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From Tim O'Sullivan (with his permission to share)

The writer who uses the pen name Paul Hyde made worthwhile contributions to Breac and to History Ireland in 2016 on the diaries question. However, I would have to disagree with the way he treated the professional performance of the document examiner, Dr Giles. He implied that there was a problem of subjectivity in her approach. Persons who were in a position to observe what was going on in 2001/2002, before the results of the purported forensic tests were made public, noticed the highly politicised atmosphere in which Dr Giles was forced to operate. A professional will find it very hard to carry out their work even-handedly in such a pressurised atmosphere. The fault lay not with Dr Giles but further up the line. Hyde maintains a website; Decoding Casement. He ascribes dishonesty to some individuals who hold the diaries to be genuine. I have had contact with some of these people and while I consider them mistaken I have found no evidence for dishonesty. Also, on the website he promotes the notion that only diary typescripts were displayed to influential figures prior to Casement’s execution and with that that there is no evidence the diaries existed prior to Casement’s execution. Archival evidence and earlier writers say otherwise. I thrashed out some of these differences with Hyde in the pages of Irish Political Review, during 2017/2018.   
There are a number of instances where the archives refer to Photostats being shown to individuals. A Photostat is the output of an early 20th century photocopying technology. Photocopies imply there was handwritten material to be copied. Thus there is evidence the diaries existed prior to the time of the execution. He has claimed, and it was to be read on his website, that the photographic reproductions referred to in archives were of typescripts. A reproduction of a typescript by whatever photographic means you want is still just another typescript. A Photostat/photocopy implies a reproduction of an original.

“On the advice of Sir Ernley Blackwell (the legal adviser to the Home Office) officially typed copies and photostatic extracts were circulated behind the scenes of the trial, through London clubs, among Members of Parliament and others, who might be thought to influence public opinion.” - The Accusing Ghost or Justice for Casement, Pg 11, (1957) Alfred Noyes.

A letter to the Times Literary Supplement of 18th April 1936 by Shane Leslie, who was on the staff of the British Embassy at Washington at the relevant time. It stated: Photographs (of pages of the Diary) were sent to the late Ambassador, Sir Cecil Spring Rice, in Washington, and he, in duty bound, showed them to American journalists.

A secret telegram to the British naval attaché in Washington, Captain Guy Gaunt, of 29 June 1916 went: Photographic facsimile & transcript of Casement’s diary of which you have, no doubt, already heard is being sent to America by today’s mail. Person receiving it will communicate with you when it arrives. (Foreign Office Archive - TNA FO 395/43)

After the execution, John Quinn, an Irish-American lawyer and friend of Casement viewed the photographic facsimile at the British embassy in Washington. On Aug 22 Gaunt wrote to London describing his reaction. He quoted Quinn: “I declare this to be the handwriting of the late Roger Casement.” (Scotland Yard MEPO 2/10664) Quinn went on to write to Gavan Duffy (Casement’s trial solicitor) describing how “the handwriting looked like” Casement’s. (National Library of Ireland MS 17603)

I have done quite a number of pieces for Irish Political Review, in the last two years or so, which concern themselves with Casement or the diaries question or both.

As mentioned previously, I would have no objection to one or both of the two attached articles appearing on a Facebook page. If Irish Political Review and the corresponding months of issue were mentioned that would be so much to the good, though it is not necessarily expected.

Best regards,  
Tim O'Sullivan

**"Origin of the Handwriting in the Disputed Diaries" Parts I & II, taken from Irish Political Review May & August 2018.**

**Tim O’Sullivan**

**Part 1**

**Origin of the Handwriting in the Disputed Diaries**

Below are three characteristic examples of diary material written by or purported to have been written by Roger Casement, with attendant dates and published sources.   
The first, from 1903, finds Casement in County Antrim, where he had spent much of his early teens, where he meets up with relatives and his sister Nina. There is a reference to the report he had recently completed on the Congo atrocities which he had just posted to the "F.O." (Foreign Office).

