ISSN 1753-2396 (Print)
ISSN 2753-328X (Online)

Journal of
Irish and Scottish Studies

Articles

J. L. P. O'Hanly, Irish Catholic Nationalism, and Canadian State Colonialism in the Nineteenth Century

Author: Michael S. McLaughlin

Volume 8, Issue 1
Pp: 32-55
2014
Published on: 1st Jan 2014

1495
ABERDEEN
UNIVERSITY PRESS

J. L. P. O'Hanly, Irish Catholic Nationalism, and Canadian State Colonialism in the Nineteenth Century

Michael S. McLaughlin

John Lawrence Power O'Hanly was born in Waterford, Ireland on 24 June 1827. He immigrated to Canada in 1846. Following his arrival in the port city of Quebec, O'Hanly became employed as a clerk for the lumber merchant Robert Ackert. He later taught school in the town of Buckingham. In March 1851 O'Hanly moved to Aylmer where he became indentured to Joseph A. Mason, provincial land surveyor for Lower Canada, and J. J. Roney, provincial land surveyor for both Lower and Upper Canada. Upon completion of his apprenticeship O'Hanly obtained his diploma as land surveyor for Lower Canada in May 1853 and Upper Canada in July 1854. In August 1854 O'Hanly moved to Bytown, soon to be renamed Ottawa. O'Hanly then embarked on a distinguished career as a civil engineer for the Canadian Pacific Railway, as well as a land surveyor for the Department of the Interior, mapping provincial boundaries and laying out Indian Reserves. Along with his professional résumé, O'Hanly was an ardent supporter of Irish nationalism and actively involved in Irish Catholic voluntary associations in Ottawa. Though not a Fenian, O'Hanly was a radical who not only attacked British imperial rule, but also Irish Catholics whom he felt betrayed the nationalist cause through their accommodationist positions.[1]

On first blush, the colonialism evident in O'Hanly's professional career might seem inconsistent with his radical Irish nationalist politics. However, the role that Irish Catholics played in various types of colonialism has begun to be rethought. Rather than an understanding of Irish Catholics functioning outside of, or in strict opposition to, the British Empire and its global colonial practices, this approach probes the role of Irish Catholics in global systems of colonialism and imperialism while aiming to destabilise the binary between Irish nationalism and imperialism. As Alvin Jackson has outlined, the Irish were 'simultaneously major participants in the Empire, and a significant source of subversion.'[2] One of the first major forays into this subject was S. B. Cook's 'The Irish Raj: Social Origins and Careers of Irishmen in the Indian

---

[1] Library and Archives Canada, O'Hanly Papers, MG 29 B11 Volume 34, File 2: 'Biography of J. L. P. O'Hanly.'

[2] Alvin Jackson, 'Ireland, the Union, and the Empire, 1800–1960' in Kevin Kenny (ed.), *Ireland and the Empire* (Oxford, 2004), 123.

Civil Service, 1855–1914.' Cook argued that of the various Irish responses to British rule the most common was that of support, which he characterised as 'a broad category encompassing conscious and active collaboration as well as acquiescence in laws, values, and social structures that were partly shaped by British hegemony.'[3] More recently, S. Karly Kehoe explored the careers of Irish surgeons in the British Royal Navy in the mid-nineteenth century. Kehoe focused specifically on two brothers from Belfast, Richard and Frederick McClement, and some of their Irish medical colleagues and concluded that the pragmatic loyalism these Irish surgeons displayed ensured a stronger relationship between Ireland's middle class and the British state.[4]

Though situated in a different geographical and professional context, O'Hanly can be placed among this group of Irish individuals who aided in the expansion and maintenance of the British Empire. As a prospering participant in Canada's internal colonial system, O'Hanly was at the leading edge of Canada's nineteenth-century nation-building project that included westward expansion through projects that aimed to define and expand Canada's boundaries and impose a paternalist, racialised order on aboriginal peoples. This essay details O'Hanly's activities as an Irish nationalist who advanced, and advanced in, the global system of colonialism, and by way of conclusion probes the relationship between O'Hanly's Irish nationalism and his views on Canadian aboriginals.

The 1867 St Patrick's Day Parade in Ottawa

J. L P. O'Hanly was elected president of Ottawa's St Patrick's Literary Association (SPLA) in the 1860s. The ethno-religious component of Irish Catholic voluntary associations meant that such organisations acted as vehicles through which individuals could demonstrate their respectability in an often hostile social environment, and indeed circumstances were especially hostile for Canadian Irish Catholics following the Fenian Raids of 1866 and 1870. Coming from the United States, Irish revolutionaries attacked Canada at Campobello, New Brunswick; Eccles Hill and Huntingdon, Quebec; Ridgeway, Ontario; and in Manitoba's Red River Valley.[5] Within this strained context, many within the Irish Catholic community sought to distance themselves from an association with the Fenians, fearing a negative backlash from

[3] S. B. Cook, 'The Irish Raj: Social Origins and Careers of Irishmen in the Indian Civil Service, 1855–1914', *Journal of Social History*, 20 (1987), 507–8

[4] S. Karly Kehoe, 'Accessing Empire: Irish Surgeons and the Royal Navy, 1840–1880', *Social History of Medicine*, 26 (2012), 204–24.

[5] C. P. Stacey, 'Fenianism and the Rise of National Feeling in Canada at the Time of Confederation', *Canadian Historical Review*, 12 (1931), 238–61; Hereward Senior, *The Fenians and Canada* (Toronto, 1978).

the wider society. Representative of moderate middle-class Irish Catholic reaction to the raids was Thomas D'Arcy McGee's swift anti-Fenian response. McGee wrote that Irish Catholics had a special obligation to take a determined stand in the defence of Canada, and this 'must be no half-way work' on their part.[6] All Canadians, McGee continued, have their duties, but Irish Catholics 'have a duty additional to the duty of others. We are belied as a class, we are compromised as a class, by these scoundrels; and as a class we must vindicate our loyalty to the freest county left to Irishmen on the globe.'[7] O'Hanly and Patrick Boyle, editor of the *Irish Canadian* newspaper and frequent ally of O'Hanly, both took a more combative approach in their response to the Fenian Raids than McGee suggested. Instead of an unqualified rejection of Fenian actions, this contingent concentrated on the unfairness of the 'duty to loyalty' position advocated by McGee, and were hostile to the suspicions leveled against the entire Irish Catholic population of Canada in the wake of the raids.

When Michael Murphy was arrested along with seven other alleged Fenians in Cornwall in 1866, Boyle, rather than deal with issues related to strains of Irish nationalism, the legitimacy of the Fenian organisation within the Irish community, or injunctions to the Irish community to show increased loyalty in tense times, instead emphasised the injustice of the Cornwall arrests. 'We cannot imagine', an editorial in the *Irish Canadian* argued, 'why they were even interfered with, as it has not been shown that they were guilty of any breach of law, and were merely traveling as ordinary citizens would and in the usual way.'[8] The *Irish Canadian* asserted the men did not act guilty before, during, or after their arrest. The eight purchased their tickets openly, and did not resist when arrested aboard the train. They were, the *Irish Canadian* argued, 'not conscious of having done anything wrong.'[9] The arrest of Murphy and the others was viewed by Boyle and the *Irish Canadian* as a consequence of their ethno-religious identity rather than alleged ties to the Fenian organisation.

