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**Casement's honours - Angus Mitchell**

[Draft‏]

Jeffrey Dudgeon

25/03/2016

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1424256744459070/permalink/1709857112565697/>

Irish Times, Thu, Mar 24, 2016  
  
Sir, – A recurring error in the escalating press discussion on Roger Casement is to refer to him as “Sir Roger Casement”. In the conflict between his various identities – as both Irish “martyr” and British “traitor” – this styling is incorrect.  
Writing from Berlin on February 1st, 1915, Casement divested himself of all his titles in his letter to the British foreign secretary, Sir Edward Grey. He wrote: “I now beg to return the insignia of the Most Distinguished Order of St Michael and St George, the Coronation Medal of His Majesty King George V, and any other medal, honour or distinction conferred upon me by His Majesty’s Government of which it is possible for me to divest myself”. But his letter was never acknowledged.  
In the immediate aftermath of his conviction for high treason at the Royal Courts of Justice, Casement was deprived of his CMG and knighthood, an act deliberately intended to degrade him in the public imagination.  
Surely this is a very important instance of “shared history” that should be properly cleared up out of respect to all traditions? – Yours, etc,

ANGUS MITCHELL,  
Limerick.

[Jeffrey Dudgeon](https://www.facebook.com/jeffrey.dudgeon) But what does Angus mean by 'important instance of shared history'? Casement returned his honours in 1915, and in 1916 London took them off him. This was done for roughly the same reason. Neither party thought it appropriate to retain them. Is that the shared history?