

**A report to the Peace II Monitoring Committee on**  
**THE BORDER PROTESTANT COMMUNITY &**  
**THE EU PEACE PROGRAMMES**

Paddy Logue, Karen McGillion and Pete Shirlow  
May, 2007

**A report to the Peace II Monitoring Committee on**

**THE BORDER PROTESTANT COMMUNITY &**

**THE EU PEACE PROGRAMMES**

**Contents:**

Executive Summary .....	3
Chapter 1: Background .....	10
Chapter 2: PEACE II Literature.....	17
Chapter 3: PEACE II Projects.....	24
Chapter 4: The Survey .....	37
Chapter 5: Focus Groups and Interviews.....	56
Chapter 6: Conclusions and Recommendations .....	64
Postscript: The Challenge of Glenmaquin .....	67
Appendix 1: Modes of Insecurity .....	69
Appendix 2: Details of PEACE II projects .....	70
Appendix 3: Border Protestant Community and the EU PEACE Programmes.....	74
Appendix 4: Border Protestant Community Questionnaire .....	77
Appendix 5: Interviewees .....	85
Appendix 6: AA AWA NOO.....	86

The Special EU Programmes Body commissioned Paddy Logue Consultants (PLC) to carry out this research. The views expressed herein are solely the views of the author(s) based on his findings and do not necessarily reflect the views of the SEUPB.

## Executive Summary

Following a review of PEACE II funded/commissioned research literature which studied perspectives and needs of the Border Protestant community, the Special European Union Programmes Body (SEUPB) commissioned the present study to identify the amount of PEACE II funds that went to the Border Protestant community; to assess the impact of this funding on the Border Protestant community and to make recommendations on how future funding programmes could contribute to addressing the needs of the Border Protestant community. It found:

1. The Border Protestant community has experienced a dramatic drop in its population since partition, (In Donegal for example in 1911 there were 35,516 Protestants, 8,000 more than the 27,562 in all the Border counties put together in 2002). The literature reveals that subsequently Protestants learned to keep their heads down and keep to themselves. They have a sense of not being listened to or valued in society. As a result some have reached the conclusion that they are not entitled to equality of funding opportunity. In recent years, however, there are signs that confidence is growing.
2. It was not possible to arrive at an accurate quantification of the PEACE II funds that went directly to the Protestant community from a study of the performance indicators. An examination of the Equality Monitoring Forms returns for PEACE II Priorities 1 and 2 revealed that 11.7% of participants were from the Border Protestant community. It is not possible, however, to determine if this 11.7% is made up of a larger than average participation or represents a smaller number of participants who participate often and regularly. Using the local knowledge of funded projects failed to quantify the amount as most promoters believed that promoting positive relations was of benefit to the whole community including the Protestant community.
3. An examination of a selection of PEACE II projects reflects a robust and intelligent engagement with the Protestant community. In particular, it charts progression in the fields of building positive relations, dealing with hurt and in the area of human rights. The main lesson from this work with the indigenous religious minority is that it is a slow process which can also be painful. Engagement with a community which had learned to keep its head down requires various approaches and the change, both in attitude and behaviour, while real is often small.

These project promoters are experienced and their conclusions are critical and realistic. The main need of the Border Protestant community that emerges from this engagement is the twofold need to build the capacity and

confidence of this minority community and also to alert the majority community to the responsibility to recognise the different identity and culture that lives alongside it.

These needs for future funding were identified: prioritised support for funding cross-community activities; support for single identity activities when considered necessary especially around confidence and capacity building; support for the refurbishment of halls as being of great symbolic significance and morale boosting; support for dedicated and specialist support for community development; and the importance of official recognition of this community by naming it as a target group of the PEACE III Programme

4. A survey targeted at PEACE II funded projects with a significant Protestant involvement, members of Protestant churches, Protestant schools and Loyal Orders was conducted. As a representative sample could not be determined within the time frame; on the basis of imprecise census data; and by the fact that this was a hard to reach population with a minority status, a snowball sample was used to give indicative results. Snowballing involves asking the groupings listed above to distribute surveys across their social networks and not merely within the grouping to which they belong.

There are several findings within this survey which show that the vast majority of respondents acknowledge and treasure a Protestant Border identity. There is also an acknowledgement that the loss of that identity, especially among younger Protestants, would be regretted. Unsurprisingly, given this sense of cultural decline there is support for community based work that would promote Protestant identities. Yet there is an equally strong indication of support for a community sector that promotes positive change and engages with the 'other' community. Evidently, the respondents identify a desire for capacity building both within and between communities. Other general observations and emergent issues include:

- An acknowledgement from those who have been involved in community groups that received PEACE I and II funding that such support has improved '*social interaction between communities*';
- Around two-thirds of respondents involved in community groups are participants in groups that support North-South co-operation; that contribute to significant cultural and attitudinal change; that positively impact upon poverty and social exclusion; that advance equality agendas; that support a culture of human rights and that actively pursue positive relationships between communities;
- A belief held by over **75%** of all respondents was that '*Protestant involvement in the community sector will promote positive change*';
- Nearly **90%** of all respondents agreed that Protestant involvement in the community sector will encourage '*greater inclusion*' and also '*break down barriers between communities*';

- Over **88%** of all respondents supported inter-community work and the *'need for community funding that promotes Protestant identities'*;
- Over **80%** of respondents also believed that *'Protestants are more likely to become involved in the community sector if such inclusion will lead to better cross-community relationships'*;
- In terms of developing positive community sector involvement the majority (**88.6%**) of respondents agreed that *'Protestants require information and training regarding community group building'*;
- Nearly **50%** agreed that *'Protestants do not feel positive about their minority status'*. However, **67.9%** agreed that their community *'is well-respected within my community'*,
- **Two thirds** agreed that their community has *'no problems finding well paid work'* although **50.8%** concurred with the proposition that *'there are industries and jobs within which Protestants are not welcome'*.

A significant majority (**73.4%**) concurred that *'there is such a thing as a South of the Border Protestant identity'* suggesting that a definable and acknowledged sense of identity was observable. Furthermore, **86.1%** stated that *'maintaining a distinctly Protestant culture in the Republic of Ireland is important to me'*.

**61%** of all respondents agreed/strongly agreed that their identity is in *'terminal decline'* compared to **one in five** who did not agree or strongly disagreed.

**83.9%** agreed/strongly agreed that *'younger people are losing their sense of a Protestant identity'* and in relation to this **92.8%** agreed/strongly agreed that if younger *'Protestants lost their sense of identity that would sadden me'*.

Evidence taken from the survey also showed that **74.7%** of all respondents agreed/strongly agreed that *'people are now more interested in promoting their Protestant identity'*.

With regard to assistance in promoting that identity **35.7%** agreed/strongly agreed that the *'majority community is keen to help us protect our identity'*. A slightly higher share (**44.5%**) disagreed/strongly disagreed.

In terms of developing a relevant community sector it is important to develop projects and programmes that will encourage involvement from within the minority community.

**87.4%** also agreed/strongly agreed that *'Protestants will apply for funding in order to develop their community if that funding is specific to their community'*. A smaller but no less significant share (**83.4%**) believed that *'Protestants are more likely to become involved in the community sector if that will lead to better cross-community relationships'*.

Regarding leadership **84.3%** upheld the proposition that *‘the development of Protestant community groups would provide much needed leadership for the Protestant community’*.

**74.2%** of respondents believed that the formation of *‘new Protestant community groups would be important to me’*. In addition:

- **75.8%** agreed/strongly agreed that *‘Protestant communities groups are needed to challenge Protestant exclusion’*;
  - **80.1%** believed that if *‘there is an appropriate funding stream the Protestant community will involve itself in the local community development process’*;
  - **82.1%** also upheld the proposition that the *‘Protestant community groups are needed to develop the Peace Process’*;
  - **91.9%** believed that *‘Protestant involvement in the community sector will promote trust between groups’*.
5. Focus groups and interviews with key stakeholders among PEACE II projects, churches, schools and members of Loyal Orders reinforced the findings in the literature review and the experience of PEACE II projects and elaborated the survey results about cultural and social exclusion; difficulties of being a small and until recently dwindling population; the negative aspects of being a distinct, indigenous, minority community; the experience, although declining, of being victims of sectarianism and the obstacles, some of which are recognized as self-imposed, to full political and community participation.

The EU PEACE Programmes were cited as one of the important engines for community development and building capacity and confidence. It was clear from the meetings that those who were involved in a funded project were much more likely to have the confidence and capacity to engage. It was also said that the PEACE programmes helped their Catholic neighbours to openly show support for them.

The overall aim of the Protestant community that emerged from these meetings was to achieve an equal partnership with the majority community in building the capacity of the entire community to deliver a genuinely shared and pluralist society.

## 6. Conclusions and recommendations:

### 6.1 Building a partnership for a shared society

Many of the problems facing the minority Protestant community derive from the lack of pluralist thinking in society. Hence the feelings of alienation repeatedly recounted by the Border Protestant community in the course of this research and the misunderstandings experienced by the majority community. Funding cross-community projects, especially on a cross-border basis, should be prioritised to support both communities together in the building of a genuinely pluralist and shared society. This conclusion was consistent throughout the surveys, the interviews with PEACE II projects, focus groups and interviews with stakeholders. It will fit with the PEACE III aims of *promoting positive relations at the local level and building the capacity of the key institutions to deliver a shared society.*

### 6.2 Named target group of the PEACE III Programme

The County Council led Task Forces and Border Action were praised in the focus groups for treating the minority Border Protestant community as *de facto* a target group of the PEACE II programme. It is recommended that the community is formally named as a target group of the new PEACE III programme. This will provide recognition of the community; it will accept that this community suffered in the conflict; it will boost the confidence of the community and will enhance its ability to gain funding; it will help break the self-imposed silence of the community and have the distinctive voice of its identity and culture heard. This was a consistent finding in the survey, in the focus groups, interviews with stakeholders and a majority of PEACE II projects. And even when individuals or groups had mixed feelings on this they plumped for named target group because it will provide recognition for the Border Protestant community. It will fit with the proposal for PEACE III of specifically targeting *areas and groups that have been affected by the conflict and experience particular problems of segregation, marginalisation and isolation.*

### 6.3 Funding for single identity projects

Many in the community lack the confidence and capacity to meet the challenges of mature reconciliation work. In addition there is a long tradition of making do on their own, not seeking funds, not making common cause with their Catholic neighbours and not engaging in community development. Single identity personal development and capacity building work is needed before they will be ready *to build positive relations at the local level.* This is a finding based on the survey, most of the focus groups, interviews and on the opinion of some of the PEACE II projects.

There is suspicion also that funding will come with strings attached and threaten the ownership and management of the Church Halls (owned by the church), the Protestant Halls (owned by a Protestant trust) or the Orange Halls (owned by the Lodge). The creative skills of the County Council led Task Forces and Border Action in distinguishing between ownership and management on the one hand and usage on the other were acknowledged. Various mechanisms were used to bridge the gap from single identity work to cross-community use of halls e.g. an action plan leading into cross-community use over an agreed period of time; the establishment of a Hall Programme Advisory Group which is cross-community and can advise on opening up to cross-community usage; a cross-community network of halls in a locality which can be programmed jointly. It is recommended that provision in PEACE III be made for single identity funding to help this community develop the confidence to move towards *the creation of shared public spaces*.

### 6.3 Dedicated community development resources

The single identity projects, Derry Raphoe Action and the Border Minority Group, were often praised as really understanding the particular needs of the Border Protestant community. Their scope is limited both in terms of staff and geographical remit. It is recommended that dedicated community development resources be established to gain the confidence of the community and build the capacity from the inside. This was raised frequently in focus groups, interviews, by some of the PEACE II projects and in the survey. A model might be to appoint staff dedicated to the Border Protestant community in existing cross-community peace projects. It is needed to help this community contribute to the *building of the capacity of the key institutions to deliver a shared society*.

### 6.4 Collecting personal and family histories

There is need in this community (expressed in the focus groups and interviews) for a remembering and healing mechanism. Many stories are told of past hurt and there is no easy way to bring closure. There is a feeling that the story of their hurt is not recognised or important. It is recommended that a project be funded that recognises, collects and cherishes the personal and family histories of this community and publicises them not as a “local history” project but as a remembering and healing mechanism. Such a project will meet an important need in this community to *acknowledge the past*. It will also provide an opportunity to showcase and profile the community to the majority community.

The implementation of these recommendations will give an immediate boost to the confidence of this community. It will mean official recognition of the special history and status of the community; it will recognise the specific

suffering of this community during the conflict; it will single the community out as in need of special support and encouragement; and it will highlight the need for the majority community in partnership with this indigenous religious minority to build a truly shared and pluralist society where difference is respected and in time celebrated.

# Chapter 1: Background

## 1.1 Partition and Conflict

In 1925 the County Donegal Protestant Registration Association submitted its case to the Boundary Commission for the inclusion of the county in the new state of Northern Ireland. It argued its case on several grounds<sup>1</sup>:

- i. The Protestants are the descendants of the Scots and English Planters and are by race, religion, associations and sentiment different to the remainder of the population;
- ii. Donegal is geographically the most northerly county and the only portion of it that adjoins the Free State is a 5 mile strip south of Bundoran;
- iii. The city of Derry is the market town of Donegal and without access to that market the Donegal hinterland will suffer economically;
- iv. The introduction of Irish by the Free State means that much educational time is wasted learning a subject that is of no use to Protestants in getting a job; and
- v. The social class of the Protestants, who in some parts (e.g. East Donegal) “own eight tenths of all the land and pay nine tenths of all the rates” should carry weight above and beyond their minority electorate base and should not be swamped by the votes of their labourers and hirelings.

The Boundary Commission listened politely to the submission as it did to submissions from the Protestants in other Border counties and then ignored them. The Border Protestant community had to commence a process of coming to terms with a state in which many did not wish to reside. And the state began a slow and uneven process of coming to terms with this community. That process continues today.

The 1911 census gave Donegal a population of 168,537 of which 35,516 (21%) were Protestants and 133,021 (78.9%) were Catholic<sup>2</sup>. The Partition of Ireland started the decline of this community as many left the Border counties either to live in Northern Ireland or further afield.

Subsequent demographic decline was driven by factors such as those itemised in the Boundary Commission submission (viz. economics, kith and kin and religion), intimidation, anti-British sentiment and emergent political regimes. The Catholic ethos endorsed in the 1937 Constitution also caused unease. Other

---

<sup>1</sup> Consultant’s private collection

<sup>2</sup> Almost all Protestant spoken to in this study referred to the majority community as Roman Catholic. That community refers to itself as “Catholic” as does the London and global media and the consultants follow that nomenclature.

factors such as emigration during World War II, and standard migration due to poverty were also prominent features that influenced out-migration.

The recent conflict (1968-1994) disfigured the physical environment with road closures and the other paraphernalia of war and created a psychological atmosphere of silence, suspicion and fear for those who lived in the Border counties. While this affected all the people of the Border counties, it had a particularly detrimental impact on the confidence of the Protestant community. In the most recent census of 2002 the Protestant population of the entire six southern Border counties was 27,562, eight thousand less than their numbers in the single county of Donegal before Partition. Such numerical decline coupled with an aging population and a sense of isolation has impacted over the years upon the capacity of the Border Protestant community to sustain itself culturally and also demographically. In recent years the population has stabilised and that, with the new power-sharing arrangements in Northern Ireland, has improved the morale of the community.

## **1.2 EU Intervention**

With the ceasefires of 1994 and the subsequent Belfast Agreement of 1998 the physical environment and the psychological atmosphere improved. The situation was greatly helped by the 1995 decision of the EU to launch a special programme to “reinforce progress towards a more stable and peaceful society and to promote reconciliation”. The first PEACE Programme was followed by a second and they became known as PEACE I and PEACE II. These programmes covered Northern Ireland and the six southern Border counties of Cavan, Donegal, Leitrim, Louth, Monaghan and Sligo. Large sums of grants were made available (PEACE II provided €994m over the period 2000-2006)<sup>3</sup> to promote economic and social development with a special focus on those groups, sectors and areas most affected by the conflict and to develop reconciliation and mutual understanding and respect between and within traditions and communities.

PEACE II is different from other EU structural funds in several respects. It is not a conventional regional development initiative; its goal is peace and reconciliation. Its Managing Authority is the Special EU Programmes Body (SEUPB), a cross-border body established under the 1998 Agreement. Its funding is administered by a variety of implementing bodies e.g. government departments, local strategy partnerships in Northern Ireland, County Council Led Task Forces in the Border Counties and non-government intermediary funding bodies. The intermediary funding body which covers the Border counties is Border Action, based in Monaghan but with offices and staff covering all the Border counties.

---

<sup>3</sup> SEUPB report on PEACE II.

At the onset of PEACE II Border Action<sup>4</sup> conducted a baseline analysis to identify key target groups and sectors in the Border region. Although the minority Protestant community was not named in the Programme Complement of Peace II as one of the target groups, Border Action identified this community as a *de facto* target group. Over the course of PEACE II the County Council led Task Forces and Border Action funded many projects which involved sections of the Border Protestant community. For example, including its cross-border funding, Border Action funded a total of 50 project promoters. In May 2005 Border Action organised a conference on “Protestants in the Border Counties: addressing the legacies of conflict, taking the opportunities of Peace and promoting Reconciliation”. In addition Border Action funded and commissioned several pieces of research which directly or indirectly focussed or touched on the experiences of Protestants and how the conflict had impacted on their lives. These were:

- Border Protestant Perspectives (LOCUS Management & Kathy Walsh, 2005)
- The Emerald Curtain (Harvey, B Kelly, A McGearty, S and Murray, S: *The Emerald Curtain*, (2005) Triskele Community Training & Development)
- All Over the Place (Ralaheen Ltd Dublin with EXPAC Monaghan and Stratagem Belfast: *All over the place*, (2005) ADM/CPA)
- Border Minority Group Strategic Plan
- Good Practice in Community Based Peace Building (Maher, H & Basanth, Y: *Good practice in community-based peacebuilding*, ADM/CPA).