The *Irish Canadian* was treading a dangerous path by taking such a truculent approach to the events of 1866, and the wider society soon became critical of the paper's views. Boyle and the *Irish Canadian* certainly did themselves no favours by defending the Cornwall prisoners, nor did it gain public sympathy when they printed a manifesto from the Canadian branch of the Fenian Brotherhood. This document read like one of Boyle's defences of Murphy and the other prisoners, stating that 'the Government of Canada has wantonly and treacherously caused the arrest and imprisonment of a

---

[6] *Canadian Freeman* (Toronto), 7 June 1866

[7] Ibid. Also see David A. Wilson, *Thomas D'Arcy McGee Volume 2: The Extreme Moderate* (Kingston, 2011) which covers McGee's response to the Fenian Raids.

[8] *Irish Canadian* (Toronto), 18 April 1866

[9] Ibid.

number of our fellow-citizens, seized them without charges.'[10] The manifesto asserted that prior to this act on the part of the Canadian government, the Fenian Brotherhood of Canada had 'steadfastly and honestly opposed any attempt at the invasion' of Canada. However, they took the arrest of the individuals at Cornwall as

> a challenge and a defiance, and will act accordingly…whenever the head centre gives his consent, we shall be ready to avenge the insult, and root out from American soil the last vestige of the tyranny to which, ninety years ago, the 'thirteen colonies' gave the first blow, and, aided by our French Canadian fellow-citizens, replace it with the emblem of an independent sovereignty or the starry flag of that nation which is the last hope of freedom, republicanism, and Ireland.[11]

Canadian press outlets had long lashed out at the *Irish Canadian* for adhering to a radical nationalist perspective, and this intensified during the period of the raids. The *Belleville Intelligencer* argued that the *Irish Canadian* ought to be shut down. It reasoned that during times of relative normalcy and peace it might be acceptable to 'allow these hot-headed treason mongers to boil over occasionally, but in times like these, when the country is sacrificing so much to preserve the peace', it was objectionable to allow 'the men who are aiding and abetting her (Canada's) enemies, and openly publishing their shame to the world' to continue their activities.[12] It was no time, the *Intelligencer* maintained, 'to trifle with treason, nor parry with traitors.'[13] This was not the only instance of the loyal Canadian press referring to the *Irish Canadian* using terms such as traitors and treasonous. The *Brantford Courier* also joined in on the attack. Calling the *Irish Canadian* a 'wretched journal' and 'the Fenian organ of Canada', the *Courier* claimed that it 'does not hesitate to give utterances to the most treasonable statements.'[14] Like the *Intelligencer*, the *Courier* argued that the *Irish Canadian* ought to be shut down on grounds of treason, calling for the government to 'snuff it out at once.'[15]

O'Hanly also openly railed against the treatment of Irish Catholics during the raids and rejected McGee's duty to loyalty position. O'Hanly and McGee had a history of animosity, especially with regard to Fenianism within the Canadian Irish Catholic community and on issues of Irish nationalism in general. O'Hanly outlined his antipathy toward McGee's actions during the Fenian tumult of 1866, when McGee

[10] *Irish Canadian* (Toronto), 25 April 1866.
[11] Ibid.
[12] *Belleville Intelligencer,* 23 March 1866; *Irish Canadian* (Toronto), 11 April 1866.
[13] *Irish Canadian* (Toronto), 11 April 1866.
[14] Ibid.
[15] Ibid.

accused members of Montreal's St Patrick's Society of having Fenian ties. O'Hanly was angered not only by McGee's assertions but by the timing of his accusations. 'Be it not forgotten', O'Hanly wrote, 'that he (McGee) played this nefarious role at a time of great excitement, at a time of acute exasperation…when all passions of the worst elements of society were in open hostility to his own countrymen, always a despised minority.'[16] He believed McGee was 'the biggest rascal that ever crossed the Atlantic Ocean', one of the most prominent of the 'innumerable breed of traitors which mother Erin has hopelessly brought forth', and referred to him as the 'informer general' of the Canadian government for what he viewed as McGee's treasonable actions toward his fellow countrymen.[17]

Owing to O'Hanly's rejection of McGee's duty to loyalty injunctions and adoption of a bellicose response to the situation, the wider society lashed out at what they viewed as O'Hanly's traitorous actions. As president of the Ottawa SPLA, O'Hanly became the central figure in a controversy surrounding the flying of two banners associated with the Fenian Brotherhood during the St Patrick's Day parade in the new nation's capital in 1867, only a year removed from the Fenian Raids. During this episode, O'Hanly's combative reaction to the government's response to the Fenian Raids was evident. At a planning meeting for the parade, a division appeared within the SPLA between supporters of the various strains of Irish nationalism. At this meeting, according to a report in the *Canadian Freeman*, 'a pretty numerous and rather unusual increase' of the society's membership took place.[18] As was usual, the election of officers of the SPLA took place on the first Tuesday in March. Under a by-law of the organisation, new members were not allowed to vote in these elections. Upon being made aware of this rule at the election meeting, the correspondent for the Freeman observed that a 'very enthusiastic' young man charged at the minute book in an attempt to seize it. This proved unsuccessful. The man was dragged off the platform, but not before a general scuffle ensued which made the continuation of the elections impossible that evening. It was believed and reported, though never confirmed, that these new members had ties to the Fenian Brotherhood. Their alleged plan was to elect officers to the executive committee of the organisation whom they felt would promote their more radical nationalism. Owing to these disturbances, a second night of election voting was held where a similar occurrence was reported to have taken place.

---

[16] O'Hanly Papers, Volume 18, File 9: 'Status of Irish Catholics, Darcy McGee of Nonsavory Memory.'

[17] Ibid.

[18] O'Hanly Papers, Volume 26, File 13: 'Press Clippings—Irish.'

At that point Father Michael Molloy, the spiritual director of the SPLA, took the floor to announce that he had been authorised by Bishop Bruno Guigues of Ottawa to inform the members present that if this trouble could not be resolved then the St Patrick's Day procession would be censured by diocesan administration. This brought the 'enthusiastic' young man back to the stage to proclaim that the SPLA had conspired with the clergy to 'kill the procession.'[19] He thanked God that he had made friends at a distance from whom he had borrowed 'two banners' that he would carry all by himself on St Patrick's Day should he have to.[20] Following the 'enthusiastic' young man's outburst, the 'hot-heads' at the meeting backed down in the wake of Molloy's threat. It was agreed by members of the SPLA, at the behest of the Catholic bishop of Ottawa, that no revolutionary flags would fly on St Patrick's Day. Notwithstanding the Bishop's demand, however, the Sunburst banner was flown during the parade. Upon seeing this flag the Chief Marshall of the parade 'turned his horse homewards and left the procession.'[21] A few members forcibly pulled the flag down and re-started the stalled procession.