28 DEC 1903 "Finished report and sent it to F.O. by 3.20 train by reg’d post. Left with Aunt C. she to Nanaveere—and I to Ballymoney and then on to Portrush. Wired Nina. Beautiful got in with sister at Ballymoney. Nina met me at station and dined together at Portrush" (The Black Diaries, 2002, Jeff Dudgeon).

The second refers to Casement arriving in Lisbon, Portugal in 1910 on his way from South America to Paris and eventually London. He goes to visit a Portuguese gentleman named O’Neill, who had aristocratic Ulster Gaelic ancestry. His attention is distracted by various "types" he observes on the streets of Lisbon as he goes by. There is a distinct note of pederasty in the account. He is, it seems, drawn into one and perhaps more brief sexual encounters. Events occur in a frantic way, as if in a cartoon.

28 DEC 1903 [1910] "On shore at Lisbon at 10 a.m. and to Avenida where long-legged boy types and sailor. Then to Largo Camoens and to Taurus to lunch and then Largo again and young soldier lad (18 or so) in grey twill—Splendid—followed. To O’Neill’s house and down to Largo near Consulate where arranged things and on to Arsenal and Necessidades Palace and several types and back to Avenido and then by Banco di Portugal an enormous offer lying on one side like Agostinho, but too late… at 4 on board and "Ambrose" sailed to Oporto" (Ibid).

The third comes from the journal Casement kept between 23rd September and 06 December 1910, which is sometimes referred to as the Putumayo Journal or the White Diary, as there are no overt sexual references. This, as the example below demonstrates, is written in a clear and elegant prose, quite in contrast to the first two examples.

26 OCT 1910 "Found Commission enjoying the pleasure of Mr Montt’s society in a horrid, abandoned, pirate stronghold. All looked pulled down and ruinous and utterly neglected. Saw only one Indian outside the staff and muchachos, he was terribly thin, a skeleton, and scarified all over the nether limbs. Sealy and Chase brought him up to the veranda to show me and I called Barnes and we inspected the poor being…" (The Amazon Journal Of Roger Casement, Ed. Angus Mitchell, p319. 1997).

**Handwriting**

The so called Black Diaries are not written in what we would regard as prose. There are few words of qualification and those that are there tend to be the same few which appear and then reappear, such as enormous, huge, and splendid. For example the word "huge" appears twenty times between July and December 1910. The writing is made up of shortened expressions suitable for the old style telegram or even the contemporary text message. That there is only limited space for each day’s entries in the pre-printed desk diary books helps provide an explanation for this.

The handwritten words that make up the Black Diary entries are fairly clearly and deliberately formed. The telegrammatic style of expression must put an onus on the writer to form the letters clearly. So much of the content is a sequence of nouns which need to be all understood by the reader, sometimes necessarily for the totality to make sense. Generally, if we are dealing with prose writing, the overall context and thrust of the narrative can assist us distinguish words we can not make out from the handwriting. However, this is not possible with the controversial diary material. Here, every word counts as it stands in for some action taken or is necessary to fill out the overall meaning. So, here every word needs be formed with some level of deliberateness.

Casement’s private letters and his other journals and diaries are written in prose, often on lined foolscap paper. The distinctive handwriting flows without hindrance; flowing up and then down, forming exuberant curves and loops and squiggles. It tends to be more anarchic and unbound than what is found in the disputed diaries. It is challenging to the unaccustomed eye. However, where the reader is flat out unable to decipher a word, the meaning can usually be derived from the overall context and theme. The production of prose allows those with problematic handwriting some leeway to let themselves go.

