Doomsday Scenario and its Impact on the Investigation of the Dublin and Monaghan Bombings 1974

JOHN O'BRIEN

Could the Doomsday Plot have precipitated the Dublin Monaghan Massacre 1974?

The Doomsday Document and Brendan “The Dark” Hughes

Brendan “The Dark” Hughes was the author of the handwritten doomsday document. Hughes held the reputed position of Officer Commanding (O/C) of the Belfast Brigade of the Provisional IRA (PIRA). Known for his unwavering commitment to the doctrine of physical force, he demonstrated a readiness to resort to violence in pursuit of his objectives.
He played a pivotal role as the chief organiser of the Bloody Friday car bombings in Belfast in 1972. In the aftermath of the bombings, Hughes began to recognise that the strategy employed was a major mistake for PIRA.
Hughes became increasingly consumed by the belief that PIRA had been successfully infiltrated by British intelligence. His suspicions intensified after his arrest, and the experiences he endured within the prison system further solidified his conviction that the organisation’s security had been compromised. These developments had a profound impact on Hughes’ mindset and contributed to the atmosphere of paranoia and distrust that characterised the era.

Political Process

“Policing is fundamentally a political process, even in circumstances where the police service as an institution is relatively independent of government and accountable to the law. The specific actions of 'the police' as an institution involves the exercise of power, relates to liberty and freedom, and relies upon authority, all of which inevitably raise political questions”. University of Leicester 1981.

It is evident that when consensus breaks down, as happened in Northern Ireland, the entire situation becomes significantly more volatile. The erosion of societal consensus was accompanied by direct attacks on the political system, further intensifying the turmoil.

Peter Taylor journalist recounts remarks made by Merlyn Rees regarding the situation he found in Belfast shortly after his arrival as Secretary for State.

When I first arrived in the province, within a day or two Brian Faulkner came down to see me and told me in so many words, 'l cannot carry the Unionist Party on Sunningdale whatever happens. 'He says, 'I cannot carry it. I have lost my on1y reason to be. I'm beaten, overwhelmed by the vote against my sort of unionism, or the unionism I'm trying to carry out.'

It could not be done. We couldn't do a Prague. You can't put down a popular rising by killing people. We're not Russia. The weakness of Sunningdale was that it was signed up over in stockbroker Sunningdale. They ought to have met in Belfast and learnt the realities of life. When people in the south said, 'put it down', they didn't know what they were talking about. Even the police were on the brink of not carrying out their duties as well. And the middle classes were on their side. This wasn't just an industrial dispute. This was the Protestant people of Northern Ireland rising up against Sunningdale. They could not be shot down.

There is little doubt the views of the British Prime Minister were conveyed in quite specific terms to Dublin by Merlyn Rees Secretary of State on Monday 13 May 1974. These views were informed by the official British Political position "*The Doomsday Plan was real" and no doubt the views of Mr. Faulkener's loss of confidence animated this discussion.*

The political process of Sunningdale was over and the so called "Doomsday Plot" provided the political cover . It was only a matter of time and the bombings on the 17 May administered the coup de grâce. *(see Background – Political Actions)*

The Political Process and the Doomsday Plot

The political process played a decisive and undeniable role in shaping the analysis and response to the so-called Doomsday Plot. There was a clear determination by the British government that the plot held genuine offensive intent, and this assessment influenced subsequent actions at the highest level. This view was formally conveyed to the Irish government, which, in turn, appears to have accepted the British perspective and acted in alignment with this determination.

The shared understanding between the British and Irish governments regarding the seriousness of the Doomsday Plot underlines the fundamentally political nature of the decisions made during this period. The acceptance and reaction to the British government's assessment by their Irish counterparts exemplifies how political judgement shaped the course

of events, reinforcing the notion that policing, security, and crisis management are inherently political undertakings, particularly in the context of Northern Ireland's deep-seated divisions and history of intercommunal violence.

Alternative Interpretations of the Doomsday Plot

Contrary to the perspective that the Doomsday Plot was conceived as an aggressive strategy, this analysis contends that it was, in fact, predominantly driven by paranoia within the Provisional IRA (PIRA). The prevailing belief among members of the PIRA was that extremist Loyalist factions were preparing to initiate a campaign akin to a unilateral declaration of independence (UDI) against the nationalist community. This heightened sense of suspicion and anxiety influenced their perceptions and responses during the period, shaping their interpretation of the political and security environment in Northern Ireland.

Background – Political Actions

It is now well settled that in 1974, British Prime Minister Harold Wilson told Taoiseach Liam Cosgrave on two occasions in September and November of 1974 that they, the British, knew who had committed the Dublin and Monaghan bombings and they had interned them. It is equally clear now that the Dublin government did absolutely nothing with that information, and we know that at least the Minister for Justice and the Commissioner were not informed of that transaction, which leaves an enormous conundrum.

Plan to Bomb Dublin and Monaghan

The plan to Bomb Dublin and Monaghan had been formulated some considerable time before it was executed. The logistical implications were of a high order and could not have been cobbled together overnight. The missing factor was the catalyst to execute. The rapidly deteriorating public order situation created its own momentum and the final impetus was the publicity which surrounded the dramatic reporting of the alleged Doomsday Plot and the accompanying hysteria. The rest is history.

Judge Henry Barrons Stinging Criticism – 2003 Report

Following the meetings, there is no evidence that the information was passed, either to the Minister for Justice or any of his officials, or indeed to the Garda Commissioner or any other Garda officer. Certainly, Patrick Cooney, the then Minister for Justice was never made aware of it, nor is there any record of such information being passed to An Garda Síochána.

This absence of apparent interest in those interned, and in whatever evidence there was which indicated that some of them were involved in the Dublin bombings, strongly suggests that the Irish Government made no efforts to assist the investigation into the Dublin and Monaghan bombings at a political level. It is also surprising that they did not convey this information to An Garda Síochána.

Plausible Explanation For Silence

The plausible explanation is that Provisional IRA were recognised both by Dublin and London as their primary, if not their only, target to the security of the respective states, and then for some reason, and this is only a hypothesis, it is not a fact, would need to be proved, that they decided unbelievably to slide away past the fact that the UVF did not have the capacity to launch the Dublin bombs.

Although there was a definite capability among certain Loyalist groups to carry out bombings as in Monaghan. The question of key political responsibility and decision-making regarding these activities was not confined to Dublin alone; London also played a significant role in shaping the response and outcomes during this period.

In the lead-up to 17 May, there was a notable increase in disorder and a loyalist backlash, as thoroughly documented. The establishment of roadblocks, the Ulster Workers Council strike, and other manifestations of unrest were all well recorded, illustrating the heightened tensions prevalent at the time.

I have published four books on policing and security and this Mass Murder has figured in each one of those and my last book published in 2024; *The Dublin and Monaghan Car Bombings* dealt exclusively this crime.

The details are graphically covered and there are number of inexplicable political questions which have never been answered. Decisions made in Dublin played a major part in the unfolding narrative but decisions made in London and Belfast created a crisis that was to have unimaginable consequences.

Questions for Dublin

1. One of the most significant unresolved issues concerns Dublin's response to the information provided by London regarding the identities of those responsible for the bombings. Despite receiving this intelligence, the Dublin government did not act upon it at the time. This lack of action remains the single most perplexing and unexplained aspect of the case. The gravity of this omission was strongly underscored by the Judge in 2003, whose remarks were particularly scathing on this point.
2. The failure to pursue the information supplied stands as a central and enduring question in understanding the broader political and investigative context surrounding the Dublin and Monaghan bombings.
3. Why did Dublin effectively stay silent for 19 years until the Hidden Hand documentary was broadcast in 1993.
4. Why did Dublin wait another 7 years before initiating a domestic inquiry.
5. Why did Dublin refuse to hold a Public Sworn Inquiry on the killings.
6. Why did Dublin not include the Dublin and Monaghan Bombings as a case for inclusion in the context of Weston Park Agreement.
7. Why did Dublin maintain this study of seeming indifference to the current time. confining themselves to making ritualistic appeals to the British to release their secret information.
8. Why did Dublin agree to the British conducting a review of the Bombings under the Banner of Operation Denton in their jurisdiction.
9. What does Dublin propose to do now that the UK Supreme Court has effectively allowed critical information to be withheld in Legacy cases as per the Thompson judgment.

Questions for London

Why did the British government publicise an alleged IRA Doomsday plot in May of 1974 without detailed analysis which had the effect of motivating the terrorist anti - agreement interests in the North. This and other related issues are explored in this paper.

The Sunningdale Agreement

The Sunningdale Process started under a Conservative British government and a Fianna Fáil Irish government. In 1973 the Fianna Fáil Dublin government was replaced by a Fine Gael/Labour coalition on the 14 March 1973. On the British side a Labour government took power on the 28 February 1974.

The Sunningdale Agreement emerged from the disintegration of Northern Ireland's post-1921 constitutional settlement. By the end of the 1960s, the Stormont system of permanent unionist majority rule had lost legitimacy among a substantial portion of the population and had ceased to function as a viable mechanism of governance. Civil-rights agitation, escalating communal violence, and the progressive militarisation of security policy exposed the inability of the Northern Ireland government to reconcile political authority with social consent.

The power-sharing **Northern Ireland Executive** took office in January 1974 against a backdrop of continuing violence and deep communal mistrust. Almost immediately, its authority was undermined by the February 1974 UK general election, which returned a decisive anti-Sunningdale majority among unionist voters. This result fatally weakened Faulkner's position and transformed opposition to Sunningdale from a factional dispute into a claimed democratic mandate.

It was in this already volatile context that the alleged **IRA "Doomsday Plot"** assumed critical political significance. In early May 1974, British authorities announced the discovery of documents purportedly outlining a Provisional IRA contingency plan for the seizure of strategic installations and the destabilisation of Northern Ireland in the event of British withdrawal or constitutional collapse.

Although the provenance, operational reality, and legal follow-through of the alleged plot were never fully tested in court, its *public disclosure* had an immediate and profound impact.

From a security perspective, the announcement served as a signal of acute state alarm, suggesting that senior authorities believed Northern Ireland to be on the brink of a catastrophic escalation. From a political perspective, it acted as a force multiplier for unionist fears. The plot appeared to confirm long-standing loyalist narratives that Sunningdale was not a compromise settlement but a transitional arrangement leading to British disengagement and an enforced Irish unity agenda. The timing and interpretation of the disclosure—during the most fragile phase of the Executive's existence—was decisive.

For many unionists, the alleged plot reframed the entire political landscape. Power-sharing was no longer viewed merely as an internal constitutional experiment, but as a security risk unfolding in parallel with an existential republican threat. The Council of Ireland, in this climate, ceased to be debated as an administrative mechanism and was instead portrayed as a strategic vulnerability. The distinction between constitutional nationalism and militant republicanism, already blurred in popular discourse, collapsed almost entirely.

The announcement also had the unintended effect of heightening loyalist mobilisation. If republicans were allegedly preparing for a decisive "doomsday" confrontation, then loyalist resistance could be framed as pre-emptive defence rather than political obstruction. This framing proved crucial in the days that followed, providing moral and psychological justification for extraordinary measures.

Within days, the **Ulster Workers' Council** launched a strike that went far beyond industrial protest. Electricity generation, fuel distribution, transport, and food supply were systematically disrupted, with enforcement provided by loyalist paramilitary groups. The strike functioned as a coordinated challenge to state authority and a direct veto on the continuation of the Sunningdale institutions.

The British government faced a stark choice: enforce the authority of the Executive and confront loyalist resistance or acquiesce in its collapse. In the shadow of the alleged IRA plot, and amid fears of wider conflagration, London chose restraint. The Army was not deployed to break the strike. This decision was widely interpreted as a signal that the state would not impose Sunningdale at the cost of internal conflict within the unionist community.

On 28 May 1974, the Executive resigned. Sunningdale collapsed not because its institutional design was unworkable, but because it was overwhelmed by a convergence of political fragility, security anxiety, and contested narratives of existential threat. The alleged IRA Doomsday Plot did not cause the collapse in isolation, but it acted as the **straw that broke the camel's back**, transforming opposition into mobilisation and hesitation into paralysis.