In the aftermath of the incident, letters printed in the Ottawa press signed 'Londonderry', 'True Briton', 'A British Canadian', and 'Young Canada', expressed unease over the degree to which O'Hanly, and Irish Catholics in general, were loyal to the crown. 'Londonderry' asserted that the Sunburst was the flag of enemies of Queen and Country and thus wanted to know whether these gentlemen were in sympathy with the robbers and pirates who murdered their fellow-citizens during the Fenian Raids. 'True Briton' argued that all 'loyal' men must look with suspicion upon processions in which the emblems of avowed enemies are paraded. The writer reasoned that, given the circumstances, O'Hanly should have known that flying Fenian flags would place the loyalty of Irish Catholics in question. 'A British Canadian' echoed these sentiments, maintaining that at a time when treason was boldly manifested in portions of the British dominions such actions were unwise. These calls were taken a step further by a group of 'Loyal inhabitants of the capital of Canada' who signed a petition addressed to Ottawa mayor Robert Lyon requesting that he take steps to find out whether there existed in Ottawa men

---

[19] Ibid.

[20] The two banners in question were the Sunburst banner and a flag associated with noted Irish nationalist Robert Emmet, which was emblazoned with the nationalist slogan 'Erin Go Bragh.'

[21] O'Hanly Papers, Volume 26, File 13: 'Press Clippings—Irish.'

whose aim it was to encourage and assist the Fenian Brotherhood in the invasion of the province and the subversion of Her Majesty's Government.[22]

O'Hanly responded to these accusations of treason in letter published in the 21 March 1867 edition of the *Ottawa Citizen*.[23] He first contested the claim that the Sunburst banner was brought to Ottawa by Fenian 'roughs.' Rather, O'Hanly asserted, the banner originated in Ottawa. The material of the banner was purchased in Ottawa and the design was prepared by a mechanic from Ottawa, it was sewn in a Convent in Ottawa by the Sisters of Charity, and it belonged to the St Patrick's Society of the township of Gloucester. According to O'Hanly this was a sufficient guarantee that the banner was neither revolutionary nor seditious in design. Further, O'Hanly questioned the contention that the flag itself was treasonous or revolutionary. If the Fenians used it, he maintained, that did not make it a Fenian flag. O'Hanly contended that the Sunburst was the old national flag of Ireland and was meant to symbolise the banner under which the fathers of Irishmen in Canada fought the common enemies of the sister isles. O'Hanly refused to denounce the unfurling of the banner, instead framing the banner in a way that would be more acceptable to the Protestant majority.[24]

The Catholic League

O'Hanly's defence of the use of a flag associated with the Fenians scarcely one year after the Fenian Raids illustrates that he did not shy away from expressing his nationalist beliefs even when Irish Catholic loyalty to crown and country was deemed paramount by the wider society and by many within the Irish Catholic community. O'Hanly's combativeness with respect to the place of Irish Catholics in Canada continued to be displayed through his participation in the Ontario-based Catholic League. An example of identity politics that sought political integration, the Catholic League was an Irish Catholic voting bloc that urged Irish Catholics to vote only for their co-religionists in order to ensure a greater number of Irish Catholic representatives in political office.[25]

The Catholic League emerged out of a belief that Canadian political culture discriminated against Irish Catholics and denied them their fair share of government appointments. The perception that discrimination against Irish Catholics permeated colonial Canada, and thus precluded the Irish from achieving positions of influence,

---

[22] Ibid.

[23] *Ottawa Citizen*, 21 March 1867.

[24] O'Hanly Papers, Volume 26, File 13: 'Press Clippings—Irish.'

[25] For the Catholic League see Michael Cottrell, 'John O'Donohoe and the Politics of Ethnicity in Nineteenth-Century Ontario', Historical Studies, 56 (1989), 67–84.

was prevalent among the Irish Catholic population at the time. As O'Hanly once remarked in a letter to John A. Macdonald in which O'Hanly was seeking government work, 'my countrymen and co-religionists complain that we (Irish Catholics) are denied a fair share of public appointments, particularly in higher offices. I am of those who have always held that that complaint was well-founded.'[26] The actions of the government during the Fenian Raids, particularly the suspension of Habeas Corpus, heightened a sense among Canadian Irish Catholics that they were not viewed on equal terms as Protestants. In the wake of the Fenian Raids of 1866, the government suspended the Habeas Corpus Act in order to facilitate the arrest of suspected Fenians in Canada. This was seen by many Canadian Irish Catholics as a deliberate attempt to arrest Irish Catholics, whether they were associated with the Fenian movement or not, and cast undue suspicions on the entire Irish Catholic community. A letter writer to the *Irish Canadian*, presumably O'Hanly, remarked on the myriad origins of the Catholic League and stressed that there could be no doubt the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act in the aftermath of the Fenian Raids, a measure he argued was 'solely directed against the rights and liberties of the Irish Catholics of Canada', contributed to the establishment of the League.[27]

In a circular announcing the formation of the Catholic League, it was asserted that while Catholics of Ontario are called upon in common with their fellow-subjects of every denomination to bear their proportion of the expenses of the government, and are affected in every way by the laws enacted by the government, they 'are almost totally unrepresented in the halls of the Legislature.'[28] The 'ostracism', as termed by the *Irish Canadian*, of Catholics in Ontario owing to this lack of representation necessitated the formation of the League.[29] The *Irish Canadian* argued that there existed power in numbers, and urged the Catholics of Ontario to form a branch of the League even if there were 'but ten men in any township or village in Ontario… the mere fact of your doing so trebles your political power at once, and your influence and vote will be courted where now you are neglected or despised by Parliamentary aspirants.'[30]

John O'Donohoe was the president of the main branch of the League, which was located in Toronto. Also on the executive committee was John Shea, first

[26] J. L. P. O'Hanly to M Macdonald, 14 October 1881 in LAC, John A. Macdonald Collection, MG26 A, Reel C1752, Volume 377, 176094 to 176097.

[27] Irish Canadian (Toronto), 12 October 1872. The vitriolic tone, and the fact that it was signed 'O'H', leads me to suggest that O'Hanly penned the letter.

[28] Irish Canadian (Toronto), 27 January 1875.

[29] Ibid., 9 August 1871.

[30] Ibid., 17 April 1872.

vice-president; Dr M. Lawlor, second vice-president; J. D. Merrick, secretary; Jeremiah Murphy, assistant secretary; and Eugene O'Keefe, treasurer.[31] Unlike church sodalities, which were organised on a parish-basis, the Catholic League was configured according to political wards and had affiliates in cities and towns across the province. In October 1871 a meeting was held to consider the advisability of opening a branch of the Catholic League in Hamilton. A provisional committee was elected for the Hamilton Catholic League, consisting of John McKeown as chairman, J. A. Devlin, M.D., as vice chairman, Martin Fitzpatrick as secretary, and George McGann as treasurer.[32] For the occasion, O'Donohoe and other Toronto representatives, John Mulvey, J. D. Merrick, and A. P. Devlin, attended the meeting in Hamilton to explain in some detail the objectives and merit of the Catholic League. O'Donohoe laid out the case for the League in a 'very forcible and eloquent' speech that lasted over an hour.[33] He repudiated the claims of opponents who saw the League as hostile to the rights or privileges of their Protestant fellow-subjects. Rather, O'Donohoe explained, it was the belief of League members that Irish Catholics should not be ostracised simply because they were Catholics, and, with a view towards remedying their exclusion, the purpose of the League was to make sure that Catholics of Ontario 'get fair play and nothing more.'[34] He asserted that given Catholics of Ontario numbered one-fifth of the population, it was strange that 'in all public offices and positions (Irish Catholics) were almost totally ignored, except in the position of menials.'[35] This object of the League was echoed in an editorial in the *Irish Canadian,* which asserted that the League sought 'fair representation of Catholics in the Provincial and Dominion Parliaments.'[36] The editorial called upon Catholics of Ontario to 'join the league if you would hold the position to which you are entitled.'[37] The *Irish Canadian* concluded this injunction proclaiming, 'until Catholics are united, and decide on the policy to be pursued, let party and politics be merged, and our sole and only motto be 'Union—Unite! Unite!! Unite!!!'[38]