**Evolving forgery thesis in its classic phase**

The decade from 1957 to 1966 formed a period when the contention that the Diaries might be forged enjoyed a wide currency. This was particularly so in Ireland. Much of this was due to the activities of a number of researchers who published their views in a variety of outlets. We can say it was the era when the forgery thesis enjoyed its prime: its classic phase. 1957 saw the publication of The Accusing Ghost or Justice for Casement by the English poet and literary academic Alfred Noyes.

A version of the Black Diary text, minus the 1911 diary (by far the most sexual and the most outrageous of the diaries), appeared in 1959, published as part of an account of Casement’s life; The Black Diaries by Peter Singleton-Gates and Maurice Girodias.  
In August 1959 the British Government finally officially admitted the existence of the Diaries. The documents however, were made available for viewing under restrictions. Only those deemed by the authorities to be legitimate Casement scholars could get an opportunity to view. One of these was Dr Roger McHugh, the Dublin-born literary critic based at University College, Dublin.

Presented with reasonably accurate typescripts and access of sorts to the handwritten documents, investigators now had an opportunity to make a more informed and precise analysis of what they were dealing with. There was an opportunity to develop new insights based on new and more accurate information. In 1960 Roger McHugh produced what is still regarded as a classic study; the thirty page Roger Casement; the Public Record Office Documents which appeared in the Belfast journal, Threshold.

He concluded that there was now a very strong case that the Diaries "were not authentic but have been faked by the interpolation of indecencies into gapped and partly pencilled volumes". In his study he reiterated arguments that had been known to the controversy for decades. But he also opened up new lines of argument based on what had recently become available.

Now he could claim there were "discrepancies and contradictions" within the documents and also with authentic outside sources. These discrepancies related to the circumstances of Casement’s Peruvian travels and investigations, witnesses to his behaviour at that time, and the quality of his then state of mind. McHugh believed it would have been inconceivable for Casement to have lived the lifestyle described while under the eye of hostile and suspicious adversaries. The Diaries relate the mind of somebody "deranged", yet Casement’s correspondence of the time bore witness to somebody in full control of their mental faculties.

Another researcher was Herbert O. Mackey, a Dublin-based skin specialist who wrote a number of articles and books advancing the view that forgery had occurred; the most interesting appearing in 1966 and was based on his own close physical scrutiny of the documents. It was a short book titled The Truth about the Forged Diaries.   
As with McHugh, the writer Frank O’Connor and other forgery theorists of the time, some of the discrepancies and inconsistencies Mackey believed he had discovered can now be seen to have an innocent explanation.

All these writers conceived the Diaries as being originally the private property of Casement which had been taken possession of by the Intelligence chiefs some time before his capture at Banna Strand. Into these original personal diaries of his compromising material had been introduced by other unseen hands.

The final product would not have required such a mighty amount of industry and effort as the great mass of it was already pre-produced and available. All that was needed were various additions and deletions to be carried out, as required, by a trained and practiced team. A more or less exact correspondence with Casement's known and established travels and movements provided a striking, and for some a jarring, note of authenticity.

Mackey, the researcher who had taken the greatest care to examine the pages up close and under magnification, referred to a number of diary pages where he claimed the physical evidence of altered writing could be witnessed.

It was only the 1911 Diary, by far the most sexual in its contents, which was deemed, by these writers, to overwhelmingly consist of forged handwriting.

**Early history of the Diaries**

Before the mid-1950s (when leaked transcripts became available to a few), what the Diaries were, or what they contained or indeed whether they existed at all, was something that could only be a matter for speculation. From 1916 to 1959, the Home Office would neither confirm nor deny their existence. They existed in a kind of limbo.

Discussion of the possibility of forgery was limited by lack of access to the originals, to copies of the originals or to transcripts. Yet, arguments in favour of forgery were made and made articulately. Attention was called to the incongruity of what was known of Casement's character and behaviour, as known to his associates and friends, and what the Diaries were said to contain; and there was a problem of a lack of corroboration. The lack of willingness of the Home Office to as much as acknowledge their existence, much less provide access, reinforced the suspicion that there was something sinister to hide. The failure of the authorities, in 1916, when the documents were put to political use, to take measures to establish authenticity in an open and legally credible way, as opposed to operating in an atmosphere of subterfuge, bolstered suspicion.