In retrospect, Sunningdale stands as a paradox. Its core principles—power-sharing, an Irish dimension, and British Irish cooperation—would later underpin a durable settlement. The difference lay not in ideas, but in context and sequencing. In 1974, political consent was shallow, enforcement uncertain, and security narratives combustible. **The Doomsday Plot episode demonstrated how untested intelligence claims, once publicly deployed, could reshape political reality regardless of their ultimate evidential status.** Sunningdale was not defeated by a single document or strike. It was undone by the collision of fragile institutions with a security environment in which fear, perception, and timing proved more powerful than constitutional text.

Media Coverage in Belfast (1973–1974) (Open Sources)

In the period surrounding the Sunningdale Agreement and its collapse in May 1974, the media environment in Belfast functioned less as a neutral forum for public debate and more as a **reflective and amplifying surface for political pressure**, particularly from unionist and loyalist mobilisation. While individual journalists and some editorial boards recognised the necessity of political accommodation, the **overall tone and effect of Belfast-based media coverage was sceptical to hostile toward the Agreement**, especially as events moved from constitutional negotiation to street-level confrontation.

The dominant structural feature of Belfast media in 1973–74 was **risk aversion**. Newspapers and broadcasters operated in a city where intimidation was real, commercial boycotts were credible, and violence against perceived "enemies" of the community was an established fact. Editorial decisions were therefore shaped not only by political judgement but by an acute awareness of consequences. This context mattered profoundly: it produced coverage that privileged *what was happening* on the streets over *why* it was happening, and visibility over interrogation.

Belfast media coverage in 1973–74 was not uniformly anti-Agreement, but the **weight, framing, and emphasis of coverage worked against the Agreement's survival**. Through

scepticism, amplification of opposition, and reluctance to interrogate coercive dynamics, the media helped construct a political atmosphere in which the destruction of Sunningdale appeared less like a defeat of democracy and more like an expression of reality.

The Orange Order and Sunningdale: Institutional Opposition and Mobilisation (1973–1974)

From its inception, the Sunningdale Agreement was perceived by the Orange Order not as a pragmatic compromise, but as a fundamental challenge to the constitutional and cultural foundations of unionism. The Order's opposition was not incidental or rhetorical; it was structural, ideological, and organisational, reflecting its role as both a fraternal institution and a mass political force within Protestant unionist society.

The Orange Order had long regarded itself as a guardian of the Union and of Protestant political ascendancy in Northern Ireland. Although it was formally non-party, its influence within unionist politics—particularly within the Ulster Unionist Party—was extensive. Many elected representatives, councillors, and MPs were members, and Orange lodges functioned as centres of political mobilisation as well as social organisation. Against this backdrop, the principles underlying Sunningdale struck at the core of the Order's self-understanding.

The concept of **power-sharing** was viewed by the Order as a repudiation of majority rule and a dilution of unionist sovereignty. However, it was the proposed **Council of Ireland** that triggered outright institutional hostility. Within Orange discourse, the Council was framed not as a consultative mechanism, but as a constitutional Trojan horse—an incremental device through which the Irish state would acquire influence over Northern Ireland. This interpretation was reinforced by decades of Orange suspicion toward any formalised all-Ireland structures, rooted in historical memory of partition, civil war, and the perceived threat of absorption into a Catholic-dominated state.

The Orange Order's opposition hardened rapidly following the December 1973 agreement. Grand Lodges at county and district level passed resolutions condemning Sunningdale, with particular emphasis on the Irish dimension. These resolutions were not symbolic gestures; they functioned as signals to the wider unionist community that resistance was both legitimate and necessary. The language employed consistently portrayed Sunningdale as a betrayal imposed by London rather than a settlement freely entered by unionist representatives.

Key figures associated with the Order played a prominent role in articulating and amplifying this stance. **Ian Paisley**, though not an officer of the Orange Order, was closely aligned with its grassroots membership and drew heavily on Orange networks for mobilisation. His denunciation of Sunningdale as "Dublin rule by the back door" echoed and reinforced Orange messaging, blurring the line between religious, fraternal, and political opposition.

Within the Ulster Unionist Party, the Order's influence proved decisive in undermining support for **Brian Faulkner**. While Faulkner himself was an Orangeman, his acceptance of the Sunningdale framework placed him at odds with the prevailing sentiment within the institution. Orange opposition accelerated the fragmentation of unionism, isolating Faulkner and delegitimising his leadership in the eyes of many traditional supporters. The February 1974 general election, which returned an overwhelming anti-Sunningdale unionist vote, was widely interpreted within the Order as confirmation of its stance.

As the power-sharing **Northern Ireland Executive** took office, the Orange Order's posture shifted from opposition to active resistance. While the Order did not formally organise the Ulster Workers' Council strike, it provided essential social and moral endorsement. Orange halls became venues for meetings, coordination, and messaging. Lodge structures facilitated communication and mobilisation at local level, lending the strike a veneer of community legitimacy that extended beyond paramilitary circles.

The alleged IRA "Doomsday Plot," disclosed in early May 1974, further entrenched the Order's position. Within Orange rhetoric, the plot appeared to validate long-held fears that Sunningdale was unfolding alongside a strategic republican threat. The distinction between constitutional nationalism and militant republicanism collapsed entirely in this narrative. In that climate, resistance to Sunningdale was reframed not merely as political dissent, but as defensive necessity.

Crucially, the Orange Order interpreted the British government's reluctance to confront loyalist mobilisation as tacit acknowledgment of unionist grievance. The decision not to deploy decisive force during the Ulster Workers' Council strike reinforced the belief that mass unionist resistance could successfully veto constitutional change. This perception would have enduring consequences, shaping loyalist strategy for decades thereafter.

By the time the Executive collapsed on 28 May 1974, the Orange Order regarded Sunningdale not as a failed experiment, but as a defeated threat. The outcome vindicated its core assumptions: that power-sharing imposed without majority consent was unsustainable, that any Irish dimension was inherently destabilising, and that organised unionist resistance could override British policy.

In retrospect, the Orange Order's role in the Sunningdale episode illustrates its function as a bridge between constitutional politics and popular mobilisation. It did not merely reflect unionist opposition; it structured, legitimised, and sustained it. Sunningdale failed in part because it underestimated the capacity of institutions like the Orange Order to translate cultural identity into political veto. The lessons of that miscalculation would loom large when similar ideas were revisited a generation later under very different conditions.

The Churches and Sunningdale

The response of the churches to the Sunningdale Agreement reflected the wider fracture within Northern Irish society, but it did so in a distinctively institutional way. Unlike political parties or paramilitary groupings, the churches were not negotiating constitutional arrangements. Their influence lay instead in **legitimisation, moral framing, and pastoral authority**. In that respect, their attitudes mattered profoundly, even when expressed cautiously.

Protestant Mainline Churches: Conditional Acceptance Without Mobilisation

Among the **mainline Protestant denominations**, the reaction to Sunningdale was generally **cautiously supportive in principle** but **restrained in practice**. Church leaders broadly welcomed any initiative that promised to reduce violence and restore political stability, yet they were acutely conscious of divisions within their congregations and avoided overt political mobilisation.

The **Presbyterian Church in Ireland**, the largest Protestant denomination, exemplified this position. Senior Presbyterian figures acknowledged that majority rule had failed to secure peace and accepted that some form of power-sharing was unavoidable. Statements from church leaders during 1973–74 emphasised reconciliation, mutual respect, and the moral necessity of compromise. However, these interventions were deliberately non-confrontational. The Church did not actively challenge unionist opposition or the Orange Order's framing of Sunningdale as a constitutional threat. Many Presbyterian congregations were themselves deeply divided, limiting the leadership's capacity to translate principle into influence.

The **Church of Ireland** adopted a similar stance. Its bishops tended to view Sunningdale as a pragmatic, if imperfect, attempt to stabilise a failing political system. Several senior clergy privately supported power-sharing and saw the Council of Ireland as a modest consultative mechanism rather than a constitutional rupture. Publicly, however, the Church of Ireland

stressed prayer, peace, and social healing rather than institutional endorsement. Its leadership was wary of provoking backlash among parishioners who were strongly unionist and increasingly alarmed by the Irish dimension of the agreement.

The **Methodist Church in Ireland** was arguably the most openly sympathetic among the Protestant churches. Methodist leaders spoke more explicitly about justice, equality, and the moral failure of exclusionary governance. Even so, their influence was limited by numbers and by the broader Protestant climate, which was moving rapidly towards resistance rather than accommodation.

In summary, the mainstream Protestant churches offered **moral assent without political muscle**. They neither led opposition nor meaningfully countered it. Their caution, while understandable pastorally, meant that organised resistance to Sunningdale went largely unchallenged in the Protestant public sphere.

The Free Presbyterian Church: Explicit and Militant Rejection

A sharply contrasting position was taken by the **Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster**, led by **Ian Paisley**. This church was unequivocally hostile to Sunningdale and framed its opposition in both theological and political terms.

From the Free Presbyterian perspective, Sunningdale represented a betrayal of Protestant heritage and a surrender to what Paisley consistently described as Roman Catholic and nationalist advance. Power-sharing was portrayed as morally illegitimate, and the Council of Ireland as an existential threat to Northern Ireland's Protestant identity. Paisley's dual role as church leader and political agitator allowed religious rhetoric to bleed directly into mass mobilisation. Sermons, rallies, and political speeches reinforced each other, creating a powerful narrative of resistance that resonated far beyond the church's formal membership.

While numerically smaller than the mainline churches, the Free Presbyterian Church exercised **disproportionate influence**, particularly in working-class loyalist areas. Its uncompromising stance helped radicalise opposition and legitimise defiance of the Sunningdale institutions.

The Catholic Church: Qualified Support with Strategic Restraint

The **Catholic Church** approached Sunningdale from a different vantage point. Catholic bishops broadly welcomed the agreement as a step towards equality, recognition, and an end to political exclusion. Power-sharing aligned with long-standing Catholic grievances, and the Council of Ireland was viewed as a modest and legitimate acknowledgment of the Irish dimension.

Bishops such as **William Philbin** spoke positively about reconciliation and political compromise, framing Sunningdale as an opportunity to move away from violence and towards democratic engagement. Pastoral letters and sermons encouraged participation in constitutional politics and emphasised the moral imperative of peace.
However, Catholic support was **carefully calibrated**. Church leaders were anxious not to be seen as endorsing British policy uncritically or as acting as political cheerleaders for Sunningdale. They were also conscious of the ongoing republican campaign and wary of inflaming tensions within their own communities. As a result, Catholic backing tended to be implicit rather than mobilising.
When Sunningdale came under sustained attack, the Catholic Church defended the principle of power-sharing but lacked the leverage to counter loyalist mobilisation. Its influence was strongest at the level of moral reassurance rather than political defence.

Comparative Effect

Taken together, the churches did not determine the fate of Sunningdale, but they shaped the **moral weather** in which it rose and fell. The Catholic Church and the mainline Protestant denominations broadly accepted the agreement as a necessary compromise, yet their caution left the public arena largely uncontested. In contrast, the Free Presbyterian Church articulated a clear, emotive, and mobilisation-ready rejection that aligned closely with wider loyalist resistance.
The net effect was asymmetrical. Support for Sunningdale was muted, defensive, and institutionally cautious; opposition was loud, confident, and embedded in networks capable of rapid mobilisation. In that imbalance lay one of the quieter, but significant, reasons why Sunningdale proved unsustainable.

Sinn Féin and the IRA: (1973–1974)

At the time of Sunningdale, **Sinn Féin** and the **Provisional Irish Republican Army** operated within a shared republican framework that rejected the constitutional foundations of Northern Ireland. From that standpoint, Sunningdale was not a flawed compromise but a settlement built on an illegitimate premise: the continued existence of the Northern state.
Sinn Féin: Ideological Rejection Without Institutional Engagement
Sinn Féin in 1973–74 was not the electoral actor it would later become. It did not participate in the Sunningdale negotiations, nor did it seek to influence the agreement from within. Its

public stance was one of **principled rejection**, grounded in abstentionism and opposition to any arrangement that accepted partition, even implicitly.

Party statements and Ard Fheis debates characterised Sunningdale as a **repackaging of British rule**, arguing that power-sharing within Northern Ireland merely stabilised a partitionist structure rather than dismantling it. The proposed Council of Ireland was dismissed as cosmetic—an advisory body without sovereign authority—incapable of delivering Irish unity and therefore insufficient to justify participation.

