

# Home Rule pour les oraux.

**John Mullen**

**Université de Rouen**

**Ces cours aident à préparer aux examens oraux de l'agrégation interne. Bien évidemment, ils peuvent être utiles pour l'agrégation externe.**

## **Agrégation interne**

### **Explication en langue étrangère assortie d'un court thème oral improvisé**

- Durée de la préparation : 3 heures
- Durée de l'épreuve : 1 heure maximum (exposé : 30 minutes maximum, entretien : 30 minutes maximum)
- Coefficient 2

L'épreuve consiste en une explication en langue étrangère d'un texte ou d'un document iconographique ou audiovisuel extrait du programme, assortie d'un court thème oral improvisé et pouvant comporter l'explication de faits de langue.

L'explication est suivie d'un entretien en langue étrangère avec le jury. Une partie de cet entretien peut être consacrée à l'écoute d'un court document authentique en langue vivante étrangère, d'une durée de trois minutes maximum, dont le candidat doit rendre compte en langue étrangère et qui donne lieu à une discussion en langue étrangère avec le jury.

Les choix des jurys doivent être effectués de telle sorte que tous les candidats inscrits dans une même langue vivante au titre d'une même session subissent les épreuves dans les mêmes conditions.

#### **Key instructions**

- 1 Do not confuse literary commentary and civilization commentary.**
- 2. Do not spend much time paraphrasing the document**
- 3. Do not recite your history courses.**
- 4. Hedge !**

**Isaac Butt's address in answer to the Queen's speech, 20 March 1874**

**MR. BUTT**, in moving an Amendment to the Address, said, he was fully aware of the objection that might be raised to a course being followed which would bring controversial questions to the vote on such an occasion as the present. He ventured at the same time to think that if the House favoured him with a hearing he would be able to satisfy hon. Members that he was justified in acting as he did—he hoped, in short, to show that there was an absolute necessity for giving Ireland a new system of internal government. The proposal he desired to submit to the House was that the following passage should be added to the Address:— We also think it right humbly to represent to Your Majesty that dissatisfaction prevails very extensively in Ireland with the existing system of government in that country, and that complaints are made that under that system the Irish people do not enjoy the full benefits of the Constitution and of the free principles of the law and we humbly assure Your Majesty that we shall regard it as the duty of Parliament, on the earliest opportunity, to consider the origin of this dissatisfaction with a view to the removal of all just causes of discontent.

He thought there was one result of this dissatisfaction in Ireland as exhibited by the recent elections to which no person could be indifferent and which no wise statesman could disregard. For the first time since the Act of Union a majority—he would call it a decisive majority—of Irish Members had been returned pledged to seek such a modification of the arrangements of the Union as would give to Irishmen in Ireland the right of managing their own affairs. He referred to this fact as evidence of dissatisfaction with the existing state of things.

The Irish Members who had been returned as Home Rulers were a decisive majority of the Irish representatives, and these had not been pledged to any mere vague declaration in favour of Home Rule. Those who had thought it right to endeavour to excite the attention of the country to the question of Home Rule had deliberately prepared and put before the country the plan contained in the Resolution, which he ventured to say was framed in terms as clear and distinct as possible. They asked that Ireland should have the management of exclusively Irish affairs. Their plan would relieve the House of business which it had not the time, and, he might say without disrespect, not the capacity, to manage. Their plan would not in the slightest degree affect the prerogative of the Crown or the stability of the Empire.

They saw no reason why an Irish Parliament could not manage exclusively Irish affairs without endangering the stability of the Empire. Had the grant of Parliaments to Canada, Australia, and other Colonies endangered the stability of the Empire? He believed he spoke for every Member who had been returned for Ireland on the Home Rule principle when he said that they repudiated in the strongest terms the slightest wish to break up the unity of the Empire or to bring about a collision between England and Ireland. They made no secret that they had all been elected to put forward the claim of Ireland to Home Rule, and, whether rightly or wrongly, they had come to an agreement among themselves that they would act separately and independently of all existing political combinations in that House. Whether that course was wise or not, it certainly was a new feature in Irish politics, and one that could not be overlooked. They took up that position because they could not acquiesce in anything that appeared to them to imply that there was nothing in the state of Ireland that required a remedy. In taking up that position he felt that they had taken a great responsibility upon themselves, and he knew the difficulty of their position.

