ostrich farming and big game hunting and played cricket on deck with the other passengers.[29] Since Little was 'slim and quiet in manner,' an identity as a big game hunter may have appeared unlikely, but Osmond Esmonde's recent 'outing' was not one the Irish envoys wished to emulate. When the 'Kenilworth Castle', docked at Cape Town, Little made contact with Ben Farrington and set off on his tour of the Union, visiting thirty nine-towns and having a resolution for recognition of an Irish republic adopted in all but six. Little found his mission to the High Veldt arduous with freezing conditions at night and uncomfortable heat in the day. He was interviewed by both the anglophone and the Afrikaner press, and attracted a fair amount of interest in both as they followed his progress around the Union. He enjoyed the hospitality and support of an Irish merchant and professional class, who were by no means exclusively Catholic, as well as the protection of the religious orders who were representative of the nineteenth century Irish missionary expansion.

Questions have been raised about the economic self-interest of this professional class, who may have deployed Irish nationalist interests to their own benefit, a fact which Little commented on with some asperity. 'They put the interest of the people here so much in front as to forget the main work'. They were 'pro-Irish', but as Moore had already observed, this did not automatically include anti-imperialism despite the bonding of the Irish clubs. Under-Secretary Robert Brennan was of the opinion that they 'were quite ignorant on the Irish Question but may be redeemed by the present movement.' Moore felt that they naturally, in a country united by the politics of race, fell into line with their fellow English speakers. An anecdote told by Archbishop Denis Hurley in the 1990s sheds some light on the ambiguity of identifying as Irish in the Cape in 1921. Hurley who was a child on Robben Island in 1921 remembers being reprimanded by his mother for

[29] P.J. Little, Bureau of Military History, W.S 1767.

identifying himself as Irish; a response that he later attributed to the coverage by the South Afrikaner press of the Irish rebellion.[30] The reports on Sinn Féin atrocities that were disseminated by the *Pretoria News, Rand Daily Mail* and the *Cape Argus,* no doubt had some bearing on the reprimand delivered by Healy's mother. This masking of a secondary Irish, Catholic identity made it easier to assimilate into British South Africanism and avoid the negative effects of the Anglophone press. But how did this negative perception of Irish identity effect the formation of an Irish Republican Association?

On Moore's arrival, Little had already gone 'up country', and Moore was met by Farrington at the Mount Nelson Hotel in Cape Town.[31] Moore found Cape Town much changed since his last visit, and confessed to a feeling of nostalgia for the old road to Wynberg, the site of the former British army garrison and now the suburbs of Cape Town which he found much modernised and more cosmopolitan.[32] Moore was favourably impressed by Farrington (1891-1974) who was politically radical, Protestant and later a communist. Possessed of a classics degree from University College Cork, a degree in Middle English from Trinity, he also had a Masters degree in English literature and had been assistant professor of Classics in Belfast from 1916 to 1920 before he took up the post of Professor of Greek at Cape Town. A Sinn Féin sympathiser, Farrington had witnessed the 1913 Lock Out in Dublin, and attended the Paris Peace Conference in 1919. Farrington's presence in South Africa by 1920 appeared to owe itself to his nationalist activism in the Irish cause as much as it did to academic ambition. An air of mystery surrounds some of his activities; his determined public anonymity for example, as he worked tirelessly for an Irish republic. Despite being the driver behind the Irish Republican Association and the editor and major contributor to its propaganda organ, the *Republic,* Farrington remained behind the scenes. Initially a supporter of race segregation he modified this position on his marriage to Ruth Schechter the Jewish intellectual and friend of Olive Schreiner, author, feminist and close friend of Jan Smuts.[33] *The Republic*, a sixteen page, weekly publication with a circulation of 2,000 copies, founded by Farrington to stimulate Irish republican awareness, was subscribed to by several public libraries, but banned from sale on South African railway platform newstands because of its anti-British opinions. Independent and impatient, Moore considered him 'the best

[30] Donal McCracken, ' 'A Minority of a Minority of a Minority, The Irish in South Africa', p.173.

[31] Letter from Moore, Cambridge Hotel, Milnerton to Foreign Affairs, 5 May 1921. Moore cut down on his expenses by moving from the expensive Nelson Hotel in Cape Town to the more modest hotel in Milnerton, seven miles outside the city. NAI, D.F.A, ES, Box 14, File 6. He returned a cheque for £175-12-4 to the Dept. of Foreign Affairs on his return. They awarded the remainder to him as 'his affairs became a bit involved during his absence.' Brennan to de Valera, NAI, D.F.A. ES, Box 32, File 223.

[32] Letter from Moore to Smuts, 20 August 1921 UCDA P., no. 23, 150/1897.

[33] Baruch Hirson, 'Ruth Schechter and Olive Schreiner, 'The Intellectual as Socialist' in *South Africa*, vol. 3, no. 1 (August, 1992)

; John Atkinson, 'Benjamin Farrington: Cape Town and the Shaping of a Public Intellectual' in *South African Historical Journal*, vol. 62, no. 4 (2010), pp 671-692.

man here'. Farrington published articles by Moore in *The Republic* and they worked together to give public lectures on Irish culture and language in Cape Town. They attended several social functions together which involved meetings with the Afrikaner politicians in the second part of Moore's mission, the political wooing of the republican parties.

A meeting with Smuts was the most pressing item on Moore's agenda, and he contacted Smuts' aide-de-camp Captain Lane to set up an interview. Smuts was due to leave for London to attend the Imperial Conference in June, leaving Moore a limited window of opportunity in which to engage his support. A contemporary view of events in 1921 often fails to appreciate the international standing enjoyed by Smuts at this time. He was held in high regard by Winston Churchill and the members of the British cabinet, and South Africa's signature along with that of the other dominions at the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919 had altered the legal position of the dominions in commonwealth. Smuts had many Irish friends: Tom Casement, the brother of Roger Casement was a close friend, who had served with Smuts in East Africa in WW1, and they kept in regular contact. Smuts had a complex commonwealth ideal which he gave the vague definition of 'higher status.'[34] He wanted dominion independence of the English parliament while remaining connected to empire through the throne. The numerical superiority of the non-white population in South Africa made Smuts aware that the continuing dominance of the white race depended on the creation and cohesion of a commonwealth founded on white supremacy.[35] A republican solution to the Irish Question would take the Irish out of commonwealth and weaken that institution, and therefore was not in South African interests.

As far as it is known, Moore had complete autonomy in the case he presented to Smuts, limited only by de Valera's brief instructions. However he was constrained by the knowledge that Smuts would privilege South African interests in any resolution to the Irish Question: 'Smuts, however he may appear on the surface is working in the Boer interest, and for the independence of South Africa when the time arrives'.[36] Moore had prepared a series of memoranda explaining in some detail the reality of the situation in Ireland: he wrote, he said, as a 'British constitutionalist' and not an 'Irish republican'.[37] According to Moore's arguments, the 1920 Government Act which partitioned the Island, and created two parliaments without a democratic mandate, negated the 1800 Act of Union and invalidated British parliamentary authority. Even though this was

[34] 'General Statement' for General Smuts, 1 May 1921, Moore Papers, Ms. 10,581.

[35] Mark Mazower, *Governing the World: The History of an Idea*, (London, 2012), p.132.

[36] Memo from Moore reporting on his period as envoy to Paris, Moore Papers, NLI, Ms. 10,586/6.

[37] 'The Act of Union Repealed by the Home Rule Act of 1920',' Memo. No. 7, 14 May 1921, Moore Papers, NLI, Ms. 10,581.

evidently a fait accompli, the Irish, claimed Moore, did not want a Repeal of the Union but a historically validated independence. The 'historical claim of the Irish people...always has been for absolute independence and repeal of the Union is granting the claim of the English Colonists in Ireland not that of the Gaelic majority; it is an English attempt at compromise'.[38] He said in his final report to the Irish government that he considered the situation as it was in the present, not 'some future time when the position of parties might change.'[39] The historical, constitutional, legal and moral arguments he advanced have the stamp of his political thought on them, in his privileging of the constitutional over the revolutionary, which had gained coherence and consistency throughout his lifetime. Moore identified an Irish planter class with the 'Uitlanders,' in a curious historical inversion that ignored the original Boer settler status and his own inclusion in the planter class.[40] This rhetorical device ignored the complex heterogeneous beginnings of South African settlement which had never achieved a distinct Boer hegemony, in his desire to compose persuasive nationalist comparisons. Knowing that it was impossible for Smuts to endorse a republic, Moore declared emphatically that Ireland would accept nothing less, but asked that Smuts might push for the 'higher status' in commonwealth that he sought for South Africa, 'You can go that far if you cannot advocate a republic'.[41] By informing Smuts of the success of the Sinn Féin Land Courts in dispensing justice on 'fair and generous terms', to all including his own landlord class, he suggested some reconciliation and unity of the previous divisions. He was, after all, originally of planter stock himself, as he defended the claims of a Gaelic population, and legitimated guerrilla warfare as within the terms of the manual of military law that permitted a population to defend its own territory and its people, which the Boers had done in 1899.[42] He employed familiar tropes of oppression and injustice within a discourse of tyranny and denied autonomy. It was an argument with which the Afrikaners were not unfamiliar. D.F. Malan, the leader of the Cape Republicans was happy to articulate a Boer history of oppression, enforced anglicisation and rebellion. This unity of 'past grievances with present discontents,' was one that Smuts had used himself in his polemical history of 'Boer resistance to British imperialism', *A Century of Wrong.* For both the Boers and the Irish 'history could be produced as an argument, or a witness' regarding Anglo-Irish, and Anglo-Boer relations'.[43]

[38] 'Constitutional Questions for General Smuts' Memo No 6 (a),14 May 1921, Moore Papers, NLI, Ms. 10,581.

[39] 'Final Report to the Republican Party of Ireland' 12 May 1921, Moore Papers, NLI, Ms.10,581.

[40] 'Questions for General Smuts,' Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10,581; Perry L. Curtis, 'Demonising the Irish Landlords since the Famine,' in Brian Casey (ed.), *Defying the Law of the Land: Agrarian Radicalism in Irish History* (Dublin, 2013).

[41] 'General Statement' (for Smuts), 1 May 1921, Moore Papers, NLI, Ms. 10,581.

[42] '2nd Rebellion 1919, 20,' 21' Memo., No. 3, 1 May 1921, Ms. 10,581. 'Present Position: Proposals for a Truce on a Permanent Basis.' No. 5 (a), Moore Papers, NLI, Ms. 10581.

[43] 'Constitutional Questions for General Smuts' Memo No 6 (a),14 May 1921, Moore Papers, NLI, Ms, 10,581.

Believing that Lloyd George was not completely opposed to Irish independence but constrained by a coalition Unionist presence, Moore considered that dominion pressure on the British cabinet might force it to change its policy on Ireland. For himself, Moore would have found an independent Ireland within empire an acceptable alternative, not from an antipathy to republicanism, but from a political pragmatism that accepted an established status quo.'[44] Before he left he thanked Smuts for his offer of help and Smuts replied, 'being what I am, how can I do otherwise'?[45]

Despite the elegiac quality of Smuts final words, Moore's report to de Valera bristled with practicality and displayed no illusions of easy solutions or assurances of future assistance. Characteristically blunt, he said it was unlikely that Smuts would support a republic, and while the National Party were supportive, they were not in power: 'Whatever personal opinions S.African politicians may have of the Irish Question, no official of the party in office would advocate an Irish Republic'.[46] Moore suggested sending a negotiating party to represent Ireland's view at the imperial conference with Alice Stopford Green, George Russell and Erskine Childers as possible candidates.[47] In Moore's opinion the dominions needed to unite and apply pressure on the British cabinet to take action on Ireland, even if that force 'must amount to threats to break up the conference'.[48] He also wrote a coded letter to Alice Stopford Green, telling her that in his business in South Africa he had 'met some friends of yours, among them one whom, I saw for the first time in your house in London'.[49] Less cautiously, he informed her that he had advocated a republic which he thought the most desirable outcome for the Irish, but that dominion status was likely to be more acceptable to the British government, with repeal of the union a good starting point.'[50]

Cultural Nationalism and the Republicans: 'A Mother Tongue is a Person's Most Precious Possession ... Deprive a Nation of the Vehicle of its Thoughts and You Deprive it of the Wisdom of Its Ancestors.'[51]

With Smuts departure for London, the first part of the mission was complete leaving Moore free to turn his attention to the National and Republican parties under the leadership of Hertzog

[44] Ibid.

[45] Moore, *The Freeman's Journal*, 30 June 1924.

[46] 'Final Report to the Republican Government of Ireland' 12 May 1921, Moore Papers, NLI, Ms, 10,581.

[47] He removed Green as a candidate in his final statement.

[48] ' Proposals for a Truce and a Peace on a Permanent Basis' Memo., No. 5 (a), 1 May 1921, Moore Papers, NLI, Ms, 10,581.

[49] Letter from Moore to Alice Stopford Green, Cambridge Hotel Milnerton, 24 June 1921, D.F.A NAI, ES, Box 32, File 223.

[50] Ibid.

[51] *De Zuid-Afrikaan*, 22 July 1873; Hermann Giliomee, *The Afrikaners: Biography of a People* (London, 2002).

and Malans. This was a more agreeable experience but it was no less difficult political territory to negotiate. The Afrikaners had a clear sense of political purpose and direction and were, according to J.D. Fage, 'keener political animals than the English-speaking South Africans'.[52] Moore's rhetoric underwent a smooth metamorphosis from constitutionalism to the more emotional terms of cultural nationalism in his communication with the Afrikaner parties. He let it be known that he was the author of the revelatory letter to the press in 1901 exposing the conditions of wartime South Africa. That letter had been printed in the South African paper, *On Lands* and the editor, F.S Malans, now the minister for education, was subsequently imprisoned by Kitchener. In his letter Moore had revealed Kitchener's 'shoot to kill policy,' and the existence of the camps. This revelation would go some way to paving the successful wooing of the republican parties. In this, the Colonel was ably assisted by Farrington who accompanied him on these public relations exercises to restore Ireland's damaged reputation. On 7 June, Moore entertained the leading republicans, Advocates de Waal and Beyers, N.C. Havenga, J.G. Vander Hort and C.T. Wilcocks to lunch at the Opera House. 'Constantly entertained at the Assembly', Moore was accompanied by Farrington and the Rowarths to a lunch at the Legislative House hosted by General Hertzog. He had meetings with Merriman, whom he described as liberal but Unionist, Senator Munnik, republican and Boer commando, Vander Horst and de Waal, whom he referred to as the South African Douglas Hyde.[53] All of these, according to Moore, were eager to meet with the Irish. Gratifying though this attention was, it compromised Moore's attempt to maintain a low key presence in Cape Town, although the *Cape Argus* had already publicly referred to him in its pages as the Irish emissary. As the public envoy and advocate for republicanism, Little avoided compromising his mission by public association with prominent South African politicians and left that part of the proceedings to Moore.

Koffiehuis:'De Valera's Envoy Welcomed'.[54]

Moore attended the birthday party for D.F. Malans, the head of the Cape Republic Party and noted advocate of the Afrikaans language, on 14 June. It was held at the Koffiehuis which was located on Adderley Street near Groote Kerk and a noted gathering place for language enthusiasts.[55] Attended by all the notables of the National and Cape Republican Parties, the guests numbered several hundred and Moore was there in a private not an official capacity.[56] The Irish party was included in the toasts and Moore to his initial consternation was introduced as an

[52] J.D. Fage, *A History of Africa* (London, 1978), p. 439.

[53] Moore, *The Freeman's Journal*, 30 June 1924.

[54] *Cape Argus*, 17 June 1921.

[55] Korf, 'D.F. Malan,'

[56] Letter from Moore to Foreign Affairs, Cambridge Hotel, Milnerton, Cape Town, 16 July 1921, NAI, D.F.A. ES, Box 32, File 223.

'attaché' to the visiting Irish emissary to South Africa and called upon to speak. Discretion was thrown to one side as Moore embarked on a speech that lasted about ten minutes and drew cultural and political parallels between the Irish and the Afrikaners. He compared the struggle for liberty of two small nations, and the revival of two languages.[57] In his defence, Malans and Hertzog, the twin champions of Afrikaans had already made contentious remarks on language and culture, all of which were reported in the national press.[58] Identifying himself as the 'emissary of a people, who like the Afrikanders were under the yoke of the stranger,' Moore spoke of the Irish resistance to the loss of national identity despite years of domination: 'united against the tyrant ... the people would never give in.' Moore's rhetoric had the 'self-consciousness of historically saturated politics,' with its attendant sense of being an 'actor in a theatre of vice and virtue'.[59] He continued to speak of the 'tyrant' who had made the 'Keltic' tongue a 'low common language not fit for civilised beings in a attempt to 'rob the people of their national consciousness.' The language was the 'greatest heritage,' of the Irish people and now it 'was being taught everywhere.'[60] Moore compared the Taal with the Gaelic Revival, remembering that in his wartime experience in South Africa at the turn of the century, the Dutch language was hardly used in Cape Town and that now it was used everywhere, in the press and in an emergent literature. Hackles may have been raised by Moore's description of the Taal as a 'vulgar tongue of farmers and back velders which had become a notational language'. Gaelic speakers may also have bristled at the comparison of the preservation of an ancient language with the codification of a vulgar tongue into a national language. His speech garnered sympathy and promises of help from the politicians present. Moore felt that the Dutch interest in their language lacked a theoretical basis linking it to nationalism. However, Malan's clearly saw some national essence residing in Afrikaans.

Nonetheless, comparisons can be made regarding the discourse surrounding the revival of language, even if objective comparison is limited by context and historical difference.[61] Both nations were politically motivated in their restoration of language: the South Africans, lacking linguistic hegemony in the Union, were striving, if not for cultural dominance than at least cultural assertion. In 1901, *The Times* commented on the foundations for such an anxiety, by quoting from an article which Captain Mahan had submitted to the *National Review* on the beneficial influence the war in South Africa had on empire. Mahan had expressed the wish that 'when the time comes, the Boer Leaders and the Boer language will receive no recognition save banishment in the official

[57] Ibid.

[58] Donal P.McCracken, 'The Imperial British Newspaper with Special Reference to South Africa, India and the 'Irish Model' in *Critical Arts*, vol. 29, no. 1 (2015), pp 5-25.

[59] Simon Schama, 'Speech Acts,' article in *Independent*, 12 April 2013.

[60] *Cape Argus*, 17 June1921.

[61] Korf, 'D.F. Malan,' p.92.

organs of the empire. A Foreign language in parliament and Courts of law is a disintegrating influence which perpetuates race rivalry in its worst terms'.[62] The Irish, being by this time principally Anglophone, saw Gaelic in terms of establishing cultural and historical difference. Moore's evocation of the loss of national consciousness echoed a speech made in 1911 by D.F. Malans in which he claimed that 'humanity was diverse and imperialism which sought to wipe out this diversity by imposing a single culture as hegemon was directly opposed to God's will'.[63] Speaking at the Koffiehuis on the occasion of his birthday, Malans invoked a past history of oppression by reminding Afrikaners of the Jameson Raid, two wars of independence and the rebellion of 1914, in his criticism of the 31,000 Afrikanders in the Cape peninsula who were apathetic in asserting their language rights. He called on the example of the municipal council in Johannesburg which had enforced Article 23. The more politically restrained Hertzog reminded the gathering of the freedoms that Afrikaners now enjoyed from 'Jingosim' the 'worst form of imperialism ... every Afrikander now has the right to give free expression to his ideal of a free and independent South Africa'.[64] The uninhibited cultural, language and republican rhetoric of the Koffiehuis brought out an answering nationalist rhetoric from the usually cautious Moore, suggesting the possibility that coffee was not the only beverage supplied at the gathering.

This discourse on the purity of language, and its cultural importance was reflected in the local press. The *Argus* carried articles on Afrikaans describing it as having three original forms, 'Burger Dutch, Boer-Dutch and Slave-Dutch ... with Afrikaans being defined as Boer-Dutch ... descending in purity from elite use to farm use in the outback'.[65] The debates in the press on the teaching of Afrikaans and the fears of its disappearance bore a resemblance to later post-independence debates on the Irish language. A critical article on the study of Afrikaans arising from an alleged National Party reluctance to employ 'unilingual officials', focused on the difficulty of providing adequate instruction in the Dutch language. Its author suggested founding an Afrikaans institute modelled on those in Europe to provide language teaching.[66] The *Pretoria News* and the *Rand Daily Mail* expressed a similar anxiety with regard to the teaching of Dutch to children in English schools. This was articulated by William Hills of the East Rand school board who feared that the children would be disadvantaged by having inadequate knowledge of Dutch and claimed that

[62] *The Times,* 29 November 1901.

[63] Korf, 'D.F. Malan,' p. 92, for additional material on the formation of an Afrikaner identity, see Sandra Scott Swart, 'A 'Ware' Afrikaner: An examination of the Role of Eugène Marais (1871-1936) in the Making of Afrikaner Identity' PhD Thesis, Oxford, 2001; eadem, 'The Construction of Eugène Marais as an Afrikaner Hero' in *Journal of South African Studie,s* vol. 30, no. 4 Special Issue: Writing in Transition in South African Fiction, History, Biography, (December, 2004), pp 847-867.

[64] *Cape Argus,* 17 June 1921.

[65] *Cape Argus,* 24 June 1921.

[66] *Cape Argus,* 7 July 1921.

teachers of the the Dutch language were having to act as supply teachers to the detriment of the instruction in Dutch.[67] The language discourse was commented on by Little who visited Stellanbosch University on his travels, where he remarked on the 'intensely nationalist' attitudes and the interest in Afrikaans shown by the students. The language, Little observed, was becoming 'the medium for all the literature and generally represents for the national what Gaelic is to the present generation at home'.[68] To Little's surprise, Dr Smith, who was the 'driving nationalist force' at the university told him that Alice Stopford Green's book on Irish history had been bought by hundreds of Stellanbosch students.

The Historical Case for Irish Independence.'

Moore followed up on his Koffiehuis speech by giving lectures on the Irish language, culture and small nations in the Banqueting Hall in Cape Town. They were delivered to a predominately Irish audience, although the articles on Afrikaans suggest that his lectures segued into an existing discourse on language and identity. Accompanied by the indefatigable Ben Farrington and reported in the *Cape Argus* and the republican paper edited by Farrington, Moore was described as inaugurating a series of lectures, the proceeds from which would go to the White Cross Fund to benefit the victims of the war of independence.[69] Presided over by Mr Upington K.C and bearing the title *Culture of Old Ireland, Oldest Western Civilisation,* Moore's lecture was a well -rafted piece of propaganda on small nations and language. He made comparisons between Gaelic and the survival of French in Canada, a conveniently distant dominion which he had visited in 1910, and, in an echo of Malans's 1911 speech, spoke of the dangers of imposing one tongue, one character and one culture on the nations of the earth. 'All small nations and small languages resemble one another', he argued, still drawing analogies between Ireland and Canada but the relevance to the situation in South Africa had to weigh heavily with the audience. The *Cape Argus* must have either missed the reference or ignored it, along with the reference to the erasure of the Irish language with the coming of the 'Saxon invader,' describing Moore as 'a gallant army officer and a man of high culture and wide literary attainments.'[70] In *The Republic,* Farrington reported that Moore could command the interest and appreciation of an infinitely wider public than that which comprised the Association.'[71] Farrington augmented Moore's historical propaganda with some of his own: introduced by Professor Reyburn, he gave a lecture titled, *Cows, Celts and*

[67] *Rand Daily Mail*, 18 May 1921.

[68] P.J. Little, Letter to Foreign Affairs from the Waverly Hotel, Three Archer Bay, Cape Town, 3 June 1921, NAI, D.F.A, ES, Box, 32, File 223.

[69] *The Republic,* 16 July 1921.

[70] *Cape Argus,* 6 July 1921.

[71] *The Republic,* 16 July 1921.

Constables, in which he described the Brehon law clan system, the persistence of Catholic worship, and Plunkett and Russell's co-operative movement.[72]

Both Farrington and Moore were participating in an earlier nineteenth century idealisation of a pastoral past in a myth of a rural nation 'chaste undefiled, spiritual - as living beyond the pale of modernity and its corrosive influences' that was an essential part of the construction of cultural nationalism for both the Irish and the Boers.[73] Moore had a further article published in *The Republic* on the history of the Anglo-Irish relations from the invasions to the Home Rule Movement, culminating in the unacceptability of the recent dominion alternatives to the Irish people. It is his final paragraph that is the most interesting and provocative as it advocates Irish independence under the protection of an Irish army. 'Ireland must be free from all influences of the English parliament, and all her history proves that her liberty has never been safe without an effective armed force rendering interference difficult and dangerous'.[74] By signing himself in the Gaelic form of his name Muiris O' Mordha he guaranteed himself some anonymity. It was a risk considering the fate of Roger Casement but it was also, given the readership of *The Republic*, a coded attempt to place himself definitively on the side of Sinn Féin, proving that the 'landlords and the people' could work together.

'**Sinn Feiners at the City Hall**'

While Moore was occupied with the Cape Republicans and the National Party, Little had been countering British propaganda with some of his own. The *Cape Argus* reported Little's speech at City Hall early in May, with the heading *Black and Tans - The Off - Scourings of Society.* [75] Little delivered a lecture on the 'Black and Tan atrocities,' describing an attack on a pregnant women that left her and her infant dead. He said that Irish soldiers did not target unarmed soldiers. Both comments were met by protest and demurral, one of the audience interjected that 'Englishmen would never do such a thing', in response to the report on the pregnant woman. Chaired by ex-president Reitz, and attended by many of the National Party politicians, there were people standing at the doors. Moore was in the audience, and described Little's speech as 'a splendid meeting ... attended by an enthusiastic 2,500 ... with a few captious critics', and an enthusiastic response from the Dutch republicans at any mention of a break up of empire. Little had to raise his voice at the end in order to be heard over the disturbance in the hall: 'it is no use talking of us

[72] *Cape Argus*, 13 July 1921.

[73] Bruce Nelson, *Irish Nationalism and the Making of the Irish Race* (Oxford, 2011), p. 142.

[74] Moore, 'The Historical Case for Irish Independence' in *The Republic*, 7 May 1921.

[75] *Cape Argus*, 21 May 1921.

of compromise ... nothing will satisfy us short of total and complete sovereign independence'.[76] Little was grilled later by a reporter from the *Argus* in an interview held at the Royal Hotel in Cape Town. He was described as 'slim in figure, with a quiet restrained manner of speech, and a complete absence of that volatility which is regarded as the characteristic of his people'. Without losing his urbanity, Little answered questions on the acceptability of terrorism as a means to gain independence. According to Little, people were being misled by the British propaganda disseminated by the cable agencies. Little's responses to questions on the financial backing of Sinn Féin, and the Irish desire to 'smash' the empire were regarded as evasive sophistries.[77] Asked about Ulster, Little claimed that a republic would bring Ulster into the Irish State in the same manner that the recalcitrant South African states were brought into the Union.[78] The *Argus* editorial response was that this was 'pure moonshine'. The attitude of the Afrikaner press *Die Burger* and *Ons Vaderland* was more sympathetic. In an interview with *Ons Vaderland* (reported in the *Rand Daily Mail*) with the secretary of the executive of the National Party, H.H. Moll, Moll claimed that there were thousands of Irish in South Africa who 'would stand with us.' He called on Afrikaners to support the Irish people, 'who also struggle for liberty under the same oppressors as ourselves'.[79]

South African Irish Republican Association: 'An Irish Play in Johannesburg.'[80]

Who were these thousands of Irish people willing to stand with the republican parties who were clearly happy to support the Irish cause in the expectation that an Irish electorate would in turn support them? Akenson has speculated on the difficulty of discerning separate Irish communities in South Africa. A report in the *Rand Daily Mail* verifies the existence of a lively Irish nationalist population in Johannesburg in 1921, in a reported disturbance at the staging of a play named *The Rebels.* Written by James Bernard Fagan, ' a well born and cultivated Irishman', who had studied at the bar, worked in the Indian civil service and then joined Sir F. Benson's theatrical company, it was performed by Irish actors and staged by Allan Doone and the African Theatre's Trust on 27 of June. The plot articulated a familiar trope of Irish opposition to English rule. During the rendering of a song with Irish patriotic sentiments, 'scores of Irish sympathisers in the audience got to their feet and then refused to do so for *God Save the King,* when it was played at the conclusion', thus exciting some furiously critical letters to the press. The play was

[76] *Cape Argus,* 21 May 1921.

[77] *Cape Argus,* 24 May 1921.

[78] *Cape Argus,* 24 May 1921.

[79] *The Star,* (Johannesburg) 28 June 1921.

[80] *The Star,* 28 June 1921.

cancelled after its initial performance due to the storm of protest from a dominant Anglophile interest that did not hesitate to employ censorship in order to prevent future demonstrations of Irish partisanship.[81] The *Rand Daily Mail*, reported 'hundreds of Irishmen from Springs, Krugersdorp, and Pretoria,' who had booked seats for the following Tuesday to learn when they arrived that the play had been cancelled without warning.[82] The character of the Irish population in Johannesburg was commented on by Little, with some restraint: Johannesburg, was, he considered, 'full of financial adventurers and I am sorry to say, our own are not all too good'.[83] Perhaps the display of nationalist feeling was a little raucous and it was that that aroused the ire of the empire sympathisers?[84] McCracken described the nineteenth century Irish residents in Johannesburg, as a vibrant and rowdy mining community in the Rand numbering about a thousand. Little described this Irish community as unruly, capable of good works but quarrelsome.[85] This community was different in character to the individuals who offered Little support on his mission. In Johannesburg, George Mulligan was a Belfast Protestant, barrister and K.C. Mr North the owner of the Masonic Hotel in Oudshorn had contacts with a North's house agents in Dublin. Two 'reverse emigrants,' Jack Moran from Durban returned to open a record shop in Dublin while from Pietermaritzburgh, Professor Lyons returned to take up a professorship in University College Cork. It is difficult to imagine any of these individuals creating a disturbance in a theatre. The Irish community is South Africa was, as well as being geographically distant, socially and religiously diverse.

Small and scattered though it may have been, it was organised into an association of Irish and colonial-born Irish who rallied to the cause under the direction of academic and Sinn Féiner, Ben Farrington. This association was known as the Irish Republican Association of South Africa, or the IRASA. It played, claimed Reilly, a crucial public relations role in making a case for the Irish Question in the South African political scene in 1921.[86] Similar associations or leagues as they were more popularly known were established throughout the dominions under the direction of Eamonn de Valera. De Valera smarted at the refusal of the long established Irish American nationalist organisation Clan na Gael, under the authority of John Devoy, to do his bidding, and he set up an American association for recognition of an Irish republic. From mid-1920 de Valera

---

81 *Cape Argus,* 29 June 1921

82 *Rand Daily Mail*, 30 June 1921.

83 P.J. Little, report to Dept. of Foreign Affairs, 22 June 1921, NAI, D.F.A, ES, Box 32, File 223.

84 James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Underworld* (Oxford, 2009).

85 P.J. Little report to Dept. of Foreign Affairs, 14 August 1921, NAI, D.F.A ES, Box 32, File 223.

86 Ciaran Reilly, 'The Magna Hibernia: Irish Diplomatic Missions to South Africa, 1921', (2015), p. 251.

ensured that similar organisations in Australia and New Zealand were operating under his direction, and known as Self-Determination Leagues rather than the more contentious republican association. Inserting republic into the name alarmed the Australasian and Canadian dominions who feared that Ireland was intent on breaking up the empire, while republican South Africa rather hoped that it might. There was little that the government could do about popular 'associations of their own citizens providing no obviously seditious terms were employed in their wording'.[87] The arrest of Osmond Esmonde and his trial in Vancouver attested to governmental unease at global emissaries for Sinn Féin and showed that Moore's caution about a public identity was not misplaced. Working closely with Katherine Hughes, who was responsible for organising smaller national communities in two continents into a large more effective and politically identifiable league, a global network was established throughout the dominions working either for Irish self-determination or a republic.[88]

The political conditions in South Africa made it possible to develop an organisation identifiable by its republican aims, but the far-flung Irish communities made it difficult to create a sense of cohesive Irish identity. Ben Farrington was largely responsible for the fact that this was done at all. According to John Atkinson, it seems possible that he came to South Africa not just to take up an academic post but to win the support of the Afrikaner nationalists for the Sinn Féin cause.[89] To this end, in 1920 he wrote a series of articles for *De Burger* on the British oppression of Irish Catholics, the importance of national language, and the readiness to rebel if necessary, all of which was guaranteed to resonate with an Afrikaner readership. Other articles dealt with tolerance of religious difference and national unity. Aware that the republic needed international recognition, Farrington was creating a public consciousness of the Irish push for self-determination, and paving the way for the official emissaries. He augmented this process by founding an official publication for the IRASA, *The Republic.* Despite being the editor and principal contributor until he handed over to Matt Clancy, he remained anonymous, rarely identifying himself as the author. *The Republic* gave the impression that the association was larger and more dynamic than it actually was. Reports on association meetings throughout the union rarely gave the numbers present, or if they were given, they were vague.[90] Farrington claimed that 500 attended a picnic held by the IRASA in Durban to commemorate the 1916 Rising, giving the impression of a sizeable Irish community in the more anglicised Durban, which was contradicted

[87] Shane Lynn, 'Osmond Esmonde's Dominion Odyssey: Irish Nationalism in the British Empire', pp 71-72.

[88] Ibid.,

[89] John Atkinson, 'Benjamin Farrington: Cape Town and the Shaping of a Public Intellectual', pp 671-692.

[90] *The Republic*, 13 August 1921.

by Little a few months later who reported a speech given by him in Durban attended by 600 persons, some 30 per cent of whom were Irish, giving a very different profile.[91]

The extent of Farrington's influence in the Association is made manifest in an appeal written by J.J. Collins, the Association's president, to Moore, after Farrington had resigned. Collins begged Moore to try and get Farrington to consider. 'Take away *The Republic* and the Association was 'reduced to the level of the *Gaelic American* and we will fizzle out in no time, much to the delight of the 'Jingo' papers'.[92] The disarray into which the Association fell into on the question of an Irish Race Conference, which had been their idea, was testimony to the warring interests and political divides within it. Collins described the Association as 'largely a stage army', giving the appearance of a 'well organised, highly effective virile force ... in which victories have been scored all along the line'.[93] The Association was organised in the face of what Collins described as 'apathy, indifference, helplessness and ignorance' and 'big talk,' relying on smoke and mirrors to convey the impression of success. Allowing for a certain disillusionment on the part of the writer, it appears as though the IRASA owed whatever success and identity it possessed to Ben Farrington and *The Republic.* In fact many of these associations and leagues born of emigrant and colonial Irish in the dominions were short-lived affairs and owed their existence to de Valera's policy of securing dominion support for Irish self-determination in the period leading up to the Imperial Conference of 1921. Farrington possessed a keen appreciation of the state of disaporic loyalties and treated cultural assimilation as an inevitability suggesting that despite his strongly voiced patriotism, he saw the Association and *The Republic* as an event; a short lived historical phenomena to assist the course of Irish independence.

This is not the opinion of Shane Lynn and Ciaran O'Reilly, who both see the Irish associations as arising from strongly-felt cultural affiliations that fed into political agitation. Lynn attests to the strength and efficacy of such political activism in Canada as early as the middle of the nineteenth century.[94] O'Reilly states that the IRASA had a 'crucial role,' in situating the Irish Question into mainstream South African politics, which was later effaced by the greater influence

[91] *The Republic,* 21 May and 13 August 1921.

[92] Letter to Moore from J.J. Collins, the President of the IRASA. 5 August 1921, NAI, D.F.A, ES, Box 32, File 223. The association executive had been based initially in Pretoria, but it was transferred to Cape Town in November 1921 with a newly elected executive body.

[93] Letter to Moore from J.J. Collins, the President of the IRASA, 5 August 1921. NAI, D.F.A, ES, Box 32, File 223.

[94] Shane Lynn, 'Before the Fenians: 1848 and the Irish Plot to Invade Canada' in *Éire-Ireland,* vol. 51, no, 1&2 Spring/Summer, (2016), pp 61-91.

of similar organisations in Britain, Australia and the United States of America.[95] It is clear from both Moore's and Little's testimony and the coverage of the South African press that they were welcomed by both the Afrikaners and the South African Irish. However, the disillusioned manifested by the organizers of the IRASA and its rapid disintegration with Farrington's disaffection, suggests that there is some measure of truth in Collins's suggestion that the organisation was a 'smoke and mirrors', affair which owed its brief vitality to Farrington's activism. A letter from one M.O'Brien, a resident of Craddock in the South African Union, to Austin Stack the Minister for Home Affairs recalled their friendship eighteen years previously in Kerry, and went on to complain bitterly to Stack about the 'Dutch' who were now supporting Little. According to O'Brien, Little was speaking to a certain 'class of Dutch who had little time for Ireland or the Catholic Church, and not one in a thousand would make a sacrifice to make Africa free. There was no honor among the Dutch, money speaks is their motto'. O'Brien went on to say that he voted for them but only because it was against England.'[96] The evidence is anecdotal, but it contributes to the sense of ambiguity that surrounds the relationship between the Irish and the South Africans.

Extraordinary Scenes of Joy in Dublin: 'Mafficking' Until 4am.'

The IRASA and the Irish emissaries were successful in gaining attention for the Irish cause and countering the propaganda that dominated the South African Anglophone press, but it was Smuts, the South African premier, who had the most effective role to play in securing Irish self-government. Moore's role in helping to secure a promise from Smuts that he would intercede has not received the historiographical attention it warrants. The reasons for this are complex and will be considered in the concluding paragraphs. While the Irish envoys were engaging the support of the Afrikaner nationalists, Smuts was meeting the British cabinet and dominion statesmen in London where he circulated a memorandum informing the cabinet that if they did not act they would be 'faced with other Irelands'. This move on Smuts part was not made public at the time, but it appears to suggest a threat from the barely contained republican sympathies in the South African Union, those in fact that the Irish contingent were at that moment attempting to convert to the Irish republican cause. Smuts met in London with his friend Tom Casement, who had already been briefed by Art Ó Briain, the head of the Self-Determination and Gaelic Leagues in Britain, and he met privately with de Valera, Griffith and Collins in Dublin, which was reported in the *Cape Argus,* with the heading, *How he Dodged the Pressmen.* The *Pretoria News* feted

[95]Ciaran Reilly, 'The Magna Hibernia: Irish Diplomatic Missions to South Africa, 1921' in *South African Historical Journal,* vol. 67, no. 3 (2015), p. 256.

[96] M O'Brien, to Austin Stack, 7 October 1921. NAI, D.F.A. ES, Box 32, File 223.

