The Other Irish Revolution: the Writing of History

David Harkness

Abstract: *This account of the revolution in the writing of history in Ireland outlines the development of a professional approach to the writing of Irish history, largely confined to the twentieth century, and then summarises, crudely and briefly, the debate generated in the latter decades of that century over what was felt by some to be an excessive revision of the traditional record of Ireland's past. In that latter section, the account below draws heavily on* Interpreting Irish History*, edited by Ciaran Brady (Irish Academic Press, 1994) and those who are interested in this part of the story are advised to consult that book, which reproduces many of the formative articles upon which this debate rests.*

It seems best to start by asking why it is that history is written at all. No doubt, to-day, we would answer that history is the memory of society and that it is important to seek out as true a record of the past as possible: to explain it to the reading public as objectively as possible so that the origins and evolution of the world, or the country or the local community can best be understood. But the writing of history has not always been so pure in spirit. The rise of history as an academic discipline is associated with the rise of nationalism and the wish to celebrate national achievement and underpin national aspiration. Pride in French military and cultural might or the need to unify the German-speaking peoples might illustrate the point. History has often had ulterior purposes, in other words, and this is no less true in Ireland than elsewhere. To-day, we might want to tell the story of Ireland's evolution as it really was: to establish as accurate an account as possible of the arrival of successive settlers, their development, their culture, language, and social and political institutions; the relationships of their petty kingdoms; the impact of their external neighbours: marauding Vikings, acquisitive Britons, ambitious continental powers, and so on. But, until recent times, historical accounts served more as a means to and end: hagiographies of ruling families to underpin privilege; propaganda tales put about by military conquerors to justify acquisition or overlordship; religious perspectives to glorify some and damn others. Myths, distortions and inventions were as frequent as real events and personalities.

If nation states glorified their achievements, then nations wishing to become states were equally inclined to manufacture ancient foundations and to stress the continuity of their claim to distinctiveness and to recognition. Where did truth fit in? Was the winner's account necessarily right? Could scholarship lay bare evidence so that a credible account of the past could be assembled? The settling of states, the creation of archival centres, the collecting of records and documents, and the growth of education helped both to ask these questions and to answer them in the developing and modernising world.

Ireland lagged behind somewhat in this process. After all, Ireland in modern times was beset by conflict, with competing religions and clashing settler groups, and further handicapped by a dominant ruling minority and foreign manipulation. In the nineteenth century, that manipulation was turned into direct control by the absorption of Ireland into a wider United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. But the nineteenth century also saw a rise in education and in democratic institutions, and it experienced also a greater interest in establishing facts, gathering knowledge and creating learned bodies. As the subject of this paper lies in the twentieth-century, it will not be possible here to do justice to the nineteenth century, but some landmarks must be listed.

Nineteenth-century Ireland was rich in historical memory. Sagas, genealogies, annals, chronicles, law tracts, the commentaries of foreigners and the histories of natives, both at home and in exile, abounded. Already, English and Irish, Protestant and Catholic accounts were at variance, with subtle differences between, as well as overlappings of, different interest groups. Attempts at reconciling these conflicting accounts had been attempted. For example, in the late eighteenth-century, the Reverend Thomas Leland's general history of Ireland from the twelfth-century to the 1770s set out to provide an acceptable synthesis. But no consensus ensued. In 1775 the Royal Irish Academy was founded and from early on sought to elucidate Ireland's celtic heritage. A State Paper Office, dating from 1702, had acted as a repository for official documents and in the nineteenth century the vogue for fact-finding created in 1825 an Ordnance Survey of Ireland which gathered great quantities of material – topographical, historical and cultural – until 1841. An Irish Record Commission lasted from 1810-30; then, by Act of Parliament in 1867, a Public Record Office of Ireland was established and Ireland also benefited, two years later, in 1869, by the founding of an Historic Manuscripts Commission of Great Britain and Ireland. Between 1848 and 1860, Richard Griffith carried out a land valuation of Ireland which recorded invaluable factual information. The Young Ireland movement of the eighteen forties placed a strong emphasis on education and history, admittedly with a particular enthusiasm for a romanticised version of the Irish past, and as Home Rule found increasing favour from the 1870s, so rival histories again burgeoned, some stressing Ireland's parliamentary tradition and national rights, others placing greater weight on British superiority, ruling strength and better judgement, and upon Ireland's future as part of the United Kingdom. The creation in 1845 of new university colleges to add to the lone Elizabethan university foundation in Dublin, laid the basis for further eventual centres of historical enquiry.