He knew the prejudice which the statement that they had determined to act independently of political combinations would naturally provoke, but he would ask the House to judge them by their conduct. They would pursue a course very different from anything like faction. He thought he might base the first part of this Amendment upon the mere fact that a majority of the Irish Members were returned expressly to endeavour to obtain for Ireland self-government. He knew not what stronger proof could be given of the dissatisfaction existing in Ireland. **“The address in answer to the Queen's Speech”.** *Hansard*, House of Commons Debates, 20 March 1874, vol 218, col. 110-112. [753 mots]

### George Fottrell meets Lord Carnarvon, Lord Lieutenant for Ireland 24 Sept. 1885

24 Sep.

On yesterday I received a letter from Sir Robert Hamilton's private secretary saying that the Lord Lieutenant (Lord Carnarvon) would be glad to see me today at the Viceregal Lodge. I went out and saw him and we had a long conversation on the present state of affairs in Ireland. His Excellency asked me could I give him any information as to the ability or inability of the tenants to pay their rents this winter and as to the course which the landlords would take in reference to such rents. I replied that I believed the Irish tenant was not dishonest, that he would pay his rent if he could do so, firstly because he was well disposed to pay his rent if he could pay & next because he had a mortal dread of law costs. Lord Carnarvon said he shared this opinion. I then remarked that as far as I could learn the majority of Irish tenants this year would not be able out of the year's harvest to pay their rents in full, and that if the landlords as a body pressed for the full rents & proceeded to evict in the case of non-payment there would be an organised resistance on the part of the tenants, which I feared would lead to very bad work. He said he also shared this opinion. He asked me to get him any information I could quietly obtain on these points & I promised to do so. He then discussed the question of Home Rule. I told him that I was a determined nationalist & that I was so because I believed that it was hopeless to expect peace until the people began to feel responsibility all round, & that they would never feel this until they became aware that practical effect would be given to the doctrines which they might support with their voices & votes. Lord Carnarvon said "the great difficulty is of course the Land Question, no English party can consent to abolish all safeguards for landlords' property". I replied that I should be sorry to see Irish landlords left without safeguards. Lord C., "what then would you do to give safeguards." I replied that I thought the plan suggested by Sir C. Gavan Duffy in his conversation with Sir R. Hamilton & myself would answer, viz. to have two chambers. One containing say 100 members of whom each of the 32 Counties should return 3, each voter being entitled to vote only for 2 & each voter being if so minded allowed to give his 2 votes for one candidate. This would give to property a representation of 1/3 at the start. The second chamber or Senate to consist of say 60 members, all in the first instance nominated by the Crown so as to fairly represent all different interests, & of this Senate a certain proportion, say 1/3, to be recruited every 5 years by election by County Boards on some restricted franchise. Furthermore, I said give a guarantee by inserting in the Constitution a provision that compulsory expropriation should never be resorted to.

Lord C., "that is very good so far as it goes, but how would you prevent the landlords being ruined by a tax being put on their property of such an oppressive nature as virtually to deprive them of their property." I replied that it was hard off-hand to devise a safeguard of absolute demonstrable efficacy but that I believed there was a large element of latent conservatism in Ireland which I believed would come into play when we had an Irish responsible Parliament.

Lord Carnarvon, "well, probably you are correct."

Source: Stephen Ball (ed.), *Dublin Castle and the First Home Rule Crisis: The Political Journal of Sir George Fottrell, 1885-1887*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2008, pp. 136-137. [612 words]

[George Fottrell as Clerk of the Crown for Dublin: he was a Crown official, and at the same time a devoted supporter of Charles Stewart Parnell. He met people like Joseph Chamberlain, Charles Dilke, Randolph Churchill and others.]