### 1.3 The Terms of Reference

The Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group of the PEACE II Programme Monitoring Committee examined these five research reports and decided to explore further the extent to which the PEACE II Programme is impacting on the Protestant community in the Border Region and bring forward recommendations for possible future funding under PEACE III. Consultants were asked to:

- i. Examine the portfolio of projects in the Border Region and identify the financial contribution the Programme has made to the border Protestant Community in the Border Region of Ireland;

---

<sup>4</sup> Border Action’s paper commenting on SEUPB’s proposal for an assessment of the impact of PEACE II on the Border Protestant community is a valuable source of the actual targeting described here and elsewhere in the report (Ruth Taillon, Border Action, November 2006).

- ii. By using desk based and primary research, identify and assess the impact of this funding on the border Protestant Community. Primary research would include meetings with key stakeholders that include Churches, schools and Loyal Orders;
- iii. Following discussions with key stakeholders and taking into consideration the issues highlighted in the reports listed above, make recommendations on how future funding programmes could contribute to addressing these issues.

#### **1.4 Methodology**

The methodology adopted by the consultants included:

- i. An examination of the Equality Monitoring Forms from projects funded under the Border counties Priorities 1-4 to quantify the number of Protestant participants and the amount of funds received;
- ii. A review of the five PEACE II funded reports and other relevant publications to extract the learning in relation to the impact of PEACE II on the Border Protestant community and to inform the structure of the survey and the agenda for the focus groups and interviews;
- iii. A review of a selection of projects which targeted the Border Protestant community along with interviews of the promoters to assess the impact of PEACE II;
- iv. A survey seeking the views of the Border Protestant community on their involvement in PEACE II projects, their role in civic life, their identity, their experience of living and working in the community, their involvement in the community sector and their knowledge of PEACE II projects. This questionnaire prioritised and was targeted at funded PEACE II projects, the clergy of the main denominations, members of the loyal institutions and Protestant schools;
- v. A supplementary questionnaire aimed at other key players in the Border region ascertaining the attitudes of key public institutions to the Protestant community;
- vi. A series of focus groups in each county and several interviews with stakeholders focussing on the current condition of the Border Protestant community and on the issues around PEACE III. This series included a special focus group on Ulster Protestant identity facilitated by the Centre for Peace Building, An Teach Ban, conducted by David Stevens,<sup>5</sup> leader of the Corrymela community, and an additional Donegal focus group hosted by Derry Raphoe Action. The focus groups were supplemented by several conversations and interviews with key stakeholders.

---

<sup>5</sup> See Appendix 1

## 1.5 Quantifying the funds

The performance indicators for Border Region projects in Priorities 1 and 2 suggest that there have been 90,831 participants. There are no participant indicators for Priorities 3 and 4. The participant indicators for the cross-border Priority 5 do not distinguish which side of the Border the participants come from. On the Equality Monitoring Forms returns, 9,746 were received from Border Region projects (99% from Priorities 1 and 2) and this is just under 11% of total participants. Of these returns 9,396 answered the community background question and the breakdown is as follows:

- 1,100 (11.7%) Protestant community background;
- 7,501 (79.8%) Catholic community background;
- 795 (8.5%) Neither Protestant nor Catholic background.

11.7% Protestant participation is higher than the share of the population<sup>6</sup>. It is not possible, however, to determine if this 11.7% is made up of a larger than average participation or represents a smaller number of participants who participate often and regularly<sup>7</sup>.

Even using the local knowledge of funded projects failed to indicate an accurate quantification of funds going to the Protestant community. Apart from single identity projects where by definition all or most of the funds go to the Protestant community, the promoters were unable to put a figure on the portion of the funds that went directly to the Protestant community. Only one project hazarded an estimate by adding single identity elements of the funded programme with travel expenses, facilitation fees and 50% of Advisory Committee meetings but excluding staffing, running and general administration costs. The general response was that the funds go to promoting positive relations and therefore went to the benefit of the whole community including the Protestant community. The Carrick-on-Shannon Heritage Group summed it up: “the funding has been a very positive contribution to both the Protestant community and the whole local and county population”. The *qualitative* impact of the funding is looked at in chapter 2 where a selection of projects is analysed.

## 1.6 Snowballing

When a representative sample cannot be determined within the time frame allotted or due to imprecise census data snowballing is a widely-used method of recruiting individuals for participation in focus groups, interviews, or surveys to achieve **indicative** results.

---

<sup>6</sup> 6.4% of the southern Border counties and 3.7% of the state’s total population in 2002 Census.

<sup>7</sup> A “participant” is defined as a person who is registered with the project and attends a structured training course or other structured programme of activities on an ongoing basis. An “attendee” is defined as someone who attends activities or events organised by the project on an ad hoc or occasional basis (Border Action’s Guidelines).

A fundamental problem with regard to conducting the survey was determining from the Irish Census the location, gender and age of Protestants within the Border region. The Irish Census lacks the capacity to locate sought after populations with the same spatial rigour as located, for example, within the Census undertaken in Northern Ireland. The lack of spatially sensitive evidence means that locating minority populations is rendered very difficult.

There is an additional problem of definition regarding locating those from a Protestant community background. There is less difficulty in determining the share within each county who state their religion as Church of Ireland (Col), Presbyterian and Methodist. Theoretically there may be Protestants (such as Lutherans, Baptists, Evangelicals) who are located in the other religions group but who are not determined as Protestants within the Census. More importantly, there may be persons who did not state or who have no religion who come from or are perceived to come from a Protestant community background. Given that the Irish Census does not pinpoint the community background of those who do not state a religion then it is difficult to ascertain the exact share of those from a Protestant or any other community background.

Locating the population is also made difficult by an extensive geographical study area. This study area stretches from as far East as Drogheda, West to Sligo and North to Malin Head. There are a few small towns that have significant shares of their population that are Protestant, and when they do these populations are less significant than those living in rural areas. The population densities within the study areas are also low and there is no specific directory of Protestant residents. In addition, publicly available census data lacks precision and the data that does exist does not satisfactorily balance/measure the Protestant population via the variables of location, gender, socio-economic background, age, employment status and educational attainment.

Due to the lack of precise Census based information stratified, clustered and quota sampling techniques were not employed. The consultants adopted a snowball sample of the Protestant population. This technique is utilised to locate hard to reach populations, especially those with a minority status. The problem caused by the geographical spread of the Protestant population is also complicated by denominational allegiances, suspicion of external investigation and no singular contact point for the respondent population. Limitations are also linked to developing representative samples via Protestant schools (age bias), churches (possible age bias, non-attendance), Loyal Orders (gender, non-membership), community groups (non-membership) and sports clubs (possible gender bias, non-membership). In addition, a remit of the survey was to locate populations that may not have been included in previous surveys/analysis of the Border Protestant population.

The snowballing method was built upon, within this survey, via initial contacts with the groups institutions/listed above. Members of these groups were asked

to distribute surveys across his/her social network and not merely within the group through which they were contacted. Although this technique is limited by the bias of identified networks it is useful with regard to locating target groups. The targeting of diverse groups as undertaken within this survey (urban/rural, denominations, member/non-member of a community group, youth, members of the Loyal Orders and geographical spread) reduced the problem of bias. The production of information on respondents regarding age, gender, location, members of Loyal Orders, community group membership also provided the opportunity to determine any overbearing influence upon the results obtained by any particular target group.

## Chapter 2: PEACE II Literature

The five documents mentioned in the terms of reference are written from various perspectives, but deal directly or touch indirectly on the southern Border Protestant community. Within the five documents the key issues for Protestants in the southern Border counties relate to: identity, cultural exclusion, social exclusion, minority experience and belonging, political and civic representation, community participation and relevance of church to individual and community life.

### 2.1 Identity

While the Border Minority Group survey found that Protestants living in the counties of Monaghan, Cavan and Leitrim identified themselves as Protestant first and foremost, Orange second, Ulster Scots third with Irish coming sixth, the other reports found that there was a strong and enduring sense of identity with the Irish state.

The *Border Protestant Perspectives* found that Protestants identified themselves as either Irish or by their denomination. This led to the conclusion that, for this group, their cultural identity is not exclusive but that religious identity is important. Denominational allegiance is important as is an identity attached to a Protestant understanding of identity and cultural belief.

The denominational point highlights the diversity among Protestants in the southern Border counties, an issue that all of the five reports with the exception of the Border Minority Group refer to. This questions how much the Border Protestant community can be seen as a homogenous group with similar needs and issues, or even if it is accurate to describe Protestants in the southern Border region as a community? *All Over The Place* makes the point that identifying the needs, perspectives and experiences of Protestants living in the Border area depends on community size, levels of integration, spill over from the conflict in Northern Ireland, road closures and, most importantly, denomination. The last point did not seem to be a determining factor in any of the research surveys carried out to date.

### 2.2 Cultural Exclusion

Leading on from identity is the issue of cultural exclusion. The Border Minority Group defined this as a major issue for their participants, almost all of whom expressed the belief that the community does not feel free to be culturally Protestant due to opposition from the Catholic community.. They also perceived a lack of support from national and public sector organizations for the Border Protestant community to pursue or express their cultural interests. *Border Protestant Perspectives* found a concern from the majority of respondents that being Irish and Protestant was a national identity not given credence and that it

was felt the state needs to promote this particular identity construct.

*Good Practice in Community Based Peace Building* states that a deterioration of community relations was a major legacy of the conflict. In the Border region, (and we assume both sides of the border are referred to here) under the surface ethno-sectarian attitudes remained intact. Such tensions are interlinked with fear and inter-community suspicion with the result that some communities hid their culture and heritage for fear of reprisal.

Each of the other reports with the exception of the *Border Protestant Perspectives* makes explicit that this cultural repression was an issue for Protestants in the southern Border counties. *The Emerald Curtain* refers to the findings from a 2003 networking report ('Border Protestants' Minority Voices') that the Protestant community was observed to keep to itself. Individual interviews undertaken for the *All Over the Place* report stated that it was advisable for Protestants to be discreet and to keep their heads down and not draw attention to themselves. This was particularly prevalent in the wake of the Dublin/Monaghan bombings. The Border Minority Group found that the overwhelming view of those consulted was that the Protestant community did not only hide their identity but that they were expected to keep their heads down.

*Border Protestant Perspectives* breaks from these findings stating that the majority of participants in their focus groups disagreed with the "keep your head down" statement. It found that the Border Protestant community has felt "respected and independent" over the last eighty years. It went on, however, to add that "respected" did not mean "included" and "independent" has meant missing out on funding opportunities. *The Legacy of the Troubles*<sup>8</sup> report found that there was no religious variance from among those surveyed in the Border Counties with regard to perceptions of perceived identity threat as a result of religious identity.

### **2.3 Social Exclusion**

All of the reports give examples of social exclusion. *Good Practice in Community Based Peace Building* refers to the fact that there is no official Community Relations Policy in the Republic of Ireland, that it is not taken seriously at government level and that some of the policies that do exist such as educational segregation are considered by many to be detrimental to the pursuit of good community relations.

This report also highlights how Equality legislation, whilst far reaching, does not take into account how social inclusion and anti-poverty legislation relates to peace building. The report concludes that there is very little attention paid to the

---

<sup>8</sup> The Legacy of the Troubles: Experience of the Troubles, Mental Health and Social Attitudes, Orla Muldoon, Queens University, Belfast, 2005

role of civil society within the process of peace building at policy level and that this gap puts additional burdens on the communities in question. It concludes that this has the effect of negating the responsibilities of statutory bodies and agencies for peace building, and that there needs to be attitudinal and institutional changes south of the Border with respect to these issues.

These findings concurred with similar examples given by the Border Minority Group. This group highlights that there has been an almost complete failure by the state to recognize the minority status of the Border Protestant community. They argue that there has been no active or structured policy of support for the cultural and community development needs of the Border Protestant community due to their minority status. These examples have contributed to their understanding that the Border Protestant community has become invisible, not seen to exist as a distinct group. Logically it can be assumed that these issues have a detrimental effect on the ability of the Border Protestant community to gain maximum benefit from the PEACE programmes.

The findings of the *Border Protestant Perspectives* report were more positive in this area. It found that descriptions such as “isolated” and “marginalized” have given way over the last ten years to “equal” and “engaged” suggesting an increased move towards social inclusion since the ceasefires of 1994.

Connected to social exclusion is the issue of displacement. The reports vary in their findings with regard to this suggesting the need for further quantitative and qualitative research. *All Over the Place* found no statistical evidence to suggest that Protestants living in the Southern border counties were displaced to Northern Ireland when the conflict was at its height in the 1970s. However a few respondents mentioned that there was displacement to Northern Ireland for some southern Border Protestants at this time, a drift attributed to the influx of republicans into towns south of the border. *The Emerald Curtain* makes reference to the fact that it was felt by a number of Protestants living in the southern Border counties that some gradually moved to Northern Ireland as the conflict worsened in the 1970s.

## **2.4 Minority Experience and Isolationism**

*Border Protestant Perspectives* found that the conflict had exacerbated the situation for Protestants in the southern Border counties by increasing feelings of isolationism and marginalization. The conflict increased perceptions of the Border Protestant community as pro-British and this added to prejudice, suspicions, intimidation and misunderstandings. This led to a reluctance of some to become involved in wider community activities. This report also highlights the contribution that the Protestant identity itself has on feelings of exclusion and isolationism with factors such as multiple Protestant denominations, decreasing population, dioceses that straddle the border, and a self-help ethos.

*The Legacy of the Troubles* however found that national identity within the border region is uncontested and attitudinal divisions on the basis of religious affiliation are not readily apparent. However the report found that attitudinal divisions were more apparent with regard to attitudes on the North in that among those surveyed, five times as many Protestants living in the Border Counties endorsed Northern Ireland remaining part of the UK than did Catholic respondents and that overall levels of support for the 1998 Agreement were less strong among Protestant respondents in the Border Counties.

## 2.5 Political and Civic Participation

*Border Protestant Perspectives* found that political representation levels for Protestants living in the southern Border counties are low, and that this is reflective of a low level of wider community involvement. 57% of those consulted felt that the Protestant community was not fairly or adequately represented. This means that their minority interests are not addressed nationally or locally. The issue of the redrawing of constituency boundaries in Donegal resulting in a splitting of the Protestant vote between two constituencies was regarded by some as deliberate. *All Over the Place* found that 78% of Protestants felt they do not have fair political representation, but that voter participation was high.

*Border Protestant Perspectives* refers to perceptions of continuing residual discrimination against some Protestants. One quarter of those consulted felt they would not have equal access to employment in the statutory sector, one fifth felt the same lack of equality of opportunity would apply in the community sector. There was an acknowledgement that they would not feel comfortable applying for some jobs such as the Gardai or County Council posts. This has an obvious effect on civic participation and subsequent representation. These perceptions were echoed in the *All Over the Place* report with similar percentage-based findings. However this report found that statistically the border Protestant community working in the state sector is proportionate to their numbers. *The Legacy of the Troubles* report assessed perceived discrimination experienced on the basis of religion for the Border Counties and found no significant variation across religious groups in the sample.

A recent report<sup>9</sup> on a human rights approach to peace building analysed the work of the Border Minority Group in terms of the principles of human rights work which are:

- i. *Participation*: one of the project's primary roles is to ensure the active participation of the Border Protestant community in the expression of their social, cultural and political rights;
- ii. *Legitimacy*: the project articulates the religious, cultural and political rights of the Border Protestant community;
- iii. *Empowerment*: the project has advocated that the cultural expression of

---

<sup>9</sup> Respect, Protect and Fulfill, Schabas & Fitzmaurice, Border Action, 2007.

- iv. *Accountability*: the constituent members are entitled to attend all the project's regular and annual general meetings;
- v. *Equality, non-discrimination and attention to vulnerable groups*: the project specifically sees its work as addressing the problems of discrimination against and vulnerability of the Border Protestant community.

## 2.6 Community Participation

Each of the five reports contains similar findings on issues facing Protestants in the southern Border counties with regard to community development. These issues can be summarized as:

- i. A lack of interest in community development, coming from a lack of confidence;
- ii. A fear of engaging with the wider community in case this requires a letting go of what resources they have;
- iii. A lack of culture for community development from within border Protestantism due to different identity and lived experiences since Partition and the conflict;
- iv. Alienation from community development processes due to weak community infrastructure;
- v. A lack of experience in applying for funding, coupled with funding mechanisms incompatible with their religious and moral values such as the National Lottery;
- vi. Feeling inhibited by funding restrictions such as the cross community requirement as much of their community activity is church-based;
- vii. Difficulty in addressing genuine Protestant issues for fear of being seen as sectarian or exclusive. This stops engagement in community development which is about addressing local community needs;
- viii. The need for single identity work to develop their own capacity, identify needs and empower themselves to make necessary changes was again not conducive to the current funding model.

*Border Protestant Perspectives* explains that the fact that almost half of their respondents belonged to a non-church aligned organization indicates that religious and cultural identity is not an inhibitor to participation in wider interest organizations, and yet only 13% of the Border Protestant community they consulted were members of a local community development organization. This report therefore concludes that the problem lies with the attitude to and understanding of the term community development held by many in the Border Protestant community.

Although there is good understanding of the principles of wider community development, in practice the term is equated with neighborhood development

which was felt by those in the focus groups to infer minority status for Protestants due to the demographical makeup of most areas. There was resentment at tokenism and at community groups not focusing on their needs. There was a desire to become engaged in a more meaningful community development, but first of all these challenges needed to be addressed.

*All Over the Place* highlighted that the lack of capacity of the Border Protestant community was a constant issue raised in discussions. These issues reflect a genuine concern from the Border Protestant community that the PEACE Programmes have not enabled them to benefit to the same extent as the Catholic community in terms of local community development opportunities. They highlight the need for greater equity in future funding as this would enable the Border Protestant community to engage more in community development. This was regarded as central to peace building work in the southern Border counties as it would bring about increased confidence and this would have a positive impact on the current fear of engaging. It would also decrease the negativity and resentment which inhibits the fostering of good relations, but there was a serious questioning as to the ability of the current funding model to meet these requirements.

## **2.7 Relevance of Church to individual and Community life**

The reports agreed with regard to the central role of the church in Border Protestant identity and in bringing the border Protestant community together. A number of the reports made reference to the perception that this is not recognized enough by funders. The argument put forward from those consulted by the Border Minority Group was that often churches are the only community development organization in a Protestant community and are therefore the only organization able to put forward a funding application. There was resentment at and citing of occasions when funding had been turned down because it was church-based.

