**MARCEL MATLEY EMAILS 2013**

Marcel

Thanks for your last email (below).

I know little about document examination but recall being impressed by David Baxendale when he spoke on a radio programme on Casement. My memory of exactly what he said has gone but it tallied with my only significant thought on the matter of authentication. Casement formed letters in different ways depending at times on which letter came before or afterwards. This I suspect would be a very particular pattern or 'signature,' like a fingerprint almost. I never learned the pattern but observed it happening in many Casement items.

I wrote in my book of Dr Baxendale that he "asserted that even the apparent later insertions corresponded to Casement’s handwriting. He has also stated there was no tremor of forgery, nor telltale break in the inkline in the entries he inspected. That individual letters of the alphabet were written in a variety of styles, depending on their placing in the word, as was the case, and as happens in genuine handwriting, was reckoned further proof of non-forgery."

In your assessment of 2002, you obviously comment, almost entirely, on what you see as faults or failings in the Giles report, except in this paragraph on p. 15:

"On page 46 we seem to be given illustration of a contentious entry, but it is cut off on the right edge and thus not entirely decipherable. One wants to know why a financial ledger has doubled as a journal. Who maintains a personal diary of sexual intimacies in a financial journal which by its very nature is meant to provide others with evidence of expenditures and/or income? The two types of entries simply do not rationally belong together both as to purpose and as to the intended reader. Further, why would a keen diplomat keep damaging information in formats which by their very nature would normally come under scrutiny of superiors, authorities, friends and family? We ought to be told some reasonable explanation for such an imprudent course of action for a person known for his prudence. Granted, such a consideration is not properly in the purview of a handwriting examiner, but it is part of the total picture the handwriting opinion must be in harmony with."

I think it was unwise to make that comment without knowing the ledger in question well, as I do. It is perhaps not dissimilar to some of your criticisms of Giles.

The ledger was for his own use and was never expected or intended to be handed over or seen by others as accounts might be. It mostly consisted of amounts of money spent on official and personal matters but also many other things. It largely concerned 1911 but also had some 1910 material. Why he wrote things that came to threaten his reputation is always an interesting question but many people jeopardise and destroy their careers for sexual reasons. I think he also wrote as he did not speak to others, making it a private conversation in a way. And if he risked his reputation every time he went out cruising at night or groomed a boy, keeping a diary of his encounters is hardly a greater risk.

My book commentary below details the ledger and its first entries:

"The 1911 Cash Ledger is a blank, hardback notebook measuring eight by five inches and follows on seamlessly from the 1910 Black Diary. It is the first of two journals Casement maintained in 1911. Bound in black half-leather the pages are lined blue horizontally, and red vertically. There is an entirely unused set of alphabetically indexed pages at the front. The word Ledger is stamped in gilt lettering on its spine while a price of 1/6 is marked inside in pencil. What follows is an abridged version, this author’s annotations, as before, being within square brackets, and in bold.

 1911 opens with Casement, aged forty-six, returning to London via Paris from the first Peruvian investigation. His task now was to write a report for the Foreign Secretary. During the first half of the year he visited Belfast and Dublin before returning to South America in August on a follow-up mission.

 This Cash Ledger acted as a small accounts system, one kept by a man who had no permanent base to store his papers or bills and who was ceaselessly travelling. It should be read as such. About two thirds of the money notations are omitted as mundane, repetitive or uninteresting, although some of the most banal are of historic relevance in assisting understanding of the detail of his and others’ lives, and of the relative cost of living in Edwardian England and Ireland.

 Despite having a separate, proper diary for 1911, Casement did not persist with it. Although well intentioned, his resolution only lasted until 18 January. Consequently he permitted his necessary expenditure records here to be enlivened by some of the more dramatic happenings he experienced from January to October. On 13 August, when back in South America, on mission, he recommenced use of the 1911 Black Diary having made a few sporadic jottings and drawn a map in between times. Entries from then to 31 October are written up in both volumes. The ledger ran out of space at the end of October and he therefore continued with the Black Diary alone from 1 November to 31 December 1911.

 Cash totals on the right hand edge of the page, added-up by line across, and by day down, are omitted unless they are themselves significant or instructive. Monthly accumulations and other occasional calculations are also omitted. The ‘cash for sex’ calculations (and totals) usually appeared in the left margin, at times out of date order. Here they are normally placed below the related daily entry. Expenditure on Foreign Office matters was also accumulated in the margins but is not reproduced.