### 3.

#### James Connolly

Home Rulers and Labour

#### A Remonstrance Addressed to English Socialists

(1901)

---

**Workers' Republic**, October 1901.

Republished in **James Connolly: Lost Writings**, (ed. Aindrias Ó Cathasaigh), [Pluto Press](#) 1997.

---

A few months ago we called attention in the columns of the **Workers' Republic** to the extraordinary utterances of certain English Socialists concerning the Home Rule party and its attitude towards Labour and Socialism. We pointed out that this Home Rule party was essentially a capitalist party, inspired solely by a consideration for capitalist interests, and that the few 'Labour men' in that party were of the type of the Woods, Burts and Pickards of the English Liberal party – were baits to lure the workers on to the official party hook. We also expressed the opinion that the action of English Socialists in giving such commendatory notices to the enemies of the Irish Socialists was nothing short of treason to the International Labour movement. [...]

For some time past Mr Keir Hardie MP and his colleagues on the **Labour Leader** newspaper have been assiduously instilling into the minds of the British Socialists the belief that Mr John Redmond's Home Rule party are burning with enthusiasm for labour and are favourably inclined towards Socialism. (We beg our readers in Ireland not to laugh at this; we are not exaggerating the case one whit.) Mr Keir Hardie has appeared on the platform with the Home Rule MPs at Irish gatherings, has given his most unqualified praise to them at gatherings of his own party – praise as staunch Labour men, please mark! – and in his paper, the aforesaid **Labour Leader**, he and another writer signing himself 'Marxian' have for the past few months left no stone unturned to imbue their readers with the belief that the Home Rule party are staunch democrats and socialistically inclined.

When Mr Keir Hardie was last in Parliament he on one occasion moved an amendment to an address to the throne – the amendment being in favour of finding work for the unemployed. The Home Rule members refused to support him. He moved an amendment to an address of congratulation on the birth of some royal baby, observing it should rather be a vote of condolence to the families of the Welsh miners who had just then been lost in a colliery disaster in Wales; the Home Rule members voted against him and in favour of royalty. The men who are leaders of the Home Rule party now, were the leaders of the party then also. This session they have voted in favour of several Labour measures, and Mr Hardie and his friends seek to make great capital of this fact. But, paradoxical as it may seem to say so, their vote is not cast in favour of these measures, but against the Unionist government which opposed them. Had a Home Rule government been in power in England and opposed these Labour measures, the Home Rule Irish party would have supported the government against Labour as they did in the past.

The present leader (?) of the Home Rule party, Mr John Redmond, is the gentleman who made himself notorious in Ireland by denouncing (at Rathfarnham) the agricultural labourers for forming a trade union. He is the gentleman who, when the Irish Working Class first got the Municipal franchise granted them in 1898, stumped this country asking the workers to vote for landlords to represent them – in order, he said, to show the English people that we would not make a revolutionary use of our power.

The Irish working class answered him by forming independent Labour Electoral organisations, and sending landlords and middle class Home Rulers alike about their business. Mr Keir Hardie praised them in the **Labour Leader** for doing so; he now praises as the leader of the Irish democracy the very man whose insidious advice they rightfully scorned.

[...]