At the time of his trial, and while the Diaries were being used against him, there was a propaganda campaign in full flow in which discrediting allegations were made against Casement which have long been revealed as spurious, for example, that he had been receiving money from the Germans. This being the case, it is not hard to envisage the forging and display of alleged extracts from personal diaries as part of the ongoing project of defamation.   
Ironically, the most intriguing and unsettling argument in favour of forgery was, unwittingly, provided by those who most assertively took the stance that the Diaries were fully and assuredly Casement's. Sir Basil Thomson, then head of Metropolitan Police Special Branch, claimed to have uncovered them among Casement's belongings held in his London apartment. Thomson was a prolific writer who published a number of books. The problem is that Thomson's accounts of the discovery in his writings differed significantly in detail one from another. It is hard to understand how such a sensational discovery could not lodge itself firmly and with precision in the mind—and especially a mind of the quality of Sir Basil's—unless, that is, in his various accounts he was being less than honest.   
F.E. Smith, the prosecuting counsel in Casement's trial, provided a different written account again of the discovery. In his book Famous Trials of History (1926), he claimed the "diary" (sic) came ashore with Casement when he arrived by rowboat from a submarine onto Banna strand, Co Kerry in April 1916.

**Northern Ireland casts a long shadow**

As the 1970s progressed, attitudes towards traditional nationalism in Ireland came under concerted challenge. Political violence, on a daily basis, was occurring in Northern Ireland. Those who regarded the Diaries as forged now tended to keep their heads down. They were wary of being accused of being somehow covert supporters of the Provisional IRA and its campaign of shooting and bombing.

The academic community avoided the pro-forgery position. It became less than respectable to advocate in favour of forgery in the prevailing wary political atmosphere. An emerging school of anti-nationalist, so-called historical "revisionism" treated the question as a closed one where the only people who disbelieved in authenticity were those harbouring a prejudice against gay people and their sexuality.

There were rare academic conferences at which the Diaries were mentioned. However, the reality was that the academic community, almost without exception, had withdrawn from the forgery question in the sense of treating forgery arguments seriously. It was left open to a tiny fringe to present such arguments.

The extent to which the academic community had withdrawn is illustrated by the contents of the monumental 754 page book; Ireland 1912-1985 Politics and Society (1989) by Joseph Lee, University College Cork, Professor of Modern Irish History at the time. Lee is and was known as a historian of nationalist outlook. Yet, Casement is mentioned only once in his book and that is in passing and in relation to somebody else. That somebody was Eamon De Valera. An eighty-three year old De Valera had risen from his sickbed to attend the interment in Irish soil of former comrade Roger Casement. This was mentioned by way of indicating the strength and quality of De Valera’s character. That a full solemn state funeral was involved got no mention. The year inaccurately given in the text was 1966. In fact the remains were interred at Glasnevin Cemetery in 1965.

Occasionally there were newspaper articles and Letters to the Editor expressing a pro-forgery position. Mostly this involved a handful of people. Chief among these were Eoin Ó Máille and Michael Payne.

**Linguistic fingerprinting**

Since the 1970s Ó Máille had studied the documents, particularly key-words and expressions commonly used by Casement. Many words and phrases to be found in Casement’s attested writings were absent. In a pamphlet, The Forged Diaries Exposed (1993), Ó Máille reported that such words as "confess", "moreover", "realise", "unless" and many more did not appear in the disputed material. According to Ó Máille, Casement’s "linguistic fingerprint" was lacking. This was, he believed, powerful evidence of forgery.

An outcome of this type of analysis was a belief that the documents had not been written by Casement at all, either partly or wholly, since his signature "linguistic fingerprint", his personally characteristic words and phrases, was missing from all of the disputed material.