Sinn Féin's rejection was also strategic. Endorsing Sunningdale would have required recognising institutions derived from British sovereignty, a step incompatible with republican doctrine at the time. Consequently, Sinn Féin neither mobilised in defence of Sunningdale nor invested political capital in its success. Its opposition was firm but **non-mobilising** in the sense that it did not organise mass protest campaigns comparable to loyalist resistance.

The Provisional IRA: Active Hostility and Armed Continuity

The Provisional IRA's attitude was more consequential. For the IRA, Sunningdale posed a strategic threat: it offered a political pathway that might undercut the armed campaign by drawing constitutional nationalism into government and normalising British authority.

The IRA rejected Sunningdale outright and continued its armed operations throughout the period. Republican statements framed the agreement as an attempt to **"criminalise resistance and stabilise occupation"**, arguing that power-sharing was designed to defeat the IRA politically where security measures had failed militarily.

Crucially, the IRA did not declare a ceasefire or even a tactical pause in response to Sunningdale. Bombings, shootings, and intimidation continued in Northern Ireland, reinforcing unionist claims that the agreement delivered no security dividend. From a republican perspective, this continuity of violence was not contradictory: Sunningdale was irrelevant to the core objective of ending British rule and therefore did not warrant restraint.

Strategic Ambiguity and the Wider Impact

The combined Sinn Féin–IRA posture created a form of **strategic ambiguity** that mattered politically. On the one hand, republicans dismissed Sunningdale as meaningless and illegitimate. On the other, their continued capacity for violence ensured that Sunningdale unfolded under constant security pressure. This allowed opponents of the agreement—particularly within unionism—to argue that power-sharing rewarded nationalism without reducing the republican threat.

This dynamic was sharpened by the **alleged IRA "Doomsday Plot"** disclosed in early May 1974. Whether operationally real or not, its announcement reinforced the perception that

republicans were preparing for decisive confrontation rather than accommodation. In that climate, republican rejection of Sunningdale was interpreted not as ideological consistency, but as evidence that the agreement was strategically naïve or dangerously permissive.
The IRA's stance also had an indirect effect on constitutional nationalists. While the **Social Democratic and Labour Party** endorsed Sunningdale as a pathway to equality and stability, it did so under the shadow of an armed campaign it did not control. Republican rejection thus weakened the SDLP's ability to claim that Sunningdale represented a unified nationalist strategy.

Dublin and International Perception

From the perspective of external observers, including the Irish government and British security planners, Sinn Féin and IRA opposition confirmed a central anxiety: that Sunningdale might stabilise relations between London, Dublin, and constitutional parties while leaving the core insurgency untouched. This perception fed doubts about the agreement's capacity to transform the conflict, especially once loyalist resistance escalated.

In retrospect, Sinn Féin and the IRA did not *collapse* Sunningdale in the way loyalist mobilisation ultimately did, but their posture contributed materially to its fragility. Sinn Féin withheld political legitimacy; the IRA denied security respite. Together, they ensured that Sunningdale never enjoyed a moment of calm in which its institutions could embed. Sunningdale asked republicans to wait—to accept interim arrangements in the hope of gradual change. In 1973–74, neither Sinn Féin nor the IRA was prepared to do so. Their rejection was ideologically coherent and strategically consistent, but it left the agreement exposed on one flank while loyalist resistance dismantled it from the other.

The rejection of the Sunningdale Agreement by republican leadership in 1973–74 was neither ambiguous nor accidental. It was articulated clearly, consistently, and at multiple levels of the republican movement, encompassing political leadership, military command, operational practice, and grassroots activism. Although less theatrically visible than loyalist opposition, it constituted a coherent ideological and strategic refusal to recognise Sunningdale as a legitimate political settlement.

At the political level, the position of **Sinn Féin** was unequivocal. Sinn Féin rejected Sunningdale not because it fell short of republican objectives, but because it was founded on

the continued existence of Northern Ireland. From the republican perspective of the early 1970s, any settlement that accepted partition—even implicitly—was irredeemably illegitimate. Power-sharing within Northern Ireland was therefore viewed not as progress, but as a means of stabilising a political entity that republicans regarded as fundamentally unlawful.

This position was articulated most clearly by **Ruairí Ó Brádaigh**, then President of Sinn Féin. Ó Brádaigh characterised Sunningdale as a partitionist trap: a political device designed to draw nationalists into administering British rule while leaving sovereignty untouched. He dismissed the Council of Ireland as illusory—an institution without sovereign authority, incapable of delivering meaningful all-Ireland self-determination. In his analysis, Sunningdale was not a transitional arrangement on a path to unity, but a deliberate effort to normalise and entrench partition under a new constitutional guise.

At the military level, the **Provisional Irish Republican Army** adopted a position that was equally clear, though often expressed more through action than rhetoric. The IRA Army Council regarded Sunningdale as political camouflage: an attempt to manage and contain the conflict while preserving British strategic control. Republican communiqués and internal commentary framed the agreement as a substitute for a declaration of British intent to withdraw, designed to divide nationalism and marginalise the armed campaign.
At grassroots level, republican activists reinforced this rejection through sustained criticism of constitutional nationalism.

The participation of the **Social Democratic and Labour Party** in the power-sharing Executive was portrayed as a strategic error—indeed, in some republican discourse, as collaboration. SDLP ministers were accused of administering British rule under nationalist cover, absorbing responsibility for governance without exercising real power. This critique was not peripheral; it was central to republican efforts to prevent Sunningdale from acquiring nationalist legitimacy.

This matters historically because Sunningdale collapsed with no flank protected. Loyalists destroyed it openly, through mass mobilisation and economic shutdown. Republicans declined to legitimise it politically or to restrain violence in support of its institutions. Meanwhile, the British state declined to enforce the agreement decisively in the face of

loyalist resistance. In that configuration, Sunningdale was exposed on all sides. It was opposed by those who rejected compromise, unsupported by those who rejected partition, and undefended by the authority that had imposed it.

Sunningdale did not fail because its ideas were novel or incoherent. It failed because, at a critical moment, no decisive actor was both willing and able to sustain it against determined opposition.

UDA and UVF attitude to Sunningdale

The two principal loyalist paramilitary organisations in 1973–74—the Ulster Volunteer Force and the Ulster Defence Association—expressed their opposition to the Sunningdale Agreement in ways that were both political and operational, and which intensified steadily over the months preceding its collapse. Their campaign did not begin with open confrontation but developed in stages, moving from rhetoric and propaganda to organised mobilisation and, ultimately, to coercive action on a scale sufficient to paralyse Northern Ireland.

In the period immediately following the negotiation of Sunningdale in late 1973, opposition from loyalist paramilitary organisations was primarily ideological and political. Both the UVF and the UDA viewed the proposed power-sharing Executive as a fundamental departure from the traditional unionist model of governance. The inclusion of nationalist representatives, particularly from the SDLP, was seen not as compromise but as concession. Even more troubling, from their perspective, was the proposed Council of Ireland. Although conceived in constitutional terms as a consultative and limited body, loyalist propaganda consistently portrayed it as a stepping stone toward Irish unity, and therefore as a direct threat to Northern Ireland's position within the United Kingdom.

Underlying these objections was a deep distrust of British Government intentions. Loyalist statements, publications, and speeches repeatedly suggested that London was preparing to disengage from Northern Ireland or to impose a settlement without the consent of the Protestant majority. This perception—whether grounded in reality or not—proved a powerful mobilising force. Murals, newsletters, and public rallies reinforced the message that Sunningdale represented not stability but surrender.

As 1974 progressed, opposition moved beyond rhetoric into visible and organised public activity. Paramilitary influence became increasingly apparent in marches, demonstrations, and workplace protests. In many areas, particularly in working-class Protestant districts where the UDA had a strong presence, the distinction between political protest and

paramilitary organisation became blurred. Road demonstrations, factory shutdowns, and intimidation of workers who did not support anti-Agreement actions were reported with increasing frequency. These activities often took place in parallel with political organisations such as the Vanguard Unionist Progressive Party and with local loyalist committees, creating a broad front of resistance in which paramilitary and political elements were closely intertwined.

Propaganda played a central role in sustaining this mobilisation. Both organisations framed Sunningdale in stark and emotive terms: as "Dublin rule by stealth," as a betrayal of Ulster, and as the prelude to civil conflict. The UDA, because of its size and neighbourhood-based structure, was particularly effective in shaping opinion at community level. Meetings, posters, and informal networks conveyed a consistent message that resistance was not only justified but inevitable.

At the same time, loyalist violence continued across Northern Ireland, contributing to an atmosphere of instability that undermined confidence in the new political institutions. Not every incident was explicitly linked to opposition to Sunningdale, yet the cumulative effect was unmistakable. Each killing, bombing, or sectarian attack reinforced the perception that the security situation was deteriorating and that the Executive was powerless to control events. Violence functioned as a political signal as much as a military act, demonstrating in practical terms that the settlement had not restored order.

The decisive phase came in May 1974 with the Ulster Workers' Council strike. What had begun as protest now became coordinated coercion. The UDA and UVF played critical roles in enforcing the shutdown: manning roadblocks, controlling the movement of fuel, intimidating workers, and ensuring that workplaces remained closed. Although the strike was presented publicly as an industrial action, its effectiveness depended heavily on paramilitary organisation and enforcement. Without that infrastructure, it is doubtful that the strike could have paralysed Northern Ireland so completely or so quickly.

During the strike itself, loyalist rhetoric intensified further. The UDA began to portray itself as a defensive "Ulster army," suggesting that if political institutions failed, loyalists would assume responsibility for their own security. Such language blurred the line between political protest and insurgent posture, reinforcing the sense that Northern Ireland stood on the brink of a fundamental constitutional rupture.

It was in this charged atmosphere that the Dublin and Monaghan bombings occurred on 17 May 1974. In the immediate aftermath, both the UVF and the UDA denied responsibility. These denials were reported in the press and contributed to an atmosphere of public

ambiguity. Yet the denials were limited in scope. They distanced the organisations from the act but did not include strong condemnation of the killings, nor did they lead to any moderation of the strike or of anti-Sunningdale rhetoric. The campaign against the Agreement continued without interruption, and loyalist political messaging remained focused on the collapse of the Executive rather than on the implications of the bombings themselves. This response was consistent with the broader pattern of loyalist opposition. The primary objective remained the defeat of Sunningdale, and events were interpreted through that lens. Violence, whether in Northern Ireland or beyond it, was often absorbed into a wider narrative of conflict rather than treated as a turning point requiring strategic reconsideration. The bombings, far from weakening loyalist mobilisation, unfolded in parallel with the final phase of the strike, which culminated within days in the resignation of the Executive.

In retrospect, the opposition of the UVF and UDA to Sunningdale can be understood as operating through three interconnected mechanisms. First, they sought to delegitimise the Agreement through propaganda and political messaging, portraying it as a betrayal and a threat to unionist identity. Second, they mobilised public resistance through demonstrations, protests, and industrial action, drawing on extensive community networks. Third, they applied coercion—most visibly during the Ulster Workers' Council strike—to create conditions in which the institutions established under Sunningdale could not function.

In the days immediately following the **Dublin and Monaghan bombings of 17 May 1974**, the public posture adopted by the **Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF)** and the **Ulster Defence Association (UDA)** was shaped by the political and strategic circumstances of the moment. The bombings occurred at the height of the **Ulster Workers' Council strike**, when loyalist mobilisation against the **Sunningdale Agreement** had already brought Northern Ireland to a standstill.

In that context, the response of loyalist paramilitary organisations was neither one of open acknowledgement nor of moral repudiation. Instead, it took the form of denial, coupled with a continuation of political messaging that left the wider atmosphere of confrontation unchanged.

In the immediate aftermath, statements circulated through journalists and intermediaries indicating that both the UDA and UVF denied responsibility for the attacks. These denials were brief and formal in character. They were not accompanied by extended explanation, nor by any sustained effort to identify alternative perpetrators or to pursue public argument in

defence of their position. Equally, they were not accompanied by strong condemnation of the bombings themselves. The organisations sought distance from the act, but not from the political climate in which it had occurred.

In retrospect, what stands out is the contrast between the scale of the atrocity and the limited impact it had on loyalist political behaviour in the days that followed. The strike continued to its conclusion, and the Northern Ireland Executive collapsed within days. The bombings did not interrupt that trajectory. The denials issued by the UVF and UDA, together with the broader framing of events as part of an ongoing conflict, helped ensure that the attacks were not allowed to become a turning point within loyalist discourse at the time.
Seen in this light, the attitude of loyalist paramilitary organisations to the bombings can be understood as a combination of public denial, strategic silence, and political continuity. They distanced themselves from the act in formal terms, but not from the climate of confrontation in which it occurred, and the campaign against Sunningdale proceeded without pause.