Though the League attempted to present itself as a non-partisan organisation, it in fact had a reformist agenda. The political stance of the Catholic League rested on the perception that Irish Catholics had not benefited from the rule of the Conservative Party during the Union period, an era marked by political struggles between conservatives and reformers in the decades following the Rebellions of Lower and

[31] Ibid., 10 April 1872.

[32] *Globe* (Toronto), 24 October 1871.

[33] *Irish Canadian* (Toronto), 25 October 1871.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Ibid.

[36] *Irish Canadian* (Toronto), 6 September 1871.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Ibid.

Upper Canada. This recognition led the League to place its support behind the Liberal Party, and promote reform sentiments.[39] Within this political context O'Hanly penned 'The Political Standing of Irish Catholics in Canada', a paper that reviewed the treatment of Irish Catholics by governments during the Union period that was written for the Catholic League in 1872 under the auspices of the Liberal Party. O'Hanly accused the Conservative Party of Canada of discriminatory treatment toward Irish Catholics with respect to patronage positions. Prior to Civil Service Act of 1882, which established a three-member board of Civil Service examiners to supervise exams for appointments and promotions, the early years of the Canadian public service was marked by patronage as newly-elected governments typically removed large numbers of civil servants employed by previous governments in order to place their own people in those positions. While O'Hanly contended that this system was generally corrupt and held Irish Catholics out of positions of power, he believed that the Conservatives predominated in such discrimination. He noted that since 1854, 495 first-class appointments to positions in the government administration had been given. Of these, the Conservative Party conferred 455, while the Liberal Party conferred forty during their time in power from May 1862 to March 1864. Of the 455 appointments made by the Conservatives, O'Hanly observed, nine went to Irish Catholics, which resulted in a ratio of about one in fifty. Of the forty appointments given by the Liberal Party, four were to Irish Catholics, which comes to a ratio of approximately one out of ten. In Quebec, where O'Hanly noted one would expect a greater proportion of Irish Catholics in positions of social power owing to the Catholic population there, the numbers of Irish Catholics in both administrative positions and elected positions were equally low. Of the 178 legislators in the province of Quebec, asserted O'Hanly, eight were Irish Catholic while forty five were Protestant. One might imagine that the high number of Protestant legislators resulted from the Protestant population of Quebec voting in a co-religionist rather than a French or Irish Catholic. However, O'Hanly remarked that an Irish Catholic did not represent a single constituency where the French element predominated. He did note, though, that 'many such are represented by Protestants.'[40] The antipathy O'Hanly believed French Catholics felt toward Irish Catholics stemmed from the influence of the George Cartier and Conservative Party in the province. 'My countrymen', O'Hanly wrote, were 'systematically ignored and sneered at by Sir George Cartier, Protestant Englishmen preferred to them and raised

[39] For useful overviews of Irish Catholic politics during this period see David Shanahan, 'The Irish Question in Canada: Ireland, the Irish and Canadian Politics: 1880–1922', PhD dissertation (Carleton University, 1989).

[40] John Lawrence Power O'Hanly, *The Political Standing of Irish Catholics in Canada, A Critical Analysis of its Causes, W With Suggestions for its Amelioration*, Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions Fiche 23746, 34.

over their heads.'[41] O'Hanly was more than a booster for the League and its principles, and ran unsuccessfully for a seat in the riding of Russell in 1872. While he lamented this defeat, he did not back away from the issue of Catholic political representation and continued to champion the cause of Catholic rights into the twentieth century.

The 1882 Home Rule Resolutions

Beyond his work for the Catholic League, O'Hanly was an active supporter of the Irish Home Rule movement, a political campaign that sought to secure Irish control over internal affairs and agitated for the creation of an Irish government. The Irish Home Rule movement originated on 1 September 1870 when Isaac Butt, a prominent Protestant lawyer in Dublin, founded the Home Government Association and began advocating for a kind of federalism for each country in the United Kingdom. Butt was a conservative who was committed to keeping the geographical and political integrity of the British Empire largely intact. For Butt, the concept of federalism within the Empire was the best possible solution to the problem of conflicting national identities in the United Kingdom. Butt led the Home Rule movement throughout the 1870s, and when he died in May 1879 Charles Stewart Parnell took over the leadership. Parnell was less enamoured with the British Empire than Butt. Parnell built up relations with the Irish population of North America, including the Irish-American revolutionary group Clan na Gael, and was a leader in the newly established Land League movement. Parnell supported the Irish Land War of 1879-82 in which Irish peasants took up arms against landlords. Parnell was arrested in 1882 after he denounced a British land reform bill, calling it inadequate to the needs of the Irish. Parnell's actions with respect to the Land League were indicative of the more militant politics he brought to the Home Rule movement relative to Butt's conciliatory approach. The Parnellite Home Rule movement embraced both moderate and radical Irish nationalists, as well as parliamentary and extra-parliamentary means.[42]

The Canadian Irish Catholic community gave moral, material, and physical support to the Home Rule and Land League movements.[43] Throughout the late

[41] Ibid., 35.

[42] For Irish Home Rule in Ireland see D. George Boyce and Alan O'Day (eds), *Gladstone and Ireland: Politics, Religion, and Nationality in the Victorian Age* (Houndmills, 2010); Alvin Jackson, *Home Rule: An Irish History, 1800–2000* (New York, 2003).