A writer then fresh to the controversy, Angus Mitchell, produced a thought-provoking book, The Amazon Journal of Roger Casement which appeared in 1997. This was a detailed account of Casement’s 1910 investigative journey to the Putumayo area of Peru. It was based on archival records, much of these consisting of Casement’s own and undisputed letters and journals. For the first time in over thirty years, a full-scale book had appeared which uncompromisingly asserted the Diaries were the result of forgery. A thirty-page chapter devoted to the forgery question formed the start of the book: the forgery claim had elbowed its way back into an uncomfortable perch at the edge of the academic and publishing mainstream.

The work of Ó Máille and Payne was mentioned with approval by Mitchell. In addition, he referred to the deliberateness with which the words and letters were formed in the disputed material, which differed from letters and other matter that had been known to have come from Casement’s hand. Though it was not precisely and definitively stated, Mitchell apparently was siding with those who said the Diaries were forged in their entirety. Yet, he was prepared to hedge somewhat, as to whether the forgery was whole or partial: "a number of sexual references look as if they have been interpolated into the text..." he wrote in relation to the 1910 Cash Book. (Amazon Journal, p28, 1997) This is an account book of Casement’s expenditure in 1910-11 which contains sexual references interspersed among mundane day to day financial details.

**The questioned Diaries and their original day to day use**

My view is that we should conceive of the Diaries as originally consisting of jotting down of words and phrases created on the move. Thus a rudimentary summary of the events of a certain day was recorded for future reference. This answers the basic questions: who, what, where, when and how. The Diaries were not intended as a facility for extended commentary or description. As such, the vocabulary in use is limited and repetitive. When a linguistic comparison is made with Casement’s voluminous prose writings, a match between the two vocabulary sets will not be found. This is because we are dealing with very different types of writing answering very different needs and purposes.

Linguistic analysis does not make sense here, as we are not comparing like with like. Language is used in a different way in the Diaries. It was not made up of prose writing. Thus it is not valid to use it for straightforward comparison with Casement prose from some outside source. The linguistic comparisons using a computer done by O Máille and Payne and referenced in their 1993 pamphlet are no indication that Casement could not have written a substantial part of the Diaries.

**Partial forgery—explanatory force**

The concept of partial forgery, as developed by figures such as McHugh and Mackey during the classic phase of the development of the forgery theory, has much more explanatory force. Such an explanation fits in with descriptions and commentaries we have relating to the appearance of the handwritten originals from a number of individuals who inspected them.   
A project of partial forgery would have meant a lesser workload for the forgers. This would have suited the narrow and fragile timeframe any such forgery undertaking would have been subject to.

If we consider the first two diary entry examples above (28 Dec 1903 and 28 Dec 1910), we have two illustrative examples of daily entries from the so-called Black Diaries. The first one has no questionable content. We can take that one as being in its original state, as Casement wrote it. The second one can be considered to have undergone a certain amount of modification, as it were, and does contain content which generally would be found objectionable, even by modern contemporary standards.

**Part 2 August 2018 (Part 1 appeared in May 2018’s Irish Political Review)**

**Origin of the Handwriting in the Disputed Diaries**

Below are two examples of daily entries from the disputed 1910 Casement diary.

20 JUL 1910

"Return to Sasana beastly Hole. At F.O. [Foreign Office]"

19 SEP 1910

"Lovely morning. Passing a new palm the Punchana pilot calls "Pona" a lovely thing indeed. Fox raving about it & well he may. Besides the assai it shoots up its graceful stem with from 6-12 magnificent fronds like those of a hart's tongue fern on top, & then a green bulging head to its long stem. Five lovely and quite differing palms growing here close together & in enormous numbers. The young pilot calls the ground an "island", probably "achawa". 8.30 a.m., a deer swimming down midstream at tremendous rate. Lowered canoe & after long chase, deer often turning upstream & beating canoe, one man jumping over, but being beaten hollow by the deer, the poor little chap was caught by the hind leg after many failures & dragged into canoe, tied by legs & hoisted on board. I should like to save him and take him home to Ireland. He richly deserves his life. I do not want to eat him! Captain Carmino, decent man, won't kill him, but has put him in a fine cage to keep & tame him. The Quichua name is “Juíchu”. On thro' desolation of desolations at 9.30 pased “Pupima” river, misnamed so as they are not pupima palms at all, but Pona."

