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Thesis Abstract

This study of the world's press reaction to the Easter Rebellion of 1916 is primarily concerned with the manner in which the events in Dublin were interpreted in a particular nation's press and the impact that the coverage had upon the public's perception of Irish affairs. In addition, the work gauges the extent that the public's interpretation as to the significance that Irish matters had upon subsequent domestic affairs such as affecting conscription for the European war, the presidential election of 1916 in the United States and prospects for American intervention in the war. Since the rebellion occurred during a war involving nations with well-established media systems, the thesis includes discussion of the propaganda efforts of nations involved in the war. In regard to this aspect, the thesis analyzes the manner in which Germany sought to manipulate Irish tales of atrocities to discredit the British claim that they were fighting the war to defend small nations against Teutonic aggression and in which the United Kingdom attempted to paint the German Empire as fomenters of the Easter Rebellion.

This is also a case study of the ability of a particular immigrant group, the Irish, to influence domestic politics in the nation to which they immigrated. Public perception as to the role of the Irish immigrant in national affairs differed from place to place but the majority of Irish immigrants were Catholics who settled in Protestant nations. Only in Canada was the Irish Catholic part of a group that constituted a religious sectarian plurality albeit one that was still a minority in the country as a whole.

In 1916, there were more newspapers than there are currently. It is evident that a paper's policies were shaped by its political perspective and guided by the agenda of its owner. For example, in the Irish Nationalist press, there was brutal in-fighting among Irish parliamentarians and this is placed in the overall context of the prospects of the country's partition. Within the other nations chosen for study, the political establishments contended with the presence of political parties that chose to capitalize upon Irish matters perhaps to discredit their opponents or to demonstrate unity for the war.

The 1916 Rising is a watershed in the development of modern Ireland. The event transformed Ireland from a nation that pursued its political progression within the United Kingdom to one that sought separation from the British Empire. This discussion of the newspaper press immediately after the rebellion hopes to shed some light upon the question of whether this was evident at the time and to whom. This dissertation is therefore a study in Irish history, but also in Ireland's impact on several other countries.
Preface

The majority of the 139 newspapers that have been incorporated in this study were borrowed by way of the interlibrary loan system in the United States and have been copied from microfilm. However, regional papers especially in Scotland and Ireland had been acquired by visiting public libraries or through the National Libraries of Scotland and Ireland.

The thesis examines the newspaper reports during the three months from the beginning of the rebellion (24 April 1916) to the execution of Roger Casement (3 August 1916). I chose to focus on those countries that had the largest Irish settlement—England and Scotland, the United States and Canada, Australia and New Zealand—and the two belligerents of France and Germany. South Africa is included in this study since there was much contrast of the treatment meted out to Irish and South African rebels during the war.

The two most thorough efforts to gauge the Irish press response to the rebellion written by Owen Dudley Edwards in his two appendices in 1916 The Easter Rebellion and by J.J. Lee in Ireland 1912-1985 Politics and Society have focused on the immediate impact upon Irish public opinion. In an attempt to augment these excellent works, the thesis attempts to interpret the coverage given to the Lloyd George initiative to implement home rule during the war and the response to Roger Casement's execution. The conservative provincial press has not hitherto been the subject of a systematic study, and to date no effort has been made to place it within the context of the more popular dailies.
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Chapter I: Introduction

I am indebted to the pioneering work into the interpretation of the world press regarding the 1916 Uprising conducted by Owen Dudley Edwards and J.J. Lee. Their efforts to understand the public's perception of the rebellion has utilized the medium of the national and provincial presses of numerous countries but mainly has focused on Ireland itself. This dissertation is broader in its scope than these previous works and includes the national presses of many countries of the British Empire, the United States, France and Germany.

Since the Irish migrated throughout the world benefiting as members of the British Empire and many as English-speakers, by 1916 many countries had significant Irish populations. I chose to focus on the national presses of those countries that had significant Irish populations: United States, UK, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada. France and Germany are included in this study because of their connection to the war and France's historical connection with Ireland as a catholic nation and enemy of England. Germany figured prominently in 1916 uprising as the country which promised (but did not deliver) assistance to Irish rebels and hoped to benefit from Irish agitation either by virtue of a protracted revolution which would divert British troops from the western front or from a propaganda coup in the event of a brutal British suppression. South Africa is included in this study mainly to demonstrate the contrasting treatment meted out to the rebels of the failed 1914 De Wet Rebellion and of the 1916 Easter Rebellion. Some countries were excluded from the study because of a paucity of Irish settlement (such as Spain) and whose press had little to add to this discussion. Irish catholic connection with the Vatican, while interesting to note, did not figure prominently in my analysis and therefore Italian papers were excluded as well.

Some terminology utilized in the dissertation needs to be assessed. Home Rule is capitalized as it refers to the piece of legislation. Likewise, home rule refers to the movement. Primarily the Irish Uprising was described as a 'revolt,' a coup against the British military presence in Dublin. It later came to be described as a 'uprising,' 'insurrection,' or a 'rebellion' depending on the acceptance of the seriousness of the events in Dublin. There seemed to be little acceptance of the particular nomenclature of the event other than the degree to which the writers believed the event to be a mere street riot or a significant Irish rebellion on the scale of 1798 or 1865.

In the end, the thesis methodology involved the collection, photocopying, and interpretation of 139 newspapers. By virtue of the sheer volume of information collected for this study, I chose to organise the dissertation chronologically instead of thematically. This afforded me the opportunity to structure the dissertation by interpreting four main
developments (which are explained below) in a linear fashion. Therefore, I could explain the factors that contributed to the public's perception of the uprising as deals with recent historical development (especially the war and politics), editorial policies and ownership of the newspaper, and what was the legacy of the uprising for these countries. Numerous themes have been analyzed on a nation by nation basis and by covering the same points in each country there tends to be repetition of a few topics. I organized and structured the material of the thesis on this basis in order to demonstrate the manner in which particular national press establishments interpret the same events but from a different perspective.

This work is a study in the events surrounding the 1916 Uprising as reported through the world press in an attempt to gauge the public's perception of Irish historical development. It is an attempt as well to reexamine many of the assumptions made concerning the rebellion. Irish myth making surrounding the 1916 Uprising tends to regard the individuals involved in the rebellion to be the natural leaders of Ireland after the Great War. Yet, it is vital to note that these individuals were hardly known to anyone outside of their small circle and certainly not household names to the Irish public. Only through the executions of the Irish rebels' leaders- Clarke, Pearse, Connolly, MacDonagh, MacDermott, Plunkett and Ceannt- would their names be immortalized and mythologized to become the founders of the Republic of Ireland. Many whose names became intertwined with the foundation of the modern Irish state, most notably Eamon de Valera, were scarcely mentioned in the world's press. De Valera, whose American citizenship may have saved him from the firing squad at Pentonville Prison, did not figure prominently in the American press and did not become known as an Irish leader until his release from gaol in December 1916.

The thesis examines the public's perception in numerous nations of the world to four main developments in the spring and summer of 1916: the outbreak of the rebellion which began on 24 April and ended five days later, the executions and incarceration of the rebels, of the attempts made to introduce a limited home rule as negotiated by David Lloyd George and the trial and subsequent execution for high treason of Sir Roger Casement.

On Easter Monday 1916, Irish rebels took control of numerous buildings, parks, rail stations and landmarks in and around the centre of Dublin in a concerted effort to wrest control of the island from British domination. The chance of spreading the rebellion to other parts of the country was compromised by an order by Irish Volunteer leader Eoin MacNeill to call off the rebellion that he believed had little chance of success without German support or smuggled arms. A few days before the rebellion, Sir Roger Casement who had failed to secure a brigade amongst Irish prisoners of war or convince the German military to send officers and men, had been captured and arrested for gunrunning on Banna Strand near Tralee. Captured also was the ship that contained rifles for the Easter
Rebellion. German Captain Karl Spindler had been forced to scuttle the Aud after he was directed by the British navy to be searched at Queenstown. Despite these setbacks, Patrick Pearse, James Connolly, Thomas Clarke and other rebel leaders decided that the rebellion would commence albeit with a rather altered plan and little chance of success.

The rebellion continued in a long line of glorious failures. Approximately five hundred civilians, British and rebel soldiers were killed in the fighting and at least five times that many were wounded. Contemporary commentators remarked on the futility of the uprising and unpopularity of the rebels as demonstrated by the angry gesticulations and jeering of Dublin's population, many of whom were wives and mothers of Irish soldiers fighting in France. Popular support for the rebels was understandably muted in the aftermath of the fighting while the British military was arresting and deporting anyone who were known by the authorities to support Irish republicanism or demonstrated sympathy for the rebels. Therefore, historians may never know the full extent of support for the Easter Rebellion prior to 3 May. Fifteen rebel leaders were executed from 3 to 12 May by the British military led by General John Maxwell. What is clear is that the British suppression of the rebellion changed nationalist Ireland's opinion from detestation of the rebels towards acceptance of their actions and support for their cause.

What was the response of the international press towards the executions? Why despite the destruction to Ireland's capital city did many papers judge the British response to be unwise? The response in nationalist Ireland was much more vociferous. The hasty executions by the British military failed to deter future unrest in Ireland and in fact had the opposite effect as intended. Many moderate Irish nationalists who before held little regard for Irish republicanism began to sympathize with those who professed more violent and active methods of controlling the political affairs of Ireland. The Irish Parliamentary Party (I.P.P.) and its leader John Redmond were viewed as ineffective in securing legislative independence for nationalist Ireland. Instead, demands for complete independence for Ireland from the British Empire became a serious threat to the stability of the UK.

In an attempt to pacify nationalist Ireland, British Prime Minister Herbert Asquith appointed his most able negotiator, the current Minister for Munitions David Lloyd George to introduce a limited home rule measure for Ireland. The obstacles in passing this measure seemed to be insurmountable considering the opposition of Irish and English Unionists who had threatened a rebellion of their own if the Home Rule Act ever was enacted. However, considering the current climate of cooperation amongst Irish Nationalists and Unionists for the successful prosecution of the war, the climate was favourable for the implementation of a limited form of home rule. Nevertheless, the Unionists still demanded that home rule be a temporary war measure and Ulster would be permanently excluded in any scheme. Nationalist Ireland, on the other hand, would not
agree on the permanent exclusion of the north of Ireland nor any measure that did not deliver a parliament in Dublin. The negotiations failed, although the opposition which doomed its prospects came not from Irish Unionist leader Edward Carson or from John Redmond but from within Asquith's coalition cabinet. The English Unionist leaders, namely Lords Selbourne and Lansdowne, did not expect Lloyd George to be able to convince Irish Unionism and Nationalism to agree on home rule. When it became apparent that home rule would be adopted; English Unionists threatened defections from the cabinet and demonstrated that Ulster's exclusion would be permanent if Redmond and his party adopted home rule. Irish Nationalist representation at Westminster would have been diminished and the Unionists would carry any future vote on the permanent exclusion of Ulster. Redmond could get no assurances that this possibility would not become an eventuality from Asquith and the home rule negotiations by July 1916 fell apart.

Sir Roger Casement's fate was being decided while the home rule negotiations continued during the summer. Prior to the rebellion, Casement had been transferred to England from Ireland to await trial for high treason. Had a military court tried him with the other rebels he would probably have been one of the sixteen executed leaders. He received what the others did not: a civilian trial. Casement's trial became an international focal point following the previous fifteen executions. That he was guilty of high treason was debated by numerous contemporaries, most notably fellow Irishman George Bernard Shaw, who contended that as an Irishman Casement could not be tried by an English court. That he was being tried in a modern court according to a medieval statute that only marginally could be applied to an Irish convict was ridiculed by detractors of the process as barbaric and as a travesty of justice. Nevertheless, Casement became a figure to many as another Irishman who would join a long line of Irish martyrs. Even to those who did not question the Irishman's culpability viewed his death sentence as unwise considering the political climate between the UK and Ireland. His execution on 3 August tended to reaffirm the notion that the Irish people could never obtain justice in a British system and further hardened Irish republican resolve for complete independence.

The rebellion did affect the immediate development of a few of these countries, especially as it pertains to the war. The most obvious of these consequences involved the imposition of conscription. In Canada and New Zealand, where the Irish were a much smaller minority than in the United States, the rebellion did not appear to have affected conscription. Moreover, the Canadian Irish were a different breed from their American counterparts. They flourished within the British Empire in a Dominion that was proud of its British heritage, and there was little support for Irish extremism especially since Canada had been the target of many Fenian activities. Within the Dominion, however, the French-
Canadians shared little of the British-Canadian enthusiasm for the empire. Despite the fact that the French-Canadian Laurier was longest-serving Prime Minister in Canadian history and who embodied the French and British unity of Canada, French-Canadians did not join the Canadian armed forces to any significant degree.

Prior to America's entry into the war, Canada was the primary source of war materiel for the allied effort. A stronger Canadian component in the British navy had been a goal of the conservative government prior to the outbreak of hostilities that now found Canada without sufficient naval resources to protect its merchantmen on the high seas. In British sections of Canada, where there was unqualified press support for the war effort, it was hoped that England would not foolishly make martyrs of the rebels, particularly Sir Roger Casement (who was thought to be insane) whose distinguished service for the Crown was universally acknowledged. The true sentiment of French-Canadians for Irish rebels, however, was portrayed in the French-Canadian press where a common Catholic suspicion of British sentiment was shared. The Canadian press in general supported the war effort, but the French-Canadian press, written in French and predominately Catholic, showed little interest in defending the cultural homeland, France, that was at times anti-clerical and liberal. They viewed British-Canadian support for the war and calls for compulsory enlistment as threats to their loyalty to Canada as a whole. This sentiment was demonstrated by the French-Canadian nationaliste paper, Le Devoir, that fidelity according to the French-Canadian meant "Canada First, Empire Second."

What effect did the geographical isolation of New Zealand have upon its interpretation of the rising? There was little natural sympathy for the Irish separatists in the first place due to the homogeneity of the British population in the country. Among the other members of the Dominion, New Zealand was most supportive of the war effort. The vast majority of its population was of British descent. New Zealand's press coverage was overwhelmingly pro-British, and reports were not sensationalized as those were in the United States or Australia. Consequently there was little sentiment for Irish rebels in New Zealand. Australia, on the other hand, had a larger Irish population than New Zealand. In particular, the Irish clergydominated the Australian Catholic Church and politicians of Irish ancestry had shaped the Australian political landscape since colonial times. Therefore, unlike New Zealand with its small Irish population, Australian newspapers were more sympathetic to events in Ireland. Most Irish-Australians, such as the members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, supported the constitutional efforts of Redmond and the Irish Parliamentary Party. They viewed the rebellion with dismay and consternation, because they believed correctly that the rebellion would threaten the implementation of home rule. Australia was one of the member nations of the Dominion that had benefited from home rule and many Australians believed that Ireland should be given Dominion
status as well. After a trip to London, Prime Minister William Hughes promised massive Australian troop support, but in order to fulfill the obligation his government needed to implement compulsory enlistment. Two referenda campaigns on conscription were undertaken but Australian Irish Catholics rejected the measure. This was blamed on the harsh British suppression of the rebellion, although it was equally clear that the majority of Australia's citizens rejected conscription for reasons of national interest. The fact that the conscription crisis took place after the failed Gallipoli campaign had more of an effect upon the proposal than the 1916 Rising.

To what extent did a larger Irish population in Australia than in New Zealand affect issues such as conscription? The focal point of the Easter Rising in Australia became the concern for conscription. The Australian Irish were similar to the Irish-American in some regards: both had a mistrust of British influence in their countries and this was reinforced during times of sectarian strife. Australian Prime Minister William Hughes was unable to convince his countrymen that conscription was a necessary component of success in the war, and the Australian Irish voted with their Labor allies in rejecting the measure twice, in 1916 and in 1917. Likewise, the UK did not impose conscription upon Ireland during the war. The rebellion created a political situation in Ireland wherein conscription was never to be a realistic possibility without violent protestations of its Catholic citizens. The effect that the rebellion had upon Australian Prime Minister Hughes' two attempts to pass conscription referenda is less clear-cut than was the case in Ireland. But the severe repression by the British military of the rebellion certainly was not an effective recruiting tactic among the Australian Irish or Nationalist Ireland.

In America, both presidential candidates pledged to keep the United States out of the European War despite the sinking of the Lusitania and continued harassment of American merchantmen by German submarines. Conversely, there was little concern that the military suppression of the rising would cause the United States to break off relations with Britain. Did the Irish immigrant press, such as Ford's Irish World and Devoy's Gaelic American, change the American opinion concerning the uprising from one that was judged initially to be futile? Or was the American press more concerned during 1916 with Wilson's diplomacy with Germany and the presence of German agents within the United States? After they were thwarted in their efforts to destroy Canada's Welland Canal, the operation was traced to the activities of German agent Wolff von Igel and by association with the German ambassador Count Johann von Bernsdorff. Despite incriminating evidence, Wilson did not recall the American ambassador from Berlin nor suggest any break in diplomatic relations with Germany. Listed among the papers seized at von Igel's New York office were documents indicating plans to foment revolution in Ireland, and while it was suggested in the American press that this information was turned
over to British intelligence in time to intercept Casement's effort to land guns in Ireland, this accusation has little evidence to support it.

In the United States with a significant and politically influential Irish minority, the Irish rebellion strengthened the natural Anglophobia of the republic. The Irish-American political strength was evident when the Senate passed a resolution calling for further Irish executions to cease (Casement was not named specifically in the Senate's resolution but he was the intended target) and they were more effective in bringing pressure to bear upon the nation's politicians. Despite the fact that moderate Irish-Americans were viewed with some suspicion regarding the recent rapprochement between Irish-American radicals and German-Americans, their influence was brought to bear upon Wilson's administration. Judging from the heightened awareness of particularism in American political life as exposed in Roosevelt's and Wilson's anti-hyphenated Americans campaign, the president was apathetic towards Irish-American concerns. Because of Wilson's strong beliefs on this matter and his lack of support for the reprieve of Casement, many Irish-American radicals branded him as anti-Irish and pro-British. However, despite numerous requests to President Wilson to intervene in a potentially embarrassing international incident, Irish-Americans protests fell upon unreceptive ears. Even a token request by the American president to delay Casement's execution was not forthcoming. Therefore, there was the serious possibility that the rebellion, Wilson's apparent pro-British policy and lack of concern for Ireland would jeopardize the president's chances for re-election in November 1916. Wilson did lose some of those areas with large Irish-American populations that had voted for him in 1912; however, in general Irish-American voters remained loyal to the Democratic candidate in 1916. Nevertheless, Wilson continued to believe that a defection among Irish voters in 1916 was a leading factor in him nearly being defeated.

South Africa's recent development offered numerous historical parallels to the 1916 rebellion. Botha's leniency towards the South African rebels was often admired as an example of the proper way to deal with an insurrection that was not supported by the majority of the population. South Africa was utilized as a paradigm in describing the way that Anglo-Irish relations should be but were not. South Africans quite naturally interpreted the events of Easter Week in Ireland in retrospection to recent Afrikaner history. That executed Irish rebel John MacBride had created the first Irish Brigade in the South African War (1899-1902) helped strengthen the historical connection. Others, notably the Irish leader John Redmond and C.P. Scott of the Manchester Guardian, compared the treatment of De Wet's rebels following the Boer Rebellion of 1914 with the Irish executions in 1916. The leniency of South African Prime Minister and former Boer leader Louis Botha was contrasted with the harshness of General John Maxwell who was
given plenipotentiary powers in suppressing the Irish rebellion. Moreover, South Africa was allowed to remain a republic within the British Empire, a form of government that many Irishmen desired. The majority of South Africans were faithful to the British Empire because home rule was conferred upon them. Their contribution to the war and suppression of De Wet's rebellion were proof of their loyalty.

The rebellion also focused attention on the issue of home rule for Ireland. While the Home Rule Act (1914) had been on the statute books since the beginning of the war, its implementation had been delayed until the conclusion of the Great War, which the British had expected to win within the year. While gunrunning at Larne had reminded the Irish Nationalists that Ulster would not support home rule, Irish parliamentarians who supported John Redmond saw the need to end the war on terms agreeable to England as a sure means to ensure its implementation. Redmond could justifiably boast that Irishmen had put aside their centuries-old hatred for England in order to volunteer in large numbers to fight for the British Empire. Thus the Liberal British press could point to the enlistment figures among the Irish as one proof that the uprising was the work of misguided zealots and not indicative of mainstream Irish opinion. In the Dominions, news from the western front carried the brave exploits of the Irish alongside the casualty figures suffered by their own fathers and sons.

The rebellion did influence Prime Minister Asquith to call for a measure of Irish home rule to be implemented during the war. Lloyd George's proposals fell quite short of the demands by Irish Nationalist politicians to have a united Ireland with its parliament in Dublin but it was clear that by 1916 that Ulster could not be coerced into this scheme. The proposals would not have been accepted by the Nationalists without Lloyd George's assurance that Ulster's exclusion would be temporary or by the Unionists without the partition of the country. Lloyd George's trickery was exposed when it became apparent that he promised one scheme to Redmond and another to Carson. But Lloyd George's double-dealing was overshadowed by the intransigence of hard-line English and Irish Unionists led by Lords Lansdowne and Selborne who refused to accept the settlements accepted by the Nationalists and Ulster Unionists.

The rebellion threatened the successful prosecution of the war. No country was more concerned with Irish agitation as a threat to depleting troops from the western front than France. The French nation had a long history of support for Irish Catholic rebellions. Within the political structure of France in 1916, there was a union between ultra-nationalists and the Catholic Church, both of whom were alarmed by the anti-clerical policies of the Third Republic. However, France was involved in a war of self-preservation and any conflict between the monarchists and the anti-clerical socialists were delayed for sake of the war effort. Why was there so little support for the Irish rebels in
France in 1916? Even those papers where there might be a show of support for Sinn Fein like in the socialist press (as represented by Jean Jaurès' *L'Humanité*) they criticized both the British suppression of the rising and the foolish Sinn Feiners of whom Casement was singled out for special venomous attacks. The socialist press and the nationalist press were fairly united in their condemnation of Sinn Fein's separatism because it threatened the allied war effort on the western front.

Despite their historical animosity for England and a desire to control Ireland, France was at war with Germany, and Britain was her most important ally on the Western Front. For the French the events in Ireland had distracted Britain by holding back troops destined for the western front. The French press feared that the rebellion would cause troops to be diverted to Ireland. Many newspapers recounted the turbulent history of Anglo-Irish relations pointing to a long list of English atrocities. French coverage of the events of Easter Week in Ireland was influenced by the connection between Catholic papers such as *Le Croix* with ultra-nationalist papers such as *Le Action Francaise* while *Le Figaro* and *Le Echo* were more restrained. Casement was ridiculed in the press due to his exposure of Belgian human rights violation in the Belgian Congo many years before the war.

The uprising provided an opportunity to focus on the propaganda battle for world opinion being waged between the British Empire and Germany. Britain had justified its entry into the war largely in support of the independence of small nations like Belgium, while Germany had decried the hypocrisy of British colonialism and its interference in world affairs by virtue of its domination of the seas. Both of the major powers sought to influence American opinion- the United Kingdom in hopes of luring the United States into the war on its side and Germany in an effort to delay the entry of America and allow for a final and decisive breakthrough on the western front. Did the conservative British press portray the executions of the Irish leaders as a measured response to German-encouraged treason or as a just response to rebellion? German propagandists, on the other hand, downplayed any Imperial complicity in the rising.

Of all the international papers in this study, the German press was the most propagandist. They were eager to report that the rebellion had spread throughout all of Ireland and their reporting only rivaled the Dublin insurgents themselves in wishful thinking that the Germans were invading Ireland to aid their rebellion. Certainly the German press made every effort to portray Casement as a hero to his nation and to Ireland's independence efforts. (Interestingly, they did not make much propaganda value of the De Wet rebellion in comparing that episode with the Irish rebellion although the parallels were common-place among British and American papers.) The Irish rebellion failed in part because of high expectations of foreign assistance that never materialized.
The Germans were deliberately neglectful for a very good reason. They had little expectation that the rebellion would succeed, and they practically ensured its failure by sending obsolete captured rifles, no troop support, and a nervous and broken Sir Roger Casement. The German government hoped to reap a propaganda victory in the event of severe British suppression. The German people upon reading the national press received a different slant than the Americans or the British. Part of the difficulty in relaying verified stories to their readers was the fact that most of the information coming from Britain was reproduced through a third party-wire reports emanating from the Netherlands and Switzerland. As well, the German dailies tended to rely upon English conservative papers like the Daily Mail and the London Times for their news. Rarely did the German populace view the opinions of the more informed socialist press of England. The Berliner Tageblatt did reproduce the opinion of the New Statesman, but this was an exception not the norm. Therefore, the German people were not very well informed as to the details of the Irish situation. For example, they believed that Connolly had been shot during the rebellion and assumed that Casement was shot instead of hanged as a traitor. Moreover, few German papers were able to grasp the difficulties facing the home rule crisis. Only the catholic press as represented by the centrist Kölnische Volkszeitung, seemed sympathetic to the concerns of their Irish brethren and the fear that Ulster Catholics would become isolated in the Lloyd George scheme. In general, the German press was the most united of the countries in this study in their attitudes toward the rebellion's effects upon UK-Irish relations, the righteousness of Sinn Fein's cause, and the blunder of executing Casement.

Germany supported Casement's efforts to raise a brigade among the Irish prisoners of war at Lemberg. However, when a meager force was recruited, the German government realized that a large-scale rebellion was unlikely. The German government gave only token support with the expectation that the Irish rebels would fail and that British repression would be overdone. Germany then stood to reap the benefits of international condemnation of Britain, mainly from the United States. Despite tight British censorship of the early events of Easter Week, the German press, although dependent upon wire reports from the Netherlands and Switzerland, did report some of the initial successes by the Irish insurgents. Some of the newspapers reported in error that all of Ireland was in revolt. When it became clear that the rebellion would fail, the Germans then distanced themselves from the affair, denying accusations that the rebellion had been planned and fomented in Germany.

While British censorship did have an effect and few German newspapers accurately reported the names and dates of the executions of the Irish leaders, political capital was reaped by the reportage of the Casement trial. Casement became the focal
point for British defamation. Why did the Germans abandon Casement in the press by the time of his executions and chose not to utilize him afterwards in the propaganda war? Ironically the German press mistakenly reported that Casement had been executed by firing squad, which of course was the exact fate the Germans had meted out to Fryatt. German Catholic papers like the Kölnische Volkszeitung showed a more sincere interest in the plight of the Irish rebels than official government organs such as Preussische Kreuzzeitung and Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung whose main interest was the propaganda battle for American public opinion.

This analysis of the international press coverage in the Easter Rebellion reveals that a number of governments were able to mold public opinion through censorship and propaganda and that the impact varied according to the freedom of the country's press and the degree of liberalism by the government. Conversely, it would appear that with the exceptions of the United States and to a certain degree, Australia, citizens of Irish descent in most countries had little ability to influence government policy. But the influence of the press was instrumental in influencing their governments or political parties. For example, the official mouthpieces of certain political parties, such as Dublin's Freeman's Journal spoke for the I.P.P. and Germany's Vorwärts was the voice of the Social Democrats. Most of the papers in this study had editorial policies that followed the political parties of their country and their editorials seemed to be better informed in 1916 than they are today. (The Galway Express' comparison of the Irish executive to black rats and the need to expel the putrefying elements from Ireland was quite colorful.) Meanwhile, the Irish journals of the Irish Independent and the Cork Free Press, were sounding boards for maverick politicians. Likewise many papers were affiliated with the Catholic Church: Glasgow Observer, London Catholic Herald, Melbourne's Advocate, or Le Croix. Henri Bourassa's Le Devoir claimed to speak on behalf of an ethnic group, the French Canadians. The papers that tried to influence the government's policies were the papers of the English Liberal press and the German Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung that was considered to be the unofficial voice of the German government.