Smuts as a South African pimpernel, outwitting politicians and press to meet with de Valera at the Mansion House in Dublin.[97]

He found de Valera obdurate on the subject of a republic, and asked him if he really thought that the British would ever agree to a republic, advising him not to ask for one.[98] On his return to London he was called by the cabinet to advise them on the question of a truce given his knowledge of the Irish leaders, whom he described as 'small men, rather like sporadic leaders thrown up in a labour strike.' He said that they were a 'people you can satisfy with phrases,' and advised the government that the 'thing to do with people of this kind is to let them talk themselves out and then get to business. Let them talk themselves to the death.' Thomas Jones, the author of *The Whitehall Diaries* and witness to these events, shook Smuts hand and said that he had 'got the psychology of the leaders right', and advised him to follow through, to which Smuts replied 'we will not let go now'. Considering Smuts' acquaintance with de Valera, who shared some of his famed political 'wiliness', it appears likely that Smuts had gauged the psychology of the British cabinet with equal acuity in his descriptions of the Irish leaders. The consequence of Smuts' intervention was de Valera's meeting with Lloyd George and the declaration of a truce, which led according to the *Argus,* to 'mafficking' in Dublin until 4am and scenes of celebration all over the country. There was a deadlock with de Valera's rejection of dominion status and partition, which he explained in a letter to Smuts. Smuts 'leaked' his reply advising him to accept partition, to the press, where it was published with some glee by the *Cape Argus.*[99] In a letter to Smuts, Moore pointed out that making the letter public had made it difficult for the 'Irish leaders to press home their original claim and reject the offer of limited independence'.

De Valera never forgave Smuts for the leak which confirmed the duplicity of 'slim jannies' for him, and he determined to minimise Smuts role in the settlement in later biographical studies, which necessarily effaced Moore's role as well.[100] Nevertheless, Smuts' intervention paved the way to a truce and the Treaty that followed. Not all the Irish leaders shared de Valera's views. Michael Collins, one of the Treaty negotiators was aware that the British would not countenance a proximate republic for fear that other imperial possessions might follow suit, but inclusion in commonwealth might provide a way in which a further renegotiation of political independence might follow in time. Collins and Smuts were both believed to have been familiar with Balliol

[97] *Pretoria News,* 9 July 1921.

[98] Reilly, 'The Magna Hibernia: Irish Diplomatic Missions to South Africa, 1921'.

[99] *Cape Argus,* 15 August 1921.

[100] Reilly, 'The Magna Hibernia: Irish Diplomatic Missions to South Africa, 1921', p. 268. For a definition of 'slim Jannie,' see Bruce Nelson, *Irish Nationalism and the Making of the Irish Race,* p.166.

Don A.D. Lindsay's paper on dominion status for Ireland. Lindsay who represented the Oxford British Idealism movement in favour of social and political reform had suggested ways in which Ireland might have independence within commonwealth in a relationship built on trust, by allowing Ireland the possibility of secession, which it was intended would remove the need to do so.[101] Collins read this paper before the Anglo-Irish Treaty, and Horace Plunkett had given it to Smuts before his intervention on the Irish behalf.[102] Thomas Jones, Lloyd George's secretary, believed that it had had an influence on him.[103]

'Smuts told an Irishman that South Africa is a great deal nearer to a Republic in fact than it happens to be in theory, it the fact rather than the theory that Ireland wants ...'[104]

The South African Anglophone press created a debate on the part that that dominion leaders would play in a settlement. It was generally agreed that it was a commonwealth affair, influenced no doubt by the work done by the Irish self-determination leagues throughout the dominions. Smuts' role came in for particular praise, he being described as the outstanding personality of the imperial conference, while Mr. Meighen, Mr Massey and Mr Hughes, the Canadian, New Zealand and Australian premiers respectively, 'had none of the popularity of Smuts who was acclaimed everywhere'.[105] At a speech at the Victoria Hotel, Smuts said that in Ireland there existed, 'a violation of the fundamental principles on which the empire rests', arguing that if the South African spirit of toleration prevailed in Ireland it would prove the precursor to a new era, which would see Ireland passing through several stages with a free constitution being the first, and the inclusion of Ulster at a later period. If Smuts had endorsed an Irish republic then a large number of Afrikaners would have agitated for a return of theirs. A more sinister side to South African democracy and toleration was visible in Smuts' speech at the Rhodes dinner in June when he stated that the 'union of the white races and forces in the world, alone would afford a true guarantor for the future of western civilisation.'[106] The author of *The Heart of the Empire*, Charles Masterman, was reported by the *Rand Daily Mail* as saying that Smuts was the greatest of the dominion premiers, in that he believed in 'the creation of a great country from the equator to the

[101] Lindsay Papers, Keele University Special Collection and Archives Ref. Code: GB172LIN. Lindsay's papers reveal his Irish contacts and interests in Irish affairs. The contents include letters from Horace Plunkett, George Russell, and Molly Childers and an account by Margaret O'Callaghan the widow of murdered Limerick mayor Michael O'Callaghan, of her husband's death. See also, Sandra M.Den Otter, *British Idealism and Social Explanation: A Study in Late Victorian Thought* (Oxford, 1996).

[102] W.David McIntyre, *The Britannic Vision: Historians and the Making of the British Commonwealth of Nations, 1907-48* (London, 2009).

[103] Thomas Jones, *The Whitehall Diary: Volume 111 Ireland 1918-1924* Keith Middlemas (ed.), (3 Vols. London, 1971).

[104] *Cape Argus*, 17 August 1921.

[105] Billy Hughes the Australian PM was so disruptive at the 1919 Paris Peace Conference that Woodrow Wilson called him a 'pestiferous varmint.' Robert Gerwith and Erez Manela, 'The Great War a Global War: Imperial Conflict and the Reconfiguration of World Order, 1911-1923', p.794-95.

[106] *Rand Daily Mail*, 21 June 1921.

Southern sea; in the amalgamation of the white races already there and the decent treatment of the black'.[107]

The Irish were happy to subscribe to this notion of white supremacy in order to gain independence. The jottings on Diarmuid Coffey's papers during the 1917 Convention reveal the preoccupations of the Irish as a white race being denied self-determination. During one of Moore's meetings with Hertzog the conversation turned inevitably to race. Hertzog's asserted that if segregation 'were not effected South Africa would be a Black Country in a hundred years', Moore did not disagree with him sharing in the 'common sense' opinions on race that existed in Europe, America and South Africa during this period.[108] In a sense, Irish independence became a part of Smuts vision of white supremacy for which he required a united and co-operative commonwealth that gradually acquired autonomy of the British parliament while accepting the nominal authority of the crown. This is the status that Ireland acquired through the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921, and it was not so removed from the vague and amorphously defined 'higher status', envisaged by Smuts for South Africa, which Moore pleaded with Smuts to support if he could not support a republic. Even the apparently fervent republican Ben Farrington supported the Treaty as a 'tactical necessity'.[109]

The mission was seen as a success. Little wrote an account some years later for the Bureau of Military History saying that 'Moore did his work very well, and de Valera's plan worked out perfectly.'[110] Donal Lowry called Moore's mission a 'significant success for Irish Foreign policy,' the timing critical, as empire transformed into commonwealth.[111] That the mission worked at all was due to the remarkable efforts of a small group of individuals who manipulated and exploited an existing set of social historical and transnational conditions that led to South African support for Ireland. The groundwork had been laid in Ireland in previous years by Alice Stopford Green, the members of the Dominion Association and Horace Plunkett who set up a Dominion League on the demise of the Association.

---

[107] *Rand Daily Mail*, 3 June 1921, Charles Masterman, *The Heart of the Empire: Discussion of Problems of Modern City Life in England* (London. 1901), Masterman (1823-1927), was a radical, Liberal Party, Politician.

[108] Shula Marks, 'White Masculinity, Jan Smuts and the South African War', proceedings of the British Academy, 111, (2001), pp 199-223; Douglas A. Lorimer, 'Race, Science and Culture: Historical Continuities and Discontinuities, 1850-1914' in Shearer West (ed.), *The Victorians and Race* (Hants., 1996).

[109] Atkinson, 'Benjamin Farrington: Cape Town and the Shaping of a Public Intellectual', p. 680.

[110] Patrick J. Little, Bureau of Military History, W.S 1767

[111] Donal Lowry, 'New Ireland, Old Empire and the Outside Word, 1922-49: The Strange Evolution of a "Dictionary Republic"', p.167.

Furthermore with regard to the relationship between Moore and Smuts, a number of parallels can be drawn between the two in terms of the contradictions that both embodied. They both represented settler colonialisms. Moore's family adopted the ethnically defining Catholicism while Smuts abandoned Boer republican independence for a modernising capitalist, South African identity with its ideological foundations in race supremacy.[112] Their nationalism was a part of the discourse of empire as it reformed and renegotiated its identity as a result of independent colonial nationalism in which Ireland and Afrikaner South Africa were reluctant participants. They were both ex-military men who had essentially changed sides. Smuts was described as a 'colonial poacher turned imperial gamekeeper', evolving from a Transvaal republican to an imperial constitutionalist. While Moore, in an ironic imperial inversion was landed elite, conservative, constitutionalist turned reluctant republican. They shared a concept of manliness built on the values of courage, character and fidelity to convictions, all the upper class British values that were considered necessary for imperial rule. Malan defined this masculinity in Afrikaner terms as composed of '... an inner strength ... with character ... and convictions ... principles for which he would give his life'.

A further analogy may be drawn between an historical omission, in both their cases. Smuts, who was considered the outstanding statesman of his time, slipped into historiographical limbo after his death, apart from a 1960s biography by the Australian historian Keith Hancock, and it seems likely that he will remain there for some time. Moore fell from the nationalist narrative into tangential references. Clearly Smuts fell much further, and in his case the omission is understandable, as the legacies of apartheid are still painful. In relation to Moore an observation made by O'Malley appears relevant. She suggested the historians of British imperialism are guilty of the 'fleeting reference phenomenon,' in which brief allusions are made to the connection between Indian and Irish nationalism that are rarely followed through. There are other possible reasons for Moore's lack of historiographical presence. The civil war that followed the Anglo-Irish Treaty led to the dismantling of the Foreign Affairs office, which was largely staffed by anti-Treatyites.[113]. The very recently implemented codes of practice for diplomatic envoys largely escaped the experience of this initial diplomatic corp. Many of these members of the embryonic Foreign Service remained and found careers in the new state, those who did not remain on a list of 44 names which were confined to the Foreign Affairs archives, Moore's among them, condemned to relative obscurity. Moore's own desire for anonymity at the time was another contributing factor. In a report by Robert Brennan, Foreign Affairs Under-Secretary, on the

[112] Bill Schwarz, *White Man's World* (Oxford, 2011).

[113] Dermot Keogh, *Twentieth Century Ireland: Nation and State* (Dublin, 1994), p.49.

mission to South Africa, Little was named while Moore was referred to as the other envoy. Reilly is of the opinion that de Valera's anger at Smuts' revelation of their correspondence during the critical period of negotiation made him anxious to minimise Smuts' role in the events leading to the Treaty and Moore's presence suffered as a consequence. According to Reilly, de Valera was 'determined to airbrush Smuts (and by extension the roles of Little and Moore) from the history of this period'.[114] There is no evidence to suggest it, but could Moore's membership of a class that was increasingly marginalised since the Land Wars and the 1903 Wyndham Act have had any bearing on this omission? The early 1950s biographies written of de Valera tended to gloss the topic. In 1951, de Valera argued to South African High Commissioner Dr. A.L. Geyer that Smuts had been responsible for the British refusal of his proposals in 1921.[115] The fracture and demise of the IRASA, which turned out to be a short lived phenomenon, and Farrington's clash with de Valera at the 1992 Irish Race Conference in Paris which led him to attack what he called de Valera's personality cult could not have endeared the leader of the Sinn Féin republicans to the IRASA.[116] Farrington and the representative of the provisional government, Eoin MacNeill, had drawn up an agenda for the conference that countered that of de Valera whose principal interest lay in gaining support for a republican government.[117] De Valera had several reasons to feel aggrieved by South Africa as a consequence. While the relationship with Smuts-led South Africa may have suffered a rupture, Hertzog, the leader of the National Party continued to openly support the Irish, and developed a warm relationship with Moore who was full of praise for the leader of the National Party. His meetings with the Afrikaner politicians were an integral part of his mission, and they were to have some significance in the later South African-Irish political relationship when the interests of Ireland and South Africa once more cohered in imperial affairs. Moore and Hertzog shared a number of similarities in terms of identity. Hertzog was Heeren-Boeren or a part of a landowning elite, ex-commando and barrister.[118] According to Moore, if he had been resident in South Africa it would have been his greatest ambition to be regarded as Hertzog's friend.[119] (Despite the perception that the Boers enjoyed a non-hierarchical, egalitarian society, a rural landed elite had been in existence since the eighteenth century.[120]) Their shared identity was reinforced by their joint emphasis on cultural and language assertion. Hertzog, who was described by Harkness as a 'man of courtesy and culture', was a strong proponent of Afrikaner language and culture in a culturally inclusive-fashion.[121] Moore described Hertzog as

[114] Reilly, 'The Magna Hibernia: Irish Diplomatic Missions to South Africa, 1921', (2015), pp 255-270.

[115] Reilly, p. 268.

[116] Atkinson, 'Benjamin Farrington: Cape Town and the Shaping of a Public Intellectual', p. 679.

[117] Atkinson, p. 677.

[118] Hermann Giliomee, *The Afrikaner: Biography of a People* (London, 2002), p. 327.

[119] *Freeman's Journal,* 30 June 1924.

[120] Bruce Nelson, p. 135.

[121] D.W.Harkness, *The Restless Dominion: The Irish Free State and the British Commonwealth.* (Dublin, 1969), p. 90.

tolerant, able and charming and said that 'he was a good friend to Ireland', and the most beloved man in South Arica, whose reputation had been damaged by an unsympathetic English Press. P.J. Little drew some thoughtful comparisons between the support drawn by the National Party from the smaller farmers ('not the very big landowners who like the graziers and big farmers in Ireland are no good') from Dutch labour and from the younger members of the educated Dutch intellectual and professional classes.[122] Would it be straining analogy to suggest that the bedrock of Afrikaner support shared a similar socio-economic profile with that shown by the composition of Irish nationalist support, despite the obvious differences in cultural and religious background? It is clear in Moore's papers for this period that the analogies that he drew were not just a result of the rational deployment of political objectives but deeply-held convictions based on his own experience. He deeply admired the Afrikaners, as a martial nation, with 'virile and intelligent', politicians, and sympathised with the traumatic memories of the concentration camps, now commemorated in a monument to Boer women and children in Bloemfontein.[123] Once again it is tempting to make comparisons with the longstanding famine memories of suffering and despair with which Moore's class was inextricably linked. However, the conversations in the Koffiehuis which was a warm celebration of joint cultural and language projects had an underbelly of religious difference and race intolerance. The Dutch Reformed Church of which both Malan and Hertzog were members had its roots in Calvinism which tended to not look kindly on Catholicism. The extension of Catholic schooling from the Catholic Colonial powers in central Africa to Rhodesia in the first decades of the twentieth century raised fears about an encroaching 'Roomsche Gevaar' or Catholic Peril, which was tactfully overlooked by both sides. The prominent Afrikaner politicians toasting Irish independence on that day in June were to become the principal architects of the later policy of apartheid, which cast a shadow over any future considerations of the support derived by Irish nationalists in South Africa.

P.J. Little drew attention to this phenomenon in 1959 on the death of D.F. Malan. Writing in the *Irish Press,* Little regretted the 'present policy of the South African government ... and the extremism of their former friends', and asked Irish people if they had 'forgotten the extraordinary

[122] P.J. Little, 'Microbes,' in a letter to Brennan from Cape Town, 13 May 1921, NAI, D.F.A. ES, Box 32, File 223; Stanley Trapido 'Landlord and Tenant in a Colonial Economy: The Transvaal 1888-1910' in *Journal of Southern African Studies* no. 5, 1,Special Issue on Themes in Agrarian History and Society, (Oct.:1978), pp 26-58. There is some ambiguity surrounding the meaning of 'Dutch' in Afrikaner culture. Moore was drawn to individual representatives of his own class who were similarly engaged on cultural and language projects. He was friends during the second Anglo-Boer war with Lord Lovat of Lovat's Scouts a Scottish landowner and cultural nationalist who, like Moore, was learning Scots Gaelic while he was on campaign in South Africa. Jonathan Hyslop questioned the 'unitary dynamic in Afrikaner ethnic identity,' in South African politics at a later period, and similarly, Irish nationalism was proven to be less unified and more fragmentary in its composition. Jonathan Hyslop, 'Problems of explanation in the Study of Afrikaner Nationalism: A Case Study of the West Rand' in *Journal of Southern African Studies,* vol. 22, no. 3 (September, 1996), pp 373-385.

[123] Letter from Moore during his period as envoy in Paris, 1922, Moore Papers, NLI, Ms. 10, 586/6.

service to this country in its hour of need' by the South African leadership'.[124] Apartheid which had been 'formally instituted in 1947,' had become an embarrassing ideology to be associated with and the affinities that were once eagerly claimed by the Irish were quietly disowned at a later period.[125] There is no narrative in which an Irish and South African relationship was an enduring phenomenon other than that they intersected at various points in imperial time as events, rather than enduring narratives. This phenomenon was something in which both nations were mutually implicated in exploiting their status in empire to similar ends. There were few natural affinities, merely explorations of affinities dictated by circumstance and contingency, in which the Irish quest for political sovereignly and Smuts commonwealth vision of dominant white races were both actively and passively, mutually implicative during this period. The analogies drawn between the two are reliant on a shared imperial past, which created the networks and connections that were made visible in this chapter.[126]

With the passing of empire and the later establishment of both South African and Irish republics this brief period of co-operation slipped from the history of the new Irish state, taking Moore's history with it. Notwithstanding de Valera's considerable animus against Smuts and Farrington, who both dominated the mission, Moore went on to work with de Valera in the years following the foundation of a new state and finally joined de Valera's constitutional Republican Party in 1927. South Africa and Ben Farrington would continue to intersect in his life. The following post-Treaty year when he was sent to Paris as the governmental envoy, the Irish Race Conference in which Farrington was the South African delegate was in full swing. Farrington's attack on de Valera was reprimanded by George Gavan Duffy the minister for Foreign Affairs, and Moore was asked to intervene personally in his official capacity and as someone Farrington respected and trusted.[127] Back in August 1921, when he embarked for home, his path crossed nautically, and perhaps symbolically with that of Smuts on their return journeys to South Africa and Ireland. Moore arrived home in time for the first officially-recognised meeting of the Dáil. This was not just an Irish victory, it was testimony to the post-war global reconfiguration that led to a partial independence for Egypt in 1922. It was a victory for a new world order in which the

[124] P.J. Little, 'Dr Malan Aided Cause of Ireland' in *Irish Press*, 20 February, 1959.

[125] J.D. Fage, *A History of Africa* (London, 1978), p.440.

[126] Osterhammel defined 'the network metaphor' as useful 'mainly, because it permits the idea of multiple points of contact and intersection ... network-relations that have attained a certain degree of regularity and permanence - traceable configurations of a repetitive relation or interaction - not one of chance relations nor organisationally entrenched institutions -although that can happen.' Jürgen Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the 19th Century.* trans. Patrick Cammiller (Princeton, 2009), English Translation (2014.) p.710; Tony Ballantyne, *Webs of Empire: Locating New Zealand's Colonial Past* (Toronto 2012); Zoe Laidlaw, *Colonial Connections, 1815-45: Patronage, the Information Revolution and Colonial Government* (Manchester, 2005); Simon Potter, 'Empire, Cultures and Identities in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Ireland and Britain' in *History Compass* vol. 5, no. 1, Jan. 2007;C.A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World 1780-1914: Global Connection and Comparisons* (Oxford, 1988); Barry Crosbie, *Irish Imperial Networks* (Cambridge, 2012).

[127] Letter from George Gavan Duffy to Moore, 14 June 1922, Moore papers, Ms. 10,581.

old elite order had tumbled allowing the legitimacy of 'power for the people,' to decide their own governance.[128] Even Lord Selborne, the aristocratic supporter of monarchy and empire, and architect of the South African Union admitted that democracy was the best form of government for the twentieth century.[129] By virtue of his services to Irish nationalism, Moore was to take a place in the new jurisdiction.

[128] Robert Gerwarth and Erez Manela, 'The Great War a a Global War: Imperial Conflict and the Reconfiguration of World Order, 1911-1923'.

[129] David E. Torrance, *The Strange Death of the Liberal Empire: Lord Selborne in South Africa* (Liverpool, 1996), p.186.

CHAPTER FIVE: THE REPUBLICAN COLONEL AND THE LAND ANNUITIES FROM 1922 TO 1932: STATE, LAND, AND EMPIRE.

The mission to South Africa on behalf of the rebel government bore fruit in the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921, which conferred both partition and dominion status on an Irish Free State. It resulted from an agreement between the Lloyd George government and the Irish political leadership, which had been facilitated by the South African premier Jan Smuts. The Southern Unionists, who had been a vital part of the earlier constitutional movements for a settlement to the Irish question found themselves on the margins of the negotiations, although delegate Arthur Griffith met with their representatives, Midleton, Bernard and Jameson to assure them that land purchase on fair terms would be a priority for a new government along with the provision of a second chamber in which Southern Unionism would receive due representation.[1] This promise set the stage for Moore's political life for the next decade.

However, the new provisional government of the Free State, with Arthur Griffith at its head, was challenged from within as early as January 1922 by the anti-Treatyite republican faction. A civil war ensued which was over by 1923 as the new government asserted its authority and consolidated a democratic system with a 38 per cent electoral victory over the 21per cent of the vote gained by the anti-Treatyites, becoming the Cumann na nGaedheal Party as it did so. The civil war left a painful legacy in Irish political culture on the basis of a party system with two nationalist narratives. The cleft or divide between those known as supporters of the Treaty and the defeated anti-Treatyites formed the ideological and political background to the first ten years of Irish statehood. The war also left a trail of death and destruction, notably in the burning of 250 'Big Houses' many of which belonged to the landlord representatives in the promised second chamber. Moore who was a supporter of the Treaty, thought it 'scandalous', of de Valera to start a civil war over it.[2] In a letter written in 1924 to the old Fenian John Devoy, he said that anything could be done with the Treaty, if it was done 'diplomatically and at the right moments', as the empire and the English constitution were in disarray'.[3]

[1] R.B., McDowell, *The Irish Convention 1917-18* (London, 1970), p. 212. John Henry Barnard was the Archbishop of Dublin and the Provost of Trinity College Dublin, Andrew Jameson was a whiskey industrialist and former governor of the Bank of Ireland, while John Broderick M.P. was the Earl of Midleton.

[2] Moore to Art Ó'Briain, 17 April 1922, Art Ó'Briain papers, NLI, Ms. 8456/9.

[3] Letter from Moore to John Devoy, 1 April 1924, John Devoy Papers, NLI, Ms. 18,008/11.

Moore began the decade as a supporter of the provisional government and at the request of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, George Gavan Duffy, he acted as the Irish Envoy to France from April to July 1922. Prior to taking up a place in the Senate, which met for the first time in the National Museum in Kildare Street in December 1922, he embarked on a campaign to free the Irish prisoners in British gaols, some of whom were ex-Connaught Rangers. As the decade beginning in 1922 progressed, Moore slowly detached from the Treatyite faction to take a position with the 'scandalous' republicans, who in their turn moved to a more flexible constitutional republicanism.

This chapter will study the progress of this evolution over that ten year period and analyse the rationale behind it. There are two major perspectives in this final chapter, both of them designed to address the two enduring themes in Moore's life; land and empire. From this perspective several legislative issues will be scrutinised allowing a reflection on the new government's policies on land and their refraction through the person of a nationalist ex-landlord and his landowning peers in the Senate. Moore's military past which contributed to his alienation from both empire and British political dominance, now made his actions suspect to the new order, even as it negotiated a new role in commonwealth from 1930-31. In addition, Ireland's relationship with South Africa in commonwealth will continue to remain a primary focus as it is examined through the prism of Moore's past. This is a perspective that has largely escaped historiographical attention as indeed has the legislative influence that the Senate had on the new state. In the generous apportioning of senatorial seats by the first Free State government to a previous ascendancy, Moore was one of those elected, rather than nominated to the new Senate. He understood the Treaty as a work in progress, and a means to achieve greater autonomy in a workable settlement. This essentially pragmatic world view was shared by the first government, while the disappointed republicans continued to cling to a separatist ideal. This situation was not unique to Ireland within empire, as South Africa and Canada had continued debates on republicanism that persisted over decades.

The question of land settlement that had dominated nineteenth century politics continued to be of overwhelming importance in the early years of the new state, even though the political power and social prestige of the previous ascendancy no longer held sway. Moore became absorbed in the land question on both sides of the divide as a landowner anxious to retain what remained of his demesne and as a champion for the smaller farmers who struggled with land annuity payments and poor harvests during these years. While he claimed to be on the side of the small farmer, he was vociferous in his demands that the landlord class was treated generously and not subjected to

any coercive measures to get them to part with their land. The revolutionary events in Russia and the perceived methods of Bolshevism and nationalisation remained uppermost in the minds of the landlord class in the Senate. As Moore strove for inclusion in the new order, he saw his class losing their grip as the terms of land transfer slowly eroded at their remaining demesnes.

A number of the landlords who were appointed to the Senate by the first independent government paid a particularly heavy toll in the loss of their homes, burned by anti-Treatyites, which allied to the loss of so many sons in WW1 signalled the end of the line for many. Moore's family home was among the 250 houses and castles that were affected.[4] In February 1923, O'Reilly, the steward at Moore Hall, telegraphed him to inform him that Moore Hall had been destroyed by fire, along with its contents. This actual and symbolic erasure of ascendancy presence saw the decampment of a few. Horace Plunkett was dismayed at the burning of his Dublin home, Kilteragh, and resigned from the Senate, while others stalwartly refused to budge.

The fact that the Senate become identified, as de Valera put it, as the last bastion of imperialism meant that its early years have been subject to little analysis and it does not figure prominently in historiography, as Elaine A. Byrne pointed out in her recent essay.[5] Nevertheless, its study remains a fruitful endeavour for those who would understand the reactions of the *ancien regime* to the legislative acts of the new nationalist government, or indeed their relationship to those representatives of labour, Ulster nationalism, or national business and farming interests who were their senatorial colleagues. More often than not, the representatives of the former elite supported government policy, even while they protested change that slowly but inevitably eroded at their perceived hereditary rights, in terms of fishing, and game laws. Some of them, the Earl of Kerry for example, advocated the protection of these rights as a tourist attraction.[6] More than the loss of these privileges they feared the republican accession to power. Moore, on the other hand often objected vigorously to government policy that appeared to him to be lack assertiveness in its dealings with the British government, and its socio-economic failures in addressing the conditions of the rural and urban poor.[7] He finally joined the republican faction and made his way onto their National Executive in 1932.

---

[4] L. Perry Curtis Jr. 'Demonising the Irish Landlords since the Famine,' in Brian Casey (ed.), *Defying the Law: Agrarian Radicals in Irish History* (Dublin, 2013), p. 31.

[5] Elaine A. Byrne, 'A Unique Experiment in Idealism:The Irish Senate 1922-28' in Mel Farrell, Jason Knirck and Ciara Meehan, (eds), *A Formative Decade: Ireland in the 1920s* (Sallins, 2015).

[6] Land Bill 1923, 27 July, Seanad Eireann Debates vol. 1, no. 34, Treaty Confirmation of Amending Agreement Bill 1925, Second Stage 16 December 1925, vol. 16, no. 4.

[7] The state was considered to be partly responsible for the wartime economic difficulties experienced by the farmers, however the Cumann na nGaedheal Party supported a cattle economy and free trade. Tony Varley, 'Irish Farmers Parties, Nationalism and Class

Why did he take this course? As always he was guided by his father's often controversially independent parliamentary career, and was unafraid of alienating his class or indeed his former colleagues as he pursued the dictates of his conscience. His behaviour also illuminated aspects of the ideological debates that have raged since the fissure that occurred in Irish political loyalties with the signing of the Treaty in 1921. According to Harkness, the decade between 1921-32 deepened the ideological fissure as the incumbent government determined to use the treaty to obtain greater autonomy within empire for all the dominions and adopted a number of means to keep the republicans out as they did so.[8] This decade also included the most interesting years of imperial development as the dominions negotiated within commonwealth for their greater autonomy.[9] More often than not the insistence on the Oath as an essential criteria of the Treaty became used a more of a means to keep the republicans out than as an ideological position.[10]

Despite his apparent ideological turn,' Moore remained a nineteenth century Victorian thinker, ' self-critical, leading to a 'life of endeavour and commitment motivated by the concepts of civic responsibility, duty and social, economic political and political obligations that underpinned the duties of care implicit in the ownership of property and the service of class. However the possession of elite values did not preclude democratic nationalist governance, even if they remained essentially non-egalitarian in terms of social status. Moore's adherence to these aristocratic ideals go at least some way to explaining his actions during the early years of Irish statehood. He never quite abandoned his landlord status or a previous past to a transformational republican ideal but maintained a classic nineteenth century liberal constitutional frame of mind. Nevertheless, there was a protean quality to his national allegiances which might best be expressed by a comparison with the Young Irelanders, Thomas D'Arcy McGee and Charles Gavan Duffy, for example. Moore exhibited a similar 'leap-frogging' in his career to McGee, who was variously a revolutionary, Canadian government minister and the 'father of Canadian Federation'.[11] In a period when Moore's aspirations might have been assumed to have been capable of fulfilment, within an 'esprit of commonwealth corps' for the greater independence of all the dominions, he shifted to the republican side.[12] For most of his career Moore showed a certain sympathy for what Daniel O'Leary described as 'the more altruistic and optimistic view of human nature that dominated the political discourse of a Burkean British Empire,' in comparison with the 'sociological outcomes of Hobbsean pessimism in republics like France and

Politics in the Twentieth Century' in Liam Weeks (ed), *Radical or Redundant? Minor Parties in Irish Politics* (Dublin, 2012), pp 162-166.

[8] D.W. Harkness, *The Restless Dominion:The Irish Free State and the British Commonwealth* (Dublin, 1969), p. xii
[9] Ibid.
[10] John M. Regan, *Myth and the Irish State*, p. 93.
[11] D.W Wilson, *Thomas D'Arcy McGee:*
[12] Ibid., p. xiv.

America'.[13] In his biography of Thomas D'Arcy McGee, Wilson explored the reasons for McGee's extreme changes of opinion within the background of the mid to late nineteenth century Canadian constitutional position. This position was marked by the 'counter-revolutionary and progressive Tory or liberal-conservative ontology of the Victorian Canadian nation'. McGee associated this ideological position with all the tolerance of the great Irish statesmen in the past, O'Connell, Grattan and Burke. It was a tradition that Moore referred to many times in his long career, and to some degree it was McGee's 'radical' moderation that Moore espoused, and continued to hold. He was never extreme and only became a republican when they constitutionalised under de Valera's leadership. Can it then be said that Moore underwent an ideological transformation? He remained constant, conservative and constitutional in many ways, but like McGee he often experienced a conflict between 'passion and reason, principle and pragmatism, tradition and modernity, religion and nationalism, idealism and ambition', and that conflict accompanied him over his adult lifetime. [14]

Despite these inner conflicts his ability to embrace change led him to became the friend, confidante, and colleague of men like the social radical, Peadar O'Donnell, and the Catholic conservative, Gaelic speaking, ex-revolutionary Pádraic Ó Máille while he carried on a correspondence with the elder Fenian, and editor of the *Gaelic American*, John Devoy, and remained on close terms with George Gavan Duffy, elite lawyer and Free State Minister.[15] These friendships were maintained in separate but intersecting political networks. He went on to become a founding member of the constitutionally Republican Party, Clann Éireann, and then Fianna Fáil, abstracting himself in the process from the interests of his class, as he became increasingly drawn into the new order.

How does the methodological authority of Prager, Garvin and Regan's studies of the ideological cleavages that are associated with the post Sinn Féin division into pro and anti-Treatyite factions intersect with the questions posed by this thesis?[16]. Do they go any way to explaining or understanding Moore's political actions or his ideological background? Prager's deployment of a Durkheimian analysis identified two apparently oppositional paradigms within

[13] Daniel O'Leary, 'Review of *Thomas D'Arcy McGee: The Extreme Moderate, 1857-1968* in *The University of Toronto Quarterly* vol. 82, no. 3 (Summer, 2013), pp.643-645.
[14] David A. Wilson, *Thomas D;Arcy McGee: The Extreme Moderate, 1867-1868 Vol. 2.* (Montreal, 2000), p. 43.
[15] Mícheál Ó Fathartaigh, 'Pádraic O' Máille: Irish Agrarian Radical? The Case Considered,' in Brian Casey (ed.), *Defying the Law: Agrarian Radicals in Irish History* (Dublin, 2013).
[16] Jeffrey Prager, *State Building and Democracy in Ireland* (Cambridge, 1986);Tom Garvin, *1922: The Birth of Irish Democracy* (Dublin, 1996); John M. Regan, *The Irish Counter-Revolution 1921-1936: Treatyite Politics and Settlement in Independent Ireland* (Dublin, 1999); idem., *Myth and the Irish State,* (Dublin, 2013); idem., 'The Politics of Reaction: The Dynamics of Treatyite Government and Policy' in *Irish Historical Studies* vol. 39, no. 120 (November, 1997), pp 542-563.

Irish political thought. Describing the first of these as having their origins in the enlightenment values of 'legalistic, democratic individualist parliamentary tradition' non-sectarian and cosmopolitan, he associated the second paradigm with a traditional, anglophobic, anti-modern republican Gaelic nationalism that expressed itself in communal, pre-industrial and militarist forms. Given the previous paragraphs exploring Moore's political thought, it would appear that he identified with the former paradigm even though later in the decade he allied himself with the latter. These oppositions are somewhat crude and create polarities where there are none. If anything, Moore combined both traditions in his person and in any case Garvin's model of nationalist pragmatism and republican moralism to these apparently opposing factions doubted Prager's assumption that the Treatyites were in some way less Irish or Gaelic in cultural nationalist terms than the anti-Treatyites. Regan on the other hand, rejected what he interpreted as a divisive and dichotomising bipolar model that erased the subcultures that were not swept away by a twentieth century revolutionary wave, but remained active. Regan developed a model for the new state as a counter-revolutionary entity as it struggled to enforce and maintain a democratic polity based on civic responsibility and law and order, coercively if necessary. According to Geertz, the phenomenon of new states are characterised by a desire for 'recognition as responsible agents,' and to be acknowledged as builders of an 'efficient dynamic state', This often came at the expense of those identifying markers of 'blood, race, language, locality, religion and tradition,' that had contributed to an earlier cohesive sense of national self.[17] Moore had a sense that the Cumann na nGaedheal government found these identifying markers of lesser importance and the first government tends to be categorised, as a pragmatic executive, however the imperatives of language, religion and tradition continued to have importance in their policies. Regan's analysis would appear to have more relevance than that of Prager or Garvin. Maintaining control and resisting republican violence was a more pressing concern for the first executive along with the assertion of as much sovereignty as possible within the terms of the Treaty. However, the revolutionary divides that have have been identified in other decolonising states suggest that Prager's analysis cannot be summarily dismissed even if his identifying paradigms require some adjustment.

Kissane pointed out the parallels between Ireland and the settler colonial Union of South Africa, and other decolonising states in Asia, revealing similar ideological divides eclipsed by revolution.[18] These divides did not escape contemporary observation. General Hertzog, the leader of the South African National Party, defined 'two streams', in South African political thought, the

[17] Clifford Geertz, 'Primordial and Civic Ties,' in John Hutchinson and Anthony D Smith (eds), *Nationalism* (Oxford, 1994), p. 30.

[18] Bill Kissane, *The Politics of the Irish Civil War* (Oxford, 2005), p. 14.

Anglophile, pro-commonwealth, party led by Jan Smuts and the republican Afrikaner ethnic identifications of culture and language led by D.F Malans and himself.[19] Peadar O'Donnell, socialist, radical, revolutionary and Moore's partner in the campaign to abolish the Land Annuities, had some sense of a similar dichotomy between what he called the republican movement of Wolfe Tone and the one represented by an ideology of the old Gaelic state as monarchist, 'pre-republican and concerned with sovereign independence and not a republic'.[20] He referred to this divide, like Hertzog, as 'two streams,' in Irish political life. In both the South African and the Irish case the differences were not deep cleavages but differences dichotomised by the exigencies of politics.

In a 1927 letter to John Devoy, Moore articulated the contemporary view of the political polarities in Irish society as the 'Anglo-Irish imperially sympathetic faction with a Praetorian Guard of Freemasons and the opposing Gaelic, Catholic crusaders, supported by the triumvirate of the Gaelic League, the Gaelic Athletic Association and the Knights of Columbanus'.[21] This rhetoric was consistent with Fianna Fáil propaganda in order to portray the government as betraying a Gaelic ideal and not necessarily a part of Moore's political thought. It was a part of electoral strategy to dilute the Catholicity of the government with a charge of Freemasonry which had the double advantage of being considered non-Irish. In an *Irish Times* article in 1927, Moore described the government as supportive of the old 'pro-British and ex-Unionist element'.[22] However his identification with the ethnic part of this divide makes it clear that a member of the ascendancy with the ethnic marker of Catholicism could insert himself into this exclusive sense of political Gaeldom by donning the garb of Fianna Fáil. Colin Kidd observed this process within the Anglo-Irish and the lowland Scots of selecting and adopting the earlier cultural and religious ethnic markers of displaced Gaeldom in order to support their national identities.[23] More recent scholarship examines the Cumann na nGaedheal role in government in the early years of independence by eschewing ideology and taking a rigorously empirical approach. In Ciara Meehan's study the focus shifts from the perceived ideological divide between Cumann na nGaedheal and Fianna Fáil to the electoral approach and creation of the party system in the new state.[24] In 2014, Jason Knirck made a case for Cumann na nGaedheal's fidelity to the ideal of a

[19] James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-Word, 1783-1939* (Oxford, 2009), p. 381.

[20] Lawrence William White, 'Peadar O'Donnell, "Red Republicanism and The Bell"' www.theirelandinstitute.com (2005), p. 91.

[21] Moore to John Devoy, 9 December 1927, Devoy Papers, NLI, Ms. 18,008/11.

[22] *Irish Times*, 29 August 1927.

[23] Colin Kidd, *British Identities Before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World 1600-1800* (Cambridge, 1999), pp 138-139.

[24] Ciara Meehan, *The Cosgrave Party: A History of Cumann na* nGaedheal, *1923-33* (Dublin, 2010).

Gaelic state, or a perceived Irish form of governance which is one of the issues on which Moore takes the government to task, as the mouthpiece for Fianna Fáil rhetoric.