The counter point was also made however in the *Good Practice in Community Based Peace Building* and in *Border Protestant Perspectives* that the individual religious denominations and church leaders were also preventing the community development of Protestants in the southern Border counties as it was in their interest to maintain a strong denominational focus. All of the reports highlighted the need for Protestant church leaders to play a strong role in developing community and reconciliation.

*The Legacy of the Troubles* stands apart from the other reports in this area as it found no variance in attitudes among the religious groups of those surveyed in the Border Counties with regard to the effects of religion on values, or with regard to attitudes towards religious integration and segregation.

## 2.8 Conclusion

The reports paint a picture similar to the summary by the Border Minority Group of a community that is diverse, lacking in community cohesion and living in the shadow of invisibility. There is a connection to be made between cultural and social exclusion and a lack of community capacity and therefore the inability of Protestants living in the southern Border region to fully take up on opportunities from the PEACE programmes. *The Emerald Curtain* refers to the Border Protestant community as having a genuine difficulty in devising a way forward so that its voice may be heard. The idea of community development work in the Border Protestant community is a relatively new one.

However, with the exception of the report from the Border Minority Group it was found that there have been changes in the last ten years with regard to engagement, identity and population decline. *The Emerald Curtain* states that the Border Protestant community is now more willing to speak out regarding these issues and argues that the PEACE programmes have provided some limited space whereby the issues arising from the conflict for the border Protestant community can be opened out. But more is needed. Derry Raphoe Action describes the Protestant community living in Donegal as forward looking and active in civic and community life with a level of commitment to both single identity and cross community involvement at a local level. *All Over the Place* found evidence of some Protestant community groups engaging in their own research projects to assess needs.

Finally the general conclusion reached by the *Good Practice in Community Based Peace Building* report can be taken as an accurate snapshot of the Border Protestant community. Protestants have a sense of not being listened to or valued in society. As a result some have reached the conclusion that they are not entitled to equality of funding opportunity.

## Chapter 3: PEACE II Projects

While it proved difficult to arrive at an accurate quantification of the PEACE II funds that went to the Border Protestant community, an examination of the qualitative impact is undertaken in this chapter.

### 3.1 The EU Peace Programmes

In 1995 the European Union set up a Special Programme for Peace and Reconciliation to operate in Northern Ireland and the six southern Border counties in Ireland. Its aim was to “reinforce progress towards a peaceful and stable society and to promote reconciliation in the region”. Then the European Union brought in another programme for the period 2000-2004 (subsequently called the PEACE II programme) followed by a PEACE II Extension to cover the years 2005 and 2006 both of which were managed by the Special European Union Programmes Body, one of the cross-border bodies set up under the 1998 Agreement.

**At the outset it should emphasised that all project promoters stated flatly that without the PEACE II funding no peace building of this kind or extent would have taken place.**

Two distinctive objectives served to distinguish these programmes from other EU Structural Fund intervention in the region and all funded projects had to score well in these:

- i. Address the legacy of the conflict: the programme is intended to address specific problems generated by the conflict in order to assist the return to a normal, peaceful and stable society. Projects and actions will be supported which address the economic and social patterns which have grown as a result of the conflict; and
- ii. Take opportunities arising from peace: the programme will encourage actions which have a stake in peace and which actively help promote a stable and normal society where opportunities can be grasped. Projects and actions will be supported which have a remedial effect on sectors, areas or groups which have been hindered in their economic and social development by the conflict and for which the prospect of a more stable society is a new opportunity.

In addition projects must show how they are “paving the way to reconciliation” through the promotion of mutual understanding and respect between and within

communities and traditions in Northern Ireland and cross-border<sup>10</sup>. For the PEACE II Extension a more elaborate definition of reconciliation<sup>11</sup> was adopted comprising five strands viz:

- i. Building positive relationships;
- ii. Developing a shared vision of an interdependent and fair society;
- iii. Acknowledging and dealing with the past;
- iv. Significant cultural and attitudinal change; and
- v. Substantial social, economic and political change.

All funded projects had to score on the first criterion (building positive relationships) and at least two of the others.

Furthermore PEACE II was structured round five priorities:

- i. Economic renewal;
- ii. Social integration, inclusion and reconciliation;
- iii. Locally based regeneration and development strategies;
- iv. Outward and forward looking region; and
- v. Cross-border cooperation.

Finally, in the southern Border region Border Action was tasked with the implementation of measures from priority 1 and 2 and, in partnership with the Community Foundation for Northern Ireland and Cooperation Ireland, measures from the cross-border priority 5. Also in the Border region the County Council Led Task Forces had responsibility for measures in priority 3. Details of the projects examined in this chapter were provided by Border Action and the Task Forces and additional information on performance indicators supplied by NISRA<sup>12</sup>.

### **3.2 Changes and progression in peace building and reconciliation as a result of PEACE II funding**

At the outset it should be emphasised that all project promoters stated flatly that without the PEACE II funding no peace building of this kind or extent would have taken place.

#### **3.2a Building Positive Relations**

Project promoters reported that the funds enabled them to seek to build bridges between the communities and to increase confidence and trust. That goes also

---

<sup>10</sup> For a full discussion of the Peace programmes see Border Action (formerly ADM/CPA) publications “On the Road to Peace” (2002) and “Building on Peace: Supporting Peace and Reconciliation after 2006 (2004)”.

<sup>11</sup> “Reconciliation: Rhetoric or Relevant, Hamber & Kelly, Democratic Dialogue (2005)”.

<sup>12</sup> See Appendices 2 & 3.

for single identity projects like *Donegal Rural Protestant Peace Building Project*<sup>13</sup> which, while accepting that it did not seek directly to build bridges, had the “implicit” intention to engage with the whole community and to develop the “necessary attitudinal change” to allow outreach and engagement. It is important to note that respondents to the survey in Chapter 4 who were funded under PEACE I and II were more confident about positive changes taking place than those who were not funded, although both sub-groups contained majorities who were working at inter-community relationships and at positive societal change.

Various means of building bridges were used. *Supporting Minorities in the Border Region*<sup>14</sup> used workshops, residentials, meetings of an advisory panel and a special forum convened specifically for Protestants. These methods did increase the capacity of individuals and groups to respond to challenges. *Riverbrooke Cross-Border Initiative*<sup>15</sup> used cross-community discussion groups and cross-border exchanges. It used “story-telling” to actively challenge participants’ moral and political stances and as a result issues and events which had been contentions became more easily managed at a community level.

*East Donegal Ulster Scots*<sup>16</sup> started from the realisation that there was no Ulster Scots element to existing community festivals in Donegal and used the means of an Ulster Scots summer school “to explain themselves” to the majority community and to increase contact between them. The promoters linked the Plantation of Ulster by Scottish settlers (1608) with the commemoration of the Flight of the Earls (1607) and had a cross-community panel of speakers.

*Celebrating Difference*<sup>17</sup> increased contact by religious diversity training, residentials, visiting churches and hearing the “real story” of other churches. This challenged stereotypes and helped to dispel distrust. The *Youth Engagement Project*<sup>18</sup> used youth work techniques to advance mutual understanding among young Catholics and Protestants in a mixed area. The *Scripture Union Border Counties Project*<sup>19</sup> also used youth work techniques in summer clubs to bring hundreds of children and teens together. The project also delivered reconciliation programmes in Protestant and Catholic schools emphasising (in the words of participants) “how similar children are, how easy it is to live in harmony and how much better it is to work together”.

---

<sup>13</sup> SEUPB Ref. No. 010985: Derry Raphoe Action, Measure 2.6, €15,000 awarded.

<sup>14</sup> SEUPB Ref. Nos. 007859 & 031278: Cavan Family Resource Centre, Measure 2.4, €588,327 awarded.

<sup>15</sup> SEUPB Ref. Nos. 006766 & 029850: Riverstown Enterprise Development. Measure 5.3, €721,228 awarded.

<sup>16</sup> SEUPB Ref. No. 034433: East Donegal Ulster Scots Association, Measure 3.3, €50,000 awarded.

<sup>17</sup> SEUPB Ref. Nos. 001971 & 029122: Monaghan Community Network, Measure 2.1, €1,028,692 awarded.

<sup>18</sup> SEUPB Ref. Nos. 010984 & 031643: St. Johnston & Carrigans Youth Project, Measure 2.2, €280,035 awarded.

<sup>19</sup> SEUPB Ref. Nos. 010221 & 029152: Scripture Union, Measure 2.2, €417,808 awarded.

*Inch Island Community Association*<sup>20</sup> used discussions, plays and workshops to break down barriers and to increase confidence between the communities on an island with a mixed population. Capital projects like *The Wee Hall in Culdaff*<sup>21</sup> used the refurbishment of “the wee hall” in the village to advance community togetherness and create a resource for reconciliation work. Another capital project, *North Cavan Church of Ireland Group*<sup>22</sup>, used the refurbishment of Protestant halls and the linking to an umbrella community development initiative to renew relationships between Protestant and Catholic communities “in an area close to the Border where there were many silent victims of the conflict”.

Single identity projects working directly with the Border Protestant community face the problems of increasing the capacity and confidence of a community which is relatively small in number, feels isolated and is coping with many demands on its time and commitment in the shape of Church societies and the maintenance and management of halls. *Empowering Our Communities*<sup>23</sup> used an extensive training programme of public speaking, media skills, communication and lobbying to aid this community to engage with the majority community and to enable it to break the silence.

### **3.2b Dealing with hurt**

*Carrick-on-Shannon Experience*<sup>24</sup> refurbished the Church of Ireland church of St. George and the Famine Workhouse as a heritage mechanism to deal with the hurt of “the sufferings of Catholics in the 19<sup>th</sup> century” and “the attrition of the Protestant community in the 20<sup>th</sup> century”.

*Donegal Rural Protestant Peace Building Project* gave rural Protestants an opportunity to relate the stories of their experiences and this helped heal feelings of past hurt. Also the fact that the project received PEACE II funding “helped restitution and confirmed a feeling that they were justly treated by funding agencies”.

Many promoters identified this aspect of the work as important but also fraught with difficulty. *Celebrating Difference* based its approach on a baseline analysis of the Protestant community in Monaghan which found issues like “lack of confidence, a feeling of fragmentation within the denominations, feelings of resentment and frustration at their inability to draw down funds, recent memories of physical and verbal attacks, fear of their culture being diluted, threat of assimilation and the fear of losing control of their halls”<sup>25</sup>. Aware that it was not a specialist counselling project, it didn’t actively encourage the voicing of past hurt

---

<sup>20</sup> SEUPB Ref. No. 011438: Inch Island Community Association, Measure 2.4C, €150,080 awarded.

<sup>21</sup> SEUPB Ref. No. 010642: Wee Hall in Culdaff, Measure 2.7, €245,875 awarded.

<sup>22</sup> SEUPB Ref. No. 002095: North Cavan CoI Group, Measure 2.8, €18,520 awarded.

<sup>23</sup> SEUPB Ref. Nos. 011394 & 034025: Border Minority Group, Measures 2.1 & 2.7, €211,722 awarded.

<sup>24</sup> SEUPB Ref. Nos. 029248 & 022123: Carrick-on-Shannon Heritage Group, Measures 1.1 and 3.3, €409,000 awarded.

<sup>25</sup> Evaluation by Kathy Walsh.

but rather created an open context where it might “float up” if participants felt comfortable.

Most promoters accepted that with increasingly open discussions sensitive issues including past hurt would surface and emphasised the need for trained staff. *Riverbrooke Cross-Border Initiative* created a “safe space” and used “appropriate speakers” and “good facilitation”. “It is important”, this project cautioned, “to recognise that not everyone is ready for this more difficult dialogue work but to appreciate the value of having people who traditionally would not have worked together in the same space”.

*Youth Engagement Project* also made sure that the “group work and workshops were facilitated by trained staff who were able to provide support and follow up to deal effectively with any conflict or issues that emerged”. *The Wee Hall in Culdaff* found that open “committee discussions on attitudes that seemed to permeate throughout the community helpful”. *Empowering Our Communities*, also aware that it is not a counselling project, knows that there are many painful issues in the community and tries to emphasise the historical, political and religious context rather than the personal.

Just how sensitive this might be is seen in the re-enactment of the Battle of Glenmaquin as part of the *East Donegal Ulster Scots* summer festival. This commemorates a battle in 1642 when 2,000 Ulster Scot “laganeers”<sup>26</sup> commanded by Sir William Stewart defeated a numerically superior army of native Irish led by Phelim O’Neill “with much blood-letting”.

With counselling back-up available, *Supporting Minorities in the Border Region* did provide opportunity for “the collective recall of the past hurts of history and the experience of living as a minority”.

### **3.2c Rights, equality, inclusion**

Although none of the selected projects would have described themselves specifically as a “rights-based” project many actually followed a rights approach. *East Donegal Ulster Scots* was aware of the lack of “awareness, recognition and respect” that the majority community had for Ulster Scots culture and determined to have that culture properly recognised. This project appealed to the 1998 Agreement which promised respect and recognition of the rights of all cultures. *Supporting Minorities on the Border Region* promoted awareness and respect in all its work and especially “recognition of the validity of the other’s point of view even if they did not agree with it”. The corner stone of the *Youth Engagement Project* was the inculcation of “greater awareness and respect for cultural and religious diversity in young people”. As a consequence of the funding a “review of the policy and work practices was undertaken in the areas of equality, equal opportunities and child protection”.

---

<sup>26</sup> The fertile land in East Donegal planted by Scots in 1611 is known as “the Laggan”. A postscript on page 67 refers to the contemporary commemoration of the battle.

Although *Riverbrooke Cross-Border Initiative* did not specifically address human rights, recognition and respect for the Border Protestant community was promoted throughout the entire project. The women's group undertook "a series of discussions looking at issues of equity and diversity". A core aspect of *Empowering Our Communities* was the advancement of the recognition and equal treatment of the Protestant community<sup>27</sup>. *North Cavan Church of Ireland Group* prioritised social inclusion in their work and made a point of informing themselves about "and complying with equality legislation".

*Donegal Rural Protestant Peace Building Project* did not see itself as a rights-based project but in the course of the work the community became aware of support from the majority community and this gave them "a sense of equality and being part of a whole, even with their diversity, culture and views".

### **3.2d Main lesson for building peace**

One project (*Inch Island Community Association*) found that people did not like the terminology of "peace building and reconciliation" and found it "woolly". They would have preferred a term like "cooperative development" for which there is a need.

All others referred to the slowness of the work of peace building. For example, *Celebrating Difference* described it as "the slow drip of water on limestone" but was aware that even in a short time much has been achieved e.g. the involvement of Orange Orders in the project would have been "unthinkable" only three years ago. It takes time to build trust. *Supporting Minorities in the Border Region* agrees with this but urges that time spent in the beginning building trust "pays off" in greater understanding down the road. *North Cavan Church of Ireland Group* agrees that one needs to build trust and relationships before progressing to reconciliation work. "It is slow and ongoing; don't expect too much too soon". *Empowering Our Communities* believes it is a matter of "re-building a trust that was once there". And it takes time.

*Riverbrooke Cross-Border Initiative* summed up the lessons learned from PEACE II funding peace and reconciliation as follows:

- It is slow and painful and cannot be rushed;
- You must work with people where they are at;
- Need to recognise the significance of small steps;
- The limitations imposed by short-term funded project must be recognised;
- Value in mixing social activities with targeted peace building;

---

<sup>27</sup> As mentioned in Chapter 2, this project was used as an example of a human rights project by Professor William Schabas in "Respect, Protect and Fulfil", Border Action, 2007.

- Need for a shared understanding of what is meant by ‘Peace Building’ and ‘Reconciliation’;
- Transparency in every action;
- A cross-border peace project brings many challenges around engagement, apathy, ownership, responsibility;
- Importance of basic relationships;
- Significance of sharing personal and family stories;
- Clear and agreed objectives.

Finally, *Donegal Rural Protestant Peace Building Project* concludes that “some communities and groups can be left behind by rapid political and social change. With a little support many such groups can gain the confidence and capacity to engage”.

### **3.3 Level and quality of engagement with/involvement of Protestants**

#### **3.3a Engagement**

Giving the “keep to yourself” attitude which was widespread among the Border Protestant community, engagement was not something that could be taken for granted. *Supporting Minorities in the Border Counties*, for example, spent much time in “personal contact” with individual Protestant families, followed up with phone calls and letters. Protestant clergy and leaders were targeted and this was useful. Only when the groundwork had been completed and a level of trust was built was it possible to organise facilitated workshops. Even a single identity project can have difficulties with the “keep your head down” attitude.

*Empowering Our Communities* had to work hard to build up to its present membership of fifty groups and even now the participation in activities can vary from “excellent” to “poor”. This project also identified a gap in the engagement of young women who prefer the more relaxed “fun” type of events which also have their place in building a community.

The reluctance of Protestants to speak openly was a difficulty to be overcome. *Riverbrooke Cross-Border Initiative* worked hard at involving the Protestant community in the design and planning of the programme. The engagement with young people through school and youth programmes was “excellent” but the engagement of the adults was much slower. Emphasis shifted from trying to bring groups in to “outreach approaches”. Sometimes simple supports are needed to assist engagement. The *Youth Engagement Project* overcame initial disinterest by laying on transport to and from the after-schools activities and “this increased the levels of participation of Protestant children”.

There is also a big difference between engaging and maintaining Protestant participation. *Inch Island Community Association* reported an initial engagement of Protestants which then began “to fade” possibly because the project did not

target the Protestant community directly but rather aimed at the engagement of “the whole community”.

Others reported that involvement was often issue led. *North Cavan Church of Ireland Group’s* main focus was the upgrading of three halls and this was a real incentive to the Protestant community because the funding delivered halls “the Protestant community could be proud of”. Similarly the facilitation provided by *Donegal Rural Protestant Peace Building Project* enabled many communities to access funding for their own facilities e.g. Glacknadrummond Methodists, Culdaff Tennis Club, Monreagh Ulster Scots, Conwall Parish Church, Newton Tennis Club.

### 3.3b Change

Generally speaking, changes are small and slow: more tendency than actual change. For example *Donegal Rural Protestant Peace Building Project* notices a “reduction in the Protestant island mentality”. It believes that the “image of some Protestants as the last remnants of the British Empire is diminishing both as to how Protestants see themselves and are perceived by others”.