[43] For useful overviews of Irish Home Rule and Land League activities in North America see Peter M. Toner, 'The Home Rule League in Canada: Fortune, Fenians, and Failure', *Canadian Journal of Irish Studies*, 15 (1989), 7–19; D. C. Lyne, 'Irish-Canadian Financial Contributions to the Home Rule Movement in the 1890s', *Studia Hibernica*, 7 (1967), 182–206; William Jenkins, *Between Raid and Rebellion: The Irish in Buffalo and Toronto, 1867–1914* (Kingston, 2013); Eric Foner, 'Class, Ethnicity and Radicalism in the Gilded Age: The Land League & Irish America', *Marxist Perspectives*, 2 (1978),

nineteenth century in Canada, Irish Catholics formed Home Rule and Land League divisions, raised funds that were sent to the main branches in Dublin, and even welcomed Parnell for a fundraising tour in 1880.[44] The central Home Rule branch in Canada was established in Montreal in 1874. The Montreal branch of the Home Rule League received its charter directly from the main branch of the Home Rule League in Dublin, and was therefore empowered to issue directions for the guidance of other branches that were to be organised in Canada.[45] The purpose of the Montreal branch was to aid their countrymen back home in the reformation of the system of property ownership in Ireland through the abolition of the landlord system. They advocated for the redistribution of land to the Irish people within an individualist framework, rather than the system of absentee landlordism which, as they saw it, had been a major source of the troubles in Ireland since the time of Cromwell.[46]

Ottawa established its own Home Rule branch and O'Hanly became an active member. His most notable act came in 1882 when he worked with Canadian Irish Catholic MP John Costigan to get a series of motions in support for Irish Home Rule passed through the Dominion Parliament. The first step in bringing the Costigan resolutions to parliament involved reaching out for support from Irish Catholic organisations 'from Cape Breton to Vancouver' to show the popularity that Costigan's resolutions had among the Irish in Canada.[47] To begin enlisting the support of Irish Catholic voluntary associations, it was first necessary to identify as many of these organisations as possible. O'Hanly thus searched through the parliamentary library attempting to locate all the Irish organisations in the country. He also scanned the names of priests looking for distinctly Irish names, or names 'that even smelt Gaelic.'[48] Aware that a general election was close at hand, O'Hanly reasoned that the Irish Catholic vote was desired and if Irish Catholic voters were unanimously in favour of passing resolutions supporting Irish Home Rule then election time would be the most likely period in which such resolutions would pass in the House of Commons. As he remarked, during election campaigns '"Pat", instead of being openly despised and spat upon, (was) courted and caressed, lifted high upon a political ladder.'[49] O'Hanly searched for the names and addresses of all Irish societies in Canada so he could communicate directly

6–55; Ely M. Janis, 'The Land League in the United States and Ireland: Nationalism, Gender and Ethnicity in the Gilded Age', PhD dissertation (Boston College, 2008).

[44] *Globe* (Toronto), 9 March 1880.

[45] *Irish Canadian* (Toronto), 14 January 1874.

[46] Ibid., 22 April 1874.

[47] O'Hanly Papers, Volume 18, File 10: 'Home Rule Resolutions.'

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid.

with the Irish electorate and initiate the plan to 'thoroughly frighten' Prime Minister Macdonald into action.[50]

The resolutions themselves invoked the language of loyalty to the Empire and Canada. They made plain the Irish subjects in the Dominion were among the 'most loyal, most prosperous, and most contented of your Majesty's subjects', and these resolutions were being presented to ameliorate the positions of the Irish in the interests of 'this loyal Dominion and of the entire Empire.'[51] The resolutions contended that because the Irish in Canada had prospered under a federal system allowing each province considerable powers of self-government, such a system ought to be established in Ireland so that the Irish in Ireland would feel 'the same pride in the greatness of your majesty's Empire…and the same devotion to and veneration for our common flag as are now felt by all classes of Your Majesty's loyal subjects in this Dominion.'[52]

These resolutions were clearly written to demonstrate the loyalty of the Irish, not only to Canada but also to the wider Empire, in the hopes of offsetting fears the wider society may have had regarding the revolutionary aspects of Irish Home Rule. Given this wording, it would have been difficult for the Protestant majority to attack these resolutions. In its description of the passing of the Home Rule resolutions, for example, the *Globe* approvingly remarked that Costigan's speech was 'moderate in tone.'[53] This tone and the language of loyalty in the resolutions resulted from political pragmatism. The resolutions moved in the House differed from the original ones drafted by O'Hanly, which were more incendiary in tone and content. The major difference between the originals and the ones that actually passed was the deletion of the call for an immediate release of the imprisoned Parnell. While the resolutions called for clemency to be extended 'to those persons who are now imprisoned in Ireland charged with political offences only, and the inestimable blessing of personal liberty restored to them' they were careful not to refer to Parnell by name, which had been a demand of Macdonald in allowing the resolutions to be read in parliament. Macdonald demanded that Costigan and O'Hanly accept the changes or face not having parliament's support for the resolutions. Upon learning of the compromises requested by Macdonald, Costigan visited O'Hanly and the two went over the counter-proposals of the government. O'Hanly reasoned that the specifics of the resolutions mattered less

[50] Ibid.
[51] *Globe* (Toronto), 21 April 1882.
[52] Ibid.
[53] Ibid.

than their successful acceptance and proclamation in parliament. He remarked that 'people would know that the parliament of Canada passed resolutions in favour of Home Rule for Ireland', and this would 'instil new hope and new vigour for those fighting for Irish Home Rule.'[54] They decided that the alternative to adopting the amended resolutions was the government's rejection of the originals, and therefore O'Hanly advised their acceptance 'in the interests of Home Rule.'[55] The resolutions easily passed the Dominion Parliament in April 1882, largely on the basis of their diluted tone.

By accepting Macdonald's counter-resolutions, Costigan and O'Hanly did not indicate their own belief in their place as Irish Catholics in the Empire. Rather, they sought to achieve the widest possible support for their movement by disassociating the resolutions from Parnell and the more revolutionary aspects of the Home Rule movement. Indeed, O'Hanly's own views on Home Rule veered toward the radical as he believed that Home Rule was but one step toward the larger goal of dismantling the British Empire. As he remarked in 1889, 'if the ultimate object of our seven centuries of struggle was merely to obtain Home Rule and reconciliation with the Saxon, I for one would have none of it…our mission…is not limited to the liberation of Ireland. It will be only complete with the annihilation of the cursed British Empire.'[56] That the full measure of their support for Home Rule could not be expressed in the resolutions demonstrates that Irish Catholics were not completely in control of their situation in Canada, and had to adjust their actions based on political contingencies and the prevailing socio-cultural climate. Yet, it also demonstrated that they were far from helpless. They could not determine the course of Home Rule or Canada's actions on Irish question, but they could participate in reacting to it. They felt an overwhelming moral responsibility to respond to the situation in Ireland, and the 1882 resolutions were the result of that responsibility.

Colonialism

Through his role in the aftermath of the Fenian Raids of 1866, political mobilisation in the Catholic League, and efforts on behalf of the Irish Home Rule movement, O'Hanly advanced a radical Irish nationalist platform and sought to achieve collective acceptance in Canada for Irish Catholics. Yet his nationalist politics did not impact his desire to secure government positions, nor did it appear to impact his ability to procure

[54] O'Hanly Papers, Volume 18, File 10: 'Home Rule Resolutions.'

[55] Ibid.

[56] O'Hanly Papers, Volume 1, File 1: 'Correspondence', 1 September 1889.

such positions. His employment was both a rationalisation of his collaboration with the British Empire and the Conservative Party that dominated the Canadian state, as well as a self-serving strategy demonstrating his pragmatism. He sought and accepted government employment because state employment offered economic opportunity and a stable source of income.[57] Furthermore, O'Hanly championed aspects of the colonial endeavour which also motivated his work. He demonstrated a belief in scientific progress, individualism, and self-improvement, all of which he put into practice through his professional undertakings.