At the dawn of the twentieth century, new histories continued to reflect opposing standpoints. Some, like those of Alice Stopford Green, still followed a traditional, romantic view; others, for example G.H. Orpen's *Ireland under the Normans, 1169-1333* (4 vols, Oxford, 1911-20), endeavoured to assert more modern standards. Orpen aimed: "to set forth the facts [...] with as much exactness of statement and indifferency of judgement as is humanly possible".[1] Sources, however, were still limited, the number of trained scholars few, but the twentieth century was to experience a more professional and disciplined scholarship than hitherto. World war, guerilla conflict and political division took centre stage in Ireland between 1914 and 1921, but political division did at least spawn a separate Public Record Office of Northern Ireland in 1924, and in 1928 the new Irish Free State founded its own Irish Manuscripts Commission, with its own journal, *Analecta Hibernica*, following in 1930.

Nonetheless, even by the late 1930s, Ireland still lacked an agreed account of its past. There was no centre of historical research, no historical journal where such research could be promulgated, no set of agreed standards of scholarship. But it was at this time that the "revolution" occurred and it was by the hands of two individuals, soon augmented by other distinguished colleagues, that it was set in motion. The story of the contribution of Theodore William Moody, of Queen's University Belfast, and Robert (Robin) Dudley Edwards, of University College Dublin, has been told often, not least in the *festschriften* in their honour and in the obituary tributes paid to them. Their achievements will therefore be related only briefly here.

Moody and Edwards met in London in the early 1930s as graduate students at London University's Institute of Historical Research. They soon determined that on their return to Ireland they would encourage the latest standards of historical writing and provide a medium through which new research could be disseminated. Thus it came about that Moody helped found the Ulster Society for Irish Historical Studies in Belfast, early in 1936; and Edwards helped bring into being the Irish Historical Society, in Dublin, later that same year. And in 1938 they founded, as joint editors, the journal, *Irish Historical Studies*, to be the voice of new Irish research, backed equally by the two Societies, North and South.

Moody was to continue as joint editor, representing the USIHS for forty years, until 1978 when the present writer had the honour of replacing him. Moody did this despite his move to Dublin in 1939 to a Fellowship, then a Chair, at Trinity College. Edwards, partly through failing eyesight, retired from his editorship in 1957, but it was to be claimed later, with some justice, that from 1938 "History as the handmaiden of nationalism" (or imperialism) began to be "replaced by history as an independent discipline".[2] Later still, Professor J.J. Lee would add, of the founding generation of *IHS*, that it "insisted on scholarly standards [...] rose above partisan passions [...] (and) established the benchmark by which [...] later achievements in their own profession must be measured".[3]

One other creative achievement of these two in 1938 was the formation of the Irish Committee of Historical Sciences to represent Ireland on the *Commité International*

des Sciences Historiques and to provide a forum for historians throughout the island. In 1944, in association with D.B.Quinn, who moved to chair at University College Swansea in that year, the two inititated a monograph series, "Studies in Irish History", to enable new research to be published in book form. And new research, by an ever-expanding body of gifted scholars, began to flow, works by R.B.McDowell, J.C.Beckett and G.A. Hayes-McCoy serving as examples.