There is also change in the confidence of the Protestant community. *East Donegal Ulster Scots* described the previous attitude of “keep your mouth shut in public but later secretly give off”. Nowadays the community is more inclined to say its piece and feels more pride in its culture e.g. bagpipes, dancing, music. Some like to boast that it was the Ulster Scots that introduced the fiddle into Irish music. *Supporting Minority Groups in the Border Region* describe the emergence of a group of Protestants in Cavan under the confident title of “Who we are matters”.

Change is not confined to attitude. Changes in behaviour are also reported. *The Wee Hall in Culdaff* notices that more Catholics and Protestants are visiting each other’s churches and that they take part in joint fundraising. Similarly with halls. *North Cavan Church of Ireland Group* reports that Catholics and Protestants are using each other’s halls much more so than before. *Youth Engagement Project* records greater levels of actual integration within the young people. “There appears to be less graffiti and evidence of sectarianism than before”. Greater contact with Protestants in Northern Ireland is another development. *Scripture Union* recruits a “substantial number of Protestants from Northern Ireland who participate as volunteer leaders”. *Drogheda Early Intervention & Integration Programme*<sup>28</sup> organised several workshops, exchanges and residentials with projects in Belfast’s Shankill Road for adults and children in Drogheda.

These are experienced projects and are not afraid to make a realistic analysis. They conclude that the change, although real, is limited. *Riverbrooke Cross-*

---

<sup>28</sup> SEUPB Ref. No. 015007, Drogheda Early Intervention & Integration Programme, Measure 2.2, €196,817 awarded.

*Border Initiative* sees more understanding among the majority community towards the Protestant community and an increase in the confidence of the latter. The change, however, is described as “slight”. *Supporting Minority Groups in the Border Region* recognises that there is “a strong Protestant enclave that is not open to the aims of this project”. *Inch Island Community Association* believes that the project “is getting better at defining the issues but has a long way to go in resolving them”.

*Empowering Our Communities* reports that their member groups are more active now and more confident but still lack the media presence their numbers and work deserves. Some member groups, including the Loyal Orders and bands, still do not advertise their activities in the local papers.

*Celebrating Difference* sums it up. The impact of the EU Peace programmes was like “dropping a stone into a lake: the ripples are still moving slowly out”.

### **3.4 Addressing the needs of Protestants**

#### **3.4a Meeting the needs**

This was not as simple as it looked. *Riverbrooke Cross-Border Initiative* found that there was avoidance “on all sides to openly acknowledge a different experience”. Preparatory work had to be done to create a climate where participants were more open to discuss specific needs.

Most of the projects made an attempt to ascertain the needs of the Protestant community from simply “asking them” (*Supporting Minorities Groups in the Border Region*) to “undertaking a survey”. The *North Cavan Church of Ireland Group* conducted an extensive survey in 1997 prior to making an application to PEACE II. The *Youth Empowerment Project* in conjunction with Derry Raphoe Action held research workshops “to identify issues, perceptions and attitudes of young people from the Protestant and Catholic communities to each other and the level of interaction between them”. *Empowering Our Community* with its strategy of “speaking up” participated in several research analyses, some of which are reviewed in Chapter 2, and participated in consultations held by funding agencies, County Councils and government departments.

Building the confidence and capacity of the Protestant community and alerting the majority community to the need to recognise the different identity and culture that exists alongside it are the main needs that emerge. Workshops, single identity work, listening, lectures, applications for funding, involvement of church groups, press statements, refurbishment of halls and a great variety of joint activities are some of the means of addressing these needs. Most projects agree that the Protestant community is, by and large, more confident in speaking out now and that there is a slight increase in awareness on the part of the majority community about Protestant identity, history and culture.

### 3.4b What else is needed?

Most projects agree that more resources are needed to support the Protestant community. *North Cavan Church of Ireland Group* goes so far as to say that unless the support for peace building and reconciliation work is forthcoming for the Protestant community, “the work will fail to continue”. *Empowering Our Communities* recommends more resources for training and organising “culturally-sensitive” events. *Youth Empowerment Project* believes there is need for increased staffing in peace projects and access to trained facilitators. *Riverbrooke Cross-border Initiative* identified need around economically unviable agriculture and rural depopulation and suggests financial support for farm families, especially the women.

The two most frequently raised needs were the necessity of single identity work and the refurbishment of halls.

For *Celebrating Difference* supporting single identity work was “not straightforward”. Single identity work resembles teaching swimming from the side of the pool. You lay the trainees on the ground and show them how to breathe and move their arms and legs. But in order to learn to swim the trainees must get into the pool. At the same time this project recognises that it still might be necessary for some Protestant communities but it should always be linked progressively to cross-community actions. *Youth Empowerment Project* had reservations also. It felt that funding single identity work should have “a cut-off point when the learning and practice gained over the past 10 years should be channelled into meaningful community building and policy development”. *North Cavan Church of Ireland Group* recognised the ongoing need for single identity work but wants it to be combined with cross-community work “except in exceptional circumstances”. Funding single identity work is a way of recognising the Protestant community and its entitlement to do its own thing, according to *Empowering Our Community*. Furthermore it is necessary for a minority community which is in fear of “being swamped<sup>29</sup> by the majority community”.

*Empowering Our Community* also believes that the funding of halls is a real need of the Protestant community. *Donegal Rural Protestant Peace Building Project* argues for sensitivity in addressing the financial needs of Protestant communities in terms of their halls. Many parishes are “now considering their sustainability and viability” and this is a “painful process” especially where the hall is surrounded by a graveyard.

---

<sup>29</sup> Interestingly “swamped” was the word used in the Submission to the Boundary Commission in 1925 with which this report opened.

### 3.5 PEACE III funding

The projects were asked three questions in relation to the incoming PEACE III Programme:

- i. What type of eligible activities are required under PEACE III to address the types of issues raised by the Protestant community?
- ii. Would it be an advantage or a hindrance if the Protestant community is named as a target group of PEACE III?
- iii. What kinds of support would the Protestant community need under PEACE III to address their issues?

#### 3.5a Eligible activities

Promoters generally supported the prioritising of funding of cross-community activities. This kind of funding will help the Border Protestant community towards full inclusion in society and the majority community to come to terms with the issues and responsibilities of having an indigenous religious minority living in its midst. This was also supported by respondents in the survey.

The conflict in Northern Ireland may be over but there is still need for peace building and reconciliation support for communities, groups, youth and children's projects (*Youth Empowerment Project* and *Scripture Union*).

There is need for funding for "breaking the silence" projects, capacity and confidence building, raising awareness of Protestant identity and heritage including Ulster Scots (*Inch Island Community Association*, *Riverbrooke Cross-Border Initiative* and *East Donegal Ulster Scots*).

There should be funding for both single identity and cross-community based on an analysis of need (*North Cavan Churches Group*). This was also echoed in the survey with the majority of respondents supporting inter and intra community projects.

The five strands of Reconciliation should remain as key criteria of PEACE III as they made people think about their project (*Donegal Rural Protestants Peace Building Project*).

The PEACE III Programme should contain funding for the refurbishment of halls and activities for youth (*Empowering Our Communities*).

### **3.5b Target Group**

Projects who supported the idea of the Border Protestant community being named as a target group of the PEACE III Programme felt the advantages would be both easier access to funding and formal recognition of the Protestant community (*Scripture Union, East Donegal Ulster Scots, Riverbrooke Cross-Border Initiative, Empowering Our Community, Inch Island Community Association and Donegal Rural Protestant Peace Building Project*).

Those who were against it either opposed it on the grounds of “don’t draw attention to yourself” (*Supporting Minorities in the Border Region and North Cavan Church of Ireland Group*) or on the basis of equality (*Youth Empowerment Project and The Wee Hall in Culdaff*).

*Celebrating Difference* feared it might reinforce “single identity forever” but was in favour if it meant that isolated, low capacity Protestant communities could access the PEACE III Programme.

### **3.5c Supports**

Several projects recommended dedicated staff specialising in working with the Border Protestant community (*Riverbrooke Cross-Border Initiative, North Cavan Church of Ireland and Empowering Our Communities*). The last mentioned argued that the dedicated staff should be located in existing peace projects to give a good geographical spread to this resource.

Other supports recommended included support for integration of youth (*Youth Empowerment Project*), for raising awareness of the Protestant tradition (*The Wee Hall in Culdaff*) and for reconciliation projects for cross-community organisations including faith-based ones (*Scripture Union*).

Capital support was recommended by *Inch Island Association, Celebrating Difference* and *Donegal Rural Protestant Peace Building Project*. The last mentioned spelled it out: “Capped expenditure on halls that need refurbishment; funding in proportion to the identified need; and partnership applications to avoid duplication”.

## **3. Conclusion**

In conclusion this review shows a robust and intelligent engagement with the Protestant community by PEACE II projects. In particular, it charts progression in the fields of building positive relations, dealing with hurt and in the area of rights. The main lesson in working with this indigenous religious minority is that it is a slow process which can also be painful. Engagement with a community which

had learned to keep its head down requires various approaches and the change, both in attitude and behaviour, while real is often small.

These project promoters are experienced and their conclusions are critical and realistic. The main need of the Border Protestant community that emerges from this engagement is the twofold need to build the capacity and confidence of this minority community and also to alert the majority community to the responsibility to recognise the different identity and culture that lives alongside it.

These needs for future funding were identified: prioritised support for funding cross-community activities; support for single identity activities when considered necessary especially around confidence and capacity building; support for the refurbishment of halls as being of great symbolic significance and morale boosting; support for dedicated and specialist support for community development; and the importance of official recognition of this community by naming it as a target group of the PEACE III Programme.

## Chapter 4: The Survey

The findings<sup>30</sup> presented below are an indication of opinions regarding civic life, minority status, labour market issues and the knowledge of and attitudes towards the community sector. Material within this section is also presented from public organisations and political parties regarding the inclusion of the Protestant community via employment quotas and the undertaking of diversity training within such bodies.

The survey<sup>31</sup> was distributed among a range of respondents and groups with regard to community sector involvement/knowledge, church membership and geographical spread. The findings from the survey replicated many of the issues discussed in the focus groups and interviews<sup>32</sup>.

The findings located below show that the majority of respondents acknowledge a Protestant border identity. There is also an acknowledgement that the loss of that identity, especially among younger Protestants, would be regretted. Unsurprisingly, given this sense of cultural decline there is support for community based work that would promote Protestant identities. Yet there is an equally strong indication of support for a community sector that promotes positive change and engages with the 'other' community. Evidently, the respondents identify a desire for capacity building both within and between communities. Other general observations and emergent issues include:

- An acknowledgement from those who have been involved in community groups that received PEACE I and II funding that such support has improved '*social interaction between communities*';
- Around two-thirds of respondents involved in community groups are participants in groups that support North-South co-operation; that contribute to significant cultural and attitudinal change; that positively impact upon poverty and social exclusion; that advance equality agendas; that support a culture of human rights and that actively pursue positive relationships between communities;
- A belief held by over **75%** of all respondents was that '*Protestant involvement in the community sector will promote positive change*';
- Nearly **90%** of all respondents agreed that Protestant involvement in the community sector will encourage '*greater inclusion*' and also '*break down barriers between communities*';
- Over **88%** of all respondents supported inter-community work and the '*need for community funding that promotes Protestant identities*';

---

<sup>30</sup> As explained earlier within this text the survey findings are indicative only.

<sup>31</sup> See Appendix 3.

<sup>32</sup> The Orange Order aided the delivery of an agreed number of surveys. The funders of this research wished to address organisations that may not have publicly participated in previous research exercises. Schools and church groups were also approached in order to seek a wide body of opinion.

- Over **80%** of respondents also believed that *'Protestants are more likely to become involved in the community sector if such inclusion will lead to better cross-community relationships'*;
- In terms of developing positive community sector involvement the majority (**88.6%**) of respondents agreed that *'Protestants require information and training regarding community group building'*;
- **73.4%** believed that there is *'such a thing as a South of the Border Protestant identity'*. In addition, **86.1%** stated that *'maintaining a distinctly Protestant culture in the Republic of Ireland'* was important to them;
- Nearly **50%** agreed that *'Protestants do not feel positive about their minority status'*. However, **67.9%** agreed that their community *'is well-respected within my community'*;
- **Two thirds** agreed that their community has *'no problems finding well paid work'* although **50.8%** concurred with the proposition that *'there are industries and jobs within which Protestants are not welcome'*.

## The Respondents

Self-completion questionnaires were distributed to **402** persons. Of these **233** replies were received, producing a completion rate of **57.9%**.

**108 (46.3%)** respondents were female, **120 (53.8%)** were male, **4 (1.7%)** did not state their gender and **1 (0.4%)** cited a mixed gender. Given the respective Protestant population in each county it was not unusual that the bulk of respondents resided in Donegal, Monaghan, Louth and Cavan. In terms of geographic spread the percentage share of all respondents by county was as follows;

- **4.7%** from Sligo;
- **3.4%** from Leitrim;
- **15.4%** from Cavan;
- **18.4%** from Monaghan;
- **21.8%** from Louth;
- **30.0%** from Donegal;
- **6.0%** did not state a county or came from another county<sup>33</sup>.

Of the **118 (50.6%)** who stated that they were members of a community group<sup>34</sup> **65 (55.0%)**<sup>35</sup> were male, **52 (44.0%)** female and **1 (0.8%)** of mixed gender. Of the **118** respondents in community groups:

<sup>33</sup> Four respondents were located in either Roscommon, Westmeath and/or Fermanagh.

<sup>34</sup> Among those who were community group members 43 were members of the loyal orders. Three other members of the loyal orders stated that they were not in community groups. The surveys received by members of the loyal orders did not have any more significance upon the overall findings anymore than other factors such as age, county of residence and community group membership;

<sup>35</sup> This percentages relates to the 118 persons in community groups;

- **38.1%**<sup>36</sup> were located in Donegal;
- **15.2%** were located in Monaghan;
- **1.6%** were located in Sligo;
- **25.4%** were located in Louth;
- **13.5%** were located in Cavan,
- **1.6%** were located in Leitrim;
- **4.2%** did not cite a county or came from outside the study area.

Among the **115**<sup>37</sup> **not** in community groups **55 (47.8%)** were males, **56 (48.6%)** were females and **4 (3.4%)** did not cite their gender.

The **115** respondents **not** in community groups were constituted as follows;

- **21.7%**<sup>38</sup> from Donegal;
- **21.7%** from Monaghan;
- **7.8%** from Sligo;
- **5.2%** from Leitrim;
- **17.3%** from Cavan;
- **18.2%** from Louth;
- **7.8%** did not cite a county or came from outside the study area others.

There was a relatively even spread of those in the age categories that stretched from 26 to over 60. The age categories<sup>39</sup> and share of respondents was as follows:

- **20 (8.5%)**<sup>40</sup> were aged 16-25;
- **57 (24.4%)** were aged 26-40;
- **53 (22.7%)** were aged 41-50;
- **53 (22.7%)** were aged 51-60;
- **45 (19.3%)** were aged over 60.
- **5 (2.1%)** did not cite their age.

Summary of all respondents:

- **27.8%**<sup>41</sup> of all respondents were males in community groups;
- **22.3%** of all respondents were females in community groups;
- **23.6%** of all respondents were males who were not in community groups;

<sup>36</sup> The percentages in this paragraph refer to the share of all respondents (118) in community groups.

<sup>37</sup> This percentage only relates to those not in a community group;

<sup>38</sup> The percentages here refers to a share of those not in community groups.

<sup>39</sup> According to the 2001 Census the share of those aged 15+ in the Census was as follows. Aged 15-24 15.9%, aged 25-34 16%, aged 35-44 16.3%, aged 45-54 17.2%, aged 55-64 14.0% aged 65+ 20.5%.

<sup>40</sup> These percentages relate to all 233 respondents.

<sup>41</sup> These percentages refer to all respondents;

- **24.0%** of all respondents were females who were not in community groups;
- **0.4%** of all respondents were in community groups but did not state their gender;
- **1.7%** of all respondents were not in community groups and did not cite their gender.

## Civic Life

All respondents were asked questions concerning civic life and the position/role of the Protestant population regarding their identity and position within their respective communities. The questions set were responded to along a continuum from strongly agree to strongly disagree in order to impart information on attitudes across various understanding and interpretations.

With regard to the supposition *‘the Protestant community has disengaged itself from cultural life within my area’* a small majority (**51.3%**) either strongly disagreed/disagreed with this proposition. Around a quarter of respondents neither agreed/ disagreed and a further **23.8%** agreed/strongly agreed (**Table 1**).

A more significant majority (**73.4%**) concurred that *‘there is such a thing as a South of the Border Protestant identity’* suggesting that a definable and acknowledged sense of identity was observable (**Table 1**). Furthermore, **86.1%**<sup>42</sup> stated that *‘maintaining a distinctly Protestant culture in the Republic of Ireland is important to me’*.

However, **61%** of all respondents agreed/strongly agreed that their identity is in *‘terminal decline’* compared to **one in five** who did not agree or strongly disagreed. **83.9%** agreed/strongly agreed that *‘younger people are losing their sense of a Protestant identity’* and in relation to this **92.8%** agreed/strongly agreed that if younger *‘Protestants lost their sense of identity that would sadden me’*<sup>43</sup>. Evidence<sup>44</sup> taken from the survey also showed that **74.7%** of all respondents agreed/strongly agreed that *‘people are now more interested in promoting their Protestant identity’*. With regard to assistance in promoting that identity **35.7%** agreed/strongly agreed that the *‘majority community is keen to help us protect our identity’*. A slightly higher share (**44.5%**) disagreed/strongly disagreed.

<sup>42</sup> Material taken from question 4 in survey.

<sup>43</sup> Evidence from question 4 in the survey.