While censorship of Irish news during the week of the rebellion was decried by many (especially Lord Northcliff), it was relatively light compared to the military censorship from the front. For example, news of the exact details of the battles of Verdun and the Jutland were not printed until after the war and the disastrous Battle of the Frontiers (when practically the entire left flank of the French armed forces was obliterated by the Germans in the first month of the war) was kept such a secret from the British public that they never knew how close the Germans came to winning the war in 1914. The Irish benefited from the fact that at least the world was receiving news of their events.
Chapter II- Irish Press Reaction to the Easter Rebellion

For the liveliest description of the inner-workings of the Nationalist press, there is the description supplied by James Joyce in Ulysses.\(^1\) Joyce described the chaotic business of the Evening Telegraph, the stablemate of the Freeman's Journal in 1909 and exemplified that news gathering in Dublin at the beginning of the twentieth century was piecemeal and haphazard at times.\(^2\) The rebellion made the reporting of news in Ireland a nightmare for their owners. Not only were the premises of the major Dublin dailies casualties for almost a week but this chaotic environment as described by Joyce must have been unmanageable. The political environment was also changed following the uprising and this proved to affect the Dublin newspaper business as well. For example, the destiny of the 'official voice of the Irish Parliamentary Party (I.P.P.),' the Freeman's Journal illustrated the future uncertainty of Irish papers in the wake of the rebellion. Within a few years of the rebellion, its editors had lost touch with Irish public opinion and it ceased to publish past 1924.

Since the beginning of the war, Ireland, as well as the rest of the United Kingdom was subject to press censorship as defined by the Defence of the Realm Act. The Act forbade the transmission of sensitive information concerning the war and all news was to pass through the British censor. In essence, because the legislation was crafted utilizing vague terminology any written word could be stricken from a newspaper. Numerous Irish newspapers were censored during the European conflict but none more than those believed to be associated with separatist organizations. Propaganda papers such as Jim Larkin's Irish Worker, James Connolly's Worker's Republic, the Gaelic League's An Cladheamh Soluis, Arthur Griffith's Sinn Fein, Scissors and Paste, and United Irishman and D.P. Moran's Leader, were targets of continuous harassment by Dublin Castle and sometimes were forced to cease publication (generally reopening under another title). During the rebellion, however, the military imposed a strict cordon around the city and news concerning the rebellion was scarce. The Belfast Telegraph, obviously frustrated by the lack of reliable information being able to circulate throughout the country, expressed the sentiment shared by all Irish papers concerning the censorship. "It is a singular and ironical circumstance that in order to ascertain in detail what is actually happening within fifty or sixty miles of Belfast we have to consult the records of Parliamentary proceeding in London."\(^3\)

---

3 Belfast Evening Telegraph, 28 April 1916, p.3.
The rebellion created numerous difficulties for the newspaper establishment. In addition to the complications of reporting during Easter week there was the fact that the premises of the major Dublin newspapers were casualties of the rebellion as well. The Unionist Irish Times and Daily Express as well as the two Nationalist ones, Freeman's Journal and Irish Independent did not issue editions during the fiercest fighting. (The Freeman's Journal's offices were completely destroyed during the week.) Therefore, there was practically no news being printed in Dublin for the last week in April. Information that passed for news during this time was generally hearsay and conjecture. For example, James Connolly was reported to have been shot only to resurrect to be shot again, German and Austrian soldiers had died in the fighting and Jim Larkin was leading the insurgents. These fallacies were reproduced in various newspapers throughout the world. As well, there were no professional correspondents in Dublin at the time in order to gather reliable information and present them to newspapers. There was certainly no one in Dublin of the caliber of C.E. Montague or J.L. Hammond, newspapermen who would later work as correspondents for the Manchester Guardian during the Irish conflict (1919-21).

Irish press coverage of the Easter Rebellion's aftermath highlighted many of the fissures in the political life of the nation. The most potentially dangerous of these divisions was the rise of Sinn Fein after the rebellion organizing as a political party committed to wresting the island from the grip of the British Empire. However, most contemporary commentators on Ireland focused on the more immediate threat of civil war between the Ulster Unionists and Nationalists understanding that the European war had temporarily forced a truce between the two warring factions. Added to these two threats to the stability of the country was the continuing feud within the former Parnellite party between the followers of the Irish Parliamentary Party's (I.P.P.) leader John Redmond and the discredited politicians such as Tim Healy and the proprietor of the most widely-read newspaper in Ireland, William Murphy. These Nationalist MPs continued to clash over the direction and leadership of the party following the Parnell split (1890-91) and their fight was publicized daily within the columns of Murphy's Irish Independent and the organ of the I.P.P., the Freeman's Journal.

As far as the Unionist agenda in Ireland was concerned, the Ulster and southern Unionists had a number of organs in which to reach their followers. Throughout the

---

5 Connolly was strapped to a plank and shot on 12 May and Larkin was in Chicago during the rising. (Edwards, O. Dudley and Fergus Pyle, eds., 1916 The Easter Rising. MacGibbon & Kee, Dublin, 1968. pp.252-254.)
country, there were many Unionist papers that lauded the achievements of the most effective protector of the union between Britain and Ireland, Sir Edward Carson. Ulster Unionism was represented by many major organs, among them the *Northern Whig*, *Belfast Newsletter* and the *Ulster Echo* and by the two newspapers in this study, the *Derry Standard* and *Belfast Telegraph*. The southern Unionist *Irish Times* continued to be the most respected newspaper in the country, so much so that it had a large Nationalist readership who may not have agreed with the editor's politics but nevertheless appreciated its news reportage. In addition to these three Unionist papers, the *Galway Express* represented a Unionist voice in a chorus of Nationalist provincial papers.

The Irish Unionist press largely judged the rebellion from the standpoint of its legality. Unionist editors did not doubt that the rebels had committed treason against Ireland. However, their ability to claim the moral high-ground was compromised considered the fact that Ulster Unionists had united in order to resist the implementation of the Home Rule Act and had imported arms to make good on that threat. This acted as a constraint upon the figurehead of Ulster's nascent rebellion, Sir Edward Carson, to portray his followers as the only loyal section of Ireland's political parties. As well, Carson called for a cessation of the executions knowing that he might have met the same fate if Ulster had rebelled prior to the war. Thereafter, Unionist commentators preferred to draw a distinction between the rebel leaders and the rank and file. The *Derry Standard*'s opinion of the Easter Rising followed the line of the other Unionist papers in believing that the rebellion was largely the result of Dublin Castle's inability to stamp out the separatist groups in the country. The paper was originally founded as a liberal paper in 1836 but following the Liberal Party's split over Gladstone's home rule proposals in April 1886, the paper became liberal unionist.

---

7 These two Ulster papers did not contribute much to the discussion of the rebellion. (Edwards, O. Dudley and Fergus Pyle, eds., 1916 The Easter Rising, MacGibbon & Kee, Dublin, 1968. pp.255-256.)


10 The misapplied name 'Sinn Fein' was used to describe the collection of the disparate groups of disaffected Irishmen and women who desired separation from the United Kingdom. These included, among others, the fenian Irish Republican Brotherhood, socialist Irish Citizen Army, Cumann na mBan, and members of the Gaelic Athletic Association. Sinn Fein, a cultural movement founded by Arthur Griffith in 1905, wanted to establish a dual monarchy of Great Britain and Ireland on the lines of the Austro-Hungarian Empire not to have complete separation from Britain.


Thomas MacKnight (1829-1899) who also edited the liberal unionist Northern Whig directed the paper's editorial policy in the latter half of the nineteenth century.\(^{13}\) MacKnight's criticism of home rule was solidified by the sectarian riots surrounding the 1885 general election, the 1886 Belfast rioting protesting home rule, and Gladstone's 'betrayal' of Ulster Liberals in 1886 who were forced to choose between home rule and support for the British Prime Minister.\(^{14}\) By 1916, MacKnight's legacy continued to shape the paper's opposition to home rule. The paper's owner, Londonderry politician J.C. Glendinning, continued the family tradition of being vociferous opponents of Liberal attempts to appease Nationalist politicians.\(^{15}\)

At the outset of the rebellion, the Derry Standard blamed Birrell's acquiescence in Irish Volunteer preparations for a 'coup' against the British presence in Dublin. The objects of the Republican rising in Dublin, the paper believed, was to strike against the British Empire, aid the Germans by diverting British soldiers from the western front and force Ireland to be garrisoned. "Enemy hopes of a big diversion in Ireland, however, will be doomed to disappointment. The only value they can receive from the Dublin outbreak is that the military authorities will be compelled to keep a fairly large force in Ireland, a force which might otherwise have been sent to the Continent to help in the overthrow of the Germans, but must now be held ready to deal with the enemy at home."\(^{16}\)

The Derry Standard ridiculed the expectation of the Nationalists that home rule would be a remedy for Ireland's ills and that the Nationalists would keep the island firmly within the Union. The rebellion had demonstrated that the separatist movement was stronger than Redmond had estimated and the Unionists believed that Nationalist control of Ireland's political affairs would be a disaster to the country's stability. "We can quite understand the Radical and Nationalist discomfort regarding the rebellious outbreak in Ireland. It is an awkward and inconvenient development, a mockery of the pretensions that the extension to Ireland of the great Act of pacification has bound every section of opinion in Nationalist Ireland to the British connection with hoops of steel."\(^{17}\) The editorial continued to assert that Nationalist politicians, not the Ulster Unionists, were responsible for the outbreak of hostilities in 1916. By virtue of their unique position


\(^{16}\) Derry Standard, 28 April 1916, p.2.

\(^{17}\) Derry Standard, 3 May 1916, p.2.
within the House of Commons as a significant voting bloc that determined the strength or weakness of the Liberal majority in 1910, the paper reasoned that the Nationalists held the British political system hostage. This forced the creation of the Ulster Volunteers who were determined to resist any violation of their liberties. "If it is an offence to have organised and prepared to resist the establishment of a Republic in Ireland Ulster Unionists must plead guilty of the charge."\textsuperscript{18} The paper did not agree with the Nationalist assertion that they were to blame for the rebellion "...let it not be forgotten by those who now seek to cast the blame for the rising on an armed force in Ireland upon Ulster Unionists that these rebels were merely carrying out the traditional Irish Nationalist policy-that of 'trampling underfoot the Act of Union' and of 'dethroning once and for all English government in Ireland.'\textsuperscript{19}

The \textit{Belfast Telegraph} agreed with the Londonderry Unionists that the rebellion was allowed to gain strength as a result of the negligence of the Liberal Irish Executive. The editor of \textit{Belfast Evening Telegraph}, Andrew Stewart,\textsuperscript{20} singled out Birrell to receive the wrath of his paper calling him "most monumental failure in the history of his office."\textsuperscript{21} In an editorial entitled "A Good Riddance" Birrell's resignation was viewed as a welcome change to a Dublin executive that had not protected the safety of the country. "The resignation of Mr. Birrell from the Irish Chief Secretaryship is the best piece of news the country has had for a long time."\textsuperscript{22}

In its analysis as to the causes of the rebellion, the Unionist paper agreed with the assertions of the Nationalist leader, Redmond, on many key points. Both Redmond and the \textit{Telegraph} were correct in assuming that the German government hoped that the Irish rebellion would divert large numbers of British troops from the western front but while Germany certainly did encourage an uprising, the German government did not plan the rebellion.\textsuperscript{23} To Stewart, Germany's complicity in planning the rebellion was obvious in light of Roger Casement's capture (after being deposited in Ireland from a German U-boat just before the rebellion.) As well, both Stewart and Redmond believed that the 'rank and

\textsuperscript{18} ibid.
\textsuperscript{19} ibid.
\textsuperscript{20} Stewart began his newspaper career as political reporter for the \textit{Northern Whig}. He was editor of the \textit{Telegraph} from 1907-1924 during the most troublesome time in the history of Ulster that witnessed the home rule crisis, the Great War, and the partition of the country. (Brodie, Malcolm. \textit{The Tele: A History of the Belfast Telegraph}. Blackstaff Press, Belfast, 1995. p.20.)
\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Belfast Evening Telegraph}, 27 April 1916, p.3.
\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Belfast Evening Telegraph}, 4 May 1916, p.3.
\textsuperscript{23} "It was a German engineered movement, and the Germans based their hopes of success for the effort upon the notorious spirit of disloyalty which this section of the community has long flaunted in the face of the authorities almost without remonstrance. ... Had the effort succeeded as against the latter it would have had instance and grave consequences for all the Allies, whose action must have been grievously crippled and obstructed on the very eve of the most critical stage of the war, when the very utmost of their united efforts must be exerted in order to win success." (\textit{Belfast Evening Telegraph}, 2 May 1916, p.3)
file' of the rebellion should be spared severe punishment. The *Telegraph* reasoned that the 'rank and file' believed that they were to take part in another drilling exercise and others had been forced to fight fearing recriminations by the rebel leaders.\(^{24}\)

The *Telegraph* supported Carson's effort to preserve Ulster's position within the Union. The *Telegraph* opposed home rule in principle but did not want the country partitioned either.\(^{25}\) However, the *Telegraph* did not demonstrate much confidence in the leadership of Lloyd George throughout the process. The paper constantly warned of his trickery in never making clear to either party exactly what was to be the nature of the proposals—whether Ulster might be permanently excluded (which was the *Telegraph*'s position) or temporarily excluded (which Redmond had believed). Stewart insisted that Ulster would not be tricked or coerced into a scheme that led to their separation from Britain, especially if they became an oppressed minority in Ireland.\(^{26}\)

Thoughout the arrest, trial and sentencing of Roger Casement, the paper contended that the rebel leader was a traitor to the empire.\(^{27}\) After he was declared guilty of treason the paper reasoned that his execution must be carried out. In the event of a possible

\(^{24}\) "The rank and file of the rebels are to be pitied. We believe it to be correct that in many cases they were unaware of the desperate business into which they were being hurried on Easter Monday. ... It is, in fact, known that some who tried to escape when they found that wholesale murder was afoot were shot at by their own comrades. If that be true, does it not make the case all the blacker against those who plotted the conspiracy, and who must have foreseen all the terror and bloodshed which it was bound to involve?"
(Belfast Evening Telegraph, 9 May 1916, p.3)

\(^{25}\) "For good or ill Ulster has pronounced judgment upon the Lloyd George proposals as these have been explained to her. We shall make no pretence of enthusiasm for what has been done. From our point of view it is a tragedy which circumstances made inevitable. We could not save Monaghan, Cavan, and Donegal, because of the changed attitude of the Coalition Cabinet, which quite as much as its Radical predecessor has broken the political truce. ... Universal sympathy will be with the three counties which have to contemplate their severance from the other (sic) with which they have stood shoulder to shoulder in common resistance to Home Rule as a thing destructive of the best interests of their country." (Belfast Evening Telegraph, 13 June 1916, p.3) See also the Cork Examiner's commentary on 28 June: "Even the "Irish Times" is compelled to admit that "the country is too small to be divided between two systems of government," and the Belfast "Evening Telegraph" is willing to withdraw its objections when the Irish Parliament, soon to be opened, proves, as it will prove, that justice, good government, and security, are to be obtained under its administration." (Cork Examiner, 28 June 1916, p.4.)

\(^{26}\) "When we have proof that an Irish Parliament will give to us the same justice, the same good government, the same security for rights material and moral that we now possess, our objections will have disappeared; until that be done our hostility is invincible. Our confidence can be won, but neither it nor our consent can be forced." (Belfast Evening Telegraph, 24 June 1916, p.3)

\(^{27}\) "Upon the 24th of October, 1913, he made his first appearance upon a political platform when he addressed what was described as a meeting of Protestant Home Rulers at Ballymoney. Little more than a twelve months had elapsed before he was found at Berlin engaged in treason against the country of his birth, and attempting to seduce better men than himself from their oath of allegiance. Within two and a half years of his advent into Irish politics he came to the shores of Ireland attended by a German ship bearing arms to be utilized for the purposes of rebellion, and two months later his life has been declared forfeit to the State against which he had raised felon hands." (Belfast Evening Telegraph, 30 June 1916, p.3)
reprieve, the Irish people would have deduced that there was "one law for the rich and another for the poor."^{28}

The Galway Express, founded in 1853 as a Protestant paper, represented a lone voice of unionism in the city. However, few Irish editors vehemently condemned the actions and motivations of the Irish rebels more than George S. Nicholls.^{29} "Easter Monday, 1916 has made history in Ireland. But, oh, what rank nauseating stains will besmear its pages! -how generations yet unborn will burn with shame when, in the calm light of detailed and exalted impartiality they scan its humiliating chapters!" According to the Express, the rebellion had destroyed thirty years of constitutional agitation that had given Ireland ownership of its land, and now that the country was prospering, Sinn Fein has taken the opportunity to 'plunge' the country into 'chaos'. The paper defended the recent relationship between Ireland and England in stating that "the British Government has made full amends for the past." During the war, Ireland had been defended by the British military in keeping Germany, 'the common enemy of Christianity and civilization from our shores.' What was worse for Nicholls was that Sinn Fein confused ignorance for patriotism and they became Germany's allies. He believed that the leaders of the uprising created dupes from the ranks of civilians and infused their hatred of Britain with Irish patriotism at the same time allying themselves with Britain's enemy. Sir Roger Casement became Sinn Fein's 'ambassador in Berlin.' Germany, in turn, was described as "baby-killers, the breakers of sacred treaties, and destroyers of convents and churches."^{30}

In commenting on the small insurrection in Galway,^{31} the Unionist paper expressed the belief that the actions of a few peasants did not represent the true sentiments of the people of Galway. Similar to the Belfast Telegraph's conclusion that impressionable 'rebels' were being forced into fighting, the Galway paper believed that the peasants could not have been responsible for their own actions. Had they not participated, the paper concluded, they would have been physically assaulted ('victimized, boycotted, perhaps shot, stock destroyed, or some members of their family injured') by those who needed support for their demonstration of force. Therefore, the Galway insurrection

---

^{28} "Various reasons had been urged in favour of his reprieve, but the great fact remains he was guilty of treason of the deepest dye, and if his sentence had been commuted it would justly have been said that there was one law for the rich and another for the poor. That he was a man of position and culture made his offence all the more heinous." (Belfast Evening Telegraph, 3 August 1916, p.3)


^{30} Galway Express, 29 April 1916. p.2.

^{31} Liam Mellows led the insurgent forces in Galway that did not rise up in great numbers partially because of the conflicting orders from Dublin. (Greaves, C. Desmond. Liam Mellows and The Irish Revolution. Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1971. p.87.)
needed to be viewed in 'proper perspective' as one led by bullies and followed by dupes and otherwise unwilling rebels.\textsuperscript{32}

The Unionist paper supported the military executions of the rebel leaders which was an extremely unpopular stance considering that the majority of Irish newspapers in southern Ireland were Nationalist. The \textit{Express} welcomed the resignations of Birrell, Nathan and Wimborne. "As the Great Fire of London destroyed the last remnants of the Plague, so the fire of revolt should have far-reaching effects in its purifying influences in Ireland."\textsuperscript{33} It was not difficult to miss the implied comparison in this statement between the Dublin Castle executive and the black rats that carried the plague.

During July 1916, the \textit{Express} scoffed at the efforts of Lloyd George to deliver home rule. Home rule, in the paper's opinion, as it existed on the statute books must not be implemented because the legislation would eventually bankrupt the country. Lloyd George was trying to convince all parties that a new home rule proposal, one in which Ulster is excluded, would be an acceptable piece of legislation (which the paper described as "a counterfeit article").\textsuperscript{34} By the end of the month, when it was apparent that the exclusion of Ulster would become a reality, the paper lamented that the proposal was politically expedient and in the long run would please none of the island's political parties. The paper wanted to wait until after the war to implement the legislation when the Home Rule Act could be discussed at an imperial conference of all Dominion nations.\textsuperscript{35}

The \textit{Irish Times} was generally the most respected of the Irish dailies. Their reporting of the news was generally without editorial commentary and this unbiased coverage was respected by Nationalists as well. The Unionist and heir to the department store fortune, Sir John Arnott, managed the \textit{Irish Times}.\textsuperscript{36} The editor was an Arnott appointee, John Edward Healy,\textsuperscript{37} who was previously the editor of the \textit{Daily Express}.

\textsuperscript{32} Galway \textit{Express}, 6 May 1916, p.2.
\textsuperscript{33} Galway \textit{Express}, 13 May 1916, p.2.
\textsuperscript{34} Galway \textit{Express}, 1 July 1916, p.2.
\textsuperscript{35} Galway \textit{Express}, 22 July 1916, p.2.
\textsuperscript{36} "Sir John Alexander Arnott- second baronet (1853-1940), newspaper proprietor, married Caroline Sydney DBE (d. 1933). Arnott's father, founder of the department store, bought \textit{The Irish Times} in 1873 from the widow of the founder, Major Lawrence Knox. In 1900 Sir John became chairman and managing director, positions which he held until his death. He presided over the appointments as editor of John E. Healy and R.M. Smyllie. In 1902 the Arnotts inaugurated the Phoenix Park race course, which stayed in the family for most of the century. Their charitable interests included a dining hall on High Street, Dublin, where the indigent could get a three-course dinner for fourpence." (McRedmond, Louis. \textit{Modern Irish Lives: Dictionary of 20th-century Irish Biography}. St. Martin's Press, New York, 1996. p.6.)
\textsuperscript{37} "John Edward Healy - (1872-1934), journalist. Born Drogheda, 17 March 1872. Educated at local grammar school and TCD, where he read classics and modern literature with distinction, winning many prizes. He entered journalism, became editor of the Dublin \textit{Daily Express}, was called to the Bar and then in 1907 was appointed editor of the \textit{Irish Times}. Healy was an opponent of Irish nationalism and used all his influence to keep Ireland within the British Empire. He was associated with the work of Sir Horace Plunkett in developing agricultural co-operation. His twenty-seven years as editor and principal leader
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The *Irish Times* had also been a casualty of the rebellion. Their editorials continued during the rebellion, (with the exceptions of 28 and 29 April) however, they were uninformative, calling for Dublin's civilians to stay indoors and avoid unnecessary casualties. It was not until 1 May that its first editorial discussed the impact of the rebellion. The editorial praised the efforts of the British Army in defeating the insurgents. Its most interesting commentary was its insistence that at least one positive development had come out of the rebellion: a naval gunboat destroyed Liberty Hall. ("Liberty Hall is no more than a sinister and hateful memory.")

The Unionist paper favored swift and severe treatment of the insurgents. "The surgeon's knife has been put to the corruption in the body of Ireland, and its course must not be stayed until the whole malignant growth has been removed. In the verdict of history weakness to-day would be even more criminal than the indifference of the last few months. Sedition must be rooted out of Ireland once and for all." The *Freeman's Journal* responded with indignation to this call for vengeance on the part of the Unionist journal. The nationalist paper equated the *Irish Times* support for the military's executions and the continuance of martial law with the sixteenth-century Spanish campaign conducted by the Duke de Alba's so-called 'Council of Blood' upon the Dutch rebels in Brussels.

As well, the *Irish Times'* opinion of Augustine Birrell was sharply contrasted with that of the *Freeman's Journal*. The Nationalist paper viewed Birrell as a scapegoat of a neglectful British policy in Ireland. The Unionist press on the other hand, explained that his administration was too weak to effectively stamp out rebellion in the country. "We take leave of Mr. Birrell without regret. The greater part of the responsibility for the Irish insurrection is on his shoulders. He will go down to history- so long as history chooses to remember him- as the most incompetent and graceless figure in the whole gallery of Irish Chief Secretaries."

While the *Irish Times* had preferred that home rule not be enacted at all, it did not want Ulster excluded either. The paper pushed for Ulster's right for self-determination. "The best Irishmen, Unionist and Nationalist, agree, however, that Ulster is an integral part of Ireland; and Ulster, as Mr. Asquith has said many times, and repeated yesterday,

---

*Irish Times*, 1 May 1916, p.2.

*ibid.*

*The German Vossische Zeitung* compared the executions to Alba's court as well. (6 May 1916, p.4);

*Irish Times*, 6 May 1916, p.4.

*Irish Times*, 20 May 1916, p.4.

See footnote 25.
must not, and cannot, be coerced.\textsuperscript{43} Moreover, the \textit{Irish Times} was not convinced that Redmond represented Nationalist Ireland. "He commands the allegiance of only a section of the Nationalist Press. The recent rebellion was, in a large measure, a protest against his policy and authority."\textsuperscript{44} The \textit{Irish Times} feared being isolated as the only major newspaper to represent Unionism in a home rule Ireland, especially if Ulster were excluded from the home rule scheme. Lloyd George's proposals would not satisfy the southern Unionist desire to remain closely tied to Great Britain and the southern Unionist press protested against an 'incomplete or defective settlement'. Even in the event of a temporary exclusion of Ulster, the southern Unionists hoped for a weak home rule settlement: one in which Unionist representation would not be diminished in the island. The exclusion of Ulster, temporary or permanent, would decrease the probability that Unionism would remain strong throughout the island.\textsuperscript{45}

The Unionist paper did not endorse the Lloyd George settlement because it gave no safeguards for southern Unionists and it was not popular with either the Nationalists or the Ulster Unionists. The paper believed that the settlement was being forced upon the Irish people in a hasty fashion. The Irish people were led to believe, the paper opined, that the settlement was an Imperial necessity but could not understand what the necessity was. Home rule was to be damaging to the sanctity of the Union and instead of being an Imperial necessity, it would become 'dangerous to the security of the empire.'\textsuperscript{46}

Healy's opinion of the impasse in June during the Lloyd George negotiations was similar to the criticism heaped upon the Asquith administration by Lord Northcliffe. "No temporary settlement that is not based on general consent can hope to smooth the way for

\textsuperscript{43}\textit{Irish Times}, 26 May 1916, p.4.
\textsuperscript{44}\textit{Irish Times}, 2 June 1916, p.4.
\textsuperscript{45} "Southern Unionists and Settlement.
... We have not changed our views about the exclusion of Ulster. We are still convinced that it would be the least desirable of all possible settlements of the Irish question. We shall accept it only under proof that it furnishes the only solution of a problem in which even greater interests than the highest interests of the whole Irish nation are concerned. If we are made to believe that the Irish difficulty is blocking victory in the field, and that it can only be cleared away by a Home Rule settlement which excludes Ulster, we shall accept that settlement, and we shall try loyally to make it a success. It will involve a bitter sacrifice, but the Unionists of the South of Ireland, are inured to such sacrifices. We are not prepared, however, and we do not believe that those for whom we speak are prepared, to make any larger or more unquestioning sacrifice than the occasion demands. Let us assume two things- that an immediate settlement of the Irish question is a matter of vital necessity, and that the settlement of Home Rule, with Ulster excluded, is the only feasible settlement. On these assumptions we have a right to demand, and do demand, that the interests of the Unionists of the three southern provinces shall receive fair consideration. Up to the present we have not heard that they are receiving fair consideration, or any consideration at all. The Ulster Unionists and the Nationalist Parliamentary leaders are being consulted at every stage of the negotiations. We have not heard that Mr. Redmond has been invited to consider any fuller safeguards for southern Unionists than the miserably inadequate safeguards contained in the present Home Rule Act. The southern Unionists have wealth, education, and an undisputed patriotism. They will always be an influence in Irish life. We insist that their voice shall be heard in any settlement of the Irish question." (\textit{Irish Times}, 5 June 1916, p.4.)
\textsuperscript{46}\textit{Irish Times}, 13 June 1916, p.4.
the work of an Imperial Conference. On the contrary, it must complicate the difficulties of a real and permanent settlement with a new crop of Irish problems. The present conspiracy of silence is of the worst omen for the peace of Ireland.\textsuperscript{47} The \textit{Irish Times} maintained that the application of home rule during the war would divert attention from the main task of defeating Germany.\textsuperscript{48} However, the main stumbling block in the negotiations remained the status of Ulster. Redmond believed Ulster's exclusion to be temporary while Carson expected the six counties to never be part of a home rule Ireland.\textsuperscript{49}

The \textit{Irish Times} had little sympathy for Sir Roger Casement. "We ask Irishmen who may have a sentimental sympathy with Sir Roger Casement to contrast his trial with that which would have been received in Berlin by a German traitor to Germany."\textsuperscript{50} "The British Government, however, gave Casement a conspicuously careful trial before eminent and impartial judges. His counsel was allowed to make every possible point in his favour. He was convicted on overwhelming evidence, and appealed. The appeal was heard with equal patience and charity, and the conviction was upheld. No prisoner ever received a fairer trial from a court of justice; the guilt of no prisoner was ever more clearly established."\textsuperscript{51} The \textit{Irish Times} noted a lack of similarity between the fate of Captain Fryatt, Nurse Cavell, and Roger Casement.\textsuperscript{52}

The remnants of the old Protestant establishment that did not join the ranks of the Unionists were centered mainly around Dublin and in Ulster in southern Ireland. They are classified as conservative in this study because they could not be counted as followers of Carson yet did not sympathize with the Nationalist desire to establish home rule. They were generally Protestants with strong ties to the Irish aristocracy. The conservative

\textsuperscript{47} \textit{Irish Times}, 17 June 1916, p.6.
\textsuperscript{48} "We do not believe that these proposals will ever become law. We are confident that Mr. Lloyd George has not yet given a moment's thought to details, and that, when he begins to work out his scheme of partition on paper, both he and the House of Commons will discover that the thing cannot be done. The proposals have achieved nothing beyond the encouragement of disloyalty and the revival of political passions. Certainly they are not worth the crisis which is now threatened in the Cabinet. We urge the Government to drop this unfortunate scheme, to govern Ireland firmly and fairly until peace is restored, and then to invite all Irish parties to vindicate Irish statesmanship and goodwill under the auspices of an Imperial Conference." \textit{(Irish Times}, 27 June 1916, p.4.)
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Irish Times}, 19 July 1916, p.4.
\textsuperscript{50} "The misunderstanding and confusion which now exist were not generated in the Cabinet, but in Ireland. They date from the very beginning of the negotiations. The Ulster Unionists accepted one proposal, and the Nationalist Party accepted an utterly different proposal." \textit{(Irish Times}, 30 June 1916, p.4.)
\textsuperscript{51} \textit{Irish Times}, 4 August 1916, p.4.
\textsuperscript{52} "Not since the execution of Nurse Cavell has Germany put to the credit of her dirty hands a crime so foul as the murder of Captain Charles Fryatt. Indeed, the case is almost worse; for Nurse Cavell had committed an offence against the laws of war in assisting prisoners to escape, and, though every instinct of humanity and chivalry protested against their action, the Germans were technically within their rights in exacting from her the extreme penalty. Captain Fryatt had committed no offence against the laws of war, and his execution is sheer murder." \textit{(Irish Times}, 29 July 1916, p.6.)
papers in this study are represented by the Limerick Chronicle, Kerry Advocate, and the Cork Constitution.