The two entries provide quite a contrast and not just because one is very brief and the other goes on at some length. In the first the diarist returns to Sasana (England), which he finds to be "beastly" and a "Hole". The outlook revealed is mean and stunted in spirit as if written by a pantomime villain. In the original handwritten entry the word "Hole" appears at the beginning of the next line underneath and has a capital "H". It is as if the writer was confused as to what he was supposed to write. Could the Gaelic script of the word "Sasana" have derailed his concentration? "

The second entry reveals an altogether different personality; one open to the magnificence and beauty of the world. He shows an interest in the different species of palm tree and in Quichua words for aspects of the natural world. The main incident recounted involves a deer which has been swimming downstream. It was followed and eventually caught by men in a canoe launched from the river ferry. The diarist was sympathetic to the plight of the deer and was happy that the captain would put him in a cage to keep and tame him. This is the Casement we have come to know from his many extant letters to friends and his fully acknowledged writings; a man positively and sympathetically engaged with the world.

The contrast between the two suggests that the diary was, in the main Casement's diary but that it has undergone certain additions and adjustments. As a result, a different voice from time to time appears, a voice which we would not normally associate with Casement. This leads naturally to the notion of forgery by interpolation which is usually how the Diaries are understood by those who do not subscribe to the view they are fully valid documents.

**All forged?**

If one were to suggest the Diaries were forged in their entirety, one could explain the way so much of the material resonates with the character and activities of Casement as he was known to his contemporaries in terms of original diaries being used as models from which direct transcriptions were made. After being so used, these diaries would have been destroyed. So, originals would have been copied from and, in among this original material, new material would be added while material inconvenient to the desired impression to be created would be ignored.

If one were to suggest the Diaries were forged in their entirety one could explain the way different handwriting styles alternate from one to another within and between entries in terms of different penmen operating in shifts in order to get the entire work finished.   
However, if one is to argue the Diaries have been forged, then the evidence favours partial forgery; that is where deletions and interpolations have been made into original diaries. There are a number of reasons to suggest that partial forgery remains by far the more compelling hypothesis.

**General evidence**

"The cause of the clamour is not hard to see: on first inspection one's immediate impression gives support to the theory that a forger inserted the erotic passages in whatever gaps he could find between innocent entries… Three distinct handwriting styles are discernible and all are unlike the handwriting of Casement's contemporary Foreign Office despatches. One style even resembles that of Basil Thomson, who was an inveterate diary writer and was, incidentally, convicted for committing an act in violation of public decency in 1925. Every so often one comes upon the tell-tale smudge which eventually appears after an eradicator has been used. Some of the best examples of conflicting handwriting styles are to be found in the 1911 diary, which has not yet been published. There one can conveniently compare and contrast the three styles which, reasonably enough, correspond with the use of three media: a fine-nibbed scratchy pen, a broad-nibbed pen and a pencil. The scratchy style has survived the years better than the broad nib and is much darker and clearer" (Roger Sawyer, Casement The Flawed Hero, Routledge & Kegan Paul (1984), Pg 137)

Sawyer, above, gives reasons for the "clamour", that is, the widespread demand that there be an effort made to forensically investigate the authenticity of the Diaries. Despite what he wrote in the passage above, Sawyer was and remains a believer in authenticity. Nonetheless, what he wrote should give cause for reflection.