The question of land settlement and the annuity payments to the British government that resulted from it were to become Moore's primary concern during his time in the Senate. The Boundary Settlement and the Ultimate Financial Settlement that followed on from it, in 1925 and 1926, further codified the payment of the Land Annuities and prompted his resistance 'we have been burgled and paid the burglar'. The Public Safety Act of 1927 that followed on the assassination of the Minister for Justice, Kevin O'Higgins led to the widening gulf between Moore and the government which can be observed in the attacks levelled at him by both ministers and senators. The Statute of Westminster in 1930, that assured dominion independence from the British parliament, is the second act that receives critical attention in this chapter: There are two reasons for this, it was considered by the government as a tour-de-force, and a diplomatic triumph, and it would have represented the culmination of Moore's hopes in the 1917-18 period. By 1930 his attitude to equality in commonwealth was guarded and qualified by his membership of the Fianna Fáil party, as his response to the abolition of the oath of allegiance to the King demonstrates.[25] An analysis of these turbulent years of early statehood reveal Moore as politically pragmatic, forging alliances in order to secure political ambitions that might have been unacceptable to him in earlier days. These changes were treated with some scepticism by both government ministers and his fellow senators and he was subject to slurs relating to his imperial career in South Africa, his elite status and the longevity and integrity of his nationalist loyalties. In the decade from 1922 to 1932 Moore pursued his objectives with a commitment that finally witnessed the abolition of the Land Annuity payments on Fianna Fáil's accession to government in 1932, as a result in large measure of his assiduous efforts over a decade, although he received little contemporary or indeed historiographical credit for his pains. It reveals, despite the gibes he endured in the Senate, that his actions were not inauthentic but a matter of adaptability, flexibility and the desire for inclusion in a manner that many of his fellow landlord class was unable or reluctant to emulate.

STATE

Moore was active within the politics of the new state from its inception, acting as Envoy to France during the summer months of 1922, before he took up his seat in the Senate. He had been appointed by George Gavan Duffy, the Minister of Foreign Affairs for the period from 19 April

[25] Land Bill 1923, 27 July, Seanad Eireann Debates vol. 1, no. 34, Treaty Confirmation of Amending Agreement Bill 1925, Second Stage 16 December 1925, vol. 16, no. 4; The Financial Settlement. Motion by Senator Colonel Moore, 15 December 1926, vol. 8, no. 1, Public Safety Bill Second Stage 9 August 1927, vol. 9, no. 8; Report of Commonwealth Conference Motion of Approval, 23 July 1931, vol. 14, no. 30; Constitution (Removal of Oath) , 8 June 1932, vol. no. 16.

to 21 July 1911.[26] It was a temporary appointment, remunerated by £500 a year. Moore and his wife Evelyn, who accompanied him to Paris, were accommodated at the Grand Hotel, where he was allocated two secretaries, Sean Murphy and Vaughan Williams to assist him in his duties. His mandate was to find a suitable premises for an Irish delegation and he was to make it clear to the French that the Irish were not pleased with the terms of the Treaty but they were committed to honouring them. The traditional friendly relationship between Ireland and France was to be emphasised, but Duffy made it clear that the Irish government had not forgotten the treatment of its representatives at the Paris Peace Conference, most notably the expulsion of its envoy in 1920. Duffy, who was that representative, had been expelled for writing to the French President to ask for his intervention with the British government in order to save the life of Terence McSwiney, and continued to feel insulted by the French rebuff. Moore was also instructed to go some way to changing the negative attitude the French press had taken towards Ireland by explaining the benefits of friendship with Ireland not least of which was the Irish influence in America, a duty which he discharged in several articles in the French press. In his report to Duffy, Moore said that he had found a premises on the Boulevarde Haussman, with four reception rooms and seven bedrooms. In this report Moore emphasised the value of an envoy to France, as he had heard on his return that the government intended to discontinue the delegation and pointed out the independent action of the Canadian appointment of a representative to Washington and that of the South Africans to Berlin. Moore praised the 'virile, yet intelligent view of the Dutch in these matters' as independent actors within dominion.[27] Moore trusted Duffy with his opinions on the government, writing to express his distaste for the behaviour of the army in 1922 as Collins staged a near military dictatorship by forming a Council of War composed of himself, Eoin O'Duffy, who had enjoyed a meteoric rise in the ranks, and Richard Mulcahy, Chief of Staff and Minister for Defence. This body was not appointed by either of the two governments and remained independent of their directives. [28]

> In 1914', Moore wrote, '150,000 Volunteers were under my sole command and I paraded 15,000 on them in the Park and marched them through Dublin. I never accepted or gave any title over that of Colonel. In South Africa the Boers had a splendid fighting army and won

[26]
[27] Moore Papers, Ms. 10,586/6
[28] Regan, Myth and the Irish State, pp 13-14.

> great victories. I don't think they ever had more than three or four generals [29]

In the same letter he went on to say that he wished that 'our people who have not yet proved themselves either greate Statesmen or great Generals would be a little more modest'. Moore wrote to Duffy again on receiving the news of his resignation. He was very much upset by Duffy's resignation and expressed his reservations about the government who were, he felt 'a small clique of persons who were out to keep themselves and their followers in office'.[30] Moore expressed the wish that Duffy would stay on even though he knew that Duffy had been uncomfortable for a long time. The governmental refusal of a court order of habeas corpus in favour of George Plunkett's detainment without charge and their ruthless actions in the Autumn of 1922 in executing anti-Treatyite republicans including Duffy's friend Erskine Childers made it impossible for him to stay in government. Duffy and Moore continued to maintain a friendship and working relationship and Duffy was to become closely allied with Moore in his campaign for the abolition of the Land Annuities.

On his return from Paris, and the fulfilment of his duties, Moore was contacted by Art Ó Briain, the London based organiser of the Gaelic League, in order to gain his support for the Irish prisoners in English gaols. Ó Briain sent him a list of thirty seven prisoners, aged about twenty five, with prison sentences of seventeen years.[31] Some of them were ex-Connaught Rangers which immediately engaged his sympathies; his 'heart was sore for my Connaught Rangers and someone must work for them,' he confided in a letter to Ó Briain.[32] Those imprisoned included Joseph Dowling, a soldier who had defected to Roger Casement's Irish Brigade, and those Connaught Rangers who were involved in the Indian Mutiny in 1920. They might, not unreasonably have been regarded as nationalist heroes, Moore claimed that they had laid down their arms in support of their countrymen and women at home, and he wrote letters to every member of the Dáil drawing their attention to the prisoners, and contacted the Home Secretary and his friend and first Catholic Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Lord FitzAlan, calling for their release.[33] He went to London in the company of fellow ex-officers Sir Bryan Mahon, (who had been described on his first day in the

[29] Moore Papers, Ms. 10, 583/3
[30] Moore Papers, Ms. 10,583/3
[31] Ó 'Brian Moore, 8 August 1922, Ó 'Briain Papers, NLI, Ms. 8456/9.

[32] Moore to Ó 'Briain, 17 April 1922.

[33] Moore to Ó 'Briain, October 1922; Stephen Gwynn, Irish Parliamentary Party member, author and ex-Connaught Ranger also took up the cause of the imprisoned soldiers, by appealing to Andrew Bonar Law, the British PM; Colin Reid, *The Lost Ireland of Stephen Gwynn: Irish Constitutional Nationalism and Cultural Politics, 1864-1950.* (Manchester, 2011), p. 200.

Senate, as 'Victorian and well groomed') and Captain Bryan Cooper for a meeting with the Minister of War and Lord Derby to discuss Dowling's imprisonment. Moore described the imprisonment of Dowling as a constitutional point and pertinent to Ireland's status within the Treaty. Moore demanded the release of Dowling as a national right.[34] Due to Moore's prodigious efforts, Dowling was eventually released in 1924, and lived out his life in England, receiving a military funeral in Ireland on his death in 1932.[35] Art Ó Briain observed Moore's ability to maintain, 'his connection with those in power - and had their confidence, which often allowed him to work behind the scenes to achieve his aims.'[36] He was often more effective when he mobilised his social and political networks than when he displayed public political opposition. The point that Ó Briain made was highly significant in the context of Moore's career. His extensive and diverse social and professional networks gave him a position of some influence, which he employed very successfully from his cloaked position behind the scenes.

Senate: The Last Bastion of Imperialism?

By November 1922 Moore had taken up his place in the Senate within a context of some political, military and social disquiet. Despite the volume of historical and political studies on this context, little attention has been given to the relationship between the Dáil and the Senate during these early years or the legislative influence held by the Senate as the early acts of government were passed into law.[37] Regarded as tainted by imperialism due to the presence of large numbers of Southern Unionists, Donal O'Sullivan observed that there was an 'imperfect sympathy' between the Dáil and the Senate from the beginning, and the Senate, unlike that of South Africa, for example, was 'never in full partnership in the legislative process'.[38].The fact that Moore fought many of his battles in this political arena, contributed to the omission of his early involvement in the Land Annuities question.

The religious and political heterogeneity of this first Senate was assured by the election of farming and commercial interests, members of the Labour Party, and Unionist Anglo-Irish; thirty of the senators were Catholic, while twenty were non-Catholic, Protestant, Jewish and Quaker..[39]

[34] *The Western People,* , 16 December 1922, 7 July 1923.
[35] Justin Dolan Stover, 'Redefining Allegiance: Loyalty, Treason and the Foundation of the Irish Free State 1922-32' in Mel Farrell, Jason Knirck and Ciara Meehan, (eds), *A Formative Decade: Ireland in the 1920s* (Sallins, 2015), p. 119.

[36] Ó 'Briain to Moore, 31 August 1922.

[37] Elaine A. Byrne, 'A Unique Experiment in Idealism' p. 59.

[38] O'Sullivan, *The Irish Free State and its Senate* p. 120.
[39] Elaine A. Byrne, 'A Unique Experiment in Idealism' p. 59;Senator J.G. Douglas, *President de Valera and the Senate: Speeches Delivered in the Senate* (Dublin,1934); Thomas Garvin, *The Irish Senate,* (Dublin, 1969); John McG. Smyth, *The Theory and Practice of the Irish Senate* (Dublin, 1972); Bolton C. Waller, 'Irelands New Era of Law and Order' *Current History,* vol. 28, no. 5 (New York) (August 1928), p. 757; John C. Humphreys, 'Election in the Irish Free State' in *The Contemporary Review,* vol. 132, (July, 1 1927),

The position of chairman was filled by Lord Glenavy, a Unionist and a member of the Orange Order. He had been the former Lord Chief Justice of Ireland from 1916 to 1918 and had also been Lord Chancellor from 1918 to 1921. His election had been opposed by Moore and Edward Lysaght, and his leadership was contested by both men and by Senator Jenny Wyse Power, who was to become a considerable ally of Moore's during their years in the Senate. Wyse Power, 1858-1941 was a suffragette, Irish speaker, ex-member of the Ladies Land League and of Cumann na mBan, owned a shop in Henry Street, The Irish Farm and Produce company. Moore objected on the basis that 'Lord Glenavy's connection with the Ulster Movement made him an unsuitable person', to act as Chairman.[40] Lysaght observed Glenavy's thinly concealed contempt for the other senators and the way he manipulated meetings to comply with games of golf.[41] Margaret O'Callaghan referred to the 'magisterial disdain', with which Glenavy presided over an assembly he considered neither, 'ornamental or useful'.[42] According to O'Sullivan, Glenavy often read his Senate reports just before or even during Senate debates, indicating a lack of focus on his role in the Senate.[43] Irked by Moore's opposition, Glenavy treated the 'amiable' Moore with a particularly sharp contempt.[44] However, in these nascent years of statehood the Senate often acted as the only opposition to government, given Sinn Féin's policy of abstention and the weak opposition offered by the Labour Party. Nevertheless, it was tainted by the perception that it was the last bastion of imperialism while De Valera came to regard it as part of the defensive armoury of the ascendancy class... 'in favour of vested interests and privileges'.[45] When in fact the contribution of the landlord class, while it partially resisted some changes was almost always deferential towards the government with the exclusion of the abolition of the Oath. Despite these negative perceptions, a position in the Senate gave Moore a platform from which to oppose what he perceived as the weaknesses and failures of government, and a position of some influence from which to involve himself in public affairs.

The following decade saw Moore take up the predicament of the poorer farmer in the West, which the social and economic policies of Patrick Hogan, the Minister for Agriculture failed to address, despite a series of useful reforms, and an avowal that the 'state is based on the farmer,

p. 196.;Bill Kissane, 'The Re-equilibration of Democracy in Inter-War Ireland' in *Democratization*, vol. 6, no. 3 (Autumn 1999), pp 190-210.

[40] *London Times*, 13 December 1922.
[41] Edward MacLysaght, MacLysaght Memoir, *Master of None VI*, NLI, Ms 750, p. 7.

[42] Margaret O'Callaghan, 'Language Nationality and Cultural Identity in the Irish Free State, 1922-7: the 'Irish Statesman' and the 'Catholic Bulletin' in *Irish Historical Studies*, vol. 24, no. 94 (November, 1984), pp 226-245.

[43] Donal O'Sullivan, *The Irish Free State and its Senate: A Study in Contemporary Politics* (London, 1940) p. 168.
[44] Margaret O'Callaghan, 'Language Nationality and Cultural Identity in the Irish Free State, 1922-7 p xxii, pp 3-5.

[45] Ibid., p. 239.

and agriculture was the most important industry in the Free State..[46] Hogan, who was from farming stock in the West, was able and informed, and his policies were progressive but unsuccessful.[47] As Ireland's international profile gained respect, both the urban and rural poor suffered as industrialisation stagnated, and poverty and misery was the lot of parts of rural Ireland. In December 1923, unemployment stood at 80,000, while 54 per cent of the population was involved in agriculture, principally livestock and dairying, according to the 1926 census.[48]

Government policy tended to favour the better off and already established businesses. Land transfer favoured those who already had some and not the landless, while the 'dispossessed rarely got market value for their land'. To make matters worse, from 1923 to 1924 there was an economic crisis in agriculture with 'famine like conditions' being experienced in the West.[49] The severity of these conditions largely escaped debate in the Senate, being referenced in only twenty-two debates from 1922 to 1928, despite the wet summer of 1924 in which crops failed, turf was saturated and the fishing industry was depressed, badly affecting the west coast. Work schemes were provided along with £30,000 worth of potato seed, timber and coal, with another £3,000 to feed the school children. Not unexpectedly, during this period the Land Annuity payments fell further into arrears, the years of civil war having already made their payment sporadic.[50] The poverty in the west was publicly denied by Patrick Hogan, who claimed that 1925 was no different to any other year in the congested districts. There was some exaggeration of these conditions by the British press, which the Irish government was anxious to downplay, in order to be seen to govern effectively, which might explain Hogan's casual dismissal of conditions in the west.[51] Across the dividing boundary line, Catholics in Ulster were experiencing political, social and economic discrimination at the hands of a Protestant majority. Subject to economic constraints, and its commitment to the Treaty, the Free State government did not feel itself to be in a position to offer much assistance.[52] Occupied by the question of the international recognition of Ireland's sovereignty, the necessity to maintain smooth Anglo-Irish relation in order to advance this aim

[46] Moore was not the only landlord to attempt to find acceptance and inclusion in the new state by taking up the case of the farmers. The Clare landowner, Colonel George O'Callaghan-Westropp, actively supported the former tenants in the Irish Farmer's Union, acting as its president from 1921 to 1927. A former Unionist, and equally critical of the CDB, O'Callaghan-Westropp became a 'non-partisan Irishman,' who like Moore, retained his military title as his preferred mode of address. Tony Varley, 'The Class that Goes to the Wall:' Colonel George O'Callaghan-Westropp, Class Politics and Identity in Cumann na nGaedheal Ireland' in John Cunningham and Niall Ó Ciosáin (eds), *Culture and Society in Ireland Since 1750: Essays in Honour of Gearoíd O'Tuathaigh* (Dublin, 2015), pp 205-224.

[47] Úna Newell, *The West Must Wait: County Galway and the Irish Free State 1922-32* (Manchester, 2015), pp 57-59.

[48]Adrian Grant, 'Workers to the Rescue: Workers International Relief in Ireland, 1925' in *20th Century Contemporary History Features,* vol. 19, issue 1 (January/February, 2011).

[49]Newell, *The West Must Wait,* p. 75.

[50] Adrian Grant, 'Workers to the Rescue: Workers International Relief in Ireland, 1925.'

[51] Newell, *The West Must Wait,* p. 80.

[52] Diarmaid Ferriter, *The Transformation of Ireland 1900-2000* (London, 2005), p. 293.

and what they perceived as the moral obligation to fulfil the terms of the Treaty the government overlooked the plight of the poor and disenfranchised on both sides of the boundary.

Land.

Land Annuities: 'a 'tribute unjustly exacted from Ireland by 'the English.'[53]

The finalisation of land transfer, the allocation of land and the payment of the Land Annuities were all issues that had long histories and were pressing concerns for smaller farmers and landlords alike, for both economic and emotional reasons. The number of landlords in the Senate made it a personal issue for many of those who were clinging on to what was left of their demesnes, and there is some speculation on the espousal of ex-Unionists of a Land Bill that would further erode their interests. Essentially, the Annuities were payments extracted from the farmer/owners by the Irish government and paid to the British government which had compensated landlords for the transfer of land. By 1923 they were an onerous burden on the economically distressed farmers with accumulated arrears due to the poor economic conditions and the civil war.

How morally obligated was the government to fulfil the terms exacted under the payments? In the earlier part of the century Selborne and Oliver, who supported the idea of a federated empire, foresaw the later objection to these payments and their federalisation scheme had included their abolition. They envisaged the payments underpinning popular agitation as a 'tribute unjustly exacted from Ireland by' the English.'[54] Symbolising the unequal relationship between Ireland and Britain, Selborne and Oliver had considered them a vital question for the 1917 Convention but the Convention's chairman, Horace Plunkett failed to give their ideas more than a limited distribution, thus losing a valuable opportunity. The 1923 Land Act was seen as the solution to several of these pressing problems, the redistribution of the land, the compensation of the landlords and the payment of the Annuities. It was a sensitive issue as much of the land to be redistributed under the terms of the 1923 Land Act which was designed to relieve congestion, belonged to the Southern Unionists. In simple terms, a land commission was created and empowered to redistribute land to relieve the congests by giving Land Bonds to the vendors, the value of which was predicated on gross rental income multiplied by 15 years, and redeemable either by selling on the London Stock Exchange or during a period to be decided by the

[53] Alvin Jackson, *Home Rule: An Irish History 1800-2000* (London, 2003), p. 189.

[54] Ibid., p. 189.

government. Thus the landlord, or the landowner, had the option of an income from twice yearly interest payments, or the opportunity to sell, the profit dictated by current values.[55]

This conservative and complex solution underwritten by the British government had the effect of satisfying the demands for land distribution and neutralising any moves by the Anti-Treatyites to capitalise on rural dissatisfactions. It also relieved the landlords of any fears of land seizures, while remunerating them on terms that were considerably less generous than previous land acts. It was a complex and ingenious solution to the problems that were pressing on a government aware of the circling republicans looking for opportunities to extend their influence. The local agrarian agitation provided such an opportunity with republicans from rural backgrounds in the west seeking additional lands. Fearing anarchy and radicalism in his own county, Moore pointed out in a letter to the Minister of Defence in 1922, the anti-Treaty politicians in the IRA, finding themselves in a hopeless minority have 'adopted a policy very dangerous to the country and the present ministry, though it has not been openly avowed, they are making a bid for support through an agrarian movement'.[56] A number of the IRA members in the West were also small holders and labourers trying to acquire lands 'under the guise', as Campbell puts it, of 'RA engagements'.[57] The conditions in the West were different to those elsewhere. Farms in Connaught were smaller than those in Munster or Leinster, most of the agitation coming from small farmers and landless labourers against graziers and landlords.

As regards the annuity payments, Moore considered them to be archaic payments originating in years of colonial oppression and criticised the government for considering them a moral obligation and not being more assertive and independent in the face of British governmental demands. He opposed the Land Act of 1923, claiming that Hogan's measures would cause trouble. Much to Hogan's irritation, he declared, 'Cromwellism as nothing to Hoganism,' and likened the powers conferred upon the Land Commission as nothing less than confiscation. There was much bandying of rhetorical flourishes during the time of the Land Act with the discourse of the late nineteenth century finding a renewed vigour. He identified himself as a 'fanatical peasant proprietor', and an 'enthusiastic land reformer' in his youth, who could not support a policy of 'revolutionary removal and despotic power'.[58] Supporting the return of the land to the people

[55] Terence Dooley and Tony McCarthy, 'The 1923 Land Act: Some New Perspectives' in Mel Farrell, Jason Knirck and Ciara Meehan (eds), *A Formative Decade:Ireland in the 1920s* (Sallins, 2015), p. 147.

[56] John M.Regan, *The Irish Counter-Revolution 1921-1936;* Terence Dooley, 'Land and Politics in Independent Ireland, 1923-48: The Case for Reappraisal' in *Irish Historical Studies*, vol. 34, no. 134 (November, 2004).

[57] Fergus Campbell, *Land and Revolution:Nationalist Politics in the West of Ireland 1891-1921.* (Oxford, 2005), p. 302.

[58] Land Bill, 27 July 1923, vol. 1, no. 34 This fear was consistent with earlier claims that the C.D.B had ignored the claims of smallholders in favour of those who already had shops and land. Tony Varley, 'A Region of Sturdy Smallholders? Western

'whose ancestors held it,' he would not endorse the forceful removal of people in order to redistribute grazing land or abandoned demesnes,' which would contribute to the insecurity of tenure. Moore also suspected that the Land Commission would facilitate every small businessman in the west of Ireland in acquiring more land than was their due extending their land holdings while they sought political power. Despite the residual pockets of agrarian radicalism, there was a significant absence of transformative social and class relationships, and the transfer of land was relocating relationships of power to an emergent shopkeeper/publican class, despite the government policy of 'fairness to both landlord and tenant.'[59] The Cumann na nGaedheal government rewarded those who had been loyal with land grants to former soldiers.

The remainder of the landlord or landowning class, as the Earl of Mayo wryly observed of the change in nomenclature, cautiously supported Hogan's measures. However, Sir John B. Keane, and Lord Mayo entered the caveat that the powers conferred by the act on the Land Commission to acquire land for the purposes of relieving congestion were akin to nationalisation and had Marxist overtones while Moore couched his objections in terms that referred to earlier relationships. The spectre of Bolshevism and socialist revolution loomed large in these days of early statehood. Keane, 1973-1956, who was ex-military and a barrister, emerged as a protagonist for the landlords, while Sir Nugent Everard pointed out that 'any land, anywhere', might be acquired, which supported Moore's references to 'despotic power'.[60] Keane also expressed concern for the passing of the landlord class, 'the landlord classes had been an expression of culture in our country and to that extent, I think we must all agree that many people in humble positions in life do agree and feel that their passing is a loss'. Colonel Sir Hutcheson Poe, a former member of the 1903 land conference, said that the evicting landlord was now as 'extinct as the great Auk'. Everard who had also been a member of the land conference observed that when the landlord and the tenant got on together 'there were many ways in which the landlord could help the tenant, in times of distress, he was the tenant's friend'. The irony inherent in these protests arising from the landlord class could not have gone unnoticed by the government. It is interesting moreover, that the language used by these still influential landowners is one of extinction and loss, coloured by a nostalgia for their landlord past. Sir John Keane, who identified himself as an unrepentant capitalist and the critic of a Gaelic, Catholic ethos in the state, like Moore, had a record of service in the South African war and had also been a secretary to the Governor of

Nationalists and Agrarian Politics during the First World War' in *Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society*, vol. 55, (2003), p. 134.

[59] Brian A. Reynolds, 'The Foundation and Development of the Fianna Fáil Party 1926-1932' Unpublished PhD Thesis, University College Dublin, 1976, p. 314.

[60] Land Bill, 27 July 1923, vol. 1, no. 34.

Ceylon, Sir A. H. Blake. Keane, who had studied public finance and accounting was a procedural and financial expert, an able debater and the organiser of paramilitary farmer vigilantes to break labourer's strikes in County Waterford in the Civil War.[61] Sir Nugent Everard, 1849-1929, was a politician, farmer and Cambridge graduate with a military background. He was an efficient farmer who had won prizes for his Hereford cattle and Shropshire sheep. Everard had been a keen supporter of Plunkett's co-operative movement and a member of the 1917 Convention.[62] Lord Mayo, or Dermot Robert Wyndham Bourke, 1851-1927, ex-Etonian, Hussar and Grenadier Guardsman was a large landowner in Kildare, Meath and Mayo. An Irish Unionist and a member of the Kildare Hunt, Mayo was a man with numerous interests. He was a member of the Royal Geographical Society, and founder of both the Kildare Archaeological Society and the Irish Arts and Crafts movement based on that of William Morris. Mayo was keen on shooting, hunting and fishing, he had also been a member of the 1903 Land Conference. Standing at six feet, Mayo was an impressive figure and described as 'kindly but fey' by his contemporaries[63].

Hogan protested the conservatism of his present bill, to this landlord presence by pointing out its continuity with the solutions proposed by the Irish Convention Committee in 1918.[64] Moore felt that these propositions demonstrated how out of touch the centralised officialdom was with the realities of rural existence in the west. A number of ironies surfaced within this Senate exchange, as Moore claimed that the landlords, despite their bad record, were 'human', and 'when they saw people in trouble they had to help them'.[65] This inverted the conventional narrative that even now remains in place of landlord despotism, cruelty, and greed. The concern which Moore claimed resulted from the paternal landlordism as it was practiced by his father who had responded generously and swiftly to the starvation of the tenants during the famine.[66] Not surprisingly, Moore found little sympathy for the sentiments he expressed in the landlords defence, and found his words attacking Hogan's proposal hurled back at him almost ten years later, when the Annuity payments became an overriding electoral concern, and Hogan's Land Act had been passed into law. Moore was in the dichotomous position of defending the rights of the landless while he also defended the remaining rights of his class. This position is reiterated by Dooley who noted the number of labourers who failed to get land while the 'big shots', the local

[61] Partick Maume, 'Sir John Keane; *The Dictionary of National Biography Vol.5 Kane-McGuinness* (Cambridge, 2009) pp 26-27.
[62] Richard H.A.J. Everard, 'Sir Nugent Everard' *The Dictionary of National Biography Vol. 3 D-F* (Cambridge, 2009), p. 669.
[63] Partick Maume, 'Bourke, Dermot, Robert Wyndham Bourke, 7th Earl of Mayo; *The Dictionary of National Biography Vol.2 A-Burchills* (Cambridge, 2009), pp 373-675.
[64] K.S. Rankin, 'The Role of the Irish Boundary Commission in the Entrenchment of the Irish Border: From Tactical Panacea to Political Liability' in *Journal for Historical Geography*, vol. 34, (2008), pp 422-447.

[65] Land Bill, 27 July 1923.

[66] L. Perry Curtis Jr. 'Demonising the Irish Landlords since the Famine,' in Brian Casey (ed.), *Defying the Law: Agrarian Radicals in Irish History* (Dublin, 2013), p. 31.

shopkeepers and publicans gained even more.[67] Meanwhile the economic stagnation that existed among the smaller farmers was compounded not just by land annuity payments but the fact that many of them had accumulated arrears.

Two years later, in 1925, the crisis induced by the Boundary Commission led to an Ultimate Financial Settlement which further codified the payment of Land Annuities to the British government.[68] Both the Annuities and the boundary between the Free State and parts of Ulster had remained sensitive political issues for the Free State. An attempt was made by a Commission composed of Eoin MacNeill the Minister for Education, J.R. Fisher representing Ulster and the South African Justice Feetham, to redraw and thus codify the territorial divisions that existed between the state and the six counties of Northern Ireland. Feetham's presence was interesting considering his previous role as a member of the South African Parliament as a Unionist representative for Parktown in Johannesburg, which undermines any perception of his objectivity.[69] The terms of the Treaty had left the partition with Northern Ireland in a fluid state, due to the vague terminology of Article Twelve. As a result of the commission, partition was no longer a vague concept but a further reduction of the Free State's territory by the proposed annexation to Northern Ireland of parts of Donegal, while conceding transfers of parts of the counties of Fermanagh and Tyrone which were principally Catholic. The howl of protest that met the end of the possibility of a thirty two county Ireland, led to MacNeill's resignation and the end of his political career. It also meant a permanent separation between religious and ethnic difference on the island. In order to bring an end to the crisis of confidence brought about by the commission, the three governments maintained the original boundary, while the Irish government entered into a financial agreement that the government hoped would defuse the boundary debacle, but in fact would prove to be their electoral undoing in years to come. It required a Treaty amendment to revoke Article Five, absolving the Free State of responsibility for the public debt and war pensions, but left the Free State with a substantial annual payment of three million pounds that further burdened an ailing economy and a stressed agricultural sector.[70]

The settlement that resulted from this crisis was intended to give the impression of a diplomatic triumph, although the haste and secrecy with which the bill was rushed through the Senate, makes

[67] Terence Dooley, *The Land for the People: The Land Question in Independent Ireland* (Dublin, 2004) p. 73.
[68] Treaty (Confirmation of Amending Agreement) Bill, 16 December 1925, vol. 16, no. 4: The Financial Settlement, 15 December 1926, vol. 8. no.1.

[69] Adrian Guelke, 'The Peace Process in South Africa, Israel and Northern Ireland: A Farewell to Arms?' in *Irish Studies in International Affairs*, vol. 15 (1994), pp 93-106: idem, 'Ireland and South Africa: A very Special Relationship' in *Irish Studies in International Affairs*, vol. II (2000), pp 137-146.

[70] K.S. Rankin, 'The Role of the Irish Boundary Commission in the Entrenchment of the Irish Border'

it clear that the government was conscious of the likely critical reception. The necessary debate in the Senate was arranged with little notice and Moore, who arrived late and by chance, was incensed by both lack of notice, and the folly of appointing MacNeill to the commission, despite his 'deep personal respect,' for him. There was a general opinion that the terms of the settlement left the northern nationalists abandoned to sectarian discrimination and inequality, while the payments to Britain were a further impediment to Irish economic development. Moore's fury was remarked upon by the Ulster nationalist, John MacLouglin who called on the 'non-compromiser and the man of iron, the denouncer of partitions,' to remember the contents of a letter he sent to the *Freeman's Journal* on 12 June 1916 urging the public to accept what was attainable given the opposition of Northern Ireland. The 'implacable Senator,' of 1925, observed MacLoughlin, had started out as Moore the 'conciliationist,' in 1916.[71] The undeniable truth of MacLoughlin's observations drew attention to Moore's ideological shift in the intervening years, which was regarded by some of his contemporaries as opportunistic rather than principled as indeed were the perceptions of his support for Sinn Fein in 1918.[72]

Moore's opposition to the Financial Settlement prompted him to put a motion to the Senate on the basis that the Settlement was 'prejudicial to the financial stability of the Irish Free State'. It would, 'if ratified prove to be an excessive burden on Irish taxpayers'.[73] His opinions left him in a minority in the Senate. According to Moore, excessive taxation and the drain on the economy from the payment of land Annuities was responsible for a situation in which people were being driven from their homes by the sheriff, 'just like the landlords fifty years before', and 'going to America in shoals'. During the speech on the settlement, Moore asked why Ireland did not claim the assets of empire which had been built by 'Irish brain, Irish blood and Irish labour'. Like Redmond he was not averse to sharing the spoils of empire and asked why 'didn't Ireland get some of the Suez Canal shares worth seventeen millions?[74] He claimed the equal moral right of Ireland on the basis of 'centuries of war, plunder, devastation ...and cultural loss', and pointed out the difficulty of defining a moral debt when it was in opposition to legal liability.'[75] The Senate was divided on the question, many of the senators supporting the government's claim that there was a moral obligation to pay the debt, despite the fact, as Jenny Wyse Power pointed out that the Treaty bore no direct mention of the Annuities. It was significant that the British government had underwritten the financial schemes to reimburse the landlords for their land, within the terms of

[71] Treaty (Confirmation of Amending Agreement) Bill, 16 December 1925, vol. 16, no. 4.

[72] In 1916 Moore had urged caution not coercion where a united Ireland was concerned, as he felt that unity could not be forced upon the Ulster Loyalists. *Connaught Telegraph*, 17 June 1916.

[73] The Financial Settlement, Motion by Senator Colonel Moore, 15 December 1926, vol. 8, no. 1.

[74] 'Objectives of Clann Eireann' Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10,560/5; 'The Programme of Clann Eireann' Ms. 10,560/9.

[75] 'Notes for a Paper on the Ultimate Financial Settlement' Moore papers, NLI, Ms 10,560/6.

the 1923 Act, and any reneging on the Land Annuities payment would jeopardise that agreement and put the landlords out of pocket. It was suggested that a committee might be formed to discuss the amendment. Moore, Wyse Power, Linehan, O'Farrell and Bennett were suggested as members, but Glenavy's casting vote killed the proposed amendment and it came to naught, Glenavy suggested to Moore that he had put the house in an unregulated position by asking that a committee unrecognised by government and with no power be formed.[76] Gogarty, who frequently made Moore the target of his wit, described the proposed committee as the 'curious committee'. Despite the opposition from the Senate a settlement was signed by the Minister for Finance, Earnest Blythe and Winston Churchill, on March 1926.

Clann Éireann

Moore's waning support for the government, on the basis of the boundary and financial settlement and the obvious frustrations of his role in the Senate led him to believe that parliamentary opposition was essential. There was little opportunity for him to achieve his objective of abolishing the Annuity payments to Britain, in fact the recent government policy had ensured that the payments would continue indefinitely. He changed his strategy by allying himself with fellow dissenters, William Magennis, 1867-1946, the conservative, Catholic professor of philosophy at UCD, and a member of the Knights of Columbanus. (Frank O' Connor called him a 'windbag with a nasty streak') and Pádraic Ó Máille, ex-Deputy Speaker of the Dáil, language enthusiast, ex-revolutionary and Galway farmer to form the 'splinter party', which they named Clann Éireann.[77] The name meant Irish People's Party, or as the *London Times* interpreted it, the 'Peoples Party,' or the 'Children of Éireann.'[78] Clann Éireann was described by the *Times* in London, as coming into being in 1925 with the agreement cancelling Article Five of the Treaty, and its policy was described as the acceptance of the Free State as a stepping stone to an independent republic', which was a cautiously phrased republicanism. The party manifesto which was both economically and ideologically driven, promised a solution to the decline in industry and agriculture by decreasing taxation, promoting protectionism, making the Land Annuities payable to the Irish government and reducing them by 30 per cent, not abolishing them completely. Furthermore, it promised the regeneration of the Gaeltacht and the Dublin slums. More ephemerally, it expressed the intention of 'penetrating the nation with the spirit and ideals of the United Irishman', and working with an 'unshakeable purpose', to achieve freedom.[79]

[76] O'Sullivan, *The Irish Free State and its Senate,* p. 203.
[77] Marie Coleman, William Magennis, *The Dictionary of Irish Biograhy Vol 6 Mc Guire –Nutt* (Cambridge, 2009), pp 248-250.
[78] Mícheál Ó Fathartaigh, 'Pádraic Ó Máille, 'Irish Agrarian Radical? The Case Considered,' in Brian Casey (ed.), *Defying The Law of The Land: Agrarian Radicalism in Irish History* (Dublin, 2013), Clann Eireann was named as the 'party without a people,' by Sean Broderick, CnaG., Newell p.149. *London Times*, 6 June 1927.
[79] 'Objectives of Clann Eireann,' Moore papers, NLI, Ms 10,560/5 'The Programme of Clann Eireann' Ms. 10,560/9.

Ensuring that key positions in the state would be filled by men who 'put this country first', Clann Éireann would 'ripen in the hearts of the children the seeds sown by Easter Week'.[80] This manifesto sounded very similar to the one adopted by the newly formed republican party Fianna Fáil in the following year, with one important exception, in that the Clann accepted the Oath, having among its members several Treatyites, while making its abolition a part of its manifesto. When de Valera was finally elected to office, he assimilated many of the Clann's economic policies into his own, some of them were already similar, but Fianna Fáil lacked any defined policy on the annuities until 1928.[81]. This was confirmed by a letter from Gerry Boland to Moore 17 January 1928.[82]. The party's language fused the nationalist narrative from the United Irishmen to Easter Week, and emphasised the national language and culture, as it was perceived, unfairly, that the Cumann na nGaedheal government was neglectful of both.[83] Considering how this policy presaged Fianna Fáil's doctrine of self-sufficiency and cultural renewal in 1932, it is astonishing that Clann Éireann has been largely overlooked by historians. Its economic policy had much in common with Arthur Griffith's economic protectionism derived from Frederich List's (1789-1846) influential theories on the economics of developing nations which argued that specific measures were needed according to the degree of national development.[84] In other words design specific economic measures to suit the needs of developing national economies, instead of imposing punitive measures dictated by policy.

Defined by John Coakley as a minor party, Clann Éireann failed to win any seats in the 1927 election or to contest more than one election, thus remaining ephemeral.[85] The party managed to garner 5,567 votes, however, as within the voting system of proportional representation 'minor parties tended to receive a lower share of seats than votes'. Brian Reynolds considered the party narrowly defined and unable to survive when pitted against the bigger and better known party organisations.[86] It did not create a new pool of voters but drew on an existing electorate which Fianna Fail with its republican history was more likely to engage in support. The party was funded by Clan na Gael, and Moore was forced to appeal to John Devoy in April 1927 for additional financial assistance. He had written to Devoy in 1924 after the army mutiny, of the need for a 'strong opposition', considering that 'peace and prosperity' would not be forthcoming under the

[80] Ibid.,

[81] [81] Brian A. Reynolds, 'The Foundation and Development of the Fianna Fáil Party', p. 319.

[82] Ibid., p. 321.

[83] Jason Knirck, *Afterimage of the Revolution: Cumann Na nGaedheal and Irish Politics 1922-1932* (Madison, 2014).

[84] Friederich List, *The National System of Political Economy*, Sampson S. Lloyd (trans.), (London, 1909).

[85] John Coakley, 'The Rise and Fall of Minor Parties in Ireland' in *Irish Political Studies*, vol. 25, no. 4 (2010), pp 503-531; Bolton C. Waller 'Ireland's New Era of Law and Order,'

[86] Brian A. Reynolds, 'The Foundation and Development of the Fianna Fáil Party', p. 195.

Cosgrave government.[87] As early as 1924 Moore was suggesting a new party with 'full national development' as its objective while maintaining an assertive attitude to the British government.[88] With these aims, and some support from members of the former National Party and what Donal O'Sullivan judged as their appeal to moderate republicans and labour supporters, Clann Eireann quite spectacularly failed to deliver. Out of eight candidates, all, with one exception, were returned at the bottom of the poll. The *Times* described Clann Éireann's electoral defeat as 'complete annihilation'.[89] Moore and the leadership of Clann Éireann were aware of their slim chances of electoral success and had been in talks with Sinn Féin before de Valera's break with them, in the interests of forming a coalition. Ó Máille acted as go-between, but it was unlikely to have been successful in any case, as de Valera was uninterested in coalition. The 'strenuous efforts', made by the Clann to obtain the support of the republicans who had broken away from the 'extremists' at the recent Republican Ard Feis, was noted by the *London Times* on 12 April 1926. That too was unsuccessful.