The Limerick Chronicle's conservative political policy dated back to its creation in 1766. A common feature of the paper was to interview Irish aristocrats to gauge their opinions of home rule. In his letter to the editor, Lord Monteagle expressed his preference for the immediate introduction of home rule into Ireland, because Asquith's Irish government had irretrievably neglected the state and allowed the Castle Government to become ineffective in controlling the country. "The breakdown of the old system was not due, of course, to the failure of the machine, but neither was it due merely to the want of a man to work the machine. The causes lay deeper in the want of motive power in the House of Commons and in the British democracy. Home Rule became inevitable (though I confess I did not then realise it) when the House of Commons on the appointment of Mr. Birrell, practically abdicated Irish Government." Baron Monteagle admitted that Carson's posturing for the exclusion for Ulster from the scheme was not desirable and believed as well that Redmond lacked the political acumen to deliver home rule as understood by the majority of Nationalists. Therefore he supported Lloyd George's plan as "the best way out."

The Cork Constitution was founded in 1822 as a conservative paper and ceased publication in 1924 following the Anglo-Irish War. The paper's editor, Henry L. Tivy viewed the Sinn Fein attempt to "free Ireland" as simply aiding Germany in the war. The paper criticized the censorship of news as having the effect of "needlessly" increasing "public anxiety" when it first commented on the rebellion in Dublin. The censorship

---


57 Cork Constitution, 27 April 1916, p.2.

58 ibid.
was resulting in rumour to become rampant in Cork. By the following week, he observed, news of the rebellion reaching Cork was full of false information.\(^5^9\)

The conservative press was eager to publicize Roman Catholic dissatisfaction with Sinn Fein. The Roman Catholic Bishop Dr. Mangan of Kerry\(^6^0\) feared that the Sinn Fein movement would jeopardize the gains of the constitutional Irish movement and the relative prosperity of the working class (especially since the European war had not touched Irish soil). "Brethren, let me ask the farmers of this diocese, who are now owners of their lands, are they going to sacrifice what they purchased so dearly to the devastation which the war brings in its train? Let me ask the labourers of this diocese, who have been supplied with neat and comfortable houses, instead of the hovels of the past, are they going to risk those houses and their wives and children to the risks of war?"\(^6^1\)

The Constitution considered the calls for mercy for Casement to be misguided and self-defeating. "The Government, however, wisely refused to be influenced in the direction of misplaced leniency. Any such course would have been interpreted in Great Britain as a mere pandering to Sinn Feinism, and such would only have detracted from the authority of the Executive, and make their handling of the situation in Ireland one of increased danger and difficulty. Any sign of weakness and vacillation on the part of the Government at the moment, not only on this matter but in anything connected with the administration, is bound to jeopardise national unity."\(^6^2\)

The short-lived Kerry Advocate was less than two years old when the Irish rising began and would expire in 1916.\(^6^3\) Despite the political position of the Advocate as an avowed conservative paper at its inception in 1914, the attitude of the paper concerning the rebellion was remarkably independent. It agreed with the Nationalist view that Carson was to blame in part for the outbreak of hostilities. By 29 April, the Tralee paper severely criticized the cavalier reporting of the conservative Cork Constitution, who 'forgot' the historical precedent of Carson's irresponsible actions prior to the war in creating an environment of hostilities throughout the island. However, the Advocate ultimately laid the blame upon the shoulders of the Liberal Government for their unwillingness to control Carson and his Unionist allies and later encouraging his actions by rewarding him with the

---

\(^5^9\) Pearse was reported to have a 'fractured thigh' and Connolly was killed during the fighting, and the surrendered rebels numbered a mere seventy-two. (Cork Constitution, 1 May 1916, p.2.)

\(^6^0\) Dr. John Mangan was the Bishop of Kerry from 1904 to 1917 and a financial contributor to Redmond's party. At the outset of the Easter Rising, Mangan criticized the 'socialistic and revolutionary doctrines' of the rebel leaders. (Miller, David W. Church, State and Nation in Ireland, 1898-1921. Gill & Macmillan, Dublin, 1973. pp.263-264, 329.)

\(^6^1\) Cork Constitution, 2 May 1916, p.4.

\(^6^2\) Cork Constitution, 4 August 1916, p.4.

post of Attorney-General. The Cork Constitution, it reasoned, continued to allege
association between Sinn Fein and the Irish Parliamentary Party. The Advocate stated
that previously Redmond had written to the Irish press that Sinn Fein was "discrediting"
his constitutional movement and distanced his party from the violence of Sinn Fein. The
Advocate maintained that the only reason why Sinn Fein could garner support for their
violent sedition was because the executive had chosen to ignore the threat from Ulster to
political stability of Ireland. "If the Executive were asleep, indifferent or ill-informed
regarding Carson is it not possible that they were in a state of coma, too, regarding Sinn
Fein, until they were awakened from their lethargy?" 64

Criticism of the military's handling of the suppression was not limited to the Irish
nationalist press. The Kerry Advocate decried the "terrible situation ... in Irish national
life" that resulted not only from the situation in Dublin but from Ulster prior to the war.
The Advocate hoped that Botha's handling of the De Wet rebellion was the model to be
emulated in Dublin. "It is not a time in which the counsels of vengeance should be
advocated ... to assume such an attitude would be political and social folly. Vengeance
for one side, and impunity for the other would be perfectly suicidal." 65

Coverage of the events during the summer in Nationalist Freeman's Journal, Cork
Examiner, Cork Free Press, and the Irish Independent, demonstrated the divide
between those supporters of Redmond and the independent Nationalists represented by the
proprietors of the Cork Free Press and the Independent, William O'Brien and William
Murphy, respectively. The Freeman's Journal was the official mouthpiece of the I.P.P.
and with its sister press, the Cork Examiner, they attacked the 'narrow interests' of
O'Brien and Murphy.

Since the beginning of the rebellion, the Examiner had defended Birrell's tenure
as Chief Secretary. Instead of lamenting Birrell's recent fall, the Cork paper chose to
remind its readers of the extremely difficult political atmosphere in Ireland as a result of the
escalating threat of violence between Carson's followers and the Irish Volunteers. Birrell,
more than any other politician in Ireland, was able to avoid the even larger proliferation of
violence that would have resulted in civil war between the Unionists and Nationalists. The
Unionist press chose to label Birrell's administration as weak, however, the Examiner
insinuated that the Chief Secretary had little authority in Ireland since the Liberal
administration could not control Edward Carson. 66 From the beginning of its reporting of
the rebellion to well into the summer months, the Cork paper named Carson and the
Ulstermen as the group most to blame for encouraging rebellion amongst Irishmen. "It is

64 Kerry Advocate, 29 April 1916, p.2.
65 Kerry Advocate, 6 May 1916, p.1.
66 Cork Examiner, 5 May 1916, p.4 and 6 May 1916, p.4.
admitted by all reasonable men that all the blood that was shed in the streets of Dublin can be directly traced to the lawless and treasonable conduct of Sir Edward Carson and those who acted with him."

The Cork Examiner disassociated the aims of Sinn Fein from the Irish socialists of the Irish Citizen Army (I.C.A.). "The section of the Sinn Feiners who took part in the outbreak, for by no means all joined, held views, we should say, quite opposed to those of the 'Citizen's Army.'" The Cork Examiner certainly risked censure from the military by stating that despite the unpopularity of the rebellion, the rebels were not an undisciplined mob. "They are misguided, but they are patriotic to the point that they are ready to die for their principles."

The Cork Examiner supported a wise policy of conciliation between the Nationalists and Unionists on home rule. The paper understood that the same standards and expectations of freedom and self-determination for Nationalist Ireland needed to be applied to Ulster as well. Ulster could not be 'coerced' or bullied into home rule because that would create a legacy of division between the two religious groups. "Home Rule, we would submit, is not a horse race where the first past the post wins, and there's an end. Our nation has to be built up bit by bit on a solid foundation of mutual respect and esteem. . . We demand freedom for ourselves, therefore we cannot deny that freedom to our neighbors." The editorial extolled the nineteenth century virtues of the United Irishmen. This reasoning was reminiscent of their aspirations of creating an Ireland devoid of religious strife: "Thus will be created a United Ireland, strong of hand and quick with intelligence that will make our land one worth living for and in."

The Examiner joined Dublin's Freeman's Journal in criticizing Murphy's Irish Independent. During the Lloyd George negotiations, the Cork paper described the Irish Independent as "a slavish imitator" (of Northcliffe's Daily Mail) and thrived on "scare journalism and halfpenny sensations." The Examiner compared Murphy's paper with some Unionists who were attempting to destroy the tentative agreement between Redmond's Nationalists and Carson's Ulstermen. "Public opinion will deal sternly with those who are so meanly and selfishly endeavoring to destroy an arrangement which must
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67 *Cork Examiner*, 18 May 1916, p.4.
68 *Cork Examiner*, 1 May 1916, p.4.
70 *Cork Examiner*, 6 May 1916, p.4.
72 *Cork Examiner*, 22 June 1916, p.4.
73 These were the former Chief Secretary for Ireland Lord Balfour, former Secretary for Egypt Lord Cromer, the symbolic figurehead for the House of Lords opposition to the Parliament Bill of 1911 Lord Halsbury, the head of the southern Unionists Lord Midleton and the son of the former Prime Minister Lord Salisbury.
necessarily be based on goodwill, and the would-be wreckers, whether they be a quintette of Peers, or a duet of discredited politicians, or a Dublin scare-journal which is endeavouring to become the chief official organ of faction in this country, will find to their cost that neither in Ireland nor in Great Britain will such despicable tactics be tolerated by clear-thinking men.  

However, articles and editorials in the Cork paper throughout July and August 1916, became more pessimistic about the prospects for home rule's deliverance. On 4 July and again ten days later, the paper reassured its readers that Redmond understood the importance of keeping the Nationalist representatives in Westminster until the issue of the exclusion of Ulster could be decided by an international conference which they believed would be sympathetic to Irish Nationalists. Despite the efforts of Lord Lansdowne to publicize his understanding that Ulster's exclusion was to be permanent, Redmond's position for temporary exclusion was firm and he would not compromise on this vital issue. In the end, the Cork paper understood the future of Ireland would be bleak if home rule was not delivered as promised by Lloyd George. The Examiner blamed the Liberal Government for its failure to meet its obligation to secure home rule. "If the Government have not sufficient backbone to abide by the terms of the agreement, the Nationalists of Ireland have, and though they desire peace, they do not fear the future, even if it bring coercion and other barbarous resources that replace constitutional Government, and which only prove that British statesmen cannot rule a country that will never yield her right to Nationhood." The Cork paper maintained that neither in fighting in the cabinet, a weak British executive nor a pseudo-Nationalist faction (Murphy's Independent) would deter the Irish people from the prize of liberty.

Despite the Freeman Journal and Cork Examiner's dire predictions that the Irish people would view the Irish Independent as quarrelsome, Murphy's criticism of Redmond's position was becoming more popular among Irish Catholics during the summer of the 1916. The Independent's circulation grew during this time to confirm its position as the most widely read paper in Dublin. The decrease in the Freeman's circulation in the summer of 1916 suggests that Dubliners had abandoned hope for a peaceful solution to the political impasse and any prospect that Redmond could deliver home rule. Indeed, the Freeman's Journal was a victim of the Anglo-Irish and Civil wars: it ceased publication in 1924. Moreover, it did not heed early warnings of its
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74 Cork Examiner, 26 June 1916, p.4.
75 Cork Examiner, 4 July 1916, p.4 and 14 July 1916, p.4.
76 Cork Examiner, 20 July 1916, p.4.
77 Cork Examiner, 22 July 1916, p.4 and 2 August 1916, p.4.
demise. "In October 1916 a Cork newsagent warned Redmond that the Freeman was selling only eighty copies in the city to the Independent's 1,500."79

By the outbreak of the rebellion, the Freeman's Journal had been publishing in Dublin for 153 years.80 The editor of the Freeman's Journal throughout the rebellion and its aftermath was William Henry Brayden.81 No issues of the Freeman's Journal were published during the week of the rebellion and not until 5 May was the paper able to print a notice explaining that its offices had been destroyed by fire. By then the paper had time to judge the mood of the Dublin populace. The vocal majority of Dubliners were shocked by the destruction to their city but they were also hardened by the British suppression of the rebels. By the time the Freeman's Journal was able to resume reporting, seven rebels had been executed and the British Government lost a golden opportunity to demonstrate goodwill towards the Irish people. The paper's first editorial condemned the Sinn Fein insurrection as pointless and unnecessarily destructive, reaffirmed Irish support for the British Liberal government, and proposed that the rebellion was aimed at discrediting constitutional agitation for home rule. But the editorial punctuated the underlying difficulty facing Irish politicians who hoped to maintain civil control of their capital: they had little authority as long as they ruled from Westminster. The rebellion would have been averted, the paper asserted, if home rule had been delivered as promised in 1914. Moreover, the paper explained that had Redmond been head of the Irish government he would have dealt more firmly with the Sinn Fein rebels. In that case, certainly no Irish rebels would have been executed by a British military court. Eight days later, the paper reminded its readers that even Robert Emmet, Smith O'Brien and the 1867 rebels were tried by a civil court.82 The paper compared Botha's leniency towards De Wet as a model that Redmond would have emulated if he had been Prime Minister of Ireland.83

The Freeman's Journal defended Augustine Birrell's tenure as Chief Secretary. The Dublin paper understood that few Chief Secretaries had won the admiration of the Irish people as well as Birrell. He had failed to avert the uprising, because forces beyond his control were constantly eroding his authority. He lost the support of the coalition government in London when the Lockout in 1913 disrupted Dublin's commerce. Seditious
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82 Freeman's Journal, 13 May 1916, p.2.
83 Freeman's Journal, 5 May 1916, p.2.
groups lost respect for his authority when the British government appeared inept in dealing with Carson and later acquiesced in the Curragh Mutiny.\textsuperscript{84} Echoing a common theme that was stated in the British Liberal press, the Dublin journal blamed Edward Carson’s treasonous activities in Ulster as the ‘root cause’ of the Easter rebellion.\textsuperscript{85}

While the \textit{Freeman’s Journal} had little patience for Carson’s activities in Ulster, the mouthpiece of the I.P.P. could not tolerate sedition within the ranks of the Nationalists. The \textit{Freeman’s} unleashed its invectives upon its main rival in circulation and influence among Nationalist Ireland’s readers, the \textit{Irish Independent}. William Murphy led the main nationalist criticism of Redmond’s leadership. The \textit{Irish Independent} was accused of sowing the seeds of discontent amongst Irish Nationalists. “For years a number of individuals and an influential section of the Irish Press have been sleeplessly at work to destroy the Constitutional Movement by poisoning the minds of the people against Mr. Redmond’s leadership and the Irish Parliamentary Party and policy. In pursuit of this policy no means were considered too base or unscrupulous. Mr. Redmond has been denounced as a traitor to the National Cause, as incapable and a weakling, the subservient slave of British Ministers. The Party has been held up to odium and distrust as the salaried hirelings of the Government of the day. Its members have been denounced as incompetent, corrupt and too cowardly and selfish to defend the interests of the people who had elected them.”\textsuperscript{86}

The \textit{Freeman’s Journal} responded to the executions with dismay and disgust. “We should be false to our trust as Irish journalists concerned only for the peace of Ireland, our friendship with America, and the triumph of the cause for which the best blood of Nationalist Ireland is being shed in Flanders, if we did not protest against a policy that seems to be merely vindictive, which no statesmanship can justify and which threatens to wreck the healing effects of a generation of statesman-like efforts to establish friendship between the British and Irish peoples.”\textsuperscript{87} To demonstrate the paper’s hostility towards and protest of the executions, they printed a large tally-sheet of the executions carried out and sentences pronounced by the military authorities in Dublin.\textsuperscript{88} For many days after the rebellion’s suppression the paper listed the names of prisoners taken, leaders executed and deportations. The rebel’s list was printed in a large type that sharply contrasted with the list of Irish soldiers who were killed or wounded on the western front.\textsuperscript{89} (But it was not until nearly one month later that the reaction of the American

\textsuperscript{84} \textit{Freeman’s Journal}, 6 May 1916, p.2.
\textsuperscript{85} \textit{Freeman’s Journal}, 8 May 1916, p.2.
\textsuperscript{86} \textit{Freeman’s Journal}, 8 May 1916, p.2.
\textsuperscript{87} \textit{Freeman’s Journal}, 9 May 1916, p.2.
\textsuperscript{88} ibid. p.3.
\textsuperscript{89} A good example is \textit{ibid.} 13 May 1916, p.7.
press to the executions was reported in the Dublin newspaper. According to the
*Freeman's Journal*, the American press explained that the military authorities in Dublin
had no 'moral right' to execute the rebels while Ulster's rebels remained unpunished.)

Irish Nationalists criticized the Hardinge Commission that investigated the causes
of the rebellion for ignoring the blatantly treasonous activities of prominent Unionists, one
being a former member of Asquith's coalition government. The *Freeman's Journal*
lampooned the standards set forth by the commission that viewed only the immediate
causes of the rebellion, i.e. illegal activities by Sinn Fein or incompetence of Dublin
Castle. An 'honest' and 'impartial' investigation would certainly 'break up the Coalition'
and discredit the King's councilors who had preached sedition in Ulster prior to the war.
The nationalist journal disparaged the fact that Birrell and Nathan, who were made
"scapegoats" for the rebellion, were forced to resign while certain Unionists were still
working for the government. When the Hardinge Report publicized its findings in July,
the paper characterized it as "not merely a maliciously unfair and partial document, it is
also a curiously maladroit one." The commission ignored significant developments that
affected Irish history. Primarily, the formation of the coalition government containing
prominent Unionists, namely Bonar Law and Edward Carson, deprived recruiters of the
ability to convince potential Irish soldiers that fighting for the empire would deliver home
rule. Secondly and consequently, Birrell's ability to effectively rule Ireland was
undermined by the formation of the coalition. Therefore, the causes of the rebellion were
wrongly attributed to incompetence on the part of Dublin Castle.

Despite initial hope that the home rule negotiations would be successful under the
guidance of Lloyd George, it was clear that by the end of July they would come to naught.
Unionist politicians, namely Lord Lansdowne, had done their worst, the paper
acknowledged, but in the end the Dublin journal held the Government responsible for the
failure of the negotiations. "The Government alone are responsible. The British public
was willing to ratify the agreement. The British Press supported the arrangement. The
Irish Party stood by its contract. The Government alone was found without faith and
without courage." The Government's ‘breach of faith’ towards Ireland, it was feared,
would affect the prospects of the United States entering the war on the side of the Allies.
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90 *Freeman's Journal*, 5 June 1916, p.4.
91 These were Andrew Bonar Law (colonial secretary and head of the Unionist Party), F.E. Smith
(Associate General for England from 1915 to 1919 and who tried Roger Casement), and James Campbell
(Associate General for Ireland from April to December 1916). (Weaver, J.R.H., ed. The Dictionary of
p.141.)
It certainly called into question the justification for Britain's entry into the European war, i.e. as a champion of small nationalities. The Government could not assure Redmond that the Irish Nationalist MPs would hold their seats in Westminster, thereby ensuring that Ulster's temporary exclusion from home rule would become permanent when a vote was raised in London after the war. The Dublin journal compared the Lloyd George proposals to Humpty-Dumpty, leaving "no memory but one of bad faith and broken pledges and unworthy intrigues."96

The Freeman's Journal agreed with the assertion that Roger Casement had committed treason but in the aftermath of the strong public disgust over the first fifteen executions, the paper believed his execution would cause irreparable harm to Anglo-Irish relations. "We have no hesitation in saying that after the stupendous blunder of the Dublin executions it would be impossible for the Government to do anything more mischievous or more stupid than to send Roger Casement to the gallows. The stupidity of the thing is so appalling that it makes one tremble to think that the destinies of the peoples of these Kingdoms should be in such hands."97 One of the few points on which the Freeman's Journal and the Cork Free Press could agree was the unwise choice in executing Casement.98

The Cork Free Press' proprietor, William O'Brien,99 believed that home rule was dead in the wake of the rebellion.100 He feared that the British government would not grant a measure of self-determination knowing that the Irish cannot even rule

97 Freeman's Journal, 3 August 1916, p.4.
98 "England last week committed the cruellest and maddest of all her wild blunders the succession of which she calls the Government of Ireland. She took a life which even to herself was of the highest value. A man upon whom she had heaped recognition of his fearlessness and praise of his honour she sent on Thursday to a terrible death. (Cork Free Press, 12 August 1916, p.4)
99 "O'Brien, William (1852-1928), nationalist and author. Born at Mallow, Co. Cork, on 2 October 1852. Though of Catholic parents, educated at the Protestant Cloyne Diocesan College and Queen's College, Cork. He took up journalism, became editor of the Land League journal, United Ireland, in 1881 and conducted it with such militancy that it was suppressed and O'Brien was arrested. Released in 1883, he was elected MP for Mallow and renewed his campaign in United Ireland. With John Dillon he started the 'plan of campaign' in 1886, to force landlords to reduce exorbitant rents and was imprisoned for six months. He reluctantly took the anti-Parnellite side in 1891, founded the United Irish League in 1898, and played a leading part in the reunification of the Party in 1900. With the passing of the Wyndham Land Act in 1903, which began the end of landlordism, O'Brien became convinced that the future for Ireland lay in agreement with unionists and nationalists. In 1910 he led a party of seven Cork MPs who combined in the 'All for Ireland' League under the motto 'Conference, Conciliation, Consent'. By 1918 Sinn Fein was sweeping the country and O'Brien and his followers did not contest the general election of that year. ... Died in London on 25 February 1928. Buried in Mallow." (Boylan, Henry. A Dictionary of Irish Biography, Gill and Macmillan, Dublin, 1978. p.245.)
100 Judging from the timing of their condemnation of the repression that did not occur until 13 May, William O'Brien and William Murphy agreed that some leaders should be executed. (Edwards, O. Dudley and Fergus Pyle, eds., 1916 The Easter Rising, MacGibbon & Kee, Dublin, 1968. p.256.)
themselves. He expected the British military to continue with martial law. (On the 8
May, the Cork police ransacked O’Brien’s offices.) He agreed with the remainder of the
Nationalist press that the executions were a tragic blunder destined only to create more
distrust of London’s rule but his condemnations did not occur until the executions were
over. O’Brien’s ally in criticising Redmond was William Murphy. Murphy has been a
political outsider of the Nationalist party and in 1905 revived the Irish Independent to be
his political voice. The Independent was influential in this regard, it had the largest
circulation of any Irish paper. It claimed a circulation to be “More Than Twice the Net
Sales of All the Other Dublin Morning Papers Added Together.” He was a maverick
Nationalist politician who forged an alliance with other independent Nationalists like T.M.
Healy. Healy supported Murphy’s fight against Irish labour during the 1913 Lockout that
solidified Murphy’s reputation as anti-labour and hostile to Jim Larkin and James
Connolly.