A comparable development should be noticed at this point at Oxford, where another Irishman, Nicholas Mansergh, had been setting new standards of political and historical publication. *The Government of Northern Ireland* (Allen and Unwin, 1934); *The Government of the Irish Free State* (Allen and Unwin, 1936) and most notably in this context, Ireland in the Age of Reform and Revolution (Allen and Unwin, 1940) comprised in effect a parallel, one-man revolution-in-exile.

Back in Ireland, the historiographical revolution expanded. Moody inaugurated broadcast history in 1953 with a multi-contributor series of lectures commemorating Thomas Davis, the Young Irelander, which has continued annually ever since, many subsequently published. BBC Northern Ireland followed in 1954 with two similar series entitled *Ulster since 1800: a political and economic survey* (1954) and *Ulster since 1800: a social survey* (1957) the latter broadcast late in 1956 and early 1957, both edited by T.W.Moody and J.C.Beckett. In 1955, the bienniel Irish Conference of Historians was inaugurated, its and subsequent papers being published as consecutive volumes of *Historical Studies*. This series also survives, as does the annual conference of the Irish History Students' Association, another Edwards initiative of the late 1940s, providing an island-wide forum bringing students of history together to deliver papers, to disseminate ideas and good fellowship and to consume considerable quantities of guinness. It was a high priority for both Moody and Edwards to nurture Ireland as a cultural unit, ignoring political division, to ensure that historians would be true first to their discipline, irrespective of their origin, political commitment or teaching location.

In 1965, Queen's University Belfast founded its Institute of Irish Studies, the only such centre in Ireland. In 1966, Moody and two UCD colleagues, Professors F.X.Martin and F.J. Byrne, created a television series of 21 programmes delivered by many scholars and published the following year as *The Course of Irish History* (Mercier, 1967): an invaluable textbook for students, embracing the latest research. Ten years later, in 1976, another of Moody's initiatives came into being when the first of eight planned volumes of a *New History of Ireland* was published. This was the start of a multi-contributor, multi-volume project designed to provide the first, agreed, scholarly, standard history of Ireland from earliest times to the present.

By 1976, already a number of significant books had appeared, reflecting the new historical professionalism, for example: J.C.Beckett's *Short History of Ireland* (Hutchinson, 1952) and his *Making of Modern Ireland, 1603-1923* (Faber and Faber, 1966); Oliver MacDonagh's *Ireland* (Prentice-Hall, 1968), an account of Ireland since 1800; then F.S.L.Lyons's *Ireland since the Famine* (Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971)

and in the following year both Robert Kee's *Green Flag* (Weidenfeld and Nicolson), a history of Irish nationalism, and Louis Cullen's *Economic History of Ireland since 1660*. (Batsford). The record of Ireland's past was being clarified, and in ever greater detail as new research in all periods was begun and increasingly completed. A glance at the two historiographical works published by the Irish Committee of Historical Sciences – *Irish Historiography 1936-70*, edited by Moody (1971), and *Irish Historiography 1970-9*, edited by J.J. Lee (1981), will reveal the astonishing breadth of this research.

Theo Moody retired from his chair in TCD in 1979 but carried on productive research and continued to be active in historical circles until his death in 1984. He had the great advantage of looking like a professor! In fact both he and Dudley (as everyone called Edwards) could have been drawn from Central Castings on appearance alone: both with large heads, dominant foreheads and lengthy manes of hair. Otherwise they were very unalike. Moody had a puritanical air. He was a Quaker and a family man, a lover of music, and an upholder of standards – especially standards of scholarly presentation (to Aidan Clarke, Moody had for forty years "policed the commas, the colons and the outlawed upper case letters' in articles submitted to *IHS*".[4] He sought peace and understanding, fought myth, prejudice and bias in historical writing, believing, above all, that to understand is to forgive.