<sup>44</sup> All additional material presented in this paragraph comes from question 4 in the survey;

**Table 1: Civic life**<sup>45</sup>

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither Agree/Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
The Protestant community has disengaged itself from cultural life within my area?	5.8% 13	18.0% 40	24.7% 55	36.0% 80	15.3% 34
There is such a thing as a South of the Border Protestant identity?	31.4% 71	42.0% 95	7.9% 18	11.9% 27	6.6% 15
The Protestant community engages in local political life?	6.7% 15	31.8% 71	24.2% 54	21.0% 47	16.1% 36
The Protestant community maintain a privileged status within my community?	5.7% 13	9.2% 21	17.6% 40	37.8% 86	29.5% 67
The Protestant community is well-respected within my community?	16.2% 37	51.7% 118	16.6% 38	10.0% 23	5.2% 12
Older Protestants feel more marginalised with my community compared to younger Protestants?	12.1% 26	37.3% 80	23.3% 50	21.9% 47	5.1% 11
The Protestant community is	7.1%	36.6%	15.2%	23.3%	17.6%

<sup>45</sup> Some respondents filled questions in by writing either yes/no as opposed to using numbers and were omitted. Some failed to complete each question. Given this all percentages in the preceding tables and text refer to the number who correctly and legibly completed each supposition.

treated equally within my community?	15	77	32	49	37
The Protestant community remains largely independent from other communities	13.1% 27	36.4% 75	20.3% 42	24.7% 51	5.3% 11
Protestants do not feel positive about their minority status?	20.6% 43	27.4% 57	28.8% 60	18.7% 39	4.3% 9

In addition:

- **44.4%** agreed/strongly agreed that the *'Protestant community is too insular'*;
- **67.9%** agreed/strongly agreed with the proposition that *'the Protestant community is well-respected within my community'*;
- **43.7%** stated that their *'community is treated equally'* while **40.9%** strongly disagreed/disagreed (**Table 1**).

A negative interpretation of the Protestant community is that they hold a privileged status, despite their minority status, regarding significant material wealth and social and cultural largesse. With regard to this **67.3%** of respondents disagreed/strongly disagreed that *'the Protestant community maintain a privileged status within my community'* (**Table 1**). There was a split in responses regarding the proposition that the *'Protestant community is involved in political life'*. **38.5%** agreed/strongly agreed compared to **37.1%** who disagreed/strongly disagreed (**Table 1**).

These findings would suggest that fear of cultural dissolution is not based upon being disrespected by the 'majority' community but that it could be solved via internal capacity building and recognition and support from the 'majority' community. It may also be the case that future funding is required to build a communicative context that both promotes a distinctive minority community and connects that group of people more firmly and interdependently with the 'majority' community.

## Work and Employment<sup>46</sup>

An important aspect of minority inclusion is linked to labour market issues and a sense/reality that members of a minority community are purposefully excluded because of their diminutive and/or peripheral status.

Just over half of all respondents (**50.8%**) agreed/strongly agreed that '*there are industries and jobs within which Protestants are not welcome*'. Around a third (**31.4%**) disagreed/strongly disagreed. **60.7%** also agreed/strongly agreed that '*Protestants sometimes do not apply for certain jobs because they think that their religion would stop them getting such jobs*'. Furthermore, **36.7%** agreed/strongly agreed that '*being a Protestant affects the ability to gain promotions within the workplace*'. Respondents were asked to comment on three sites of employment (the Garda Síochána, Councils and the community sector) with regard to how comfortable they perceived Protestants to be when applying for jobs with these organisations. With regards to each of these sectors there was a near equitable split between those who agreed/strongly agreed, those who neither agreed/disagreed and those who disagreed/strongly disagreed. Nearly half (**49.2%**) agreed/strongly agreed that '*there is no job discrimination against Protestants in the border counties*'. **66.6%** also agreed that the local Protestant community has no problems '*finding well-paid work in comparison to other communities*'.

The findings within this section of the report would suggest that there is no overwhelming interpretation of purposeful labour market based discrimination against the Protestant community. But it is also evident that there are specific sites and sections of the labour market that are perceived to be/or are problematic with regard to inclusion, appointment and promotion.

## Community Involvement and Future Development<sup>47</sup>

**118** respondents stated that they were involved in a community group. As noted above<sup>48</sup> **52** were females, **65** males and **1** was mixed gender. The geographical spread of these respondents was as follows;

- **45 (38.1%)** were located in Donegal;
- **18 (15.2%)** were located in Monaghan;
- **2 (1.6%)** were located in Sligo;
- **30 (25.4%)** were located in Louth;
- **16 (13.5%)** were located in Cavan,
- **2 (1.6%)** were located in Leitrim;
- **5 (4.2%)** did not cite a county.

---

<sup>46</sup> The evidence in this section is based on responses from question 5 in the survey.

<sup>47</sup> All responses in this section relate to question 6a and 6b.

<sup>48</sup> Page 38

Among those in community groups the following was observed<sup>49</sup>;

- **52** respondents (**44.0%**) stated that their group was **not** in receipt of PEACE I or II funding;
- **42** respondents (**35.5%**) did not believe that PEACE I and II funding had improved social interaction between Protestants and other communities; The majority of these respondents were involved in community groups that were **NOT** in receipt of such funding;
- Virtually all of the respondents who **WERE** involved in community groups that received PEACE I and II funding stated that such funding *'had improved social interaction between Protestants and other communities'*. In essence experience and knowledge of PEACE I and II funding is linked to the identification of a meritorious impact;
- With regard to the supposition that PEACE I and II funding encouraged *'Protestants to become more involved in promoting their identity'* the majority (**54.3%**) agreed that this was the case. Yet again those in receipt of such funding were more positive that such assistance was beneficial with regard to identity promotion;
- **74.6%** agreed with the proposition that their group was aiming to *'develop a shared vision of an interdependent and fair society'*.
- Over **75%** of respondents involved in community groups stated that their group was involved in;
  1. Building North-South cross-border cooperation;
  2. Contributing to significant cultural and attitudinal change;
  3. Working to impact positively on poverty and social exclusion;
  4. Advancing the equality agenda e.g. gender, religious belief, race, sexual orientation and disability?
  5. Supporting the growth of a human rights culture;
  6. Working actively to build positive relationships between communities.

Although nearly half of all respondents are **not** involved in community groups there was strong support for developments within this arena. As shown in **Table**

---

<sup>49</sup> The figures in these bullet points relate only to the those in community groups.

**2 - 58.7%** of respondents strongly disagreed/disagreed that there *'are ample Protestant based community groups in my area'*. However, **59.7%** of all respondents stated that their *'community lacks knowledge of the community sector'*. A small majority (**52.4%**) stated that members of their community are *'keen to become involved in the community sector'* compared to **17.4%** who disagreed/strongly disagreed. Exactly **30%** neither agreed/disagreed.

A significant **78.2%** believed that Protestant involvement in the community sector would promote *'positive change'*. With regard to this **89.1%** believed that Protestant involvement in the community sector *'will encourage greater inclusion'*. **84.9%** also stated that *'Protestant involvement in the community sector will help break down barriers between communities'*. **83.0%** also agreed/strongly agreed that *'grants to upgrade Protestant facilities, such as church halls and Orange halls would encourage the Protestant community to become more involved in community life'*.

**Table 2: Community Involvement**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither Agree/Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
There are ample Protestant based community groups in my area?	9.0% 20	18.0% 40	14.0% 31	37.0% 82	21.7% 48
The Protestant community lacks knowledge of the community sector?	19.9% 44	39.8% 88	17.1% 38	20.3% 45	2.7% 6
Protestants are keen to become involved in the community sector?	9.4% 21	43.0% 96	30.0% 67	15.2% 34	2.2% 5
Protestant involvement in the community sector will promote positive	28.5% 63	49.7% 110	17.1% 38	4.0% 9	0.4% 1

change?					
Grants to upgrade Protestant facilities, such as church halls and Orange halls would encourage the Protestant community to become more involved in community life?	47.3% 106	35.7% 80	11.1% 25	4.4% 10	1.3% 3
Protestant involvement in the community sector will encourage greater inclusion?	40.3% 90	48.8% 109	8.9% 20	0.8% 2	0.8% 2
The Protestant community has the confidence needed to become more involved in the community sector?	15.6% 35	38.5% 86	17.4% 39	21.5% 48	6.7% 15
Protestant involvement in the community sector will help break down barriers between communities	33.0% 75	51.9% 118	12.3% 28	1.7% 4	0.8% 2

There was a small majority (**54.1%**) who agreed/strongly agreed that *'the Protestant community has the confidence needed to become more involved in the community sector'*. **28.2%** disagreed/strongly disagreed. Confidence building is an obvious key element in the deconstruction of negative aspects of being a minority community.

**Table 3** considers some of the ways in which involvement could be broadened and encouraged. **73.2%** of respondents believed that ‘*Protestant churches are a key player in terms of building Protestant involvement in the community sector*’.

**Table 3: Developing Community Involvement**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither Agree/Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
The Protestant churches are a key player in terms of building Protestant involvement in the community sector?	29.5% 68	43.5% 100	12.1% 28	10.0% 23	4.7% 11
Facilities controlled by Protestants should be used to build better cross-community relationships?	26.8% 62	45.8% 106	15.5% 36	6.9% 16	4.7% 11
The main barrier to Protestant involvement in the community sector is a lack of knowledge about that sector?	18.6% 42	44.4% 100	16.8% 38	16.0% 36	4.0% 9
Engaging with the other community via the community sector needs to be promoted?	28.3% 64	58.8% 133	9.3% 21	1.7% 4	1.7% 4
Most Protestants think that the community sector is controlled by the Catholic community?	38.9% 88	39.8% 90	14.1% 32	6.6% 15	0.4% 1
The Peace Process is making Protestants more aware of the	16.4% 37	47.1% 106	22.6% 51	11.1% 25	2.6% 6

need to involve themselves in the community sector?					
---	--	--	--	--	--

Furthermore, **72.6%** believed that *‘facilities controlled by Protestants should be used to build better cross-community relationships’*. **87.1%** also agreed/strongly agreed that *‘engaging with the other community via the community sector needs to be promoted’*. A mere **3.4%** disagreed. Roughly two-thirds (**63.5%**) believed that *‘the Peace Process is making Protestants more aware of the need to involve themselves in the community sector’*. **63.0%** believed that *‘the main barrier to Protestant involvement in the community sector is a lack of knowledge about that sector’*. In terms of the ‘other’ community **78.7%** agreed/strongly agreed that *‘Protestants think that the community sector is controlled by the Catholic community’*. If such a perception is accurate then there is an evident need to challenge such a position.

In terms of developing a relevant community sector it is important to develop projects and programmes that will encourage involvement from within the minority community<sup>50</sup>. Given the issue of minority status it was not surprising that **89.8%** of respondents agreed/strongly agreed that *‘there is a need for community funding that promotes Protestant identities (Table 4a)’*. **87.4%** also agreed/strongly agreed that *‘Protestants will apply for funding in order to develop their community if that funding is specific to their community’*.

A smaller but no less significant share (**83.4%**) believed that *‘Protestants are more likely to become involved in the community sector if that will lead to better cross-community relationships’*. The development of capacity is understood and **84.3%** upheld the proposition that *‘the development of Protestant community groups would provide much needed leadership for the Protestant community’*. If such findings are accurate within a wider Protestant population then there is a requirement to develop both single identity projects in order to bolster confidence but also deliver programmes that build inter-community connections.

Nearly three-quarters of respondents (**74.2%**) (Table 4b) believed that the formation of *‘new Protestant community groups would be important to me’*. In addition:

- **75.8%** agreed/strongly agreed that *‘Protestant communities groups are needed to challenge Protestant exclusion’*;

<sup>50</sup> The remaining information in this section comes from Tables 4a and 4b.

- **80.1%** believed that if *‘there is an appropriate funding stream the Protestant community will involve itself in the local community development process’*;
- **82.1%** upheld the proposition that the *‘Protestant community groups are needed to develop the Peace Process’*;
- **91.9%** believed that *‘Protestant involvement in the community sector will promote trust between groups’*.

**Table 4a: Making Funding Relevant**

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither Agree/Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
There is a need for community funding that promotes Protestant identities?	59.6% 136	30.2% 69	6.5% 15	2.1% 5	1.3% 3
Protestants are more likely to become involved in the community sector if that will lead to better cross-community relationships?	26.6% 60	56.8% 128	12.4% 28	2.6% 6	1.3% 3
Younger Protestants are those most likely to become involved in the community sector ?	21.9% 48	38.3% 84	26.4% 58	11.8% 26	1.3% 3
The development of Protestant community groups would provide much	35.2% 79	49.1% 110	13.3% 30	1.7% 4	0.4% 1

needed leadership for the Protestant community?					
Protestants require information and training regarding community group building?	38.9%	49.7%	7.2%	3.1%	0.9%
	86	110	16	7	2
Protestants will apply for funding in order to develop their community if that funding is specific to their community?	44.8%	42.6%	9.7%	2.2%	0.4%
	101	96	22	5	1

**Table 4b: Making Funding Relevant**

	<b><i>Strongly Agree</i></b>	<b><i>Agree</i></b>	<b><i>Neither Agree/Disagree</i></b>	<b><i>Disagree</i></b>	<b><i>Strongly Disagree</i></b>
The formation of new Protestant community groups would be important to me?	37.1%	37.1%	17.6%	6.6%	1.3%
	84	84	40	15	3
Protestant community groups are needed to challenge Protestant exclusion?	35.7%	40.1%	16.5%	5.3%	2.2%
	80	90	37	12	5
Protestant community groups are needed to develop the Peace	38.1%	43.9%	15.2%	2.2%	0.4%
	85	98	34	5	1

Process?					
We need a community sector that will promote local industry?	40.6% 91	43.8% 98	13.8% 31	0.8% 2	0.8% 2
Protestant involvement in the community sector will promote trust between groups?	38.7% 86	53.1% 118	8.1% 18	0	0
Funding should be sought to promote citizenship programmes that promote respect for diversity within the Protestant community?	38.2% 83	41.4% 90	16.5% 36	2.3% 5	1.3% 3
Funding should be sought to promote citizenship programmes that promote respect for diversity for both the Catholic and Protestant communities?	35.3% 76	48.3% 104	13.0% 28	2.7% 6	0.4% 1
There is a need for funding to facilitate reconciliation, especially amongst the more senior members of the Protestant community ?	33.3% 71	40.3% 86	17.3% 37	7.9% 17	0.9% 2
If there is an	33.3%	46.7%	18.9%	0.9%	0

appropriate funding stream the Protestant community will involve itself in the local community development process?	72	101	41	2	
The Protestant Community lacks the capacity to apply for Peace III Programme?	29.0%	24.2%	21.9%	19.6%	5.1%
	62	52	47	42	11

With regard to what kind of funding should be sought **78.7%** believed that *‘funding should be sought to promote citizenship programmes that promote respect for diversity within the Protestant community’*. However, **52.9%** agreed/strongly agreed *‘that the Protestant Community lacks the capacity to apply for PEACE III programme’*. With regard to the issues of community development there is an identifiable sense that respondents locate the community sector as an instrument of solutions to problems as opposed to merely identifying problems in themselves.

Respondents were asked to identify community groups within their respective counties. Members in community groups in Donegal, Louth and Monaghan named on average 3.6 groups compared to non-community group members who acknowledged 0.7 groups. With regard to this latter group it is evident that they support the development and enlargement of the community sector with regard to community capacity building and inter-community contact. However, their less than precise knowledge of the community sector, if reflected more widely among border Protestants, would act as a significant impediment in the development of that sector<sup>51</sup>.

Within Donegal the following groups were acknowledged by at least **25%** of respondents. With regard to this;

- **90.0%** identified Derry and Raphoe Action;

<sup>51</sup> The lack of knowledge concerning groups is an evident communication barrier. This is regrettable as it could be that border populations have indirectly benefited from PEACE I and II funding and the social changes that have emerged. Building up community awareness of the community sector is important with regard to both participating in and acknowledging socio-cultural change.

- **47.1%** identified Cathedral Hall Management Committee;
- **35.7%** identified Balor Developmental Community Arts;
- **34.2%** identified Irish Genealogy Ltd;
- **28.5%** identified St. Johnston/Carrigans Family Resource Centre;
- **28.5%** identified Donegal YMCA;
- **27.1%** identified inishowen Rural Development Ltd;
- **25.7%** identified Lifford/Clonleigh Resource Centre;
- **25.7%** identified Raphoe Youth and Community Project;

Within Monaghan the following was observed;

- **97.6%** identified Border Minority Group;
- **97.6%** identified the Scripture Union;
- **93.0%** identified Co. Monaghan Partnership;
- **88.3%** identified Clones Community Network;
- **53.4%** identified Glenree Centre for Reconciliation;
- **39.5%** identified North Cavan Church of Ireland Group;
- **25.5%** identified Triskele Community Training.

In Louth over 35% of respondents identified Cox's Demense Youth and Community Project and the Border Minority Group<sup>52</sup>.

### **Survey of Public Bodies**

Additionally, arising out of some issues contained in the literature review, a short questionnaire was sent to all the county managers, the Garda Chief Superintendents, the general secretaries of the main political parties (Fianna Fail, Fine Gael, Labour, Sinn Fein, Progressive Democrats, Greens), ICTU, IBEC, GAA and the editors and managers of the local newspapers and radio stations.

It contained the following 6 questions:

1. Does your organization believe that there is such a thing as 'the Border Protestant Community'?
2. What attempts does your organization make to build links with that community?
3. Does your organization take note of the number and the grades of its Protestant members?
4. Does your organization undertake any form of diversity training and, if so, what communities are included?
5. In recent publications Protestants have identified the county councils, the Gardai and the political system as realms where they are underrepresented. Do you think they are incorrect in holding this view?

<sup>52</sup> In the remaining counties the number of participants was too low to make any significant point concerning the knowledge of community groups.

6. Do you think there is a need for your organization to introduce procedures or set targets for the inclusion of this community?

Responses were received from Fianna Fail, ICTU, IBEC, Donegal County Council, the Progressive Democrats, Labour and An Garda Siochana.

The following was recorded from:

#### **An Garda Siochana:**

- An Garda Siochana does not *'compartmentalise the population but recognises that the community embraces ethnic and religious diversity'*;
- Formal structures are being developed as a wider strategy of engagement with the Protestant community;
- Inclusiveness is being promoted by easing qualifying conditions for minority groups;
- Garda personnel are trained to embrace diverse groups;
- Garda Siochana have undertaken seminars in Cavan/Monaghan and have invited members of minorities to act as guest speakers and participants;
- Contact has been made with various Orange lodges in border areas to *'improve communication, trust and mutual respect....'*
- It was stated that *'An Garda Siochana must reach out more to those community/cultural groups and in turn those community/cultural groups must participate'*.
- The setting of targets regarding recruitment is not as *'inclusive as a voluntary and effective participation'*.