The Diaries show frequent changes in writing style and writing material used, often within the one daily entry. There is evidence of erasure of inked writing. The sexual material tends to appear at the end or beginning of daily entries. One can argue that this was because sexual activity occurred nocturnally and so was recorded at the end of a daily record of events. However, how does one then explain sexual activity being recorded at the beginning of a daily entry or on a margin or diagonally across a page?

One can conceive of the very frequent changes in writing material, especially from pen to pencil and back again, as being there for the purpose of disguise; the change of writing material disguises the change in the hand behind the writing.

**Specific evidence**

There are a few specific instances of physical evidence uncovered by researchers which point to interpolation onto an existing personal diary. These do not amount to open and shut, one hundred per cent, proof. But they are intriguing nonetheless.

In an entry for January 1911, part of a letter simply has disappeared from the page. On the corresponding opposite side of the leaf is writing which suspiciously looks like it has been overwritten onto a section which has been previously deleted with erasing fluid. The fluid apparently seeped onto the opposite page erasing a portion of a letter.   
Beverages and culinary specialities on occasion appear by name in the Diaries, as names for the sexual partners of the diarist. For example in the Cash Book for early 1911 'Welsh' (note single quotation marks) makes an appearance and reappears twice afterwards, in the guise of Welsh rarebit (quotation marks omitted). The single quotation marks, on the first instance of the name, give the reader a textual nudge indicating a sexual partner. As the nudge has been given already, the later instances appear without quotes, at least, so it seems. The addition of quotation marks is a simple way of changing the name of an object in an existing narrative into a human character without expending much time or effort. If there were a continuous narrative forged from start to finish, you would expect characters could be fleshed out more and would not require to be created by a crude improvisation using quotation marks.

**Viewpoint of Intelligence chiefs**

If we put ourselves in the shoes of Reginald Hall of Naval Intelligence and Basil Thomson of Special Branch in the period 1915-16, it can be seen that, if forgery is to be carried out as a discrediting tactic against Casement, then the forged material has to be improvised swiftly. There are inhibiting time constraints.

If the decision to launch a forgery operation was made only after it had been learned Casement was to travel to Ireland from Germany by submarine in the Spring of 1916, then the time constraints are obvious. The work needed to be done roughly within a two month timeframe.   
However, if the decision to launch such an operation occurred in 1915, say early 1915, there are still time constraints as when Casement might become vulnerable to the possibility of capture is an unknown. This is because it was not known when he might decide to leave Germany and travel elsewhere. So, it is still necessary to get the material prepared and ready as quickly as possible so it can be put to use when needed.

The quickest way to prepare discrediting material would have been to take existing diaries and modify them as needed. This would have required a fraction of the time needed to accomplish a complete forgery resulting in a final product of the same scale.   
The 1911 diary is the only one that looks to have been in greater part produced by forgery. Here too speedy improvisation can be conjectured in the way there have been different writing media used as mentioned in the quotation above. This would suggest different penmen working in shifts to get the final product finished within a short time frame.

**Captain Hall**

A forgery project based upon deletion and interpolation would require a great deal less work. As such, it would require less supervision and management. Less work to do means there is less chance penmen will lose concentration, bringing a loss of precision and quality to their work. The less extensive the project the less scope there is to make mistakes.

Captain Reginald Hall, Director of Naval Intelligence, was a specialist in the feeding of false information to the enemy. On one occasion he had a fake issue of the Daily Mail printed, with a headline about troop concentrations in the south of England which was deposited where it could be found by the Germans. The idea was to present corroborative data which could convince somebody who held doubts about what he desired them to believe.   
What more convincing piece of corroborative data could one imagine than a diary written in the actual hand of the subject of a project of disinformation?   
A partial forgery fits in well with Reginald Hall's standard modus operandi.