UVF Attacks 1974

1. 10 January: The UVF shot dead a Catholic civilian near his workplace on Milltown Row, Belfast.
2. 14 January: The body of a Protestant civilian was found in a field near Carrowdore. It is believed he was shot by the UVF.
3. 17 January: The UVF launched a gun attack on Boyle's Bar in Cappagh. Two gunmen entered the pub and opened fire indiscriminately on the customers. A Catholic civilian was killed and three others wounded. The attack has been linked to the "Glenanne gang".
4. 30 January: The UVF shot dead a Protestant civilian at his home on Gosford Place, Belfast. It believed he was an informer.
5. 4 February: The UVF shot dead a Catholic civilian outside his garage on Whiterock Gardens, Belfast.
6. 19 February: Two civilians (Patrick Molloy, a Catholic, and Jack Wylie, a Protestant) were killed when the UVF exploded a bomb at Trainor's Bar, Kilmore, County Armagh. Two other men were injured. The attack has been linked to the "Glenanne gang". In 1981, a serving UDR soldier, a former UDR soldier and a former UVF members were convicted of the murders.
7. 28 February: The UVF exploded a bomb at Red Star Bar, Belfast, killing a Protestant civilian.
8. 5 March – Nine people are injured when the UVF carries out a bomb attack on a house in Mourne Crescent, Coalisland.
9. 11 March: The UVF shot dead a Catholic civilian in an attack on Bunch of Grapes Bar, Belfast.

10. 15 March: The UVF shot dead a Catholic civilian on the Ormeau Road, Belfast.
11. 24 March: The UVF shot dead a Protestant civilian near his home on Spruce Street, Belfast.
12. 29 March: Two Catholic civilians, James Mitchell and Joseph Donnelly were killed when the UVF exploded a bomb at Conway's Bar, Belfast.
13. 1 April: The UVF shot dead one of its own members, Jim Hanna, on Mansfield.
14. 6 April: The UVF shot dead a Protestant civilian as she walked with her boyfriend on Shankill Road, Belfast.
15. 16 April: A UVF member died when his bomb prematurely exploded in a house on Union Street, Portadown.
16. 21 April: The UVF shot dead civilian Sinn Féin member James
17. 2 May: Six Catholic civilians were killed and eighteen wounded when the UVF exploded a bomb at Rose & Crown Bar on Ormeau Road, Belfast.
18. 7 May: The UVF shot dead a married couple (James and Gertrude Devlin) near their home at Congo Road, outside Dungannon. As they were driving home, a man in British Army uniform stopped their car and opened fire on them. Their daughter, Patricia, in the back seat, was wounded. A UDR soldier was convicted for the killings.
19. 14 May: The UVF and Sinn Féin were declared legal following the passing of legislation at Westminster.
20. 15 May: The Ulster Workers' Council strike began in protest at the Sunningdale Agreement. For the next two weeks, loyalist paramilitaries forcibly tried to stop many people going to work and to close any businesses that had opened.

IRA Attacks 1974

1. 1 January 1974: A Catholic civilian (John Whyte, aged 24) was shot dead during an IRA sniper attack on a British Army patrol on McClure Street, off Ormeau Road, Belfast.
2. 3 January 1974: A 10-lb bomb exploded in London at the home of Major General Philip Ward, General Officer commander of the London district. The building was heavily damaged. The IRA is suspected.
3. 17 January 1974: The IRA shot dead an off-duty UDR soldier (Robert Jameson, aged 22) near his home at Trillick, County Tyrone.
4. 20 January 1974: A UDR soldier (Cormac McCabe, aged 42) was shot dead by the IRA; his body was found in a field near Aughnacloy, County Tyrone.
5. 21 January 1974: A British soldier (John Haughey, aged 32) was killed by an IRA remote-controlled bomb hidden in an electricity distribution box on Lone Moor Road, Creggan, Derry. It was detonated when a British foot-patrol passed.
6. 23 January 1974: An IRA unit which included Rose Dugdale and Eddie Gallagher hijacked a helicopter and used it to drop bombs on Strabane RUC station. One of the bombs landed on the grounds of the station,

but failed to explode.
7. 25 January 1974: A British soldier (Howard Fawley, aged 19) was killed by an IRA landmine as he and his patrol searched a field at Ballymaguigan, near Ballyronan, County Londonderry.
8. 26 January 1974: The IRA shot dead a patrolling RUC officer (John Rodgers, aged 50) on Antrim Road, Glengormley, County Antrim.
9. 29 January 1974: An IRA sniper fired at a bus carrying Royal Air Force (RAF) personnel at Shimna Parade, Newcastle, County Down. The RAF personnel returned fire, killing an elderly civilian, Matilda Withrington (aged 79).
10. 29 January 1974: The IRA shot dead a patrolling RUC officer (William Baggley, aged 43) on Dungiven Road, Derry.
11. 2 February 1974: An IRA unit fired small arms and six rocket propelled grenades at an RUC outpost near Belcoo, County Fermanagh. The British army returned fire.
4 February 1974: Twelve people were killed in the M62 Coach Bombing, when a bomb exploded on a coach as it was travelling along the M62 motorway at Birkenshaw, England. The dead included eight soldiers, and the wife and two young children of one of the soldiers.
13. 18 February 1974: A British soldier (Allan Brammagh, aged 31) was killed by an IRA booby-trap bomb hidden in a parcel which was left at the side of the road, while on foot-patrol at Moybane, near Crossmaglen, County Armagh.
14. 23 February 1974: A large gun battle between the IRA and the British army occurred near Strabane, County Tyrone. The engagement also involved mortar rounds fired by the IRA. Some 25 traveller caravans were trapped between the warring factions; one caravan was destroyed by a mortar bomb.
15. 24 February 1974: A civilian (Patrick Lynch, aged 23) was found shot dead at Rathlin Drive, Derry. He was killed by the IRA as an alleged informer.
16. 2 March 1974: The IRA shot dead a patrolling RUC officer (Thomas McClinton, aged 28) on Donegall Street, Belfast.
17. 3 March 1974: An IRA landmine exploded and killed a UDR soldier (Robert Moffett, aged 30) at Dunnamore, near Cookstown, County Tyrone.
18. 10 March 1974: Two civilians, Michael McCreesh (aged 15) and Michael Gallagher (aged 18), were killed by an IRA booby-trap bomb hidden in an abandoned car at Dromintee, near Forkill, County Armagh. It was meant for a British foot-patrol. Gallagher died on 14 March 1974.
19. 12 March 1974: A Fine Gael senator, Billy Fox, was kidnapped by the IRA and later found shot dead at Tircooney, near Clones, County Monaghan.
20. 13 March 1974: The IRA shot dead a British soldier (David Farrington, aged 23) at a pedestrian checkpoint on Chapel Lane, Belfast.
21. 15 March 1974: Two IRA volunteers, Patrick McDonald (aged 21) and Kevin Murray (aged 27), were killed when their landmine prematurely exploded on Aughnacloy Road, Dungannon, County Tyrone.
22. 15 March 1974: A civilian (Adam Johnston, aged 34) was killed by an

IRA lorry bomb on Queen Street in Magherafelt, County Londonderry. The warning sent by the IRA had been inadequate.
23. 16 March 1974: IRA snipers shot dead two patrolling British soldiers, Roy Bedford (aged 22) and Philip James (aged 22), at Moybane, near Crossmaglen, County Armagh.
24. 17 March 1974: An IRA sniper shot dead a patrolling RUC officer (Cyril Wilson, aged 37) in Rathmore, Craigavon, County Armagh.
25. 17 March 1974: An IRA sniper shot dead a patrolling British soldier (Michael Ryan, aged 23), on Foyle Road, Brandywell, Derry.
19 March 1974: An off-duty RUC officer (Frederick Robinson, aged 40), was killed by a booby trap bomb attached to his car outside his home, Glenkeen Avenue, Greenisland, County Antrim.
27. 21 March 1974: An IRA sniper shot a patrolling British soldier (James Macklin, aged 28), on Antrim Road, Belfast. He died on 28 March.
28. 23 March 1974: The IRA shot dead a former British soldier from Northern Ireland (Donald Farrell, aged 56), while he was sitting in a stationary car near his home, Mountfield, near Omagh, County Tyrone. He had recently retired.
29. 26 March 1974: A civilian (Joseph Hughes, aged 25), was killed when an IRA car bomb exploded on Springfield Road, Ballymurphy, Belfast. He had been driving past at the time.
30. 31 March 1974, a civilian (Sean McAstocker, aged 28), was found shot dead, Lagan Street, Markets, Belfast. The IRA were responsible.
31. 1 April 1974: It was reported that "small arms fire, mortar bombs and possibly rockets were used" in an attack on a British base in Derry. Two British soldiers were injured.
32. 9 April 1974: The IRA shot dead John Stevenson, a Commanding Officer of the British Army, at his home near Otterburn British Army base, Northumberland, England.
33. 10 April 1974: The IRA shot dead a former UDR soldier (George Saunderson, aged 58), at his workplace, Derrylin Primary School, Derrylin, County Fermanagh.
34. 11 April 1974: A patrolling British soldier (Norman McKenzie, aged 25) was killed by an IRA land mine attack while on mobile patrol, Mullynaburtlan, near Lisnaskea, County Fermanagh.
35. 11 April 1974: A patrolling UDR soldier (David Sinnamon, aged 34), was killed by a remote-controlled bomb, hidden in a derelict house which detonated when an Ulster Defence Regiment foot patrol passed by, Dungannon, County Tyrone.
36. 14 April 1974: The IRA shot dead an undercover British soldier (Anthony Pollen, aged 27), observing a republican commemoration parade at Meenan Square, Bogside, Derry.
37. 16 April 1974: An IRA sniper shot dead an RUC officer (Thomas McCall, aged 34), outside Newtownhamilton RUC base, County Armagh.
38. 18 April 1974: A civilian (Seamus O'Neill, aged 32), was killed when he triggered a booby-trap bomb on his farm, The Loup, near Moneymore, County Derry. It exploded about 8 ft from his tractor as he drove past Saltersland church hall. There had been a small explosion there earlier in the day. It is believed both bombs were planted by the IRA and that the second bomb was for security forces investigating

the first.
39. 20 April 1974: A civilian (James Corbett, aged 20), was shot dead by the IRA as an alleged informer. His body was found by the side of Upper Springfield Road, Hannahstown, Belfast.
40. 22 April 1974: A civilian (Mohammed Khalid, aged 18), who worked for the British Army was shot dead by the IRA in his car at Silverbridge, County Armagh.
41. 1 May 1974: A British outpost came under IRA attack at Crossmaglen, County Armagh. It was hit by three rockets and a 15-minute gun-battle followed. No injuries were reported.
42. 2 May 1974: Up to 40 members from the Provisional IRA East Tyrone Brigade attacked the isolated 6 UDR Deanery base in Clogher, County Tyronewith machine gun and RPG fire resulting in the death of Private Eva Martin, a UDR Greenfinch, the first female UDR soldier to be killed by enemy action.
43. 10 May 1974: The IRA shot dead two patrolling RUC officers, Brian Bell (aged 29) and John Ross (aged 40), on Finaghy Road North, Finaghy, Belfast.
44. 13 May 1974: Two IRA volunteers, Eugene Martin (aged 18) and Sean McKearney (aged 19), were killed when their bomb prematurely exploded at a petrol filling station, Donnydeade, near Dungannon, County Tyrone.