O'Hanly worked as a land surveyor for the Dominion government, and two of his major projects consisted of surveying land in the Canadian west. Mapping this land was important in the nation-building process for the newly-established Canadian state to demonstrate its sovereignty in domestic affairs. Knowing and controlling the land through scientific cartography was a crucial component to this project of national rule. Such a project aimed to project dominant Western European meanings onto the land and in the process marginalise and subordinate indigenous meanings of the same land.[58] In addition to the nation-building aspects of O'Hanly's work, land surveying also re-configured the spatial dimensions of the Canadian west within a liberal philosophy that promoted individualist property ownership.[59] O'Hanly worked on the Ontario-Quebec boundary survey of 1873-4, where he was employed as boundary commissioner for the province of Ontario. O'Hanly received his instructions for the Ontario-Quebec boundary survey in March 1872. He was to proceed to the mouth of the Mattawan River and determine the latitude. He was then to proceed to the west side of the Ottawa River where he was to survey the islands in the lake and river and determine their positions. O'Hanly was instructed to plant structures along the line that were to be marked out by the surveying team, to sketch the natural features of the ground over which the line passed, and note the character of the soil and the timber. In all, O'Hanly spent 253 days on this project from 21 October 1872 through 30 June 1873.[60]

---

[57] O'Hanly Papers, Volume 10, File 3: 'Ontario-Quebec Boundary Survey.'

[58] Shelia McManus, *The Line Which Separates: Race, Gender, and the Making of the Alberta-Montana Borderlands* (Edmonton, 2005), xviii; a post-colonial perspective of Canadian history is also presented in Julie Cruikshank, *Do Glaciers Listen? Local Knowledge, Colonial Encounters, and Social Imagination* (Vancouver, 2005) and Adele Perry, *On the Edge of Empire: Gender, Race, and the Making of British Columbia, 1849–1871* (Toronto, 2001).

[59] Ian McKay, 'The Liberal Order Framework: A Prospectus for a Reconnaissance of Canadian History', *Canadian Historical Review*, 81 (2000), 617–45; Jean-Francois Constant and Michel Ducharme (eds), *Liberalism and Hegemony: Debating the Canadian Liberal Revolution* (Toronto, 2009).

[60] O'Hanly Papers, Volume 10, File 24: 'Ontario-Quebec Boundary Survey.'

O'Hanly was a promoter of railway expansion, which, along with the scientific and technological advancements that allowed for this expansion, was a fundamental marker of progress and improvement in the nineteenth century. In *Machines as the Measure of Men* Michael Adas argues they were also key symbols of colonialism. Not only did these forms of knowledge aid colonists in transforming the physical landscape through their application of Western forms of property, but their belief in the superiority of Western based knowledge 'buttressed critiques of non-Western value systems and modes of organisation.'[61] O'Hanly participated in the expansion of scientific forms of knowledge in his work on major railway projects during the second half of the nineteenth century. He was employed as an engineer on the Intercolonial Railway in 1869, a division engineer on the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1871 and 1875, and he was chief engineer and director of two smaller railway lines that he and his business partners organised, the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway and the Ontario Pacific Railway. O'Hanly was an active promoter of the progress he felt was engendered through the technological advancements associated with railways. As he wrote,

> The nineteenth century has witnessed a marvellous development in the subjection of natural forces…to the control of man…it (the nineteenth century) has beheld the infancy, growth, and maturity of railroads with all the ingenious mechanical devices which have kept up with its progress…a journey from Ottawa to Montreal through the primitive forest would take three or four weeks of arduous toll, peril, and privations at a very great expense…this can now be done in as many hours at a trifling cost with all the comfort and luxury of a palace on wheels.[62]

The Ottawa and Gatineau Railway was to connect the hinterlands to the emerging urban centre of Ottawa. To promote the building of this railway in the 1870s, O'Hanly employed arguments infused with the social philosophy of liberalism, focusing on both the economic and moral improvements that would accompany its construction. He argued that railroads were the veins and arteries of the body politic, because through them flowed the agricultural productions and commercial supplies which were the life-blood of the state. Without these transportation routes, argued O'Hanly, the richest productions of nature rot and waste. He observed that before railroads were laid across the prairies the west was no better than a 'barren

---

[61] Michael Adas, *Machines as the Measure of Men: Science, Technology, and Ideologies of Western Dominance* (New York, 1989), 15.

[62] O'Hanly Papers, Volume 10, File 5: 'Ontario and Pacific Survey.'

wasteland.'[63] A well-planned rail-line through the land around the city of Ottawa could, according to O'Hanly, bring economic benefits to the area. Because the land adjacent to the mineral- and resource-rich Ottawa country was 'thoroughly neglected' the citizens there were ostracised and 'shut out from the rest of creation.'[64] A railway connecting these two areas 'would add largely to the wealth and population of Lower Canada.'[65] In addition to the economic benefits of such a project, O'Hanly argued that the moral environment would be improved as a result of the construction of railroads. He pointed to the example of the Highlands in Scotland, and how the habits of the working classes there had been improved owing to the increased and improved facilities of communication, and noted that a similar transformation would occur in the Ottawa Valley in the wake of the railway.[66]

Tied to his enthusiasm for railway expansion was O'Hanly's support for colonisation of the prairies in order to open up lands to prospective immigrants.[67] Beginning in earnest with the passage of the Dominion Lands Act in 1872 and following the government's acquisition of Rupert's Land in 1871, colonisation schemes aimed to attract immigrants to the Canadian west with the promise of land and opportunity. O'Hanly hoped for these intending settlers to establish an agricultural economy that, in conjunction with railway development, would bring goods to larger markets across the new Canadian territory. For O'Hanly there were qualifications that prospective agricultural settlers had to meet. He divided prospective settlers into two classes. First were immigrants from Europe, whom O'Hanly reasoned should receive a free grant of 200 acres to begin their homesteading. The other class of settlers O'Hanly wanted to see re-settle the land were 'the more indigent class . . . those who live in our towns and cities on a daily wage—the precarious wage of a day.'[68] These prospective settlers should be furnished with farm implements, cattle and seed, and receive a sufficient sum for transport and maintenance until the first crop is garnered. He argued that these monetary advances, 'with moderate interest', should be payable in ten years. The hard-working immigrant and the hard-working day labourer transformed into pioneer with improved moral qualities were necessary for his colonisation plans. In keeping with his support for self-improvement, O'Hanly opposed land speculators

[63] O'Hanly Papers, Volume 7, File 9: 'Ottawa and Gatineau Railway.'

[64] Ibid.

[65] Ibid.

[66] Ibid. It is ironic that O'Hanly used the example of the Scottish Highlands to make his argument, as that process aimed to transform the social structure of the Highlanders in order to integrate them into the British state, a process he ostensibly opposed being done to the Irish.

[67] O'Hanly Papers, Volume 20, File 9: 'The Northwest Land Regulations.'

[68] Ibid.

because he believed they would monopolise the region. His plans would not allow any man whose real and personal property exceeded $1,000 a single acre of land, and would make every man who claimed a homestead make a declaration to that effect.[69] O'Hanly felt the individuals and families re-settling the land ought to be of the proper moral quality. He noted that in his professional capacity he had come into contact with these 'pioneers of civilisation' and he admired their 'upward and onward struggles', as well as their 'steady and undaunted perseverance under trying hardships.'[70] O'Hanly thus employed the rhetoric of rugged individualism and the pioneer myth to support colonisation schemes that would be a part of the self-improvement of the settlers through their ownership of property.