The actual significance of the Clann lies in two factors, it was the first political party to focus on the Land Annuities by drawing attention to the payments to Britain and secondly, many of its identifying policies were adopted by the emergent, and more successful Fianna Fáil party.[90] In 1927, the *Times* in London referred to the party's decision to 'throw all its weight into the scales on Mr de Valera's side'. According to this organ, Magennis had stated 'in a pretentious manner,' that Fianna Fáil had at last adopted the policy which was propounded without success by Clann Éireann.[91] In September 1927 Moore sent a telegram to Devoy telling him of Clann Éireann's decision to support Fianna Fáil in the coming election as a 'progressive national party pursuing the same political and economic ideals for the advocacy and attainment of which Clann Éireann was founded'.[92] Two months later, in a letter to Devoy, he explained the reasons behind the Clann's actions, knowing that Devoy was not favourably disposed to de Valera. With a mixture of blighted political hopes and political pragmatism Moore directed his letter to the editor of the *Gaelic American*, constructing a story of a dignified exit for a failed and disbanded party, and accurately attributing Fianna Fáil's success to its ability to absorb the smaller parties into itself. Moore and his fellow Clann Éireann members decided that throwing in their political lot with Fianna Fáil was the least divisive and most pragmatic action to take under the circumstances,

[87] Moore to Devoy, 6 April 1924.

[88] Moore to Devoy, 6 April.

[89] *The Times*, 17 June 1927; Donal O'Sullivan, *The Irish Free State and Its Senate* (London, 1940), p. 183.

[90] Reynolds, p. 319.

[91] *The Times*, 30 August 1927.

[92] Telegram from Moore to Devoy, nd. September 1927.

given Fianna Fáil's adoption of constitutional methods, despite the entry of the Republican Party into the Dail on the basis of Clann Éireann policy 'without publicly admitting it'. [93] The *Mayo News* printed an article by Moore in which he said that the Clann had been crushed between the larger and better equipped parties, and that Fianna Fáil borrowed their propaganda lacking any of their own that actually affected the lives of the people. Moore said that the Clann Eireann candidates were 'men of good character with fine fighting records and popular in their own districts but their resources were small and the speeches from headquarters were not sufficient'.[94]

What drew Moore to the Clann? Or more accurately, what caused Moore to draw up a manifesto whose composition and agenda were markedly different to the political bodies he had been allied to ten years previously, when he formed a committee with Alfred Douglas, George Russell and Edward Lysaght, and worked with Alice Stopford Green and her contacts in British and Irish politics. William Magennis and Pádraic Ó Máille, were conservatively Catholic, Magennis particularly so, while Ó Máille came from the Gaeltacht of Connemara and was committed to a Gaelic Ireland ideal. Like Moore, Ó Máille had supported the Treatyite government, but his commitment to protectionist land policies in order to develop agriculture led him eventually, along with Moore into Fianna Fáil.[95] It was established in the third chapter that Moore lamented the loss of 'traditional' Ireland, in his understanding that existed in an older set of social relations and occupations sanctified by long practice and ideals of craftsmanship. His brother George, once commented that Maurice still believed in the possibility of a reformed landlord/tenant relationship in which both landlord and tenant would be Irish speaking.[96]

Moore was too pragmatic and realistic to be guided by set of impractical ideals, but there is no doubt that he was influenced by cultural nationalist ideas that the Cumann na nGaedheal government displayed a lesser interest in. The Gaelicism espoused by Moore and his fellow Clann members bestowed a party distinctiveness as it did later for Fianna Fáil, according to English 'it provided republicans with definition and justification'.[97] It has to be noted that economic policies and 'Gaelicism' were linked by a lack of economic and industrial advantage in the Gaeltacht areas despite a government policy to rejuventate these areas as a 'core' for the survival of the language. By espousing the economic cause in the poorer areas in the West, Moore was also supporting the

[93] Moore to Devoy, December 1927.

[94] *The Mayo News*,30 July 1927.

[95] Mícheál Ó Fathartaigh, 'Pádraic Ó ' Máille: Irish Agrarian Radical? The Case Considered,' p. 240.

[96] Adrian Frazier, *George Moore 1852-1933* (London, 2000), p. 362.

[97] Richard English, 'Green on Red: Two Case Studies in Early Twentieth Century Irish Republican Thought' in George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall, and Vincent Geoghan (eds.), *Political Thought in the Nineteenth Century*. (London, 1993), p.172.

language movement as a part of the indentity of the new state.[98]The opposition offered by the specificity of their doctrine required an identity that was acceptable to the electorate. This same identity was acceptable when it was adopted by Fianna Fáil, however the leadership of Clann Éireann with the intellectual Magennis, the ex-soldier and landlord Moore, and the revolutionary history of Ó Máille which was not quite sufficient to compensate for the other two, failed to ignite public sympathies. Magennis's Catholicism was too doctrinaire for the more cosmopolitan Moore. Magennis was overheard to remark to Ó Máille, during the Senate debate on divorce that he could not be a 'good Catholic if you allow divorce even between Protestants'.[99] This would have been a step too far for Moore who was supremely tolerant of religious difference although his arguments during the Senate debate on divorce revealed a slippery refusal to engage with a Catholic position on the subject. Public perceptions of his abilities remained ambivalent as an article in the *Irish Times* in 1926 suggests. Moore was described as

> ..a man of great courage in following his own convictions even when he opposition against him was quite powerful. Possessed of a charming personality, he has many friends, but it is doubtful whether he has either the strength physically or enough pugnacity for political leadership[100]

From Tourmakeady to Vladivostock

Aside from ideological responses to the politics of independent Ireland, anecdotal evidence suggests that Moore felt a personal responsibility to alleviate the conditions of poverty in the rural west, and this probably influenced his decision to join the Fianna Fáil party. Despite Cumann an nGaedheal's administrative successes, poor housing conditions were the norm for the poorer rural and urban dwellers, and emigration continued unabated. Two letters in Moore's papers dating from 1927 and 1928 are both personal appeal and eye witness account of the hardship that was the lot of both Moore's county of Mayo and the midland county of Carlow. The first of these

[98] Padraig O'Riagain, *Language Policy and Social Regeneration: Ireland 1893-1993* (Oxford, 1997)
[99] J. Anthony Gaughen, *Memoirs of Senator James G. Douglas*, pp 113-114; Dermot Keogh, *Twentieth Century Ireland: Revolution and State Building* (Dublin, 1994), p. 31.
[100] *Irish Times* 23 January 1926.

letters came from Brother Jas. Molloy from the monastery in Tourmakeady in County Mayo that Moore's father George Henry had endowed many years before. Composed on 25 May 1927, Brother Molloy was considering the sale of land to alleviate conditions

> Our woollen mill could not compete with the imported (cheap and worthless) goods dumped all over the Free State; moreover money seems to have all gone on taxes or to England and the people and the people are unable to pay their bills and so shops and mills are failing and closing down.[101]

The second letter dated from 5 September 1927, but referring to conditions in Carlow the previous year came from Matthew Roche who was serving as a wireless operator on the S.S Pendeen in Vladivostock.[102] Roche, who was from North Carlow had made a visit home and was 'appalled and distressed at conditions', and the 'dejections and hopelessness and starvation of the people from all walks of life'. The shopkeepers, according to Roche, were suffering because no one had any money. Claiming that conditions were similar to those in 1846, Roche predicted that de Valera would sweep the polls, despite 'his nonsensical attitude on the oath', and pleaded with Moore not to allow the matter of the annuities to drop. Roche's father had sent him an *Irish Independent* article on Moore's efforts to have the Land Annuity payments to Britain abolished and this had prompted him to write to Moore, he asked that 'God might reward his noble efforts'.

Moore had written a pamphlet at the behest of Clann Éireann, in fact a series of pamphlets, but the most notable of these was the one he named; *British Plunder and Irish Blunder or The Story of the Land Purchase Annuities.*[103] It was a detailed moral, legal, financial and historical argument drawn up in consultation with George Gavan Duffy and heavily based on the report of the Childers Commission and the Oldham report.[104] In 1896 the Childers Commission had found that Ireland should be awarded two and a half million as compensation for over-taxation from 1853 onwards.

---

[101] Letter from Bro. Jas. Molloy to Moore, Moore Papers, NLI, Ms. 8489 /2.

[102] Letter to Moore from Mathew Roche S.S Pendeen Vladivostok, 5 September 1928, Moore Papers, NLI, Ms. 10,560/3.

[103] Senator Maurice Moore, *British Plunder and Irish Blunder or the Story of the Land Purchase Annuities* (Dublin, 1928); idem *Catechism of Land Annuities*, October 1928, Moore Papers ,NLI, Ms. 19,560/8.

[104] Professor Oldham, 'The Present Taxable Capacity of Ireland' 28 June 1921, report at Ireland Social Enquiry Society.

In 1912, Professor Oldham, an English economist substantiated the findings of the Childers report. Moore's premise rested on the terms of the financial agreement, the poverty of the people and the moral unacceptability of extracting such payments from Ireland after years of wrong. In order to get his pamphlet serialised in the pages of *An Phoblacht* the organ of republicanism, he approached its editor, the radical socialist, republican and author Peadar O'Donnell.[105]

O'Donnell had embarked on his own anti-annuities campaign which he began in his home place of Dungloe, County Donegal in 1923. O'Donnell had initially been dismissive of Moore's presence in the Senate but his respect increased when he saw Moore's willingness to work with him despite his impression that O'Donnell was working for the IRA. O'Donnell could hardly afford to be too discerning, as up to 1927, Moore was one of the few supporters he attracted to his cause, Fianna Fáil and Sinn Féin had shown little interest up to then. It was with the aim of drawing Fianna Fáil support to the campaign that Moore and O'Donnell, an unlikely social and political pairing agreed to work together. Superficially uneasy political bedfellows, Moore and O'Donnell shared a commitment to concrete issues and not abstract political theorising. Both were convinced that parliamentary agitation must be allied to fieldwork. O'Donnell arranged for Moore to have secretarial assistance in order to set up a countrywide correspondence by examining the local press for signs of support, and from such beginnings a propaganda movement was born.[106] Moore had already gained the support of the Labour Senators but the party remained aloof, O'Donnell approached P.T. Daly Secretary of the Dublin Trade Union, and some Trade Union officials joined them on a platform at a meeting Moore had arranged at the Rotunda. With his usual single mindedness Moore did not observe a party directive on this issue by joining the Anti-Tribute League, which was largely composed of Sinn Féin and made his way onto their provisional committee.[107] As ever Moore's role tended to be behind the scenes as an able and efficient propagandist and his extensive network of contacts together with his presence in the Senate gave him a wide sphere of influence.

By August of 1927, Moore had become a member of Fianna Fáil, in fact one of the early organisational meetings of the party had been held in Moore's home in Donnybrook on 23 March

[105] Peadar O'Donnell, *There Will be Another Day*, (Dublin, 1963) p. 86; Peter Hegarty, *Peadar O'Donnell* (Cork, 1999); Charles Travis, 'Rotting Townlands': Peadar O'Donnell, The West of Ireland and the Politics of Representation in Saorstát hÉireann (Irish Free State) 1929-1933 *Historical Geography*, vol. 36 (2008), pp 208-224.

[106] Articles by Moore to the *Gaelic American*, 18 December 1926, 1 November 1927; *Irish Times*, 5 May 1929, Moore papers, Ms. 10,560/3.

[107] Letter from Moore, 14 February1928, representing the Anti-Tribute League to County Councils November 1. 1928. Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10,560/6; Letter from Moore to *Irish Independent*, 19 December 1928, rebuking Bishop Fogarty of Killaloe for his warning to those County Councils who passed resolutions denying that Irish farmers were legally compelled to pay annuities. The Bishop called the resolutions 'Bolshevik principles'. Moore papers, Ms. 10,560/10.

1926, which was revelatory of Moore's political flexibility at this time. De Valera, Lemass, Sean T. O'Kelly, Sean MacEntee, P.J. Rutledge, Dr. James Barry and Gerry Boland were all present on this occasion.[108] Rutledge was in charge of the organizing committee and Lemass acted as secretary while de Valera did not take a prominent leadership role. However, at a further meeting three days later, he emerged as the leader of the new party.[109] This party was regarded as a unifying force, sweeping new elements into the fold. A public policy was published on the 16 April issue of *An Phoblacht.*[110] Essentially, Fianna Fáil's aims included the restoration of the language, the establishment of an equitable and Christian social system, a distribution of land that would encourage rural settlement and industry, a self-sufficient economy, the abolition of the Oath of Allegiance and the eventual unification of Ireland. It was a policy, as Moore was at pains to point out, that had the same political and economic ideals of Clann Eireann. On the basis of a resolution sponsored by Ó Máille, at the 1927 Fianna Fáil Ard-Fheis, a committee was formed to develop a policy on the annuities. Moore was not on this committee, which included Gerry Boland and Thomas Derrig but he was consulted over the final report.[111] Boland, 1885-1973, had been a Volunteer, and was possessed of administrative and organisational abilities. A dedicated practitioner of yoga, he was described by Lawrence White as 'plebeian, but reflective and erudite'. He was also a member of the Knights of Columbanus.[112] Derrig, 1897-1956, who was from Westport in County Mayo, had been the headmaster of Ballina school, and was a strong supporter of the Irish language.[113] It was likely given their past experiences and interests that both men knew Moore previously.

By 1928, Moore had risen to the National Executive, where party policy was developed. According to Reynolds, Moore was the chief propagandist on what had become Fianna Fáil's Land Annuities Campaign, as he had on O'Donnell's movement and the pamphlet that he had brought to O'Donnell *British Plunder, and Irish Blunder* was the principal source of the party's arguments.[114] De Valera had been impressed by the economic, moral and legal reasoning in Moore's pamphlet and virtually adopted it as his own, situating his own argument within that of the sixteenth and seventeenth century land confiscations by the English. Fianna Fáil's legal case against the payment of annuities might have been taken directly from Moore's pamphlet. In a

[108] Noel Whelan, *Fianna Fáil: A Biography of the Party* (Dublin, 2011), p. 17.

[109] Ibid. p. 18.

[110] Ibid. p. 19.

[111] Brian A. Reynolds, 'The Foundation and Development of the Fianna Fáil Party 1926-1932 p. 320.

[112] Lawrence William White, *Dictionary of National Biography Vol* White, *The Dictionary of National Biography Vol. 1 A-Burchill* (Cambridge, 2009), pp 632-634.

[113] Pauric J. Dempsey, *Dictionary of National Biography Vol 3 D-F* (Cambridge, 2009), pp 185-186.

[114] Ibid. p. 322.

series of articles in the *Nation* in 1928 and 1929, Fianna Fáil activated another of Moore's arguments regarding Ireland's entitlement to a share of empire.[115]

By 1932 Moore's long campaign was about to find some resolution.[116] Fianna Fáil used the Land Annuities campaign as an electoral platform challenging the government on the legality of the payments. In January 1932 in the Senate's response to the government White Paper on the Land Purchase Annuities, Moore moved to censure the government for its failure to address the legality of the payments until it had become a 'major political issue.'[117] Accusing the government of settlement without consultation or advice and of accepting terms that were unfavourable to Ireland, without demur, permitting five millions to bleed from the Irish State to the British exchequer in the form of payments. They had, Moore claimed, 'done their worst for Ireland,' and 'their best for Britain.[118] Characteristically, Gogarty pointed out that the Colonel had made a 'major' out of the issue as the argument ranged from the Tudor conquests to the nineteenth century Land Acts. Although Gogarty was described by Lyons as 'wounding his unarmoured political foes with his barbs', he saved the majority of them for de Valera.[119] As usual, Moore came in for particular attack in the Senate from Patrick McGilligan who was the Cumann na nGaedheal Minister for Industry and Commerce from 1924-32 and the Minister for External Affairs from 1927-32. Attacks on Moore by the government became a part of their policy of defence during this time and few were more able than McGilligan, who undermined Moore by referring to his military past and attributing the Land Annuities campaign to O'Donnell and not Moore.

The Land Act of 1923 had been regarded as the legal sanction for the payments, McGilligan claimed in the government's defence, adroitly using the Senate records on the Land Act debates ten years previously to provide ballast in his interrogation of Moore. Moore, claimed McGilligan had been more concerned at the time with the landlords loss of income, 'he takes his place with that oppressed class, the landlords,' reminding the assembly of Moore's origins. By making a subtle reference to Moore's army pension, McGilligan made the point that during this time, Moore was the beneficiary of England', undermining his role as defender of the people. 'Peadar

[115] Ibid.p. 329.

[116]Moore had politicized the Land Annuities payments as early as 1922, calling them 'former rents imposed by the British conquerors' *Connaught Telegraph* 15 April 1922. He was involved in propagandising the anti-Annuities payment campaign during 1932. Letters were sent to the *Times,* 4 July 1932; *Manchester Guardian,* 27 August 1932; *Manchester Guardian,* 6 November 1932;;Letter to *Manchester Guardian* 30 August 1932. Ms. 10,560/7; Letter from J. Connolly dept. of Posts and Telegraphs to Moore, discussing a publicity campaign on the land annuities payments for the British and Irish Press, 19 August 1932; Letter from Joe Devlin M.P. gave details on sums paid by Northern Ireland in Imperial Contributions from 1929-1932, 2 July 1932 Moore Papers, Ms. 10.560/6/7/8.

[117] Land Purchase Annuities, 28 January 1932, vol. 15, no. 8.

[118] Ibid.

[119] J.B. Lyons, ' Oliver St. John Gogarty *Dublin Historical Record* vol. 38, no. 11, (December, 1984) pp 2-13.

O'Donnell' claimed McGilligan was the true originator of the annuities campaign with an injunction to the farmers to not pay, the question had its roots in O'Donnell and the 'man who is incapable of understanding accounts or figures'. McGilligan was referring to a remark Moore made ten years ago in which he described himself as someone who knew nothing at all about finance or accounts.[120] The moral, financial and legal arguments put forward by Moore in 1928 which were appropriated by Fianna Fáil, had subsequently become the language of the government's defence of their actions. All those years before, Moore had discerned accurately that there was a lack of adequate information underpinning governmental financial policies.

Senator Comyn credited Moore for the 'zeal and courage,' with which he had pursued the Land Annuities question making it a major political issue, pointing out that Moore had been treated with 'derision' and 'impatience', and now, finally had the 'respectful attention of the Senate'. That Comyn, 1871-1952, lawyer and son of a Clare farmer was friendly with Moore is borne out by Moore's request for his presence in a proposed propaganda office in London a year or two later.[121] Labour senator Thomas Johnson admired the 'pertinacity', of Moore who succeeded in inducing the largest political party in the country to support what was not just a political but a national issue.[122] Within a few months of Fianna Fáil entering government in 1932, de Valera had defaulted on the payments.[123] The British government responded by adding levies to Irish exports. In the economic war that ensued from 1934 to 1938, Ireland used the annuities payments which had been frozen pending arbitration.[124] Moore finally saw his objectives realised, although as McGilligan's attacks in the Senate proved, he received none of the credit.[125] Peadar O'Donnell is historiographically associated with the agitation in regard to the annuities payments with Moore as a peripheral presence. O'Donnell was keenly aware of this omission and at his wife, Lile O'Donnell's urging that 'one dare not fail so good a man', he began on *There Will be Another Day*, which was published in 1968 and gave the background to the Land Annuities movement and Moore's place within it.[126]

There was some contemporary recognition of Moore's role, as Reynolds pointed out, one of the first appointments made by the party, on their accession to power in 1932 was that of Moore

[120] Ibid.

[121] Pauric J. Dempsey, *Dictionary of Irish Biography Vol 2 Burdy-Czira* (Cambridge, 2009), pp 723-724.
[122] Ibid.

[123] Donal Ó' Drisceoil, 'When Dev Defaulted: The Land Annuities Dispute, 1926-38' in *History Ireland*, vol. 19, no. 3 (May, June, 2011), pp 42-49.

[124] Cormac Ó Gráda, 'Five Crises,' UCD Centre for Economic Research Working Papers Series, (2011), pp 5-7.

[125] *Ballina Herald*, 29 July 1939, stated that 'It is not generally known that Senator Colonel Moore was one of the originators of the agitation that resulted in the Fianna Fáil government's refusal to pay the Land Annuities to the England'.

[126] Peadar O'Donnell, *There Will be Another Day* (Dublin, 1968), p. 5.

to the London Bureau that negotiated the Land Annuities question with Britain.[127] This appointment which may ostensibly appear to validate Moore's work in this regard, proved to be ambiguous. In reality it was a disappointment to Moore. In August 1933, he wrote to Art Ó Briain telling him he was going to London to 'instruct the British M.P.'s and journalists on the real legal and moral rights connected with the present financial quarrel'.[128] Ó Briain wrote back with advice on service flats in St. James. Moore failed to reply until September, stating the he wasn't getting expenses or official recognition. With a minister already in London, no one would bother with him, in a few months he would return, humiliated at his failure. Significantly, Moore felt that this might be the object of his posting, to allow him to fail at his own expense.[129] Disillusioned, he realised that his appointment was little more than a cosmetic exercise. Moore's posting was, as he felt, not what it appeared, as a series of letters between him and de Valera from mid-August to September of 1933 confirm. Moore had a number of discussions with de Valera on the objectives for his role in London and the structures that would have to be put in place to support them. Moore saw his role as providing an explanation to the British public for Ireland's position in the economic war between the two countries. He outlined the team he wanted to put together naming George Gavan Duffy, Art Ó Briain, Tom Johnson, Vaughan Dempsey, Captain Henry Harrison and Senator Comyn with Moore at their head in the London H.Q. Given their other duties, Moore envisaged this team as being available on an ad hoc basis, called upon whenever their abilities were required. Moore had a similar list of individuals in London whom he felt might be called upon, significantly a number of these were also friends. Grattan Doyle, Irish Tory M.P. Pat Hanna, Unionist M.P. Michael McDonagh an *Irish Times* journalist, and George Berkeley who had served in the Volunteers.[130]

Moore anticipated some friction between his proposed committee for Publicity and the office of the High Commisioner John Whelan Delanty, who was the official representative of the Free State government. By 24 August, Moore was continuing to lobby for his London office but increasingly unsure of his position.[131] It became clear that Captain Harrison, one of his proposed team, had his own ideas for a London News Bureau under his management, and wanted an agency dedicated to disseminating up to date Irish news to the British public.[132] Henry Harrison 1867-1954, was like Moore, a politician, soldier and writer from County Down. In 1899 he had been imprisoned for helping tenants resist eviction, and later stood as a nationalist parliamentary

[127] Brian A. Reynolds, p. 22.

[128] Moore to O'Briain, 18 August 1933.

[129] Moore to O'Briain, 6 September 1933.

[130] Moore to de Valera, 17 August 1933, Moore Papers, Ms. 10,586/1

[131] Moore to de Valera, 24 August 1933, Moore Papers, Ms. 10, 586/2

[132]Harrison to de Valera and Moore, 21 September 1933, Moore Papers, Ms. 10, 586

candidate for Tipperary Mid. He served in theVolunteers and later joined the army during WW1 where he was awarded the M.C and an O.B.E. In 1920 he was the secretary of Plunkett's Dominion League, by the time of the Civil War he was the supervisor of military intelligence to counteract republican threats. From 1922-27 he was the Irish correspondent for the *Economist,* and a member of the National League. A former confidant of Parnell, he wrote several studies on him, publishing *Parnell Vindicated* in 1931. Harrison's career, like Moores incorporated a landlord complex of sponsoring land transfer, service in the military and an alliance with constitutional nationalism, finally, like Moore he found a position in the new state. Unfortunately for Moore, they came into conflict over the appointment of a London Bureau for propaganda/news. Significantly, Harrison had published his own booklet on the Land Annuities, *The Strange Case of the Irish Land Annuities : An Education* in 1932, several years after the publications of Moore's pamphlets in 1928.[133] He had also forged a good relationship with de Valera, going on to write pamphlets defending de Valera's policies, *Ireland and the British Empire: Conflict or Collaboration?* in 1937 and *Ulster and the British Empire: Help or Hindrance?* in 1939, both of them from a Fianna Fáil perspective. He followed these up in 1942 with *The Neutrality of Ireland:Why it was Inevitable.* Not unsurprisingly he was persona grata with the leader of Fianna Fáil. Moore attempted to establish his own claim to the current Land Annuities policy by sending an article along with his pamphlet on the Annuities to the *Manchester Guardian* in 1932. In his reply, the editor said that

> it was interesting to be reminded that the point of view now held by the present government of the Free State was being so vigorously and persuasively argued five years ago[134]

An appointment to a London office to make the case for the Land Annuities might have assuaged Moore's dignity as he watched others capitalise on his work. It was not to be, Harrison was appointed first manager and chief editor of the Irish News and Information Bureau in London defending Fianna Fail policy on the Land Annuities, partition and Constitutional reform, all the issues that had animated Moore's senatorial career. Harrison had communicated with Moore

[133] Owen McGee, *Dictionary of Irish Biography Vol. 4 G-J* (Cambridge, 2009), pp 487-488
[134] Moore Papers, Ms. 10,586.

before taking up his appointment saying that they were not in conflict, and Moore suggested that they combine interests with himself as director and head of organisation, but Harrison found this unacceptable.[135] Moore saw his objectives as ending the economic war between the two countries. In an appeal to de Valera he said that he 'felt very sorely' that the work that he had done had not proved 'as great a service to the country as he had anticipated and he hoped in spite of all the difficulties to put the matter right'.[136] Which suggests that he felt some guilt in relation to the economic war which imposed penalties on the sale of Irish agriculturally produced goods in the United Kingdom, and perceived these measures as resulting from his long campaign. Moore's failure to secure the London appointment which fell to Harrison would appear to indicate de Valera's desire to identify the Land Annuities campaign with Fianna Fáil's successful electoral policy of default and detach it from its origins in the campaigning of the indefatigably, pertinacious ex-landlord Colonel Moore

Empire

'…the most persistently upright mischief maker in Ireland of our time…'[137]

With his membership of Fianna Fáil, Moore had surrendered his previously independent position in the Senate and from then on his opinions would support party policy and it is from this platform that he continued to oppose the government. This opposition brings us to the second consideration in this chapter, as he was exposed to the attacks that undermined his national interests and used his landlord and military background to question the depth and longevity of his commitment to nationalism. Given his earlier constitutional background, Moore's apparent apostasy appeared incongruous to both the government and his fellow senators. Despite his support for his party, Moore was still capable of transcending party politics to pursue his own objectives. His work in aid of the abolition of the Annuities made this clear.

By 1927 Cumann na nGaedheal faced several crises with the sudden assassination of Vice-President and Minister for Justice, Kevin O'Higgins, to which it responded with draconian measures to contain any incipient republican insurgency. The government had, as the *London Times* put it in a report on the 1927 election, 'incurred much unpopularity'. The Public Safety bill that followed on O'Higgins death and an Electoral Amendment Act that made it mandatory for parliamentary candidates to take the oath of allegiance ensured that Fianna Fáil would be kept out

[135] Harrison to de Valera and Moore, 21 September 1933, Moore Papers, Ms. 10, 586/4

[136] Moore to de Valera, 22 September 1933 Moore Papers, Ms. 10,586/5

[137] Gogarty, J.B. Lyons, 'Old Dublin Society: Oliver St. John Gogarty' in *Dublin Historical Records*, vol. 38, no. 11, (December, 1984), pp 2-13.

of government and did nothing to increase the popularity of the government in the eyes of the public. Since its foundation, the principal aim of Cumann na nGaedheal was the preservation of the Treaty, however its years in office had broadened and expanded its programme. According to the analysis of the *London Times*, it was divided into three sections; those who had a direct link with 1916 and the original Sinn Féin policy, such as Cosgrave and Ernest Blythe and a group of younger men composed of Kevin O'Higgins, Patrick Hogan and Patrick McGilligan who represented a generation free from the 'Procrustean traditions of Irish Fenianism'.[138] The third group identified in Cumann na nGaedheal was led by J.J. Walsh and was protectionist. The measures taken by the government in the wake of O'Higgins assassination were not atypical for new states who, in the presence of a weak civil politics found it necessary to enforce allegiance by using coercive measures to make themselves appear as a responsible, efficient, modern and dynamic. Moore reacted to these manifestations of coercion by accusing the government of trying to maintain their hegemony by keeping the republicans out and reinforcing divisiveness instead of reconciliation. The Public Safety Bill allowed for the arrest and detention of offenders in measures that Moore deplored as despotic. Raiding the arsenal of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries for comparative idioms of oppression he called the Coercion Bills the methods of 'Bloody Balfour or Buckshot Forster.' He pointed out that the 'Penal laws, the methods of Soviet Russia, constitutional change and military rule were not the answer'.[139] More practically, he called for a deferral of the bill for six months in order to give time for passions to settle. Nevertheless, Moore's viewpoint articulated the party line as de Valera had compared the Public Safety Act to the British Coercion Acts.[140] His opposition to the Public Safety Bill was shared only by Jenny Wyse Power and the Labour senators.

His condemnation of coercive methods to maintain civil order and his decampment to Fianna Fáil via the Clann brought opprobrium and reminders of his own military past about his ears. Gogarty, along with some of the other senators, was in favour of military courts, and asked how the country would fare under the law and order protection of Moore, who after a lifetime of militarism had developed a 'Glaxo outlook'.[141] Taking the same line of attack, Cosgrave, the head of the executive, reminded Moore caustically that he had restored order to the Boers from 1900 to 1902 with a gun and not appeasement. In his response, Moore reminded the government that he had 'risked everything he had in life by opposing,' the restriction of liberty in South Africa and he had been thanked by the South Africans on his return in 1921'. He reminded Cosgrave of the

[138] *London Times,* 6 June 1927.
[139] Public Safety Bill, 9 August 1927, vol. 9, no. 8.
[140] O'Sullivan, *The Irish Free State and its Senate,* p. 141.
[141] Glaxo Health Care Products founded in the 1850s. In 1904 they produced dried milk baby foods.

more recent destruction of his family home during the civil disorder of 1923. In Cosgrave's brusque dismissal of Moore, he told him that he had been compensated for the loss. Moore's replied

> Is that compensation for a two-century old house, for all the family stores, pictures and books that had been stored up there, all destroyed. But, I do not carry the petulance, enmity and vengeance so far as to act against my countrymen, I have forgiven these things.[142]

He might have reminded the government of the clemency shown by Premier Louis Botha to the 1914 Afrikaner insurgency that threatened the authority of the South African Union.[143] Just as the Senate debates on Coercion led to the vaunted details of Moore's military career, the diplomatic encounters with the South African delegations in London a few years later were further reminders, with particularly scathing attacks from the Ulster Barrister and Minister for External Affairs, Patrick McGilligan who had been working closely with the South African politicians in the 1930 Imperial Conference. McGilligan used this as an opportunity to question both the authenticity and longevity of Moore's commitment to nationalism, to suggest that he was self-seeking and opportunistic

> Senator Colonel Moore has always been a nationalist - if we are to believe what he says here. I sat beside South Africans and discussed the Senator's nationality with them, and I may mention they have a different point

[142] Public Safety Bill, 9 August 1927, vol. 9, no. 8.Moore lamented the loss of 300,840 books after the burning of Moore Hall, some of them first editions of his brother's works while others dated from the sixteenth century. *Connaught Telegraph* 3 February 1923.

[143] Sandra Swart, 'Desperate Men': The 1914 Rebellion and the Politics of Poverty' in *South African Journal*, vol. 42, no. 1(2000), pp 161-175; '"Men of Influence." The Ontology of Leadership in the 1914 Boer Rebellion' in *Journal of Historical Sociology*, vol. 17, no. 1 (2004), pp 1-30.

> of view about the Senator's nationalism. There is an old saying, 'if blood be the price of Admiralty, Lord God, we ha'paid in full.' If blood be the price of nationality Senator Moore had made other people pay in full.[144]

McGilligan's quote which he claimed as an old saying was, as he doubtless knew, the last few lines in a poem called 'The Song of the Dead' by the arch-imperialist Rudyard Kipling, in which he recalled the many scenes of imperial victory, the Boer War among them. By 1930, Moore's mission to South Africa in 1921 was common knowledge due to an article he had written for the *Freeman's Journal* in 1924. This article had been taken up by several regional newspapers appearing in *The Mayo News* and the *Connaught Telegraph* on the 5 July 1924. When Moore reminded McGilligan of the success of that particular mission, McGilligan accused Moore of hypocrisy, and advised that he visit the conferences, and speak to the South Africans to find out what they thought of that earlier part of his career. Moore was able to remind McGilligan that both the present premier and the previous one were friends of his and he knew what they thought of him.[145] On his 1921 mission to South Africa Moore had been charged with personally approaching both Smuts and the leaders of the opposition and he had formed friendly relationships with both. McGilligan said that the 'South Africans must be a very forgiving people to tolerate nationalists like Moore.' McGilligan used what had been a source of heroic narrative in the earlier part Moore's career, to associate him negatively with the outrages of imperial warfare, attempting to make him an anachronism in contemporary Irish/South African politics. He claimed that Moore chafed under criticism and at the lack of acceptance of his own story of what he had done when historical facts were against him. By attacking Moore's version of events McGilligan undermined Moore's claims to a longstanding nationalist sympathy and accused him of pretence. 'My predecessor said on one occasion that when a person gets an attack of Anglophobia late in life, he is very unlikely to recover, and that is the Senator's position'. Moore found it necessary to defend himself and pointed out that he was sixteen when 'he got it', in the year of his father's death in 1870.[146] Edward Lysaght's earlier observation that the military veneer he wore never quite obscured the Catholic nationalist beneath, seems to have become inverted during this period as

[144] Report of Commonwealth Conference, Motion of Approval, 23 July 1931, vol. 14, no. 30.

[145] McGilligan also developed a warm relationship with the South African leadership. Both Hertzog and Havenga acted as referees when he applied for the post of Professor of Law in UCD in 1934. Donal Lowry, 'Captive Dominion: Imperial Realities behind Irish Diplomacy 1922-49' in *Irish Historical Studies* vol. xxxvi, no. 142 (November, 2008), p. 222.

[146] Report of Commonwealth Conference, Motion of Approval, 23 July 1931, vol. 14, no. 30.

the ministers attacked Moore's military past and refused to accept the Catholic nationalist beneath.[147] The attitude of the government to Moore reflected a longstanding ambivalence in Irish nationalist circles to Moore despite the numerous respectful obituaries on his death. The refusal of Sinn Fein to nominate him as a party candidate and the occasional resistance to his leadership of the Volunteers indicated a thinly veiled distrust for Moore which was not shared in his native county. The Mayo press always supported him, frequently with reference to either his father or his family generally. In 1930 Moore's exchange with McGilligan was provoked by the recent participation of McGilligan in the commonwealth agreement leading to the Statute of Westminster, that Cumann na nGaedheal, with some justification, considered to be their finest hour. The government sought to discredit Moore as an ex-imperialist who now objected to imperial gains that a few short years ago he would have regarded as successes. The government suffered from a curious blindspot as they attempted to smite the imperial mote in Moore's eye all the while disregarding the imperial beam in their own. During their attacks on Moore's imperial past they were engaged in a process to secure Ireland's position in an imperial future. In 1917 Moore had suggested that Ireland would welcome a commonwealth of empire- with a constitution somewhat similar to that of South Africa and Canda. By 1930 Moore had changed his political tack and Ireland, South Africa and Canada wanted so much more from empire. Sir Ivor Jennings credits all three with the 'notion to develop a subject British Empire into a commonwealth of equal and autonomous states'.[148] The attacks on his nationalist commitment on the basis of his landlord status and military career diminished his moral authority and weakened his political initiatives.

Statute of Westminster

This ground-breaking piece of legislation in the history of empire was a formal codification of the earlier 1926 Balfour Declaration that ensured that no dominion would be bound by the passage of a British law without their consent and gave power to the dominions to amend or repeal 'existing and future legislation, passed by the British parliament and affecting the dominions.'[149] An undeniable coup for Cumann na nGaedheal but the economic conditions at home meant that it was not received as such despite governmental efforts to gain political capital from it. The mood of the country was not receptive to imperial triumphs. R.M. Dawson described the statute as existing 'chiefly to satisfy those sensitive dominions and fussy persons who were not content with

[147] Edward MacLysaght, Memoir *Master of None VI*, NLI, Ms. 750, p. 7; Tadhg Foley, and Sean Ryder (eds), *Ideology and Ireland in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin, 1998), pp 7-8.

[148] Andries, Wessels, "A Rich and Rare Land": The Experience and Expression of Nationalism in Poetry Among Reluctant Colonists in Ireland, South Africa and Quebec' in *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies*, vol 25, no.1/2 (1999) pp. 352-371.

[149] Gerard Keown, *First of the Small Nations: The Beginnings of the Irish Foreign Policy in the Inter-War Years, 1919-1932* (Oxford, 2016) p. 155.

constitutional practice as enunciated in 1926 but who demanded legal as well as practical', assurances that these aims would be met.[150] The Canadian journalist, J.W. Dafoe attributed the declaration to the efforts of Hertzog and Ireland, and according to Harkness, the statue had its origins in a memorandum drawn up by the Irish delegation in 1926.[151] This was proof that the Treaty could be used to gain further autonomy, and it owed much to the skilful diplomacy of the Irish delegation to the Imperial Conference of 1930. Under the leadership of McGilligan they played a pivotal role in the passage of the act by seeking South African support from Hertzog who, as the South African premier was equally determined to assert South African sovereignty, and the right of secession for all the dominions. Something of this nature had been proposed as far back as 1921 by A.D. Lindsay whose own report had influenced Smuts prior to the Anglo-Irish Treaty. McGilligan and Joe Walshe arranged to have lunch with Hertzog at the Geneva Metrepole Hotel, where they had a two hour discussion on the issues involved. Hertzog was described by the Irish team as not being completely aware of the subtlety of the British legal arguments where commonwealth membership was concerned and the meeting was arranged to make these clear to him.[152]

The question of Hertzog's lack of understanding might refer back to the 1926 Imperial Conference when he wanted a declaration of dominion equality and the Irish delegation made a more subtle appeal for specifics such as control of shipping and abolition of the Privy Council appeal.[153] During this time, Kevin O'Higgins described Hertzog as 'a very decent likeable kind of a man...who talks a lot and none too clearly', in 1930 this opinion was reiterated by Desmond Fitzgerald who called Hertzog 'a dear' but went on to say that he did not always completely understand what was going on.[154]. It was a coup for the Irish and McGilligan attempted vainly to convince the Senate at the debate on the Report of the Conference that imperial conferences actually improved Ireland's status, thus validating the Treaty as a means to further render empires obsolete.[155] The lack of fanfare accompanying this legal breakthrough in Ireland's status in commonwealth and the mysterious lack of an actual report accompanying the request for the Senate approval on the Report of the 1930 Imperial Conference was a curious oversight on the part of the government. An absence, the labour senator Thomas Johnson remarked on, as he voiced concerns of greater commonwealth involvement and the possibility of a commonwealth

[150] Deirdre McMahon, *Republicans and Imperialists: Anglo-Irish Relations in the 1930s*, p .48.

[151] Harkness,*The Restlesss Dominion* pp 97-100

[152] D.F.A., vol .III, 1926-1932 (Dublin, 2002), p. 603. Also see Donal Lowry 'Captive Dominion.'

[153] Jacqueline D.Krikorian 'British Imperial Politics and Judicial Independence.' p. 321.