 Casement was not a mean man, as many have suggested by virtue of his recording of tiny payments – literally even the spending of a penny in a lavatory. Far from it, he was constantly giving his money away. But he did want to keep track of his spending. Such accounting is best done comprehensively or not at all. Casement in 1911 chose the former, although he did not always manage accurate monthly totals. He also needed a record of his expenditure in order to reclaim from the Foreign Office money spent on official business.

 The notion propounded by some, and oft repeated, that his precision regarding expenditure had some sort of psychological connection to his homosexuality – evidencing an anal personality, is thinly based given the lack of other cash ledgers. Jeffrey Meyers in a 1973 article stated “For Casement’s compulsive and repressed personality, the spending of money was closely related to the spending of sperm and the former often financed the latter in remote places where bed and boy were easily available.” Such a view is momentarily convincing but the unquestionable fact that Casement wrote so ceaselessly meant it was a small extra effort to keep daily accounts. There is also a near universal truth, evidenced by joke, that gay men make lists and are notoriously tidy which undoes a compulsive personality theory being uniquely attributed to Casement...

 In the flyleaf, Casement stuck a photograph of a standing toddler on which he inscribed “My godson “Roger” Hicks.” Baby Roger had been christened on 15 February 1910, in Casement’s absence. The baby’s father Lt. Col. F.R. Hicks was an officer at Fermoy, Co. Cork and Dick Morten’s brother-in-law. It is this sort of private, human detail, as Roger Sawyer notes, that precludes the likelihood of forgery.

 On the first two pages or flyleaf there are a few notes, mostly addresses of foreign males picked up in London during 1911:

1/6 **[this ledger’s price]**

Amron Kali. Ahmed Khaled. 7 March **[Casement overwrote a figure 8 with a 7 and the episode is duly diaried on 7March below.]** 12.35 a.m. New Oxford St. **[An arrow from this note then points to]**

Mr Gatty.

9 Jensen Street Jansen John’s (? Johnson Street) Jones St.

Farringdon Road. E.C. **[The precise address of this individual annoyingly eludes Casement.]**

25 July 12.15 p.m. T Court Road corner

Jean of Algiers. Clerkenwell Rd.

Enormous. twice as big as Amron’s.

Master E.K. Biddy.

Bishop’s Court Hill.

Bridgetown. Barbados.

**[Before and after this ledger’s dated entries there are four pages of notes to do with expenditure in 1909 and 1910 (some which tally precisely with entries in the 1910 Diary) indicating that the book had been around for a year and was previously, if briefly, in use. Those at the front are labyrinthine in complexity and in tiny writing. A few that are more comprehensible or relevant now follow:]**

Expenditure at Rio.

February 1910.

Previous to Janry 1st 1910

1909 in Rio from 22 Mch 1909…Decr…9 Months 9 Days = R 9:825.400… to Tuesday 18 Jan- … 20 To Petropolis Ticket 9.600…24 Lunch O’S.B **[O’Sullivan Beare]** …Pedro 60.000 **[Pedro, although otherwise unrecorded, is certainly a sexual partner and one who was considerably rewarded]** …Icarahy 221.000…Less Petropolis journeys 4. 4. 4. £80. 1.0

18th won at Bridge 16.000 Bridge 37.500…Pedro 5000…Tue 22 **[22 February 1910]** \*Lunch 50.000 **[at top]** \*Nordenflychts lunch…Thurs 24…Pedro 10.000 **X**…Val 20.000 **[Thursday 24 February 1910 diary – “Valdemiro – Rua 20$”]** …Sat 26 Pedro\* 10.000…Monday 28 …Mario Rua Hospicio **[See graphic 1910 diary entry for Mario, $40]** … 743 000 less won at Bridge 10 800 R. 732 200 Add – Total 732 200 Icarahy 100$000 Petropolis Pension Central 578$000 Pedro 60$000 Do. Boots &c 40$000 **[Mario]** 40$000 English hotel 24-28 103$000 **[Grand total]** R. 1:613 200

Sat. 19. Saw “Beauty” at Raiz da Serra in down train. Smiled & looked: but turned away – alas!

“Beauty” on *Barca* **–** Would not like – cut me dead **–** alas! – followed in Avenida to General Camara – last saw going along it in black.