The examples showcasing O'Hanly's participation in, and support for, the material and cultural aspects of Canada's system of internal colonialism indicate that he conforms to the argument put forth by S. B. Cook that the most common form of Irish response to the British Empire was not hostility, but rather multiple varieties of support. These varieties of support could take the form of those who self-interestedly became 'agents of empire', or those who saw holding administrative positions within the imperial structure as a temporary expedient.[71] O'Hanly's enthusiasm for colonialism was a function of his belief in advancing the liberal order with its emphasis on individualism, independence, and self-improvement, a cause he viewed as being independent from the British imperial project. And though O'Hanly did not see imposing a liberal regime on the west as advancing the cause of British imperialism, and would likely have bristled at the suggestion of his complicity in the imperial project, he, an Irish nationalist, certainly played a role in the expansion of the British Empire through the Canadian state.

Irish Nationalism and Aboriginals

O'Hanly must be looked at as a Canadian example of the many cases of Irish Catholics who advanced the British imperial system and who themselves advanced within that system. Yet O'Hanly's radical nationalist perspective does make him stand out among Irish agents of empire. O'Hanly was not simply an Irishman who advanced his career through practices of colonialism; he was a self-identified Irish Catholic nationalist who supported a radical political agenda and was at pains not to compromise his beliefs even when

---

[69] Ibid.

[70] Ibid.

[71] Lisa Chilton, *Agents of Empire: British Female Migration to Canada and Australia, 1860s–1930* (Toronto, 2007).

they outraged the wider society and did so only when he felt that accommodation would benefit the nationalist cause in the long term, as was the case with the 1882 Home Rule Resolutions. Given O'Hanly's virulent nationalist views and his professional work with aboriginals in the Canadian west, the extent to which his Irish nationalism conflated with his views on Canadian aboriginals is an important topic for scholars to approach.

O'Hanly worked on aboriginal lands and in aboriginal communities in his professional capacity as an engineer, railway promoter and land surveyor, including a stint working on the Manitoba boundary survey of 1881. Just over a decade previous in 1869/70 Louis Riel led a Métis resistance against the encroachment of the Dominion government. Tensions had not dissipated following Manitoba's entry into Confederation in 1870, and within this context the Canadian state sought to use map-making as a strategy to control the land and the population. O'Hanly was head surveyor on this endeavour, reporting to Lindsay Russell, Surveyor General of Dominion Lands who worked in the Department of Interior. O'Hanly's work on this project was much the same as his work on the Ontario-Quebec survey, marking lines for boundaries, and keeping notes on the region's natural resources such as types of soil and trees.[72] This particular time in Manitoba was also significant in the Canadian nation-building project as it was only shortly after the passage of Indian Act of 1876, which consolidated previous laws concerning the governing of aboriginals.[73] The Indian Act promoted a policy of assimilation; it made aboriginals wards of the state and banned traditional cultural practices such as the potlatch. There was perhaps no clearer act of colonialism in the imperial project than the establishment of a system of reserves for aboriginals. The reserve system set aboriginals apart from broader society until they could be 'civilised' by state authorities. The imperial tool of mapping, which created physical boundaries between 'Indians' and 'whites', worked simultaneously with creating cultural boundaries and racial categories between them. It was possible to physically separate aboriginals from the rest of the population because this way of thinking had been established for years. In turn, physically separating aboriginals on reserves from the rest of the population extended the notion that they were 'different', and hence inferior. This mutually constitutive

[72] O'Hanly Papers, Volume 10, File 25: 'Manitoba Boundary Survey.'

[73] For a useful general overview of the Indian Act and its assimilationist objectives see John F. Leslie, 'The Indian Act: An Historical Perspective', *Canadian Parliamentary Review*, 25 (2002), 23–7.

process of transforming the material and cultural landscape was fundamental to the imperial project, as was the civilising discourse that accompanied it.

Involvement in the material and cultural re-constructions of space based on Western forms of knowledge did not mean that O'Hanly uncritically supported Canadian colonialism. He opposed government policies toward aboriginals because he felt they created a sense of dependency within the aboriginal population, rather than cultivating autonomy. Yet, O'Hanly did not see this as a reason to abandon colonial practices. It was his view that efforts geared toward 'civilising' the native population were necessary, but should create responsible individuals able to look after themselves. He believed that aboriginals had the capacity to be good citizens and autonomous individuals, but only after they had been 'civilised' through liberal colonial practices. His views on this subject were most forcefully expressed in a paper entitled 'The Indian.'[74] In it, O'Hanly issued a scathing critique of the actions of the Canadian government toward aboriginals in Canada. He argued against the idea 'drummed into the public ear, yet utterly devoid of truth…that Indians are lazy and will not work.' It was not the aboriginal population that was to blame for their state, believed O'Hanly, but rather poorly thought-out governmental policies regarding their treatment of aboriginals. The government, he contended, had failed to live up to the responsibilities it had set for itself: 'we folded our arms in indifference, forgetting or ignoring the trust voluntarily assumed when we seized his possessions and by a legal fiction deprived him of all rights, reducing him to the condition of a minor or a maniac.' O'Hanly demonstrated a paternalistic attitude toward the aboriginal population, however, lamenting that 'a helping hand we never stretched forth to ameliorate his condition, to redeem or rescue him from barbarism.'[75]

In 'The Indian', O'Hanly defined aboriginals as savages, wearing costumes, clinging to a non-English language. It was their difference from Western culture that O'Hanly held to be essential to their identity. Once these identities based on difference were outlined, he then sought to explore the similarities between their culture and Western culture by comparing what he called 'the progress of the several tribes.'[76] This comparative approach ranked the aboriginal groups of Canada based on a set of criteria which placed great emphasis on Western forms of knowledge such as science and economic progress. O'Hanly believed that even the least cultivated of the Winnipeg tribes were far

[74] O'Hanly Papers, Volume 20, File 4: 'Indian Affairs.'

[75] Ibid.

[76] Ibid.

ahead of the most advanced Eastern Canadian tribes in his hierarchy of civilisation. He asserted that this resulted owing to contact that Canadian tribes had with what he sarcastically called 'our humane and beneficent treatment of the poor Red Man.'[77] O'Hanly was critical of the treatment of aboriginals and offered the following comment regarding the Winnipeg tribes: 'since their contact with civilisation – fatal to them as to all their race through no fault of their own – deteriorating influences are at work, which if not stopped will soon reduce them to the same low level as their brethren in Canada.'[78] O'Hanly invoked the 'extinction' narrative, arguing that as a result of contact with the Canadian state aboriginals were being transformed into an abject population. The prospect of extinction troubled O'Hanly because he believed that by their inherent nature, aboriginals were 'fitted for as high a degree of culture and civilisation as any race hitherto rescued from barbarism, and if he is not today enjoying all the benefits of civilized life it is owing to the culpable neglect in the past of his would be guardians.'[79] O'Hanly thus argued that the aboriginal population had inherent characteristics that made them suited to enjoy the benefits of civilisation and culture, but that these attributes had to be cultivated under the influence of external forces. According to O'Hanly the aim of all relief should be the transformation 'from the savage to the civilised state… to extinguish the savage Indian and raise in his stead a civilised Indian.'[80] O'Hanly argued that 'civilisation' could only be achieved by aboriginals if administered by the forces of colonialism. O'Hanly was constructing an 'Indian' identity for Western consumption, in order to justify imposing the more 'civilised' Western culture to supplant pre-existing aboriginal ways of life. It was not that O'Hanly opposed state intervention into the lives of aboriginals. Rather, he objected to how the state intervened. He believed in the necessity of the civilising mission to transform aboriginals into autonomous individuals, but objected to the ways the government was going about that mission.