But have not the Home Rulers declared in favour of Labour, has not Mr Redmond at Westport declared the fight against landlordism in Ireland to be a ‘trade unionist fight’? The meaning of phrases can only be understood when you study the conditions out of which they arise. The Home Rule party in Ireland is today fighting for its very existence. The ‘scenes’ in Parliament are but the distant echo of the fight made by the Home Rulers to regain the support of the Irish Democracy. Despite all the puffing and booming of the press, despite the lavish expenditure of money on bands and faked up demonstrations, the United Irish League has not caught on in Ireland, and has not forty sound branches in all the country. The intelligent Irish Working Class despise the politicians. When after the first Local Government election in Ireland the professional politicians saw that the Irish workers had turned their backs upon them they took alarm, and in order to sidetrack the Labour movement in the next two elections they ran bogus labour candidates on their tickets in opposition to the independent candidates ran by genuine Labour organisations. This fact involved two sets of rallying cries. The Home Rule politician’s election cry in such contests was, “Nationality and Labour should go together”; that of the genuine Labour candidates was voiced by the then President of the Dublin Trades Council, Mr Leahy, when he said in reply that “Labour should stand alone.” We need not insist upon asking which side English Socialists should agree with. Imagine then our surprise and amusement when we found such utterances as that of Mr Redmond at Westport, and the Home Rule rallying cry we have quoted, both in their essence piteous appeals to the Irish workers to return to the Home Rule fold to be shorn, reproduced in the **Labour Leader** and ILP speeches, as “magnificent utterances in favour of Labour”. When an English Liberal says “we are fighting the cause of Labour”, the ILP laughs him to scorn, and when an Irish Home Ruler says the same thing it is accepted as gospel truth. But not in Ireland, we know our men.

[...] We ask Mr Keir Hardie to consider these facts; we challenge any of his Home Rule friends to dispute either the statements or the inference drawn therefrom. We do not agree with Hardie’s general policy, would most decidedly not adopt it as our own, but we believe in his honesty of purpose. We ask nothing from the English democracy but we do not wish to cross one another’s path. We believe the Irish working class are strong enough and intelligent enough to fight their own battles and we would be the last to advise them to trust to outside help in the struggle that lies before them. We do not propose to criticise Hardie’s voting alliance with the Home Rulers, but a voting alliance need not be accompanied by indiscriminate praise of your temporary allies.

Signed  
Executive Committee  
Irish Socialist Republican Party,  
138 Upper Abbey Street, Dublin

## 4.

*John Redmond, KING'S SPEECH (MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS).*

*House of Commons Debates 19 February 1906 vol 152 cc175-204*

Lord Lansdowne, in the House of Lords not many months ago, used this remarkable phrase—“There is room for considerable improvement in the old-fashioned and complicated organisation of the Irish Government”. Sir West Ridgeway, Under-Secretary in Dublin Castle when the late Prime Minister was Chief Secretary, has told us, in a remarkable declaration, that at the very time when he was engaged in carrying out a coercion regimen in Ireland he was at the same time engaged in preparing a great scheme of local government—not of county councils, but of local government in the sense even of devolution, or national council, or something of that kind; and he has told us that from his experience Dublin Castle government is a chaotic anachronism. The same views have been expressed by Sir Robert Hamilton, Sir Redvers Buller, Lord Dudley, and Lord Carnarvon, not to speak of Liberal statesmen. I confess I wish I had by me at the moment the Radical programme—it has gone out of print, and I think the Irish Party will have to reprint it. I have it at home and I am very familiar with it, and I directly controvert the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham to-night that his scheme for reform in Ireland was such as has been satisfied by the concession of local government. Nothing of the kind; this scheme was a scheme for the abolition of the rule of Dublin Castle, and the putting into the hands of a great representative body all the great Irish questions including, if I am not mistaken, the questions both of the land and of education. The result of all this was inevitable—the neglect of every interest in Ireland and the dissatisfaction and discontent of every class of the community in Ireland. Our fisheries are neglected, our great waterways are neglected, and our system of transit and railway facilities is the most expensive in Europe. Our harbours are neglected. Our system of education is fifty years behind the least progressive country in Europe. Our working-classes are worse housed and less effort is made to improve their lot than in the case of the working-classes of any country in the world, and it follows that every class in Ireland is dissatisfied with the present system of government. The latest proof of this is to be found in the votes of the Orange democracy of West Belfast which returned my hon. friend. Not long ago Lord Rosebery said he would be prepared to give a colonial constitution to Ireland if only Ireland were loyal. I ask the House of Commons what race of men who are not fools or slaves would be loyal to such a system of government as Ireland has? The remark which I have quoted was a thoughtless, heartless remark, showing a strange forgetfulness of history, which has ever shown that loyalty is the result, not the forerunner, of the concession of self-government. Where you give self-government there you have loyalty. Where you withhold self-government there you have dissatisfaction, disloyalty and disaster. Are Irishmen less loyal than the Canadians, to whom Home Rule was given when they were ready for armed resistance? Are they less loyal than the Boers, to whom responsible government is to be given after a sanguinary war? Would the Australian colonies have been loyal for twenty-four years if government were attempted from Downing-street? If you have any doubt of it ask the Colonial Premiers. There is nothing more remarkable than the fact that every self-governing colony in the Empire has declared openly through its Parliament in favour of Home Rule for Ireland. The last is the declaration to be found in the petition to the King, adopted by the Commonwealth Parliament of Australia.