March 1910

…Wed 2 Antonio 10.000…Frid 4 S Paulo Hotel…Lottery…Fri 11 arr B.A. on shore…Sun 27 Left San Marcos for B.A. **[Notes inscribed here of assignations with Ramón can be found in the 1910 Black Diary at dates in March and April.**

**As there are no pre-printed dates in the Black Cash Ledger, Casement had to inscribe them daily. His style of dating varied considerably, as did the month abbreviations he chose to use. The 1911 dated entries now start:]**

JANUARY

Janry 1st. 1911. Sunday.In Paris with Denis **[Hilaire]** first 30 fcs. To Prefecture and Quai d’Orleans and Montparnasse and back to Place de l’Opera and Pierre – “*bien servi*” 40 fcs. Say 80 fcs.”

In your email of 10 June you make constant reference to falsity as regards the diaries (15 times in fact, speaking also of “unarguable evidence” of same). This is not consistent with what you say in your 2002 report for, as I read it, you provide no evidence of falsification of the diaries; this being outwith your commission.

You also wrote on 10 June (and I am afraid I don’t understand it), “Her report actually establishes the many significant differences that compel a finding of falsity. However, she dismisses these many aspects of the unarguable evidence of falsity with a wave of the forensic hand. The evidence of falsity is so unarguable that she herself is compelled to note it.”

Where does she note that?

In your report you also said:

“Under *Results* on page 36 we are told many similarities were found, but we are not told precisely what they are or whether any are significant for identification. There were allegedly no significant differences, however, if the anomalies described were not found within the authentic diaries, they become significant differences which, absent a reasonable explanation, at least prevent identification from being made. If they are of great import, as their numbers and descriptions suggest they are, they are positive evidence of falsity absent a reasonable explanation.”

This I also do not understand, especially how you move to your present position of certainty as to falsification, without seeking out and assessing any “reasonable explanations” for any anomalies. The logic also escapes me and I wonder if you could expand on it.

(I don’t have the Giles report, in its first form, to hand, just the Royal Irish Academy book ‘Casement in World History’ which carries Giles and James Horan’s response to it. Therefore your p. 36 reference is not sufficient to pinpoint the ‘Results’ you write about. However the various paragraphs headed ‘Results’ are fairly similar.)

In fact there is no extant tangible evidence of falsification. There are a few assertions, mention of a small number of inconsistencies or oddities, and suggestions of possibly interpolation, even tampering, but never evidence that would pass muster for forgery, and never a hint of documentary trails for the mammoth task of such forging.

I ask therefore if you have written elsewhere about this forging and falsification and could explain further how you have come to this definitive view.

Horan’s proposal to use the ‘Write-on’ programme is eminently sensible and probably a lot cheaper than when he suggested it.

You mention the blotter at some point and may be interested in my book commentary on blottings:

“The 1911 Diary ends abruptly here [18 January] and is not taken up again until Casement resumes entries on Sunday 13 August, just prior to the commencement of his return journey to the Amazon and Peru. In the intervening months there is a scattering of notes and jottings: A street plan runs over the three days 20 to 22 February, while on the blotter opposite 3 to 5 April the words “A. Pogson, Esq., H.B.M. Consulate Pará” can be read. Opposite 27 to 30 April on the blotter is the diarist’s full new title (from July that year) of “Sir Roger Casement C.M.G”. These half dozen legible items are actually blottings of separate letters or envelopes. Some can only be read with the use of a mirror as the ink has not penetrated through to the other side. Opposite 8 May the blotted phrase “keep them in your house” can be distinguished. Those opposite 15 to 17 May include the words “Reported lost or stolen. Please look”, while another is an address for “D. Brown esq. Booth & Co, Iquitos” and is dated 6 November 1911. It is hardly credible that these blots have been forged.”

I’ll keep an eye out for a copy of Tim O’Sullivan’s presentation in Tralee.

Best wishes

Jeff Dudgeon.

To: jeffreydudgeon@hotmail.com
Subject: Re: drb articles on Casement in Germany/Easter Rising and the Black Diaries
From:
Date: Mon, 10 Jun 2013 20:03:19 -0400

Dear Mr. Dudgeon,

Thank you for the reply, generous with materials and references. I believe it most sad that Dr. Audrey Giles is uncritically believed, if as I assume she was the major factor in "authenticating" the false portions of Casement's diaries, the so-called Black Diaries. Her report actually establishes the many significant differences that compel a finding of falsity. However, she dismisses these many aspects of the unarguable evidence of falsity with a wave of the forensic hand. The evidence of falsity is so unarguable that she herself is compelled to note it. Yet the false attribution seems to have become cherished even by groups with contrary interests, because the usage that can be made of the false evidence is so supportive of cherished beliefs. As a forensic examiner I do not care professionally whether any group's cherished myths about Casement are true or false, I only concern myself with the physical and technical evidence of falsity. Whether he was a sexual scoundrel who molested boys or a political opportunist creating false accusations against others, particularly the self-pictured helpless, innocent politicos of WW I era UK, is irrelevant to my critical review of Dr. Giles' very flawed and incorrect report on the so-called Black Diaries. The blackness of them comes from the black-hearted scoundrels who ordered their falsification and executed the order, then falsely published the lie thus created.