#### **Fianna Fail:**

- There was an explicit recognition that *'the entity that is the Border Protestant Community'* does exist;
- That Fianna Fail via meetings with church representatives has been informed *'of the need to vigilantly protect the rights of all Christian traditions, particularly the Border Protestant Community'*;
- They do not record the religious background of members;
- That Fianna Fail does not support employment quotas in the public sector and that the growth in the Protestant population *'may help alleviate some of the perceived imbalance'* in the labour market;
- It is acknowledged that *'one possible avenue to improve representation in the public sector might be a targeted information campaign (aimed at the Protestant community) to highlight the career opportunities in the public realm'*;

#### **Labour:**

- The party is conscious of building links among all sections of society.

- This party are less strong in memberships terms in border areas but would be *'conscious of seeing the Protestant members of the community as potential members, activists and candidates'*;
- 'Feeling' under-represented *'is in itself an issue which must be addressed'*;
- *'Improved procedure and greater awareness of processes which lead to exclusions are part of'* any challenge to issues involving target setting.

#### **IBEC:**

- IBEC stated that quotas were not a requirement of law.

#### **ICTU:**

- ICTU stated that there is a Border Protestant Community *'which has existed from the foundation of the State'*;
- It was noted that the trade union movement is broad based and aims to work with all persuasions.

#### **The Progressive Democrats:**

- Affirmed that there is Border Protestant Community;
- That they engage via outreach work (Dundalk Grammar School);
- A candidate in Meath East is a Protestant and maintains links with that community;
- They support inclusion and are open to all communities.

#### **Donegal County Council:**

- Donegal County Council acknowledges that there is a substantial population belonging to the Protestant community in the border area;
- The Donegal Council led PEACE II Task Force via EU Programme for Peace and Reconciliation linked with the Protestant community, and in so doing provided funding for three Orange Halls, the restoration of work on St. Finian's Church and lighting in the Wee Hall Culdaff;
- The Council has also stated that it worked with Protestant groups to assist in the writing of grant applications, and have supported various reconciliation and peace-building initiatives;
- The council does not record the affiliation of its employees;
- They have organised a number of Cultural Diversity Days to create awareness of the *'increasing number of cultures that exist in Donegal'*;
- It was stated that the setting of targets would be *'counter-productive'* and contrary to Equality Legislation.

## Chapter 5: Focus Groups and Interviews

In addition to the survey focus groups, individual interviews were held that aimed to broaden the discussion around key themes, concerns and also potential progress<sup>53</sup>. These were arranged in each county within the study area via advertisements in local papers. The agenda for the focus groups and the interviews included:

- Discussing the previous and current condition of the Border Protestant community;
- Interpreting and acknowledging the aims of the PEACE III programme and the challenges it presented to the Border Protestant community;
- Providing an open space for issues to be debated and explained.

The following timetable for focus groups was observed.

### Details of Focus Groups

County	Venue	Date	Time (pm)
Donegal	Breezy Centre, Cashelard	Tuesday: March 6	7.00-9.00
Louth	FOY Centre, Carlingford	Wednesday: March 7	7.00-9.00
Leitrim	Bee Park Centre, M'Hamilton	Thursday: March 8	7.00-9.00
Monaghan	Protestant Hall, Clones	Monday: March 12	7.00-9.00
Donegal	Volt House, Raphoe	Tuesday: March 13	7.00-9.00
Sligo	Sligo Folk Park, Riverstown	Thursday: March 15	7.00-9.00
Cavan	Burrowes Hall, Stradone	Tuesday: March 20	7.00-9.00

In addition Derry Raphoe Action hosted an additional focus group in St. Johnston, Co. Donegal, and the PEACE II funded Centre for Peace Building facilitated a “master class” on Ulster Protestant identity led by David Stevens, leader of the Corrymeela Community.

As in the survey participants in the focus groups were assured of confidentiality being identified only by county of address, denomination, membership of a loyal order, gender and age. This decision was informed by the finding in the literature review of Chapter 2 that there was reluctance in this community to speak out frankly and an apprehension about drawing attention to themselves.

In total **97** people attended the focus groups, **41** women and **56** men of whom **22** were members of loyal orders. By denomination it broke down Church of Ireland **52**, Presbyterian **39**, Methodist **3**, Free Presbyterian **2** and **1** not denominated. By county it broke down Donegal **52**, Monaghan **17**, Louth **14**, Cavan **11**, Sligo **2**, Leitrim **1**. The average age of these participants was **49**.

---

<sup>53</sup> See Appendix 5

## **5.1 The Condition of the Border Protestant Community Today**

The focus group meetings confirmed the findings of the previous research documents described in Chapter 2 and elaborated on the results of the survey in Chapter 4. The focus groups included meaningful and robust discussions regarding:

- Identity;
- cultural and social exclusion;
- minority experience;
- political and cultural participation;
- churches and schools;
- challenges and opportunities.

### **5.1a Identity**

There was a consistent and enduring argument that the Border Protestant community is a distinct, indigenous religious community. Although it was explained that it is not entirely homogeneous due to:

- geographical spread;
- variability between themselves and Protestants in Northern Ireland and places such as Dublin;
- denominational differences.

Although there is this heterogeneity there remains a shared sense of community distinction.

Despite recent growths in the Protestant Border population there was a common concern that longer-term decline had taken place. Despite this long-term numerical decline there was a generally shared notion of the need to strengthen community identity in order to resolve problems, promote demographic survival and sustain cultural cohesion. Individual interviewees reinforced this strong sense of being a distinct community and emphasised the importance of maintaining the community.

### **5.1b Cultural and social exclusion**

There was widespread agreement that the Border Protestant community was culturally and socially excluded. It was acknowledged that this was perpetuated by its own “keep your head down” attitude. It was also articulated that maintaining silence and “keeping to your own” was “the Protestant way”.

Some respondents felt that with regard to silence and sensed exclusion that an emergent age differential was apparent, with older members of the community being more isolated from the majority community than younger members who are more likely to engage in inter-community socialising and for whom religious affiliation is less important. This did not mean that younger members of the Protestant community are not interested in their identity but that new channels of communication between Catholic and Protestant youth are emerging.

While some of this exclusion is self-imposed there was recognition that there were objective difficulties for this community to involve itself in the cultural life of the wider community. Firstly, the different denominations have distinct characteristics and modes of practice and getting an agreed Protestant involvement is difficult. Secondly, national, community and sporting celebrations and events which tend to take place on Sundays are not conducive to the community's participation. Since there is a real fear of losing culture and identity there is an apprehension of assimilation. Assimilation around business, farming, political or commercial life is generally agreeable but is not desirable with regard to religious assimilation.

Some focus group participants noted that it is the members of the community who wish to maintain religious separateness who are those least likely to gain from cross-community public funding while those who readily engage in inter-community activity are those most likely to get funding.

Others are reluctant to get involved in inter-community activities because they will have to go to meetings and speak out and this is contrary to 'tried and trusted survival' mechanisms. Some participants wondered if minority ethnic communities who are not indigenous are required to engage on inter-community basis in order to attract Government funding.

### **5.1c Minority experience**

Participants narrated stories of harassment dating back to 1922<sup>54</sup>, a year which witnessed displacement of Protestants to Northern Ireland and attacks on Protestant property and individuals in the Border region. The population declined. The hurt caused by decline and examples of intimidation was allowed to "fester" and for some still does in the absence of closure.

As noted above decline both demographically, culturally and politically gradually settled and the community learned "to hold its tongue" and not draw attention to itself. This silence and relative tranquillity was disrupted by the emergence of the conflict in the late 1960s. Unfolding events, it was argued by many participants, led to a worsening situation and renewed disengagement for some.

---

<sup>54</sup> 1922 is described as "the breaking of the covenant" in an Ulster Scots poem presented by the poet at a focus group. See Appendix 6.

Within the focus groups anecdotes concerning harassment of individuals at school and work; of damage to farm buildings, church property, halls and sports grounds were recounted. Stories of intimidation were also forthcoming e.g. black flags hoisted in vicinity of Protestant farms and on Protestant buildings on the occasions and anniversaries of hunger strikers' deaths; wearing poppies only inside the Church for fear of giving offence; family members who had found employment in the British security forces were not able to come home for solemn family occasions. Examples of discrimination in job opportunities in the public sector and farming support industry were recounted but no complaints were made in the expectation of nothing being done about it.

At every turn in these difficult conversations the speakers praised the decency and generosity of their neighbours and the good relations they had with the majority community. The Gardai support at the July 12<sup>th</sup> celebrations in Rosnowlagh was repeatedly mentioned and acknowledged (although the failure of the County Council to provide port-a-loos at the same event troubled one interviewee).

**“The condition of the Border Protestant community, especially the community living in the three Ulster counties of Donegal, Cavan and Monaghan, is a window through which northern Protestants view the Republic of Ireland” - focus group participant**

#### **5.1d Political, civic and community participation**

The overwhelming response to this history was the repeated refrain that the community learned to keep its head down and survive. According to Senator Martin Mansergh this silence was motivated not just by prudence but also by reluctance to “get into the awkward implications of confronting the ethical issues of the past or expressing regret from a position of weakness.”<sup>55</sup>

Political shifts and funding strategies that provide signs of legitimacy and acknowledgement appear to have instilled, among some, a greater confidence to speak up. Those who pinpointed this growth in confidence tied it to a perception that survival and confidence building within their community is necessary and requires “standing up” and explaining their community and in so doing assert community rights and perspectives.

The promotion of a Protestant identity was also tied to the sentiment that such a culture is a treasure whose preservation would enrich the whole of Irish life. “The Border Protestant community has a pivotal role to play in developing the aspiration for a new, independent all-island Ireland among Northern Protestants”,

<sup>55</sup> Untold Stories: Protestants in the Republic of Ireland 1922-2002, Ed. Colin Murphy and Lynne Adair, Liffey Press, Dublin, 2002.

said one interviewee, “and the majority community must rise to the challenge of recognising and treasuring the Protestant heritage.”

The EU PEACE programmes were cited as one of the important engines for future community development. It was clear from the meetings that those who were involved in a funded project were much more likely to have the confidence and capacity to engage. It was also said that the PEACE programmes helped their Catholic neighbours to openly show support for them.

Such funding is seen as important but not as a ‘cure for all ills’. Many focus group participants are pinning their hopes on:

- Government recognition as a cultural, religious and social group;
- Government recognition of their history;
- Wider recognition and support for diversity for the whole of Irish society;
- Mechanisms for dealing with past hurt should be put in place; the personal and family histories of this community should be collected and prized;
- sectarian attacks and actions should be taken more seriously by the authorities;
- religious discrimination in education, business or work should be examined with the same energy as that accorded examples of ethnic discrimination; and
- that the government should seek via the 1998 Agreement to promote and sustain equality for all on the island.

### **5.1e Church and schools**

Traditionally the community has kept to itself and its cultural life has centred on the Church, church-based organisations and their own halls. The Church halls, other Protestant facilities and Orange Halls are deemed to be safe places within which identity and culture are maintained and community morale sustained. As shown in the survey there is for the most part willingness for such facilities to be used for inter-community activities and events as long as there is no threat to the ownership and management of these facilities. They were after all built, often over a century ago, by the unaided efforts of the Border Protestant community’s forebearers.

**Following one meeting where the consultants were surprised by the level of anger and hurt expressed, they asked one participant well-known for his moderation and community involvement whether it was exaggerated and he said: “No. That’s how we talk when we’re on our own”.**

Sport, especially for schoolchildren and young people, presented specific problems for the community. With soccer and GAA<sup>56</sup> sports played on Sundays little provision for “Protestant” sports like rugby, cricket and hockey is available. Protestant schools would be the obvious location to meet this sporting deficit on a reconciliation basis as much as on educational grounds. This is important in consideration of the inter-community dimension regarding these sports that existed prior to 1969.

## 5.2 Challenges and Opportunities of PEACE III

Focus group participants put great store on the EU PEACE Programmes for the recognition, support and survival of their identity and culture. They praised the creativity of the County Council led Task Forces and Border Action in finding ways of engaging them and leading them through the funding labyrinth. But the community is aware that it will have to make changes. It will have to find the confidence, capacity and the voice to assert its own culture. It will have to be more active in opening its halls and facilities to cross-community usage. It will have to overcome divisions within itself which some see as social snobbery towards both Catholic and Protestant working class people which comes from a very high percentage of home and land ownership. Others see the main division as being between those who are staunch to the traditional culture and those who are mixing with the majority community in the cultural life of society.

**“The Border Protestant community is not the problem. The problem is that the people of this country haven’t even started the process of building a genuinely pluralist and shared society where no group has to apologise for its existence. Prevention is better than cure”- Interviewee.**

As shown in the survey the Protestant community’s aim is to achieve a partnership with the majority community in building the capacity of the entire society to deliver a genuinely shared society. This, it was noted, will require a programme of cross-community funding for a shared society; clear targeting of the funds towards the Protestant community; support for single identity work; specialist resources for projects coming out of the Protestant community; mechanisms for collecting and cherishing the stories of this community.

(a) Cross-community funding for a shared society.

Although the Equality Monitoring Forms show (see Chapter 1) an 11% take up by members of the Protestant community under PEACE II, there remains a persistent perception in this community that it did not gain a sufficient share of the previous PEACE programmes. In a situation where perceptions, right or

<sup>56</sup> The naming of some GAA clubs after republican martyrs was raised as a negative issue by several interviewees.

wrong, are real the Protestant community does not absolve itself entirely from blame for this but is eager now to play its full part in the third and widely expected to be the last PEACE Programme. It does not seek a favoured or special status but believes that a programme of cross-community funding for a shared society is required for three reasons. Firstly, to help it to achieve the capacity to access the funds necessary for its full and active inclusion in society; secondly, to help the majority community to come to terms with the issues of having an indigenous religious minority living in its midst; and, thirdly, to help both communities build “a genuinely pluralist and shared society where no group has to apologise for its existence”. Rather than seeking a cure to these problems it would be better in the long term to create a society where these problems would be prevented from arising. “Prevention is better than cure” as one interviewee put it.

(b) Clear targeting of funds towards the Protestant community

Although some feared that being named as a target group of the PEACE III Programme would draw attention to themselves and possibly cause resentment, the majority of focus group participants and individual interviewees believed that the naming of the Border Protestant community as a target group will provide important recognition of the community. This recognition will be an important confidence-building measure for a community which has been silenced for a long time and bring it out of itself. It will help it to meet the majority community on a more confident, equal footing.

(c) Single Identity work

There is need in the short term for single identity work (“still need for some hand-holding”) as many in this community are not confident enough for mature reconciliation work. This will be particularly important in the area of Church, Protestant and Orange halls.

(d) Dedicated community development support

Given the limited capacity of this community dedicated community development resources are required to build the confidence and the capacity of this community from the inside.

(e) Remembering and healing

There is an acceptance that some mechanism for remembering and healing is required. The collection and cherishing of the histories of the community will help bring closure to the long years of exclusion and hurt.

### **5.3 Field Trip**

In an unaccompanied field trip the consultants sought to verify the repeated claims of Protestant public buildings being visited by vandals with malicious damage and graffiti. In some cases it was not possible to determine whether it was targeted or simply indiscriminate vandalism. Some, however, were in close proximity to buildings belonging to or frequented by the majority community which bore no evidence of attack. A few are mentioned here:

- i. There is an Orange Hall in the middle of a village street surrounded by busy and bright shops and pubs which is covered in graffiti and completely boarded up. Prising open the corner of the steel plate covers on the windows revealed all windows totally bereft of glass and open to the elements;
- ii. A Presbyterian Church Hall in an open and highly visible location which had received a visit from the glazier the previous day and from the evidence of the still soft putty it was clear that every single window in the hall had several panes of glass broken. No window escaped;
- iii. A cricket club next door to a soccer club, the latter's changing rooms freshly painted and in pristine condition, the former's pavilion (no more than 15 paces away) completely vandalised, graffiti everywhere, steel bolts determinedly jemmied off and the interior totally trashed with clear evidence of fires and abundance of rubbish and worse. The cricket pavilion is utterly decommissioned.

It is important to emphasise that this is not just the "normal" level of vandalism which affects almost all communities in to-day's world. The evidence is there to suggest that both the motivation and the targeting are sectarian.

In mentioning these and other examples of sectarian criminal damage the Protestant community stresses that community relations are good and that this is the work of a small minority who have imbibed a serious dose of malevolence towards the Protestant community. Examples of support from the majority community are cited. When the Protestant Greenbank Hall in Quigley's Point was burned down in 2003 the local community raised €90,000 for repairs much of it coming from the Catholic community. Generous financial support from the Catholic community was recognised when the roof of Kilmore Cathedral had to be replaced.

These findings combined with the survey results show that there are enduring problems but that there is also an emergent recognition of the need to solve problems via single identity work and also inter-community partnership. The changing political landscape and more shared inner-community contact among the young is crucially important. Evidently confidence building, recognition and meaningful capacity building both within and between communities are also important with regard to future initiatives.

## Chapter 6: Conclusions and Recommendations

A wide range of opinions were expressed in this research. It ranged from the confident “it’s cool to be Prod” to the defensive “who we are never hurt anyone”.

The majority opinion expressed was in between. The consultants accept the view that the Border Protestant community is an indigenous religious minority whose identity and culture has been threatened by falling numbers and lack of recognition. It has felt ignored, tolerated or resented by the majority community. It did not feel appreciated or valued. The people and their property have been subjected to personal and physical attack down the years and there remains a residual sectarianism. “The Protestants in the southern Border counties”, as Channel Research found, “feel that they were abandoned by both the Irish Government and by northern Protestants<sup>57</sup>”.

This dual (north/south) orientation was picked up by David Stevens also. “As time went on they absorbed much of the political and cultural ethos of the South and most of them gave their allegiance to the Republic, but their sense of a shared identity with Northern Protestants remained strong, partly based on kinship and friendship links<sup>58</sup>”. In recent years their confidence has increased due to the population stabilising, the success of the Northern Ireland peace process and funding provided by the EU PEACE programmes. The cross-border nature of the PEACE III Programme is ideally suited to support the dualism mentioned above.

Increasing members of the community are ready to speak out now and work with the majority community. This is motivated by the conviction that in order for their identity and culture to survive, it is necessary for them to explain themselves to the majority community and assert themselves. However, many still lack the confidence. And even where there is some confidence, the capacity is often lacking. What is needed is a programme which will bring this community, not into a privileged position, but rather on to an equal partnership with the majority community. Such a partnership will seek to build a truly pluralist and shared society.