Robert (Robin to his intimates) Dudley Edwards, Professor at UCD from 1944 –79, was a contrasting character: cautious in his written scholarship, he was daring, not to say outrageous, in his lectures, in his conversation, in his behaviour. An affectionate obituary by Professor Aidan Clarke, after his death aged 79 in 1988, contains the following adjectives applied to Dudley: "iconoclastic", "provocative", "mischievous", "demotic", "flamboyant", "arrogant", "perverse", "passionate", "erudite", "theatrical", "exuberant". His capacity for drink and women was "legendary".[5] Over a period of thirty-five years he built up his Department at UCD, was a great encourager of graduate research, an inspiring lecturer. It was he who created the Irish History Students Associations and it was its annual conferences that provided him with a stage for some of his most outrageous performances. He was dedicated to the island-wide community of Irish historians and it was perhaps for the reason that I held the chair in Belfast that he was always courteous and generous to me. From the mid 'fifties to the 'seventies he had eyesight problems which lifted latterly to pernitt a late burst of writing. He also specialised in this later period in archive management and collection, establishing a Department of Archives at UCD and putting his weight behind a demand for proper state archival provision, as government papers increasingly began to be opened up to public inspection. In 1986, two years before his death, a National Archives Act merged the PROI and the State Paper Office, laid down better standards of provision and made official the thirty-year rule for the opening of government papers to public inspection.

It could be asked, of course, whether or not these two creative giants had stayed too long at their task. Moody's hand had become a bit heavy and rather deadening at the helm of *IHS* by 1978. New specialisms had established themselves within history and

an Economic and Social History Society, founded in 1970, had begun its own journal in 1974. A *Journal of Labour History (Saothar)* had also appeared, in 1976, and voices had risen against a preoccupation with constitutional and political history that seemed to characterise the founding fathers. They were soon to have the opportunity to put their own case against their critics, but to explain the circumstances in which this arose, it is necessary to step back to the mid 'sixties in Northern Ireland, where a major challenge to the political status quo had begun.

In 1966, the fiftieth anniversary of the 1916 Rising provoked reappraisals of political progress, North and South. A new generation of Northern Nationalists in particular questioned their subservient position in Northern Ireland. By 1969, violent confrontation there had forced many back upon a simpler, more black and white version of the past. It seemed to them necessary to harness history once more to current political causes, to justify present stances. In North and South angry questions were asked and charges made. The subsequent debate became heated.

Beleagured Nationalists in the North, for example, asked what had become of the old traditional certainties. Now, above all times, they needed their heroes. They and their southern confreres began to condemn what they perceived to have been an assault on the myths and legends that had sustained their forefathers during centuries of British oppression. History had been revised too far. Irish suffering had been played down, British "progress" had been exaggerated. The *IHS* generation was accused of claiming to have pursued a "value-free", objective scholarship, while in reality its practitioners had simply swapped their own prejudices and biases for the older truths of traditional history: professional historians had become the servants of a new Irish and British Establishment, unconcerned with goals of unity and national fulfilment. "Revisionism" thus became a term of abuse and historians were forced to defend their work, to justify their reinterpretations.

In this context, in 1975, Nicholas Mansergh, now at Cambridge, having observed the impact of the fiftieth anniversaries of "the great landmarks of the revolutionary years in Anglo-Irish reltions" and the outbreak of violence in the North, and noted the sharpening of focus caused by the 1972 suspension of parliamentary institutions in Belfast and the introduction of Direct Rule there, identified three preoccupying revisionist themes:

> the need for more critical reassessment of the role of force in Anglo-Irish history and its effect on community relations [...] then the desirability of some further probing of the relevance of concepts of Irish nationhood to an understanding of the deeper causes of contemporary conflict, and finally some closer scrutiny of the origin of the Northern Ireland polity.[6]

The founding fathers of *Irish Historical Studies* now felt obliged to defend their achievements. Theo Moody, in valedictory interviews and articles as he prepared to retire from his Chair in 1977, observed:

> Irish people have a reputation for being steeped in their history, but it is more often mythology rather than history that possesses their imagination [...]. All continuing human societies have their myths and it is the business of historians to study myths as part of the past, but to study them without swallowing them. The history of Ireland has been, and still is, used as a quarry from which to hew material to support entrenched and dogmatic attitudes in the present.[7]

Later he would list and denounce some of the many myths hitherto accepted as history: the Catholic separatist myth; the Protestant (Anglican) myth; the 1641 massacre myths; the rich and many-sided Orange myths; the myths of Ulster loyalty; the Irish nationalist myths, the Famine myths; the land-purchase myths, the predestinate nation myth[8] He would also assert with pride that:

> Irish historians to-day are concerned to inform, to explain, to interpret, rather than to condemn, to justify or to condone. All historians have biases, being human persons, and some biases are more injurious to the pursuit of truth than others. Historians have to be aware of their biases and to be on their guard accordingly [...]. But there are worse dangers than bias. Prejudice, the forming of judgements in the light of preconceived opinions and without weighing the evidence is an unmitigated evil that historians strive to be, and can succeed in being, delivered from. To know and control their biases, to discipline themselves against prejudice, to base their findings on a rigorous examination of the available evidence, to illuminate in a spirit of understanding, tolerance and compassion, what men have really done and thought and to present the multifarious events and personalities of the past in their due perspective and proportion – these are the characteristics of historians at their best.

And, on a personal note, he added:

> The worst fault in a historian is prejudice. Bias is quite another thing. I confess to a bias against violence, but I try to understand the motives of those who have employed it. Prejudice does not try to understand. It condemns the labels it dislikes. Prejudice might be defined as bias over which no control has been attempted and established.[9]

His pupil, F.S.L.Lyons, and in his turn Lyons's protegé Roy Foster, Protestants both, would, like Moody, be attacked for their unacknowledged, anti-national, cultural standpoints, but, so far as revising history was concerned their defence was a solid one. "Revisionism", Lyons argued, "is proper revisionism if it is a response to new evidence which, after being duly tested, brings us nearer to a truth independent of the wishes and aspirations of those for whom truth consists solely of what happens to coincide with

those wishes and aspirations".[10] All good historians revise our understanding of the past – otherwise why would they write at all? But the fact of the matter is that Rivisionism had by now become a political term and the battle of how history should be written, which commenced in the 1970s, is still with us.

Lyons regretted the slowness of the historiographical revolution to impact upon the schools and the population in general. Hardly surprising, argued his critics, when what is being offered is so out of step with what people have traditionally accepted and still cherish. Foster regretted both the use of "past history [...] to serve a legitimising function for present commitment" and "the popularisation of invented tradition".[11] He rejoiced that old assumptions had been exploded and that Irish history could at last be seen as "a complex and ambivalent process rather than a morality tale".[12] He understood, of course, that "the simplified notions have their own resilience: they are buried deep in the core of popular consciousness".[13]

As argument was joined, it became clear that the popular consciousness embraced origin myths and medieval and early-modern oversimplifications as well as those of more recent times. A vigorous dispute developed between medievalist Steven Ellis, an Irish-speaking Englishman lecturing in Galway, and an English-speaking Irishman, Brendan Bradshaw, medieval lecturer at Cambridge. This was sparked by an *IHS* article, "Nationalist historiography and the English and Gaelic worlds in the late Middle Ages", in 1986, by Ellis. Bradshaw's rejoinder, "Nationalism and historical scholarship in modern Ireland", also in *IHS*, was published in 1989. By then, Bradshaw, the only Irish historian teaching in Cambridge and therefore accustomed to fielding brickbats in all periods, had become the champion of the anti-revisionists. He damned those of the *IHS* school of "'value-free' history", rejecting their dull and desiccated publications which had in his view two besetting sins. Firstly, they had marginalised the central dimension of Irish History, the trauma of its catastrophes: the violence of colonisation, for example, or the horror of the Great Famine. Secondly, they had adopted a cynical, corrosive approach to the past, sceptical of those valuable origin-myths which a nation needs.