Murphy called for the execution of socialist elements to be eliminated from the
country. There is no mistaking that he was specifically naming the socialist James
Connolly as one individual who should be executed. The paper did discriminate between
the rank and file of the rebellion and the ringleaders on 10 May but it did call for clemency

101 “After the incidents of the past week the fight for Home Rule becomes more a labour of Sisyphus than
it was even in the darkest days of the Coercion regime. The Tory Press of England has been given the one
great weapon which can defeat all our logic in favour of a grant of self-Government. The reckless Sir
Roger Casement and his friends have succeeded in doing us the great good of rousing against not only the
anger of the British military authorities and the British Government but more important and lasting of all
the anger of the British electorate. That and the dead who have died are the only tangible results of this
maddest of mad efforts to break the power of the greatest maritime nation of all ages with a ship load of
arms which Ireland never saw.” (Cork Free Press, 29 April 1916, p.4)

102 “These sentences are infinitely more severe than even the sternest penalty that was really required, and
it is to be feared that they will do nothing to eradicate the evil they are intended to cure, but merely recoil
on the Government which is responsible for them. ... No leniency has been shown, and the Government’s
action is to be deplored even more deeply than the mad rising which occasioned it. Anybody with even the
most curtailed knowledge of Irish history must realise that if it is the Government’s desire to preclude for
the future all chance of another Irish rising they are going completely the wrong way about it.” (Cork
Free Press, 13 May 1916, p.4)

103 “Murphy, William Martin. (1844-1919), founder of Independent Newspapers. Born Bantry, Co. Cork,
21 November 1844. Educated at Belvedere College. Took over the family business at nineteen when his
father, a building contractor, died. His enterprise and business acumen expanded the business and he built
churches, schools and bridges throughout Ireland, as well as railways and tramways in Britain and Africa.
Elected Nationalist MP for St. Patrick’s Dublin, 1885-1892. In 1904 he bought three Dublin daily
newspapers and replaced them in 1905 with the Irish Independent. In 1906 he founded the Sunday
Independent. Refused knighthood from Edward VII that year. He led Dublin employers against the trade
unions, an opposition that culminated in the lockout of 1913. James Larkin led the workers. After the
1916 Rising, he bought ruined buildings in Abbey Street as sites for his newspaper offices. He owned
Clery’s drapery store, the Dublin United Tramways Company and other large concerns. Wrote one book

104 Irish Independent, front page, 1916.
for the all rebels under the age of 21.\textsuperscript{105} However, not until 13 May did it call for all executions to cease. By then all the signatories to the proclamation had been executed, including the target of Murphy's wrath, James Connolly.\textsuperscript{106}

Blame for the rebellion fell squarely on the shoulders of Dublin Castle. Carson was singled out for his role in encouraging revolt throughout the island and for making Germany aware that seditious elements existed in the country to be exploited for its ends. "For his handling of the whole situation which developed from the Covenanting movement until the whole country became an armed camp of irresponsible bodies of men, Mr. Birrell is primarily responsible."\textsuperscript{107} When the resignation of the Chief Secretary was announced in the \textit{Independent} on 5 May, the paper felt that the lamentable affairs of Ireland were due to his incompetence. "Mr. Birrell cannot free himself of the moral responsibility for a condition of affairs in this country which for the time covers Ireland with discredit before the world."\textsuperscript{108}

The \textit{Cork Free Press} and the \textit{Irish Independent} criticized what they viewed to be the poor leadership of John Redmond especially since it appeared that the I.P.P. leader would compromise on Ulster. Both feared that Redmond would be successful in bringing home rule to Ireland that would result in the permanent partition of the country.\textsuperscript{109} Murphy's editorials portrayed Redmond as 'politically weak' in dealing with Sinn Fein. This criticism of the Irish Parliamentary Party's leader brought the \textit{Freeman's Journal's} to severely criticize the \textit{Independent}. The \textit{Independent} defended itself in the best manner possible by going on the offensive in declaring that the \textit{Freeman} supported the suspension of the Arms Act which allowed seditious elements (Ulstermen and Sinn Fein) to arm themselves. Therefore the Government could not meet threats of rebellion with

\textsuperscript{105} \textit{Irish Independent}, 10 May 1916, p.2.
\textsuperscript{107} \textit{Irish Independent}, 4 May 1916, p.2.
\textsuperscript{108} \textit{Irish Independent}, 5 May 1916, p.2.
\textsuperscript{109} "While being quite open as to our attitude towards Mr. Lloyd George's missions, let us also make clear what we think of the possibility of its success. We would prefer to say otherwise, but we fear that possibility is not exceptionally great. The entire English Press of yesterday (Wednesday) published the news that a settlement had already been almost arrived at. This is quite possibly a fact. Then the English Press added cautiously that the approaching solution was one embracing Partition. If it does embrace partition it is as well to say at once that it can and will never be an acceptable settlement. We were made an undivided nation. No British Minister is going to slice us into two nations-into two religious camps each of which would, by statute, be the deadly rival of the other, each of which by all the laws of human nature would conceive a hatred for the other which would never die." ( \textit{Cork Free Press}, 3 June 1916, p.4)

"ANY PRICE FOR A UNITED IRELAND, BUT PARTITION -NEVER! ...Partition Ireland and you sound the knell of a proud nation's squalid death. Divide the country into two nameless territories, one under the heel of armed and triumphant Orangemen and one under the control of armed sham-Catholics and the commerce and industry and peace of the people is sacrificed until the crack of doom." ( \textit{Cork Free Press}, 10 June 1916, p.4)
force without risking bloodshed.\footnote{Irish Independent, 6 May 1916, p.4.} The \textit{Independent} held the "so-called official organ" of the Nationalist Party, the \textit{Freeman's Journal}, partly to blame for feeding Dublin Castle and the Cabinet poor information concerning the threat of Sinn Fein. Murphy sympathized with the attitudes and aims of Sinn Fein in many ways. Both he and Sinn Fein were anti-socialist, pro-capitalist and Murphy believed that Sinn Fein had a role to play in shaping Ireland after the war.

Murphy would not compromise on the status of Ulster during the Lloyd George negotiations. "A Home Rule measure which would not bring full responsibility in all sections and classes in Ireland to work together for the good of their common country, would be a curse instead of a blessing to the country. No plan that human ingenuity could invent would make the exclusion of Ulster a workable proposition."\footnote{Irish Independent, 22 May 1916, p.2.} Redmond's compromise on the status of Ulster was severely criticized by Murphy who reminded his readers that before the war Redmond was firm on Ulster's status (he recounted one of Redmond's speeches made at Limerick in 1913- "A UNIT Ireland is and must remain.").\footnote{Irish Independent, 8 June 1916, p.2.} Murphy explained that nationalist Ireland would be worse off under the Lloyd George settlement than under the proposals that failed during the Buckingham Palace Conference, because Carson would gain two additional Ulster counties. The \textit{Independent} decided that the best course of Ireland would be not to endorse any settlement during the war that would compromise on Ulster and instead leave home rule for an Imperial conference after the war.\footnote{Irish Independent, 14 June 1916, p.2.} When it became clear that Lloyd George's proposals were going to be accepted by the Ulster nationalists\footnote{\textit{The acceptance} by Ulster's nationalists was refuted a month later: "It is evident now that the vote of the Belfast Conference did not represent the views of the Nationalists of Ulster on the question of exclusion. The meetings recently held show that outside certain well-selected individuals there is not in the six counties a Nationalist who regards otherwise than with detestation the proposals of Mr. Lloyd George and the Government." (Irish Independent, 18 July 1916, p.2.)} and endorsed by Redmond, the \textit{Independent} lambasted the Nationalist leader. "Mr. Redmond and his company directors of the Nationalist policy will go down to history as leaders who, presented with an unique opportunity of securing a splendid Home Rule Act, not only missed the tide but dismembered their country."\footnote{Irish Independent, 24 June 1916, p.4.} When, in the end, Lloyd George's proposals were not accepted by Redmond, the \textit{Independent} unleashed its severe criticism upon Prime Minister Asquith. "He may be a statesman in dealing with British and Imperial interests, but in his relations with Ireland, not only now but for a long time past, his whole conduct has been that of a cunning trickster."\footnote{Irish Independent, 1 August 1916, p.2.}
The Irish papers represent a full spectrum of editorial opinion about the causes and consequences of the Easter Rising. The full breath of political stances were represented among the Unionist, Conservative and Nationalist newspapers. Of particular note is the absence of discussions relating to German complicity and the relative lack of concern for American opinion following the rebellion. As might be expected, the Unionist press defended Carson and the Ulster Volunteers from any culpability while the conservatives and nationalists often saw the Larne gun-running as the root cause of the rebellion. Similarly, there was a wide disparity between Unionists, conservatives, and nationalists on the prospects for home rule. Generally, the Unionists were totally opposed to home rule and looked upon the Lloyd George initiatives as superfluous. In contrast, the conservative press called for immediate implementation of home rule and admired Lloyd George's efforts at conciliation. The Nationalist press was severely divided. The Cork Examiner felt that the difficulties in the implementation of home rule were only resolvable through a form of reconciliation between the main parties in which the rights of both Ulstermen and Nationalists were equally respected. The Examiner genuinely believed that issues separating Ulstermen and Nationalists were not irreconcilable. The paper envisioned an ultimate settlement devoid of religious strife. The Freeman's Journal placed complete confidence in the ability of Redmond and the I.P.P. to deliver home rule. The Freeman's indulged in speculation that had home rule been implemented by the government in 1914, Redmond as Irish Prime Minister would have been able to avoid the rebellion altogether.

The executions of the rebels and the prolongation of martial law evoked widely disparate views among the Irish papers. The Unionist press supported full military reprisals against the rebels including the full measure of martial law. The Irish Times invoked the analogy of the surgeon's knife to extirpate the malignancy of sedition. This brought a strong rebuttal from Nationalist papers such as the Freeman's Journal which likened the vengeance advocated by the Unionist press to that of Duke de Alba's 'Council of Blood.' The conservative Kerry Advocate hoped that Asquith would emulate a leniency for the Irish rebels similar to that of the South African Prime Minister Botha. The Advocate pointed out that without a wise policy world opinion would immediately see that the British government had one standard toward catholic rebels and another toward protestant Ulstermen. Nationalist papers, as represented by the Freeman's Journal, noted that Dubliners were shocked by British suppression. The paper reacted with disgust and dismay because in its view the only justification for the executions was vengeance, and the Liberal administration had lost an opportunity to practice wise statesmanship.

Among the nationalist newspapers, William Murphy's Irish Independent deserves special mention. It had the largest circulation of any Irish paper, and its editorial
stance criticizing Redmond reflected the frustration of the Irish. The *Independent* placed
the blame for the uprising solely on the ineptitude of the Castle executive and its
unwillingness to redress the wrongs perpetrated by Carson's followers. In its view,
Birrell was morally responsible for failing to act decisively against Ulster Protestants in
1912. Murphy was no less critical of what he perceived to be Redmond's political
weakness during the negotiations over the status of Ulster's protestant counties.
Redmond, according to Murphy, should never have compromised on the original
principles incorporated in the Home Rule Act of 1914. On the other hand, Murphy's
paper asserted that the rights of Ulster Protestants needed to be protected. Therefore, he
rejected the prospect of implementing home rule during the war and preferred that the issue
be decided at the end of hostilities by referring the matter to an imperial conference. His
hostilities toward the executions were not proclaimed until his former enemy in the
Lockout of 1913, James Connolly, was shot. In the final analysis, Murphy explained that
the home rule muddle and poor Anglo-Irish relations were directly attributable to Asquith
whom he described as "a cunning trickster."117 In many regards, the day that Murphy
had hoped for had arrived. The leadership of the I.P.P. was discredited by its people, the
*Freeman's Journal* was losing its readership daily, and a new set of politicians would
come forth to rule an uncertain future.118
Chapter III- English Press Reaction to the Easter Rebellion

The one bright spot in the whole of this terrible situation is Ireland. The general feeling throughout Ireland— and I would like this to be clearly understood abroad— does not make the Irish question a consideration which we feel we have now to take into account. I have told the House how far we have at present gone in commitments and the conditions which influence our policy, and I have put to the House and dwelt at length upon how vital is the condition of the neutrality of Belgium. 1

When the British Foreign Secretary spoke these words to a tense House of Commons at the beginning of the Great War, the home rule controversy had been a preoccupation of British and Irish politics for at least four decades and appeared to have finally been settled, albeit a solution that threatened to split the island between Unionists and Nationalists. The third Home Rule Bill would have given Dublin a parliament with limited control over the island's national affairs, but not complete separation from Britain, which was a fate that Unionists feared. Irish home rule did not satisfy the republicans who agitated (sometimes violently) for complete separation and autonomy outside of the empire. However, the off-hand manner in which he dismissed the fear that Ireland would prove to be a fifth column in the empire demonstrated (to the British at least) the confidence that British politicians had in not only Ireland's loyalty to the war effort but in their attempts in pacifying Ireland. One aspect of Grey's speech that needs to be stressed is his insistence that Ireland, both nationalist and unionist, was in favour of war in 1914 and had sent the flower of its youth to save Catholic Belgium. In addition, the foreign secretary was concerned about a favorable foreign opinion towards shelving home rule for the remainder of the war. The home rule issue had been a preoccupation of American as well as Dominion politicians who had closely followed the third Home Rule Bill's progress from a constitutional issue to its maturity in 1912. The outbreak of hostilities in Western Europe in 1914 dramatically changed the fortunes of the home rule movement. Even though the bill was passed in the House of Commons, the House of Lords had rejected it. However, in 1914, the Lords could only delay the implementation of the bill and after its third reading it became law. By virtue of the Parliament Bill of 1911 that limited the veto power of the House of Lords, the third Home Rule Bill was finally passed in 1914, only to remain on the statute book never to be implemented. However, subsequent events, most notably an invitation to the main opponent of home rule, Sir Edward Carson, to become a member of Asquith's 1915 coalition cabinet, the 1916 uprising, and the success of Sinn Fein as a political party, signaled the end of the home rule movement. However, it must be remembered that the majority of the citizens of Dublin in 1916 deplored the rebellion allowing John Dillon to remind the House of

Commons that the Easter Rebellion was "the first rebellion that ever took place in Ireland where you had a majority on your side."  

The growth of Sinn Fein as a political party was in many ways a result of the military repression initiated and conducted by General John Maxwell. This unwise British policy caused the constitutional Irish Parliamentary Party to lose influence amongst the Irish Catholics. Redmond's criticism of the military clampdown of revolutionaries in Ireland was muted because of his pledged cooperation with the war effort and was therefore sealing his political future. However, the censorship of information about Ireland created uncertainty as to who was actually in control of Irish affairs and whether the executions were causing irreparable damage. The more radical voice of the Irish Parliamentary Party (I.P.P.), John Dillon, Redmond's deputy minister, initiated debate in the House of Commons and condemned the actions of the British military. His speech of 11 May 1916, received considerable attention in the major English papers, expressed the fear that the executions were becoming arbitrary and that the Government did not have control over events or the military in Dublin. Dillon stated emphatically that the real government in Ireland was Maxwell and the military. Dillon contrasted the manner in

---


4 "When Ireland takes the stage even the world war recedes into the background." That was the reflection that occurred to one this afternoon during a tense and dramatic hour in the House of Commons. The Russian delegates now visiting this country were in the House at the beginning of questions, but they missed the Irish episode, having left the gallery just before Mr. John Dillon rose and addressed his half dozen interrogatories to the Prime Minister.

Mr. Dillon was in Dublin all through the revolutionary rising, and his haggard and careworn face showed what one of Ireland's most devoted sons must have suffered owing to this ill-starred rebellion. He asked the Prime Minister to give an undertaking that no more military executions ordered by secret military tribunals will take place in Ireland.

Mr. Asquith, while unable to give a specific undertaking to this effect, said his opinion was that there would be no further necessity to proceed with extreme penalties." (Daily Chronicle, 11 May 1916, p.1)

The following day almost the whole front page was devoted to the coverage of Dillon's protest and Asquith's reply. "Mr. Asquith's speech in reply to Mr. Dillon's protest against the continuation of martial law and executions in Ireland, was a plea for a united effort to avoid the things that embitter Ireland and to secure the unity of that unhappy country with the rest of the Empire. (Daily Chronicle, 12 May 1916, p.1)

The Times made the most of the opportunity to demonstrate its disgust of Asquith's leadership. "Mr. Dillon declared that Mr. Asquith was being kept in the dark as to secret shootings in prisons and military barracks in Ireland, and that Dublin was being maddened by rumours of dozens of such furtive massacres. The Government and soldiers were washing out life-work of the Nationalists in 'a sea of blood, ..." (Times, 12 May 1916, p.9)


6 "... are we to be told by the head of the Government in this country- there being no Government in Ireland- absolutely none, except Sir John Maxwell- that he (Asquith) knows nothing of what Sir John Maxwell was doing, although he told us before that Sir John Maxwell was in constant communication with the Cabinet, and that all proceedings were submitted? At this moment, I say, you are doing

---
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which General Botha and President Lincoln treated their rebels, with the British policy following the Easter Rebellion. Dillon believed that Botha's and Lincoln's lenient treatments created an environment wherein national healing could take place while the executions and the continuance of martial law was ruining the work done by the I.P.P. that has 'brought the two races closer together.' Dillon's warnings were not heeded.

The Easter Rebellion (and its brutal suppression) is generally regarded as the point after which a significant proportion of nationalist Ireland began to view the constitutional methods of the Irish Parliamentary Party as ineffectual and turn instead to those who professed a more active and violent means of securing complete separation from Britain. The English press reports that chronicle the fortunes of the home rule movement from the beginning of the rebellion to the execution of Sir Roger Casement, generally focus on four developments. The execution of fifteen rebels between May 3-12 was met either with praise or revulsion, depending on the political persuasion of the paper. Most of the English press admitted that Casement's execution for treason on 3 August 1916 was justified. However some debated whether this was a wise choice considering the strain placed upon Anglo-Irish relations in the aftermath of rebellion and execution of the fifteen rebel leaders. The inquiry into the rebellion laid blame primarily on the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Augustine Birrell, although not all of the English press agreed with this conclusion. Finally, when the Lloyd George negotiations to implement some form of home rule failed in the summer of 1916, many papers that initially held high hopes for its success lamented its demise.

The radical press (the socialist New Age, Labour Leader, The Call, Daily Herald: National Labour Weekly, New Witness, New Statesman, The Nation, and the suffragist organ Woman's Dreadnought) vehemently denounced the military repression of the rebellion and were generally sympathetic towards the rebels' attempt at independence. A.R. Orage's New Age, supported the liberal regime of Asquith. However, many of the socialist papers such as the Labour Leader, The Call and the Daily Herald, criticized Asquith's prosecution of a war which they viewed as irrelevant to the greater goal of improving the lives of workers. In particular, the Labour Leader was critical of the Labour leader Arthur Henderson in joining Asquith's first coalition cabinet that included liberals, socialists, and conservatives. In effect, by participating in such a coalition, Labour could offer no vociferous opposition to Asquith's domestic policies. This had the everything conceivable to madden the Irish people and to spread insurrection- perhaps not insurrection- but to spread disaffection and bitterness from one end of the country to the other.” (ibid. p.65.)

7 ibid. p.72.
inevitable result of making the Labour Party politically ineffective, in the words of the
Labour Leader, "becoming neither fish, flesh, fowl, nor a good red herring."\(^{10}\)

Socialist criticism of Asquith's government resulted in government scrutinization
of their news reporting. George Lansbury's Daily Herald became a target of censorship
throughout the Great War after the editor publicly denounced the British declaration of war
in August 1914.\(^{11}\) He constantly complained about the arbitrary wording of the Defence
of the Realm Act (D.O.R.A.), as the legislation hampered the editorial freedom of his
paper.

Our readers will understand that at present we are unable to comment on the latest phase of the
Conscriptionist movement. The latest Press regulations issued under the Defence of the Realm Act are so
stringent and so widely drawn that it is almost impossible to say what is legal or illegal.\(^ {12}\)

The criticism leveled against Birrell, i.e. he was unfit for his position as Chief
Secretary, was refuted by the New Age. The weekly London paper believed that Birrell
could do very little concerning the arming of either the Ulstermen or Nationalists and that
disarming them would have led to a marked increase in violence. By most standards, he
kept the home fires covered. The paper opined that Birrell was the right man in an
impossible situation. "As for the charge that Mr. Birrell has been a weak administrator in
Ireland, what, we should ask, would have constituted strength?"\(^ {13}\)

The 'official organ of the International Labour Party', the Labour Leader,\(^{14}\) was
adamant in its assertion that the Larne gunrunning in 1914 was the event that led directly to
the hostilities in Dublin during Easter week.\(^ {15}\) The Mancunian socialist paper had
pinpointed three main culprits in causing the rebellion: Sir Edward Carson and his
Unionist allies, the complacent British government, and the capitalist Sinn Fein
movement.\(^ {16}\) Of these three culprits, the socialist papers blamed Sir Edward Carson as
the individual most responsible for the rebellion. In a direct reference to Casement's trial
for treason, the Labour Leader supplied its own judgment as to the identity of the true
enemy of the state. "It is Sir Edward Carson who ought to be in the dock; instead, he is
being hailed by our Jingo press as one of the strong savours of the nation."\(^ {17}\)

\(^{10}\) Labour Leader, 22 June 1916, p.3.
\(^{12}\) Daily Herald, 29 April 1916, p.1.
\(^{13}\) New Age, 18 May 1916, p.49.
\(^{14}\) Under the editorship of Fenner Brockway, the Labour Leader remained a constant opponent of the war.
(Smith, Adrian. The New Statesman Portrait of a Political Weekly, 1913-1931. Frank Cass, London,
1996. p.80.)
\(^{15}\) Labour Leader, 27 April 1916, p.1.
\(^{16}\) Labour Leader, 4 May 1916, p.1.
\(^{17}\) Labour Leader, 11 May 1916, p.2.
The Daily Herald initially did not condemn any one particular group of Irish politicians for the outbreak of hostilities, but agreed with the Labour Leader's conclusion that Ulster gunrunning set into motion a series of events which culminated in an attempt by the rebels to create an Irish republic. Nor did the paper name Chief Secretary Birrell as a scapegoat for the uprising (which was common in the Unionist and some Liberal newspapers), rather it stated that British coercion of the Irish population would have been a 'political folly.' However by the beginning of May 1916, George Lansbury named Sir Edward Carson and his fellow Ulster Unionists as instigators of the current unrest in Ireland. Lansbury reminded his readers that the Unionists in Ireland had armed themselves to oppose a piece of legislation thereby threatening the British government with violence and bloodshed. This action was repeated in kind by the republicans in Dublin. Nevertheless, Lansbury did not support the Easter rebellion, stating that "the Rising was foredoomed to failure, and in my judgment was a crime against the Irish people." Yet, he did not agree with the assertion that the Irish rebels, and James Connolly in particular, were dupes of the German government. The essence of his message was that the British government and the Irish people, by whom he meant the nationalist majority, should have the ability to decide the future of Ireland without a threatening Unionist minority jeopardizing home rule. The pacifist Lansbury did not advocate violent means to achieve a democratic settlement, however, and concluded that bloodshed should be avoided at all costs by reaching an agreement which "should be satisfactory to all parties concerned."

Cecil Chesterton took over Hilaire Belloc's weekly The Eye Witness, and renamed the paper The New Witness in 1912. Cecil Chesterton edited the New Witness during the summer of 1916. His brother G.K. Chesterton took over the editorship while Cecil was called to service in December 1916. (Cecil Chesterton died on 6 December 1918 from illness contracted while serving in France.) The Irish Nationalist, Louis McQuilland, writing in the New Witness, mocked the Sinn Fein movement because it was led by Eoin MacNeill, a 'political imbecile' and by Casement whom the writer believed might be insane. McQuilland explained that Casement was of little concern to the majority of Irishmen as he had never been associated with any movement and was relatively unknown to Irishmen prior to the war. He described

---

18 The Daily Herald supported the home rule causes of both Ireland and India. (Richards, Huw. The Bloody Circus The Daily Herald and the Left. Pluto Press, London, 1997. p.16)
19 Daily Herald, 29 April 1916, p.9.
21 Hilaire Belloc was a former MP who continued to write for the paper after he sold it to Cecil Chesterton. (Sewell, Brocard. Cecil Chesterton. Saint Albert Press, Faversham, 1975. p.41.)
22 Ibid. p.95.
23 The New Witness' criticism of Casement reflects the fact that professional catholics staffed the journal and many of its contributors were Irish. For example, the editor Cecil Chesterton was catholic and
Casement as a 'Napoleonic megalomaniac.' In the end, he hoped that Irishmen would not fall victim to German intrigue. McQuilland, as might be expected of a devoted nationalist, also had an equally venomous diatribe against Sir Edward Carson. In his view, the rebellion was but the culmination of events set into motion by Carson's exploits with the Germans to obtain the means to threaten the hard fought accomplishments of Redmond and the I.P.P.

In an unsigned article, pressure was placed on Asquith to gain the respect of both the United States and Ireland. "If we would win the friendship of any people we must base our action not upon our own opinion as to how they ought to feel but upon a thorough understanding of how they actually do feel." The British Government was warned not to assume that there was an inherent kinship between Britain and America. Similarly, the rise of Sinn Fein was the result of the Irish perception that the nationalist leader had become a lackey of the British government and was no longer respected by his people. This perception was wrong both for the followers of Sinn Fein and those in Britain who believed that British goodwill towards Ireland was dependent upon Redmond doing England's will. "Mr. Redmond is not loyal to England. Mr. Redmond is loyal to Ireland." Ireland's loyalty must be gained by the demonstration of equality among peoples. Ireland is a nation, the writer explains, and she expected to be treated not as a conquered people but as a belligerent in the war.

As a Dubliner, George Bernard Shaw could indulge himself (through humour) with the hope that something good could come of the insurrection: the destruction of the derelict sections of his native city which bred disease on an unimaginable scale and its unsightly 'pseudo-classical architecture,' e.g. the G.P.O. Writing in the New Statesman, he bemoaned the fact that his warnings about the 'romantic separatism' of Sinn Fein went unheeded in the days proceeding the insurrection. To the accusations that Sinn Fein were dupes of the German government, however, he answered with the logical

contributor George Bernard Shaw was born in Dublin. Casement's exposure of Belgian atrocities in the Congo reflected poorly upon Catholics and therefore Cecil Chesterton did not endorse efforts to have Casement's death sentence reprieved. Shaw, however, offered many scenarios of defence for Casement, the most convincing being that as an Irish nationalist, Casement should be treated as a prisoner of war not tried for treason against the state. (Shaw, Bernard. The Matter With Ireland, Rupert Hart-Davis, London, 1962. pp.114-123.)

24 "They (insurgent Dubliners) have at times an appearance of revolution; but they have too keen a sense of humour to turn a good joke into a bad one; and the situation in the end will probably be solved by laughter. In the interim it is a pity that some lives should have been lost in this harebrained attempt to play Germany's game at the expense of Celtic common sense." (New Witness, 27 April 1916, p.788.)

25 "The hands of this apostle of treason and pioneer of insurrection are metaphorically red with the blood of his misguided fellow-countrymen, who carried his rebellion and his treason into effect." (Ibid. p.18 May 1916, p.76.)

26 New Witness, 4 May 1916, p.2.

assertion that as republicans they could neither show allegiance to a Prussian monarch or an English King.28

Henry William Massingham had edited the Nation since 1907. Massingham was an experienced journalist of the radical liberal press. He edited the Labor World in 1891 and the Daily Chronicle from 1895 to 1899 when he was forced to resign from that position due to his lack of support for Britain in the South African War.29 Massingham warned in his editorial of 20 May that Sinn Fein was gaining support due to the British suppression of the uprising and deportations of Dublin's citizens.30

The Woman's Dreadnought, a socialist weekly suffragette paper published in London, viewed the Irish rebellion as part of a larger class struggle. Its editor, Sylvia Pankhurst, favoured self-determination for Ireland as the most prudent answer to the 'Irish Question.' "Differences of opinion in England, Scotland, and Wales as to what measure of self-government Ireland is to have ought not to affect the matter- by the "freedom of small nations" which the British Government has so bombastically sworn to defend, this is essentially a question for Ireland herself to decide. Let a popular vote be taken in Ireland as to whether she shall be an independent self-governing republic, or an autonomous part of the British Empire, like Australia and New Zealand. That is the only method by which the Irish difficulty can be solved and Ireland learn content.31

The Call ('An Organ of International Socialism') viewed the rebellion as the latest attempt of the Irish people to stake a claim for nationhood. The paper denounced Redmond's 1914 speech at Woodenbridge, which pledged Ireland's support for the war effort, as a betrayal of Irish nationalism and an attempt to further his political career. "Mr. Redmond may fervidly disclaim the rebels and their action; but his own treacherous acquiescence in their piece of disgraceful trickery which, in 1914, sacrificed the demand of the Irish people for self-government to the exigencies of party politics."32 (The speech resulted in a division of the Irish Volunteers into two sections, the Irish Volunteers led by MacNeill and the more numerous National Volunteers led by Redmond.)