Security Force Strength Northern Ireland 1974 (Open Sources)

By 1974, Northern Ireland was one of the most heavily militarised regions in Western Europe. Two years after the suspension of the Stormont Parliament and in the wake of Bloody Sunday, the British state had settled into a posture of sustained internal security operations under ***Operation Banner****, with force levels remaining close to their historic peak. The* ***British Army*** *maintained an* ***official strength of approximately 21,000 personnel*** *deployed in Northern Ireland during 1974. This figure was frequently cited in parliamentary answers and Ministry of Defence summaries and was generally presented as the total military footprint. In practice, however, this headline number understated the true scale of the deployment, as it primarily reflected infantry battalions and general-duties units engaged in visible security tasks such as patrolling, vehicle checkpoints, border operations, and the guarding of prisons and key infrastructure. This number did not include the Ulster Defence Regiment UDR. The* ***effective military manpower in Northern Ireland in 1974 closer to 27,000–30,000****, before including Intelligence or other Specialists.*

*Beyond these conventional forces, a substantial number of **specialist and covert units** operated alongside, and often independently of, routine Army formations. These elements were rarely disaggregated in public reporting. Rotational detachments of the **Special Air Service (SAS)** were present throughout 1974, typically amounting to several hundred personnel at any given time. Their role centred on covert surveillance, intelligence-led targeting, and ambush operations, particularly in urban and border environments. Although operationally decisive, SAS personnel were often excluded from standard troop counts or treated as a separate category.*

*Military intelligence capacity was also significant. Units such as **14 Intelligence Company**, Field Security sections, and other intelligence detachments collectively accounted for an estimated **1,000 to 1,500 personnel**. These soldiers operated in plain clothes, managed surveillance operations, and worked in close liaison with police intelligence structures. Their presence was largely invisible to the public but fundamental to the security architecture of the period. In addition, **Royal Engineer** units specialising in explosive ordnance disposal and infrastructure protection were heavily engaged due to the scale of bombing activity in 1974, adding several hundred further personnel. The **Army Air Corps**, operating helicopters for troop movement, surveillance, and casualty evacuation, also contributed several hundred troops based in-theatre.*

*When these specialist, intelligence, engineering, and aviation elements are fully accounted for, the **effective British Army presence in Northern Ireland during 1974 rises to approximately 27,000–30,000 personnel**, rather than the commonly quoted 21,000.*

*Alongside the military, the **Royal Ulster Constabulary** constituted the second pillar of the security system. In 1974 the RUC had an **established strength of roughly 8,500 officers**. This figure included uniformed policing, criminal investigation departments, and support units, but, as with the Army, it concealed significant internal differentiation. The force was operating in a highly abnormal policing environment, with routine law enforcement subordinated to counter-terrorist and public-order priorities.*

*Within the RUC, **Special Branch** had grown into a dominant component of operational decision-making. Estimated at **approximately 1,000 to 1,200 officers**, Special Branch controlled intelligence collection, agent handling, and liaison with the Army and British intelligence agencies. While formally part of the overall RUC establishment, its strength and influence were seldom publicly delineated. In addition, reserve and auxiliary elements—although part-time—provided several hundred further personnel who could be mobilised rapidly during periods of crisis, strikes, or widespread disorder.*

*Taken together, the **effective operational strength of the RUC in 1974 can be assessed at approximately 8,500 to 9,000 personnel**.*
This figures produced an extraordinary security-to-population ratio—approaching one security force member for every fifty civilians—and reflects a system that relied heavily on intelligence dominance, military support to policing, and discretionary enforcement rather than conventional civilian policing norms.
This numerical reality is critical context for understanding events of 1974, including loyalist mobilisation, the Ulster Workers' Council strike, selective enforcement decisions, and subsequent claims regarding state capacity or incapacity in responding to major acts of violence.

British Army Bomb Intelligence and Weapons Intelligence Function 1972 -1977

Lieutenant Colonel Nigel Wylde (Reference)

The British Army Bomb Intelligence20 (BIT) organisation was set up in early 1974. In about 1976 it changed its title to Weapons Intelligence. In 1974 there were three Bomb Intelligence Units supporting each of the three Brigades in Northern Ireland 39 Brigade in Lisburn, 8 Brigade in Londonderry and 3 Brigade in Portadown). They were commanded and controlled by their own Brigade Headquarters. Technical co-ordination throughout Northern Ireland was undertaken by the Chief Ammunition Technical Officer (CATO) a Lieutenant Colonel on the staff of Headquarters Northern Ireland. In 1974 their sole role was to deal with the threat posed by terrorist bombings.
Over the next two years their role expanded to include all types of terrorist weapons and equipment. Co-ordination across Northern Ireland was then transferred from the very part time control of the CATO to a full time Grade 2 Staff Officer (a Major) on the Intelligence staff of Headquarters Northern Ireland.
A Captain who had undertaken a recent (within 12 months) tour of duty as the ATO in the Brigade Area commanded the section in that area. Soldiers from the Royal Army Ordnance Corps, Royal Military Police and the Intelligence Corps supported him.

Prior to the establishment of the BIT organisation all information on bombs had been passed to the Data Reference Centre of the RUC located at Sprucefield outside Lisburn. From 1974 onwards information was still passed to Sprucefield, but the BIT staff would collate information immediately on incidents.

Sources of Information. Information was available from two prime areas to the British Army in 1974:

Covert sources and Open sources

Covert Sources of information. The following sources of covert information were available in 1974: Covert surveillance units and operations. The Army was able to deploy specially trained undercover teams to run long-term covert surveillance operations. Until 1974, this unit was called the Mobile Reconnaissance Force (MRF).

Human intelligence, agents and informers. Human intelligence sources (technically called "HUMINT") have been of critical importance since the beginning of the Troubles. The main human intelligence organisation in the province was and is the Special Branch of the RUC. However, agents were and are also run by the Army (at different levels), by the Secret Intelligence Service, (SIS also known as MI6), and by the Security Service (commonly called MI5). In 1974 MI6 ran operations in the Republic of lreland.

SIGINT and ELINT: The most sensitive sort of surveillance is Electronic Intelligence (or ELINT) and Signals Intelligence (or SIGINT). SIGINT and ELINT are specialised technical activities concerned with deriving intelligence from intercepting radio or communications signals. SIGINT is primarily organised by Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ), which is Britain's largest intelligence agency. In the context of Northern Ireland, in 1974 ELINT was almost entirely concerned with detecting and countering radio-controlled bombs (known technically as Remotely Controlled Improvised Explosive Devices, or RCIEDs). Since the early 1970s, the IRA has used radio-controlled bombs. These were at first made from model aircraft control systems. Communications interception activities, including SIGINT and telephone tapping, are another major source of intelligence on terrorist activities. The methods and results are highly sensitive and are not used in Court. They are however a valuable source of information.

TECHINT. Technical intelligence or TECHINT is the process of determining the function of equipment or devices and the capability of people to make them. TECHINT in Northern Ireland is often reliant on the speedy analysis of the forensic evidence. In the Dublin Monaghan bombings for instance the presence of ammonium nitrate prilles and the use of the beer keg would have indicated immediately where to target further intelligence collection resources.

Shadow of Kitson in Northern Ireland

By the time of Sunningdale and its collapse, the British Army in Northern Ireland was no longer operating as a conventional peacekeeping force. Its institutional mindset had evolved through successive counter-insurgency campaigns, most notably in Kenya, Malaya, and Cyprus, and by the early 1970s that experience had hardened into a distinct philosophy: insurgencies were not defeated by force alone, but by **manipulating, fragmenting, and penetrating hostile networks** while controlling the political environment in which they operated.

No single figure embodied that approach more clearly than **Frank Kitson**. Although Kitson did not command forces in Northern Ireland during the Sunningdale period, his intellectual influence was already embedded within British military doctrine and officer education. His books Low Intensity Operations (1971) and earlier writings were widely read within the Army and formed part of the conceptual background against which Northern Ireland was understood.

Kitson's core proposition was that modern insurgencies were **political wars disguised as security problems**. The enemy, in his view, was not merely an armed organisation but a **networked movement** drawing strength from ambiguity, popular support, and moral legitimacy. Counter-insurgency, therefore, required more than neutralisation; it required **dislocation**, **confusion**, and **control of narrative space**.

Central to that philosophy was the use of **counter-gangs**: units composed of turned insurgents, informers, or pseudo-gangs operating in the style of the enemy to penetrate and disrupt insurgent structures. Kitson regarded such methods as effective precisely because they

blurred lines—between combatant and civilian, between loyalist and insurgent, between crime and politics. He argued that ambiguity favoured the state, provided it retained strategic control.

There is no documentary evidence that the British Army ever formally adopted a "counter-gang policy" in Northern Ireland under that name. However, **there is ample record that Kitson's thinking shaped attitudes**, especially among senior officers and intelligence planners. British military and security papers from the period consistently frame the conflict not as a conventional war, but as a **low-intensity struggle for control**, in which intelligence dominance and psychological effect were prioritised over kinetic outcomes.
This mindset manifested itself in several observable ways.

First, the Army and associated intelligence agencies placed extraordinary emphasis on **agent handling, penetration, and information control**. The cultivation of informers within republican and loyalist paramilitary organisations was not incidental; it was regarded as decisive. Success was measured less in arrests or convictions than in **situational awareness and leverage**. This aligns closely with Kitson's insistence that winning meant controlling the enemy's options rather than eliminating every adversary.

Second, there was a persistent institutional tolerance for **ambiguity in loyalist violence**, particularly when such violence appeared to fragment republican cohesion or apply pressure outside direct state action. This does not require a claim of formal policy. Rather, it reflects a **hierarchy of threat perception** within military thinking. Republican insurgency was treated as the strategic enemy; loyalist violence, while officially condemned, was often viewed through a secondary lens—dangerous, but sometimes tactically useful in shaping the environment.
It is in this context that later allegations of collusion gained plausibility. Kitson's philosophy did not advocate illegality per se, but it did normalise the idea that **indirect methods and morally uncomfortable alliances** were sometimes necessary in low-intensity conflict. Once such thinking is internalised, the boundary between manipulation and complicity becomes dangerously thin.

Third, British military attitudes during the Sunningdale period reveal a deep reluctance to **enforce political outcomes through force against the unionist population**. When the

Ulster Workers' Council strike paralysed Northern Ireland, the Army possessed the capability to restore essential services. The decision not to do so reflected not incapacity, but judgement. ***Within a Kitsonian framework, confronting mass loyalist resistance risked transforming a manageable insurgency into a broader legitimacy crisis. Avoidance of that outcome took precedence over defending the political settlement.***

This same mindset helps explain the reaction to the alleged IRA "Doomsday" documents. Their disclosure suggests genuine alarm within the security establishment. Yet once the situation was framed as approaching systemic breakdown, the priority shifted decisively towards **containment** rather than enforcement. In such a framework, tolerating instability—even severe instability—can be rationalised if it avoids a wider conflagration.

There are also retrospective records that illuminate this culture. Testimony from former intelligence officers and soldiers in later inquiries and memoirs repeatedly emphasises that Northern Ireland was understood internally as a **long game**. Short-term moral or political cost was accepted if it was believed to preserve strategic advantage. That worldview is entirely consistent with Kitson's teaching, even where his name is not invoked.

It is important to be precise. There is no known document in which a British general states that Kitson's counter-gang philosophy should be applied in Northern Ireland in the form used in Kenya. There is, however, a substantial record demonstrating that the **assumptions underlying that philosophy—network disruption, psychological dominance, exploitation of internal enemies, and tolerance for ambiguity—were deeply embedded** in British military thinking during the period.

In that sense, Kitson's influence was cultural rather than programmatic. His ideas provided a **conceptual licence**: a way of thinking that made certain choices appear prudent, others reckless, and some morally uncomfortable options acceptable. Once that licence existed, it shaped behaviour even without explicit orders.

Historically, this matters because it helps explain how a situation could arise in which:

- a political settlement was allowed to collapse rather than be enforced,
- loyalist mobilisation was tolerated despite its illegality,
- intelligence manipulation became inseparable from political signalling,
- and the boundary between control and loss of control blurred catastrophically.

Kitson did not design Northern Ireland policy. But his philosophy helps explain the **attitudes of those who did**—and why, at moments of crisis such as May 1974, the British military response favoured **containment through ambiguity** over authority through enforcement.