He damned most post-1970 accounts for their denial of national continuity from earliest times (Ellis's sin in particular); their denial of the beneficent influence of a public perception of the continuity of the past. To Bradshaw, it seems, public perception of the past is too important and necessary to deny, even if it might be misguided in places.

He had earlier joined swords with Ruth Dudley Edwards, daughter of the infamous Dudley, over her biography of Patrick Pearse, *The Triumph of Failure* (Gollancz, 1977): a biography which showed Pearse's faults as well as his achievements, making him a human hero rather than a demigod. But Bradshaw wanted no slur cast against the originator of the 1916 Rising.

He summarised his general critique in the peroration of this *IHS* article. The Moody and Edwards School is basically flawed, he claimed. It is "inappropriate as a means of approaching the Irish historical experience in two respects". Its practitioners have displayed inhibitions "in face of the catastrophic dimension of Irish history [...] its

vulnerability to tacit bias has been highlighted by the negative revisionism practised in its name in exploring the Irish nationalist tradition". Furthermore it has opened up a "credibility gap [...] between the new professional history and the general public" His remedy, however, appears contradictory and unrealistic: "an imaginative and empathetic approach [...] [to achieve] [...] a professional Irish historiography which concedes nothing in the way of critical standards of scholarship, while at the same time responding sensitively to the totality of the Irish experience"[14]. His critique also over-generalises the concepts of "scientific" and "value-free" history, as though all historians of the second half of the twentieth century had sailed only under these flags. Like Desmond Fennell, another resentful of modern Irish historians, he seems to see a self-conscious school pursuing a set agenda. Both men underestimate the extraordinary opening up of urban history, women's history, business history and the sheer variety of practitioners even in the fields of political and constitutional history, spread over excellent departments of history throughout Ireland and also in several British and American Universities.

Desmond Fennell imagines a revisionist school dedicated to buttressing the establishment of the day. He argues that

> it has met that establishment's need for a history that would "buttress and legitimise" its major departure from the nationalist ideology on which the state was founded, and the attitudes and policies following from this; particularly its suspension of the demand that Britain withdraw from Ireland, its assumption that Britain's attitude towards Ireland is benevolent, and its collaboration with Britain against the nationalist armed rebellion in the North.[15]

Revisionism is regarded, then, as a conspiracy – immoral and damaging to the nation. People need their heroes, need their national history, which should serve the nation, not undermine it.

The revisionist debate spread to America, where recent historians have made major contributions to Irish history. Critics there condemned the Anglo-centric view of the *IHS* historians and their failure to come to grips with popular culture. The literary critic, Seamus Deane, next added his voice, attacking history as a "slippery discipline" and historians of the *IHS* school for undermining "the notion of a single narrative [of Irish evolution] and pretending to supplant it with a plurality of narratives".[16]

The debate, in the end, is a political and emotional one. Some Irish nationalists (including some who are historians) prefer their history straightforward and simple and believe the bulk of historians have gone too far in complicating Ireland's past. Many modern Irish historians (most of whom would call themselves nationalists also) feel that the professional pursuit of their discipline has to recognise that the past is not a black-and-white record, where a monopoly of good lies on one side and a monopoly of bad on the other, but is rather greyer and more complex. Skill and endeavour, they argue, can uncover a greater amount of truth: truth about motives and actions, about

Celts and Vikings, Normans and Anglo-Irish, Irish and British, Catholic and Protestant, Nationalist and Unionist. Comprehending truth about the past can assist tolerance in the present and help build co-operation in the future. They would argue that much understanding has been improved already: from St. Patrick to Patrick Pearse, via Brian Boru, Hugh Roe O'Neill, the Penal Laws, the Great Famine itself.