---

28 Both of these leaders were also protestant. New Statesman, 6 May 1916, p.106.


30 "That, I need not say, is far from being the opinion of many distinguished Unionists, whose leaning is to the military power, and who do not criticize its use. That is the natural impulse of a minority, under the stress of events which I think they bore with exemplary coolness. But here I enter on more promising ground. I have heard no appeals from this quarter for more bloodshed. These men feel and resent- as who does not?-the frightful recklessness of the rebels. They desire, and with reason, the temporary presence in Ireland of an adequate force. The Southern Protestant gentry and their dependents are not without fears for the future; and these, even if they are groundless, are not irrational. But they want no more executions, and they have a regard for their country's future. They do not want to go back; to tear the Home Rule Act out of the Statute Book, and treat it as a mere freak of British Liberalism. They are by no means converted; but this mood on the purely political ground is neither ungenerous nor unstatesmanlike. H.W.M.'s (The Nation, 20 May 1916, p.208.)

31 Woman's Dreadnought, 6 May 1916, p.469.

32 The Call, 4 May 1916, p.1.
Redmond did not live to see his party completely destroyed, but by the time of his death of heart failure, 6 March 1918, the I.P.P. had failed to contain the electoral threat of Sinn Fein. The one exception to Sinn Fein's landslide in Ireland after the Easter Rising was the South Armagh by-election in 1917. In 1918, Sinn Fein candidates won most of the seats in the parliamentary elections with the obvious exclusion of Unionist seats in Ulster and Trinity College. This trend was anticipated by the Labour Leader in June 1916 as "a bad thing for Ireland, holding out no hope of self-government, but only years of turmoil, disturbances, risings, repressions, shootings, leading to little or nothing." This prediction turned out to be the unfortunate immediate future of Ireland. The Labour Leader’s astute analysis of Irish sympathies toward the mismanagement of the rebellion’s suppression was the harbinger of the next five years of Anglo-Irish relations.

By 18 May 1916 the socialist press recognized that the executions in Dublin had a profound effect upon the opinion of the average Englishman and that the Government's Irish policy had become too militaristic. The Labour Leader expressed the fear that international opinion would condemn England for the extreme steps the Government has taken. "And the attitude of the American press and people, universal condemnation in that country of the barbarous stupidity of these executions after the 'revolt' is at an end, has made a great impression." The impression that had been made by these 'stupid executions' contributed to a general rebellious attitude amongst Dubliners who had previously shown little support for, if not outright hostility towards, the rebels.

While the British press was buzzing over the execution of Captain Charles Fryatt at the beginning of August, The Call reported the speeches made in Parliament by Irish MPs who condemned the hesitation to fully investigate the North King Street murders and the treatment of female prisoners during the rebellion. These discussions were not printed (allegedly 'suppressed') by the English press but were reproduced in The Call. "The cowardly and hypo-critical Liberal Press successfully competed with its Harmsworth contemporaries in suppressing all references to these speeches." Alfred Byrne, MP,

---

34 Labour Leader, 22 June 1916, p.3.
35 "The savage tyranny of the British Government is having the effect of tremendously increasing the sympathy of Irishmen with those who led the rebellion, and we are afraid it will mean that a new chapter of blood revolt and cruel suppression extending over many years will be opened. The bitterness of the Irish people will be intensified and conciliation made difficult. We hope the Government will change its course immediately, though we hear repentance is now too late." (Labour Leader, 11 May 1916, p.2.)
36 Labour Leader, 18 May 1916, p.2.
37 "Fryatt, Charles Algernon (1872-1916), born at Southampton 2 December 1872." Fryatt captained the S.S. Brussels, was tried and executed on 27 July 1916 for trying to ram and sink a German submarine, the U.33. (Davis, H.W.C. and J.R.H. Weaver, eds. The Dictionary of National Biography, 1912-1921, Oxford University Press, London. 1927. pp.204-205.)
38 The Call, 10 August 1916, p.1.
 contrasted the coverage of the Captain Fryatt and Nurse Edith Cavell\(^{40}\) cases with that of the execution of Willie Pearse.\(^{41}\)

The *Woman's Dreadnought* took a special interest in the investigation concerning the execution of Francis Sheehy-Skeffington because he was the editor of the *Irish Citizen*, the only woman's suffrage paper in Ireland. Francis Sheehy-Skeffington had an enormous influence upon the framers of the Easter Proclamation and even though he was not a member of Sinn Fein, the Irish Republican Brotherhood (I.R.B.) or the Irish Citizen Army (I.C.A.), he was well respected by these organizations' leaders. Sylvia Pankhurst, while she did not sympathize with the murderous methods of the I.R.B. and I.C.A.,\(^{42}\) was encouraged by the section of the proclamation, which was probably influenced by James Connolly, that declared "equal rights and equal opportunities for all its citizens" thereby stating that a republican Irish government would be duly elected by both men and women on the island.\(^{43}\)

The principle of including women in revolutionary organizations was certainly not new in Ireland. Constance Markievicz helped form the female auxiliary of the Volunteers, *Cumann na mBan*, and James Connolly was a long-time supporter of female suffrage. To this end, however, the rebels were proclaiming a tradition of equality that was rare in Western Europe prior to the war.\(^{44}\)

During the later half of May 1916, George Lansbury was in communication with the widow of the slain Irish pacifist Francis Sheehy-Skeffington. Lansbury addressed a meeting of suffragists to mourn the loss of Mr. Sheehy-Skeffington and recounted his own efforts to extend women's rights.\(^{45}\) On 27 May, the *Daily Herald* reproduced a letter from Hanna Sheehy-Skeffington.\(^{46}\)

---


40 Edith Cavell was executed on 12 October 1915 for helping British and French soldiers elude capture and aiding in their escape from occupied Belgium. (Davis, H.W.C. and J.R.H. Weaver, eds. *The Dictionary of National Biography*, 1912-1921, Oxford University Press, London. 1927. pp.100-101.)

41 "You talk about the atrocities on Nurse Cavell and Captain Fryatt, and you try to make the best you can in your newspapers. Of course, I abhor those atrocities, but I say how do they compare with the treatment that has been meted out to lady prisoners arrested during the rebellion in Ireland? The shooting of the two brothers Pearse is such a crime as will be remembered for the next hundred years, as one of the blackest crimes ever committed by the English Government against Ireland. The shooting of Pearse junior, because he was a brother of Pearse senior, is a thing which can never be excused." Statement by Alfred Byrne, MP, *The Call*, 10 August 1916, p.1)

42 She was known to have utilized the destruction of public property to publicise her suffragette program during the four years prior to the war but this fell far short of homicide. (The Women's Rebellion* in Dangerfield, George. *The Strange Death of Liberal England*, Capricorn Books, New York, 1961.)

43 *Woman's Dreadnought*, 5 May 1916, p.469.


46 "Dear Mr. Lansbury- Thanks for your kind letter. As you will since have learnt, poor Frank was a victim of blood-lust. He was shot without even the semblance of a trial. His body lay for a day on the
disgust that Lansbury felt for the civilian deaths during the rebellion and especially for the execution of the syndicalist James Connolly. The Daily Herald appealed to its readers for funding of the Irish Citizen, Francis Sheehy-Skeffington's suffragist organ. The appeal was to cover a £200 debt in the hope that the paper might continue to flourish, which it did until 1920.47 Hanna Sheehy-Skeffington continued to raise funds for the Irish Citizen while she was in America from 1916 to 1918. She continued as its editor until the paper became a casualty of the War of Independence.48

The home rule negotiations presided over by Lloyd George during the summer of 1916 had as its major focus on appeasement of both the Unionists and Nationalists.49 While Lloyd George assured Redmond that the exclusion of Ulster was temporary, Sir Edward Carson and his Unionist allies understood the exclusion of Ulster to be permanent. At this point it appears that, in principle, Carson was contemplating the partitioning of Ireland, a fate that the southern unionist strongly hoped to avoid. The Call recognized that the partitioning of Ireland would economically damage the island and politically destroy the nationalist I.P.P.50 The prediction that the I.P.P. would be weakened by the negotiations which compromised the implementation of Home Rule over the whole island, became a reality by the end of June 1916. The continuance of martial law and Redmond's negotiations with Carson strengthened Sinn Fein's political future and significantly increased sympathy amongst the nationalist population for the republicans.51

The Labour Leader, after witnessing the failure of Lloyd George's proposals concerning the temporary exclusion of Ulster in the Home Rule negotiations, favoured leaving the bill on the statute books until after the war when it was to have become operational. The measure of partition that was favoured by many Unionists was one that

---

49 Lloyd George's efforts were foredoomed to failure because he would not have been able to please both the Unionists and Nationalists. (Dangerfield, George The Damnable Question: One Hundred and Twenty Years of Anglo-Irish Conflict, Little, Brown and Company, Boston, 1976. p.225.)
50 "No sound argument can be adduced in favour of the exclusion of Ulster. To speak of the difference of race is simply to argue for the disintegration of the United Kingdom, and is an example of nationalism gone mad. The fear that religious persecution for Protestants will occur under Home Rule is a bogey created largely for political purposes. ... Finally, the absurdity of regarding Ulster as a homogeneous political unit will be recognised when it is remembered that the Nationalist population in that province nearly equals the Unionist. Ulster is essential to the economic and cultural development of Ireland. Apart from Dublin and one or two districts of lesser importance, Ulster is the only industrially developed portion of Ireland. The rest is agricultural, at present but poorly developed. ... The secession of Ulster from the rest of Ireland would be equivalent to permanently depriving France of the territory now occupied by the Germans." (The Call, 1 June 1916, p.2.)
was not supported by the socialist paper in the wake of the rebellion.52 When by the end of July it became apparent that Lloyd George's proposals were not satisfactory for the Nationalists and that the negotiations had fallen apart, the paper revealed in the knowledge that Ireland was not partitioned. "The only consolation is that he (Lloyd George) has failed in this Irish business before greater harm had been done by a plausible but fatal success."53 By placating the Unionist minority in Ireland, albeit a politically powerful one, Lloyd George demonstrated his preference for the Unionist position, one that kept Ireland strongly within the Union.

In a leader entitled "Why Carson Coos", the Daily Herald directed its disgust at the current Liberal government's acquiescence to Tory policy in Ireland and for succumbing to the demands of the Unionist minority in Ireland led by Carson, his southern Irish and English Unionist allies (Lansdowne, Midleton and Salisbury) and the overwhelmingly conservative House of Lords. According to the paper, the Lloyd George settlement failed because Asquith was weak in dealing with Carson.54

By July 1916, the Daily Herald turned its attention towards clemency on behalf of Sir Roger Casement. "Cannot Great Britain give up one life for Ireland? Cannot Roger Casement be given back for some slight atonement for the loss of the three innocent victims of Captain Colthurst's insanity?" The paper repeated Casement's statements at his trial for high treason on June 30.55 Following Casement's sentencing for treason, the Labour Leader was moved by Casement's articulate defence that he was fighting for the high ideal of national sacrifice.56

Casement's fate, the New Witness asserted by 4 May, should be in the hands of the Irish and not the jingo press. Redmond feared that Casement would be given the status of an Irish patriot and martyr if the British executed him. First and foremost,

54 "Sir E. Carson, who in these days coos like any suckling dove, is receiving much adulation and praise because he patriotically assented to the proposals put forward by Mr. Lloyd George. We don't see that either praise or thanks are due to him or any other Ulster leader, for the simple reason that his patriotism and loyalty to the British Constitution has been conditional on getting his own way; and this he has managed to do in a very dexterous manner... If he were truly loyal he would never have raised an armed force in defiance of law and order and thus laid the foundation for the Dublin rising last Easter." (Daily Herald, 29 July 1916 p.1.)
55 "And an Ireland who has wronged no man, who has sought no domination over others, is treated to-day among the nations of the world as if she were a convicted criminal. If it be treason to fight against such an unnatural thing as this, I am proud to be a rebel and shall cling to my rebellion with the last drop of my blood." (Daily Herald, 8 July 1916, p.2.)
56 "No one of us can have read through Sir Roger Casement's address without being moved to the depths by the haunting loveliness of his testimony of the willingness of Ireland's sons to die for her; no one of us, either, can have read the story of the Sinn Fein rebellion without realising how, as through the ages, the converting power of their martyrdom has been overshadowed by the will they shared with their oppressor to slay... Her poignant cry for "Home Rule" has gone echoing round the world until in every country there are men and women who have waked to see that nothing short of that can ever satisfy the hunger in their hearts." (Labour Leader, 6 July 1916, p.1.)
Casement was a traitor to the Irish people, and the Irish people should have the right to try him in an Irish court by his Irish peers. Casement's legacy should not place him in the same category as Robert Emmet. When Casement was sentenced for treason the journal claimed that the only course available was execution. The British government could not summarily execute Pearse and his followers and spare the life of Casement. To do so would prove to the Irish Nationalists that there was one standard for a Catholic (Pearse) and yet another for a Protestant (Casement).

The Liberal press (Daily Chronicle, Manchester Guardian, Daily News & Leader) coverage of the rebellion demonstrated greater understanding of the Irish situation and, since they supported the Liberal government, was less critical of Asquith or the Castle government than were the Conservatives. The Daily Chronicle supplied a balanced account of the rising, in light of the confusion and misinformation concerning the news that came from Ireland. The Daily Chronicle's editor, Robert Donald, understood that the rising, for the most part, was limited to Dublin. "The censorship still withholds the names of the places, "principally in the West," where disorders in sympathy with those at Dublin have broken out; but we have reasons for believing that they are neither very numerous nor very important." However the editor misinterpreted the motives and determination of the rebel forces, instead likening the rebellion to a riot led by misguided youth. "But the rebel membership is to be found mainly among very young men, many of them little more than boys, whose ideals have gone to their heads and temporarily bereft them of their senses but who are not the sort of material for whom there is no medicine but extirpation." The paper already understood that rebellions in Ireland had a tendency to make martyrs or heroes out of those who fail in their noble sacrifices. "It is probably inevitable, that after order is restored, the rebel Sinn Feiners should enjoy some sort of halo among some Irishmen, present and future; but it is very undesirable that it should seem to any of them a halo of success."

The Daily News exalted Nationalist self-restraint in not using the rebellion to berate the Unionists for encouraging revolt prior to the war. The Nationalist Party which represented the majority of Irishmen continued to be unswerving supporters of the war.

57 New Witness, 4 May 1916, p.6
58 New Witness, 6 July 1916, p.295
59 Among the liberal journals that described the Easter Rebellion as a German plot is the Westminster Gazette. William Butler Yeats sent numerous articles of the paper to Lady Gregory that she criticised for their characterization. Her comparison of the Easter martyrs with Shelley's opinion that those who die for their country "make death not evil but good" became a basis for Yeats poem 'Easter 1916.' Foster, R.F. The Irish Story, Telling Tales and Making It Up In Ireland. Allen Lane, 2001, p.63.)
60 Daily Chronicle, 29 April 1916, p.4.
61 Daily Chronicle, 29 April 1916, p.4.
62 George Cadbury had been the sole owner of the Daily News since 1901. A Quaker, who abhorred war in general, he believed nonetheless that Britain was justified in checking German aggression in 1914. (Gardiner, A.G. Life of George Cadbury. Cassell and Company, Ltd., London, 1923. pp.272-274.)
The paper's editor, A. G. Gardiner, contrasted the patriotism of Redmond's party with the Irish Unionists whose patriotism depended upon their ability to get their way. The Unionists, the paper asserted, established the precedent before the war that violence was a viable alternative to constitutional agitation. The Nationalists had secured home rule by playing according to England's rules. Redmond had expelled those members of his volunteer force who chose to follow the example of Ulster Protestants in extolling violence. The rebellion against England's government began "in Ulster in 1913-14 (who) revived the old schemes of the physical force party. It seemed to show that violent resistance was still a conceivable policy in Ireland, and it was a matter of comment at the time that the extremists had found a point of contact with the Ulster extremists and regarded them as giving them not only a working model of rebellion by an example for imitation." The Asquith government was partially to blame according to this liberal paper, for allowing treasonous posturing by Carson and Craig in opposing a legal constitutional measure, i.e. Home Rule passed by the House of Commons.

C.P. Scott's Manchester Guardian recognized that recruitment of Irish soldiers had dramatically decreased following Sir Edward Carson's invitation to become a member of Asquith's 1915 coalition cabinet. The liberal journal calculated that as many as 1200 to 1700 Irish civilians per week were staying put in protest of the appointment of the offensive anti-Home Ruler to the position of England's Attorney General. "A year ago recruiting was proceeding in Ireland at the rate of 1,500 to 2,000 a week. In three weeks after Sir Edward Carson's appointment the figures had dropped to one-third, and they went steadily down until the average was only 300." The Manchester Guardian sought to explain the Rising and its underlying cause to a world largely uninformed about the Irish question. In its view the whole affair was at the prodding of labor activists, i.e. socialists whose political agenda was well known to this liberal journal. It seemed prudent, the paper surmised, to remain calm and to resist wholesale reprisals against the Irish lest world opinion, particularly the majority in America, would be diverted from its sympathy for England. "If, on the other hand, we take the whole thing for what it really is, the clever stroke of a handful of extremists, many of whom have very little interest in Irish independence and are much more concerned for

---

63 Gardiner praised Redmond's level-headedness even before the Easter Rising tested his loyalty. In 1914, Gardiner described the I.P.P. leader: "Mr. Redmond could not wear the rebel robe, for his genius is Parliamentary and constitutional. He is, indeed, one of the ablest Parliamentarians in the House." (Gardiner, A.G. Prophets, Priests and Kings. J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., London, 1914. p.107.)
64 Daily News, 26 April 1916, p.4.
66 C.P. Scott was as uninformed as to the composition of the 'Sinn Fein' rebels as was the Asquith government. (Wilson, Trevor, ed., The Political Diaries of C.P. Scott, 1911-1928. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1970. pp.203-208.)
the social revolution, we shall convince the world of the true estimate which is to be formed of the significance of the whole affair."67

Three days afterwards the Manchester Guardian contrasted the methods of a handful of Irishmen, who chose violence instead of parliamentary action, with the conduct of most Englishmen who abhor bloodshed as a means to achieve a political settlement. The paper held that those who led the rebellion were infused with revolutionary ideologies similar to French liberalism/syndicalism and Irish Larkinism. In its view the recent uprising was the latest clash in Ireland between two conflicting European ideological methods of national development: "... one of ordered progress the other of violent revolution. We have had object-lessons in both. The rising of last week was not merely-perhaps one may even say not so much-an attack upon England as an attack upon Ireland herself and the ideas of her future which are common to both political parties, to both creeds, and to all parts of the country."68 It was imperative; therefore, that the British government understood the true significance of the rebellion and not overreact to calls for massive reprisals against the Irish people.

The Manchester Guardian did not view Sinn Fein as a potential political opponent of Liberalism. It reasoned that the constituents of the movement were not held together by an easily discernible common political agenda. This had been evident when it was remembered that those among the group who sought a violent solution to the Irish question were virtually unknown in Irish politics just days before the outbreak. The paper surmised that it was a clever group of labour activists who had taken the reins of the organization and brought them into armed conflict. The paper thus supposed by 13 May that Sinn Fein was not responsible for the rebellion but rather labour supporters had infiltrated the cultural organization's ranks and had taken them in the direction of rebellion. "I am informed to-night that at the meeting of the Sinn Fein Executive in Dublin some days before the rebellion a three-to-one majority voted emphatically against an armed rising. The minority was composed solely of Larkinites who had wormed their way into the Sinn Fein organisation and who had no single aim in common with Sinn Fein generally."69

The novelist Arnold Bennett, writing for the Daily News, could also be included among those that discounted the importance of Sinn Fein as a political movement. Commenting upon the deplorable conditions in the slums of Dublin as a breeding ground for social discontent, Bennett judged that the moving force that sparked the rebellion was the labour movement embodied in Larkin and Connolly. To be sure they were aided by others who had a score to settle with the British Empire, among them Tom Clarke and

67 Manchester Guardian, 29 April 1916, p.4.
68 Manchester Guardian, 2 May 1916, p.4.
69 Manchester Guardian, 13 May 1916, p.4.
Eoin MacNeill. Nonetheless Bennett believed that Sinn Fein did not have the organizational acumen of the Irish labour movement.70

The Daily Chronicle supported the Nationalist Party's position and policies during the summer of 1916. Robert Donald reminded his readers that Redmond's actions were constitutional and lawful, and the fact that he supported Asquith's liberal Government was conducive to favorable editorial commentary by many liberal papers. Even though Sir Edward Carson was a one-time member of Asquith's cabinet, the spokesman for Irish Unionists continued to be associated with those groups in Ireland who imported arms into Ulster with the intent of violating a law (albeit one that never was enacted) by violent resistance. Redmond on the other hand had been a loyal and law-abiding MP who might have threatened to pressure Asquith with his support for the immediate implementation of home rule. Instead he preferred to not only support the war effort but also became in the words of many of his detractors the 'Irish recruiting sergeant of the British Army'.

Because he was able to place regional or national matters aside while the British Empire was involved in a life and death struggle with the Central Powers; Redmond received the praise of the liberal press.71

The Daily Chronicle strongly endorsed Redmond's leadership before and during the rebellion and was critical of Redmond's detractors within his party, namely Tim Healy and William O'Brien (who was also the proprietor of the Cork Free Press). Redmond had been receiving a number of supportive telegrams from throughout the world. It appeared to the world that his position as Irish Parliamentary Party's leader was secure, but in the "aftermath of the rebellion, rekindling old passions and suspicions, has spread a

70 "The explanation of the very rapid development of the rebellion is twofold; it lies both in internal causes and in external causes. The main internal causes were as follows. First. The vigour and success of the recruiting campaign in Ireland, which had aroused jealousy and fear in the councils of sedition. Ireland's general loyalty to the Allies was in part the origin of her misfortune. Second. Mistrust of the Nationalist Parliamentary Party, on account of its enthusiastic official support of the British War Government and of its consent to the postponing of Home Rule. Third. The fear of conscription for Ireland (an absurd fear). Fourth. The influence of the younger priests, and especially of those who spring from the labouring class and are impecable on the subject of labour grievances (very legitimate grievance).

The external causes were the Clan-na-Gaels in the United States, and the support promised (through the Clan-na-Gael and through other minor channels) by the German Government. The Clan-na-Gael is an interesting and rather human society. ... It was and is terrifically opposed to the Home Rule Act, for the reason that Home Rule would put an end to the Irish problem." (Daily News, 29 May 1916, p.4.)

71 "Ever since the Ulster Volunteers under Sir Edward Carson's leadership set the deplorable example of open lawlessness and armed defiance of the Crown in the months before the war, the temptation to all extremists on the other side of St. George's Channel has been to preach violence as the one argument to which English rulers must listen. Mr. Redmond and the Irish Nationalist party, to their eternal credit, have set their faces against this evil gospel throughout. They have stood firmly for adherence to constitutional action, and by their devoted labours in the cause of recruiting have done their utmost to make their country solid with the Empire in the prosecution of the war. ... They and the Southern Unionists have been alone in their respect for the law, with armed Ulstermen on one side of them and armed Sinn Feiners multiplying on the other. ... The Irish Nationalist leaders deserve every sympathy. They have contended for Irish autonomy all their lives; many of them have grown grey in the cause." (Daily Chronicle, 26 April 1916, p.4.)
misgiving in Ireland and in America that faith will not be kept with Mr. Redmond." The doubts about his leadership abilities had been reinforced by his support of Asquith whose administration allowed the military executions to occur and martial law to continue in many parts of Ireland. Many English politicians considered Redmond's political fortunes to be waning when they expressed the belief that Redmond would not be reelected to his Waterford district. Indeed, forces outside of his control ensured that by 1918 the Sinn Fein leadership voiced the sentiments of the majority of the nationalist population.

By May 1, 1916, the *Daily Chronicle* favoured lenient treatment of the rebel prisoners. In the opinion of the editor, the leaders should have been considered political prisoners and should have been given status similar to the Boer leaders following the South African War. The following day's editorial outlined a possible policy in dealing with the rebels. For Sir Roger Casement, however, whom the editor was convinced had gone insane, and those rebels whose collusion with Imperial Germany and the Clan na Gael was without suspicion, the paper recommended that they be "severely dealt with." Rank and file Sinn Fein rebels on the other hand should be treated with leniency so that they would not be glorified as martyrs. Such a policy in Ireland, albeit a rare one in Irish history, "now might bear rich fruit." The *Manchester Guardian* echoed the sentiments of the *Daily Chronicle* in the hope that the rebels would not become martyrs. In addition it developed two main themes in depicting the Asquith government as unwise toward the Irish insurgents. The first was the observation that the experience of the British in suppressing the Boers had not been acknowledged for its effectiveness when time came to handle the Irish rebels. "A series of military executions could only produce a baneful effect in Ireland and a very painful one in England. Enough of blood has flowed." In a letter to the editor, F.S. Salisbury (Manley Park, Manchester) compared South Africa's loyalty to the Empire after the Boer War to the position of Ulster in a proposed Home Rule Ireland. The Ulster Unionists had the opportunity to enter into a power-sharing scheme with the Nationalists in which their aspirations for continued political connection with Great Britain could be assured. "If the Ulster Unionists have looked on Home Rule as a menace to the Imperial tie they will immensely aggravate that menace by standing out of the scheme, while if the risk they anticipate is real they can best neutralize it by adding their steadying influence to the ranks of an Irish Parliament."
The South African Commissioner for Revenue, J. Clare Sheridan, in a letter to the editor of the Daily News proposed that the British government had mismanaged the suppression of the rebellion because Asquith and Maxwell had adopted a repressive policy borne out of anger rather than wise clemency. He offered the parallel with Botha's treatment of De Wet in 1914 in the hope that the British would emulate the leniency given to South African rebels by his government. He stated that the first mistake Asquith had committed to allow military authorities to solve a civilian matter. Maxwell had been given too much responsibility and plenipotentiary power in suppressing an uprising that was never a threat to the stability of the whole of Ireland or the war effort. The second mistake that Asquith committed was overestimating the military significance of the rebellion and underestimating the emotive effect that a stern military response by Britain would have upon the Irish people.77

Moreover, the liberal press asserted that the responsibility for having chosen a harsh repression of the Rising was ultimately Asquith's choice and not Maxwell's. The Manchester Guardian commented that the Government should deal with the executions and not place the burden upon the shoulders of Maxwell.78

R.C.K. Ensor's79 'Note of Warning' to the British government was typical of the Liberal press support for Asquith's coalition. Liberal editors desired to suppress the uprising without giving the Irish republicans martyrs. The Daily Chronicle did not object to the executions of Patrick Pearse, Thomas MacDonagh, and Tom Clarke because they

---

77 "The military authorities in South Africa, while handling the rebellion, were never detached from civil policy and authority because they were under the order of the Minister of Defence, General Smuts, and the Prime Minister, General Botha, himself took chief command in the field. That will explain why the suppression never for a moment took on the spirit of a campaign against an enemy people; the feeling was never absent that the mass of offenders were of the same people as those out against them, therefore brothers and friends, though for the time being erring or deluded. The work of suppression had to be undertaken as an obligation of honour and duty, and was conducted more in sorrow than in anger. Another point always kept in mind was that the mass of the rebels were mistaken and misled, and that if any of them were really dangerous they would be less dangerous in their own homes than anywhere else." (Daily News, 13 May 1916, p.4)

78 "But the question of retribution is one involving high considerations of policy which it is for the statesmen to determine... It is monstrous that a military tribunal, sitting in secret, should be allowed to determine this great and critical matter in hot blood. The responsibility is for the Cabinet, and it ought not to hesitate or to delay in its exercise... If from weakness or carelessness the Cabinet seeks to shuffle off its responsibility on to the shoulders of the soldiers, it may be laying up for the future in the hearts of Irishmen the seeds of misfortunes as great as those which are now our sorrow and our shame." (Manchester Guardian, 6 May 1916, p.4)

"Let it be clearly borne in mind that not General MAXWELL but the Government; and since there is no Irish Secretary the head of the Government, is now directly responsible for what happens in Ireland. There will be in the minds of Irishmen and of neutral observers throughout the world no question of imputing anything that may now occur to the irresponsible action of a military man. What happens now will take place under the sanction and with the authority of the Government of the United Kingdom, whose attention is not now awake to the movement of affairs in Ireland." (Manchester Guardian, 11 May 1916, p.4)

79 Ensor was leader-writer for the Daily Chronicle therefore it is quite likely that this unsigned article was written by him. (Dudley Edwards, O. and Fergus Pyle. 1916: The Easter Rising. MacGibbon & Kee, London, 1968. p.255.)
were signatories to the Proclamation of the Irish Republic and their culpability was never in doubt. However, on 6 May, the editor warned: "But the list of four more shootings which occurred yesterday - only one of them that of a signatory to the manifesto60- will make most people with memories feel a little anxious lest the process should be carried too far."81

The Daily Chronicle hoped that the military reprisals and especially the executions of fifteen82 of the rebels' leaders had not created a legacy of Irish hatred towards British rule. The London paper believed that by implementing home rule or at least in the short-run the establishment of a temporary Unionist-Nationalist war council to administer the island for the remainder of the war, would alleviate the current souring of the Anglo-Irish relationship. As well, the paper warned that the executions might have affected the Irish-American opinion, which the paper maintained was pro-British.83

John Dillon, deputy leader of the I.P.P., initiated debate in the House of Commons concerning the continuing executions in Dublin. Dillon insisted upon questioning the Prime Minister about Irish matters. Dillon was a captive in his home during the rebellion and after the rebellion was suppressed by the British military, he returned to London to try to halt further executions. Before he traveled across St. George's Channel, he was approached by the newly widowed Hanna Sheehy Skeffington who relied upon his good nature to apply political pressure to initiate an inquiry into the death of Francis.84 By May 11, 1916, the Daily Chronicle's leader announced the murder of Francis Sheehy Skeffington by Captain Bowen-Colthurst. On April 7, 1916, Francis Sheehy Skeffington wrote a personal note to Robert Donald, whom the slain activist had known personally, warning him of the unsettling political climate in Ireland and the fear of an uprising which, in the opinion of the Irish pacifist, would probably be a result of British military provocation in an attempt to disarm the Irish Volunteers or the Citizen Army.85 The letter was published posthumously.