## 5.

### **Edward Carson speaking in the debate on the Government of Ireland Bill, 11 February 1914.**

I desire above all things to make my own position perfectly clear. I am not going to be led into making any suggestions whatsoever until I see how the Government have discharged what is now their admitted duty of taking the initiative, but I think it right to say, and I would be a hypocrite if I did not say, what it would be impossible for us to accept, so that we may, at all events, give the Government some guide when they come to consider these suggestions. They are always talking of concessions to Ulster. Ulster is not asking for concessions. Ulster is asking to be let alone. When you talk of concessions, what you really mean is, "We want to lay down what is the minimum of wrong we can do to Ulster." Let me tell you that the results of two years' delay and the treatment we have received during these two years have made your task and made our task far more difficult. You have driven these men to enter into a covenant for their mutual protection. No doubt you have laughed at their covenant. Have a good laugh at it now. Well, so far as I am concerned, I am not the kind of man who will go over to Ulster one day and say, "Enter into a covenant," and go over next day and say, "Break it." But there is something more. You have insulted them. I do not say the Prime Minister has done so. I would be wrong if I were to say that he has done so. He has treated them seriously, but the large body of his colleagues in the rank and file of his party have taken every opportunity of jeering at these men, of branding them as braggarts and bluffers and cowards, and all the rest of it. Well, do not you see that having done that, these men can never go back, and never will go back, and allow these gibes and insults and sneers to prove true.

The Speech from the Throne talks of the fears of these men. Yes, they have, I think, genuine fears for their civil and religious liberty under the Bill, but do not imagine that that is all that these men are fighting for. They are fighting for a great principle, and a great ideal. They are fighting to stay under the Government which they were invited to come under, under which they have flourished, and under which they are content, and to refuse to come under a Government which they loath and detest. Men do not make sacrifices or take up the attitude these men in Ulster have taken up on a question of detail or paper safeguards. I am not going to argue whether they are right or wrong in resisting. It would be useless to argue it, because they have thoroughly made up their minds, but I say this: If these men are not morally justified when they are attempted to be driven out of one Government with which they are satisfied, and put under another which they loath, I do not see how resistance ever can be justified in history at all [...]. Ulster looms very largely in this controversy, simply because Ulster has a strong right arm, but there are Unionists in the South and West who loath the Bill just as much as we Ulster people loath it, whose difficulties are far greater, and who would willingly fight, as Ulster would fight, if they had the numbers. Nobody knows the difficulties of these men better than I do [...] Yes, we can never support the Bill which hands these people over to the tender mercies of those who have always been their bitterest enemies. We must go on whatever happens, opposing the Bill to the end. That we are entitled to do; that we are bound to do. But I want to speak explicitly about the exclusion of Ulster. I am not at all sure that I entirely understood what the Prime Minister said yesterday in his speech on this subject. In one part of his speech I understood him to say that he did not, in making these changes, which are eventually to be put upon the Table of the House, reject the exclusion of Ulster as a possibility. In another part of his speech he said: "There is nothing we will not do, consistent with the maintenance of the fundamental principles of the Bill, in the solution of this question, to avoid the terrible calamity of civil war or bloodshed." If I take these two passages together I suppose I am entitled to say that the exclusion of Ulster is not opposed to the fundamental principles of the Bill. Now that is a very important matter. If the exclusion of Ulster is not shut out, and if at the same time the Prime Minister says he cannot admit anything contrary to the fundamental principles of the Bill, I think it follows that the exclusion of Ulster is not contrary to the fundamental principles of the Bill. If that is so, are you really going on to these grave difficulties in the future that the Gracious Speech from the Throne deals with, and not going to make your offer now, at once, with a view, not to our adopting the Bill, but to putting an