[154] Harkness, *The Restless Dominion*, pp 191-192

[155] Ciara Meehan, *The Cosgrave Party: A History of Cumann na nGaedheal, 1923-33* (Dublin, 2010), p. 138. Press Release by Minister for External Affairs Patrick McGilligan 11 December 1931 No. 617 DFA 5/3

constitution. The focus on national status, which Ireland shared with the previously colonial nations reflected what Carlyle called a national 'moral self' in which the colonies wished to be a nations of citizens with the standing of other nations across the globe.[156] The commonwealth involvement of Ireland was an outcome of a progressive development of the earlier 1921 missions to the dominions to solicit their support for Irish independence. Relationships were established then through the first department of Foreign Affairs under the leadership of de Valera.

Moore's views on Ireland's dominion status had undergone a radical change since 1921, as one might expect from a Fianna Fáil senator, but his expression of them was somewhat ambiguous. He declared Ireland a dominion, but 'not expressly so,' while the King was a 'King of the air....a stellar King', whose value was negligible.[157] McGilligan was not the only one present to find Moore's opinions objectionable, O'Farrell who was also a labour senator, expressed his surprise at the evolution in Moore's opinions by commenting that the 'Boer farmers of 1900 would be astonished by his 1931 political opinions' despite his assertions of boyhood conversion to nationalism.[158]

In the aftermath of the passing of the Statute of Westminster, Hertzog was invited to Dublin. He arrived in November 1930, accompanied by his Minister for Finance C.T. Havenga, where he attended a dinner held in the Shelbourne in his honour, at which Cosgrave spoke warmly of the links between Ireland and South Africa.[159] It was a very short visit, Hertzog arrived at 4.30 and left the following day. He was greeted at Dun Laoghaire by a band playing 'Afrikaander Landgeknoten' and four cars bearing South African flags.[160] Cosgrave had been primed before the dinner, on the topics he was to include. He was instructed to point out the familiarity of Hertzog's name in Ireland in the story of the South African nationalist struggle. Analogies were to be drawn between the Irish and South African national struggle and their settlement at the council table and not by force, thus reinforcing a constitutional model for the foundation of the state. He was to emphasise the part played by Ireland in South Africa and the present position of both nations in commonwealth.[161] Cosgrave described the two nations as new and independent states united by a common concern for their indigenous languages, which they both sought to promote through a bilingual educational system. Cosgrave reminded those present that 28 years ago 'General Hertzog saw his country beaten in an unequal war with the world's greatest power

[156] John Hirst in *The Historian's Conscience: Australian Historians on the Ethics of History*.(ed.) Stuart MacIntyre (Melbourne, 2004)
[157] Report of Commonwealth Conference, Motion of Approval, 23 July 1931, vol. 14, no. 30.
[158] Ibid.
[159] 'Arrival of General Hertzog,' *Irish Times,* 1 November 1930; 'Ireland and South Africa,' *Irish Times,* 2 November 1930.
[160] DFA/ES, GR, 256 34, National Archives, Dublin.
[161] Ibid.

and stricken from the proud status of an independent state to the humiliation of a conquered province, only to emerge again to a new freedom which today is measured in terms of friendly equality with her former conqueror'.[162] In his reply, which was published in the *Rand Daily Mail,* Hertzog spoke of the common aims and aspirations of Ireland and South Africa. 'Today both nations belonged to a free and independent people...' who were voluntarily associated with Commonwealth.[163] These identifications were couched in diplomatic terms acknowledging a history of colonial oppression and a present of commonwealth co-operation when in fact, national sovereignty was the overriding aim of both. In terms of public relations it was a statement to the Irish people of their freedom and equality, and declared to the world Ireland's political sovereignty.

The invitations to the banquet honouring Hertzog and Havenga had been sent out at the last minute and there were many refusals citing previous commitments or the short notice. Representatives of government, leaders of the opposition and notable business and industrial figures were asked. Five senators, S. Brown, Andrew Jameson, J. McLoughlin, J.T. Douglas, Michael Comyn, and O'Farrell were invited, along with Dr Anthony McBride, the brother of Sean McBride of the Irish Brigade and Dr. M.S. Walsh and Captain Tom Byrne, who had fought for the Boers in South Africa.[164] But not Moore, despite his personal acquaintance with both Hertzog and Havenga and the knowledge in South Africa which had been communicated to F.S.Malans, the Minister for Education, that Moore had been the author of the letter in 1901 that drew attention to both the concentration camps and Kitchener's orders to shoot to kill. Obviously, judging by his exclusion from the banquet and McGilligan's hostile references to his military past, Moore was persona non grata with the government. However the relationship between South Africa and Ireland continued to be positive. In April 1931 Cosgrave was asked by the London editor of the South African Argus press group, N.K. Kerney to send a message for publication in a special edition of the Argus group on the tenth anniversary of the South African Union.[165] On May 10 1931, *The Cape Argus, The Star* and *The Natal Advertiser* published special commemoration issues.[166] Cosgrave composed a message of support mentioning the bond between Ireland and South Africa: 'we belong to the same group of nations, and we have both endeavoured to establish within this group, those conditions of mutual relationship which make for free co-operation and

[162] D.F.A., vol. III, 1926-1932, p. 683

[163] *Rand Daily Mail,* 3 November 1930.

[164] DFA/ES, GR, 256-34, National Archives, Dublin.
[165] Letter to Cosgrave, 8 May 1931, DFA/ES,GR, 1630, National Archives, Dublin.
[166] N.K. Kerney to Cosgrave, DFA/ES, GR, 1630, National Archives, Dublin.

permanent association'.[167]. Two months after the passing of the Statute the government was out of office and replaced by Fianna Fáil

By 1930, Moore was in an undeniably ambiguous situation, that may have caused the government some embarrassment, particularly as they appeared to be unaware of the details of Moore's history in South Africa. The political relationship that existed between Ireland and South Africa in 1930 owed much to Moore's 1921 mission, and he had personally witnessed the development of the previous Boer republics into the South African Union within commonwealth and the foundation of an Irish state in not dissimilar terms. That he maintained cordial relations with Hertzog seems likely given the letter he wrote to him before his visit to Dublin in 1930, a copy of which remains in Hertzog's papers in South Africa.[168] That Moore's past continued to be interrogated testifies to the contested nature of his identity. Which was paramount the Colonel or the Catholic nationalist? When Moore pointed out to McGilligan that the government had little experience of making Treaties, McGilligan's tart reply that Moore had experience of empires, seemed to be making that point. Yet much of Moore's experience in empire had contributed to the warm relationship between the Irish and the South African leadership, which the government adamantly refused to acknowledge while losing no opportunity to focus on his perceived role in the Boer war, thus creating a political smokescreen of Moore as a British colonel out to slaughter the Boers. The government wished to discredit Moore's role in empire while at the same time negotiating for a more autonomous role in empire for Ireland. It appeared as thought there was an unwillingness to incorporate certain elements of the Irish past into what was envisaged as an Irish future and Moore was a casualty of these possibly unconscious elisions.

During these years Moore's formerly unengaged attitude to India underwent a change. Asked to speak at a public meeting in the Mansion House in 1932, Moore made his apologies to the Chairman of the India/Irish meeting regretting that he was unable to attend, in an article entitled, 'Wanted in India. A Revolutionary Army. Views of Colonel Maurice Moore; he

> …called to give sympathy and help to the Indian people in the struggle for liberty. It was right, said Moore that these two peoples

[167] Message from Cosgrave, nd. DFA/ES, GR, 1630, National Archives, Dublin.
[168] Moore had written to Hertzog, 11 October 1930, before his visit to Ireland. Hertzog Papers, Prime Minister's Office, S.A.P. vol. 1/77; Donal Lowry, 'Captive Dominion' p. 216;

> who had suffered so much from the same unjustifiable aggression, the same cruel tyranny, should stand together as a moment when both are assailed and help each other to effect liberation.[169]

He advised India to

> …place no trust whatsoever in promises and soft words, in each country there has been no promise and no treaty made by English Ministers in adversity that has not been broken when opposition has been withdrawn and a new dominance secured.

Moore's quote was a paraphrasing of Edmund Burke's comments during the later eighteenth century when the impeachment of Governor Warren Hastings focused Burke's gaze on India and caused him to make comparisons between India and Ireland.[170] Moore reaffirmed Burke as 'that great Irishman' who defined the nature of British exploitation and betrayal of India. Moore called for the withdrawal of British troops from India and an Indian army trained to defend their freedom as they were in danger of military action. An Indian corp of National Volunteers such as the Irish raised in 1913? This is exactly what Moore had in mind

> In 1800 when the Volunteers were disbanded we lost our liberty, not to be regained until the Irish Volunteers were re-established in 1914-1921

[169] *Mayo News*, 17 October 1932
[170] Conor Cruise O'Brien, *The Great Melody* p.257-309.

By his reference to the Volunteers he also reminded the Irish public of his own leadership of that force. This letter was an open attack on the history of empire, made somewhat ambiguous when Moore's military history was considered. He had spent at least twelve years on the Indian continent without a whisper in his correspondence that he had any sympathy with its inhabitants.

The following year a constitutional amendment was suggested in order to abolish the Oath of Allegiance to the King. In the debate that followed, Moore questioned the validity of an obligation conferred by a treaty signed under duress, by quoting Lionel Curtis on the difficulties of making Treaties where 'mutual relations are undefined'.[171] E.H. Carr attested to the mutable quality of Treaties over time when they were signed in conditions of crisis in his 1939 study on international relations from 1919 to 1939.[172] In 1921, Moore thought it scandalous that de Valera would not support the Treaty, however any perception of a damascene conversion on his part would be premature. All of Moore's expressed opinions throughout the years of his active involvement in nationalism had proposed constitutional measures and referred to Grattan's parliament as both a political ideal and a golden age. Alvin Jackson perceptively drew parallels between the 'dreams of legislative independence', of the 1780s patriots and those of the separatists of the 1920s, and similar parallels between Grattan's parliament and that of the Treatyite government until the Second World War. He described the political elite of both parliaments as politically gifted but, (unfairly) uncharismatic, working within constitutional settlements that did not give complete independence and similarly ideologically committed to an inclusive democracy.[173] In 1932 in the debate on the Oath, Moore referred to the eighteenth century parliament as a 'distinct Kingdom - with a parliament of her own'. He compared the Statute of Westminster to the Renunciation Act, which had been repudiated by the 1800 Act of Union, as identically conferring parliamentary legislative independence, and thereby creating the conditions under which the Oath might be abolished, in other words, constitutional conditions existed which would justify that action.[174] It was typical of Moore that he plotted a torturous constitutional route to his assertions of independence from the crown.

[171] Lionel Curtis, *The Commonwealth of Nations Part 1: An Inquiry into the Nature of Citizenship in the British Empire, and into the Mutual Relations of the Several Communities Thereof* (1918) p. 492.; David Gorman, *Imperial Citizenship: Empire and the Question of Belonging,* (Oxford, 2010)

[172] E.H. Carr, *The Twenty Years Crisis: 1919-1939* (New York, 1939).

[173] Alvin Jackson, *Home Rule: An Irish History, 1800-2000*, p. 272.

[174] Removal of Oath, 8 June 1932, vol. 15, no. 8.

Conclusion: '...Moore Hall Will be Pulled Down to Build Cottages in Derrinanny and Ballyhooly...'[175]

Moore's record inevitably raises questions about the successful integration of the landlord class into the new order despite his membership of Fianna Fáil and his earlier attempt with Magennis and Ó Máille to found a party based on the values of Catholic conservatism, rural communitarianism and Gaelic culture and language. Those same ideological foundations that the constitutional republicans later based their party manifesto upon. His inclusion in Fianna Fáil suggested that the party at the time of its inception was capable of absorbing disparate elements to itself as it struggled to establish a broad appeal. Recent research on Catholic elites show that Moore's career was not completely anomalous, and he was identifiably a part of the landed elite that by their presence in the Senate found inclusion in the new state. These elements of the *ancien regime* represented a formidable display of talents, abilities and experience in the service of the nation. Despite the active, influential, independent and effective role taken by the Senate, it was often regarded with irritation by the Dail members as conservative, when in fact, the class and religious minorities of which it was formed tended to support the government, principally, according to Garvin, from fears that the anti-Treatyites might reform. When they did so, they called for the abolition or reform of the Senate, particularly after it delayed the passage of the bill to abolish the Oath of Allegiance, proving itself to be one of the last bastions of British imperialism in Ireland. The ex-landlord class articulated earlier Burkean arguments in favour of maintaining traditions or integrating them into a slow process of change After all, it was not impossible for former revolutionaries to become moderate conservatives, the careers of Young Irelanders Charles Gavan Duffy turned premier of Victoria and Thomas D'Arcy McGee, the 'father of Canadian Confederation' are testimony to this

Moore was acutely aware of the threat to the political relevance of his class from the disbandment of the Senate and he had rebuked those members of that class in the Senate debates on the abolition of the Oath, which would remove a powerful link with the old order. He both mourned its passing and was angry and frustrated with its resistance to change. Moore had borne ambiguous feelings towards the changing social order for quite some time. In a few undated, hand written pages to an unknown recipient, in connection with the breaking up of the grazing ranches by the Congested Districts Board, Moore revealed some of his inner conflict. He had learned some '…forty years ago...to believe in peasant proprietorship,' and he supported the necessity of breaking up the grazing ranches to relieve congestion, He added a caveat on the practice of the

[175] George Moore to Maurice in the final volume of his autobiography, *Vale*; Adrian Frazier, *George Moore, 1852-1933* (London, 2000), p. 363.

board of requisitioning demesnes and horse ranches, thus making it difficult for members of his class to remain in the country, 'otherwise they will go, many have left already'. According to Moore this class contributed to the civilisation of the country

> ...a peasantry is as essential to a nation as a trunk to a tree, but a nation consisting of nothing but peasants is a repulsive object and I would like the country to be saved from such a fate.[176]

Moore utilised his Cromwellian analogy yet again, by comparing the Congested Districts Board, among whom certain officials suffered from a 'narrow view of life', to Cromwell and William who destroyed one aristocracy from which the country was still recovering, while the C.D.B was bent on destroying another.

Some ten years later his own family home had succumbed to such a fate. In 1929 Moore had purchased three hundred acres of remaining Moore Hall demesne from the C.D.B with the intention of partly restoring the house as an inheritance for his son.[177] Rory Moore, who was Moore's last remaining son, was ranching in Wyoming at this time, with an inheritance from his mother's sister. The annuity payments on the land amounted to sixty four pounds which was a considerable drain on a Senate salary of £320. With the abolition of the Senate in 1936, Moore found himself unable to retain ownership. He attempted to get the forestry board to take it on, and when that failed he sold it to a timber cutter. When de Valera heard the news, he said 'but this is dreadful... I can't bear to think of a fine old place like Moore Hall being torn down'.[178] The Colonel's 'rejoicing' at the defeat of the Cosgrave government may have been a little premature if he felt that his own plans for Moore Hall might advance under a Fianna Fáil administration.[179]

---

[176] Handwritten, undated page to an unknown recipient, Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10,571. It was probably written about 1912 when Moore and his brother George were negotiating the Congested Districts Board over the sale of Moore property in Mayo. The C.D.B wanted the demesne as well, Moore wasn't happy as he felt that the board wanted the landlord out; Adrian Frazier, *George Moore 1852-1933* (London, 2000), p. 382; The 1909 Land Act had given the C.D.B. powers of compulsory purchase and it was criticised for failing to prevent ranching and allowing the landlords to wrongfully claim land as demesne. Agrarian unrest had intensified by 2012 with a great deal of anti-grazing intimidation. Tony Varley, 'A Region of Sturdy Smallholders? Western Nationalists and Agrarian Politics during the First World War' in *Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society* vol. 55, (2003), pp 130-133.

[177] Documents relation to Moore Hall, 8 February 1933, Moore Papers, NLI, Ms. 10,560/3.

[178] Joseph Hone, *The Moores of Moore Hall* (London, 1939), p. 269.

[179] Ibid., p. 274.

Up to then Moore had avoided the social and political suicide committed by many of his class by his continued support for nationalism and the redistribution of land. He challenged Sir John Keane during the Senate debate on the abolition of the Oath, when Keane spoke of the honour that his class had brought to the country in the past. Revealing his own accommodations to the new order, Moore asked Keane why the class that had once being powerful enough to rule the country was now reduced to making appeals? He reminded Keane of the actions of the triumphant American colonists who had rid themselves of their opposition and the situation in Ireland where the 'opposition,' found inclusion in the Senate, where Moore added, they had failed to do anything for their country. Not all of the landlord class opposed the bill, Sir Thomas Grattan Esmond objected to the removal of the Oath but supported the government. Sir Shane Leslie was one of those who embraced nationalism and Catholicism and thought that the landlords might have more effectively fought their corner or 'put themselves at the forefront' of the next democratic movement in support of Home Rule, thus establishing a place for themselves in a 're-established Dublin parliament'.[180] According to Dooley, the former landlords accomplished little in the Senate because of their attitude.[181] Moore claimed that he had tried over a lifetime to get them to see that their interest lay in this course. 'The knee breeches and lace scarfs of our great grandfathers became the frock coats and top hats of our younger days...but as Moore went on he made it clear that those days and intellectual ideals were gone and if this class wanted to retain relevancy it would have to adapt.[182] Moore had failed to persuade his class to support the Home Rule bills of Butt, Parnell and Redmond, which they might have done as the descendants of Grattan and Burke and thus retained their leadership'. Moore knew that the obstruction of this class to the abolition of the Oath would be its undoing, even if they succeeded, the success would be temporary. 'Just as an unwound clock stops when it has run its course, so will their activities'. Moore expressed his regret at this, as 'they represented an element in this country'. He ended by quoting Parnell who had represented popular landlord leadership, 'no man can put a limit to the progress of a nation'.[183]

However the situation of the previous elite was hardly singular, contemporary elites were being displaced across Europe during this period. The Polish Szlachta, with which the Irish ascendancy had been compared had their hereditary juridical status abolished by the second Polish republic

[180] Terence Dooley, *The Decline of the Big House in Ireland: A Study of Irish Landed Families 1860-1960*, (Dublin, 2001), p. 207.

[181] Ibid., p. 237.

[182] Moore Papers, NLI, Ms.10, 560 /4.

[183] Ibid.

in 1921.[184] The new Czech state, despite being one of the most liberal in Europe hired very few ethnically German civil servants, despite the fact that, Germans accounted for one fifth of the population and moreover the previous Austro-Hungarian Empire had hired Czech civil servants.[185] The Irish elite had at least a nominal influence from their place in the Senate, which attempted the assimilation of a former ruling class with a perceived ethnic difference, which Moore had been at pains to point out.

Despite his references to the days of Grattan's parliament, the eighteenth century apotheosis of Protestant ascendancy power and Irish political independence, which had ensured its own destruction with the 1800 Act of Union, as a Catholic, Moore could not have been a member of this fraternity. Equally unable to unambiguously claim membership of a Catholic, Gaelic aristocracy, his Catholicism still defined him, and fused a moral vision with an elite identity and cultural nationalism. Among the papers he donated to the National Library on his Land Annuities campaign can be found a printed pamphlet of his father George Henry Moore's letters to Archbishop John MacHale in the 1850s. In one of the letters dating from 1851, in response to a remonstrance from Cardinal Paul Cullen, George Henry wrote that he would act as a 'Catholic and an Irish gentleman', characters which he considered to be identical.[186] George Henry Moore's self-identification gives some clue to the late nineteenth century character of Moore's own sense of Irish nationalism which despite its ideological evolution remained wedded to an elite Catholic identity, and an aristocratic ideal.

Since the years of the Land League campaigns the landlord class, in some cases, but not all, deservedly had an extremely bad reputation which had persisted in the founding of the new state. As L.P. Curtis has pointed out, 'demonising the traditional Anglo-Irish landlord elites had a long history', and moreover the negative perceptions of this class persisted long after they had lost privileges and power.[187] By and large, the Moores had not fallen into this category of antipathy. George Henry Moore's treatment of his tenants during the famine and John Moore's membership of the United Irishmen had ensured that their memory had endured in folk memory and fused with a national narrative and indeed has until the present.[188] The events in which a number of landlords turned their faces away from the suffering of their tenants and evicted many of them made its way

[184] Colin Kidd, *British Identities before Nationalism,* p. 179.

[185] Mark Mazower, *Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century* (London, 1998), p.58.

[186] 1847-1852 pamphlet of correspondence between George Henry Moore (1810-1870), and Archbishop John McHale (1789-1881), the Archbishop of Tuam. Moore papers, NLI, Ms. 10,560/3.

[187] L.Perry Curtis, 'Demonising the Irish Landlords Since the Famine', p. 21.

[188] Guy Beiner, *Remembering The Year of The French: Irish Folk History and Social Memory* (Wisconsin, 2007).

into the British press which contributed to the negative perceptions of the Irish landed ascendancy who now met with opprobrium on both sides of the Irish Sea. The Land League rhetoric of Parnell and Davitt depicted the landlords as 'rack renters and evictors', leading to the end of the traditional deference shown to this class in Irish society.[189] The Moores were among the paternal landlords who did not charge exorbitant rents, did not evict, provided for their tenants in hard times, and in Moore's case set up schools in his area and helped to develop local industry, embodying the local good will that Plunkett had advised the landlord class to cultivate.[190]

It is clear however, that Moore was not pursuing a radical social agenda by joining the republicans. Fianna Fáil represented the traditional, Catholic Gaelic communitarian policies that Moore favoured. When his brother George wanted to sell out under the favourable terms of the Wyndham Act of 1903, Moore prevaricated, because he thought that there was still a future in Ireland for a patriotic, Catholic, nationalist, Gaelic speaking landlord, exemplified in the figure of his father, George Henry Moore.[191] Moore's dedication to the language, cultural, and co-operative movements, his respect for the traditional values and authority that created communal bonds, define both his character and his political strategies.[192] This can be seen in his respect for Boer society from 1899 to 1902, and his distress at the destruction caused by the devastation of the veldt and the break-up of Boer families by incarceration In the early days of the new state. He deplored what he saw as a threat to rural communities by emigration, with 'shoals' of the people, 'leaving for America', as a result of the government policy towards agriculture. From the origins of his landowning family in Mayo, he identified closely with his local area as a community of shared memory and history, the landlords, Moore claimed, were 'human',and when 'people were in trouble, they helped them'. Fianna Fáil was to say as much in their electoral campaign in 1927, claiming that the government had lost touch with the people.[193] The less acceptable side of his communitarian values were their hierarchical foundations, which, as the former quote proves, Moore thought essential to the beneficial ordering of society. The apparent ease with which Moore was absorbed into Fianna Fáil, causes one to speculate on the possibility that the ideological gap between Moore's landlord sensibility and Fianna Fáil's paternal political attitude was narrower than might have been supposed. The land wars that followed on the establishment of the Land League in 1879 had an obvious political interest in depicting the landlords in the most inhuman

[189]L.Perry Curtis, 'Demonising the Irish Landlords since the Famine' p. 24.

[190] Horace Curzon Plunkett, *Noblesse Oblige: An Irish Rendering* (Dublin, 1908), p.31; Margaret Digby, *Horace Plunkett: An Anglo-American Irishman* (Oxford, 1949); Edward E. Lysaght, *Sir Horace Plunkett and His Place in the Irish Nation* (Dublin, 1916).

[191] Adrian Frazier, *George Moore 1852-1933* (London, 2000), p. 362.

[192] This romantic yearning for a idealised pre-capitalist, ethnic and religious past is discussed by John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith (eds), *Nationalism* (Oxford, 1994), reprinted 2012 pp 7-8.

[193] Newell, *The West Must Wait*, p. 148.

light possible. This had the effect of obscuring the complexity of the landlord/tenant relationship in the case of Catholic landlords like the Moores, in which the ties of a shared religion made for stronger bonds within rural communities and a perception of a conjoined history, not a divided one. This perception challenges the earlier assumptions of warring Anglo-Irish and Irish-Ireland cultures as Moore's career makes it evident that the divides were porous.[194]

Finally, the question of Moore's historiographical neglect which has received some attention in all five chapters of this thesis, and the reasons for which have been found to be various. The scholarship of Ciara Meehan suggests that the legacy that the Fine Gael party inherited from their Cumann na nGaedheal predecessors was an uncomfortable one that they were reluctant to commemorate resulting in an historiographical blind spot.[195] Despite their success in establishing an effective administration, internationally recognised status, and maintaining civil order, the memory of arbitrary arrest, trial without jury, the execution of the republicans, and virtually unopposed government for a decade cast a long and controversial political shadow. Consequently the decade from 1922 to 1932 has not received as much attention as the years dating from the de Valera led Fianna Fáil accession to power. The superb performance of Cumann na nGaedheal internationally, fulfilled Collin's prophecy that the Treaty might be used to gain freedom, but it was in a form that was no longer acceptable to the Irish nation, which was more interested in the economy, partition and fiscal restraint.[196] Additionally, as a more charismatic personality, de Valera left Cosgrave in a historiographical shadow, as Stephen Gwynne remarked, de Valera was regarded as a legend and Cosgrave could not match such a reputation.[197] Moore's Senate record suffered from the same neglect when the Fine Gael successors to Cumann na nGaedheal were not overly anxious to integrate them into their legacy, Moore's history of senatorial opposition to the government whose values were antithetical to him suffered as a result. Moore was a part of an Irish culture that almost disappeared into early twentieth century Ireland. The campaign over the Land Annuities which absorbed the decade, between, 1922 to 1932 and fused two periods of nationalist agitation in Moore's moral imagination, the early years of the state and the mid-nineteenth century when his father George Henry took up the cause of Tenant Right. For Moore, the issue transcended politics, it was a national issue, like the Tenant League of 1852. Contemporary opinion supported the idea that the emotional force of the moment embodied much of the fire and power of the nineteenth century Land Movements. Effectively, for Moore the

[194] F.S.L.Lyons, *Culture and Anarchy in Ireland, 1890-1939* (Oxford, 1979)

[195] Ciara Meehan, '"Fine Gaels Uncomfortable History" The Legacy of Cumann na nGaedheal', in *Éire-Ireland,* vol.43, nos. 3&4 Fómhar/Geimhreadh (Fall/Winter, 2008), pp 253-266.

[196] Jason Knirck, 'The Dominion of Ireland: The Anglo-Irish Treaty in an Imperial Context' in *Éire/Ireland,* Farrach/Samradh Spring/Summer (2007). p 255.

[197] Stephen Gwynn, 'The Shift in Irish Leadership' in *Current History,* (New York), vol. 36, no. 1 (April, 1, 1932), pp 8-14.

movement represented a continuation of his father's work and justified the contribution to be made by a landlord class.

It remains something of an enigma that Moore did not receive more recognition for his contribution to nationalism and the new state. Recruited by de Valera in 1921 and then ignored as a result of his anger at Smuts role in the signing of the Treaty, Moore would have provided a useful scapegoat if anything went wrong. Much of Moore's nationalist involvement from 1921 onwards was a result of his relationship with de Valera. It was a long association with ambiguities on both sides, and was most probably at least partially responsible for Moore's exclusion from the reception held for Hertzog. Moore's letters to John Devoy are often critical of de Valera, but it was in Moore's home that one of the earliest meetings of Fianna Fáil took place. Once Moore joined the party his accession to the executive council was relatively swift, and his public pronouncements were invariably loyal. De Valera had undoubtedly been impressed by his arguments in relation to the abolition of the Land Annuities but they failed to gain him the recognition he deserved. De Valera appointed Harrison and not Moore to a London News Bureau dedicated to publicising government policy in regard to the Land Annuities, completely overlooking Moore's long campaign and his contribution to what was to become the Fianna Fáil electoral policy. In 1936 de Valera nominated Moore to the newly reformed Senate, yet these markers of favour seemed too little and too late while de Valera never failed to make use of Moore's landlord and imperial connections when it served his interests. In 1938, the year before Moore's death, the *Irish Times* observed him 'sturdily taking his place in the new senate' and wondered how he felt about the new trade agreement, for it was 'his pamphlet on the Land Annuities which was the first shot fired in the Economic War'.[198]

[198] *Irish Times*, 29 April 1938.

CONCLUSION: 'THAT LONELY INCORRUPTIBLE FIGURE...'[1]

This thesis opened with a consideration of the obituary by the socialist historian R.M.Fox in which he weighed up the meaning of Moore's contribution to his times, just as another war broke on the horizon. Moore had corresponded with Fox some months before his death in September 1939, in what was, Fox believed, his final public statement. Moore reflected once again on the political significance of his father's career, and acknowledged the role played by the men of 1916 in bringing about a state of Irish independence when the slow advances made by the Home Rulers came to a halt. Born just after the Tenant League agitation in the 1850s, and coming of age during the Land Wars of the 1880s, Moore witnessed revolution, civil war and the foundation of the state. His letter to Fox was a leave-taking in which he paid homage to the men of the Rising and those who worked with him on the Land Annuities issue some years previously. By referring to George Gavan Duffy, he created a loop between the Young Irelanders and the Free State Ministry, as Duffy was the son of Charles Gavan Duffy, a prominent member of the Young Irelanders, who had worked with Moore's parliamentarian father on the Tenant Right League many years before. Moore's 'passing', as the *Connaught Telegraph* observed removed a link with Irish nationalism that began with O'Connell. His credentials for inclusion in the nationalist pantheon seemed assured. Failing to receive the contemporary plaudits that might have been his due, time and historiography reveal that inclusion to be partial, and the persistence of that historiographical lacuna is one of the questions that has dominated this thesis. Moore's ubiquitous, but fragmented presence in several archives contributed to this historiographical elision or led to studies with a focus on disparate periods and always from the perspective of the nationalist movement. His childhood, education, earlier imperial career and association with South Africa, remained unexamined. His forays into constitutional nationalism have received a similar lack of attention, due to their links with that other historiographical omission, the 1917 Irish Convention.

By focusing on these oversights this study of Moore has yielded some unexpected finds in the political legacy of a Catholic landed class, revealing a complex ideological inheritance of elite Catholic consolidation. Moore's family, from their origins as Catholic merchants in Spain to wealthy Irish landowners ran an ideological gamut from revolution and Whig liberalism, up to the mid-nineteenth century Tory Catholic conservatism of Moore's father, George Henry. This phenomenon has been compared to other examples of Catholic elites in the Esmonde family of County Wexford, for example or that of John Redmond. Born into the age of empire, Moore was the first member of his family to take an active part in the imperial enterprise in two of the most

[1] Moore was so described in an obituary for Joseph Hone in the London *Times* 28 March, 1959.

significant and symbolic sites of empire, India and South Africa. His experience of South Africa in particular, as this study has revealed, had a significant effect on the later course of his nationalist career, and located Moore in number of historical, geographical, social and cultural contexts.

In order to address these contexts this biographical study has focused on his experience from a broader transnational context in order to dislodge him from previous interpretations of his life from solely nationalist perspectives or those of elegiac landlord supremacy. Since a transnational approach lacks a definite manifesto of intent, it is to some degree adjunctive to the nation-state narrative. Much of Moore's experience, as his obituaries attest to, is chronologically bound to a nationalist narrative that began in a family story of revolutionary nationalism and culminated in the foundation of the state. Moore was complicit in the creation of such a narrative, by writing a biography of his father's career and a history of his own involvement with the Volunteers. However, by taking a transnational approach to an examination of the imperial connections, networks, and military experiences of Moore, a more complex and less teleological narrative has emerged. Moreover, this approach was revelatory of the connections, identifications, and political and military involvement of the Irish in South African affairs from 1879 to 1930. This had its origins in sympathetic identifications with the Zulu rebellion in 1879 on the basis of imperial oppression and the removal of the rightful owners from their land to more complex and fruitful identifications with the rebellious Boer republics from 1899 to 1902. In both cases Moore's experience of military engagement has provided the lens from which this relationship with South Africa may be studied. A third example of the Irish/South African connection emerged in 1921, when the embryonic Irish state sought dominion recognition of its independent status. Once more this series of events can be regarded from Moore's account from his role as Irish envoy. Moore's imperial careering tends to be eclipsed in any assessment of his political role by his military organisation of the Irish Volunteers in 1913, or his accession to the Senate in 1922. Owing to the disbandment of the early diplomatic corps with the signing of the Treaty, Moore and his fellow envoys were, until recent times consigned to archival obscurity, while a vital new diplomatic corps was formed on the foundation of the state.

By employing a conceptual framework that placed an equal emphasis in five chapters on each of these periods in Moore's experience these previous networks and associations were again made visible to reveal the transnational identity of Moore's life and the 'webs', of connections that he activated in his long nationalist involvement. Moore is revealed as a complex figure whose imperial experience like that of Casement, provoked both a humanitarian response to those who suffered under empire and a desire to become involved in separatist nationalism. This

consideration illuminates another historiographical oversight, observed by Fearghal McGarry, who asked how many of those who had successful Irish careers in empire, either in administration or the military, had been radicalised by that experience and, like Roger Casement for example, who appears frequently in this thesis, joined the ranks of the separatists? Interestingly, for both Moore and Casement their estrangement from empire occurred on the basis of their humanitarian concern. Casement was repulsed at the treatment of the indigenous people at the hands of the Belgians in the Congo, while Moore found himself shocked and horrified by the British wartime treatment of the Boer women and children who came under his care. For both, their experiences appeared to awaken them to the political subjection of Ireland by empire. The tradition of Irish involvement in nineteenth-century Empire had been of long standing. The apparent contradictions in the characters of Moore and Casement found a precedent in the career of Sir John Pope Hennessey who had been appointed Governor to Mauritius a couple of years after Moore's visit to the island in 1879. Pope Hennessy, who was a Catholic Tory, Home Ruler and like Moore's father, a friend to Disraeli, was an anti-slavery reformer who was sympathetic to the complex racial and national population on Mauritius.[2] Making these comparisons, reveals the complexity of Moore's identity as a colonial careerist and a nationalist Irishman, and begs the question; could Irishness confer a subtle ability to make identifications with a subject people that a more unconflicted imperial identity could not? The answer to this lies in further detailed examinations of the imperial careers of the elite who became identified with nationalism.

Combining an examination of Moore's transnational career with the ideological identities of his family presents a fascinating picture of the varied and complex identities of a Catholic elite over time, and their continuing attempts, despite adversity, to maintain relevance in an Irish nation. Moore cannot be abstracted from his family history as the first chapter has attempted to prove. It was the crucible for his nationalism given the history of his Catholic forbears for intellectual legacy and nationalist activity, revealing a complex and distinct Catholic identity and determined efforts to effect Catholic equality, and to establish themselves as either literary witnesses or political influences. Not as the stereotyped, quixotic, and temperamental eccentrics that were seen to emerge from Hone's biography but as examples of European constitutional thought and Whig/liberal ideology. It was a formidable legacy and a powerful set of Catholic and patriotic identities for Moore to incorporate to himself. He did not spring, Minerva like, from the temples of Irish nationalism or even imperial experience, but emerged from a line of Catholic

[2] Philip Howell, and David Lambert, 'Sir John Pope Hennessey and Colonial Government: Humanitarianism and the Translation of Slavery in the Imperial Network' in David Lambert and Alan Lester (eds.) *Colonial Lives Across the British Empire: Imperial Careering in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2006)

elites for whom the question of their status within the Irish Protestant ascendancy was not a given, but a process of negotiation

The methodology used in this study was designed to bring to the fore those elements of Moore's life that had previously escaped scrutiny. A fragmented and incomplete assessment of his importance to Irish nationalism and to studies of the effects that a career in empire had on subsequent involvement in nationalism gives an incomplete picture of the foundation of the new state. By foregrounding Moore's years in South Africa in two chapters, the relationship between the resurgence of the nationalist movement in 1879, and its public sympathy with the Zulu rebellion reveals Ireland's increasing perception of the relevance of empire to its own situation. It was generally an expression from self-interest and not a political statement of support or indeed a real understanding of the position of the Zulu's under British rule, and it made crude comparison's on the basis of eviction from hearth and homeland, nevertheless it was testimony to the growing awareness of the nationalist movement from inward preoccupations to the beginnings of useful comparison with other colonial situations, when previously Irish nationalists had rarely identified their own situation with non-European colonial peoples in Asia or Africa. [3] By the time of the second Anglo-Boer war twenty years later, the Irish national movement had some useful propagandists to exploit the war to their advantage to add emphasis and force to claims of oppression and domination, and more interestingly this time there were Irish soldiers on both sides in the war, fighting for the Boers and for the British army. There were even more fruitful identifications to be made between the Irish and a pastoral, religious people with a distinct language and culture who were fighting to maintain their republican independence. By the time of Moore's return in 1921, after a gap of another twenty years, it was to a South African Union of English and Boer/Afrikaner interests within the commonwealth. The issues of language and cultural identity had intensified under the anglicising threats to the Afrikaner identity. Now, South Africa represented a form of political accommodation to empire or commonwealth in dominion status with a sizeable number of Afrikaners still desirous of a return to the republics. The 1920s were a time of imperial change and dominion assertions of independence from British parliamentary authority. Fruitful comparisons could be and were made by the Irish between their aims and Canadian and South African commonwealth positions, but South Africa for the above reasons struck a powerful resonance in an Irish nationalist breast, and this identification was shared by the South African republican parties.

[3] Joe Cleary, 'Misplaced Ideas'? : Colonialism, Location, and Dislocation in Irish Studies.' Clare Carroll and Patricia King (eds.), *Ireland and Postcolonial Theory* p.22

This close political relationship continued until the Second World War, and endured through several imperial conferences in which both states worked for a more autonomous position in empire. This relationship was conveniently abandoned with the imposition of apartheid, ironically by some of the South African statesmen most admired by Moore. He considered that he had a close friendship with Hertzog for example. The weakening bonds of the Irish/South African relationship were commented on by Moore's fellow envoy to Africa in 1921, and government minister P.J. Little, on the death of D.F. Malan in 1959. In the *Irish Press*, Little asked the Irish people if they had 'forgotten the extraordinary service to this country in its hour of need by the South African leadership'. Clearly they had, as Little said, attempted to distance themselves from the 'extremism,' of 'their former friends'. In order to do that the old bonds were not strengthened and memories of support and identification not commemorated. Moore's memory suffered as a result of that erasure, on two counts, one of his military involvement in colonial warfare on the continent and again for the not remembered diplomatic excursions.

This study has also attempted to address the complex motivation behind Moore's involvement in cultural nationalism. This was evinced by his membership of the Gaelic League and associations such as the Society for Irish tradition. While this was not unusual for a member of his class, a closer analysis revealed Moore's interest arose not just from concerns for national identity. His interest in linguistic and cultural identity formed a complex with a neo-traditionalist belief that accepted land reform but rejected the destabilising social structures that might topple the hierarchical status quo. Moore, like his father before him believed that the landlord might yet lead the people and secure a position for that class in a new political dispensation. This opinion finds some support in historiography and contemporary opinion that located Moore as a constitutionalist and not a radical as some of his political positions might suggest, in his willingness to politicise the language movement and his later membership of Sinn Féin, for example. It is also revelatory of the anxiety of elites globally who were subject to change that threatened their privilege. Moore found a broader European context in the Bohemian/Czech linguistic revival which bore a number of the markers of the Gaelic Revival; both languages had been confined to the most part to communication between peasants, in the Czech case it was initially a response in the face of German hegemony. The Czechs also experienced religious tensions as a primarily Protestant population subject to enforced re-Catholicisation. The eventual Czech success in language revival rested on their willingness to politicise the issue, a practice endorsed by Moore. His thinking was neither anachronistic nor outdated as the late nineteenth century was a period in which reconciliation and even collaboration might have been possible

between cultural traditions due to the extraordinary cultural diversity at the turn of the century.[4] By allying himself with the language movement, he encouraged a spirit of co-operation between classes.