80 At dawn, on May 4th Joseph Mary Plunkett (after marrying Grace Gifford the previous evening), Edward Daly, Michael O'Hanrahan and Willie Pearse were executed. Plunkett was a signor of the proclamation, the others were not. (Caulfield, Max 'The Executions' in Dublin 1916 edited by Roger McHugh, Arlington Books, London, 1966, pp. 264-265; MacLochlainn, Piaras F. Last Words: Letters and Statements of the Leaders Executed After the Rising at Easter 1916, Stationary Office, Dublin, 1990, p.95.)
83 "But once the rebellion was suppressed the counsels of mercy should have been heard, and there is a feeling that some at least of the rebels who have been shot were fit subjects for clemency. ... It must be remembered that the overwhelming majority of Irish-Americans ranged themselves on the British side of this war. To estrange their sympathies would be a blunder of the first magnitude." (Daily Chronicle, 16 May 1916, p.1.)
However, in the Daily News, novelist Arnold Bennett asserted that Francis Sheehy Skeffington was not as innocent a bystander and victim of the rebellion as the liberal press contended.86 A letter to the editor dated 31 May, written by Francis' wife, Hanna Sheehy Skeffington, refuting Bennett's allegation that Francis was anything other than a pacifist.87

The political situation in Ireland, while martial law continued, made it very difficult for Nationalist MPs to convince the majority of the Irish people about the sincerity of the current mission to implement home rule. This would explain, in part, why Redmond had a harder time convincing Nationalist Ireland to agree to Lloyd George's negotiations.88

It became apparent to the Manchester Guardian that the viability of the I.P.P. depended upon its ability to deliver home rule. If the Lloyd George settlement were to fail, as it did, the paper warned that extremism would overtake the home rule movement in favour of those who demanded complete separation. "As far as can be seen, if the proposed settlement fails, the constitutional movement goes down with it. The moderate men, the men who first built up the Home Rule movement and on it based the new economic prosperity of Ireland, go under. They leave in possession of the field the irreconcilables on the one hand, government by the strong arm on the other."89

The Manchester Guardian saw clearly the results of indiscriminate retribution against the Irish. The message to the average Irishmen would be to deprecate the work of their fellow countrymen who worked arduously for a peaceful solution to the Irish

86 "By no means all the leaders were Irish patriots, and even the alleged pacifists among them wanted armed rebellion. Thus the late Sheehy-Skeffington, whose pacifism has strangely been accepted as axiomatic by all British newspapers, speaking at the centenary banquet of the John Mitchel Club, appealed at great length for money to buy arms with which to fight the British Government 'When the time came.' He is dead. I greatly regret the manner of his death, but a pacifist he was not." (Daily News, 29 May 1916, p.4.)

87 "Writing of my husband, he denies that he was a pacifist, alleging that he appealed for arms in America at the John Mitchel centenary banquet to fight England 'when the time came.' My husband was a guest and speaker at the banquet- beyond that the statement is pure fable.

A profound believer in the right of our small nationality, Ireland, to her independence, he believed and he upheld the belief by word and pen, in season and out of season, that such independence was only to be won, as Norway won independence, by mutual agreement or by arbitration, not by militarism, which was repugnant to him in any form, whether it was Prussian, British, or Irish. His pacifism did not prevent him deeply honouring (while disagreeing from them as to method) those who were ready to lay down their lives in the assertion of the equal right of Ireland to independence as Belgium or Poland.

... Is it too much to expect writers of Mr. Bennett's reputation and prestige to refrain meanwhile from hasty pre-judgments and from wilful libels of the dead?" (Daily News, 2 June 1916, p.5.)

88 "The stories told to one by responsible Irish members are of constant and repeated humiliation and insult the moment they set foot on their native soil and try to go about their public business. Even to get back to England is a process requiring a great deal of self-control and rather difficult patience. The hope of an Irish settlement trembles in the balance as a consequence of this state of things. Nationalist Ireland, which means practically the whole of Ireland, could still be won to a settlement, but there is a danger, and a serious danger, that all Nationalist Ireland will turn against it. No one who has talked to Irish members just back from Ireland can have any doubt about the situation and the danger. It altogether overshadows the negotiations for a settlement in the minds of the Irish people." (Manchester Guardian, 10 June 1916, p.4.)

89 Manchester Guardian, 23 June 1916, p.4.
question, a solution that seemed in their minds to be in the best interest of the British Empire as well. The choice would be clear. Without home rule and the limited autonomy that it offered the Irish, the only recourse was to fall in with those that preached a violent solution as the guarantor of civil rights.90

The *Daily News* understood that Irish revolutionary organizations did not have many supporters at the beginning of the rebellion and that the organizations were not widespread. Therefore, Birrell, the paper contended, did not need to stay in Dublin throughout the war because his administrative duties were in London. This attempt to deflect criticism of Birrell's administration was based on the fact that the rebellion took Dublin completely by surprise, and the main focus in April 1916 was the war on the continent. "The real importance of the incident, it is already clear, will be political. The excessively silly attacks on Mr. Birrell yesterday need not be taken too seriously; there is doubtless a case against the Government in this business, but it is not this case, nor in any way connected with the absence of the Chief Secretary from Ireland at a time when, if ever, his Cabinet duties required his presence in London."91

By 4 May 1916 when the rebellion was over, English papers began focusing their attention on the inquiry into the causes of the rebellion. Birrell had resigned as Chief Secretary the previous day but the *Daily Chronicle* was not satisfied with placing the blame entirely and squarely upon the shoulders of the MP from Dundee.92 In addition, both the *Daily Chronicle* and the *Daily News* chose to laud Birrell's achievements rather than condemn the Chief Secretary for matters that they believed were largely beyond his control. Birrell gave stability to Ireland before the rebellion. His administration was responsible in large measure for a number of significant accomplishments: a university system, amendments to the Wyndham Land Act, and, most importantly, home rule. "The contributory causes underlying the rebellion are not confined to the past month or to the past year, or to the sworn members of the Sinn Fein movement... . The inquiry must take cognisance of the armed forces, openly organised and either prudently or weakly countenanced by authority, that cannot but have formed an attractive model to the Sinn Fein fanatics."93 The *Daily Chronicle* added that Birrell was a valuable recruiting sergeant as 150,000 Irish soldiers had volunteered during his administration.94 The *Manchester Guardian* believed that history would be kind to Birrell as he was a popular administrator, secured Home Rule, and established a Catholic University.95

---

91 *Daily News*, 27 April 1916, p.4.
93 *Daily News*, 4 May 1916, p.4.
The *Manchester Guardian* suggested that at no time during the past century had the Unionists and Nationalists been more unified than when Irishmen were fighting on the continent.96 The *Daily Chronicle* invited both sides to form an Irish executive or to recreate an Irish Parliament where they can work toward implementation of home rule. The paper stated that there needed to be a new form of government in Ireland as the old Castle system had not only broken down but also proved to be unworkable and unretrievable. The only form of government, the *Daily Chronicle*'s editor opined, that would be successful in Ireland now was one run by Irishmen who could sympathize with Irish issues and come to a common understanding amongst their fellow countrymen.97

Sacrifices by both parties needed to be made for a successful settlement. The *Daily News*, however, believed that Nationalist Ireland had much to lose in these negotiations. "That the sacrifice made by the Nationalists was the greater will hardly be denied, for they were yielding up the integrity of their country, surrendering the full measure that Parliament had conceded to them and allowing Home Rule to be stripped of one of its greatest guarantees of success."98

From the beginning of the uprising the *Manchester Guardian* had favored home rule as a means of bringing stability to Ireland and improving Anglo-Irish relations.99 The *Guardian* stated that the rebellion was aimed mainly at the Nationalist Party that was cooperating with the British government. Asquith, the paper suggested, had been ignoring the Nationalist leaders regarding Irish domestic matters.100 The *Daily News* echoed the *Guardian*'s opinion that home rule was the only plausible method of obtaining peace on the island. Irish rebels were encouraged by the lawlessness of Sir Edward Carson who demonstrated that the threat of force and intimidation was a viable political policy. The Castle government underestimated the importance of the rebellion as a symbol of republican determination to expel the British from Ireland. "It is the sort of error which has been responsible in the past for most Irish tragedies; and it is bound to be repeated, with similar disastrous results, until Ireland is governed with Irishmen."101

James Douglas, writing for the *Daily News*, indicated that the case compelling Ulster into a home rule parliament should not be insurmountable as it might first appear. Ulstermen, Douglas contended, are primarily concerned with their economic prosperity, and if the remainder of Ireland can prove that they can protect Ulster's future within the British Empire, then Ulstermen will join their fellow countrymen in home rule. "The one

---

97 *Daily Chronicle*, 20 May 1916, p.4.
99 Two of the *Guardian*'s best reporters on Ireland, J.L. Hammond and C.E. Montague were fighting at the front. Both returned to the *Guardian* in 1919.
100 *Manchester Guardian*, 26 April 1916, p.4.
thing to remember is that Ulster is Irish to the core, and that it can never be anything else, in spite of its differences of religion, of blood, of temperament, and of character. The Ulster character is practical. Show it Home Rule in being, working on sound, stable, businesslike lines, and it will soon take a hand in the spadework. It has no use for visions or visionaries, dreams or dreamers. It has every use for Home Rule as a business proposition."102 The Manchester Guardian concluded that if Home Rule were not implemented immediately, the consequences would be tragic.103

The Daily Chronicle questioned the view that military control of the island was desirable or even necessary in the aftermath of the rebellion. The British people, the paper continued, could not understand the extent of the volatile situation in Ireland after the rising and how it needed to be handled very carefully. If, the paper warned, the Irish people were not consulted on the immediate future of the island, the military handling of the situation would have catastrophic and long-lasting consequences. This problem would not be only a domestic issue concerning Irish and British relations but this repression would affect the relations that the British government had upon the Irish in America. "Observe too, that the American Press- significant fact- while raising no question as to the justice of the military executions, doubt their expediency."104 Thus the paper favoured a civilian response to the machinery of government at the end of the rebellion. The paper was especially critical of the British military's handling of the rebellion (and of the current war as well).

The Daily Chronicle favoured the immediate implementation of home rule during the war as the only viable solution for keeping the nationalist population in support of the war. The paper had understood that the British response to the rising had begun to polarize the nationalist population. "No journal in this country has fought more

102 Daily News, 22 May 1916, p.4.
103 "Mad and futile as the rising was, its consequences may yet prove far more serious than at first appeared. For it is not the rising itself, but the way in which it has been put down, from which danger is to be feared, and a whole train of consequences have been set going of which we are far enough from seeing the end, and which, if not wisely and courageously dealt with in a spirit not of mere evasion and make-believe but of a resolute statesmanship, may yet bring about something very like disaster. This is to cause confusion and deep division in Ireland and grave distraction to Great Britain was the object of the Sinn Fein rising, it may yet prove, if the matter be not wisely handled, to have been not so mad or so futile as it seemed.

The danger is twofold. There is the danger of alienation rising to disaffection in Ireland, destructive of its new-found loyalties and of its active and splendid spirit of co-operation with the rest of the country in the war; and there is the further danger of the spread of such a spirit of resentment in an intensified form to the Irish in the United States.

. . . The only possible policy remaining which shall restore confidence and confirm loyalty in Ireland is to bring Home Rule, with such modifications as the changed circumstances demand, at once into operation, not indeed in its final shape, but as an avowedly provisional and experimental measure. . . . Another modification of the Act, which would appear to be rendered necessary at once by the provisional character of the new measure and in order to mark it as provisional, would be the retention at Westminster in their full numbers of the Irish members until Home Rule could take its final shape." (Manchester Guardian, 29 May 1916, p.4.)

104 Daily Chronicle, 10 May 1916, p.4.
strenuously or steadfastly for Home Rule. Our view is that Ireland is one and indivisible in much more than a geographical sense. We dislike profoundly the notion of the exclusion from the sphere of an Irish Government even temporarily of any part of Ulster."105 But the editorial continued to call attention to the fact, one that most Nationalists had completely ignored that Ulster could not be forced into a united Ireland. Ulster, the paper contended, would (over time) feel compelled to join a national assembly in Dublin and therefore the temporary exclusion of Ulster should be supported as a means to solve the impasse over home rule. The alternative to not implementing a modified form of home rule during the war, the paper later asserted, would be "anarchy, coercion, poverty, bloodshed, and crime."106

By 15 June 1916, the English liberal press noted that the Irish people's support for Redmond's apparent willingness to compromise on Ulster was causing irreparable harm to his leadership in the Irish Parliamentary Party. The Manchester Guardian cited a change of opinion in Ireland concerning Home Rule.107 Dubliners had been punished collectively for the misdeeds of a few insurrectionists who were not supported by the majority of the Irish.

Lloyd George's entry into the home rule negotiations was first reported in the Daily Chronicle on Friday 26 May. (The Daily Chronicle and Lloyd George were destined to have a closer relationship when he became Prime Minister in December 1916 and purchased the paper. Prior to December 1916, it is not clear that Robert Donald particularly favoured Lloyd George, although they had a friendly professional relationship. Following the death of Kitchener on 5 June 1916, the Daily Chronicle did not endorse an increase of Lloyd George's powers as war minister, a slight that apparently incensed the ambitious politician.108 Perhaps this slight convinced the new Prime Minister of the need to control the leading liberal newspaper of its day.) The paper stressed that any settlement would not be implemented or could not be permanent without the 'crux' of the Irish question being solved, i.e. the issue of Ulster. News of Lloyd George's appointment as chief negotiator was met with initial optimism. Many aspects of Lloyd George's personality were advantageous to the resolution of the current Irish situation. Primarily, as a Welshman it was believed that he possessed a disposition to understand the Celtic temperament. As a politician, he appealed to both the Nationalists

105 Daily Chronicle, 10 June 1916, p.4.
107 "At the time of the insurrection the overwhelming majority of the Irish people were against the insurrection and were solidly behind the Parliamentary party. Now the Parliamentary party is itself in serious danger... The settlement proposed by Mr. Lloyd George concedes the maximum practical demand of the Ulster Unionists. It asks a complete and most generous surrender on the part of the Nationalists. Yet the Irish people would almost certainly have accepted it if the regime of martial law had ended with the suppression of the insurrection." (Manchester Guardian, 15 June 1916, p.4.)
and Unionists and was viewed as impartial. As the summer months continued, however, he came to favor the Unionist position. His secret negotiations created mistrust amongst the Irish politicians. He assured Redmond that the exclusion of Ulster would be temporary but to Carson he pledged that it would be permanent. By the end of May, Lloyd George’s abilities had raised great expectations that he might be the man to solve the Irish question which had tarnished the reputations of politicians who were more adept than the ‘Welsh Wizard’. The *Daily Chronicle* echoed the common sentiment of the Liberal press who suggested that in "entrusting to the Minister of Munitions the task of helping the parties to bridge their differences the Cabinet have made a common-sense choice. Mr. Lloyd George’s talents never show to greater advantage than in finding middle ways, on which opponents can unite; he has by general consent a most exceptional gift in that direction. Moreover, though a member of the Cabinet which carried the Home Rule Act, he has more recently been a good deal associated with Sir Edward Carson; and his mediation should be less alarming to the Ulster extremists than that of most Home Rulers."109 The paper continued, "The fact that Mr. Lloyd George is himself a Celt, with a full share of Celtic imagination and sympathy, helps to make his appointment more acceptable to the Nationalists. ... Sir Edward Carson publicly stated a few weeks ago that he had more confidence in him than in any other member of the Cabinet."110 The paper pursued a policy (and invited the national press to do so as well from that time forth) to keep speculative criticism of the negotiations to a minimum in the hope that a possible solution would not be derailed by false rumors.

By the end of May, when Lloyd George was appointed by Asquith to negotiate on home rule, the *Manchester Guardian* expressed hope and confidence that Lloyd George would be successful in bringing Home Rule into effect during the war. Moreover, the paper impressed upon its readers the necessity of appointing Lloyd George who had a successful record of negotiating in volatile situations (namely labour disputes prior to the war). The Irish settlement would be difficult, and in the opinion of the paper, had to be resolved in order to prosecute the war. "From a war point of view the Irish question is not a side issue. The Government are very much alive to the fact that the Irish quarrel is doing us great harm diplomatically with all neutral nations, both in Europe and America. If only as a war measure, an Irish settlement with Irish consent is most urgently needed."111

The *Daily News* asserted that the Unionist councils would not have agreed to the immediate implementation of home rule if it were not clear to them that Ulster would be excluded permanently. "It is argued by Unionists that if the proposals meant no more than the temporary exclusion of the six counties the Ulster Unionist Council would have

absolutely and instantly rejected them. It is hinted that either Mr. Redmond or Sir Edward Carson may have misunderstood the proposals of Mr. Lloyd George.\textsuperscript{112} However, Prime Minister Asquith assured his supporters that the agreement on the exclusion of Ulster was temporary. The Prime Minister's speech at Ladybank on 14 June 1916 stated ". . . that the present basis of settlement was provisional, and that 'when the war ended we shall have to take stock as an Empire of our international relations,' (but) there has been a marked change of feeling amongst Ulster Nationalists, who had previously shown pronounced hostility to the exclusion of the six counties.\textsuperscript{113}

The preliminary Lloyd George settlement began to unravel by the third week in June. Initially, the difficulties facing the minister of munitions and Redmond were represented by numerous divisive groups in Ireland. Redmond had to placate the Irish Catholic Church, which was not eager to partition the country and 'lose' the Ulster Catholics. The extreme nationalists (mislabeled Sinn Fein during the Easter Rebellion but this term was quickly becoming the accepted nomenclature for a disparate number of groups that ranged from the Irish Citizen Army, Fianna, Cumann na mBan, Irish Republican Brotherhood to the Irish Volunteers, to name a few) although many of its leaders were either executed or languishing in British gaols, wanted complete separation from the British Empire not a reorganization of an inadequate home rule settlement. The majority of the Nationalists did not wish to see Ireland partitioned even on a temporary basis. Redmond's influence, however, remained strong in May, as he was able to unite at least two-thirds of the representative nationalist population behind Lloyd George's proposals.

The obstacles facing Edward Carson were equally as daunting. The Southern Unionists (of whom Carson was a member although not their leader- that was Lord Midleton) faced political and geographic isolation if a Dublin Parliament was to be established and Ulster excluded. The protestant leaders of the north were more easily convinced that Ulster should be excluded permanently. Therefore, Carson was able to unify his Ulster Unionist coalition before Redmond's support had coalesced. The real opposition to home rule in 1916 actually emanated from Westminster, not from Belfast. In June, 1916, when the settlement seemed to be acceptable to both sides in Ireland, the Unionist politicians in Great Britain, led by Lords Selborne and Lansdowne, sought to destroy this most fragile of settlements. Asquith had tied his own hands in the matter by placing in his cabinet opponents of home rule. Since Asquith offered the conservative opposition the opportunity to form a coalition government on May 26, 1915, eight

\textsuperscript{112} Daily News, 14 June 1916, p.5.
conservatives had held cabinet posts.\textsuperscript{114} There had been numerous changes in this first coalition cabinet between May 1915 and June 1916 most notably the defection of Carson as Attorney General in October 1915 over the failed Dardanelles campaign.\textsuperscript{115} Three of the original eight (Lords Selborne, Lansdowne, and Walter Long) threatened to resign when it became clear that the Lloyd George scheme might be enacted. Lord Selborne was content to see Home Rule enacted with Lloyd George's stipulations for Ulster but he was determined that this should not take place until after the war.\textsuperscript{116} Walter Long, who had been uneasy about the formation of a Liberal-Unionist coalition in the first place, did not want to see the Sinn Feiners awarded Home Rule as a prize for armed rebellion.\textsuperscript{117} To be sure, Long and Lansdowne did not want to see home rule enacted during the war. They did not give Lloyd George their assent to negotiate concerning Ulster's status on behalf of the Unionists (even though Carson reluctantly agreed to what in essence were partition and therefore his surrender to home rule). But the puzzling defection was Lansdowne for the following reason. Before the war, in July (21-24) 1914, the Unionist politicians (Carson, Craig, Lansdowne and Law) offered practically the same terms at the Buckingham Conference. The conference broke down over the issues of a time limit for the exclusion of Ulster and especially which counties would be exempted from the home rule scheme. Such acceptance on the part of Redmond for the Unionist and Liberal proposals was not forthcoming or at any time was politically possible for the Irish Parliamentary Party's leader.\textsuperscript{118} Nearly two years later, however, it was Lansdowne who chose not to allow that scheme to be accepted. This prompted the \textit{Daily Chronicle} to wonder if the "Buckingham Palace offer (was) a sham?"\textsuperscript{119}

The \textit{Daily News} explained that the failure of the Lloyd George negotiations was due to many factors: failure of communication between Redmond and Lloyd George concerning the status of Ulster, the attempt to derail the home rule settlement by Lord Lansdowne, and the continuance of martial law in Ireland. Redmond understood that the 1914 Act (which was on the statute books) would be implemented in its entirety, or with


\textsuperscript{116} \textit{Daily Chronicle,} 28 June 1916, p.4.

\textsuperscript{117} Kendle, John. \textit{Walter Long, Ireland, and the Union, 1905-1920.} Glendale, Dublin, 1992. pp. 91-92 for Long's position on Home Rule following the rebellion see p.120.

\textsuperscript{118} For a brief discussion concerning the Unionist position at the conference see (Blake, Robert. \textit{The Unknown Prime Minister: The Life and Times of Andrew Bonar Law} (1858-1923). Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, 1955. pp. 215-217.)

\textsuperscript{119} \textit{Daily Chronicle,} 27 June 1916, pp. 1,4.
Ulster temporarily opting out of the scheme, until its status could be reevaluated after the war. This new development (Ulster's temporary exclusion) necessitated keeping all Irish MPs in Westminster until home rule was enacted on a permanent basis, otherwise, Ulster's exclusion would undoubtedly become permanent. Lansdowne, on the other hand, delivered a "wrecking speech" intended to express the Unionists' understanding that Ulster would be permanently excluded from the home rule scheme. Finally, the paper warned that the British government must act quickly to find a reasonable alternative to Castle Rule and cease martial law in Dublin. "The existing situation is disturbing and dangerous. It works inevitably to the advantage of those forces on both sides which do not want a peaceful settlement and are aiming to make a peaceful settlement impossible. Unless the Government act firmly and quickly the moment that is so full of hope will pass and events will be our master. It will then be too late to act." 120

The conservative House of Lords initiated their own debate on the causes of the uprising. Lord Midleton was severely criticized by the Daily Chronicle who stated he "had the audacity to attribute the beginnings of the troubles to the landing of arms at Howth by the Nationalists in July, 1914, conveniently forgetting that this was preceded in May by the Ulster gun-running at Larne- an exploit lauded and justified by Lord Midleton's journalistic and political friends." (Northcliffe and Carson) 121 Lord Midleton stated in his Records and Reactions that on numerous occasions he had tried to warn the British governments in London and in Dublin that a rising was about to occur in the spring of 1916. (Augustine Birrell stated that Midleton's warning only referred to Sinn Fein activity around Cork, not Dublin) 122 Midleton stated that he had received information from naval authorities in Queenstown Harbour that German money was being used to support covert operations in the south of Ireland, but these reports were discounted by Asquith and Birrell. 123 His recollections concerning the period are a bit suspect, however, as he later asserted that the Aude (sic) had been captured, the German sailors taken prisoner, and the Aude towed to Queenstown. In fact, the ship was scuttled, in an attempt to block Queenstown Harbour, before the German sailors surrendered. 124

The Manchester Guardian hinted that the Unionist Party was not united behind Edward Carson but that many members of the English Unionists were suspicious of the Irish leader of the Ulster Unionists. They felt Carson was too eager to compromise on

122 Daily Chronicle, 20 May 1916, p.3.
home rule. One month later, the Manchester Guardian warned of the difficulties needed to be overcome by the Nationalists and Unionists alike. For the Ulster Unionists, difficulties arose from the intransigence of Selborne and Lansdowne. Redmond had to convince Catholic bishops that Ulster Catholicism would not be separated from the remainder of the country.

The Daily News published during the next few days concerns about the unity of Asquith's cabinet. By the end of June 1916, it became clear that not all members of the cabinet agreed with the proposals set forth by Lloyd George. The divergence of views amongst the English Unionist members and Asquith was a recent development and proved to be the obstacle that doomed the agreement. The London liberal journal was impatient with those members of the cabinet who chose to continue with an absentee landlord mindset when dealing with Irish matters. The paper accused the English Unionists of being obstructionists to every Irish settlement, "gentry (who) are politicians pure and simple, and the nation as a whole is sick to death of them." In the end, the Daily News blamed the English Unionists for the impasse and eventual failure of the Lloyd George negotiations. "Lord Lansdowne in calling this a "structural alteration" in the Home Rule Act implies that the separation will be permanent- that the experiment, that is to say, will fail of its main object, a contented and united Ireland."

Lord Lansdowne's announcement that the Irish settlement would contain the permanent exclusion of Ulster caused Redmond to denounce Lansdowne's attempts to destroy Lloyd George's efforts. While reminding its readers that the nationalists were loyal during the war, had condemned the Sinn Fein rebellion and that Redmond's own brother was fighting in France, the Daily Chronicle sharply criticized the actions taken by the English Unionist members of Asquith's cabinet. "While Lord Midleton and his fellow-fanatics pursue the paths of domestic feud Mr. Redmond's brother, now Captain William Redmond, MP, has been in the forefront of the battle with a battalion whose officers have suffered heavily. The greatest asset that the Empire has in Nationalist Ireland is this loyalty of the Nationalists."