O'Hanly held condescending views of the 'primitive' state of aboriginals, and his work on railway expansion and surveying projects which enlarged and solidified the presence of the Canadian state on aboriginal land demonstrates that in his professional capacity he held little sympathy for the plight of aboriginals as they became entangled in the global forces of colonialism. Yet

[77] Ibid.
[78] Ibid.
[79] Ibid.
[80] Ibid.

O'Hanly's view that Irish Catholics were the victims of British discrimination and abuses of power in both Ireland and Canada did not lead him to adopt a perspective of shared brotherhood between the Irish and aboriginals as two groups impacted by the violence and oppression of colonialism. In fact, it is possible that O'Hanly believed that such an association between Irish Catholics and aboriginals would have weakened the cause of the former by aligning them with aboriginals, whom O'Hanly viewed as 'barbarians.' His attempt to categorise aboriginals as something less than human was possibly aimed at comparatively demonstrating the heightened civilisation of the Irish and thus their worthiness for equality in the Canadian state and fitness for running their own country free from British authority.

Ireland's colonial status is at the heart of the matter when probing possible links between O'Hanly's views on Irish Catholics and aboriginals. Scholars remain divided on the classification of Ireland's colonial status. Terry Eagleton has argued that the relationship between Britain and Ireland was most certainly a colonial one, which makes it appropriate to consider Ireland's experiences within the same paradigm as non-European colonies.[81] Declan Kiberd has likewise argued that Ireland's political, economic, cultural, and ideological domination by Britain was a form of colonialism that only ebbed through a protracted process of decolonisation following 1921.[82] Stephen Howe presented a more ambivalent view of Ireland's colonial status, arguing that Ireland was seen as both a sovereign kingdom and a location fit for colonial exploitation prior to the Act of Union, and that ambivalence was never fully erased.[83] Liam Kennedy has similarly demonstrated there existed higher living standards in Ireland relative to non-European colonies, and thus concluded that a meaningful comparison between the two cannot occur and Ireland cannot rightly be considered a colony.[84]

This field of inquiry also addresses questions regarding the extent to which the Irish nationalist movement can be categorised as an anti-colonial movement, as well as whether the Irish nationalist movement categorised itself as such. In studies that approach this issue, the place of Ireland and the Irish in the British Empire is transformed into explorations into the subversive role

[81] Terry Eagleton, 'Afterword: Ireland and Colonialism' in Terrence McDonough (ed.), *Was Ireland a Colony? Economics, Politics and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin, 2005), 326.

[82] Declan Kiberd, *Inventing Ireland: The Literature of the Modern Nation* (Cambridge, 1997), 6.

[83] Stephen Howe, *Ireland and Empire: Colonial Legacies in Irish Histories and Culture* (Oxford, 2000), 13.

[84] Liam Kennedy, *Colonialism, Religion and Nationalism in Ireland* (Belfast, 1996), chapter 7.

the Irish played alongside other anti-colonial activists. Matthew Kelly and Paul Townend have presented two important examples of the imperial subversion of the Irish. Kelly has argued that until recently, Irish nationalists never accepted that they were colonised, thus making their identification with other anti-colonial movement seemingly impossible, yet in his study of Irish nationalism in the 1850s and 1860s he found that a heightened level of anti-colonialism and solidarity with non-European colonies existed in the Irish press. He thus concluded that anti-imperialism was a powerful component of Irish nationalist thought and rhetoric at this juncture.[85] Townend has probed how the imperial shaped Irish nationalism, and the degree to which anti-colonialism was integral to Irish nationalism as a social movement. Exploring the Irish Home Rule campaign of the 1870s and 1880s, Townend found that anti-British and anti-colonial solidarity existed between Irish nationalists in Ireland and Zulu nationalists in Africa. Townend observed that throughout the politically charged year of 1879, the Irish press condemned British imperial policies in South Africa and championed the cause of the Zulus.[86]

A review of the literature demonstrates that the relationship between Irish nationalism and anti-colonialism was marked with ambivalence. Illustrations provided by Kelly and Townend demonstrate identification with other anti-colonial movements among Irish nationalists, yet contrasting examples of Irish nationalists, such as O'Hanly's patronising and racialised views on Canadian aboriginals, abound. Moreover, Pauline Collombier-Lakeman remarks that major figures in the Irish nationalist movement including Daniel O'Connell, Issac Butt, Charles Stewart Parnell, and John Redmond, all used the themes of slavery to present the Irish as victims of British domination and oppression.[87] Yet, she goes on to argue, those leaders were careful not to present Ireland as a British colony. Instead, they described the Irish political situation as provincial rather than colonial.[88] Collombier-Lakeman suggests that one of the reasons why Irish nationalist leaders did not frame Ireland as a colony is because Ireland and Irish people have historically been deeply involved in the construction and expansion of the British Empire.[89]

---

[85] Matthew Kelly, 'Irish Nationalist Opinion and the British Empire in the 1850s and 1860s', *Past and Present*, 204 (2009), 130.

[86] Paul A Townend, 'Between Two Worlds: Irish Nationalists and Imperial Crisis, 1878-1880', *Past and Present*, 194 (2007), 148.

[87] Pauline Collombier-Lakeman, 'Ireland and the Empire: The Ambivalence of Irish Constitutional Nationalism', *Radical History Review*, 104 (2009), 60.

[88] For this point also see Sean Ryder, 'Defining Colony and Empire in Early Nineteenth Century Nationalism' in McDonough (ed.), *Was Ireland a Colony*, 180.

[89] Collombier-Lakeman, 'Ireland and the Empire', 61.

By and large, anti-colonial writers have not included Ireland in their analyses, and Irish nationalists have not framed Ireland's colonial status as analogous to non-European colonies. This separation from non-European colonialisms suggests a relationship between the ways in which Irish nationalists such as O'Hanly framed Irish identity in distinction to non-European identity. Indeed, O'Hanly's condescending views on aboriginals and his self-righteous Irish nationalism demonstrates how he perceived the place of Irish Catholics in Canada, the British Empire, and historical context. From O'Hanly's perspective, aboriginals were uncivilised and primitive, hence unworthy for citizenship without the proper guidance from white men. On the other hand, Irish Catholics, especially professional men like himself who espoused a liberal ideology, were automatically placed at the top of the racial hierarchy and thus worthy of equality in Canada and fit to govern themselves in an independent Ireland. In O'Hanly's estimation, the fact that Irish Catholics were denied their fair share in Canada, and forced to live under British rule in Ireland, was all the more shameful because the Irish, unlike aboriginals, were a 'civilised' race.

Carleton University