History, after all, should be a matter for rational debate, not dogma. Historical scholarship itself is an endless process and we can note in regard to this phase that the outcry against the revisionists has been even more determined by contemporary events and needs than the histories its critics condemn. And, as Ronan Fanning remarks, this particular dispute happens to have coincided with both the outbreak of violence in North East Ireland and the opening up of archival sources in London, Dublin and Belfast.[17]

The last observations should go to Geroid O'Tuathaigh, as they do in Ciaran Brady's, *Interpreting Irish History*, though justice cannot be done here to his scope and subtle perceptiveness. He reminds us that the condemnation of the revisionists is very narrow in its focus, very general in its critique. There has been no real complaint about revising the orthodox view of Irish Catholicism, launched by Emmet Larkin, or much of the revisionism of economic and social history – demography, land ownership, emigration, migration, urban and labour studies – on both sides of the Atlantic; or recent revisions of early Irish history: regnal succession, the laws, social and family structure etc. In fact, a substantial body of revisionist writing has caused no public or academic indignation. Real heat has been confined to a relatively limited corpus: the settled myths of Irish nationalism and Ulster Unionism. There the new generation of historians has confronted "the myths and legends which constituted an obsessively determinist nationalist historiography" and "it is the outcome of this interrogation [...] that is the matter of contention between the revisionists and their critics".[18] He decries the harnessing of history to a nationalist agenda; the putting of history to use ("purposeful unhistoricity"). He does see value in addressing issues in critical theory, however, if a better balance is to be struck in the future.

And so the debate continues. The revolution in scholarly standards was necessary and remains healthy. Like Moody, who did more than any man before or since to transform his subject, it is still possible for those striving amongst the archives in pursuit of a more perfect record to believe: "*tout comprendre, c'est tout pardonner"*

Notes

1 Vol. 3, p 9: see Sean Duffy. "Historical revisit: Goddard Henry Orpen". In: *IHS* vol XXXII, n· 126, Nov. 2000, p. 251.

2 The original observation was made by John A. Murphy in "Comment". In: WATT, D. (Ed.). *The Constitution of Northern Ireland* (London, 1981), p. 167, but this version is in J.J. Lee, *Ireland 1912-85* (CUP, 1989) p. 589.

3 Lee, *Ibid*.

4 Aidan Clarke. "Robert Dudley Edwardes (1909-88)". In: *IHS* vol XXVI, nº 102, p. 124.
5 *Ibid*., pp. 121-7.
6 Preface to the third edition, *The Irish Question: 1840-1921* (Allen and Unwin, 1975) p. 19.
7 *Irish Times* 9 Sept 1976.
8 Moody, T. W. "Irish History and Irish Mythology". In: *Hermathena*, 124 (1978) pp. 7-24. Published as chapter 5 in Ciaran Brady (Ed). *Interpreting Irish History* (hereafter *I.I.H*).
9 *Irish Times*, *op. cit.*
10 F.S.L.Lyons, *The Burden of our History*, (Queen's University Belfast, 1979) chp 6 in *I.I.H*., p. 91.
11 Foster, Roy. "History and the Irish Question' chp 8. In: *I.I.H.*, p. 123.
12 *Ibid*., p. 140.
13 *Ibid*., p. 143. The most obvious expressions of this phenomenon are the murals of paramilitary organisations in Belfast and Derry: the "gable-end" versions of history.
14 Bradshaw, Brendan. Op. cit., chp 12 in *I.I.H*., pp. 214-5.
15 Fennell, Desmond. "Against Revisionism", chp 11. In: *I.I.H.*, p. 183.
16 Deane, Seamus. "Wherever Green is Read", chp 15. In: *I.I.H.*, pp. 241-2.
17 His "'The Great Enchantment': uses and abuses of modern Irish history", chp 9. In: *I.I.H.*, is worth reading in full.
18 M.A.G.O'Tuathaigh, "Irish historical 'Revisionism'; state of the art or ideological project?", chp 20. In: *I.I.H.*, p. 312.