A few days later it appeared that the settlement was

---

125 "The majority of Unionists interpret the Nationalist demand for clemency for the rank and file of the insurgents as a proof of sympathy with a policy of rebellion and violence. They have convinced themselves that the appeals by Unionists as well as Liberal journals for a settlement on a basis of compromise are connected with a plot to place Ulster under a Home Rule Parliament. They are watching the actions of Sir Edward Carson with extreme suspicion, and they do not hesitate to declare that if he shows the slightest sign of "betraying" them by helping to bring about a settlement they will immediately repudiate him." (Manchester Guardian, 17 May 1916, p.5.)

126 Manchester Guardian, 22 June 1916, p.4.
ruined. The paper targeted a small portion of the Unionists as the wreckers of the plan.\textsuperscript{130} The negotiations ended with the issue of Ulster unsettled and the Nationalist membership in the House of Commons unaffected (their numbers would have been reduced to 40 which was stipulated by the Home Rule Act of 1914). Redmond was not assured by the settlement that the exclusion of Ulster would be temporary or that a reduction in the legislative power of the nationalists would be permanent before the Ulster question was settled. The Lloyd George scheme stated that nationalist representation would 'remain unaltered'.\textsuperscript{131} Redmond was not consulted on either of these new developments and therefore had no choice but to reject the altered settlement.\textsuperscript{132} 

From the \textit{Manchester Guardian}'s London correspondent, the paper offered its opinion about how best to deal with Sir Roger Casement: "Amongst people who do not let themselves be carried away by gusts of passion it is considered that the proper course with Sir Roger Casement would be to put him in a lunatic asylum."\textsuperscript{133} In the view of this paper only the verdict of lunacy could rationally explain Casement's seemingly enigmatic actions while denying any legitimacy to a claim for his impending martyrdom on the gallows. Casement was to be tried in a civil court in England rather than a military court in Ireland. Casement based his defence upon the understanding that as an Irishman (he was born in county Antrim) he should be tried under Irish law. The \textit{Manchester Guardian} devoted considerable discussion to the seemingly contradictory treatment of the rebels in Dublin who were executed under Regulation 58a of the Defence of the Realm Act, while Casement, who was obviously a rebel leader, was given the opportunity to plead his case in civil court. The liberal journal recognized the fact that had Casement been tried in Ireland, he would have undoubtedly been executed by a firing squad in May instead of being hanged in August.\textsuperscript{134} Because he was captured prior to the outbreak of the rising and the suspension of the civil courts in Ireland, the Defence of the Realm Act stipulated that he would be tried in London. "... Sir Roger is proceeded against under the Defence of the Realm Acts, as he no doubt could be, he has the right as a British subject to demand

\textsuperscript{130} "A great new opportunity opened itself, almost too good to be true; and the vast majority of Englishmen, Unionists and Liberals alike, hailed it with relief and joy. The voice of faction was only heard in this country from a very small Unionist minority; influential in the House of Lords but almost negligible in the constituencies even among its own party. It was the old voice of the Irish Ascendancy landlords, which had blocked reconciliation between England and the Irish Catholics ever since the eighteenth century." (\textit{Daily Chronicle}, 21 July 1916, p.4.)

\textsuperscript{131} \textit{Daily Chronicle}, 28 July 1916, p.5.

\textsuperscript{132} "It has fallen through because the Government have changed the terms, not merely in form, but in substance. What was good enough for Sir Edward Carson and the Ulster Council was not good enough for Lord Midleton and Lord Beresford and Ministers, after waivering all this month, have finally capitulated to the latter. They did so knowing full well that they were killing the settlement, and that a Bill drafted on their new lines must be dead before it was introduced." (\textit{Daily Chronicle}, 25 July 1916, p.4.) Why Admiral Lord Beresford is included in this discussion is unclear. He was not mentioned by other papers in this study as a vociferous opponent of the scheme.

\textsuperscript{133} \textit{Manchester Guardian}, 26 April 1916, p.4.

\textsuperscript{134} \textit{Manchester Guardian}, 30 June 1916, p.4.
trial by a civil court with a jury, and the inference is that he had exercised it. In the circumstances the Government are taking the only course the law allows by subjecting him to trial by the ordinary forms." George Bernard Shaw's comments on Casement appeared in the liberal paper in an op-ed column entitled "Shall Roger Casement Hang?" Shaw did not excuse Casement's crime as a traitor but questioned whether this term should be applied to his situation. That Casement is an Irishman was not refutable and to the charge that he forfeited the defence that he was not being tried by his peers because he had received a pension from the British Government, he explained that simply because he received payment from one authority did not strip him of his nationality. He concluded by stating that Casement should be considered a prisoner of war.  

The beginning of the Casement proceedings was reported in the press on May 15th and continued throughout June. On the last day of June, the first editorial in the Daily Chronicle concerning the verdict stated that his real crime was not that he was an Irish separatist but that he was in collusion with Britain's enemy and therefore undoubtedly

---

136 "First let me say that I have no sentimental appeal to make. Casement (he is no longer technically Sir Roger; but I really cannot bring myself to throw Mister in his teeth at such a moment) has lived his life not without distinction. His estimate of the relative values of the political rights of his country as he conceives them and of the integrity of his neck may be more Irish than English (though I hope I have no right to say so); but at any rate he has staked his life and lost, and cannot with any sort of dignity ask, or allow anyone else to ask on his behalf, for sentimental privilege. There need be no hesitation to carry out the sentence if it should appear, on reflection, a sensible one. . . . I presume I may count on a general agreement that Casement's treatment should not be exceptional. This is important, because it happens that his case is not an isolated one just now. There are several traitors in the public eye at present. At the head of them stands Christian De Wet. If De Wet is spared and Casement hanged, the unavoidable conclusion will be that Casement will be hanged, not because he is a traitor, but because he is an Irishman. We have also a group of unconvicted, and indeed unprosecuted, traitors, whose action helped very powerfully to convince Germany that she might attack France without incurring our active hostility. As all these gentlemen belong to the same political party, their impunity, if Casement be executed, will lead to the still closer conclusion that his real offence is not merely that of being an Irishman but of being a rationalist Irishman. I see no way of getting round this. If it was proper to reprieve De Wet, whose case was a very flagrant one, Casement cannot be executed except on the assumption that Casement is a more hateful person than De Wet; and there is no other apparent ground for this discrimination than the fact that Casement is an Irishman and De Wet is a Boer. . . . On the question of allegiance, Casement was equally explicit. . . . In any case, the word traitor as applied to a rebel has always been a mere vituperation from the days of Wallace to those of Sir Edward Carson and Sir Frederick Smith, and in my opinion it should be disused in this sense by intelligent men. Certainly, no one outside Great Britain will have any desire to apply it, even for vituperative purposes, to Casement.

Public opinion seems to be influenced to some extent by the notion that because Casement received money for his work from the British Empire and earned it with such distinction that he became personally famous and was knighted for it, and expressed himself as gentlemen do on such occasions, he is in the odious position of having bitten the hand that fed him. . . . The reasonable conclusion is that Casement should be treated as a prisoner of war. I believe this is the view that will be taken in the neutral countries whose good opinion is much more important to us than the satisfaction of our resentment. In Ireland he will be regarded as a national hero if he is executed, and quite possibly as a spy if he is not. For that reason it may well be that he would object very strongly to my attempt to prevent his canonisation. But Ireland has enough heroes and martyrs already, and if England has not by this time had enough of manufacturing them in fits of temper experience is thrown away on her, and she will continue to be government, as she is at present to so great an extent unconsciously, by Casement's countrymen." (Manchester Guardian, 22 July 1916, p.3.)
guilty of treason. While the Irish were loyal to the Empire during this war, the activities of Casement, the paper opined, had stained the good name of the Irish.137

The Manchester Guardian's coverage of the trial provided an opportunity for it to engage in some poetic license in order to return to its theme of Casement as deranged. Drawing the analogy that Casement seemed Quixotic at his trial, the paper went on to suggest that Private Bailey "... plump and childlike and fair, was the queerest contrast—one would say Sancho Panza unwillingly yoked to Don Quixote, and ... his part in the bizarre enterprise precisely that of an unquestioning Sancho."138 (April 27, 1916 was the 300th anniversary of the death of Cervantes.) In a letter to the Manchester Guardian's editor, Sir Edward Fry questioned the decision to execute Casement. "Assuming the failure of Roger Casement's appeal, would it not be a political blunder to let him die upon the scaffold? Would it not add a new name to the roll of so-called martyrs for Ireland? Would it not increase the trouble of her waters, already, as Heaven knows, troubled enough?"139 John Dillon responded by agreeing with Fry but wondered why more people had not openly criticized the military executions in Dublin which "had poisoned the minds of the Irish people against the Government of this country."140

Journalists who knew Casement's exploits in Africa and South America tended to lament his final demise. There was a sincere sense of regret for Casement who was a true humanitarian. This opinion was supplied by the African Mail, a colonial paper for British expatriates living in Central and West Africa, which was published in Liverpool and London. The paper believed like many of those who were fond of him that he had temporarily gone insane. "The natives of the Congo owe him much; England thought highly of him; he was honoured by his Sovereign with a knighthood; and now he lies in a prison cell charged with the worst crime a man can commit against his country."141 In the end, however, his death was reported as "a deplorable end to a distinguished career."142

Both the Daily Chronicle and Manchester Guardian believed Casement to be insane. The Guardian favoured placing Casement in an asylum even to compare his mentality with that of Cervantes' hero. The Manchester paper quoted Shaw's opinion that Casement be treated as a prisoner of war and debunked the argument that he was a British subject by virtue of his paymaster. The execution of Casement was viewed in the end as a political blunder and would create trouble for the future. The Liberal press was in opposition to its government as to the fate of Casement. However, it must be kept in mind that Casement's sentence could only have been rescinded by King George and Asquith

137 Daily Chronicle, 30 June 1916, p.4.
138 Manchester Guardian, 16 May 1916, p.4.
141 African Mail, 5 May 1916, p. 311
142 ibid. 4 August 1916, p. 446
was unwilling to request this of the monarch. This was another example of Asquith's indifference to Irish sensitivities and his preoccupation with the war.

The conservative press (Globe and Traveller, Daily Express, Times and Daily Mail and The Round Table) advocated harsh treatment for the rebel leaders and demanded that Asquith's Irish administration shoulder the responsibility for the rebellion's outbreak. By the summer of 1916, the invincibility of British diplomacy and military-might had come into question. The reports from Verdun spoke of stalemate, Townsend's forces had been overrun by the Turks, and Kitchener had been the victim of a lone German mine. America's attitude toward the war, despite numerous provocations by German submarines, was staunchly neutral. Britain's most troublesome colony, Ireland, which until the Easter Rising had been a steady source of recruits, now threatened to be a thorn in the side of the British prosecution of the war. Into this the British conservative press called for "patriotism and wisdom." Max Aitken's Daily Express took a solemn tone in warning its readers of just how critical the situation in Ireland had become. But the conservative press offered no tangible solution for Ireland. Lloyd George’s settlement was viewed as a temporary solution to an impossible situation. Threatening this fragile settlement were "irreconcilables" in both Ireland (most notably Sinn Fein) and England (the English Unionist "mischief makers").

In the aftermath of the Easter Rebellion the British conservative press did not reflect on the results of the Rising only to conclude that the situation in Ireland would remain a frustration to British diplomacy. While on the one hand the British Empire could tolerate divergence in the political spectrum, e.g. liberal v. conservative, socialist v. capitalist, in their view the principle that united all British subjects was loyalty to the crown. When the Daily Express looked at Ireland, however, it saw only extremism that naturally equated to disrespect for British benevolence. The Daily Express noted that the Easter Rising had damaged the progress made since 1903 when the Wyndham Act eliminated the long-standing economic grievance for peasant ownership of their land. Extremists in Ireland (despite their small numbers) still held much influence and the island would remain divided as a result.

The Globe and Traveller in 1916 was the oldest evening paper in England and supplied some of the bitterest commentary about Asquith's Liberal regime and the Irish nationalist movement. 

143 Daily Express, 20 June 1916, p.4.
144 "The unpleasant truth is that, however conciliatory the Irish leaders may be, and however close is the entente between British parties, the extremists of all sections still exercise a great, and perhaps a predominant, influence in Ireland itself... Ireland will always be Ireland- the country that inspires poets and breaks statesmen's hearts." (Daily Express, 26 May 1916, p.4.)
145 In 1911, Max Aitken bought a controlling interest in the paper for £40,000, although he was not influential in the paper's editorial policy. (Taylor, A.J.P. Beaverbrook, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1974. p.95) After Aitken's ownership, the paper was sold to Dudley Docker in 1914 (ibid. p.117) and managed by Arthur Bellamy (since 1912). In January 1916, Aitken became Lord Beaverbrook.
government. It was owned by the Birmingham industrialist Dudley Docker. This conservative paper had been described by Viscount Camrose (the owner of the Daily Telegraph and Morning Post) as an 'unstable, sounding-board for rich, irresponsible proprietors', "most of them had an axe to grind in some form or another." The Globe and Traveller was a sensationalist paper and not very well respected by the government. (The paper even went so far to allege that Asquith's wife was homosexual). On 6 November 1915, Asquith's government suppressed the paper and only was allowed to resume publication after its editor, Charles Palmer, was forced to resign on 20 November. Beaverbrook and Northcliffe's papers, on the other hand, were much more populist and representative of mainstream Unionist thought. Lord Northcliffe (who also published the Times and many other newspapers) owned the Daily Mail. The Daily Mail had the largest circulation of any London daily during the war, it served the readership of lower to middle class citizens, and it was Northcliffe's real mouthpiece. The Daily Express was edited by Ralph D. Blumenfeld and owned by Max Aitken (Lord Beaverbrook) who also owned the Evening Standard, Sunday Express and Glasgow's Evening Citizen. Aitken, who was a Scots-Canadian and a prosperous one at that, favored home rule for Ireland believing that the Irish could prosper as did Canada under the Union. One of Aitken's close friends was Tim Healy. They both recruited for the Empire in Canada shortly after the declaration of war. However, as a Presbyterian, he desired religious protection for Ulster Protestants.

The London Times was edited by Geoffrey Dawson and published by Lord Northcliffe. The Times acknowledged the skills of Asquith in the area of home rule, but blamed the Irish Executive for failure to bring law and order to Ireland. Northcliffe's other paper, the Daily Mail, had emphasized the point that the Allies must win the war and all other considerations were a diversion. The Irish situation must be dealt with expeditiously or left until after the war. The Times agreed with the Daily Mail's sentiment. "We shall all do well to remind ourselves daily that our first business is to win the war, with or without a contented Ireland. . . . The Home Rule Bill is 'on the Statute-

149 Aitken's acquisition of the Daily Express was fortuitous. While on vacation in the south of France to celebrate his recent election as Unionist MP for Aston-under-Lyne, Aitken was approached by the debt-striken editor of the Daily Express, Ralph Blumenfeld. Aitken agreed to finance the paper, partially because it afforded him the opportunity to use the Unionist paper as his political mouthpiece. (Taylor, A.J.P. Beaverbrook, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1974. pp.83-85.)
book.' Let it remain there."152 The Times added its voice to the chorus of condemnation of Birrell in the aftermath of the Irish uprising. The independent organ applauded the resignation of the Chief Secretary but lamented that he was another appointee that was ill-suited for the complexities of Irish government. "He is the victim of a perverse political system which distributes rewards- and punishments- for other reasons than that of fitness for a vacant post. He is an extreme example of this perverse system, which his disappearance from our political life may help to undermine."153

The lack of accurate information concerning the uprising, it was feared, was creating the impression in America and elsewhere that the situation in Dublin was far more serious than the British government would allow the press to report. This was substantiated by German reports that portrayed the British government as unable to control a relatively minor conflagration. In addition, the British military was being portrayed by German propagandists as unduly harsh in their repression of the rebellion.154

Two days later this concern over censorship had created exactly what Northcliffe and Dawson predicted would happen if America did not receive substantive reports from Ireland. In an article entitled "American Comment, Advice to the Censor"155, written from Washington, the Times acknowledged the role of British censorship in shaping American opinion about the rising by default. Censorship could determine whether the Rising was to be viewed as an insignificant aside in Anglo-Irish relations or create a void that would be filled by propaganda from the German-Irish coalition in America.156

The Times considered that the average American had little understanding of the religious and political complexities of Ireland. While Americans interpreted the home rule crisis in terms of British Imperialism infringing upon the national development of Ireland, the more discerning Englishman understood the inaccuracy inherent in this colonial scenario. The American public discounted the presence of a significant protestant minority

152 Times, 17 May 1916, p. 9.
153 "It is notorious that the Maxwell regime has made Sinn Feiners by the thousand and the ten thousand, that moderate men are being converted into extremists in battalions. The one hope of checking this disastrous landslide was to give Ireland some proof of our good will, and the Nationalist Party some support against the revolutionary movement in opposition to which they had been fighting so loyally. The wrecking of the agreement gravely imperils that hope. It has left the Nationalist Party an object of ridicule to its Irish enemies." (Times, 4 May 1916, p.9.)
154 Times, 27 April 1916, p.7.
156 "So far as the United States are concerned the British Censor is perhaps the greatest factor in deciding how serious the reverberations of the Irish uprising are going to be. If he allows full and frank accounts of what has happened and is happening to reach these shores, the American public will be able to form its own judgment, and it may be said with reasonable confidence that that judgement will not be favourable to the extremist Irish on either side of the Atlantic or to their German friends. If, on the contrary, he persists in his present course of allowing only the most meager and most tantalizing items to filter over the cable, the American public will be inclined to draw sombre conclusions, and the German-Irish party will be able to make free use of its most valuable asset- a picturesque and ingenious imagination, unfeathered by any regard whatever for truth." (Times, 29 April 1916, p.10.)
whose liberties the British government was obligated to preserve. The British understood that while home rule might deliver the Irish Nationalist aspiration for local self-government, it would open a Pandora's box of sectarian conflict. In an article entitled "American Comment, German Propaganda" the Times correspondent in America wrote that Americans expected home rule for Ireland to be enacted.157

In a letter to the editor by "An Irishwoman" (nom de plume unidentified, but 'she' may be Northcliffe; refer to Daily Mail 13 May 1916, p.4)158 wrote that a Cromwellian settlement of the Irish situation was impractical, but the alternative was equally distasteful. Irish rebels in English jails would not be thwarted in their quest for independence nor would they respect English law. This unidentified writer proposed that their repentance and punishment would be better served on the Western front with their fellow countrymen. "...send these captives to join their brothers in the trenches, there to find out for themselves what manner of man the German is."159

On 3 May 1916, the Anglican Archbishop of Dublin, John Henry Bernard, pleaded to Dawson for the continuation of martial law as the best way to protect life and property at least until Birrell's administration could be replaced by someone judged to be more resolute in maintaining law and order. "This is not the time for amnesties and pardons; it is the time for punishment, swift and stern. And no one who lives in Ireland believes that the present Irish Government has the courage to punish anybody.160

The Times was kept abreast of current Irish public opinion by the editor of the Irish Times, John Healy who was also the Dublin correspondent for the London paper. The Irish Times favoured the continuation of martial law in Dublin as the only form of public order since 'Castle rule' was in disarray and the Chief Secretary had resigned. Northcliffe, therefore, interpreted Healy's views to reflect the opinion of Dublin's protestant population.161

The Daily Express extracted a sampling of various opinions from the national press regarding the breakdown of liberal Castle government. The conservative paper excerpted many criticisms of Birrell's administration during the aftermath of the rising and

157 "The average American is theoretically a Home Ruler... The Ulster crisis was followed here with the keenest interest and apprehension. Although it did much to disabuse Americans of the idea that Ireland was a tight little island united in dislike of the yoke of British Parliament, it must be admitted that Sir Edward Carson's attitude was rather generally deprecated... But, owing to the strength of Irish Nationalist sympathizers in American politics, international as well as domestic, it is only fair that it should be understood at home that American public sympathies are with the demand for leniency, and that the present state of affairs is affording excellent ammunition for German propagandists and their Irish friends and hirelings." (Times, 15 May 1916, p.9.)

158 In a letter to the editor "An Irishwomen" described her preference for the Prince of Wales to be appointed Viceroy of Ireland.

159 Times, 9 May 1916, p.7.

160 Times, 5 May 1916, p.9.

reported there to was a consensus among liberal, conservative and independent papers that Birrell and his administration had shown their incompetence in preventing the rebellion. The *Daily Mail* described Birrell as "a nice old gentleman for a tea-party," but "totally unfitted by his record and antecedents and character to suppress a dangerous revolt." The Unionist *Daily Telegraph* urged Asquith to appoint a stronger Chief Secretary. The paper believed that the liberal press shared the *Daily Telegraph*’s conclusions when it reported that the *Manchester Guardian* equated Birrell with a librarian, not an administrator.162

Ernest Townley, the *Daily Express*’ Special Correspondent in Dublin, expected the colonial viceroyalty system to be eliminated. The Castle executive as it operated during the war was inefficient in governing Ireland. The Chief Secretary, so Birrell believed, needed to be in London closer to the western front and the machinery of government. Birrell’s primary duty was to mediate between Great Britain and the Irish soldiers at the front. Nathan, Birrell concluded, was capable of informing him of domestic Irish affairs. This protocol proved to be, as a result of the uprising, ineffective in governing the island. In a leading article entitled "Let the Castle go," the Dublin correspondent advocated a new direction for Ireland’s governance. Townley reported a significant change in Irish Unionist attitude toward a representative body of Irishmen who would have control over their domestic affairs. Recognizing that the Irish executive had broken down, he suggested "creating a scheme of government in which representative Irishmen would have direct authority and responsibility."164

*The Globe and Traveller* continued to berate the Liberal Government in Dublin for its inability to foresee how the gunrunning in Howth had led directly to the outbreak of the rebellion by Easter 1916. By not suppressing the nascent radical nationalist movement before it had the opportunity to strike against the Irish government, the paper opined that the Chief Secretary and Lord Lieutenant were guilty of a breach of duty. Instead of understanding the gravity of the situation made worse by their lack of proper leadership in Ireland, Birrell and Wimborne chose to use humor in order to lessen the severity of the uprising. "It is of interest to note in this connection that the Chief Secretary described the arms of the rebels as 'a job lot' of rifles and shot guns, and the Lord Lieutenant suggests that the failure of the gun-running adventure induced them to decide to 'have a run for their money.' We hardly know whether or not to congratulate Lord Wimborne and Mr. Birrell on the admirable detachment of view which these light-hearted phrases on a terrible situation imply."165 The editor unleashed his wrath on Birrell three days later.166

164 *Daily Express*, 17 May 1916.
165 *Globe and Traveller*, 1 May 1916, p.2.
When the Irish rebellion began, Northcliffe did not hesitate to criticize Asquith's Irish regime and to ask for the Prime Minister's resignation. As soon as reports from Dublin indicated that the rebellion had begun, Northcliffe unleashed his venom on the Liberal government and its Irish counterpart, the Dublin Castle executive. The Daily Mail editorial of Wednesday, 26 April entitled "The Irish Revolt. The Fruit of Wait and See.", described the Asquith government as "feeble" and the Irish revolt as "the natural result of the Government's policy in Ireland." "This colossal blunder", the editorial continued, "be it remembered, follows upon and surpasses all the other blunders of the war. How much longer is the nation prepared to drift under the domination of leaders who refuse to lead, who will not act, and who suffer from a chronic inability to make up their minds?"167 In the days to follow, Northcliffe continued to hold the Asquith regime responsible for the rebellion. "He (Asquith) promised a "searching investigation" into the responsibility for this new war yesterday. He need not look far. The culprits are in Downing-street."168

The conservative press had supported Redmond and the I.P.P. in return for their efforts to recruit Irish troops. The Daily Express asserted that the rebellion was directed against the I.P.P. and those moderate nationalists who supported the war. They believed that Sinn Fein and other violent republicans had been deceived by a German government that had little interest in Gaelic revival, rather had planned from the beginning of the war to use a rebellion to divert a large contingency of British troops away from the western front. "The Berlin Government believed two years ago that the unrest in Ireland would prevent British intervention on the side of France."169

The significance of the rebellion had not become apparent to the Globe and Traveller which it described as 'the Irish riots' thereby deriding the sacrifice of a few ultranationalists who were fast approaching martyrdom. The editorial continues: "A rebellion is measured by its political significance, in this case contemptible, and not by the deplorable extent of the destruction which follows when the mob gets out of hand, as that practically depends upon the supineness of the Executive which led up to it."170 The paper, however, continued to describe the outbreak of hostilities as the 'Sinn Fein rising'. Therefore, Northcliffe was not alone among conservative editors in not

166 "What we are surprised at is the ready condonation meted out to a Minister who for the nine long years of his tenure of office has consistently and persistently mal-administered Ireland. We are not in the least interested in Mr. Birrell's apologies, which constitute no sort of atonement for the long series of cattle-driving and other agrarian outrages which have marked his administration. We are not content to review his Chief Secretaryship in the light solely of the Sinn Fein outbreak. His bad record extends back far beyond that." (Globe and Traveller, 4 May 1916, p.2.)
167 Daily Mail, 26 April 1916, p.4.
168 Daily Mail, 28 April 1916, p.4.
169 Daily Express, 26 April 1916, p.4.
170 Globe and Traveller, 2 May 1916, p.2.
understanding that Sinn Fein was formed by Arthur Griffith in 1905 as a cultural organization to foster growth and development of Ireland. The term “Sinn Fein” had been indiscriminately appropriated to any group that had participated in the Easter Rising. Among them was the Irish Republican Brotherhood, an outgrowth of the Fenian movement of post-Famine Ireland.

In an article entitled "Sinn Fein The True Patriotic Movement and the False, Traitors to Ireland", Ben Tillett171 wrote in the Daily Express suggesting that Sinn Fein was not to blame for the rebellion because it was a cultural movement and incapable of such a political move. Sinn Fein pushed for the establishment of a Dual Monarchy not the establishment of a separate republic. "What has been crushed in Ireland is not Sinn Fein, but the dastardly mob who used the term Sinn Fein to organise one of the most wicked and insane revolts that ever disgraced Ireland."172 Unlike Northcliffe, the labour leader acknowledged the avowed purpose of Sinn Fein and drew a distinction between its beginnings as a movement to preserve Gaelic heritage and its recent perversion to that of violent republicanism. For Tillett this misdirection was the work of "cowardly... agitators" the more contemptible because they struck when true Irishmen were "bleeding" for the greater cause of the Empire. Tillett found many groups to blame for the rising in addition to the radical Sinn Feiners: a weak Irish governance, Ulster gunrunning, and Irish-American, pro-German complicity with its well head in the United States. He summed up the rising as not a blow for freedom but a treasonous act against the totality that is England. For the "agitators" he offered no quarter and denied that punishment would raise some to martyrdom. Rather the Daily Express reminded its readers that Sinn Fein was "born of an honest and not unworthy ideal" and that this and other risings have been a tragic reminder of the futility of anti-British treachery.173

The English conservative press devoted considerable attention to the attitudes of the American government and general public following the rising. Two years of bitter, suicidal warfare on the Western front had resulted in a frustrating stalemate for both Allied and Central powers. The prospects for breaking through the German lines during the summer of 1916 were hardly promising, as the disastrous Verdun and Somme campaigns were soon to demonstrate. If the Germans were to be defeated in this war the allied war effort demanded an endless supply of men and material. The war by 1916 had proven to be one of attrition for which British resources were inadequate. Moreover, British diplomatic relations with the United States were as frustrating as the impasse on the


172 Daily Express, 3 May 1916, p.2-4.

173 Daily Express, 4 May 1916, p.4.
Western front. In fact every indication from the United States suggested that Americans wished to remain neutral at all costs.