Paramilitary Strength in Northern Ireland, 1974 – (Open Sources)

*By 1974, the conflict in Northern Ireland had entered a phase in which **paramilitary organisations on both sides were numerically substantial, operationally experienced, and deeply embedded in their respective communities**, yet still vastly outnumbered by the combined forces of the state. The year marked a critical juncture: the collapse of the Sunningdale power-sharing experiment, the Ulster Workers' Council strike, and a sharp escalation in loyalist violence, including the Dublin and Monaghan bombings.*

*The **Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA)** was, by 1974, the largest and most sophisticated non-state armed group operating in Northern Ireland. British Army and RUC intelligence assessments at the time consistently estimated the PIRA's **active strength at between 1,200 and 1,500 volunteers**. These were individuals available for operational deployment, including bombing teams, gun units, intelligence officers, and logisticians. In addition to this active cadre, the organisation was supported by a **much larger pool of auxiliaries and sympathisers**, often estimated at several thousand, who provided safe houses, transport, intelligence, fundraising, and weapons storage.*

*Structurally, the PIRA had largely transitioned by this period from the earlier battalion model to a **cell-based Active Service Unit (ASU) system**, designed to reduce penetration by security forces. This organisational evolution meant that relatively modest numbers could generate a high operational tempo. The PIRA in 1974 possessed a significant explosives capability, access to automatic weapons, and a command structure capable of coordinating sustained campaigns in Belfast, Derry, border areas, and in England. While attrition through arrest and internment had affected the movement, it had not critically degraded its operational capacity.*

*On the loyalist side, the **Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF)** had re-emerged as a major force following its partial eclipse in the late 1960s. By 1974, security estimates placed the UVF's **active operational strength at approximately 800 to 1,000 members**. This figure refers to individuals involved directly in violence, intelligence gathering, and weapons handling, rather than the broader membership rolls often cited by the organisation itself.*

The UVF's structure was less centralised and less disciplined than that of the PIRA, but it had nonetheless developed a ***lethal capacity for coordinated attacks****, particularly against civilians. Its strength in 1974 was amplified by access to local intelligence, collusion by individual members of the security forces (as later established in multiple inquiries), and a permissive environment during periods of loyalist mass mobilisation. The UVF was especially active in Belfast and parts of Mid-Ulster, and its ability to operate across the border into the Republic of Ireland, despite the density of security forces, is a notable feature of this period.*

The ***Ulster Defence Association (UDA)*** *represented a different phenomenon. In numerical terms, it was* ***by far the largest paramilitary organisation in Northern Ireland in 1974****, though also the least cohesive. Contemporary intelligence estimates suggest that the UDA had* ***between 15,000 and 20,000 registered members*** *at its peak in the mid-1970s. However, this figure is potentially misleading if taken at face value.*

Only a ***small proportion of the UDA's membership was actively involved in violence****. Security assessments typically estimated that* ***1,000 to 1,500 members*** *were engaged in operational roles such as shootings, bombings, weapons procurement, and intimidation. The remainder functioned as neighbourhood patrols, protest organisers, strike enforcers, or passive affiliates. In 1974, the UDA was a central organisational backbone of the* ***Ulster Workers' Council strike****, providing manpower for roadblocks, intimidation, and enforcement, even where it was not directly involved in lethal attacks. (UDA was not a Proscribed Organisation)*

The asymmetry between numbers and lethality is striking. While the UDA dwarfed both the PIRA and the UVF in nominal membership, it was the ***smaller, more clandestine elements within loyalism—particularly the UVF and associated units—that delivered the most strategically consequential acts of violence*** *in 1974.*

Taken together, the ***active paramilitary landscape in 1974*** *can be summarised as follows: approximately* ***1,200–1,500 Provisional IRA volunteers****,* ***800–1,000 UVF operatives****, and* ***1,000–1,500 violent actors within a much larger UDA structure****. These forces operated in an environment saturated by state security personnel, yet retained the capacity to plan, execute, and conceal major operations.*

This numerical comparison underscores a central reality of the conflict: ***the outcome of events in 1974 cannot be explained by paramilitary strength alone****, but must be understood through the interaction of numbers, intelligence control, enforcement discretion, political decision-making, and, in certain cases, the selective absence of intervention.*

Strength of the Garda Síochána and Irish Defence Forces, 1974

In 1974, the Republic of Ireland confronted a severe and unprecedented security challenge, yet the ***numerical strength of its primary policing body was significantly smaller than is sometimes assumed in retrospective commentary****. Contemporary parliamentary records provide a clear and authoritative baseline.*

According to a ***Parliamentary Reply by the Minister for Justice in March 1974****, the* ***Garda Síochána*** *had a* ***total strength of 7,526 members on 14 March 1973****, rising modestly to* ***7,906 members by 31 March 1974****, the latest date for which complete figures were available at that time. These numbers represent the entire sworn establishment of the force nationwide, encompassing uniformed gardaí, detectives, and all specialist branches.*

This correction is not merely technical; it materially alters any assessment of state capacity. A force of fewer than ***8,000 gardaí****, dispersed across the full territorial and population responsibilities of the Republic, stood in stark contrast to the security density in Northern Ireland during the same period. Unlike the RUC, the Garda Síochána was not structured as a counter-insurgency police force. It remained a predominantly* ***unarmed civilian service****, with routine policing obligations that severely limited the proportion of personnel available for counterterrorist or emergency response duties.*

Within this already modest establishment, ***Special Branch capacity was extremely limited****, generally assessed at* ***approximately 300 officers or fewer****. These officers carried responsibility for intelligence on republican and loyalist paramilitaries, cross-border liaison, and direct advisory input to government. There was no large-scale, embedded intelligence apparatus comparable to that operating north of the border, nor was there a layered system of covert units supporting routine policing.*

The ***Irish Defence Forces****, by contrast, had a broadly comparable numerical establishment. In 1974, total Defence Forces strength stood at approximately* ***10,500 to 11,500 personnel****, including the Army, Air Corps, and Naval Service. However, only a* ***fraction of this force was committed to internal security or Aid to the Civil Power*** *tasks. The Army's primary orientation remained territorial defence and overseas peacekeeping, while specialist capabilities—intelligence, surveillance, explosive ordnance disposal, and rapid armed response—were limited in scale and centralised.*

When combined, the ***total uniformed security manpower of the Irish state in 1974 amounted to roughly 18,500 to 19,500 personnel****. Crucially, this figure does not represent an integrated security system. There was* ***no joint Garda–military operational command****, no routine armed patrol environment, and no pervasive intelligence-led enforcement model. The Garda Síochána and Defence Forces operated in parallel, not as a fused counter-terrorism structure.*

This corrected numerical reality sharpens the analytical picture considerably. In 1974, the Republic was attempting to manage spillover from a fully militarised conflict with ***a small, thinly stretched police service and a modest defence force****, both operating under tight legal, constitutional, and political constraints. Any assessment of capacity, preparedness, or alleged omission must therefore begin with the recognition that the* ***Irish state's security apparatus was numerically and structurally limited****, and fundamentally different in character from that deployed in Northern Ireland.*

Dublin's Intelligence Deficit – Finlay Report

Following the helicopter escape by three leading members of the Provision IRA from Mountjoy prison on the 31 October 1973, the government ordered a review of all the security features relevant in the state. This review was undertaken by a small team under Mr Justice T. A. Finlay. The task was undertaken with a significant degree of expedition and the first reports, because there were several reports that were submitted in February of 1974.

One of the key areas that Judge Finlay looked at was an assessment of the security threats to the State and he divided the threats to the state under three separate headings or at least three separate groupings.

In his opinion and that of his group, the long-term danger to the security of the institutions of the state came from the activities of the Official IRA and from the political groups associated with it.

Secondly, he looked at the Provisional IRA and he said the information before him suggests that the present official policy of the Provisional IRA is not to engage in any form of armed conflict with the security forces of the Republic, nor to engage in militant action within the Republic.

The fact that the helicopter escape was organised from Mountjoy prison and it freed three leading Provisionals and there was over a hundred provisional prisoners in that jail at the time, does not seem to have figured in the threat assessment relative to the Republic.

He went on to state that the third major threat to the internal security of the state exists from what he described as extreme Protestant militant groups in Northern Ireland. He said, *I am satisfied that the extent of knowledge of the Garda and Army Intelligence regarding the* ***identity, strength and present intentions of these groups is still significantly less*** *than the equivalent knowledge which they have concerning both branches of the IRA.*

Also summarising that conclusion that indicating whatever the issues were in relation to gathering intelligence on the two branches of the IRA, he said these problems are tremendously intensified however in the case of militant Protestant groups who have no association at all with the Republic of Ireland as far as their personnel is concerned.

There would appear furthermore to be a greater reluctance on the part of the security forces in Northern Ireland to freely communicate information regarding these groups than there is regarding activities of the IRA in Northern Ireland.

With regard to the threat presented to the state from this type of Protestant militant action, it can only at present be said in a general way that the logical and obvious purpose of these groups is to engage in some form of militant action either against the newly formed executive in Northern Ireland or against the minority nationalist population in Northern Ireland and that the logistical situation would appear to deter them from the wide scale or significant militant action south of the border.

Changes in the political situation in Northern Ireland and again the desire to bring pressure on the government of the Republic in relation to any agitation could alter this significantly and drastically. These words were strangely prophetic in the short few months before the 17th of May. Therefore it will be seen that there was little INTELLIGENCE knowledge of the activities of the Loyalists or Protestant groups in Dublin. The individual subversive organisations in the North were not named.

Doomsday Plot – Plan or Concept

Public Announcement of Doomsday Plot before Harold Wilson confirmed the Plot.

Any assessment of the Dublin and Monaghan bombings must begin with the recognition that they occurred at a moment of extreme political compression. By mid-May 1974, the Sunningdale settlement was no longer merely fragile; it was visibly failing. Authority was contested, narratives of existential threat were ascendant, and the British state appeared uncertain about its willingness to enforce constitutional outcomes. It was into this volatile environment that the alleged IRA "Doomsday Plot" was publicly introduced.
From a political–security perspective, the disclosure of the plot altered the atmosphere in three critical ways: **it reframed perceptions of imminence, it recalibrated loyalist threat assessment, and it constrained state responses at precisely the moment when decisive intervention might otherwise have been possible.**

Crucial Timing

The bombings occurred **one week into the Ulster Workers' Council strike**, at the precise moment when the British government was deciding whether to confront or accommodate loyalist defiance. The attacks dramatically raised the stakes, widened the conflict geographically, and made any forceful suppression of loyalist action politically and psychologically more complex. In that sense, the bombings may have accelerated the collapse of Sunningdale by making restoration of order appear riskier than acquiescence.
Finally, the Doomsday Plot episode and the bombings together contributed to a **narrative cascade** in which fear displaced analysis. Once mass civilian casualties had occurred in Dublin and Monaghan, attention shifted from constitutional process to emergency response, from accountability to stabilisation. The space for political rescue of Sunningdale effectively disappeared.
In speculative summary, the alleged IRA Doomsday Plot's disclosure plausibly altered the strategic psychology of the period. It intensified loyalist threat perception, legitimised pre-emptive logic, constrained state decisiveness, and created an atmosphere in which a spectacular act of violence could be conceived as both necessary and effective. The bombings, in turn, sealed the fate of a political settlement already weakened by mistrust and

miscalculation. **Unproven intelligence narratives**, once publicly deployed, can reshape behaviour and outcomes—sometimes with catastrophic consequences far beyond their original purpose.

On 10 May 1974, two Provisional IRA members —Brendan Hughes, known as "The Dark", and Denis Loughlin—were arrested during a raid at a house in Myrtleville Park, Malone Road, Belfast. The operation was conducted by the security forces, including the British Army, the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC), and Special Branch. During this action, it was alleged that crucial intelligence was recovered, suggesting that the Provisional IRA had developed a plan, often referred to as a "Doomsday plan".

Rush to Publicity Saturday May 11

The *Belfast News Letter* published a concise article detailing the arrest of Brendan Hughes and the recovery of highly sensitive Provisional IRA documents. Alongside these documents, a list of IRA members operating within Belfast and the locations of several arms dumps was reportedly seized. The security forces also discovered an array of modern firearms, ammunition, bomb-making equipment, as well as various maps and operational plans. Speculation within the report suggested that Denis Loughlin was the other IRA member apprehended during the operation.
The article featured a photograph of the house in Myrtleville Park, located off the Malone Road, where the arrests took place. This area was characterised as the "stockbroker belt", indicating its affluent status. It was further noted that Hughes, in an apparent attempt to maintain his cover, was allegedly dressed in a three-piece pinstripe suit and presenting himself as a businessman at the time of his arrest.

On Monday, the 13 May, two significant events took place in relation to press announcements. One was a briefing by the army and police in Belfast and the second, or probably simultaneously, was an announcement by the British Prime Minister in London relative to the same topic of the arrest of the two individuals and the information that were obtained at that stage.

Two conflicting narratives arose one from the Prime Minister and one from the Belfast Press Conference as reported the following day.

The Prime Ministers announcement was framed in precise language.