This is a question that Foster has turned to in a recent publication *Vivid Faces: The Revolutionary Generation in Ireland 1890-1923*, in order to examine some of the minority opinions of the past that have suffered from historiographical omission If this question is deliberated upon before the event of 1916, Moore's political opinions become more credible than they are when they are viewed from the present, and they explain the tenacity with which he held them. The particular forms taken by Moore's interest in cultural nationalism become relevant to an understanding of his transnational career as they influenced his attitudes to Boer society in the years from 1899 to 1902. His reactions were predicated, not just on his dawning awareness of a shared imperial oppression, but an elite awareness of the break-up of traditional hierarchical societies, based on agrarian, religious values, as part of the seemingly inexorable progress of nineteenth century capitalism and imperial warfare. At a later date, revived cultural tradition and language became a part of the cultural exchange between Moore and the political elite of the Afrikaner nation. There are few precedents for Irish/colonial cultural comparisons with Africa, India or the Middle East, given the absence of a developed post-colonial vocabulary, due, Bill Kissane claims, to the 'socio-political cleavage before 1921 which was created by the seventeenth century wars of religions'.[5] Regarding Irish/South African political relationships through the lens of Moore's experience made possible a number of comparisons that were not visible previously, and show the transnational application of Moore's ideas on culture, language and social institutions. Bearing in mind, that the ideological contexts in which he existed included the liberal ideology that dominated nineteenth century Britain and the very early rhetoric of colonial comparison which was not ideologyically inspired but a direct result of an intimate experience of Ireland and the colonies.

The middle part of this thesis focused on the most documented and well known part of Moore's career from 1913 to 1918 when he undertook the military organisation of the Irish Volunteers. Although he was based in Ireland for this period, the international context for these years included the First World War, the social revolution of 1917, and the rise of smaller European nationalisms that were to find realisation in the post 1919 Wilsonian Doctrine of self-determination of small

[4] R.F. Foster, *Paddy and Mr Punch: Connections in Irish and English History* (London, 1993), p. 16-22.

[5] Bill Kissane, p.21.

nations. All of these events challenged the position of elites throughout Europe, particularly the Bolshevik victory in 1912. Moore, who had been dislodged from the family estate by his brother George in 1911, created a public profile by publishing a biography of their father the parliamentarian George Henry Moore. Coinciding with the turbulent years in which the Home Rule bill failed to become enacted due to the resistance of the Ulster loyalists who had formed a martial force in opposition, Moore joined the nationalist martial response in the Volunteers and found himself both military organiser and committee member. From this position he might have assumed a more autonomous and radical role, it was one that was held out to him as a possibility, by the O'Rahilly, one of the inner revolutionary circle. The fact that Moore refused may have saved his life, as he was not involved with the 1916 Rising but it also located him with the Redmondites who were steadily losing influence to a radicalising faction. He was to refuse to become permanently allied to the Irish Parliamentary Party as well, despite a cordial relationship with the party leader, John Redmond, which left him without a clearly defined role and nationalist identity. He countered that by forming associations with those nationalists who still believed, post 1916, that a constitutional agreement might be reached between the government and the nationalists. This was a period in which his old associations with South Africa found a new relevance, and in fact become pivotal a few years later to the foundation of independent government. This was also a period when Moore became alienated from his earlier supports in the army, and members of his class without being able to carve out a clearly defined role in the nationalist movement, but maintaining some middle way, that he described himself as being a link between the parliamentarians, the unionists and the nationalists. He abandoned his middle way some time in 1917, after the failure of the 1917 Convention which he had worked towards, and by 1918 he was a fully-fledged member of Sinn Fein, and loudly and publicly in defence of their policies. He had even sought nomination as a Sinn Fein candidate in the upcoming election, finally making a decisive political choice. Political opportunism or a well-judged reaction to the possible risks of social revolution making him a member of a displaced class? He knew that a 'new era' was at hand, and the Bolshevik revolution had demonstrated that an elite could be toppled. Land redistribution in Ireland had revealed in a less blood thirsty fashion that Irish elites were also vulnerable to change.

Moore attempted to transition from a figure representing a resented elite to an active nationalist politician as far as his military demeanour and imperial record would allow him. That had ambiguous results; his imperial experience was sought in 1921 when the newly formed assembly sent representatives to dominion governments in order to gain support. On the creation of the Free State, when he found himself in the Senate both his landowning background and his history in colonial Africa became political targets in order to neutralise his political projects. His efforts in

the national cause may have been approved in some quarters, but in others, notably the first government, they were often resented and subjected to scorn and ridicule. Despite the opposition from government quarters Moore continued to work for the causes that most concerned landowners, a group that now absorbed the landlords, who in some cases retained control over large areas of land. Embodying David Carr's dictum that 'many, if not most, public men see their conduct as in part situated between role models from an heroic past and expectation of the judgement of posterity', Moore relived the glory days of his father in the Tenant League of 1852 in the long campaign over the land annuities payments.[6] In his dedication to George Gavan Duffy in *Blunder and Plunder*, he reminded him of the work that engaged their two fathers more than seventy years previously in the days of independent opposition. Moore was to experience a similar erasure of his political role to that of his father, whose parliamentary career was diminished in relation to that of Charles Gavan Duffy by Duffy's memoirs. Despite Moore's work along with Peadar O'Donnell and Padraig Ú Maille to get Fianna Fáil to adopt their strategies of abstention from the Land Annuities payments into their electoral policy, Moore's role was later eclipsed and subtly effaced with the Fianna Fáil victory in 1932. Despite some respects being paid in the Senate to his role in the abolition of the payments to Britain what might have been a political legacy became absorbed into the narrative of the foundation of the Fianna Fáil party.

This absence of a clearly defined legacy or sufficient analysis of his role in Irish politics contributed to Moore's disappearance from public memory. There are no commemorations, statuary, or public parks in his memory and no burial place sanctified by nationalist sacrifice. The sum of his achievements did not amount to a tradition although it could be argued that a substantial change resulted from his role in the Land Annuities payments. His most substantive legacy may lie in his biography of his father and his history of the Irish Volunteers as narratives from an unrepresented minority in Irish historiography. He attempted to secure his legacy by imploring Peadar O'Donnell to write an account of the Land Annuities campaign and collaborated with Joseph Hone on his biography of his brother George and a family history *The Moores of Moore Hall* which was published in the year of his death. These omissions lead to the final objectives of this thesis; to question Moore's lack of historiographical attention or plaudits for his political achievements. Minister McGilligan laid the credit for the Land Annuities campaign at O'Donnell's feet and paid scant attention to Moore's role. Fianna Fáil was happy to incorporate Moore's published findings into their own electoral campaign but not to validate his contribution. These oversights were not a recent phenomena for Moore. In 1901 his revelatory letters to the press concerning the concentration camps in South Africa were anonymous and not attributed to his

[6] Simon Schama, *Citizens: A Chronicle of the French Revolution.* (London, 1989) p. vii.

authorship until many years later. In 1917, when Moore and his fellow Dominion Association members agitated to have their ideas heard among their peers, Russell published his own version of their prepared memorandum in the *Irish Times* as *Thoughts for a Convention* where it was accepted by moderate unionists, such as Lord Monteagle who had refused to sign an earlier memorandum sent to him by Moore, The later part of Russell's memorandum had been taken verbatim from this report and written almost entirely by Moore who received no mention in the *Irish Times,* a circumstance that led to an estrangement between him and Russell. His personal modesty and his belief in nationalist unity meant that he made no public complaint, but it was Russell who received the credit for the ideas expressed in the article.

In the few years preceding the fiftieth commemoration of the 1916 Easter Rising in 1966, F.X. Martin published a history of the Irish Volunteers in which Moore received scarcely a mention and when he did it was within Bulmer Hobson's account of these times. It might reasonably have been expected that Moore's career as a Colonel and as military leader of the Volunteers would have received some interrogation. That it did not was remarked upon by Denis Gwynn, 1839-1973. Professor of History at University College Cork, ex-volunteer and second son of parliamentarian nationalist Stephen Gwynn. Gwynn read Martin's history of the Volunteers, and having known Moore personally, he wondered at both the omission and the lack of interrogation of Moore's insufficient rank and lack of public profile when he undertook the military training of the Volunteers. In his column in the *Cork Examiner,* 'Now and Then', Gwynn expressed the opinion that ...'Moore's position deserves more consideration than it received, and there are probably few people now, who remember the facts.' Some of the reasons may be found in the reviews of his *History of the Volunteers* published for the first time in 1936. The *United Ireland* reviewer commented that Moore's account was mid-way between that written by an observer who was completely on the outside and what might have been written by a man who was completely on the inside...' Herein lies Moore's dilemma; the uncertain public and later historiographical perceptions of his role and status in the national movement. The early historiography of Michael Tierney, F.X Martin and Leon O'Broin mentioned what they perceived as his embodiment of contradictory elements in his character and background, his landed status, imperial warfare and nationalist involvement, but for the most part he has existed on the peripheries and in historiographical footnotes. Those elements may prove to be not contradictory at all as further research on Catholic elites reveals their diversity of experience as in the aforementioned Pope Hennessey, or Moore's father, George Henry. The later scholarship of O'Neill, Keogh, McConnel, Enright and Lynn make it clear that Moore's apparently anomalous status was actually shared by a number of elite Catholics in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Their presence has been clearly indicated by O'Neill's study of transnational Catholic elite education, and it can

be expected that further studies will emerge of this historiographically underrepresented group modifying the understanding of the cultural composition of Irish nationalism within these periods and testifying to its cultural and ideological diversity.

The specific focus of this study has been on Moore's imperial experience in South Africa and the methods by which his understanding of Irish cultural nationalism caused him to make colonial comparisons on the basis of threatened traditional rural societies. His leadership of the Irish Volunteers, forays into constitutional nationalism based on dominion comparisons, and finally his election to the Irish senate where he continued to act on the values of paternal landlordism, means that aspects of his long experience have not been given equal attention. His long years on the Indian continent for example, where he served in the Connaught Rangers. The rationale behind this omission lies in the lack of impact that his experience of Empire in India had on him in comparison with that in South Africa. Moore's humanitarian concerns were primarily animated by the suffering of the white races not by any other. Questions of gender were largely been omitted as a consideration, primarily because of the paucity of primary sources. Moreover, the content of sources available did not impinge heavily upon the major issues within the thesis. The importance of the influence of Moore's mother, Mary Blake, his strongly autonomous grandmother Louisa Brown, who managed the Moore estates, or his Galway Protestant wife Evelyn Handcock who endured some of the privations of the Indian climate with him, were not given a focus, not because this thesis thinks that their influence negligible but largely due to the fact that the questions posed did not permit them much visibility. Moore had a personal admiration for Mary Spring Rice, a long friendship with Alice Stopford Green, and Mrs Parry, Roger Casement's cousin, and a good working relationship in the Senate with Jenny Wyse Power, however the composition of his archival sources do not permit an interrogation of these relationships in regard to this thesis, nevertheless his attitudes to gender is clearly that of late Victorian ideology. His responses to the suffering Boer women and children demonstrated outrage at their treatment by the military and he risked his career in order to protect them, despite some lack of co-operation and appreciation on their part. Moore selected the sources he submitted to the archives on the basis of their relevance to his public life, and not the private, apart from some early letters to his family. The exception to this was his correspondence with his novelist brother George Moore However, that relationship has been explored exhaustively within literary disciplines, consequently only those elements of that relationship that impinge directly on the questions asked of this thesis are given consideration. The narrative is driven by an interrogation of the aspects of Moore's existence that allow the most opportunity to question the significance of colonial identifications, links and connections with Irish nationalism between 1879 and 1932. While an equal significance has been given to the significance of his paternal landlord inclinations, their impact on his political career,

and his later absorption into the political and social composition of the new state. The historian/anthropologist James C. Scott suggested that studies of nations and people might be augmented by 'studies of particular families and their interactions over time.'[7] As George Moore suggested,'the decline and fall of a family is quite as interesting as that of an empire.'[8] This study has used the experience of a particular individual and his family over time to question the relationship between Catholic elites, empire and nation.

Essentially, what makes this thesis singular is the opportunity to examine Irish nationalism from the optic of a member of a threatened landed class determined to maintain their influence by co-operation not domination. His colonial experience at the turn of the century gave him an opportunity to witness an accelerated change in a traditional society induced by rapidly expanding capitalist enterprise and eventual warfare, in a period during which the *ancien regime* retained its hegemony in Britain and most of Europe despite the threats to its existence by reform, revolution and warfare.[9] Moore resisted those aspects of modernity that destabilised traditional class relations, and the certainties that enclosed the old world of landlord tenant relations, and traditional occupation.

A final word on the structure of the narrative in this study, which has largely been explained in the opening paragraphs as possessing a conceptual framework that focused on five critical periods in Moore's life. This methodology was chosen in order to avoid the trap of constructing a narrative that might 'correspond,' too closely to the 'ways in which historical actors construct events.'[10] Mid-nineteenth century autobiography for example, created a narrative from an 'ancestral heritage,' followed by the events of childhood, education, and eventual occupation culminating in reward as the result of development and travail, all the while avoiding accounts of personal relationship with women.[11] Moore's biography of his father demonstrated this 'discursive consistency,' and the opening chapter in this thesis corresponds to this narrative form.[12] The aim of this study was to use Moore's archives with due regard to their historical context to construct a

---

[7] Cited in Jo Guldi and David Armitage, *The History Manifesto,* (Cambridge, 2014) p. 120

[8] George Augustus Moore, quoted in Seamus Mac Donncha, 'Letters of George Moore (1852-1933) to his Brother Colonel Maurice Moore CB. (1854-1939) PhD Thesis, National University Galway, 1973.pp 49-50.

[9] Perry Anderson

[10] David Carr, *History and Theory* (1986) cited by Simon Schama, *Citizens: A Chronicle of the French Revolution* (London, 1989) p. vii.

[11] Donna Loftus, 'The Self in Society: Middle Class Men and Autobiography,' in David Amigoni (ed.) *Life Writing and Victorian Culture* (Hants, 2006) p.68.

[12] Ibid.

narrative that bears in mind the inevitability of contingency, while locating the broader historical relevance of a life subject to the forces of class, empire, nationalism and colonial connection.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Table of Contents

A. Primary Sources

Primary Sources (i) Archival Material, Britain

National Army Museum, London

H.F.N. Jourdain War Diaries and photographs

Army Lists

The National Archives Kew

Personality Files CO.

London Gazette

British Library, London

South African Newspapers

Bodleian Library Oxford

Sir Matthew Nathan Papers

Sir Augustine Birrell Papers

Disraeli Papers

Keele University, Special Collections and Archives

Lindsay papers: A Handlist, Ms. Ref. Code GB172 LIN

Archival Material, Ireland

National Archives Dublin

Department of Foreign Affairs Papers, Early Series

National Library Ireland

Maurice Moore Papers

George Moore Papers

George Henry Moore Papers

John Redmond Papers

Lawrence Parsons Diaries

Art Ó Bríain Papers

Edward Lysaght Memoir

George Berkeley Papers

Coffey and Chenevix Trench Papers

John Devoy Papers

Mrs Sydney Czira Papers (John Brennan)

UCD Archives

Eoin MacNeill Papers

Joseph Hone Papers

Trinity College Dublin

Berkeley Library

Castlebar County Library

Archive on the Moore's of Moore Hall

Bureau of Military History Witness Statements

Diarmuid Coffey: W.S. 1248.

George Berkeley: W.S. 971 and 994.

P.J. Little: W.S. 1769.

Bulmer Hobson: W.S. 50

Comdt. Michael McHugh: W.S. 1632.

Seamus MacManus: W.S. 283

Mrs. K. O'Callaghan: W.S. 688

Thomas McCarthy: W.S. 307.

Material held by Kevin Coyne, Carnacon, Co. Mayo.

Documents relating to an exchange of correspondence between descendants of the Moore family and local residents of Carnacon. This collection includes photographs, and details on Moore Hall.

ii) Official Papers

Seanad Éireann Debates, 1923-36 and 1937-39.

Hansard 1900.

(iii) Newspapers and Periodicals

U.S.A

Gaelic American, 1926-27

New York Times, 1921

Ireland

The Connaught Telegraph (formerly known as the Telegraph or Connaught Ranger), 1840-1965.

The Ballina Herald, 1939

The Western People, 1900-1916

The Mayo News, 1900-1928

The Ballinrobe Chronicle, 1902

The Mayo Examiner, 1870-1869

The Irish Press, 1938

The Irish Independent, 1918-1928

The Irish Times, 1901-19232

The Daily Express, 1899

The Freeman's Journal, 1879-1916

Cork Examiner, 1960

Tablet, 1901

Evening Telegraph, 1918

South Africa

Pretoria News, 1921

Rand Daily Mail, 1921

The Cape Times, 1921-30

The Cape Argus, 1921-30

Johannesburg Star, 1921-30

Die Burger, 1921

The Republic, 1920-22

England

The Times (London), 1901-1928

Blackwoods Magazine, 1901

Manchester Guardian, 1932

London Gazette, 1874-1904

iv) Contemporary books and pamphlets

Breen, Dan, *My Fight for Irish Freedom* (1924).

Butler, Sir W. F., *Sir William Butler: An Autobiography* (London, 1911).

Burke, Sir Bernard, *A Geneological and Heraldic History of the Landed Gentry of Ireland* (London, 1912)

Callwell, C.E., *Field-Marshal Sir Henry Wilson, Bart., G.C.B. D.S.O: His Life and Diaries* (London, 1927).

Carlyle, Thomas, *Reminiscenses of my Irish Journey in 1849* (London, 1882).

Cunynghame, General Sir Arthur Thurlow, G.C.B., *My Command in South Africa Comprising Experiences of Travel in the Colonies of South Africa and the Independent States* (London, 1879).

D'Alton, Rev. E..,L.L,. D. M.R.I.A, *History of Ireland from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. 3 Volumes* (London, 1910, 1911, 1912).

De Beaumont, Gustave, *Ireland* (London, 1839).

De Burgh, Hussey, U.H. Land Agent, *The Landowners of Ireland: An Alphabetical List of the Owners of Estates of 500 Acres or £500 Valuation and Upwards in Ireland with the Acreage and Vaulation in Each County.*(Dublin, 1878).

Devoy, John, *Recollections of an Irish Rebel* (Shannon, 1969, first published 1929).

Douglas, James Green, *President De Valera and the Senate* (Dublin, 1934).

Doyle, Sir Arthur Conan, *The Great Boer War* (London, 1902).

Duffy, Charles Gavan, *The League of North and South: An Episode in Irish History, 1850-1853* (London, 1886).

Dun, Finlay, *Landlord and Tenant in Ireland* (London, 1881).

Fox, R.M., *Green Banners: The Story of the Irish Struggle* (London, 1939).

Gosse, Edmund, *Father and Son: A Study of Two Temperaments* (Oxford, 1974, first published 1907).

Grant, Captain Harold Maurice, *History of the War in South Africa: 1899-1902 Vol 11* (London, 1910).

Griffith, Richard, *General Valuation of Rateable Property: Ireland. Union of Oughterard. Valuation of the Several Tenenments Compirsed in the Above Named Union Situated in the*

Counties of Galway and Mayo Together with that portion of the Union of Ballinrobe in the Count of Galway (Dublin, 1855)

Griffith Richard, *General Valuation of Rateable Property: Ireland.County of Mayo: Valuation of the Several Tenenments in that part of the Union of Ballinrobe Situated in the County above named.*(Dublin, 1857).

Hegarty, P.S., *Victory of Sinn Féin* (1924).

Hone, Joseph, *The Moore's of Moore Hall* (London, 1929).

Hone, Joseph, *The life of George Moore* (*London*, 1936)

Jones, W. Bence, *The Life's Work in Ireland of a Landlord who tried to do his Duty* (London, 1888).

Jourdain, H.F.N., *Ranging Memories* (Oxford, 1934).

Jourdain, H.F.N., and Fraser, Edward, *The Connaught Rangers Vol. 1* (3 Vols. Cork, 1924).

Kelly's Handbook of the Titled Landed and Official Classes (1929).

Kettle, Thomas, *The Days Burden* (Dublin, 1968).

List, Friederich, *The National system of Political Economy* Sampson S. Lloyd (trans.) (London,

Lysaght, Edward, E., *Sir Horace Plunkett and his Place in the Irish Nation* (Dublin, 1916).

Macardle, Dorothy, *The Irish Republic: A Documented Chronicle of the Anglo-Irish Conflict and the Partitioning Of Ireland, with a Detailed Account of the Period 1916-1923* (London, 1937).

MacIntosh, James, *History of the Revolution in England: 1688* (European Library, 1834).

McClelland, D., (ed.), *Education for Values* (New York, 1882).

Moore, George, *Treatise on the Art of Reasoning with a Preliminary Chapter on Human Knowledge and a Concluding One on the History of Morals* (London, 1830)

Moore, George, *The History of the Revolution in 1688, Recording of all the Events Connected with that Transaction in England, Scotland, Ireland, down to the Capitulation of Limerick in 1691 in the Last of its Kingdoms, Inclusive* (London, 1817).

Moore George, *The Lives of Cardinal Alberoni and the Duke of Ripperda, Ministers of Philip V. King of Spain* (London, 1806).

Moore, Thomas, *Thomas Moore V Adams: Proceeding in a Case tried in the Court of Kings Bench, December 21 1815 for Special Damages in Consequence of an Assault Committed at Alicant in Spain. Including an Appendix Containing the Brief of Instruction given by the Plaintiff to his Leading Counsel Mr. Sergent Best* (R.S. Kirby, 11 London House, Yard, Paternoster Row, 1816) Digitised by Google Books.

Moore, George, *Conversations in Ebury Street* (London, 1924).

Moore George, *The Untilled Field* (London, 1932).

Moore, George *Hail And Farewell: Vale* (1914) (Buckinghamshire, 1985)

Moore, Maurice, *British Plunder and Irish Blunder or the Story of the Land Purchase Annuities* (Dublin, 1928). Duffy, Charles Gavan, *My Life in Two Hemispheres* (London, 1886).

Moore, Maurice, *George Henry Moore: An Irish Gentleman* (London, 1913).

Moore, Maurice, *Tús Agus Fás Óglach na hÉireann 1913-1917* Liam Ó 'Rinn (trans.) (Dublin, 1936).

Musgrave, Sir Richard, *Memoirs of the Different Rebellions in Ireland* (Dublin, London, 1802).

O'Brien, Richard Barry, *The Life of Charles Stewart Parnell,1846-1898* (New York, 1898).

O'Connell, Frank, *The Big Fellow* (1937).

O'Donnell, Peadar, *There Will be Another Day* (Dublin, 1963).

O'Donnell, Peadar, *The Gates Flew Open* (1932).

O'Dwyer, Sir Michael, *India as I Knew it, 1885-1925* (London, 1925).

O'Hart, John, *The Irish and Anglo-Irish Gentry: When Cromwell came to Ireland* (Dublin, 1884).

O'Malley, Ernie, *On Another Man's Wound* (1936).

O'Sullivan, Donal, *The Irish Free State and its Senate: A Study in Contemporary Politics* (London, 1940).

O'Sullivan, Seamus, *Essays and Recollections* (Dublin, 1944)

Ryan, Desmond, *Unique Dictator* (1936).

Smiles, Samuel, *Self Help: With Illustrations of Character, Conduct and Perseverance* Peter, W., Sinnem (ed.), (Oxford, 2002) (1859).

Strachey, Lytton, *Eminent Victorians* (London, 1918).

v) Contemporary journal articles

Blake, Martin, J., 'Sir Thomas Moore: His Descendants in the Male Line' in *The Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland,* fifth series, vol.36, no.3 (30 September, 1906).

Gwynn, Stephen, 'The Shift in Irish Leadership' in *Current History,* vol. 36, no. 1 (1 April, 1932, New York), pp 8-14.

Humphreys, John H., 'Elections in the Irish Free State' in *The Contemporary Review,* vol. 132, (July, 1927), pp 196-201

Moore, Maurice, 'George Henry Moore' in *The Irish Monthly.* vol. 45, no. 523 (January, 1917), pp 18-32.

Moore, Maurice, 'George Henry Moore' in *The Irish Review* vol. 4, no. 37. (March, 1914), pp 34-35

Moore, Maurice, 'George Henry Moore' in *The Irish Review*, vol. 4, no, 38 (March, 1914), pp 93-103.

Oldham, Professor, 'The Present Taxable Capacity of Ireland' 28 June 1921, Report at Ireland Social Enquiry Society.

Waller, Bolton C., 'Ireland's New Era of Law and Order' in *Current History*, vol. 28, no. 5 (August, 1928), pp 757-72.

Index of Estates of Tenanted and Untenanted Lands at 31st March 1936: Land Act, 1923-1936.Land Owners in Ireland 1876- of One Acre and upwards in the Several Counties, Counties of Cities, and Counties of Towns in Ireland (Baltimore, 1988, first published in Dublin, 1876).

B. Secondary Sources

i)Books and pamphlets

Akenson, Donald H., *Occasional* '*Papers in the Irish in South Africa* (Grahamstown, 1991).Akenson, Donald H., *Small Differences: Irish Catholics and Irish Protestants, 1815-1921* (Dublin, 1996)

Akenson, Donald H., *God's Peoples: Covenant and Land in South Africa, Israel and Ulster* (London, 1992).

Allen, Nicholas, *George Russell (AE) and The New Ireland, 1905-30* (Dublin, 2002).

Alvarez, José Junco and Schubert, Adrian, (eds.), *Spanish History since 1808* (London, 2000).

Amigoni, David, *Life Writing and Victorian Culture* (Aldershot, 2006).

Arendt, Hannah, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (London, 1967). Armitage, David, *Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge, 2000).

Arnold, Dana, *Cultural Identities and the Aesthetics of Britishness* (Manchester, 2004).

Attridge, Steve, *Nationalism, Imperialism, and Identity in Late Victorian Culture: Civil and Military Worlds*, (Basingstoke, 2003).

Augusteijn, Joost, (ed.), *Ireland in the 1930s* (Dublin

Augusteijn, Joost, *The Irish Revolution, 1913-1923* (Basingstoke, 2002).

Augusteijn, Joost, *Patrick Pearse: The Making of a Revolutionary* (Basingstoke, 2010).

Backscheider, Paula R., *Reflections on A Biography* (Oxford, 2001).

Ballantyne, Tony, and Antoinette Burton, *Bodies in Contact: Rethinking Colonial Encounter in World History* (London, 2005).

Ballantyne, Tony, *Webs of Empire: Locating New Zealand's Colonial Past* (Toronto, 2012).

Ballantyne, Tony, *Orientalism And Race: Aryanism in the British Empire* (Basingstoke, 2002).

Bartlett, Thomas and Keith, Jeffery, (eds), *A Military History of Ireland* (Cambridge, 1996).

Bartlett, Thomas, *The Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation: The Catholic Question* (Dublin, 1992).

Bartolovich, Crystal, and Lazarus, Neil (eds), *Marxism, Modernity and Postcolonial Studies* (Cambridge, 2002).

Bateman, John, *The Great Landowners of Great Britain and Ireland* (New York, 1971)

Bayly, C.A., *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1914: Global Connections and Comparisons* (Oxford, 2004).

Beckett, J.C., *The Making of Modern Ireland 1603-1923* (London, 1981).

Beckert, Sven, *Empire of Cotton: A New History of Global Capitalism* (London, 2014).

Bielenberg, Andy, *The Irish Diaspora* (London, 2014).

Biener, Guy, *Remembering the Year of the French: Irish Folk History and Social Memory* (London, 2006).

Bence Jones Mark, *The Twilight Of The Ascendancy* (London, 1987).

Bew, Paul, *The Land and the National Question In Ireland, 1858-82* (Dublin, 1978).

Biagini, Eugenio F., *British Democracy and Irish Nationalism 1876-1906* (Cambridge, 2007).

Blackstock, Allan, and O'Gorman, Frank, (eds), *Loyalism and the Formation of the British World* (Suffolk, 2014).

Bloch, Marc, *The Historian's Craft* (Manchester, 1954).

Blyth, Robert J., and Jeffery, Keith, *The British Empire and its Contested Pasts* (Dublin, 2009).

Boehmer, Elleke, *Empire, the National and the Postcolonial, 1899-1920*: *Resistance in Interaction* (Oxford, 2002).

Bolger, Patrick, *The Irish Co-Operative Movement* (Dublin, 1977).

Bolton, G.C, 'The Anglo-Irish and the Historians' 1830-1980' in Oliver MacDonagh, W.F. Mantle and Pauric Travers (eds), *Irish Culture and Nationalism, 1750-1950* (London, 1983).

Bourke, Joanna, *An Intimate History of Killing: Face to Face Killing in Twentieth-Century Warfare* (London, 2000).

Boyce, D. George, *Nineteenth Century Ireland* (Dublin, 1990).

Boyce, D.George and O'Day, Alan, (eds.), *Parnell In Perspective* (London, 1991).

Brady, Ciaran, *James Anthony Froude: An Intellectual Biography of a Victorian Prophet* (Oxford, 2013).

Brady, Ciaran, (ed.), *Ideology and the Historians* (Dublin, 1991).

Brady, Ciaran, *Interpreting Irish History: The Debate on Historical Revisionism,* 1938-1994 (Dublin, 1994).

Brown, Terence, *Ireland: A Social and Cultural History 1922-2002* ((London, 1981).

Buckner, Philip and Francis, Douglas, (eds), *Rediscovering the British World* (Calgary, 2005).

Bull, Philip, *Land Politics and Nationalism: A History* (Dublin, 2005).

Burke, Peter, *New Perspectives in Historical Writing* (Cambridge, 2001).

Burton, Antoinette, *Empire in Question: Reading, Writing, and Teaching British Imperialism* (London, 2011).

Busteed, Mervyn, Neel, Frank, and Tonge, Jonathan, (eds), *Irish Protestant Identities* (Manchester, 2008).

Caine, Barbara, *Biography and History* (Basingstoke, 2010).

Cain, P.J., and Hopkins, A.G., *British Imperialism: Innovation and Expansion, 1688-1914* (Harlow and New York, 1993).

Cammack, Diana, *The Rand at War, 1899-1902: The Witwatersrand and the Anglo-Boer War* (London, 1999).

Campbell, Fergus, *The Irish Establishment, 1879-1914* (Oxford, 2009).

Campbell, Fergus, *Land and Revolution: Nationalist Politics in the West of Ireland 1891-1921* (Oxford, 2005).

Campbell, Fergus, and Varley, Tony, (eds), *Land Questions in Modern Ireland* (Manchester, 2013).

Cannadine, David, *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy* (London, 1990).

Cannadine, David, *Ornamentalism : How the British saw their Empire* (London, 2001).

Canovan, Margaret, *Hannah Arendt: Reinterpretation of her Political Thought* (Cambridge, 1992)

Carr, E.H., *The Romantic Exiles: A Nineteenth Century Portrait Gallery* (Harmondsworth, 1949).

Carr, E.H., *The Twenty Years Crisis 1914-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations* (London, 1946).

Carver, Michael, *The National Army Museum Book of the Boer War* (National Army Museum, 1999).

Chadwick, Owen, *The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1975).

Chakrabarty, Dipesh, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton, 2000).

Colley, Linda, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (London, 1992).

Colley, Linda, *Captives: Britain, Empire and the World, 1600-1850* (New, York, 2004).

Comerford, R.V., *The Fenians in Context: Irish Politics and Society, 1848-82* (Dublin, 1985).

Comerford, R.V., and Dooley, Terence, A.M., *Ireland's Polemical Past: Views of Irish History in Honour of R.V. Comerford* (Dublin, 2010).

Cook, Scott B., *Imperial Affinities: 19th Century Analogies and Exchanges between India and Ireland* (London, & New Delhi, 1995).

Cooper, Frederick, *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History* (London, 2005).

Crawford, Heather K., *Outside the Glow: Protestants and Irishness in Independent Ireland* (Dublin, 2010).

Crosbie, Barry, *Irish Imperial Networks* (Cambridge, 2012).

Crowe, Catriona, Fanning, Ronan, Kennedy, Michael, Keogh, Dermot and O'Halpin, Eunan, (eds), *D.F.A Documents in Irish Foreign Policy: The Anglo-Irish Treaty, December 1920-December 1921*.

Curthoys, Ann, and Lake, Marilyn, (eds), *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspectives* (Canberrra, 2005)

Curtis, L.P., *Coercion and Conciliation in Ireland, 1880-1892: A Study In Conservative Unionism* (Princeton, 1963).

Curtis, L. Perry, *Depiction of Eviction in Ireland, 1845-1910* (Dublin, 2011).

Dangerfield, George, *The Damnable Question: A Study in Anglo-Irish Relations* (London, 1979).

Daly, Mary E., and Hoppen, Theodore, (eds), *Gladstone, Ireland and Beyond* (Dublin, 2011).

Darwin, John, *The Empire Project: The Rise and Fall of the British World System, 1830-1970* (Cambridge, 2009).

Davies, Martin L., *Imprisoned by History* (New York, 2010).

Davies, Bronwyn, *Doing Collective Biography: Investigating the Production of Subjectivity* (Berkshire, 2006).

Deacon, Desley, Russell, Penny, and Wollacott, Angela, (eds), *Transnational Lives: Biographies of Global Modernity, 1700-Present* (London, 2010).

Deane, Seamus, *Foreign Affections: Essays on Edmund Burke* (Cork, 2005)

Denman, Terence, *Ireland's Unknown Soldiers: The 16th Division in the Great War, 1914-1918* (Dublin, 1992).

Denman, Terence, *A Lonely Grave: The Life and Death of William Redmond* (Dublin, 1995).

Den Otter, Sandra M., *British Idealism and Social Explanation* (Oxford, 2011).

Dobson, Miriam, and Ziemann, Benjamin, (eds), *Reading Primary Sources: The Interpretation of Texts from Nineteenth and Twentieth Century History* (Oxon, 2009).

Documents on Irish Foreign Policy, Volume III, 1926-1932.

Dooley, Terence, *The Decline Of The Big House In Ireland: A Study Of Irish Landed Families* (Dublin, 2001).

Dooley, Terence, and Ridgeway, Christopher, (eds), *The Irish Country House: It's Past, Present and Future* (Dublin,2011).

Dooley, Terence, *The Big House And Landed Estates Of Ireland: A Research Guide.* (Dublin, 2007).

Dudink, Stefan, Hagemann, Karen, and Tosh, John, *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History* (Manchester, 2004).

Dunleavy, Janet Eagleson, *George Moore: The Artist's Vision, the Storytellers Art* (New Jersey, 1973).

Dwan, David, *The Great Community: Culture and Nationalism in Ireland* (Dublin, 2008).

Eagleton, Terry, *Scholars and Rebels in Nineteenth Century Ireland* (Oxford, 1999).

English, Richard, *Radicals and the Republic: Socialist Republicanism in the Irish Free State 1925-1937* (Oxford, 1994).

Fage, J.D., *A History of Africa* (London, 1978).

Fanning, Bryan, *Histories of the Irish Future* (London, 2015).

Fanning, Bryan, *The Quest for Modern Ireland: The Battle for Ideas, 1922-1986* (Dublin, 2008).

Farmar, Tony, *Privileged Lives: A Social History of Middle-Class Ireland, 1882-1989* (Dublin, 2010).

Farrow, Anthony, *George Moore* (London, 1978).

Ferguson, Niall, *Empire: How Britain made the Modern World* (London, 2003).

Ferriter, Diarmuid, *The Transformation of Ireland, 1900-2000* (London, 2005).

Ferriter, Diarmuid, *A Nation and Not a Rabble: The Irish Revolution 1913-1923* (London, 2015).

Ferriter, Diarmuid, *Judging Dev: A Reassessment of the life and Legacy of Eamonn de Valera* (Dublin 2007).

Finkelstein, David, *The House of Blackwood: Author Publisher Relations in the Victorian Era* (Pennsylvania, 2002).

Finnan, Joseph P., *John Redmond and Irish Unity, 1912-1918.* (Syracuse, 2004).

Finnegan, Diarmid A., and Wright, Jonathan Jeffrey (eds), *Spaces of Global Knowledge: Exhibition, Encounter and Exchange in an Age of Empire* (Surrey, 2015).

Fitzpatrick, David, *The Two Irelands, 1912-1939* (Oxford, 1998).

Fitzpatrick, David, *Politics and Irish Life, 1913-1921: Provincial Experience of War and Revolution* (Cork, 1977).

Flanagan, Frances, *Remembering the Revolution: Dissent, Culture and Nationalism in the Irish State* (Oxford, 2015).

Flannery, Eoin, *Versions of Ireland: Empire, Modernity and Resistance In Irish Culture* (Cambridge, 2006).

Flannery, Eoin, and Mitchell, Angus, (eds), *Enemies of Empire: New Perspectives on Imperial Literature and Historiography* (Dublin, 2007).

Foley, Tadhg, and Ryder, Sean, (eds), *Ideology and Ireland in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin, 1998).

Foley, T., and O'Connor, M., (eds,) *India and Ireland:Colonies, Culture and Empire* (Dublin, 2000)

Foster, R.F., *Irish Freedom: The History of Nationalism in Ireland* (London, 2006).

Foster, R.F., *The Irish Story: Telling Tales and Making it up in Ireland* (London, 2001).

Foster, R.F., *Paddy and Mr Punch: Connections in Irish and English History* (London, 1993).

Foster, R.F., *Charles Stewart Parnell* (New Jersey, 1979).

Fox, R.M., *Years of Freedom: The Story of Ireland 1921-1948* (Cork, 1948).

Frazier, Adrian, *George Moore, 1852-1933* (London, 2000).

French, David, *Military Identities: The Regimental System, The British Army, And The British People, c 1870-2000* (Oxford, 2005)

Fuller, Steve, *The Sociology Of Intellectual Life* (London, 2009).

Gailey, Andrew, *Ireland and the Death of Kindness: The Experience of Constructive Unionism* (Cork, 1987).

Garvin, Tom, *Nationalist Revolutionaries in Ireland 1858-1928* (Oxford, 1988).

Garvin, Tom, *The Birth of Irish Democracy* (Dublin, 1996).

Garvin, Tom, *The Irish Senate* (Dublin, 1969).

Garvin, Tom, *The Lives of Daniel Binchy* (Sallins, 2016).

Geary, Laurence M., and McCarthy, Andrew J., *Ireland, Australia and New Zealand: History, Politics and Culture* (Dublin, 2008).

Genet, Jacqueline, (ed.), *The Big House in Ireland: Reality and Representation* (Kerry, 1991).