There is an old saying that in their race against each other Deceit gets halfway round the world before Truth can put on her boots. In these days of the Internet, the falsehood has gone around several times in the first hour with hordes of the otherwise uninformed asserting it with absolute certitude. When the issue is no longer a hot tonic, it is not heard of again lest buyers for the advertisers become too bored to watch through the next broadcast. This abandonment of an issue for news coverage is something that may take as long as a week, but most often only till tomorrow's news broadcast which must devour new "news reports" daily, however questionable and unsupported, which are regurgitated in partly digested and redesigned format for the ease of assimilation by those comfortable with whatever fuels their preexisting bias. Ideally, the false is so formatted that contrary biases can safely argue from the same false premises but still meet in complete opposition to each other. Evidence we had it wrong must be ignored, denied its very existence, especially if we do indeed have it wrong.

Without the belief that the false black entries in Casement's diaries were written by him, so much activity, by both the scholarly and general public, would have to be curtailed to someone's economic loss. And it is such a bother *to look* at the Diaries and note the obvious discrepancies of execution between "White" entries and "Black" entries. It is even more a bother to study technically and critically the alleged "proof" of single authorship and discover in it compelling evidence of inauthenticity.

Regards,

Marcel

To: jeffreydudgeon@hotmail.com

Subject: Re: Roger Casement: The Glocal Imperative, 24-26 Oct 2013 Tralee, Kerry, Ireland

From:

Date: Thu, 6 Jun 2013 15:03:56 -0400

Dear Mr. Dudgeon:

Thank you for the notice of the conference regarding Roger Casement. Unfortunately, I am unable to attend. Will a collection of papers presented be available for purchase afterwards? I am especially interested in "Tim O'Sullivan (Athol Books) „The Case for Forgery: Old Arguments & New Developments.‟

The thought just occurred to me that those of us who are ordinary mortals are safe from the debate the well known deceased of Casement's accomplishment and esteem suffer after their death and some even during life. No one whose opinion is in desperate need for either enemies or allies will bother interpreting, reinterpreting and/or misinterpreting what we said and did to serve the desperate need.

Regards,

Marcel B. Matley

San Francisco

To: jeffreydudgeon@hotmail.com
Subject: Re: Casement article attached
From:
Date: Tue, 26 Mar 2013 14:29:32 -0400

Good afternoon.

Please use this e-mail address if you wish to write further. Here is my report. Afterwards I heard that Dr. Giles was a bit peeved when I used the term "junk science" in reference to her report and said I should be sued for defamation. I was not, but on other occassions when document examiners threaten to sue me, I typically say several encouraging things, the last one being that at trial I would be co-counsel with my attorney for one purpose, to cross-examine the document examiner suing me.

May you and yours have a blessed and joyful Easter.

Marcel

-----Original Message-----
From: Jeff Dudgeon <jeffreydudgeon@hotmail.com>
To: Marcel Matley <mmatley@aol.com>
Sent: Mon, Mar 25, 2013 3:22 pm
Subject: RE: Casement article attached

Happy to receive an electronic copy of your report.

JD

To: jeffreydudgeon@hotmail.com
Subject: Re: Casement and Oscar Wilde articles attached
From: mmatley@aol.com
Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2013 13:43:04 -0400

Sir:

The so-called Black Diaries are interlineations by a second individual. Audrey Giles, in her efforts to prove the government at the time right in its assassination of both the body and reputation of Casement, set forth such a list of significant differences between the Black and non-Black portions of the diaries that there is no doubt the Black portions are written by someone other than Casement. If you have not had the opportunity to read the report I wrote for Mr Mannerings, I would be pleased to send it to you.

Regards,

Marcel B. Matley

San Francisco, CA

-----Original Message-----
From: Jeff Dudgeon <jeffreydudgeon@hotmail.com>
Sent: Mon, Mar 25, 2013 8:19 am
Subject: Casement and Oscar Wilde articles attached

Two chunky items attached. One a talk on Casement I gave recently in Dublin with special reference to the novel by Mario Vargas Llosa; the other (43 pages) a review of a recent book on Oscar Wilde by Eibhear Walshe in the Dublin Review of Books - see http://www.drb.ie/

Apologies if received before.