### 6.1 Building a partnership for a shared society

Many of the problems facing the minority Protestant community derive from the lack of pluralist thinking in society. Hence the feelings of alienation repeatedly recounted by the Border Protestant community in the course of this research and the misunderstandings experienced by the majority community. Funding cross-community projects, especially on a cross-border basis, should be prioritised to

---

<sup>57</sup> Evaluation of the Peace and Reconciliation Impact of PEACE II Measures 5.3 & 5.4, Brusset, Buchanan-Smith, Hainsworth & McGearty, Cross-Border Consortium, 2007, page 40.

<sup>58</sup> David Stevens, Leader of the Corrymeela Community: See Appendix 1

support both communities together in the building of a genuinely pluralist and shared society. This conclusion was consistent throughout the surveys<sup>59</sup>, the interviews with PEACE II projects, focus groups and interviews with stakeholders. It will fit with the PEACE III aims of *promoting positive relations at local level* and *building the capacity of the key institutions to deliver a shared society*<sup>60</sup>.

## 6.2 Named target group of the PEACE III programme

The County Council led Task Forces and Border Action were praised in the focus groups for treating the minority Border Protestant community as *de facto* a target group of the PEACE II programme. It is recommended that the community is formally named as a target group of the new PEACE III Programme. This will provide recognition of the community; it will accept that this community suffered in the conflict; it will boost the confidence of the community and will enhance its ability to gain funding; it will help break the self-imposed silence of the community and have the distinctive voice of its identity and culture heard. This was a consistent finding in the survey<sup>61</sup>, in the focus groups, interviews with stakeholders and a majority of PEACE II projects. And even when individuals or groups had mixed feelings on this they plumped for named target group because it will provide recognition for the Border Protestant community. It will fit with the proposal for PEACE III of specifically targeting *areas and groups that have been affected by the conflict and experience particular problems of segregation, marginalisation and isolation*<sup>62</sup>.

## 6.3 Funding for single identity projects

Many in the community lack the confidence and capacity to meet the challenges of mature reconciliation work. In addition there is a long tradition of making do on their own, not seeking funds, not making common cause with their Catholic neighbours and not engaging in community development. Single identity personal development and capacity building work is needed before they will be ready *to build positive relations at local level*.<sup>63</sup> This is a finding based on the survey<sup>64</sup>, most of the focus groups and interviews and on the opinion of some of the PEACE II projects.

---

<sup>59</sup> 80% believe that “Protestants are more likely to become involved in the community sector if such inclusion will lead to better cross-community relationships”.

<sup>60</sup> SEUPB Consultation Document on PEACE III.

<sup>61</sup> 87.4% agreed/strongly agreed that “Protestants will apply for funding in order to develop their community if that funding is specific to their community” and 72.2% believe that “Protestants will involve themselves in the local community development process if there is an appropriate funding stream”.

<sup>62</sup> SEUPB Consultation Document on PEACE III.

<sup>63</sup> SEUPB Consultation Document on PEACE III.

<sup>64</sup> It was agreed that the formation of Protestant community “will promote trust between people” (76.4%); “is needed to develop the peace process” (66.1%) and “is needed to challenge Protestant exclusion” (71.9%).

There is suspicion also that funding will come with strings attached and threaten the ownership and management of the Church Halls (owned by the church), the Protestant Halls (owned by a Protestant trust) or the Orange Halls (owned by the Lodge). The creative skills of the County Council led Task Forces and Border Action in distinguishing between ownership and management on the one hand and usage on the other were acknowledged. Various mechanisms were used to bridge the gap from single identity work to cross-community use of halls e.g. an action plan leading into cross-community use over an agreed period of time; the establishment of a Hall Programme Advisory Group which is cross-community and can advise on opening up to cross-community usage; a cross-community network of halls in a locality can be programmed jointly. It is recommended that provision in PEACE III be made for single identity funding to help this community develop the confidence to move towards *the creation of shared public spaces*<sup>65</sup>.

#### **6.4 Dedicated community development resources**

The single identity projects, Derry Raphoe Action and the Border Minority Group, were often praised as really understanding the particular needs of the Border Protestant community. Their scope is limited both in terms of staff and geographical remit. It is recommended that dedicated community development resources be established to gain the confidence of the community and build the capacity from the inside. This was raised frequently in focus groups and interviews and by some of the PEACE II projects and in the survey<sup>66</sup>. A model might be to appoint staff dedicated to the Border Protestant community in existing cross-community peace projects. It is needed to help this community contribute to the *building of the capacity of the key institutions to deliver a shared society*<sup>67</sup>.

#### **6.5 Collecting personal and family histories**

There is need in this community (expressed in the focus groups and interviews) for a remembering and healing mechanism. Many stories are told of past hurt and there is no easy way to bring closure. There is a feeling that the story of their hurt is not recognised or important. It is recommended that a project be funded that recognises, collects and cherishes the personal and family histories of this community and publicises them not as a “local history” project but as a remembering and healing mechanism. Such a project will meet an important need in this community to *acknowledge the past*<sup>68</sup>. It will also provide an opportunity to showcase and profile the community to the majority community.

---

<sup>65</sup> SEUPB Consultation Document on PEACE III.

<sup>66</sup> 88.6% agreed that “Protestants require information and training regarding community group building” and 84.3% agreed that “the development of Protestant community groups would provide much needed leadership for the Protestant community”.

<sup>67</sup> SEUPB Consultation Document on PEACE III.

<sup>68</sup> SEUPB Consultation Document on PEACE III.

## Postscript: The Challenge of Glenmaquin

The message of this report is simple: much has been achieved by the Border Protestant community through the EU Peace Programmes but much remains to be done. Nothing short of the development of a genuinely shared and pluralist society will meet the community relations needs of both the minority and majority communities.

Just how difficult a challenge it might prove to be, could be seen this summer at the commemoration of the Battle of Glenmaquin which the consultants attended on the invitation of the organisers, the East Donegal Ulster Scots Society<sup>69</sup>.

In the years following the departure of O'Neill and O'Donnell in 1607 the flat and fertile land of East Donegal lying between the River Foyle and the upper reaches of Lough Swilly known as the Laggan<sup>70</sup> was prepared for Scots and English settlers and veterans. The land was divided into lots varying in size from one to three thousand acres. Bogs and waste lands were not counted but were thrown in with a liberal hand so that an estate of one thousand acres often amounted to six or eight or even more. Then in September 1611 a proclamation was made in the square in Lifford ordering all the native Irish to cease occupying the lands of the Laggan and move themselves west of Kilmacrennan. English titles to the lots were then issued to the Planters.<sup>71</sup>

Within a generation in 1641 the dispossessed Irish rose up led by Owen Roe O'Neill and attempted to regain their lands. They laid siege to the Planter towns of Strabane, Derry, Limavady and Coleraine and invaded the Laggan. In the following year (1642) the Irish met a numerically smaller force of Scottish planters known variously as "the Lagganeers" or "the Laggan army" led by Sir William and Sir Robert Stewart. The Stewarts had had many years military experience in the army of the King of Sweden during the Thirty Years War which engulfed Catholic and Protestant Europe between 1618 and 1648. The Lagganeers were victorious, many Irish were killed, and the sieges were gradually lifted on the neighbouring towns. The Scots believed that their victory saved the Plantation in west Ulster and that Glenmaquin is the birthplace of their Ulster Scots identity in Donegal.

The battle site is not marked nor is the nearby mass graveyard where the bodies of the Irish are thought to lie.

---

<sup>69</sup> This is one of the projects examined in Chapter 3 which was funded by the Donegal PEACE II Task Force

<sup>70</sup> The Laggan extends from Derry south to Stranorlar and from Lifford west to Letterkenny.

<sup>71</sup> The history is detailed in the application to the Donegal PEACE II Task Force by the Donegal Rural Protestant Peace Building project also examined in Chapter 3.

Inspired and emboldened by the 1998 Agreement which promised equality of respect to all traditions in Ireland the East Donegal Ulster Scots Society decided to commemorate the Battle of Glenmaquin during a summer dominated by the commemoration of the Flight of the Earls in which the Society also participated. The commemoration was advertised in the local papers and on local radio; there were signs and posters around the Laggan; directions to the site were posted on trees, walls and gateposts. On the day five hundred people turned up to enjoy a community fun-orientated festival with bouncy castles, fast food outlets, sports, traditional Scottish dancing, lectures and, since it is very much a farming community, an exhibition of dismantling and putting together a tractor. The high point of the day was the enactment of the battle in costume which was conducted in a good-humoured and friendly atmosphere.

According to the organisers none of their neighbours, members of the majority community, turned up. Indeed the only representative of that community that the consultants could identify was a Sein Fein councillor from Letterkenny who showed up to wish the organisers well. "They probably wanted to leave us to our own devices", said one by way of explanation. Another added: "If we thought the commemoration was giving offence, we wouldn't do it".

Much remains to be done.

## **Appendix 1: Modes of Insecurity**

### **The Position of Ulster Protestants**

**David Stevens**

**Leader of the Corrymeela Community**

**Author: "Land of Unlikeness", Columba Press, 2004**

#### **Extract from lecture to the Centre for Peace Building, An Teach Ban, (23.03.07):**

Borders are often places of tension and they push people apart. They find themselves on the 'wrong' side of borders – borders they often didn't want or at least not there – and this happened all over Europe after the First World War. Borders often bring a sense of separation and loss and people find themselves growing apart as their experiences start to diverge in their new 'homes' – now separated by borders. There is an increasing complexity of relationships across borders over time.

Protestants in the three border counties of Ulster – Donegal, Cavan and Monaghan – found themselves set adrift. These were people who identified culturally with Northern Protestants and to a considerable degree with their politics. There was a strong sense of betrayal about what happened in 1920 and many subsequently migrated across the border or married across the border. As time went on they absorbed much of the political and cultural ethos of the South and most of them gave their allegiance to the Republic, but their sense of a shared identity with Northern Protestants remained strong, partly based on kinship and friendship links.

Protestants elsewhere in the Republic remained conscious of their difference to the Catholic majority community. For a long time those who did not leave – and there were many who left – sought to insulate themselves from the new political and cultural order and kept the expression of their views to the private realm. But slowly they abandoned their British identity and Unionist politics and felt more at home in their present dispensation.

The Irish Protestant community has now clearly fragmented into three parts: the Northern Ireland community orientated towards Britain; a fragment Ulster Protestant community in the three excluded Ulster counties orientated at once towards North and South; and a small and widely dispersed Southern Protestant community committed to working within an Irish context.

## Appendix 2: Details of PEACE II projects<sup>72</sup>

<b>Ref. Nos. Promoter's name, Measure and funds</b>	<b>Project title (if different from promoter's name) and project description</b>	<b>Indicators &amp; Progress</b>
010985 Derry & Raphoe Action, Measure 2.6 €15,000	Donegal Rural Peace-Building Project: Fund the Donegal Rural Peace-Building Project which will support six named groups and two targeted communities in South Donegal.	Projects assisted: 1 Participants: 72
007859 Cavan Family Resource Centre, Measure 2.4c €310,596	Supporting Minorities in the Border Region: To fund Cavan Family Resource Centre Ltd to explore the counselling needs of ex-prisoners and their families, displaced persons and their families and the Protestant Community in the Southern Border Counties. In addition existing recognized programmes will be delivered on a pilot basis in partnership with these target groups and additional training provided for volunteers. Funding will be provided to employ a Project Worker and an Administrator.	Projects assisted: 1 Participants: 204 Male: 46 Female: 158 Participants trained in reconciliation, conflict resolution, mediation work: 204 Receiving accreditation: 68 Local needs assessments, skills audits: 2
031278 Cavan Family Resource Centre, Measure 2.4 Ext. €277,731	Supporting Minorities in the Border Region: Through this project Cavan Family Resource Centre will provide support, counselling and mediation services, training and opportunities for dialogue for the Protestant Communities and Ex- political Prisoners in the Cavan, Monaghan and Leitrim area. The work will also involve looking at issues of diversity, conflict transformation and social reconciliation.	Projects assisted: 1 Participants: 126 Male: 32 Female: 94 Participants trained in reconciliation, conflict resolution, mediation work: 66 Male: 24 Female: 42 Receiving accreditation: 36 Male: 4 Female: 32
006766 Riverstown Enterprise Development Measure 5.3 €371,229	Riverbrooke Cross-Border Initiative: This is a programme of cross-border cooperation by bringing together the Roman-Catholic and Protestant communities of the villages of Riverstown in Co. Sligo and Brookeborough in Co. Fermanagh by means of joint educational activities, environmental experience and cultural exchanges. Funding will be provided to employ a Co-ordinator and two Administrators.	Cross-Border projects supported: 1 Participants in cross-border & cross-community activities: 571 Jobs created: 3
029850	Riverbrooke Cross-Border Initiative:	Cross-Border projects

<sup>72</sup> Central database search conducted on 21.06.07. Note numbers of participants relate to those living in Republic of Ireland: the participants in cross-border projects (Measure 5.3) are not distinguished by location north or south.

Riverstown Enterprise Development Measure 5.3 Ext. €350,000	To continue the work of the Riverbrooke Cross-Border Initiative in creating a safe space in which people can come together in a spirit of openness and trust to build reconciliation and understanding on a cross-community/cross-border basis.	supported: 1 Participants in cross-border & cross-community activities: 324 Male: 139 Female: 185 Cross-border partnerships established: 1
034433 East Donegal Ulster Scots Association Measure 3.3 €50,000	To fund a pilot Ulster Scots Festival, Summer School and associated activities.	No information on central database
001971 County Monaghan Community Network Measure 2.1 €509,053	Celebrating Difference: Implement strategies to develop additional participation from the minority community in Co Monaghan and provide developmental support to other initiatives, groups and areas enabling interagency networking cooperation. Funding is provided to employ two Development Workers and an Administrator.	Projects supported: 73 Individuals involved in events and activities: 1,840
029122 County Monaghan Community Network Measure 2.1 Ext. €519,639	Celebrating Difference: Assist County Monaghan Community Network to engage with and support the integration of low activity community groups and put the necessary supports in place to promote and facilitate both peace-building and enhanced levels of community interaction within the county and on a cross border basis.	Projects supported: 7 Groups participating: 60 Individuals involved in events and activities: 1,271 Male: 487 Female: 784 Local networks established: 2
010984 St. Johnston & Carrigans Family Resource Centre Measure 2.2 €215,535	St. Johnston & Carrigans Youth Project: Support the implementation of the St.Johnston/Carrigans Community Youth Engagement Project. Funding will be provided to employ a Youth Worker and an Administrator.	Child, young person centred projects supported:1 Children and young people participating: 372 Male: 161 Female: 211 Numbers progressing within education/employment: 61 Male: 27 Female: 34
031643	St. Johnston & Carrigans Youth Project:	Child, young person centred

St. Johnston & Carrigans Family Resource Centre Measure 2.2 Ext. €64,500	The project will develop and broaden the scope of the existing youth programmes. Young people in the St. Johnston and Carrigans area, aged 3 to 25, will have opportunities to take part in a comprehensive programme of activities that will enhance their personal and emotional well being and will build on the integration that has already taken place within the centre, leading to increased opportunities for peace building. Funding will be provided to employ a youth worker and part-time administrator.	projects supported:1 Children and young people participating: 304 Male: 142 Female: 162 Numbers progressing within education/employment: 11 Male: 7 Female: 4
010221 Scripture Union Measure 2.2 €191,543	Scripture Union Border Counties Project: Engage with local communities and churches to establish and support cross community youth related activities in specific areas in the Border Counties. This engagement will result in hosting between 6 to10 Summer Clubs over 2 years, training of leaders and supporting local communities to sustain these activities in the longer term. Funding will be provided to employ a Youth Director and an Administrator.	Child, young person centred projects supported: 1 Children and young people participating: 1,788
029152 Scripture Union Measure 2.2 Ext. €226,265	Scripture Union Border Counties Project: The project is about building positive relationships through fostering and supporting annual cross community youth related activities. 800 children and teenagers will participate an eight week long community based summer club in seven locations in the border counties.	Children and young people participating: 160 Children or young people progressing within education or employment: 160
011438 Inch Island Community Association Measure 2.4c €150,080	Development Officer for Inch: Support the work with young people, women and the minority Protestant community on Inch Island, to facilitate a needs analysis, promote mutual understanding, tolerance, respect and reconciliation, through the development of social, education and training programmes and activities.	Projects assisted: 1 Participants: 197 Participants receiving accreditation in reconciliation, conflict resolution, mediation work: 52
010642 Culdaff Community Association Ltd. Measure 2.7 €245,875	Wee Hall in Culdaff: To rebuild, extend and refurbish the "Wee Hall" and add an extension to include a kitchen, toilet facilities, disabled access and storage space.	Projects assisted: 1 Facilities created/improved: 1 Groups/organisations supported: 10
002095 North Cavan Col Group Measure 2.1 €318,520	Fund the refurbishment of Stonepark Hall, Drung Parish Hall and Burrowes Hall as part of an overall peace building strategy being implemented by North Cavan Church of Ireland Group.	Projects supported: 1 Facilities created/improved: 3 Projects using new or improved facilities: 16 Increase in use of improved facilities by disadvantaged and excluded groups and communities: 60%
011394	Planning for the Future:	Projects supported: 1