Gilbert, Felix, *History: Choice and Commitment* (Cambridge, Mass., 1977).

Gillomee, Hermann, *The Afrikaners: A Biography of a People* (London, 2003).

Golding, G.M., *George Gavan Duffy, 1882-1951: A Legal Biography* (Dublin, 1982).

Gooch, John, (ed.), *The Boer War: Direction, Experience and Image* (London, 2000).

Gorman, David, *Imperial Citizenship: Empire and the Question of Belonging* (Manchester, 2010).

Graham, Colin, and Litvack, Leon, (eds.), *Ireland and Europe in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin, 2006).

Grant, Kevin, Levine, Philippa and Trentmann, Frank, *Beyond Sovereignty: Britain, Empire, and Transnationalism, c.1880-1950* (Basingstoke, 2007).

Grant, Robert, *Representations of British Emigration, Colonisation, and Settlement, 1800-1860* (Basingstoke, 2005).

Gray, Peter, *Victoria's Ireland? Irishness and Britishness, 1837-1901* (Dublin, 2004).

Gray, Tony, *A Peculiar Man: A Life of George Moore* (Michigan, 1996).

Greaves, C. Desmond, *Liam Mellows and the Irish Revolution* (London, 1971).

Gregory, Adrian, and Pašeta, Senia, *Ireland and the Great War: A War to Unite us All?* (Manchester, 2001).

Guldi, Jo, and Armitage, David, *The History Manifesto* (Cambridge, 2014).

Hall, Catherine, and Rose, Sonya, O., (eds), *At Home With the Empire: Metropolitan Culture and the Imperial World* (Cambridge, 2006).

Hall, John, C., *Ernest Gellner* (London, 2010).

Haupt, Heinz-Gerhard and Jurgen Kocka (eds), *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives* (New York, 2009).

Hay, Marnie, *Bulmer Hobson and the Nationalist Movement in Twentieth-Century Ireland* (Manchester, 2009).

Hayton, David and Holmes, Andrew R. *Ourselves Alone? Religion, Society and Politics in Eighteenth-and Nineteenth-Century Ireland: Essays presented to S.J. Connolly* (Dublin, 2016).

Healy, Roisin, *Poland in the Irish Nationalist Imagination, 1772-1922: Anti-Colonialism within Europe* (Basingstoke, 2017).

Hechter, Michael, *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966.* (London, 1975),

Hegarty, Peter, *Peadar O'Donnell* (Cork, 1999).

Heyck, Thomas William, *The Transformation of Intellectual Life in Victorian England* (London, 1982).

Heywood, Andrew, *Political Ideologies: An Introduction* (Basingstoke, 2012).

Himmelfarb, Gertrude, *Victorian Minds* (New York, 1952).

Hobsbawm, Eric, *The Age of Capital, 1848-1875* (London, 1975).

Hobsbawm, Eric, *The Age of Empire, 1875-1914* (London, 1983).

Hobsbawm, Eric, *The Age of Revolutions, 1789-1848* (London, 1962).

Hobsbawm, Eric, *Nations and Nationalisms since 1780* (Cambridge, 1983).

Hobsbawm, Eric and Terence Ranger (eds), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge, 1983).

Hobson, Bulmer, *Ireland Yesterday and Tomorrow* (Tralee, 1968).

Hobson, J.A., *Imperialism A Study* (New York, 1975).

Holmes, Richard, *Soldiers* (London, 2011).

Holmes, Richard, *Sahib; The British Soldier in India 1750-1914* (London, 2005).

Hoppen, K.Theodore, *The Mid-Victorian Generation, 1846-1886* (Oxford, 1998).

Hoppen, K.Theodore, *Elections, Politics and Society, 1882-1885* (Oxford, 1984).

Howe, Stephen, *Ireland and Empire* (Oxford, 2000).

Hunt, Lynn Avery, *Politics, Culture and Class in the French Revolution* (Berkeley, 1986).

Hyam, Ronald, *Understanding the British Empire* (Cambridge, 2010).

Hyam, Ronald, and Henshaw, Peter, *The Lion and the Springbok: Britain and South Africa since the Boer War* (Cambridge, 2003).

Hyam, Ronald, *Empire and Sexuality: The British Experience* (Manchester, 1991).

Hyam, Ronald, *Britain's Imperial Century, 1815-1914: A Study of Empire and Expansion* (London, 1976).

Iriye, Akira, *Global and Transnational History: The Past, Present, and Future* (Basingstoke, 2013).

Jackson, Alvin, *Ireland 1798-1998: Politics and War* (Oxford, 1999).

Jackson, Alvin, (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Irish History* (Oxford, 2014).

Jackson, Alvin, *Home Rule: An Irish History, 1800-2000* (London, 2003).

Jackson, Tabitha, *The Boer War* (London, 1999).

Jeffrey, Keith, *An Irish Empire? Aspects of Ireland and the British Empire* (Manchester, 1996).

Jeffrey, Keith, *The British Army and The Crisis Of Empire, 1918-22* (Manchester, 1984).

Jenkins, T. A., *Gladstone, Whiggery and the Liberal Party, 1874-1886* (Oxford, 1988).

Jones, Thomas, *The Whitehall Diary: Volume III: Ireland, 1918-1924* Keith Middlemas (ed.), (3 Vols, London, 1971).

Jones, David Seth, *Graziers, Land Reform, and Political Conflict in Ireland* (Washington, 1995).

Jordan, Anthony, J., (ed.) *Boer War to Easter Rising: The Writing of John McBride* (Westport, 2006).

Jordan, Donald E., *Land and Popular Politics in Ireland: Mayo from the Plantations to the Land War* (Cambridge, 1994).

Judd, Denis, and Surridge, Keith, T., *The Boer War* (London, 2002)

Kearney, Hugh, *Contested Ideas Of Nationalism And History* (Cork, 2007).

Kelleher, Margaret, and Murphy, James H., (eds), *Gender Perspectives in Nineteenth Century Ireland: Public and Private Spheres* (Dublin, 1977).

Kelly, James, *Food Rioting in Ireland in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries 'The Moral Economy' and the Irish Crowd* (Dublin, 2017).

Kennedy, Michael, *Ireland and the League Of Nations 1919-1946: International Relations, Diplomacy and Politics* (Dublin, 1996).

Kenny, Kevin, (ed.), *Ireland and the British Empire* (Oxford, 2004).

Keogh, Dermot, *Twentieth Century Ireland: Revolution and State Building* (Dublin, 1994).

Keohane, Leo, *Captain Jack White: Imperialism, Anarchism and the Irish Citizen Army* (Dublin, 2014).

Keown, Gerard, *First of the Small Nations: The Beginnings of the Irish Foreign Policy in the Inter-War Years* (Oxford, 2016).

Kidd, Colin, *British Identities before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationalism in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800* (Cambridge, 1999).

Kilfeather, T.P., *The Connaught Rangers* (Dublin, 1996).

Kinealy, Christine, *Repeal and Revolution: 1848 in Ireland* (Manchester, 2009).

Kinealy, Christine, *The Great Irish Famine: Impact, Ideology and Rebellion* (Basingstoke, 2003).

Kinealy, Christine, *Repeal and Revolution: 1848 in Ireland* (Manchester, 2009).

Kissane, Bill, *Explaining Irish Democracy* (Dublin, 2002).

Kissane, Bill, *The Politics of the Irish Civil War* (Oxford, 2005).

Kissane, Bill, *New Beginnings: Constitutionalism and Democracy in Modern Ireland* (Dublin, 2011).

Klein, Bernard, *On the Uses of History in Recent Irish Writing (*Manchester, 2007).

Knirck, Jason, *Afterimage of the Revolution: Cumann Na nGaedheal and Irish Politics 1922-23* (Madison, 2014).

Knirck, Jason, *Imagining Irish Independence: The Debate over the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921* (Plymouth, 2006).

Koselleck, Reinhardt, *The Practice of Conceptual History: Timing History, Spacing Concepts* (Stanford, 2002).

Kotsonouris, Mary, *The Winding up of the Dáil Courts, 1922-1925* (Dublin, 2004).

Laffan, Micheal, *The Resurrection Of Ireland: The Sinn Fein Party, 1916-1923* (Cambridge, 1999).

Laffan, Michael, *Judging W. T. Cosgrave* (Dublin, 2014)

Laidlaw, Zoe, *Colonial Connections, 1815-45: Patronage, the Information Revolution and Colonial Government* (Manchester, 2005).

Lee, J.J., *Ireland, 1912-85: Politics And Society* (Cambridge,1989).

Leerssen, Joep, *National Thought in Europe: A Cultural History* (Amsterdam, 2006).

Leerssen, Joep, *Remembrance and Imagination: Patterns in the Historical and Literary Representation of Ireland in the Nineteenth Century* (Cork, 1996).

Lefebvre-Regan, Jennifer, *Cosmopolitan Nationalism in the Victorian Empire: Ireland, India and the Politics of Alfred Webb* (Basingstoke, 2009).

Legg, Marie-Louise, *Newspapers and Nationalism: The Irish Provincial Press, 1850-1892* (Dublin, 1999).

Le Quesne, A.L., (ed.), *Victorian Thinkers: Carlyle, Ruskin, Arnold, Morris* (Oxford, 1993).

Lloyd, David, *Ireland after History* (Cork, 1999).

Lowry, Donal, (ed.), *The South African War Reappraised* (Manchester, 2000).

Lloyd, David, *Irish Culture and Colonial Modernity, 1800-2000* (Cambridge, 2011).

Lloyd, David, *Anomalous States: Irish Writing and the Post-Colonial Moment* (London, 1993).

Lyons, J.B. *The Enigma of Tom Kettle: Irish Patriot, Essayist, Poet, British Soldier, 1880-1916* (Dublin 1983).

Lyons, F.S., *John Dillon: A Biography* (London, 1968).

Lyons, F.S., *Culture and Anarchy in Ireland, 1890-1939* (Oxford, 1979).

MacBride, Ian, *History and Memory in Modern Ireland* (Cambridge, 2001).

MacDonagh, Oliver, *States of Mind: A Study of Anglo-Irish Conflict, 1789-1980* (London, 1983).

MacDonagh, Oliver, *Ireland the Union and its Aftermath* (London, 1977).

MacDonagh, Oliver, Mandle, W.F., and Travers, Pauric (eds.), *Irish Culture and Nationalism* (London, 1983).

MacIntyre, David W., *The Britannia Vision: Historians and the Making of the British Commonwealth of Nations, 1907-48* (London, 2009).

Malcolmson, A.P.W., *John Foster: The Politics of the Anglo-Irish Ascendancy* (Oxford, 1978).

Mangan, Nicholas, J.A., *The Cultural Band: Sport, Empire, Society* (London, 1992).

Manning, Maurice, *Irish Political Parties: An Introduction* (Dublin, 1972)

Mansergh, Nicholas, *The Irish Question, 1841-1921: A Commentary on Anglo-Irish Relations and on Social And Political Forces In Ireland in the Age of Reform and Revolution.* (London, 1965).

Mansergh, Nicholas *The Irish Question 1840-1921* (London, 1965, revised edition, first published in 1940).

Mansergh, Nicholas, *The Unresolved Question: The Anglo-Irish Settlement and its Undoing, 1912-72* (London, 1991),

Mansergh, Nicholas, *Nationalism and Independence: Selected Irish Papers,* Diana Mansergh (ed.), (Cork, 1997).

Mansergh, Nicholas, and Mansergh, Diana, *The Independence Years: The Selected Indian and Commonwealth Papers of Nicholas Mansergh* (Oxford, 1999)

Mansergh, Nicholas, *The Commonwealth Experience* (London, 1982).

Mansergh, Nicholas, *The Irish Free State: Its Government and Politics* (London, 1934).

Marley, Laurence, *Michael Davitt: Freelance Radical and Frondeur* (Dublin, 2010).

Martin, F.X., (ed.), *The Irish Volunteers, 1913-1915; Recollections and Documents* (Dublin, 2013).

Martin, F.X., *The Howth Gun-Running and the Kilcoole Gun-Running, 1914* (Dublin, 1964).

Mathews, P.J., *Revival: The Abbey Theatre, Sinn Féin, The Gaelic League and the Co-operative Movement* (Cork, 2003).

Maume, Patrick, *The Long Gestation: Irish Nationalist Life, 1891-1918* (Dublin, 1999).

Mayer, Arno J., *The Persistence of the Old Regime: Europe to the Great War* (New York, 1981).

Mayer, J.P., *Prophet of the Mass Age: A Study of Alexis de Toqueville* (1939)

Mazlish, Bruce, *The New Global History* (New York, 2006).

Mazower, Mark, *Governing the World: The History of an Idea* (London, 2012).

Mazower, Mark, *The Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century* (London, 1998).

McCarthy, Angela, *Irish Migrants in New Zealand, 1840-1937:'The Desired Haven'* (Woodbridge, 2005).

McCarthy, Mark, *Ireland's Heritages: Critical Perspectives on Memory and Identity* (Hants., 2005).

McConnel, James, *The Irish Parliamentary Party and the Third Home Rule Crisis* (Dublin, 2013).

McCord, Norman, *British History, 1815-1914* (Oxford, 2007).

McCracken, Donal .P., *The Irish in Southern Africa, 1795-1910* Durban: Ireland and Southern Africa Project, (1992).

McCracken, Donal .P., *Forgotten Protest: Ireland and the Anglo-Boer War* (Belfast, 2003).

McCracken, Donal .P., *The Irish Pro-Boers, 1977-1902* (Johannesburg, 1989).

McCracken, Donal. P., *MacBride's Brigade: Irish Commandos in the Anglo-Boer War* (Dublin, 1999).

McDonough, Terence, (ed.), *Was Ireland a Colony? Economics, Politics and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin, 2005).

McDowell, R. B., *Alice Stopford Green: A Passionate Historian* (Dublin, 1967).

McDowell, R.B., *The Irish Convention 1917-18* (London, 1970).

McGarry, Fearghal, and McConnel, James, (eds), *The Black Hand of Republicanism: Fenianism in Modern Ireland* (Dublin, 2009).

McGee, Owen, *The IRB: The Irish Republican Brotherhood from the Land League to Sinn Féin* (Sallins, 2005).

McGee, Owen, *Arthur Griffith* (Dublin, 2015).

McIntyre, W. David, *The Britannic Vision: Historians and the Making of the British Commonwealth Of Nations, 1907-48.* (Basingstoke, 2009).

McMahon, Deirdre, *Republicans and Imperialists: Anglo-Irish Relations in the 1930s* (London, 1984).

McMahon, Timothy G., *Grand Opportunity: The Gaelic Revival and Irish Society, 1892-1910* (New York, 2008).

McMahon, Timothy, G., Michael de Nie and Paul A.Townend, (eds.) *Ireland in an Imperial World: Citizenship, Oppostion and Subversion* (London, 2017).

McWilliam, *Popular Politics in Nineteenth-Century England* (London, 1998).

Meehan, Ciara, *The Cosgrave Party: A History of Cumann na nGaedheal,* 1923-33 (Dublin, 2010).

Mehta, Uday, Singh, *Liberalism And Empire: A Study In Nineteenth Century British Liberal Thought* (London, 1999).

Mitchell, Angus, *Casement* (London, 2003).

Moody, T.W., Martin, F.X., Byrne, F.J., Cosgrave, Art, and Vaughan, W. E., *A New History of Ireland* (Oxford, 1976).

Moore, Barrington, *The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World* (Harmondsworth, 1996).

Moran, Gerard, *A Radical Priest in Mayo: Fr. Patrick Lavelle: The Rise and Fall of an Irish Nationalist, 1825-86* (Dublin, 1994).

Moran, Gerard, *The Mayo Evictions of 1860* (Dublin, 1886).

Morrell, Robert, *Changing Men in Southern Africa* (New York, 2001).

Morrison, Jeffrey H., *The Political Philosophy of George Washington* (Baltimore, 2009).

Morrissey, John, Nally David, Strohmayer, Ulf and Whelan, Yvonee, (eds.) *Key Concepts in Historical Geography* (London, 2014).

Munslow, Alun, *Narrative and History* (Basingstoke, 2007)

Navari, Cornelia Tivey, and James, Leonard, *British Politics and the Spirit of the Age: Political Concepts in Action* (Keele, 1996).

Nasson, Bill, *The South African War, 1899-1902* (London, 1999).

Nelson, Bruce, *Irish Nationalists and the Making of the Irish Race* (Princeton, 2012).

Ó 'Broin, Leon, *Dublin Castle and the 1916 Rising: The Story of Sir Matthew Nathan* (Dublin, 1966).

Ó Broin, Leon, *Protestant Nationalists in Revolutionary Ireland: The Stopford Connection* (Dublin, 1985).

Ó Broin, Leon, *Charles Gavan Duffy, Patriot and Statesman: The Story of Charles Gavan Duffy, 1816-1903* (Dublin, 1967).

Ó Broin, Leon, *The Chief Secretary: Augustine Birrell in Ireland* (London, 1969).

O'Callaghan, Margaret, *British High Politics and a Nationalist Ireland: Criminality, Land and the Law under Forster and Balfour* (Cork, 1994).

O'Kell, Robert P., *Disraeli: The Romantic of Politics* (Toronto, 2014).

O'Leary, Cornelius, and Maume, Patrick, *Controversial Issues in Anglo-Irish Relations, 1910-1921* (Dublin, 2004).

Oliver, Frederick Scott, *The Life of Alexander Hamilton: An Essay on American Union* (London, 1931).

O'Mahoney, Patrick, and Delanty, Gerard, *Rethinking Irish History: Nationalism, Identity, and Ideology* (Basingstoke, 1998).

O'Malley, Kate, *Ireland, India and Empire: Indo-Irish Radical Connection 1919-64* (Manchester, 2008).

O'Neill, Ciaran, *Catholics of Consequence: Transnational Education, Social Mobility, and the Irish Catholic Elite, 1850-1900* (Oxford, 20140).

O'Neill, Ciaran, (ed.), *Irish Elites in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin, 2013).

Omissi, David O., and Thompson, David S,. *The Impact of the South African War* (New York, 2002).

O'Rahilly, Aodogan, *Winding the Clock: O'Rahilly and the 1916 Rising* (Dublin, 1991).

O'Ruairc, Pádraic Og, *Revolution: A Photographic History of Revolutionary Ireland, 1913-1923* (Cork, 2011).

O'Siochan, Seamus, (ed.), *Social Thought On Ireland in The Nineteenth Century* (Dublin, 2009).

Osterhammel, Jürgen, *The Transformations of the World: A Global History of the 19th Century* Patrick Cammiller trans. (Princeton, 2009).

O'Sullivan, Kevin, *Ireland, Africa, and the End of Empire: Small State Identity in the Cold War, 1955-75* (Manchester, 2012).

O'Tuama, Sean, (ed.), *The Gaelic League Idea* (Cork, 1972).

Pakenham, Tom, *The Boer War* (New York, 2001).

Pakenham, Tom, *The Year of the French: The Bloody Story of the Great Irish Rebellion of 1798* (London, 1972).

Pareto, Vilfredo, *The Rise and Fall of Elites: An Application of Theoretical Sociology* (New Jersey, 1991).

Parke, Catherine N., *Biography: Writing Lives* (New York 1996).

Pašeta, Senia, *Before the Revolution: Nationalism, Social Change and Ireland's Catholic Elite, 1879-1922*. (Cork, 1999).

Pettit, Philip, *On the People's Terms: A Republican Theory and Models of Democracy* (Cambridge, 2013).

Petrusewicz, Marta, *Latifundium: Moral Economy and Material Life in a European Periphery* (Michigan, 1996).

Philips, Richard, *Sex, Politics and Empire: A Postcolonial Geography* (Manchester, 2006).

Pittock, Murray G.H., *Celtic Identity and the British Image* (Manchester, 1999).

Pocock, J.G.A., *Nineteenth Century Politics, Language and Time; Essays on Political Thought and History* (New York, 1971).

Pocock, J.G.A., *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Though and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton, 1976).

Pocock, J.G.A., *Politics, Language and Time: The Discovery of Islands: Essays in British HIstory* (Cambridge, 2005).

Poovey, Mary, *Uneven Developments: The Ideological Work of Gender in Mid-Victorian England* (London, 1989).

Poovey, Mary, *Making a Social Body: British Cultural Formation, 1830-1864* (London, 1995).

Potter, Matthew, *The Life and Times of William Monsell, First Baron Emly of Tervoe (1812-1894): A Catholic Unionist* (Limerick, 1994).

Porter, Bernard, *The Absent-Minded Imperialists: Empire, Society and Culture in Britain* (Oxford, 2004).

Potter, Simon, (ed.), *Newspapers and Empire in Ireland and Britain: Reporting the British Empire c. 1857-1921* (Dublin, 2004).

Prager, Jeffrey, *Building Democracy in Ireland: Political Order and Cultural Integration in a newly Independent Nation* (Cambridge, 1986).

Pretorius, F. Fransjohan, *The Anglo-Boer War, 1899-1902* (Cape Town, 1998).

Pretorius, F. Fransjohan, *Scorched Earth* (Cape Town, 2001).

Pretorius, F. Fransjohan, *The Great Escape of the Boer Pimpernel, Christiaan de Wet: The Making of a Legend* (Pietermaritzburg, 2001).

Price, Dominic, *The Flame and the Candle: War in Mayo, 1919-1924* (Cork, 2012).

Purdue, Olwen, *The Big House in the North of Ireland: Land, Power and Social Elites 1878-1960* (Dublin, 2009).

Rafferty, Oliver P., *The Catholic Church and the Protestant State: Nineteenth Century Irish Realities* (Dublin, 2008).

Ramsay, Maureen, *What's Wrong With Liberalism?:A Radical Critique Of Liberal Political Philosophy* (London, 2004)

Regan, John M., *The Irish Counter-Revolution1921-1936: Treatyite Politics and Settlement in Independent Ireland* (Dublin, 1996).

Regan, John M., *Myth and the Irish State* (Dublin, 2013).

Reid, Colin, *The Lost Ireland Of Stephen Gwynn: Irish Constitutional Nationalism And Cultural Politics, 1864-1950* (Manchester, 2011).

Robertson, Nora, *Crowned Harp: Memories of the Last Years of the Crown in Ireland* (Dublin, 1960).

Robinson, Robert, Edward, Gallagher, John, and Denny, Alice, *Africa and the Victorians: The Official Mind of Imperialism* (London, 1961).

Rodgers, Daniel T., *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age* (London, 1998).

Said, Edward, *Culture and Imperialism* (London, 1993).

Sandel, Michael J., *Liberalism and Its Critics* (New York, 1984).

Schama, Simon, *Citizens: A Chronicle of the French Revolution* (London, 1989).

Schwartz, Bill, *White Man's World* (Oxford, 2011).

Shields, Andrew, *The Irish Conservative Party 1852-1868: Land, Politics, and Religion* (Dublin, 2007).

Shore, Chris, and Nugent, Stephen *Elite Cultures: Anthropological Perspectives* (London, 2002).

Sibbald, Raymond, *The Boer War* (Great Britain, 1977).

Silvestri, Michael, *Ireland and India: Nationalism, Empire and Memory* (Basingstoke, 2009).

Sinha, Mrinalini, *Colonial Masculinity: The 'Manly Englishman' and the 'Effeminate Bengali' in the Late Nineteenth Century* (Manchester, 1995).

Sisson, Elaine, *Pearse's Patriots: St Enda's and the Cult of Boyhood* (Cork, 2004).

Smith, Anthony D., *National Identity* (London, 1991).

Smith, Iain R., *The Origins of the South African War, 1899-1902* (London, 1996).

Smout, T.C., *Victorian Values*, A Joint Symposium Of The Royal Society Of Edinburgh and The British Academy, (December 1990), (Oxford, 1992)

Smyth, John, McGowan, Christopher *The Theory and Practice of the Irish Senate* (Dublin, 1972).

Spiers, Edward M., *The Late Victorian Army* (Manchester, 1992).

Spiers, Edward M., *The Victorian Soldier in Africa* (Manchester, 2004).

Stedman, Jones Gareth, and Claeys, Gregory, (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth-Century Thought* (Cambridge, 2011).

Stephens, Susan A., and Vasunia, Phiroze, (eds.) *Classics and National Cultures* (Oxford, 2010).

Streets, Heather, *Martial Races: The Military Race and Masculinity in British Military Culture 1857-1914* (Manchester, 2004).

Surridge, Keith T., *Managing the South African War 1899-1902: Politicians V. Generals* (London, 1996).

Suzman, Mark, *Ethnic Nationalism and State Power: The Rise of Irish Nationalism, Afrikaner Nationalism and Zionism* (London, 1999).

Swift, Roger and Gilley, Sheridan (eds), *Irish Identities in Victorian Britain* (2011).

Tanner, Duncan, *Debating Nationhood and Governance in Britain, 1885-1945* (Manchester, 2006).

Thompson, J. Lee, *A Wider Patriotism: Alfred Milner and the British Empire* (London, 2007).

Thornley, David, *Isaac Butt and Home Rule* (London, 1964).

Tierney, Michael, *Eoin MacNeill, Scholar and Man Of Action, 1867-1945.* (Oxford, 1980).

Tonra, Ben, Kennedy, Michael, Doyle, John, and Dorr Noel (eds), *Irish Foreign Policy* (Dublin, 2012).

Torrance, David E., *The Strange Death of the Liberal Empire: Lord Selborne in South Africa* (Liverpool, 1996).

Tosh, John, (ed.), *Historians and History* (Essex, 2000).

Tosh, John, *The Point of History* (Essex, 1984).

Tosh, John, *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England* (London, 1991).

Townend, Paul, A., *The Road to Home Rule: Anti-Imperialism and the Irish National Movement* (London, 2016).

Townshend, Charles, *Ireland: The Twentieth Century* (London, 1999).

Townshend, Charles, *Easter 1916: The Irish Rebellion* (London, 2005).

Townsend, Charles, *The Republic: The Fight for Irish Independence 1918-1923* (London, 2014).

Turner, Frank M., and Lofthouse, Richard, *European Intellectual History from Rousseau to Nietzsche* (New Haven, 2014).

Valente, Joseph, *The Myth of Manliness in Irish National Culture 1880-1922* (Ilinois, 2011).

Vann, J. Donn and Van Arsdel, Rosemary, T., *Victorian Periodicals and Victorian Society* (Buffalo, 1994).

Vargas, Llosa Mario, *The Dream of the Celt* (London, 2012).

Vaughan, W.E., *Landlords & Tenants in Mid-Victorian Ireland* (Oxford, 1994).

Webster, Wendy, *Englishness and Empire, 1939-1965* (Oxford, 2005).

Webster, Anthony, *The Debate on the {Sic} Rise of the British Empire* (Manchester, 2006).

Weiss, Ruth, *Peace in their Time: War and Peace in Ireland and Southern Africa* (London and New York, 2000).

West, Trevor, *Horace Plunkett: Co-Operation and Politics: An Irish Biography* (Gerrards Cross, 1986).

West, Shearer, (ed.), *The Victorians and Race* (Hants., 1996).

Whelehan, Niall, (ed.), *Transnational Perspectives on Modern Irish History* (Oxon, 2015).

White, Hayden V., *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representations* (Baltimore, 1987).

Whyte, J.H., *The Tenant League and Irish Politics in the Eighteen-Fifties* (Dundalk, 1963).

Winstanley, Michael J., *Gladstone and the Liberal Party* (London, 1990)

Wilson, David, A., *Thomas D'Arcy McGee: Passion, Reason and Politics 1825-1857Vol 1* (Montreal, 2008)

Wilson, David, A., *Thomas D'Arcy McGee; The Extreme Moderate 1857-1868 Vol. 11* ( )

ii) Journals and Collected Works.

Adam, Thomas, and Luebken, Uwe, 'Introduction' in *Bulletin* of the German Historical Institute, vol. 55 (Fall, 2014), pp 1-8.

Allen, Nicholas, 'Out of Eure Sanscreed into Oure Eryan': Ireland, the Classics, and Independence' in Susan A. Stephens, and Vasunia, Phiroze (eds), *Classics and National Cultures* (Oxford, 2010).

Anbinder, Tyler, 'Lord Palmerston and the Irish Famine Emigration' in *The Historical Journal,* vol. 44, no. 6 (January, 2001), pp 441-469.

Atkinson, John, 'Benjamin Farrington: Cape Town and the Shaping of a Public Intellectual' in *South African Journal,* vol. 62, no. 4 (2010), pp 671-692.

Aurell, Jaume, 'Autobiographical Texts as Historiographical Sources: Rereading Fernand Braudel and Annie Kriegel' in *Biography,* vol. 29, no. 3 (Summer, 2006), pp 425-445.

Badsey, Stephen, 'The Boer War (1899-1902), and British Cavalry Doctrine: A Re-Evaluation' in *The Journal of Military History,* no. 71 (January, 2007), pp 75-97.

Ballantyne, Tony, 'Empires, Modernisations and Modernities' in *International Journal for History, Culture and Modernity,* vol.12, no. 1 (2014), pp 25-42.

Ballantyne, Tony, 'Putting the Nation in its place?: World History and C.A. Bayly's *The Birth of the Modern World'* in Ann, Curthoys and Marilyn Lake (eds), *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspectives* (Canberra, 2005)

Ballantyne, Tony, 'The Changing Shape of the Modern British Empire and its Historiography' in *The Historical Journal,* vol. 53, no. 2 (June, 2010), pp 429-452.

Ballantyne, Tony and Burton, Antoinette, 'Introduction: Bodies, Empires and World Histories in *Bodies in Contact: Rethinking colonial Encounters in World History* (Durham, N.C., 2005).

Banner, Lois, M., 'Biography as History' in *The American Historical Review,* vol. 114, no. 3 (June, 2009), pp 579-586.

Bartlett, Thomas, '"So Many Wheels Within Wheels": the 1792 Catholic Relief Act Revisited' in D.W. Hayton and Andrew R. Holmes, (eds), *Ourselves Alone? : Religion, Society and Politics in Eighteenth Century Ireland* (Dublin, 2016)

Bartlett, Thomas, 'The Catholic Question in the Eighteenth Century' in *History Ireland,* vol.1, no. 1 (Spring, 1993), pp 17-21.

Bayly, C.A., 'Ireland, India and the Empire: 1780-1914' in *Transaction of the Royal Historical Society* vol. 10 (2008) pp 377-397.

Boyce. D.G., 'Brahmins and Carnivores: The Irish Historian in Great Britain' in Ronan Fanning and David Harkness (eds), *The Joint Journal of the Irish Historical Society and the Ulster Society for Irish Historical Studies,* vol. xxv, no. 99, (May, 1987), pp 225-235.

Boyce, D., George, 'Trembling Solicitude: Irish Conservatism, Nationality and Public Opinion, 1833-86' in D.George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall and Vincent Geoghan (eds), *Political Thought in Ireland Since The Seventeenth Century,* (London 1993).

Bradley, Anthony, 'Hearts of Darkness: Conrad, Casement and the Congo' in *ARIEL: A Review of International Literature,* vol.34, nos. 2-3 (April-July, 2003), pp 197-214.

Brann, Private R.W. 'Wynberg Military Base and The Army Officers Club' in *Scientia Militaria, South African Journal Of Military Studies,* vol. 19, no. 1 (1989), pp 1-11.

Brasted, H.V., 'Irish Nationalists and the British Empire in the Nineteenth Century' in Oliver MacDonagh, W.F. Mandle and David Harkness (eds), *Irish Culture and Nationalism, 1750-1950* (London, 1983).

Braudel, Fernand, and Kriegel, Annie, in *Biography,* Biographical Research Centre, vol. 293 (Summer, 2006) pp 425-445.

Briggs, Asa, 'The Language of Class' in Early 19th Century England' in Asa Briggs and John Saville (eds), *Essays In Labour History* (London, 1960).

Bromage, Arthur W. and Bromage, Mary C., 'Foreign Government and Politics: The Vocational Senate in Ireland' in *The American Political Science Review,* vol. 34, no. 3 (January, 1940), pp. 519-538.

Brown, Peter, 'How Revolutionary were the Irish Volunteers?' in *History Ireland,* vol. 21, no. 6 (November, December, 2013), pp 32-36.' In *Irish Historical Studies,* vol. 28, no. 111 (May, 1993), pp 283-305.

Bull, Philip, 'The Significance of the National Response to the Land Act of 1903

Burdiel, Isabel, 'The Liberal Revolution 18018-1843' in José Alvarez Junco and Adrian Shubert, (eds), *Spanish History Since 1808* (London, 2000).

Campbell, Fergus, 'Irish Popular Politics and the Making of the Wyndham Land Act 1901-1903' in *Historical Journal* vol. 45, no. 4 (2002), pp 755-773.

Carson, Kevin A., 'Legibility & Control: Themes in the Work of James C. Scott' Centre for a Stateless Society, paper no. 12 (Winter/Spring, 2011).

Cleary, Joe 'Republicanism and Aristocracy in Modern Ireland' in *Field Day Review,* vol.10, (2014), pp 5-39.

Cleary, Joe, ‘Misplaced Ideas? Location and Dislocation Ireland in Colonial and Postcolonial Studies’ in Crystal Bartolovich and Neil Lazurus, (eds), *Marxism, Modernity and Postcolonial Studies* (Cambridge, 2002).

Clendinnen, Inga, ‘The History Question: Who Owns the Past? in *QE,* 23 (2006), pp 1-23.

Coakley, John, ‘The Rise and Fall of Minor Parties in Ireland’ in *Irish Political Studies,* vol. 25, no. 4 (December, 2010), pp 503-538.

Coleman, Marie, ‘Ireland after the Rising 1916-18’ in *Changed Utterly, the 1917 By-Elections and the Rise of Sinn Féin, History Ireland: Supplement: Changed Utterly. Ireland after the Rising* (2017), pp 22-25.

Collini, Stefan, ‘The Idea of Character in Victorian Political Thought,’ in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 5th Series vol.35., (1985), pp 29-50.

Collini, Stefan ‘Idealism and 'Cambridge Idealism’ *The Historical Journal,* vol. 18 no.1 (March, 1975), pp 171-177.

Collini, Stefan, Biddess, Michael, Hollingworth, David, Skinner, Quentin, Pocock, J.G., B Kuklick, Bruce, Hunter, Michael ‘What is intellectual History’ in *History Today,* vol. 35, no. 10 (1985), (ref. From Michael Hunter 5603-10 no. 5), pp 46-54.

Crosbie, Barry, ‘Networks of Linkage: Empire and Reciprocity in Nineteenth-Century Irish and Indian History’ in *History Compass,* vol.7, no. 3 (2009), pp 993-1007.

Cullen, L.M., ‘Economic Development, 1691-1750’ in Moody, T.W., and Vaughan W.E., (eds), *A New History of Ireland IV: Eighteenth Century Ireland* (Oxford, 1986).

Curtis, Perry L., ‘Demonising the Irish Landlords Since the Famine’ in Brian Casey (ed.), *Defying the Law of the Land: Agrarian Radicalism in Irish History* (Dublin, 2013).

Curtis, L.P., ‘Encumbered Wealth: Landed Indebtedness in Post-Famine Ireland’ in *The American Historical Review,* vol. 85, no. 2 (April, 1980), pp 332-367.

Darwin, John, ‘A Third British Empire? The Dominion Idea in Imperial Politics’ in Judith M. Brown and W.M. Louis (eds), *The Oxford History of the British Empire: The Twentieth Century* (Oxford, 1999).

Davis, Natalie Zemon ‘On The Lame’ in *The American Historical Review,* vol. 93, no. 3. (January, 1998), pp 572-603.

Delaney, Enda, ‘Directions in Historiography: Our Island Story? Towards a Transnational History of Late Modern Ireland’ in *Irish Historical Studies,* vol. xxxvii, no. 148 (November, 2011), pp 83-105

Delaney, Enda, and MacRaild, Donald, M., 'Irish Migration, Networks and Ethic Identities Since 1750: An Introduction' in *Immigrants and Minorities,* vol. 23, nos. 3-4 (2003), pp 127-142.

De Nie, Michael, Moulton, Mo, O'Neill, Ciaran and Delaney, Enda, 'Roundtable Discussion" Teaching Transnational Irish History' *Éire-Ireland,* vol. 51, nos. 1&2 (Spring/Summer, 2016), pp 266-276.

Denman, Terence 'The Red Livery Of Shame' The Campaign Against Army Recruitment in Ireland, 1899-1914' in *Irish Historical Studies*, vol. 29, no. 114 (November, 1994), pp 208-233.

Depkat, Volker, 'The Challenges of Biography: European - American Reflections' *Bulletin,* of the German Historical Institute, vol. 55, (Fall, 2014), pp 39-48.

Diggins, John Patrick, 'The Oyster and the Pearl': The Problem of Contextualism in Intellectual History' in *History and Theory*, vol. 23, no. 2 (May, 1984), pp 151-169.

Dillon, Geraldine, 'Irish Republican Brotherhood' in *Irish University Review*, vol. 2, no. 9 (Spring, 1962), pp 23-36.

Diver, Luke, 'Ireland's South African War, 1899-1902' in *Scientia Militaria, South African Journal Of Military Studies,* vol. 42, (2014), pp 1-17.

Diver, Luke, 'What's New in Manuscripts:The letters of George Wardell and the Battle of Isandlwana 1879' in *History Ireland,* vol. 24, no. 1 (January, February, 2016), pp 34-37.

Dooley, Terence, and McCarthy, Tony, 'The 1923 Land Act: Some New Perspectives' in Mel Farrell, Jason Knirck and Ciara Meehan (eds), *A Formative Decade: Ireland in the 1920s* (Sallins, 2015).

Dooley, Terence 'Land and Politics in Independent Ireland 1923-48: The Case for Reappraisal' in *Irish Historical Studies*, vol. 34, no. 134 (November, 2004), pp 175-197.

Douma, Michael James, 'Ethnic Identities in a Transnational Context: The Dutch American Reaction to the Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902' in *South African Historical Journal,* vol. 65, no. 4 (2013), pp 481-503.

Doyle, Francis Bernard, O.F.M., 'South Africa' in Patrick J. Corish (ed.), in *A History of Irish Catholicism,* (Dublin, 1971).

Dude, Saurabh, 'Historical Identity and Cultural Difference: A Critical Note' in *Economic and Political Weekly,* vol. 37, no. 1 (January, 2002), pp 77-81.

Duggan, Christopher, 'The Nation, Nationalism and The National Principle' in Gregory Claeys (ed.), *Encyclopedia Of Nineteenth Century Thought* (Oxon. 2005).

Ellis, Steven G., 'Writing Irish History: Revisionism, Colonialism and the British Isles' in *The Irish Review,* no. 19 (Spring-Summer, 1996), pp 1- 21

Ellis, Steven G., ‘Historiographical Debate: Representations of the PST in Ireland: Whose Past and Whose Present’ in *Irish Historical Studies,* vol. 27, no. 108 (November, 1991), pp 289-308.

Ellison, Robert H., and Engelhardt, Carol Marie, ‘Prophecy and Anti-Popery in Victorian London: John Cumming Reconsidered’ in *Victorian Literature and Culture,* Victorian Religion vol. 31, no. 1(2003), pp 373-389.

