

## 1916 RISING & MANDATE

Sir,

Seán McDonagh (June 25th), [responding](#) to James Connolly Heron's "Why we should pay tribute to the 1916 [leaders](#)" (Opinion & Analysis, June 24th), speaks disparagingly of Mr Connolly's stated view that "no mandate was required for the violence of Easter week, a view that has informed the century-long 1916 legacy of political violence inflicted on this island".

Mr McDonagh is clearly questioning the legitimacy of the 1916 Rising. May I remind Mr McDonagh that it was British terror in Ireland that had no mandate and revolutionaries by definition act first, then seek a retrospective mandate, which is what was given to Sinn Féin in the 1918 general election. This election was the first democratic plebiscite to pass judgment on events of 1916 and Sinn Féin, which espoused separation from Britain, received a massive electoral endorsement, winning 75 of the 103 seats.

The armed rebellion of 1916 was formally and massively endorsed. Either way, British rule in Ireland was a product of conquest, not of democracy, and therefore devoid of authority.

The right to resist foreign occupation does not necessarily stem from the ballot box. There is a long-established and internationally recognised right of people to resist foreign occupation, as expressed in UN resolutions 3070 and 3103, which acknowledge the status of combatants struggling against colonial domination and the rights of people to self-determination.

Yours, etc,

TOM COOPER,  
'Irish Times' 29/6/15