**Giles Report 2002**

Video Spectral Analysis is a technique which can detect variations in ink types on the page. It was used as part of the Giles examination of the Diaries in 2001-2. The data uncovered was never made public, however. There was a relevant mention in the ensuing report to the effect that the Video Spectral Analysis (VSA) indicated there were frequent changes in writing material used on the pages which had been examined.

Raman Spectroscopy is a powerful technique which can be deployed to uncover erasure and interpolation in documents. The Giles Report, rather than reporting on the results arising from the deployment of this methodology, provided a lame excuse as to why it had not been used.   
From the above we can draw some conclusions. For a start, the reported VSA findings are in line with what one would expect if the type of partial forgery envisaged had occurred. Secondly, the general evasiveness regarding these two techniques, which are known to detect interpolation, is itself worthy of note.

As a forensic exercise, the Giles examination did not measure up. However, it provided intriguing pointers to what the underlying reality of the Diaries might be.

**Observations of researchers**

Dr. Herbert O. Mackey, was a dermatologist who took a keen interest in the Diaries and write a number of books and pamphlets on the matter prior to his death in 1966. He maintained that, on close physical examination, evidence of erasure and interpolation was discernible. The documents were examined by him a number of times and viewed under magnification. He claimed part of this evidence was in the form of the indentations left on the paper on some diary pages by original writing where the ink had been erased.   
The researcher Kevin Mannerings who has also closely viewed the documents a number of times has been happy to confirm Mackey's observations.

**National Archives at Kew, London**

In the past few years, the National Archives at Kew, London have not been making the physical Diaries available to members of the public. Instead a negative microfilm has been made available. If the original is not being made available, then why not provide a high definition PDF file?

Could it be people are being deliberately prevented from scrutinising the documents closely? If so, one has to ask; why?

**An intriguing pink overlay**

On some pages of the 1910 and 1911 diaries there is a pink overlay. This was applied round about the late 1960s. A paste was crudely painted on to a number of pages. This has provoked some curiosity down the years. A question put to the National Archives by researcher Kevin Mannerings, about a decade ago, brought back the answer that the substance was Polyvinyl Acetate. Further research revealed that such a substance could block the action of technical equipment which scanned a paper document to uncover evidence of erasure/interpolation—such as changes in the chemical composition of inks or the presence of erasing fluid. Is this more than an intriguing coincidence? It is hard to escape a feeling of profound suspicion.  
The paste could possibly have been applied to undermine any attempts to detect deletion/interpolation using testing equipment based on Ultra Violet and Infra Red light, equipment which was standard in the 1960s-70s.

If the Diaries had been wholly and entirely forged, measures which obstruct the search for evidence of interpolation/deletion would not be relevant. How else can the painting of a chemical substance on to some pages make sense except as a screening measure? But with a scenario of total forgery such screening measures are irrelevant.

**In summary**

Partial forgery by interpolation/deletion best explains the emergence of the Casement diaries that we have today and which we have come to know and dispute over. This notion has by far the greater explanatory force. It is the hypothesis that grapples with all the facts available and provides plausible answers.

As discussed in the first part of this article computer vocabulary analysis does not validly find the disputed diaries to be, in their totality, the product of forgery. This is because they were not written in prose and had a different purpose and nature from Casement's known writings, such as his personal letters and published articles. Thus the two bodies of writings are not properly comparable.

There is evidence for partial forgery from the general appearance of the diary writings, from some unique specific instances within them, from the operational context and time constraints the Intelligence chiefs found themselves under in 1915-16, from an understanding of how Captain, later Admiral, Hall operated, from the odd omissions of the Giles examination/report, from the observations of some dedicated researchers, from the current evasiveness at the National Archives, Kew, and last, but by no means least, from the presence of a chemical coating on some pages of the 1910 and 1911 diaries.

When we evaluate and consolidate all this evidence in its totality we can see the case for a partial forgery of the disputed Casement diaries is vastly better than the case for a complete forgery.

**Tim O'Sullivan  
Concluded**