end to resistance in Ulster. Why do you hesitate? Surely something that is not fundamental to the principles of the Bill is a thing that you may readily concede, rather than face these grave difficulties which you yourselves admit to exist. I can only say this to the Prime Minister: If the exclusion for that purpose is proposed, it will be my duty to go to Ulster at once and take counsel with the people there; for I certainly do not mean that Ulster should be any pawn in any political game. I say once more, that no responsible leader [...] No responsible man, whether he was a leader or follower, could possibly go to the people, under any condition, and say, "We are offered something," but say to them that, for political purposes, "You ought to prepare to fight for it rather than accept it"; and I am not going to do anything of the kind.

On the other hand, I say this, that if your suggestions—no matter what paper safeguards you put, or no matter what other methods you may attempt to surround these safeguards with for the purpose of raising what I call "your reasonable atmosphere"—if your suggestions try to compel these people to come into a Dublin Parliament, I tell you I shall, regardless of personal consequences, go on with these people to the end with their policy of resistance. Believe me, whatever way you settle the Irish question, there are only two ways to deal with Ulster. It is for statesmen to say which is the best and right one. She is not a part of the community which can be bought. She will not allow herself to be sold. You must therefore either coerce her if you go on, or you must, in the long run, by showing that good government can come under the Home Rule Bill, try and win her over to the case of the rest of Ireland. You probably can coerce her—though I doubt it. If you do, what will be the disastrous consequences not only to Ulster, but to this country and the Empire? Will my fellow countryman, the Leader of the Nationalist party, have gained anything? I will agree with him—I do not believe he wants to triumph any more than I do. But will he have gained anything if he takes over these people and then applies for what he used to call—at all events his party used to call—the enemies of the people to come in and coerce them into obedience? No, Sir, one false step taken in relation to Ulster will, in my opinion, render for ever impossible a solution of the Irish question, I say this to my Nationalist fellow countrymen, and, indeed, also to the Government: you have never tried to win over Ulster. You have never tried to understand her position. You have never alleged, and can never allege, that this Bill gives her one atom of advantage. Nay, you cannot deny that it takes away many advantages that she has as a constituent part of the United Kingdom. You cannot deny that in the past she had produced the most loyal and law-abiding part of the citizens of Ireland. After all that, for these two years, every time we came before you your only answer to us—the majority of you, at all events—was to insult us, and to make little of us. I say to the leader of the Nationalist party, if you want Ulster, go and take her, or go and win her. You have never wanted her affections; you have wanted her taxes [...].

For my own part I might well rest satisfied, if I perhaps merely wanted to stand in the best position to push this thing to the bitter end—I might well stand satisfied with the declaration of my leader, that so long as there was no General Election he and the great party to which he belongs will back us up in our armed resistance in Ulster to the end. I know that pledge will be made good. I know it will be made good at any sacrifice. Surely the Ulster people, with at all events half, or nearly one-half—perhaps more than half—of Great Britain, with a majority even at the present moment here of thirty-two English Members, the predominant partner, the people who pay, against the Bill, I must really think I stand on a very solid foundation. Why, Sir, you cannot wage and carry on a war against a foreign power against such conditions as that, and do you mean to tell me when you cannot do it against a foreign power, you are going to do it against your own kith and kin in Ulster, solely because they desire to stay in your community? It is impossible.