Mr. Harold Wilson, speaking in the House of Commons yesterday afternoon, said the documents revealed a specific and calculated plan on the part of the IRA by means of ruthless and indiscriminate violence to ferment inter-sectarian hatred in a degree of case, with the object of enabling the IRA to achieve a position in which they could proceed to occupy and control certain pre-designated and densely populated areas in the city of Belfast and its suburbs.

The plan, said Mr. Wilson, shows a deliberate intention to manipulate the emotions of large sections of the people by inflicting violence and hardship on them, in the hope of creating a situation in which the IRA could present themselves as the protectors of the Catholic population. In Belfast, copies of the document, along with an associated map, were distributed to members of the press.

Arising from the same set of circumstances and at the press conference in Belfast, the Belfast Newsletter said this was ***an IRA plan for civil war*** and talking about the targets in different, it says the Premier ***reveals IRA chaos plan*** and another subheading says ***a bloodbath planned by the Provos.***

The Cork Examiner's report was balanced and was clearer on the issues raised at the Belfast press conference.

It reported that the conference was addressed by an anonymous representative of both Army Intelligence and the RUC Special Branch, the press officers of both organisations and a representative from the Northern Ireland Office of the British Governments.

The conference was confused and garbled with contradictory statements being made by all.

In Belfast, copies of a seized document, along with an associated map, were distributed to members of the press.

The document was undated, but security forces said the documents were new in our opinion, and the plans were in a reasonably advanced stage.

The document ***was a transcript of a handwritten document*** seized in the recent security swoop.

Page 1 of the document says the areas on the accompanying map, coloured green and red, are to be taken and held, and that in the event of an area not being held, it is to be destroyed by fire.

Page 2, in a statement to the civilian population, which begins, ***IN THE EMERGENCY WHICH HAS BEEN FORCED UPON US,*** the IRA has had no alternative but to employ its full resources in the defence of its people, **in the face of the armed offensive against the Catholic working class.**

When *asked exactly what the, quote,* ***EMERGENCY FORCED UPON US****, unquote, referred to, contradictory replies emerged.*

REPLY: *said that the IRA would first have placed bombs in catholic areas to stir up the catholic population.*

REPLY: *Then amended to the IRA first putting bombs in protestant areas to trigger off a loyalist attack to which the IRA would respond by defensive action involving the civilian population and both wings of the IRA, (who at present detest each other).*

REPLY: *then it was stated that the document was to trigger action which would incense the protestant population who would then attack catholic areas, hence creating a need for defensive action and putting the IRA in the role of heroes of the people.*

Although the document referred to, **contingency plans and an emergency, they (army etc) were adamant that it did not refer to contingency plans in the event of a loyalist attack.** The security forces consistently maintained that the document revealed plans for an **offensive** rather than a **defensive action** by the Provos.

Influencing Dublin's Political Agenda Monday 13 May 1974

It was also learned by the Examiner that that copies of the document, were being brought to Dublin.

The Examiner's political correspondent wrote,

I learned from British sources in Dublin last night that under the direction of Mr Wilson, copies of the document and maps found in the Provo headquarters were brought to Dublin yesterday by the Northern Secretary, Mr Rees. They were later made, quote, available by the British Ambassador in Dublin, Sir Arthur Galsworthy, to the Taoiseach, Mr Cosgrave, during a meeting in government buildings.

This is done purely as a matter of courtesy, it was explained. The documents were also, quote, briefly touched upon, unquote, at the meeting between the Northern Secretary and Dr

Fitzgerald. It seems likely that Mr Rees and the Taoiseach would have some discussion about the documents when the Northern Secretary pays a courtesy visit to Mr Cosgrave at government buildings later today, that's on Tuesday the 14th of May.

There is little doubt the views of the British Prime Minister were conveyed in quite specific terms to Dublin by Merlyn Rees Secretary of State on Monday 13 May 1974. These views were informed by the official British Political position "*The Doomsday Plan was real" and no doubt the views of Mr. Faulkener's loss of confidence animated this discussion.*

*The documents revealed a **specific and calculated plan on the part of the IRA** by means of ruthless and indiscriminate violence to ferment inter-sectarian hatred in a degree of case, with the object of enabling the IRA to achieve a position in which they could proceed to occupy and control certain pre-designated and densely populated areas in the city of Belfast and its suburbs.*

This claim of a ***specific and calculated plan on the part of the IRA*** was not supported by factual evidence and is widely at variance at the information shared at the Belfast Press Conference which alleges that ***The conference was confused and garbled with contradictory statements being made by all.(Examiner)***

No charges laid in relation to the Doomsday plot.

The two men arrested at Myrtleville Park , were subsequently charged not with involvement in the plot, but rather with possession of an arsenal of weapons. The charges included four rifles, a submachine gun, two pistols, approximately 3,600 rounds of ammunition, as well as explosives and detonators. Notably, these charges were not addressed until the following year, indicating a significant delay in the legal process. These charges were preferred on the 28 January 1975

Undisputable Conclusions

Given the extremely limited timeframe in which events unfolded, it must be recognised that conducting a thorough and professional risk assessment was not feasible. As such, officials and investigators could not have reasonably expected to reach a conclusive judgement regarding the exact purpose of the handwritten PIRA document. The ambiguity lay in whether the document outlined preparations to defend against an anticipated assault or set out plans for carrying out an offensive act.

The PIRA had been involved in a guerilla type hit and run conflict in Northern Ireland. It was estimated that their "fighting strength" was in the region of 1200 to 1500 with wide support in republican areas from the population. Approximately **1,580–1,760 PIRA prisoners** were held across detention, remand, and sentence. Additionally they recognised that their Bloody Friday bombing attacks in Belfast had been an unmitigated disaster for them.

By contrast the UK forces combined came to 34,000 members and they also had strong support from sections of the Loyalist population including the UDA.

In simple terms the PIRA did not have the numeric capacity to conduct open military conflict on a face-to-face basis apart from episodic attacks.

In situations involving credible intelligence of an imminent threat, the standard protocol for the security services, working in tandem with the government, is to conduct a thorough evaluation of the potential danger. This begins with a careful assessment of the information received, followed by the adoption of measured, pre-emptive actions designed initially to contain the threat and, ultimately, to eliminate it altogether.

Drawing on established experience, this process necessitates a period of intensified security operations. The main objective during this phase is to identify and isolate the key components and individuals involved in the conspiracy. Such a systematic approach not only helps in neutralising the immediate risk but also lays the groundwork for subsequent criminal prosecutions against those implicated in plotting or executing the threat.

At the appropriate juncture, and after the main strands of the conspiracy have been disrupted, full disclosure to both the public and Parliament would typically follow. This ensures accountability and transparency, reinforcing public trust in the authorities' handling of the situation.

At that stage, Northern Ireland and Belfast were in a febrile state, as the power-sharing executive was meeting to consider the various aspects of the Sunningdale Agreement. One of the principal elements under discussion was the proposed Council of Ireland, which faced staunch opposition from unions and loyalist interests who were entirely against it.

Public Disclosure – Lighting the Fuse for Bombing

The decision to make public the findings and arrests related to the so-called Doomsday Plan had an immediate and dramatic effect, comparable to igniting a fuse on an already primed explosive device. This disclosure did not merely raise tensions in an already volatile environment; it directly precipitated further violence. Both in a literal sense, through the tragic events that unfolded, and in a metaphorical sense, by destabilising the political atmosphere, the public announcement set in motion the catastrophic events of 17 May in Dublin and Monaghan.

It was apparent that the plan to bomb Dublin and Monaghan had not arisen spontaneously but had been under consideration for a significant period. The government's announcement of the Doomsday Plan served as the catalyst that moved the perpetrators from preparation to action. Thus, the sequence of public revelations and consequent developments underscored the peril inherent in premature or ill-considered disclosure, which, in this instance, contributed to the deadly outcome.

Merlyn Rees Removed the UVF and Sinn Fein from the Banned List

During this turbulent period, Merlyn Rees held the position of Secretary of State for Northern Ireland. On 12 May, Rees took a significant step by issuing a statutory instrument that formally removed the Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF) from the list of proscribed organisations. At the same time, Sinn Féin was also deprescribed, meaning both groups were no longer officially banned. The decision to deprescribe the UVF represented a marked change in the government’s approach to such organisations, signalling a pivotal shift in official policy towards these entities.

Belfast Media Reaction to the Failure of Sunningdale (May–June 1974)

When the Sunningdale Agreement collapsed in May 1974, the Belfast media did not treat its failure as a constitutional rupture or a defeat of democratic process. Instead, **the dominant framing presented the collapse as an unfortunate but understandable outcome of political reality**, shaped by unionist opposition and rendered inevitable by events on the ground. In doing so, the media largely **normalised the destruction of the Agreement** and muted scrutiny of how, and by whom, that destruction had been engineered.

In the immediate aftermath of the Ulster Workers' Council strike, Belfast newspapers and broadcasters focused heavily on **practical consequences rather than constitutional implications**. Headlines and lead stories emphasised power cuts, shortages, economic disruption, and public hardship. This framing subtly displaced responsibility: attention was directed away from the political objective of the strike—overturning a democratically endorsed settlement—and toward the inconveniences and fatigue experienced by the population. The strike was increasingly described as a crisis that had "run its course," rather than as a coercive intervention that had succeeded.

The **Belfast Telegraph** adopted a tone of weary resignation. Editorials and commentary pieces acknowledged regret at the collapse of power-sharing but consistently framed Sunningdale as having **failed to command sufficient consent**, particularly within the unionist community. The question of whether consent had been *overridden* by intimidation and paramilitary enforcement was rarely explored in depth. Instead, the emphasis fell on political miscalculation, haste, and the supposed fragility of the Agreement's design. Responsibility was diffused across all actors—London, Dublin, the Executive, and the communities—thereby avoiding a sharp focus on the agency of those who had deliberately sought to bring the institutions down.

The **News Letter** treated the collapse more assertively. Its coverage presented the fall of Sunningdale as a **vindication of unionist resistance**. The strike was framed as evidence of popular will, and the Agreement's demise as proof that it had been imposed without legitimacy. Commentary celebrated the restoration of what was described as constitutional reality, with little reflection on the precedent set by extra-parliamentary pressure backed by paramilitary organisation. In this telling, Sunningdale did not collapse because it was overthrown, but because it was intrinsically flawed.

By contrast, the **Irish News** treated the failure of Sunningdale as a profound setback. Its coverage highlighted the role of coercion, intimidation, and the tolerance shown toward loyalist mobilisation. The collapse was framed as a defeat not merely for power-sharing but for the rule of law itself. However, as with its coverage before the strike, this interpretation remained largely confined to a nationalist readership and did not shape the dominant Belfast narrative.

Broadcast media, particularly **BBC Northern Ireland**, moved quickly to a tone of closure. Reports stressed the need for stability, order, and a return to normality. The end of the Executive was treated as the conclusion of a failed experiment rather than the interruption of a democratic process by organised

pressure. While the BBC continued to reference violence and intimidation, it did so largely as background context rather than as the central explanatory factor. The political lesson implied by this coverage was pragmatic rather than normative: that settlements must reflect what can be sustained, not necessarily what is democratically agreed.

Across the Belfast media, retrospective **analysis of the collapse was notably restrained**. There was limited sustained examination of:

- the role of paramilitary enforcement in the strike,
- the failure of the state to intervene decisively,
- or the implications of allowing unelected actors to veto constitutional arrangements.

Instead, the dominant narrative portrayed Sunningdale as an **overambitious compromise**, out of step with political realities, whose failure—while regrettable—was ultimately explicable.

The cumulative effect of this treatment was to **depoliticise the collapse**. By framing Sunningdale's failure as a matter of misjudgement or inevitability rather than coercion and choice, the Belfast media helped to insulate key actors from accountability and to normalise the notion that constitutional change in Northern Ireland required the acquiescence of the most mobilised—and potentially violent—opponents.

In sum, the Belfast media did not mourn the fall of Sunningdale as a democratic defeat. It largely **absorbed and rationalised the outcome**, reinforcing a lesson that would echo in later peace processes: that political settlements could survive only if those capable of disruption chose not to destroy them.

Irish Government Views on the British Failure to Use the Army Against the UWC (1974)

What is known of the Irish Government's view in 1974 regarding the British decision **not** to confront the Ulster Workers' Council (UWC) strike with military force points to a position of **private frustration, guarded criticism, and strategic resignation**, rather than public confrontation. Dublin understood clearly that the collapse of Sunningdale was not inevitable in a security sense, but it also recognised that **the decisive choices lay in London**, not in Merrion Street.