Border Minority Group Measure 2.1 €40,000	Carry out a piece of action research needs assessment with the 40 group members of the Border Minority Group so as to advance the practice and capacity of community development, cooperation and communication through engagement in adult education and lifelong learning programmes operational within the region.	Groups participating: 35 Research projects, local audits or pilot studies completed: 1 Individuals involved in events or activities: 382
034025 Border Minority Group Measure 2.7 Ext. €171,722	Empowering Our Communities: Build the confidence and capacity of the minority Protestant community in counties Cavan Leitrim and Monaghan, while bridging divisions between communities to assisting the process in creating a peaceful society within the region.	Projects assisted: 1 Groups or organisations supported: 20
029248 Carrick-on-Shannon Heritage Group Measure 1.1 Ext. €250,000	Carrick-on-Shannon Heritage Experience: To establish a significant heritage and tourism attraction in the town of Carrick on Shannon, Co. Leitrim by renovating, linking and opening to the public, two historic buildings in its environs; The Famine Workhouse attic above St. Patrick's Hospital and the Protestant Church of St. George.	No information on central database
022123 Carrick-on-Shannon Heritage Group Measure 3.3 €159,000	Carrick-on-Shannon Heritage Experience: The Carrick on Shannon Heritage Experience involves the simultaneous restoration of St Georges Church of Ireland. The plan is to open the site to the public and through them to enable people to address the misunderstandings of the past. In particular the project will highlight the sufferings of the Roman Catholics in the 19th century and the silent attrition that has been suffered by the Protestant population of Co. Leitrim in the 20th century which has left them today as a very small minority.	Community-based projects supported: 1 Enhancement of community infrastructure facilities: 1 Increase in use of community recreational, leisure and social resources: 87.5%
015007 Drogheda Early Intervention and Integration Programme Measure 2.2 €196,817	Support children and their families in the catchment area of the Presentation Primary School, Drogheda to remain positively engaged in education, assist them in reaching their full potential and to increase awareness and appreciation of cultural difference, through cross border and cross community activities, in order that they are better equipped for life and become active participants in the labour market. Funding will be provided to employ a Project Co-ordinator and an Administrator.	Child, young person projects supported: 1 Children and young people participating: 325 Participants receiving accreditation: 325 Interdepartmental strategies developed to meet the needs of vulnerable young people: 1 Numbers progressing within education/employment: 325

## Appendix 3: Border Protestant Community and the EU PEACE Programmes

### Impact of PEACE II Projects on BPC Questionnaire

#### 1. Type of Project

Project's primary aims and activities – provision of services; capacity building/training/education; provision of facilities or other resources; dialogue ?	
Main beneficiaries of project/target groups	
Project catchment area	
Elements of the project's activities that are Peace funded	
Total amount of Peace II and Extension funding	
Measure	

#### 2. How has Peace Building and Reconciliation changed/progressed as a result of the PEACE funding?

Did the project seek explicitly to build bridges between the different communities?	
Did the project increase contact, confidence or trust between the communities? Did it seek to dispel distrust?	
Did the project create or increase the capacity of individuals or groups to identify and respond to peace and conflict challenges and opportunities?	
What mechanisms were put in place to deal with past hurt and issues of healing, justice and restitutions?	
What impact did the project have on human rights conditions e.g. awareness, respect, recognition, levels of abuse, legislation?	
Did the project contribute to the development or consolidation of equality, justice or social inclusion?	
In summary, what lessons have been	

learnt from this work with regard to promoting peace and reconciliation?	
--	--

### 3. Level and quality of engagement with/involvement of Protestants

How does the minority Protestant community engage with the project?	
What actions, if any, has the project taken to increase, improve quality of engagement	
Have these actions been successful? Why? If not, why not?	
How many Protestant individuals participate (i.e. beneficiaries) in the project / use the project's facilities / are part of the project management / are involved as volunteers – Is there evidence to support this (e.g. monitoring forms, records etc)?	
How has involvement of Protestants changed? Quality and quantity?	
How has the practice of the project changed as a result of their involvement?	
What have been the outcomes of any change in practice?	
How has Peace funding contributed?	
Does this level of involvement reflect the number of Protestants in the catchment area? Are all sections of the Protestant community appropriately represented? If not, what else could/should be done?	
Is it possible for you to quantify how much of your funding has gone to the BPC?	
Can you identify other benefits regarding this work and wider societal change?	

### 4. Addressing the needs of Protestants

What has the project done to identify the specific needs of Protestants?	
Has the work of the project resulted in any change in awareness/ attitude	

among the majority community about the needs/ concerns of Protestants?	
What has the project done to address these needs of Protestants?	
Has this been effective? What has been achieved? What have been the problems?	
How does the project intend to build on its work discussed above?	
Has the project identified (or is it aware from other sources) the needs of people in the Protestant community that are outside its remit /capacity to address?	
What else is needed? (e.g. additional resources, changes in policy, practice or attitudes)	
What additional resources/ actions are required from others e.g. community and voluntary organisations/ statutory bodies/ elected representatives/ organisations within the Protestant community/ funders?	
Is there still need for single identity work/ capital expenditure on halls/ specialist resources for the Protestant community?	

### PEACE III

What types of eligible activities are required under PIII in order to address the types of issues raised by the Protestant community?	
Would it be an advantage or a hindrance if the Protestant community to be named as a target group of PIII?	
What kinds of supports would the Protestant community need under PIII to address their issues?	

## Appendix 4: Border Protestant Community Questionnaire

Questions regarding the impact of EU Peace II Programme and potential of the Peace III Programme:

The following survey is designed to gauge the impact of Peace II and encourage the development of funding and other mechanisms that will support the Protestant community in the Southern Border counties. The information that you provide is anonymous and you will not be identified in any way.

### Q1. Please fill in the following:

Age (circle)	16-25	26-40	41-50	51-60	60+
Gender					
County					
Denomination					
Are you a member of the loyal orders					

### Q2: If you **ARE** involved in a community group please fill in the following. If **NOT** go to Q.3

	Yes	No
Did your community group benefit from previous Peace I and II funding?		
Has Peace I and II funding improved social interaction between Protestants and other communities?		
Did Peace 1 and II funding encourage Protestants to become more involved in promoting their identity?		
Does your community group actively work to build positive relationships between communities?		
Is your group developing a shared vision of an interdependent and fair society?		
Is your group acknowledging and dealing with the past?		
Is your community group building North-South cross-border cooperation?		
Is your group contributing to significant cultural and attitudinal change?		
Does your group's work impact positively on poverty and social exclusion?		
Does your group advance the equality agenda e.g. gender, religious belief, race, sexual orientation disability?		
Does your group support the growth of a human rights culture?		

**Q3. With regard to civic life do you feel about the following questions:**

***On a scale of 1 to 5 were: 1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neither Agree/Disagree 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree***

The Protestant community has disengaged itself from the cultural life within my area?	
There is such a thing as a South of the Border Protestant identity?	
The Protestant community engages in local political life?	
The Protestant community maintain a privileged status within my community?	
The Protestant community is well-respected within my community?	
Older Protestants feel more marginalised with my community compared to young Protestants?	
The Protestant community is treated equally within my community?	
The Protestant community remains largely independent from other communities ?	
Protestants do not feel positive about their minority status?	

**Q4. With regard to a Protestant identity what do you feel about the following questions:**

***On a scale of 1 to 5 were 1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neither Agree/Disagree 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree***

Maintaining a distinctly Protestant culture in the Republic of Ireland is important to me?	
Younger people are losing their sense of a Protestant identity?	
If younger Protestants lose their sense of identity that would sadden me?	
There is no such thing as a Protestant identity in the Republic of Ireland?	
Many people are now more interested in promoting their Protestant identity?	
Maintaining denominational loyalty is important to me?	
The majority community is keen to help us protect our identity?	
Our identity has been purposefully undermined?	
Protestants feel that their identity is in terminal decline?	
The Protestant community is too insular?	

**Q5. With regard to working and living in your community what do you feel about the following questions:**

***On a scale of 1 to 5 were 1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neither Agree/Disagree 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree***

There are industries and jobs within which Protestants are not welcome?	
There is no job discrimination against Protestants in the border counties?	
My local Protestant community has no problems finding well-paid work in comparison to other communities?	
Protestants sometimes do not apply for certain jobs because they think that their religion would stop them getting such jobs?	
Being a Protestant affects the ability to gain promotions within the workplace?	
Protestants feel uncomfortable about applying for jobs with Garda Síochána?	
Protestants have equal access to jobs in the County Council?	
Protestants have equal access to jobs in the Community Sector?	

**Q6. With regard to working and living in your community what do you feel about the following questions.**

***On a scale of 1 to 5 were 1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neither Agree/Disagree 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree***

There are ample Protestant based community groups in my area?	
The Protestant community lacks knowledge of the community sector?	
Protestants are keen to become involved in the community sector?	
Protestant involvement in the community sector will promote positive change?	
Grants to upgrade Protestant facilities, such as church halls and Orange halls would encourage the Protestant community to become more involved in community life?	
Protestant involvement in the community sector will encourage greater inclusion?	
The Protestant community has the confidence needed to become more involved in the community sector?	
Protestant involvement in the community sector will help break barriers between communities ?	
The Protestant churches are a key player in terms of building Protestant involvement in the community sector?	
Facilities controlled by Protestants should be used to build better cross-community relationships?	
The main barrier to Protestant involvement in the community sector is a	

lack of knowledge about that sector?	
Engaging with the other community via the community sector needs to be promoted?	
Most Protestants think that the community sector is controlled by the Catholic community?	
The Peace Process is making Protestants more aware of the need to involve themselves in the community sector?	

**Q6. With regard to working in a future community sector what do you feel about the following questions.**

***On a scale of 1 to 5 where 1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Neither Agree/Disagree 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree***

There is a need for community funding that promotes Protestant identities?	
Protestants are more likely to become involved in the community sector if that will lead to better cross-community relationships?	
Younger Protestants are those most likely to become involved in the community sector?	
The development of Protestant community groups would provide much needed leadership for the Protestant community?	
Protestants require information and training regarding community group building?	
Protestants will apply for funding in order to develop their community if that funding is specific to their community?	
The formation of new Protestant community groups would be important to me?	
Protestant community groups are needed to challenge Protestant exclusion?	
Protestant community groups are needed to develop the Peace Process?	
We need a community sector that will promote local industry?	
Protestant involvement in the community sector will promote trust between groups?	
Funding should be sought to promote citizenship programmes that promote respect for diversity within the Protestant community?	
Funding should be sought to promote citizenship programmes that promote respect for diversity for both the Catholic and Protestant communities?	
There is a need for funding to facilitate reconciliation, especially amongst the more senior members of the Protestant community?	
If there is an appropriate funding stream the Protestant community will involve itself in the local community development process?	

The Protestant Community lacks the capacity to apply for Peace III programme?	
---	--

**Q7 (a). What knowledge do you have of the following groups in Cavan/Leitrim? Please fill in only if you are located in Cavan/Leitrim.**

Organisation	Good Knowledge	Some Knowledge	No Knowledge
Messines Association			
Cavan Services to the Unemployed Committee Ltd			
Bunnoe Community Development Association Ltd.			
Cavan Family Resource Centre			
Cavan Services to the Unemployed Committee Ltd			
Killeshandra Community Council			
Laragh Area Development Ltd.			
Redhills Development Association			
North Cavan Church of Ireland Group			
Carrick On Shannon Heritage Group Ltd.			
Derry & Raphoe Action			
Glencree Centre for Reconciliation			

**Q7 (b). What knowledge do you have of the following groups in Donegal? Please fill in only if you are located in Donegal.**

Organisation	Good Knowledge	Some Knowledge	No Knowledge
Messines Association			
Cathedral Hall Management Committee			
Balor Developmental Community Arts Group Ltd			
CDVEC Curriculum Development Unit			
Culdaff Community Association Ltd.			
Donegal YMCA			
Dunfanaghy Community Resource Assoc			
Foinn Chonallacha Teo			
Inch Island Community Assoc			

Inishowen Rural Development Ltd			
Lifford/Clonleigh Resource Centre			
North Western Health Board			
Raphoe Economic Development Group Ltd			
Raphoe Reconciliation Project			
Raphoe Youth & Community Project			
Rural Mental Health			
St. Johnston & Carrigans Family Resource Centre			
St. Johnston/Carrigans Family Resource Centre			
Irish Genealogy Ltd.			
North Cavan Church of Ireland Group			
Derry and Raphoe Action			
Glencree Centre for Reconciliation			

**Q7 (c). What knowledge do you have of the following groups in Monaghan? Please fill in only if you are located in Monaghan.**

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Good Knowledge</b>	<b>Some Knowledge</b>	<b>No Knowledge</b>
Messines Association			
Cavan Services to the Unemployed Committee Ltd			
Irish Genealogy Ltd.			
North Cavan Church of Ireland Group			
Carrick On Shannon Heritage Group Ltd.			
Upstate Theatre Project			
DEIIP			
Cox's Demense Youth & Community Project Ltd.			
Drogheda Community Forum			
Drogheda Early Intervention and Integration Programme			
Drogheda Northside Community Partnership			
Dundalk Institute of Technology			
Cumann Gaelach Chnoc na Ros Doire			
Border Minority Group			
Triskele Community Training & Development			

Clones Community Forum Ltd			
Co. Monaghan Community Network Ltd.			
Co. Monaghan Partnership			
Scripture Union			
Derry & Raphoe Action			
Glencree Centre for Reconciliation			

**Q7 (d). What knowledge do you have of the following groups in Sligo? Please fill in only if you are located in Sligo.**

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Good Knowledge</b>	<b>Some Knowledge</b>	<b>No Knowledge</b>
Messines Association			
Cavan Services to the Unemployed Committee Ltd			
Cavan Family Resource Centre			
Cavan Services to the Unemployed Committee Ltd			
Riverstown Enterprise Development ( Sligo) Ltd. (Riverbrooke Project)			
Derry & Raphoe Action			
Glencree Centre for Reconciliation			

**Q7 (e). What knowledge do you have of the following groups in Louth? Please fill in only if you are located in Louth.**

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Good Knowledge</b>	<b>Some Knowledge</b>	<b>No Knowledge</b>
Messines Association			
Irish Genealogy Ltd.			
Upstate Theatre Project			
DEIIP			
Cox's Demense Youth & Community Project Ltd.			
Drogheda Community Forum			
Drogheda Early Intervention and Integration Programme			
Drogheda Northside Community Partnership			
Dundalk Institute of Technology			
Border Minority Group			
Triskele Community Training & Development			
Clones Community Forum Ltd			
Glencree Centre for Reconciliation			

**Q8. What knowledge do you have of the following groups that were funded under Peace II and which worked with the Protestant community?**

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Good Knowledge</b>	<b>Some Knowledge</b>	<b>No Knowledge</b>
Special European Union Programmes Body			
Monaghan Low Income Small Farm Holders Initiative			
Drogheda Early Intervention and Integration Programme			
Carrick-on-Shannon Heritage Experience			
Drogheda Northside Community Partnership			
Clones Community Forum's Building Bridges Project			
Killeshandra Let's Build Together			
Creative Arts for Young People			
Cavan Community IT Skills Project			
Communities Connect			
Voice of Older People			
A Cultural Experience			
Irish Genealogy Ltd,			
Finding Your Place			
Mind Matters			
Engineering Sector Skills Showcase			
Foyle Training Towards Reconciliation			
Cross-over Community Theatre			
WEBCITER (West Belfast and Cox's Demesne IT Project			
Border Arts Centre,			
Riverbrook Cross-border Initiative			
Cavan and Larne Integrated Network (CALIN)			

## Appendix 5: Interviewees

The following members of PEACE II funded projects and members of the Border Protestant community's churches, schools and Loyal Orders generously participated in conversations and/or interviews and in some cases entered into correspondence:

1. Anderson, William, Inch Island Community Association
2. Brady, Eileen, Cavan Family Resource Centre
3. Bredin, John and Mary O'Carroll, Carrick-on-Shannon Heritage Group
4. Brown, Rev. Brian, Presbyterian Church
5. Buchanan, Stewart, Ulster Scots
6. Carleton, Noel, Apprentice Boy, Orange Order, Black Perceptory
7. Crossan, Mary, St. Johnston and Carrigans Resource Centre
8. Devenney, Jim, former independent councillor
9. Donnan, Jim and Rita Killian, Scripture Union
10. Good, Bishop Ken, Church of Ireland
11. Graham, Angela, Free Presbyterian, Drum Accordeon Band, Drum Community Development Association
12. Hall, Michael, Headmaster of Monaghan Collegiate School
13. Hanna, Maynard, Ulster Scots
14. Henry, Norman, Orange Order, Black Perceptory, Boys Brigade
15. Mahon, David, County Grand Master, Apprentice Boy, Black Perceptory
16. Matthews, Marian, Drogheda Early Intervention & Integration Programme
17. McAdams, Charley, Border Minority Group
18. McCarron, Francis, Monaghan Community Network
19. McCord, Ethne, St. Muadain's Church Select Vestry
20. McCracken, Ian, Derry Raphoe Action
21. Moore, Rev. Richard, Church of Ireland
22. Murphy, Rev. Stephen, Baptist Church
23. Oliver, Wynn, Headmaster, Sligo Grammar School
24. Pringle, Walter, Church of Ireland Pastoral Assistant
25. Roberts, David, Apprentice Boy, Orange Order, Black Perceptory
26. Roberts, Ivy and Philomena Finnegan, North Cavan Church of Ireland Group
27. Robinson, Rev. Ken, Methodist Church
28. Smyth, Barbara, The Wee Hall in Culdaff
29. Sweeney, Bridie, Riverbrooke Cross-Border Initiative
30. Trenier, Beryl, Principal, Fairgreen NS, Belturbet
31. Wallace, Gerald, Apprentice Boy, Orange Order
32. Wallace, Jane, Ulster Scots

## Appendix 6: AA AWA NOO

### “AA AWA NOO”

Thars niboodie roun heir bie that naim ma freen  
Thar ustebae yins doon tha en o tha lane  
Bit thie aa left roun twenny two  
Yeal hede luik elsewar, fer thair aa awa noo

Ach ye wudnae min it fer yer ony a wean  
Thay broke tha cov'nant, an left us oor lane.  
Tha Kirks wur aa foo tha Sabbath efter  
Tha clergie had tae goul ouer tha greetin an cleamer

Monies a maun wud leuk tae hie stied  
Bit crossed tha wicht line ouer tae tha far side  
Wi thir wemmin an weans, an bits thie cud cerrie  
Thie rowed awa at nicht, it shos thie war warie.

Tha wans that wur left jist stied on tha lan  
Fer tha breed that wie'r fae is ken'd tae bie thran  
An fer monies a yeir, tho things wernie grate  
Wi kep oor heids doon an jist tholed oot oor fate

But noo hit's naw feir, ner discriminecyin  
That thins oot oor ranks, its edyekaecyin  
Fer fairmin's nae guid tae gie ye a leivin  
Onie bodie wi breins is naw stai'in, thair leein.

Tha feir's gang awa o assassinaeyin  
Bit noo weir roined wi assimilaeyin  
If we dinnae ketch oan am afeard then weir thru  
It'l naw bae lang tae thair saein, thar aa awa noo.

Wully frae tha Brae  
07.02.04