English, Richard, ‘Green on Red: Two Case Studies in Early Twentieth Century Irish Republican Thought’ in George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall and Vincent Geoghan (eds), *Political Thought in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1993).

Fabricant, Carole, ‘Colonial Sublimities and Sublimations, Swift, Burke, and Ireland’ in *ELH,* Essays in Honour of Ronald Paulson, vol. 72, no. 2 (Summer, 2005), pp 309-337.

Fannin, Samuel, ‘Spanish Archives of Primary Source Material: Malaga, Córdoba, Granada and Cadiz’ in *The Irish Geneologist,* vol.13, no. 3 (2012), pp 1-25.

Fay, Brian, ‘History and Theory: The Next Fifty Years’ in *History and Theory,* Theme Issue 49, vol. 149, no. 4 (December, 2010), pp 1-5.

Fay, Brian, ‘Introduction: Unconventional History’ in *History and Theory*, Theme Issue Unconventional History, vol 41, no. 4 (December, 2002), pp 1-6,

Fedorowich, Kent, ‘Reconstruction and Resettlement: The Politicisation of Irish Migration to Australia and Canada, 1919-29’ in *The English Historical Review,* vol. 114, no. 459 (November, 1999), pp 1143-78.

Fitzpatrick, David, ‘Irish Consequences of the Great War’ in *Irish Historical Studies,* vol. 39, no. 156 (November, 2015), pp 643-658.

Fleming, Neil C., ‘Aristocratic Rule? Unionism and Northern Ireland’ in *History Ireland,* vol. 15, no. 6 (November, - December, 2007), pp 26-31.

Foster, R.F., ‘Forward to Methuselah; The Progress of Nationalism’ in Terence Dooley, (ed.), *Ireland’s Polemical Past: Views of Irish History in Honour of R.V. Comerford* (Dublin, 2010).

Foster, Gavin, ‘Res Publica na hÉireann? Republican Liberty and the Irish Civil War’ in *New Hibernia Review/ Iris Éireannach Nua,* vol 16, no. 3 (Fómhar/Autumn, 2012), pp 20-42.

Frazier, Adrian, ‘Fraticidal Fictions: George and Maurice Moore’ in *New Hibernia Review/Irish Éireannach Nua,* vol. 3, no. 4 (Winter, 1999), pp 118-129.

Gahan, Peter, ‘Bernard Shaw and the 1917 Irish Convention’ in *Ireland after the Rising, 1916-18: Changed Utterly, History Ireland* (2017), pp 81-85.

Garnham, Neal, '"The Only Thing British that Everybody Likes:" Military, Civilian Relations In Late Victorian Ulster' in *Éire: Ieland,* vol. 41 no. 324, Fómhar/Geimhreadh/ (Fall/Winter 2006), pp 59-79.

Geertz, Clifford, 'Primordial and Civic Ties,' in John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith (eds), *Nationalism* (Oxford, 1994).

Geyer, O. 'Irish Independence: Jan Smuts and Eamonn De Valera in *The Round Table,* (1998), pp 473-484.

Gewarth, Robert and Manela, Erez, 'The Great War as a Global War: Imperial Conflict and the Reconfiguration of World Order, 1911-1923' in *Diplomatic History,* vol. 38, no. 4 (2014), pp 786-800.

Gilbert, Felix, 'Intellectual History: Its Aims and Methods' in *Daedalus: Historical Studies Today,* vol. 100, no. 1 (Winter, 1971), pp 80-97.

Goodland, Lauren M.E. "'A Middle Class Cut In Two' Historiography and Victorian National Character" in *ELH,* vol. 67, no. 1 (Spring, 2000), pp 143-178.

Gordon, Peter E., 'What is Intellectual History? : A Frankly Partisan Introduction to a Frequently Misunderstood Field' The Harvard Colloquiem, (2012).

Grant, Adrian, 'Workers to the Rescue: Workers International Relief in Ireland, 1925' in *20th Century Contemporary History Features,* vol. 19, issue.1 (January/February, 2011), pp 38-41.

Grew, Raymond, 'The Case for Comparing Histories' in *The American Historical Review,* vol. 85, no. 4 (October, 1980), pp 763-778.

Guelke, Adrian, 'The Flexibility of Northern Ireland Unionists and Afrikaner Nationalists in Comparative Perspective' (Institute for British Irish Studies, Working Papers 99), University College Dublin, pp 1-10.

Guelke, Adrian, 'Ireland and South Africa: A very Special Relationship' in *Irish Studies in International Affairs,* vol. II (2000), pp 137-146.

Guelke, Adrian, 'The Peace Process in South Africa, Israel and Northern Ireland: A Farewell to Arms?' in *Irish Studies in International Affairs,* vol. 5 (1994), pp 93-106.

Harders, Levke, 'Legitimizing Biography: Critical Approaches to Biographical Research' in *Bulletin* of the German Historical Institute, vol. 55 (Fall, 2014), pp 39-56.

Harris, José, 'Epilogue' in Garth Stedman and Gregory Claeys (eds), *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth Century Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2011).

Harvey, Karen and Shephard, Alexandra, 'What Have Historians Done With Masculinities? Reflections on Five Centuries of British History circa 1500-1950' in *Journal of British Studies,* vol. 44, no. 2 (April, 2005) pp 274-280.

Hayden, Anthony P., 'Sir Matthew Nathan: Ireland Before' in *Studia Hibernica,* no. 15 (1975) pp 162-176.

Hayton, D.W., and Holmes Andrew R., (eds), *Ourselves Alone? : Religion, Society and Politics in Eighteenth-and Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin, 2016).

Heinz, John P., Laumann, Edward, O. Salisbury Robert H. and Nelson, Robert L. 'Inner Circles or Hollow Cores? Elite Networks in National Policy Systems' in *The Journal of Politics,* vol. 52, no.2 (May, 1990), pp 356-390.

Hirson, Baruch, 'Ruth Schecter: Friend to Olive Schreiner: The Intellectual and Socialist' in *Searchlight South Africa,* vol. 3, no. 1 (August, 1992), pp 47-71.

Holmes, Michael and Holmes, Denis, (eds), 'Victorian Ireland: Irishness and Britishness, 1838-1904 in *The Oxford History of the British Empire Vol. III: The Nineteenth Century* (Oxford, 1999).

Honahan, Iseult, 'Putting Irish Republicanism in a Wider Context' in Iseult Honahan (ed.), *Republicans in Ireland: Confronting Theories and Traditions* (Manchester, 2008).

Hone, Joseph, 'Sir William Gregory' in *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review,* vol. 44, no. 175 (Autumn, 1955), pp 337-341.

Hutchinson, John, 'The Irish Revival, Elite Competition and the First World War' in Ciaran O'Neill (ed.), *Irish Elites in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin, 2013).

Hutton, Patrick H. 'The History Of Mentalities: The New Map Of Cultural History' in *History And Theory,* vol. 20, no. 3 (October, 1981

Hyslop, Jonathan, 'Undesirable Inhabitants of the Union...Supplying Liquor to Natives: D.F. Malans and the Deportation of South Africa's British and Irish Lumpen Proletarians, 1924-1933' in *Kronos,* no. 40, (November, 2014), pp 178-197.

Hyslop, Jonathan, 'Scottish Labour, Race, and Southern African Empire c. 1880-1922: A Reply to Kenefick' in *International Instituut Voor Sociale Geschiedenis* vol. 55 (2010), pp 63-81.

Hyslop, Jonathan, 'Problems of Explanation in the Study of Afrikaner Nationalism: A Case Study of the West Rand' in *Journal of South African Studies,* vol. 22, no. 3 (September, 1996), pp 373-385.

Hyslop, Jonathan, 'On Biography: A Response to Ciraj Rassool' in *South African Review of Sociology,* vol. 41, no. 2 (2010), pp 104-115.

Hyslop, Jonathan, ‘Comparative Historical Sociology and Transnational History: A Response to Julian Go’s Patterns of Empire’ in *Comparative Studies of South Asia and the Middle East,* vol. 34, no. 3 (2014), pp 610-617.

Jordan, Thomas E., ‘Queen Victoria’s Irish Soldiers: Quality of Life and Social Origins of the Thin “Green” Line’ in *Social Indicators Research,* vol. 57, no. 1 (January, 2002), pp 73-85.

Joyce, Toby, ‘Ireland’s Trained and Marshalled Manhood: The Fenians in the mid-1860s’ in Margaret Kelleher and James H. Murphy (eds), *Gender Perspectives in Nineteenth Century Ireland: Public and Private Spheres* (Dublin, 1997).

Karsten, Peter, ‘Irish Soldiers in the British Army, 1792-1922: Suborned or Subordinate?’ In *Journal of Social History,* vol.17. no. 1 (Autumn, 1983), pp 31-64.

Kelly, Darren, ‘The Irish Free State’s First Diplomats: Jealousy, Antisemitism and Revenge’ in *History Ireland,* vol. 24, no. 1 (January/February, 2016), pp 44-46.

Kennedy, Michael, ‘Civil Servants Cannot Be Politicians:' The Professionalisation of the Irish Foreign Service 1919-22’ in *Irish Studies in International Affairs,* vol. 8 (1997), pp 95-109.

Keogh, Richard, and McConnel, James, ‘The Esmonde Family of County Wexford and Catholic Loyalty’ in Oliver P. Rafferty S.J., (ed.), *Irish Catholic Identities* (Manchester, 2013).

Keogh, Richard A., ‘“ Nothing is So Bad for the Irish as Ireland Alone”” William Keogh and Catholic Loyalty’ in *Irish Historical Studies* xxxviii, no. 150 (November, 2012), pp 230-248.

Kissane, Bill, ‘The Re-Equilibration of Democracy in Inter-War Ireland’ in *Democratization,* vol. 6, no. 3 (1999), pp 190-210.

Klemencic, Matjaz and Harris, Mary, N., (eds), *European Migrations, Diasporas and Indigenous Ethnic Minorities* (Pisa, 2009).

Knirck, Jason, ‘The Dominion of Ireland: The Anglo-Irish Treaty in an Imperial Context’ in *Éire/Ireland* Farrach/Samradh Spring/Summer, (2007), pp 229-255.

Konstantaras, Dean, ‘Culture, Structure and Reciprocity: *Histoire Croisée* and its Uses for the Conceptualization of the Rise and Spread of National Movements in Europe and the Atlantic World during the Age of Revolutions’ in *European Review of History,* vol. 20, no. 8 (2012), pp 383-405.

Krikorian, Jacqueline, ‘British Imperial Politics and Judicial Independence: The Judicial Committee’ in *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue Canadienne de Science Politique,* vol.33, no.2 (June, 2000), pp 291-332.

La Capra, Dominick, ‘Rethinking Intellectual History and Reading Texts’ in *History and Theory,* (1980), pp 245-276.

Lake, Marilyn, 'On History and Politics' in Stuart MacIntyre (ed.)*The Historian's Conscience: Australian Historians on the Ethics of History* (Melbourne, 2004)

Lane, Fintan, 'William Thompson, Class and his Irish Context, 1775-1833' Fintan Lane (ed.), *Politics, Society and the Middle Class in Modern Ireland* (London, 2010).

Larkin, Emmet, 'Church, State and Nation in Modern Ireland' in *The American Historical Review,* vol. No. 5 (December, 1975), pp 1244-1276.

Lässig, Simone, 'Towards A Biographical Turn? : Biography In Modern Historiography-Modern Historiography In Biography' in *German Historical Institute Bulletin,* no. 35 (Fall, 2004), pp 147-155.

Lecky, W.E.H., *A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century* abridged and with an introduction by L.P. Curtis Jr. (Chicago, 1972) first published (1892-6).

Leersen, Joep, 'Ango-Irish Patriotism and its European Context: Notes towards a Reassessment' in *Eighteenth Century Ireland, Iris An Dá Chultúir,* (eds), Eagarthóirí, Alan Harrison and Ian Campbell Ross vol. 111 (Dublin, 1988), pp 7-24.

Lepore, Jill, 'Historians Who Love Too Much: Reflections on Microhistory and Biography' in *The Journal of American History,* vol. 88, no. 1 (June, 2001), pp 129-144.

Livesey, James, 'From the Ancient Constitution to Democracy: Transformations in Republicanism in the Eighteenth Century' in Thomas Bartlett, David Dickson, Daíre Keogh and Kevin Whelan, (eds), *1798:A Bicentenary Perspective* (Dublin, 2003).

Lorimer, Douglas A., 'Race, Science and Culture: Historical Continuities and Discontinuities, 1850-1914' in Shearer West (ed.), *The Victorians and Race* (Hants., 1996).

Lorimer, Douglas, 'From Victorian Values to White Virtues' in Philip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis, *Rediscovering the British World* (Calgary, 2005).

Lowry, Donal, 'New Ireland, Old Empire and the Outside World, 1922-49: The Strange Evolution of a "Dictionary Republic"' in Mike Cronin and John M.Regan (eds), *Ireland: The Politics of Independence 1922-49* (New York, 20001).

Lowry, Donal, 'The Captive Dominion: Imperial Realties behind Irish Diplomacy, 1922-49' in *Irish Historical Studies,* vol. xxxvi, no 142, (November, 2008), pp 202-226.

Lowry, Donal, 'The Fellowship of Disaffection: Irish South African Relations from the Anglo-Boer War to the Pretoriastroika, 1901-1991'in *Étude Irlandaise,* vol. 17, no. 2 (1991), pp 105-121

Lush, Nicola, 'The Irish Connection' in *Theatre Ireland,* no. 8 (Winter, 1984), pp 99-101.

Lyons, J.B. 'Oliver St John Gogarty' in *Dublin Historical Record,* vol. 38 no. 1 (Dec., 1984), pp 2-13.

Lynch, Niamh, 'Defining Irish Nationalist Anti-Imperialism: Tomas Davis and John Mitchel' in *Éire-Ireland,* vol. 42, no. 192 (Spring/Summer, 2007), pp 82-107.

Lynn, Shane, 'Osmond Esmonde's Dominion Odyssey: Irish Nationalism in the British Empire' in *The Australasian Journal of Irish Studies,* vol. 14 (2014).

Lynn, Shane, 'Friends of Ireland: Early O'Connellism in Lower Canada' in *Irish Historical Studies,* vol. 40, no. 157 (2016), pp 43-65.

Lynn, Shane, 'Before the Fenians: 1848 and the Irish Plot to Invade Canada' in *Éire-Ireland,* vol. 51, nos. 1&2 (Spring/Summer, 2016), pp 61-91.

McAuliffe, Mary, 'The Campaign against Conscription, 1918' in *Ireland after the Rising, 1916-18: Changed Utterly, History Ireland* (2017), pp 46-48.

Mandler, Peter, 'Race and 'Nation' in Mid-Victorian Thought' in Stefan Collini, Richard Whatmore and Brian Young (eds), *History, Religion and Culture in British Intellectual History 1750-1950* (Cambridge, 2000).

Manela, Erez, 'Peoples of Many Races: The World beyond Europe in the Wilsonian Imagination' in John Milton Cooper and Thomas J. Knock (eds), *Jefferson, Lincoln and Wilson: The Dilemma of Race and Democracy* (Virginia, 2010).

Manela, Erez, 'The United States in the World' in E. Foner and L. McGirr (eds), in *American History Now,* (Philadelphia, 2011).

Manoff, Marlene, 'Theories of the Archive from Across the Disciplines' in *Libraries and the Academy,* vol. 4, no. 1(January, 2004), pp 9-25.

Marjanen, Jani, 'Undermining Methodological Nationalism: Historie Croiseé of Concepts as Transnational History' in Matthias Albert, Gesa Bluhim, Jan Helmig, Andreas Leutzsch and Jochen Walter (eds.) 'Transnational Political Spaces: Agents-Structures-Encounters'in *Histoirische Politikforschung,* 181(Frankfurt/New York, 2009), pp 239-263

Marks, Shula, 'White Masculinity, Jan Smuts and the South African War,' Proceedings of the British Academy, III (2001)

Mathews, P.J., 'Stirring Up Disloyalty: The Irish Literary Theatre and the Emergence of a New Separatism' in *Irish University Review,* vol. 33, no. 1, (2003), pp 99-116.

McConnell, James, 'John Redmond and Irish Catholic Loyalism' in *English Historical Review,* vol. CXXV, no. 512. (2010), pp 83-111.

McConnel, James, ‘Fenians at Westminster: The Edwardian Irish Parliamentary Party and the Legacy of the New Departure’ in *Irish Historical Studies,* vol. 34, no. 133 (May, 2004), pp 42-64

McConnel, James, ‘“Après La Guerre’: John Redmond, The Irish Volunteers and Armed Constitutionality, 1913-1915’ in *English Historical Review,* vol. cxxxi, no. 553 (December, 2016), pp 1445-1470.

McCracken, Donal P., ‘The Imperial British Newspaper with Special Reference to South Africa, India and the ‘Irish Model’ in *Critical Arts,* vol. 29, no. 1 (2015) pp 5-25.

McCracken, Donal P. ‘A minority of a Minority of a Minority, The Irish in South Africa,’ in McCracken, Donal P., ‘Equivocators or Zealots? Post-Revolutionary Re-Imagining Colonial Languages, Names and Name Change’ in *Critical Arts,* vol. 26, no. 4 (2012), pp 447-465.

McCracken, Donal P., ‘The Imperial British Newspaper, with Special Reference to South Africa, India and the ‘Irish Model’ in *Critical Arts,* vol. 29, no. 1 (2015), pp 5-25.

McCracken, Donal P., ‘Imperial Running Dogs or Wild Geese Reporters? : Irish Journalists in South Africa’ in *Historia,* vol. 58, (May/Mei, 2013), pp 122-138.

McKenna, Mark, ‘Writing the Past: History, Literature and the Public,’ in *Best Australian Essays,* vol. 96, no. 110 (2006), pp 96-110.

McIndoe, Tara, ‘Irish and UK Migration to South Africa 1900-2000: Who Went: Why did they Go? What Input did they Have?’ in *Student Economic Review,* vol. 19, (2000), 203-216.

McMahon, Richard, and Newby, Andrew G., ‘Introduction-Ireland and Finland, 1860-1939: Comparative and Transnational Histories’ in *Irish Historical Studies,* vol. 41, no. 160 (2017), pp 166-179.

Meehan, Ciara, ‘Fine Gael’s Uncomfortable History: The Legacy of Cumann na nGaedheal’ in *Éire/Ireland,* vol. 43, nos. 3&5 (Fómhar/Geimhreadh/Fall/Winter, 2006), pp 253-266.

Miller, Stephen M. ‘In Support Of the 'Imperial Mission'? Volunteering For the South African War 18991902’ in *The Journal Of Military History,* vol. 19, no. 3 (Jul. 2005), pp 691-711.

Milne-Smith, Amy, ‘A Flight to Domesticity? : Making a Home in the Gentleman's Clubs of London, 1880-1914’ in *Journal of British Studies,* vol. 45 (October, 2006), pp 796-818.

Moore, Col. Maurice, ‘Col. Maurice Moore to ‘Lord Mayor’ [Lorcan Sherlock] UCD, archives IEUCDA, P102/353, *From the Archives,* (Dec., 2014), pp 1-7. **wwwhistoryhub.ie**

Mulvagh, Conor, ‘The Decline and Fall of the Redmond Empire’ in *Ireland after the Rising, 1916-18: Changed Utterly, History Ireland,* 2017, pp 68-71.

Nasaw, David, ‘Historians and Biography’ in *The American History Review,* (June, 2009), pp 573-578.

Newell, Úna, ‘The Rising Of The Moon: Galway 1916’ in *Journal Of The Galway Archaeological And Historical Society,* vol. 58 (2006), pp 114-135.

O'Byrne, Deirdre, ‘The Last of their Line: The Disappearing Anglo-Irish in Twentieth Century-Fictions And Autobiographies’ in Mervyn Busteed, Frank Neel and Jonathan Tonge (eds.), *Irish Protestant Identities* (Manchester, 2008).

O'Callaghan, Margaret, ‘language, Nationality and Cultural Identity in the Irish Free State, 1922-7: The *Irish Statesman* and the *Catholic Bulletin* Reappraised’ in *Irish Historical Studies,* vol. 24, no. 94 (1984), pp 226-245.

O'Callaghan, Margaret, ‘Casement, Colonialism and a Remembered Past’ in Mary E. Daly (ed.), *Roger Casement in Irish and World History* (Dublin, 2005).

O’Callaghan, Margaret, ‘Denis Patrick Moran and “the Irish Colonial Condition,”1891-1921’ in D.George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall, and Geoghan, Vincent, (eds), *Political Thought in Ireland Since the 17th Century* (London, 1993).

Ó Dálaigh, Dominic, ‘The Young Douglas Hyde’ *Studia Hibernica,* no. 10 (1970), pp 108-135.

O'Drisceoil, Donal, ‘When Dev Defaulted: The Land Annuities Dispute, 1926-38’ in *20th Century Social Perspectives/Contemporary History,* vol. 19, no. 3. (May/June, 2011), pp 42-45.

Ó Fathartaigh, Mícheál, ‘Pádraic Ó Máille: Irish Agrarian Radical? The Case Considered’ in Brian Casey, (ed.), *Defying the Law: Agrarian Radicals in Irish History* (Dublin, 2013).

O' Halpin, Eunan, ‘Dorothy Macardle 'The Irish Republic' (1937) in *Irish Historical Studies,* vol. 31, no. 123 (May, 1999), pp 389-394.

O'Neil, Timothy M., ‘Handing Away the Trump Card? : Peader O'Donnell, Fianna Fáil, and the Non-Payment of Land Annuites Campaign 1926-32’ in *New Hibernia Review/ Irish Éireannach Nua,* vol. 12. no. 1 (Earrach/Spring 2008), pp 19-40.

O'Neill, Maura, ‘Sarah Cecilia Harrison: Artist and City Councillor’ in *Dublin Historical Record,* vol. 42, no. 2 (March, 1989), pp 66-81.

O'Neill, Ciaran, ‘Power and Catholic Identity in Ireland 1850-1900’ in Oliver Rafferty, S.J. (ed), *Irish Catholic Identities* (Manchester, 2013).

O'Neill, Ciaran, ‘Education, Imperial Career and the Irish Catholic Elite in the Nineteenth Century’ in David Dickson, Justyna Pyz and Christopher Shephard (eds), *Irish Classroom and British Empire: Imperial Contexts in the Origins of Modern Education* (Dublin, 2012).

O'Neill, Ciaran, ‘Power, Wealth and Catholic identity in Ireland, 1850-1900’ in Oliver P. Rafferty, S.J. (ed.), *Faith, Wealth and Catholic Unionism* (Manchester, 2003).

O'Neill, Ciaran and Delaney, Enda, 'Introduction: Beyond the Nation' in *Éire-Ireland,* vol. 51, nos. 1&2 (Spring/Summer, 2016), pp 7-13.

Orford, Anne, 'Moral Internationalism and the Responsibility to Protect' in *The European Journal of International Law,* vol. 24, no. 1 (2013), pp 83-108.

Ó' Síocháin, Séamas, 'Casement's Vision of Freedom,' in Mary E. Daly (ed.), *Roger Casement in Irish and World History* (Dublin, 2005).

Ó' Síocháin, Séamas, '"More Power to the Indians": Roger Casement, the Putumayo, and Indigenous Rights' in *Irish Journal of Anthropology,* vol. 14, no. 2 (2011), pp 5-12.

Peers, Douglas M., 'The Noble Exemplar of the Military Tradition: Construction of the Indian Army in the Mid-Victorian Press' in *Modern Asian Studies,* vol. 31, no, 1 (February, 1997), pp 109-142.

Peers, Douglas M., 'The Habitual Nobility of Being:' British Officers and the Social Construction of the Bengal Army in the Early Nineteenth Century' in *Modern Asian Studies,* vol. 25, n0 3 (July, 1991), pp 545-569.

Perry, Nicholas, 'The Irish Landed Class and the British Army 1850-1950' in *War in History,* vol. 18, no. 3, (July, 2011), pp 304-332.

Petit, Philip, 'The Tree of Liberty: Republicanism, American, French and Irish' in *Field Day Review,* vol. 1, (2005), pp 29-42.

Petrusewicz, Marta, 'The Modernisation of the European Periphery: Ireland, Poland, and the Two Sicilies, 1820-1870: Parallel and Connected, Distinct and Comparable' in Deborah Cohen and Maura O'Connor (eds), *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective* (New York and London, 2004),

Pollard, Michael, 'Sunset or Dawn? F.S. Oliver's *Endless Adventure* in History and Politics, 1921-1934' The Historical Association and Blackwell Publishing Ltd., (Oxford, 2005), pp 387-410.

Porter, Andrew, 'Sir Roger Casement and the International Humanitarian Movement' in *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History,* vol. 29, no. 2 (2001), pp 59-74.

Porter, Andrew, 'The South African War (1899-1902) Context and Motive Reconsidered' in *The Journal of African History,* vol. 31, no. 1 (1990), pp 43-57.

Potter, Simon, 'Empire, Cultures and Identities in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Ireland and Britain,' in *History Compass,* vol. 5, no. 1 (January, 2007), pp 51-71.

Quinn, James, 'Sir Francis Vane's Quest for Justice after Easter Week' in *History Ireland,* vol. 24, no. 2 (March/April, 2016).

Rankin, K.S., 'The Role of the Irish Boundary Commission in the Entrenchment of the Irish Border: From Tactical Panacea to Political Liability' in *Journal for Historical Geography,* vol. 34 (2008), pp 442-447.

Regan, John M., 'The Politics of Reaction: The Dynamics of Treatyite Government and Policy 1922-33' in *Irish Historical Studies*, vol. 30, no. 120 (November, 1997), pp 542-563.

Repina, Lorina P. 'Historical Memory and Contemporary Historical Scholarship' in *Russian Studies in History*, vol. 49, no. 1 (Summer, 2010) pp 8-25.

Romani, Robert, 'British View on Irish National Character 1800-1846: An Intellectual History' in *History of European Ideas,* vol. 23, nos. 5-6 (1997), pp 193-219.

Rüger, Jan, 'OXO: Or the Challenge of Transnational History' in *European Quarterly,* vol. 40, no. 4 (2010), pp 656-668.

Russell, Penny, 'Almost Believing: The Ethics of Historical Imagination' in Stuart MacIntyre (ed.) *The Historian's Conscience: Australian Historians on the Ethics of History* (Melbourne, 2004).

Ryder, Sean, '"With a heroic Life and a Governing Mind": Nineteenth Century Irish Nationalist Autobiography' in Liam Harte (ed.), *Modern Irish Autobiography: Self, Nation and Society* (Basingstoke, 2007).

Ryder, Sean, 'Reading Lessons: Famine and the Nation 1845-49 in Morash, C., Hayes R., (eds.) *Fearful Reallities:New Perspectives on the Irish Famine* (Dublin, 1996).

Scalmer, Sean, 'Translating Contention: Culture, History and the Circulation of Collective Action' in *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political,* vol. 25, no. 4 (October, - December, 2000), pp 491-514.

Schwartz, Roberto, 'Misplaced Ideas: Literature and Society in Late Nineteenth-Century Ireland Brazil' in *Comparative Civilizations Review,* vol. 5, no. 5 (1980), pp 33-51.

Scott, Helen, 'Capitalist Modernity and the Origins of Racism' in Crystal Bartolovich and Neil Lazarus, *Marxism, Modernity and Post-Colonial Studies* (Cambridge, 2007).

Seay, Scott D., 'For the Defense and Beauty of the Catholic Faith: The Rise of Neo-Scholasticism among European Catholic Intellectuals, 1824-1879' in *Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture* vol. 5, no. 3 (Summer, 2002), pp 131-146.

Sewell, William Jr., 'Marc Bloch and the Logic of Comparative History' in *History and Theory,* vol. 6, no. 2 (1967), pp 208-218.

Simms, J.G., 'The Irish on the Continent, 1691-1800' in T.W., Moody and W.E. Vaughan (eds), *A New History of Ireland IV: Eighteenth Century Ireland 1691-1800* (Oxford, 1986).

Shields, Andrew, 'Serving the Farmer: The tenant Right Movement in the West, 1848-57' in Carla King and Conor McNamara (eds), *The West of Ireland: New Perspectives on the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin, 2011).

Skidelsky, Edward, 'The Strange Death of British Idealism' in *Philosophy and Literature,* vol. 31 no. 1. (April, 2007), pp 41-51.

Skinner, Quentin, 'Meaning and Understanding in the History Of Ideas' in *History And Theory,* vol. 8, no. 1(January, 1969), pp 3-53.

Smith-Milne, Amy, 'A Flight to Domesticity? Making a Home in the Gentleman's Clubs of London, 1880-1914' in *Journal of British Studies,* vol. 45, no. 4 (October, 2006), pp 796-818.

Smith, M.Van Wyk, 'The Boers and The Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902), in the Twentieth Century Moral Imaginary' in *Victorian Literature And Culture,* vol. 31, no 2 (2003), pp 429-446.

Smyth, Jim, 'An Entirely Exceptional Case: Ireland and the British Problem' in *The Historical Journal,* vol. 34, no. 1 (1991), pp 999-1007.

Spiegel, Gabrielle M., 'Comment on "A Crooked Line"' in *The American Historical Review,* vol. 113, no. 2 (April, 2008), pp 406-416.

Spiegel, Gabrielle M., 'The Task of the Historian' in *The American Historical Review,* vol. 114, no. 1(February, 2009), pp xiv, 1-5.

Stephens, Shane, 'The Society of Irish Tradition 1917-1919' in *Béaloideas,* vol. 67 (1999). pp 139-169.

Stone, Lawrence, 'The Revival of Narrative: Reflections on a New Old History' in *Past & Present,* no. 85 (November, 1979) pp 3-24.

Stover, Justin Dolan, 'Redefining Allegiance: Loyalty, Treason and the Foundation of the Irish Free State, 1922-32' in Mel Farrell, Jason Knirck and Ciara Meehan (eds), *A Formative Decade: Ireland in the 1920s* (Sallins, 2015).

Streets, Heather, 'Martial Races: The Military, Race and Masculinity in British Imperial Culture 1857-1914 in *Journal of British Studies,* vol. 46, no. 4 (October, 2007), pp 979-980.

Surridge, Keith, 'All You Soldiers are What we Call Pro-Boer:' The Military Critique of the South African War 1899-1902' in *History,* vol 82, no. 267 ((Oct, 1997), pp 582-600.

Swart, Sandra, 'Desperate Men:" The 1914 Rebellion and the Politics of Poverty' in *South African Journal,* vol. 42, no. 1 (2004), pp 161-175.

Swart, Sandra, 'Men of Influence,' The Ontology of Leadership in the 1914 Boer Rebellion' in *Journal of Historical Sociology,* vol. 17, no. 1 (2004), pp 1-30.

Swart, Sandra, 'A Boer and his Gun and his Wife are Three Things Always Together': Republican Masculinity and the 1914 Rebellion' in *Journal of South African Studies,* Special Issue on Masculinities in Southern Africa, vol. 24, (December, 1998), pp 737-751.

Swart, William, J., ' Constructing the "Self" of Self-Determination: Liberal and Anti-Liberal Tensions in Modern Irish Nationalism' in *Social Thoughts &Research* vol. 22, no. 1/2 (1999), pp 136-66.

Taylor, Barbara, 'Separations of Soul: Solitude, Biography, History' in *The American Historical Review,* vol. 114, no. 3 (January, 2009), pp 640-651.

Tierney, Michael, 'John Dillon and the Home Rule Movement' in *An Irish Quarterly Review,* vol. 58, no. 229 (Spring, 1996), pp 63-73.

Titunik, Regina F., 'The Continuation of History: Max Weber and the Advent of a New Aristocracy' in *The Journal of Politics,* vol. 59, no. 3 (August, 1997), pp 680-700.

Toews, John, 'Intellectual History after the Linguistic Turn: The Autonomy of Meaning and the Irreducibility of Experience' in *American Historical Review,* (1987), pp 879-907.

Tosh, John, 'Gentlemanly Politeness and Manly Simplicity in Victorian England' in *Transactions Of The Royal Historical Society,* Sixth Series vol. 12 (2002), pp 455-472.

Tosh, John, 'Masculinities in an Industrialising Britain, 1800-1914' in *Journal of British Studies,* vol. 44, no. 2 (April, 2005), pp 330-342.

Tosh, John, 'From Keighley to St-Denis: Separation and Intimacy in Victorian Bourgeois Marriage' in *History Workshop Journal,* no. 40 (Autumn, 1995), pp 193-206.

Townend, Paul A., 'Between Two Worlds: Irish Nationalists and Imperial Crisis 1878- 1880 in *Past & Present* no. 194 (February, 2007), pp 139-174.

Trapido, Stanley, 'Landlord and tenant in a Colonial Economy: The Transvaal 1880-1910' in *Journal of Southern African Studies,* vol. 5, no. 1 Special Issue on Themes in Agrarian History and Society (October, 1978), pp 26-58.

Travis, Charles, 'Rotting Townlands: Peadar O'Donnell, the West of Ireland and the Politics of Representation in Saorstát Éireann (Irish Free State) 1923-1933' in *Historical Geography,* vol. 36, (2008), pp 208-224.

Tyrell, Ian, 'Reflections on the Transnational Turn in United States History: Theory and Practice' in *Journal of Global History,* vol. 4, (2009) pp 453-474.

Vance, Norman, 'Celts, Carthaginians and Constitutions: Anglo-Irish Literary Relations, 1780-1820' in *Irish Historical Studies,* vol. 22, no. 86 (September, 1980), pp 216-238.

Van Heyningen, Elizabeth, 'The Concentration Camps of the South Africa (Anglo-Boer)War, 1900-1902' in *History Compass,* vol. 6 (2008), pp 23-43.

Van Heyningen, Elizabeth, 'The South African War as Humanitarian Crisis' in *The International Review of the Red Cross,* Vol. 97, (2015), pp 999-1028.

Varley, Tony, 'Irish Farmer's Parties, Nationalism and Class Politics in the Twentieth Century' in Liam Weeks and Alistair Clarke (eds), *Radical or Redundant? : Minor Parties in Irish Politics* (Dublin, 2012)

Varley, Tony, 'Bobby Burke' in Emmet O'Connor and John Cunningham (eds.), *Studies in Irish Radical Leadership: Lives on the Left* (Manchester, 2016).

Varley, Tony, 'A Region of Sturdy Smallholders? Western Nationalists and Agrarian Politics during the First Word War' *The Journal of the Galway Archaeological Society and Historical Society* vol. 55, (2003), pp 127-150.

Varley, Tony, 'The Class that Goes to the Wall': Colonel George O'Callaghan-Westropp, Class Politics and Identity in Cumann na NGaedheal Ireland' in John Cunningham and Niall Ó Ciosáin (eds), *Culture and Society in Ireland Since 1750: Essays in Honour of Gearoíd Ó Tuathaigh* (Dublin, 2015).

Warren, Allen, 'The Twilight of the Ascendancy and the Big House House: A View from the Twenty First Century,' in Terence Dooley and Christopher Ridgeway (eds), *The Irish Country House: It's Past, Present And Future* (Dublin, 2011).

Weeks, Liam, 'Minor Parties: A Schematic for Analysis' in *Irish Political Studies,* vol. 25, no. 4 (December, 2010), pp 481-501.

Werner, Michael, and Zimmerman, Bénédicte, 'Beyond Comparison: Histoire Croisée and the Challenge of Reflexivity' (*EHESS* Paris) pp 1-25. werner@ehessifr,ozim@ehess.fir.

Wessels, Andries, 'The Rhetoric of Conflict and Conflict as Rhetoric: Ireland and the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902), in *Literator,* vol. 20, no 3 (Nov., 1999), pp 161-174.

Wessels, Andries, 'An Irish Gentleman in Africa: The Ambiguous Political and Cultural Identity of Sir Percy Fitzpatrick' in *English in Africa,* vol. 31, no. 1, (May, 2004), pp 5-22.

Wessels, Andries, '"A Rich and Rare Land": The Experience and Expression of Nationalism in Poetry among Reluctant Colonists in Ireland, South Africa and Quebec' in *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies,* vol. 25, no 1/2 (Jul., -Dec., 1999), pp 352-371.

Whelan, Kevin, An Undergound Gentry? Catholic Middlemen in Eighteenth-Century Ireland*'* Eagarthóirí, in *Eighteenth Century Ireland Iris an dá Chultúr,* vol. 10, (1 Jan., 1995), pp 7-68

Whelehan, Niall, 'Ireland Beyond the Nation -State: Antecedents Of Transnational History In Irish Historiography,' University of Edinburgh. School of History, Classics and Archaeology, Working Paper Series. 2013 http:/**www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/history-classics-archaeology/history/research/working-papers**

White, Hayden, 'Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe' *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* vol. 18, no. 1 (Jan., 1976), pp 129-143.

White, Lawrence, William, 'Peadar O'Donnell, "Red Republicanism and the Bell"' www.theirelandinstitute.com. *Culture in the Republic* (2005)

Wiener, Jonathan, M., 'The Barrington Moore Thesis and its Critics' in *Theory and Society,* vol. 2, issue. 1 (Jan., 1975).

'On The Heels of De Wet' *Blackwood Edinburgh Magazine* June 1902. 171, 1040: British Periodicals p745

iii) PhD Theses

Belling, Veronica, Sue, 'Recovering the Lives of South African Jewish Women during the Migration Years c1880-1939' PhD Thesis, University of Cape Town, 2013.

Diver, Luke, 'Perceptions Versus Reality: Newspaper Coverage on the Anglo-Zulu War of 1879' Unpublished M.A. Thesis, National University Maynooth, 2010

Enright, Aidan, 'The Political Life of Charles Owen O'Conor, 1860-1906' PhD Thesis, Queens University Belfast, 2011

Hannon, Charles, 'The Irish Volunteers and the Concepts of Military Service and Defence, 1913-1924' Unpublished PhD Thesis, University College Dublin, 1989.

Korf, Lindy, 'D.F. Malan: A Political Biography,' PhD Thesis, University of Stellenbosch, 2010.

Levitt, Geoffrey, James, 'Playing the Man: Sport and Imperialism 1900-1907' Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of London, 2014.

Mac Donncha, Seamus, Letters of George Moore (1852-1933) to his Brother Colonel Maurice Moore CB. (1854-1939) PhD Thesis, National University Galway, 1973**.**

O'Neill, Ciaran, 'Leaning Towards Empire: Jesuit Education at Clongowes and Tullabeg 1870-1900' M.A. Thesis, National University of Ireland Galway, 2005.

Reynolds, Brian, A., 'The Foundation and Development of the Fianna Fáil Party 1926-1932' Unpublished, PhD Thesis, University College Dublin, 1976.

Ridden, Jennifer, ‘Making Good Citizens': National Identity, Religion and Liberalism Among The Irish Elite. c 1800-1850,’ PhD Thesis, Kings College University Of London, 1998.

Wright, Jonathan, Jeffrey, ‘The Natural Leaders’” the Tennant Family and the Political and Intellectual Life of Presbyterian Belfast c. 1801-1832,’ PhD Thesis, Queens University Belfast, 2009.