From the Irish Government's perspective, the UWC strike was never regarded as a conventional industrial dispute. It was understood, from an early stage, as a **political and security operation**, enforced by loyalist paramilitaries and sustained by intimidation, roadblocks, and the selective tolerance of illegality. Senior officials and ministers in Dublin were acutely aware that, in purely operational terms, the British

Army possessed **overwhelming capacity** to dismantle the strike had the political decision been taken to do so. This was not a question of manpower or capability, but of **will and risk tolerance**.

Privately, Irish officials regarded the British response as **extraordinarily permissive**. The contrast with earlier confrontations was stark. The British Army had shown itself willing to use force against nationalist areas, civil rights demonstrators, and republican paramilitaries. That it now declined to act decisively against loyalist mass mobilisation was noted in Dublin as a **profound asymmetry**, even if rarely articulated in public language. Within the Department of Foreign Affairs and at cabinet level, there was an understanding that London had chosen **containment over confrontation**, prioritising the avoidance of a direct clash with the unionist population over the preservation of the power-sharing Executive.

The Irish Government's public posture, however, was markedly restrained. Ministers continued to express formal support for Sunningdale and regret at its collapse, but they **avoided direct accusations** that the British state had failed to uphold its own authority. This restraint was deliberate. Dublin was deeply conscious of its limited leverage and of the fragility of Anglo-Irish relations at a moment of extreme tension, only days after the Dublin and Monaghan bombings. To accuse Britain openly of acquiescing in the overthrow of Sunningdale by loyalist pressure would have risked a diplomatic rupture without any realistic prospect of altering outcomes on the ground.

At the same time, Irish officials were under no illusion about what the British decision implied. The failure to deploy the Army decisively against the UWC was interpreted as a **political judgement that unionist consent was a veto**—even where that consent was expressed through coercion rather than democratic process. In Dublin's internal assessments, this raised troubling questions about the durability of any future settlement that relied on British guarantees alone. The lesson drawn was not merely that Sunningdale had failed, but that **British policy would not impose a settlement on unionism at the point of force**, regardless of prior commitments.

There was also a secondary, more pragmatic reading within the Irish system. Some officials accepted that a direct military confrontation with the UWC risked widespread violence, potential mutiny within locally recruited forces, and an uncontrollable escalation. From this perspective, the British decision was seen as **risk-averse rather than collusive**—a choice to sacrifice an institution to prevent a wider security collapse.

Even those who held this view, however, recognised that the consequence was to **reward extra-parliamentary pressure** and to fatally weaken confidence in the Agreement.

In the aftermath of Sunningdale's collapse, Irish Government thinking shifted subtly but decisively. There was a growing acceptance that future progress would require:

- deeper institutionalised involvement by Dublin,
- clearer international anchoring,
- and mechanisms that reduced the scope for unilateral veto through mobilisation.

This reassessment would later inform Ireland's approach to Anglo-Irish cooperation in the 1980s and beyond. The memory of 1974—of an agreement abandoned rather than defended—remained a quiet but persistent reference point in Irish strategic thinking.

In sum, the Irish Government viewed the British failure to confront the UWC with the Army as **a conscious political choice**, not an operational necessity. While publicly expressed in muted terms, it was privately understood in Dublin as the moment when Sunningdale was allowed to fall—not because it could not be defended, but because **London decided it would not pay the price of defending it**.

Critical Days - Cain Website

Wednesday 15 May 1974

Day 1 of the UWC strike

The initial response to the strike was poor with many workers going to work. However, following meetings held at several workplaces, people began to leave work during lunchtime and early afternoon. By the end of the day the port of Larne, County Antrim, was effectively sealed off. Several roads had been blocked by hijacked vehicles. Some buses were hijacked in Belfast. Electricity supplies were also disrupted with rotating four-hourly power cuts occurring across the region. The power cuts forced some factories to close and send workers home. The Ulster Workers' Council (UWC) issued a *statement*[IMAGE] saying that it would ensure that essential services would continue.

Members of the UWC together with Loyalist leaders met for talks with Stanley Orme, the then Minister of State at the Northern Ireland Office (NIO).

Thursday 16 May 1974

Day 2 of the UWC strike

The effect of the strike deepened with the engineering sector of the economy being the hardest hit. The use of intimidation (or 'persuasion' as the Loyalist paramilitaries preferred to call it) had a significant impact on the number of people who managed to get to work. The strike began to have several effects on the farming sector with uncollected, or unprocessed, milk having to be dumped and fresh food not reaching shops. The Ulster Workers' Council (UWC) issued a list of *'essential services'* [which were to be allowed to operate as normal and issued a telephone number for anyone engaged in such work. The UWC also ordered public houses to close. There was an outbreak of sectarian rioting.

One thing that became clear was that the timing of the removal of barricades by the police was tactically wrong. In many instances barricades were not removed until people had made an initial attempt to get to work. Having been turned back first thing in the morning few people were attempting to travel mid-morning or mid-afternoon when several roads would have been reopened. There were complaints about a lack of action, particularly to clear obstructions on roads, on the part of the British Army. The strike was the main subject of Northern Ireland 'question time' in the House of Commons at Westminster. Paddy Devlin, a then member of the Executive, threatens to resign on the issue of interment.

Merlyn Rees, the then Secretary of State, met with Loyalist leaders in Stormont. Mr Rees said that he would not negotiate with the UWC.

Friday 17 May 1974

Day 3 of the UWC strike

Reductions in the supply of electricity continued to have serious consequences for industry, commerce, and the domestic sector. In addition to problems in maintaining petrol distribution, a lack of electricity also meant that pumps did not operate for substantial periods of each day. Postal delivery services came to a halt following intimidation of Royal Mail employees. There were continuing problems in farming and in the distribution of food supplies. Special arrangements were made by the Northern Ireland Executive to ensure that payments of welfare benefits would be delivered to claimants. The car in which Glen Barr, one of the leaders of the strike, was traveling suffered a mechanical fault which almost led to a serious accident as he travelled to Belfast from Derry.

William Craig, the then leader of Ulster Vanguard, criticised Merlyn Rees, the then Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, for not negotiating with the Ulster Workers' Council (UWC).

News of car bombs in Dublin and Monaghan, Republic of Ireland, in which 34 people were killed raised the tension in Northern Ireland. The death toll in the bombs remains the highest to occur during any single day of 'the Troubles'.

Tuesday 28 May 1974 Day 14 of the UWC strike - Effective End Northern Ireland Executive

The Ulster Workers' Council (UWC) strike took place between Wednesday 15 May 1974 to Tuesday 28 May 1974. The strike was called in protest at the political and security situation in Northern Ireland and more particular at the proposals in the Sunningdale Agreement which would have given the government of the Republic of Ireland a direct say in the running of the region. The strike lasted two weeks and succeeded in bringing down the power-sharing Northern Ireland Executive. Responsibility for the government of Northern Ireland then reverted to the British Parliament at Westminster under the arrangements for 'Direct Rule'.
The crisis came to a head. Brian Faulkner resigned as Chief Executive following a refusal by Merlyn Rees, the then Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, to meet with representatives from the Ulster Workers' Council (UWC). Faulkner's Unionist colleagues also resigned. This effectively marked the end of the Northern Ireland Executive.
A large demonstration of farmers in tractors blocked the entrance to the Stormont parliament buildings and much of the Upper Newtownards Road News of the collapse of the Northern Ireland Executive spread to the protestors. Celebrations took place in Protestant areas across the region.

Dublin’s Acceptance of British Security Analysis and its Consequences

The Pivotal Decision: Embracing the British Security Narrative

At a pivotal moment in the unfolding crisis, the Irish Government made the significant decision to accept the British Security assessment regarding the so-called Doomsday Plot. This acquiescence proved to be a turning point, as it placed considerable constraints on Dublin’s ability to respond independently. By placing its trust in the British analysis at such a critical juncture, the Irish Government effectively narrowed its policy options and found its subsequent actions shaped by this security narrative for years to follow. The reliance on the

prevailing assessment meant that Dublin was unable to challenge or diverge from British policy, leaving it bound to the parameters set by London's approach.

Implications for Irish Policy and Perspective

This course of action reflects the underlying principle encapsulated by the phrase, "The enemy of my enemy is my friend." By choosing to adopt the British viewpoint, the Irish Government set aside consideration of other threats and perspectives, prioritising the maintenance of alliance and cooperation with London over conducting an independent evaluation of its own security interests. In consequence, alternative risks or challenges were marginalised, and Irish governmental policy throughout the ensuing period was fundamentally shaped by this alignment with British security thinking. The decision to prioritise trust in the British analysis thus had a lasting impact on both Dublin's strategic position and its capacity to develop alternative responses.

Claim by the Prime Minister was not credible.

On Monday 13 May, Prime Minister Harold Wilson addressed the House of Commons regarding the so-called 'Doomsday plan'. His remarks set the cornerstone for the ensuing events. He characterised the plan as:

"A specific and calculated plan on the part of the IRA, by means of ruthless and indiscriminate violence to ferment inter-sectarian hatred and a degree of chaos, with the object of enabling the IRA to achieve a position which they could occupy and control certain predesignated and densely populated areas in the city of Belfast and in its suburbs."

The Prime Minister's emphasis on the words *"specific and calculated plan"* underscored the perceived seriousness of the threat. Calm analysis clearly indicate that it was no where near that threshold.

Simultaneously, a document was unveiled at a press conference in Belfast. This was *a hand written document*, couched in conditional terms. The document referred to the notion of an armed offensive against the Catholic working class, though its language was far from definitive.

At its most pessimistic, the document outlined a concept which, if anything, would enable the undertaking of a defensive operation in Belfast.

No one was charged with any offences relating to the plan. There was no subsequent roundup of suspects, nor was there any seizure of materials that such an operation would have required.

Brendan "The Dark" Hughes who was arrested at that time later said that,

There was a great fear of a unilateral declaration of intent, a UDI, we believed, and the reason why I was caught was we were drawing up plans for, for defence of, of nationalist areas on the outside.

He was worried about infiltration of the IRA and generally they were not in a good place.

It is also true that the British had a sophisticated intelligence gathering operation which was continually making inroads and for good measure the PIRA and the British had been engaged in back-channel discussions for a couple of years.

PIRA and Security Forces: Comparative Military Capabilities

The core issue in evaluating the situation is the relative military capability of the Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA) compared to the Security forces. The armed campaign carried out by PIRA in Northern Ireland, from around 1969 until the mid-1990s ceasefires, does not fit the mould of a conventional military conflict. Instead, it was characterised by a long-term insurgent political-military campaign. Open conventional military conflict was the direct opposite of their strategy.

PIRA's approach combined several elements: **guerrilla warfare**, terrorism, intelligence operations, and engagement in electoral politics. All these facets were directed towards achieving a strategic goal that was fundamentally political, rather than purely military.

From early on, the organisation recognised that direct military confrontation with the Security forces—who possessed overwhelming advantages in manpower, intelligence capability, and technology—would inevitably lead to defeat. Consequently, PIRA avoided conventional engagements and instead adopted tactics that exploited their strengths while seeking to offset their inherent disadvantages.

John O’Brien MSc Author and Security Commentator

John O’Brien has become widely recognized as a distinguished author and commentator in the fields of policing, justice, and national security. His published works include several notable titles: “The Great Deception, Dublin and Monaghan Bombings 1974” (2024), “Securing the Irish State 1922 - 2022” (2022), “A Question of Honour” (2020), and “The Troubles Come South – Murder and Mayhem” (2023). Through these books, John delves into critical themes such as the complex relationship between politics, policing, and truth recovery on both sides of the Irish border, the far-reaching impact of The Troubles within the Republic of Ireland, and the enduring legacy of these significant historical events. “The Troubles” specifically refers to the period of conflict in Northern Ireland and its ongoing effects in both the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom. John O’Brien’s writing is characterised by a unique combination of first-hand operational experience and thorough historical research and analysis. He is a frequent contributor to media outlets and participates in policy discussions focused on contemporary policing issues, legacy investigations, and the importance of public accountability. His perspectives are deeply informed by his comprehensive understanding of The Troubles, state security policy, and the structures of inter-agency intelligence cooperation

He is a retired Detective Chief Superintendent from An Garda Síochána.