The Globe and Traveller began reporting the uprising on Tuesday, 25 April 1916, and expressed the conservative American opinion as well. The paper felt compelled to reproduce conservative American opinion of the rising for two main reasons. The first was to assure their readers that the rebellion was not supported by mainstream American Democrats and Republicans who would read the Democratic New York World, the Press, or the Republican Tribune, therefore allaying fears that the United States would cease to support the Allied war effort in deference to its vocal Irish-American population. The second reason was to tailor the information from American papers to affirm the editorial stance of the Globe.174

The Daily Express granted that Americans were not pleased with the British suppression of the rising. In particular, the London daily feared that amongst the Irish-Americans those with pro-German sympathies would become more vocal. The paper implored the British government to reach a settlement that would keep Ireland within the Empire. Reasoning that the revolt was 'futile,' the real fear was that diplomatic and political repercussions would cause damage to the reputation of the British government out of proportion to the rising’s significance. Therefore, the wise course of action would be to limit British ‘vengeance’, especially since the leaders were romantic figures. "Its leaders were poets, some of them good poets, others silly poets, all of them hopelessly impracticable. The whole thing was a revolution of butterflies."175

The Globe and Traveller favoured swift trials for the rebel leaders in military courts. This call for strong action was typical of those papers which supported the Unionist view in Parliament.176 Maxwell wrote a letter to the Daily Mail explaining that repressive measures were needed in order to stamp out rebellion in Ireland. Prior to the executions, he expressed the belief that 'A Revolt of this kind could not be suppressed by velvet glove methods,' and ordered the excavation of a pit that could hold a hundred bodies.177 The Daily Express called for strict punishment for the rebel leaders and rejected the comparison between Ireland and South Africa that was popular in the Liberal press and introduced by the Manchester Guardian.178 Yet, one week later, the Daily

---

174 Globe and Traveler, 26 April 1916, p.2.
175 Daily Express, 17 May 1916, p.4.
176 "There has been too much toleration shown in the past to the malcontents and malignants who foster sedition. The time for action has now come, and we are glad to see there is no hesitancy in applying the powers of the Crown to enforce order. We have enough on hand elsewhere to permit any conspiracies to flourish within our borders. The suspension of civil trial is a step in the right direction." (Globe and Traveller, 27 April 1916, p.2.)
178 "While the dupes of the German agents in Ireland will doubtless be treated with a measure of leniency, the ringleaders must be ruthlessly punished . . . analogies are found between the rise of the Sinn Feiners and the rebellion of De Wet in South Africa. There is, however, a world of difference in the two
Express seemed to change its view toward swift and stern punishment for the rebels, remarking that it was pleased to learn that Maxwell's policies had been softened.179

The Daily Mail had an interesting if not ridiculous solution for the nationalistic fervor of the Sinn Feiners. Knowing that Sinn Feiners would never join the British Army under any circumstance, they nonetheless could make a positive contribution to the war effort as members of an Irish unit in the French army. Irish soldiers had fought as mercenaries for numerous continental armies, as integral units of the ancien régime and in the Napoleonic wars. "What is there to prevent the Sinn Feiners of to-day enlisting in a new Irish Brigade in the French ranks, under the pledge that, by so doing, they would wipe out the past? Many of them are undoubtedly "misguided youths, with hearts full of patriotic fire." Such men would probably not be unwelcome in the French Army."180

J.W.T. Mason, the Daily Express correspondent in New York, discounted the reports of widespread condemnation by Americans toward the British policies in Ireland. The assertion that the average American was outraged by the executions he believed was simply not true. Rather the swift response to the uprising was viewed to have elevated the respect for the British government in the eyes of most Americans. Even the majority of Irish-Americans had by their silence indicated that they did not support the aims or methods of the rebel leaders. In the midst of a "world war" in which Britain was fighting to keep democracy alive, the actions of the insurrectionists were a treacherous "stab in the back." Of course the minority of irreconcilable, pro-German, Irish-Americans, while outraged by the suppression of the rising, could not offer any reasonable explanation for its timing or impudence. Moreover those supporters of Home Rule in America feared that this new rebellion could deny moderate Irishmen the fruits of decades of statesmanship. "Moderation of criticism among the Nationalists in America of the execution of the Irish insurrectionists is due to the deep alarm among them lest the Dublin revolt should put back Home Rule for a generation."181

The more staunchly conservative Globe and Traveller feared that the recent rebellion would result in Irish-American "relief" efforts to supply arms and ammunition for a future uprising. It was basing its opinion upon its assertion that American sentiment differed significantly from city to city and region to region, and that in some sections of America, Britain was losing the propaganda initiative. "Washington may be absolutely correct in its attitude, while San Francisco is flauntingly hostile to Britain. The point is

cases. The Boers fought as soldiers. They did not endeavour to establish an independent republic." (Daily Express, 2 May 1916, p.4.)
179 "...to sanction the penalty of death 'as sparingly as possible.' We earnestly trust therefore that it will not be thought necessary to add to the number of executions...there is just a danger that further executions will make 'martyrs'...The leaders have been justly punished. Now is the time to show that we can be merciful as well as strong." (Daily Express, 9 May 1916, p.4.)
180 Daily Mail, 10 May 1916, p.4.
181 Daily Express, 13 June 1916, p.4.
that the United States are being treated to highly imaginative horrible tales of destitution in Ireland due to British brutality, and that these tales are being believed. Cannot our Government circulate the truth and ask the U.S.A. Government to assist in that work?"  

This article is certainly misinformed as to the extent that Wilson would aid in this endeavor. The paper assumes that the United States government would break its neutrality.

Despite lukewarm Anglo-American relations and an American public determined to remain isolated from the 'European War', the Asquith government harbored the expectation that America would enter on the side of the Allies. The Irish uprising, therefore, could not have come at a worse time for the British. British diplomats prior to Easter 1916 could court Americans with the inherently democratic principle that they were fighting the war on behalf of small nations like Belgium and combating Prussian militarism. Following the British repression of a small handful of 'Irish patriots,' some Americans felt that Asquith could no longer hold the moral high ground against German Imperialism. The Irish rebellion proved to be a valuable asset for the Germans in the propaganda war with the British.

The Daily Express noted that neutrals had already known about the uprising from German reports and that the German people were critical of the German government's support for Irish rebels. A report from Stockholm dated 8 May relayed the opinions of Swedes on German citizens' impressions and expectations of the rising. The Daily Mail accused its German counterparts of blatant falsehood in their reporting of the Irish uprising. News reports from the Berlin paper Continental Times had been dropped upon British and Irish troops along the Western front in an attempt to create a soldier's mutiny and/or weaken the morale of the troops. The Berlin paper reproduced extracts from the Daily Mail in which the wording and inherent meaning were changed giving quite a different impression of events during Easter Week and portraying the British suppression of the rebellion as needlessly brutal upon civilians, Catholic priests, and unarmed rebels. The left column gives the text from the London paper as it appeared on 29 April 1916, and the right column is the Berlin paper's fraudulent translation as it appeared in that paper on 5 May 1916.

"The Daily Mail.  
There are many reports  
Continental Times.  
There are many reports

182 Globe and Traveller, 5 July 1916, p.3.
183 "The Irish rebels alone would suffer from an abortive insurrection, but, naturally, that is no German concern. The talk of Irish revolt was chiefly in Catholic Bavaria and in South Germany generally. Certain Sinn Feiners negotiated with the Catholics, but the Centre Party, which is Clerical as well as Catholic, has no sympathy for the anti-Clerical Sinn Fein. It is tied up with the Vatican, and the Bavarians who were in the secret themselves did not want the revolt to succeed, and approved of it only from the German patriotic standpoint as a blow to England. In general, the Germans have no great sympathy for Ireland; they consider the Irish the exact opposites of themselves. In general the Germans have no great opinion of rebellion prospects; their whole notion of military success is based on trained soldiers and scientific leading." (Daily Express, 13 May 1916, p.5.)
of what is happening in the remoter parts of Ireland. The National Guardsmen also are said to have joined the rebels.

The following did not appear at all in the Daily Mail:-

Of other rebel forces in various parts of Ireland there are said to be from fifty to sixty thousand, but they are under the disadvantage of having communications interrupted, while the Government after the cables were cut still had wireless communication with England.”

The continuance of martial law in Dublin and other metropolitan areas of Ireland had the effect of causing the Irish to question British policy. Only a handful of Dubliners supported or were sympathetic to the cause of Sinn Fein during Easter 1916. Therefore, when presented with few alternatives with which to govern their daily lives, some Dubliners chose to support the promise of a Sinn Fein deliverance from the suppression of British martial law. However, the Globe and Traveller’s editorials continued to ignore or failed to recognize the effect that martial law in Dublin was having upon the changing sentiments of the Irish people. “We recognize nothing as to what Mr. Redmond calls ‘a rapidly increasing bitterness among large sections of the population who have no sympathy with the insurrection.’ We can only take into account the acknowledged fact that to treat rebels leniently is to encourage rebellion.”

Ernest Townley, the Daily Express’ Special Correspondent in Dublin, feared that the 1916 rebellion would be placed alongside the other unsuccessful, albeit symbolic, uprisings throughout the island’s history. He acknowledged that much of Sinn Fein’s support was amongst the lower classes in the countryside. Fearing that this movement would become a grass roots struggle for independence, Townley wrote that "the seeds of the Sinn Fein movement are scattered far and wide, and will come up.” The British government, he believed, had the ability to stamp out any future rebellion, because the British war effort had brought economic prosperity to Irish farmers who now recognized the importance of remaining loyal to the British cause. But, he asserted, peace must be achieved from a mutual nationalist and unionist understanding.

A peaceful solution was even sought in the summer of 1916 with the introduction of Lloyd George into the Home Rule fracas. Northcliffe was not a supporter of the Liberal regime of H.H. Asquith or of the coalition government that the Prime Minister had formed in 1915. The newspaperman was a constant critic of Asquith’s handling of the war and especially of Asquith’s appointment of Lord Kitchener as Secretary of State for War. Although Northcliffe and Lloyd George disagreed on what theater of war should

185 Globe and Traveller, 9 May 1916, p.2.
186 Daily Express, 12 May 1916.
have precedence, they agreed on the importance of conscription and the need for changes at the highest political and military levels.

A high point in the *Times* coverage of the Lloyd George negotiations was when they printed the opinions of the staunch Unionist, Lord Hugh Cecil. He viewed the implementation of the Lloyd George proposals as a serious threat to the peace of Ireland. Home rule, in his opinion, would create a lax security allowing Sinn Fein to possibly mount another rebellion. Martial law therefore needed to continue in Ireland until the European war had come to a conclusion and peace restored. The English Unionists were assuaged by the failure of the Lloyd George negotiations. Criticism focused on the composition of the current coalition Cabinet and the fact that there was no War Committee to either consult with the Cabinet or to approve or reject the provisions of the Lloyd George scheme.

The opposition of the English Unionists leads the historian to believe that Lloyd George's 'secret negotiations' (to the English Unionists they were 'unauthorized negotiations') should have been more candid. The English Unionists did not expect Lloyd George's negotiations to be successful or that Carson and Redmond would compromise on Ulster. Nevertheless, it was apparent that Lloyd George had promised permanent exclusion to Carson but allowed Redmond to believe Ulster's exclusion to be temporary, thereby postponing the resolution of the issue until after the war. In either case, Lloyd George had nothing to lose. If the negotiations were successful, Lloyd George would further solidify his reputation as a man who could deliver the impossible solution and thereby hearken back to the days of his labour negotiations before the war (which in reality only avoided a general strike and did not solve the underlying issue of labour-owner dispute). However, if the negotiations failed, the English Unionists (who probably should garner most of the blame), Redmond, or the Government would be scapegoats. Certainly no one would blame the current Minister of Munitions for the failure of the Home Rule negotiations. If he were successful, however, his path to becoming Prime Minister would be laid.

A lively controversy took place between Henry Bellingham and Sir Horace Plunkett in the *Times*. The Unionist view was contrasted with that of Henry

187 Lloyd George favored the strengthening of the Salonika front while Northcliffe saw the western front as the main area of operations. (McEwen, J.M. 'Northcliffe and Lloyd George at War, 1914-1918' in *The Historical Journal*, 24,3, Great Britain, 1981. p.660.)
188 *Times*, 30 June 1916, p.5.
189 "If objections are to be effective in England at this stage, they must first show that the Government are wrong in holding that Imperial necessity- or, in other words, the conduct of the war- demands a provisional Irish settlement. For our own part we believe that on this point the Government are perfectly right." (*Times*, 21 June 1916, p.9.)
Bellingham, H.M. Lieutenant County Louth and a home ruler, who expressed the belief (in a letter to the editor) that Irish parliamentary action had almost delivered home rule. He believed that the partition of Ireland might actually be beneficial in the long run as it would create “mutual respect” between Ulstermen and Nationalists. He understood partition to be a temporary arrangement during which time Ulsterman would come to see that Home Rule was not a stepping stone to eventual separation from the union of Great Britain and Ireland, rather home rule would create a political environment in which the union could remain secure.

Sir Horace Plunkett extolled the importance of Britain’s credibility by delivering home rule. He accepted the fact that home rule could not be enacted during the war, but insisted that the Prime Minister reaffirm his commitment to the Irish nationalists. He contrasted the opinions of Irish newspapermen that were uniformly opposed to the Lloyd George proposals with their British counterparts.

In the end, Northcliffe restated his previous disgust with Asquith’s leadership and inability to control his Unionist cabinet members. In an editorial entitled “Still Drifting Over Ireland,” Dawson and Northcliffe placed the ultimate blame on the failure of Lloyd George’s negotiations with the Prime Minister. "The real responsibility for putting an end to this confusion and delay rests, as it seems to us, with one man, and one man only, and that is the Prime Minister as head of the Government. . . . All the misunderstanding so far has been inside the Cabinet, and it has all arisen from the inveterate habit of allowing things to drift."

The political journal *The Round Table* expressed the expectation that not only would Ireland’s fate be changed after the war but the entire empire would become more of a loose confederation of states. *The Round Table* was the journal of an elitist clique of conservative intellectuals recording the politics of the British Empire. It was founded and edited by Philip Kerr (Lord Lothian), a follower of the imperialist Alfred (Lord)

---


191 “No one, Home Ruler or Unionist, in 1916, any more than in 1914, likes the partition of Ireland, but times are peculiar and the general good of the country must be considered, and one can hope that the effect of a temporary arrangement would tend to the establishment of a mutual respect, that would make the severance involved in partition less bitter, and pave the way to a real reunion, after some experience had been gained of what Home Rulers believe would be the beneficent effects of Home Rule.” (Times, 28 June 1916, p.9.)

192 "The opposition of the Irish Press is not factious or anti-British, least of all pro-German; it is based upon the knowledge that the proposed measures will exasperate and not placate the majority of the Irish people. . . . How any man with the most elementary knowledge of modern Ireland can imagine that a Parliament, constituted without an election, would be an effective agency of government under existing conditions passes my comprehension." (Times, 3 July 1916, p.6.)


194 The 11th Marquis of Lothian was born on 18 April 1882. He held a number of colonial posts in South Africa and founded *The Round Table* in 1910 that he edited through 1916. He became the Director
Milner. Their analysis was very narrow-minded and seemingly out-of-touch with public opinion in Ireland. The journal endorsed a federal solution to the home rule crisis. If Ireland were to be given home rule, it must relinquish its representation at Westminster. The journal had been anticipating the Commonwealth that was established after the war. Then the issues between the Nationalists and Unionists would be decided not only by themselves but also with the support of a confederation of nations. Sinn Fein's separatism was not only a threat to the stability of Ireland but to the empire as well.195

The Globe was reticent to predict that Lloyd George would be successful in breaking the home rule impasse. The Irish situation, in the opinion of the Globe, had been the 'graveyard of many reputations', and many diplomats throughout the years had not been able to solve it.196 Lloyd George had the advantage of not being associated with either the Nationalists or Unionists, although it became apparent that he would not support dissolution of the Union. The paper followed the negotiations throughout the summer, commenting on the resignation of Lord Selborne on 27 June and the assault upon Lloyd George's proposals in the House of Lords, led by Lords Lansdowne, Salisbury and Midleton. The Globe hoped that the negotiations would fail and the Union stay intact. "Above all, Unionism and all that it means must be kept inviolate."197 When by mid July the Lloyd George negotiations had collapsed over the two issues of the temporary partition of Ulster and the Irish representation at Westminster, the paper exulted, "From the first we had no favourable opinion of Mr. Lloyd George as negotiator with the Irish parties. Because a man has proved successful in some cases of industrial unrest in bringing matters to a successful issue, it by no means follows that he will prove similarly happy in calming stormy political passions of age-long growth and excited at the moment to their most (sic) dangerous pitch."198

Furthermore, the Globe criticized those members of the Unionist party (namely Bonar Law and Balfour) who chose to wait and see and who would not make a decision concerning the Irish settlement.199 "Anything more dispiriting to a great party- the

195 The Round Table, pp.650-651.
196 "Statesmen of every school have brought their talents for a hundred years and more to the settlement of the Irish Question, but without success. No one has yet been able to overcome the primary difficulty, that while, vis-a-vis of the rest of the world, all Irishmen are Irishmen with an ineradicable conviction that nobody else can understand them, Ireland itself is the home of two nations, widely separated by race and by ideals, each of which is firmly resolved to yield no point to the other, while both are deficient in that sense of compromise which enables their Scotch and English neighbors to solve so many difficulties." (Globe and Traveller, 26 May 1916, p.3.)
197 Globe and Traveller, 6 July 1916, p.3.
198 Globe and Traveller, 15 July 1916, p.3.
199 Bonar Law and Balfour feared that the Nationalists would become more radical on the issue of Home Rule and reject Redmond's compromise that was essentially Bonar Law's position at the pre-war Buckingham Conference. (Kendle, John, Walter Long, Ireland, and the Union, 1905-1920, Glendale Publishing, Dun Laoghaire, 1992. p.120-121.)
greatest in the State, in every sense of the word- than the utter lack of guidance that has been the fate of Unionism since its nominal leaders entered the Coalition it would be impossible to imagine."200 The *Globe* could see no advantage for England if home rule were enacted during the war and brought about continued unrest among the Irish belligerents. In truth the paper sided with the Ulstermen. "But we are quite sure that to bring the Home Rule Act into operation during the war will revive most dangerous controversies, and will bring to Ireland not peace but a sword. It is no small thing that in this hour of national peril the most loyal party in the country should feel that it has been betrayed."201 The paper did not endorse the imposition of home rule in Ireland during the war.202 The probable civil war between Ulstermen and Nationalists that appeared certain to ensue had been avoided, so the paper reasoned, by the coming of the European war, and many Englishmen did not want the Irish situation to be a distraction from the war. "Ulster may be unduly apprehensive or Nationalist Ireland too grasping and aggressive. . . the outstanding fact is that union between Irishmen for the purposes of the war is only possible so long as the existing truce is maintained. Any attempt to use either the Sinn Fein rising or the present happy co-operation between Sir Edward Carson and Mr. Redmond as a basis for forcing on a settlement before the end of the war can result in nothing but a revival of the old controversies, and in once more dividing Ireland into two camps."203 The paper did endorse a temporary settlement in order to bring peace to this volatile situation but one that would ensure that home rule was not enacted during the war and hopefully not at all. "Home Rule, as understood by the Nationalists, should be opposed at any time."204 "But in the meantime anything which throws the Nationalists and the Ulstermen into opposite camps and revives Irish divisions would be equally a folly and a crime."205

Editorial comment in the Unionist *Daily Express* noted a divide between the English and Ulster Unionist positions on Home Rule following the rising. The rising alarmed its editor, Ralph Blumenfeld, because it had become a distraction from the British prosecution of the war. He drew a distinction between imperial interests and national ones

---

200 *Globe and Traveller*, 8 July 1916, p.3.
201 *Globe and Traveller*, 12 July 1916, p.3.
202 "To judge by the newspapers they do not reflect the opinion of the Unionist party in the country. Nearly all the great Unionist journals in London and the provinces advocate a settlement of the Irish problem on the Lloyd George lines. Among them are the "Times," "Daily Telegraph," "Daily Mail," "Daily Express," Pall Mall Gazette," "Evening Standard," "Scotsman," "Glasgow Herald," "Western Mail," "Birmingham Post," and "Daily Dispatch." The only important Unionist papers in England that are opposing a settlement are the "Morning Post" and the "Yorkshire Post." (Daily Chronicle 29 June 1916, p. 1.) The *Globe and Traveller* was omitted from this list perhaps because it did not expect Lloyd George to be successful.
204 *Globe and Traveller*, 18 July 1916, p.5.
in contending that the Home Rule impasse threatened the ability of Britain to win the war. A temporary Home Rule settlement would, in his view, placate the dissatisfaction of Nationalist Ireland and allow Ireland to be pacified until the war had ended. On the other hand, he was critical of Ulster's intransigence in holding onto an uncompromising attitude concerning Home Rule. Ulster Unionists, he asserted, threatened to perpetuate the division between Catholic and Protestant Ireland for regional interests and therefore had become a drain on British resources that could better be directed toward an earlier resolution of the conflict in Europe. The rejoinder from the Belfast papers- *Belfast Evening Telegraph* and *Ulster Echo*- was, in the view of Blumenfeld, another example of the uncompromising attitude of the Ulstermen:

Preserve us from our "friends," cries the "Belfast Evening Telegraph" in a big headline, and quotes the word "friends."  
... The "Ulster Echo," another Belfast evening paper, alludes to the "cowardice" of the "hitherto Unionist" "Daily Express."  
All this confirms the statement wired from here to the "Daily Express" on Monday night that recent events have intensified Ulster's determination to have no part in any negotiations with the Nationalist party.206

Blumenfeld was willing to draw attention to the religious prejudice that characterized the Ulster Unionist position and to recount its origin at the Boyne. Only time, he felt, could change the opinion of the Ulsterman who "... entertains a deep and abiding distrust of Roman Catholics and Nationalists. The two terms are regarded as synonymous in this corner of the world... it will require another five centuries before Ulster Protestants are convinced that their fellow-countrymen in the other Church are not the worst type of Huns thinly disguised."207 The following day, in an editorial entitled "Think Imperially", Blumenfeld proposed not only a solution to the Home Rule impasse but also clarified the paper's position regarding uncompromising Unionism. "Great Britain must regard the Irish difficulty from the broad Imperial point of view... The Empire is more to us than the prejudices of County Antrim." He regarded Nationalist Ireland as an ally during this war, not as a threat to the stability of the Empire. He noted the patriotic fervor that Mr. Redmond had displayed since the beginning of the war and the denunciation of the Sinn Fein rebels. "These are the facts that seem to us to matter... We are convinced that if Ulster will now look facts in the face with the rest of Ireland and attempt to secure stable popular government she can ensure herself for ever from separation and from any chance of Nationalist tyranny." Blumenfeld admonished Ulsterman to adopt an Imperial solution for Irish Nationalism. Otherwise the alternative could be an Irish civil war or years of internecine conflict. He asked rhetorically, "But is Ireland for ever to be the battleground of faction and suspicion?"208

206 *Daily Express*, 18 May 1916.  
207 *Daily Express*, 18 May 1916.  
208 *Daily Express*, 19 May 1916, p.4.
The home rule negotiations were a threat to the stability of Asquith’s coalition government as well. His Unionist ministers, it was feared, would resign if Home Rule were enacted during the war. “Whatever may be the facts as to the promises made by Mr. Lloyd George or his powers, plenipotentiary or otherwise, during the recent negotiations, their net result is a deadlock, and the Cabinet may not improbably lose two, or perhaps three, more Unionist members.”209

Northcliffe ultimately blamed Asquith for the failure of the Lloyd George negotiations, because he was unable to corral his Unionist ministers Selborne and Lansdowne. In an editorial entitled “Making Mischief. Lord Lansdowne and His Party Politics,” the Daily Mail lamented the trouble being caused by the English Unionists. The paper's policy concerning Lloyd George's negotiations was that Home Rule was on the statute books and could not be ignored. Nonetheless Ulster should not be coerced, and therefore should be excluded at least until after the war. Lloyd George should be given support to see this through because Ireland should not distract the Empire from the main issue at hand: defeating Germany. It was their opinion that Lord Lansdowne was acting unpatriotically by derailing the settlement.210

Northcliffe noted that every significant politician and group intimately associated with home rule had accepted Lloyd George's proposals: Irish Unionists, Irish Nationalists, the Prime Minister, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Bonar Law, and Lord Robert Cecil. However, there was a small group of English Unionist ‘irreconcilables’ who were “still obsessed by the ideas of the plantation period,” and therefore opposed any solution which would diminish their power in Ireland.”211 Lloyd George understood that as a negotiator he was to have plenipotentiary powers, an assumption with which Lansdowne did not agree. While Asquith had the power to decide the nature of Lloyd George’s powers, the Prime Minister shrank from his responsibility as leader. Asquith allowed Lansdowne to be “the rallying-point for all who are opposed by instinct and tradition to any Irish settlement that threatens their own position and privileges.” Northcliffe accused the British government of keeping the public in the dark about the details of the negotiations. “Nothing facilitates intrigue so much as an atmosphere of darkness; nothing so effectually checkmates it as publicity.” Lastly, Northcliffe accused the Prime Minister of betraying

209 Globe and Traveller, 29 June 1916, p.3.
210 “We are now witnessing a deplorable example of the failure of a few of our public men to put the Empire above their party and the war above their own petty prejudices and interests. . . . So long as the attempt to come to an agreement seemed likely to fail, Lord Lansdowne held his tongue. But as soon as he finds that everyone else is satisfied Lord Lansdowne speaks- a mischievous, wrecking speech, which can have had no purpose except to smash the agreement, and, if it succeeded in this, could have no more certain result than to produce disastrous consequences in Ireland.” (Daily Mail, 1 July 1916, p.4.)
211 Daily Mail, 22 July 1916, p.4.
Lloyd George, Carson and Redmond by changing the agreement in order to placate one or two Unionist ministers in his cabinet.212

At the beginning of June 1916, the Daily Express anticipated the issues that became the stumbling blocks of the Lloyd George settlement. The 1912 Home Rule Bill stipulated that when Ireland received its parliament in Dublin, Irish MPs would relinquish their seats in London. The original bill made no provision for the separation of Ulster. Now that the temporary partition of Ireland had become an acceptable option to both Redmond and Carson, it was crucial from the Nationalist point of view that they retain their votes in Westminster. Redmond understood that by 1916 Asquith no longer needed the support of Irish nationalists to secure his position as Prime Minister. Therefore Ulster’s partition might become permanent if Irish nationalist MPs were no longer members of the British parliament. The Daily Express wondered why Irish MPs would have both a vote in Britain and Ireland. “To us the one doubtful point in the scheme is the retention of the Irish members at Westminster while they have a Parliament of their own.”213 The Daily Express offered its final word on the Lloyd George proposals.214

By the end of the unsuccessful Lloyd George negotiations the Globe and Traveller still believed that the best course of action to quell the Irish dissidents was to demonstrate a strong ‘imperial presence’ in Ireland and to maintain martial law in the island. “Why the Sinn Fein insurrection, which, if it proved anything, proved that what Ireland needed was not any extension of self-government, but a strengthening of Imperial authority, should have been taken to indicate a necessity for breaking the party truce we have never been able to understand.”215 The paper did not want home rule to become a distraction from the successful completion of the war and thus opposed any settlement in Ireland. When Lloyd George’s proposals were ‘dropped’ by the end of July 1916, the paper rejoiced. While it tried to hide its delight in the dissolution of the newest Home Rule settlement, its Unionist sympathies were already clear, as its editorials were replete with references to the Protestants in Ulster as loyalists. While the paper was hesitant to designate the Nationalist leaders as stalwarts of the current war effort, nonetheless they were necessary to suppress republicanism. “Any attempt to make a fundamental change in the Government of Ireland immediately after a serious insurrection was bound to depress the loyal and encourage the

213 Daily Express, 12 June 1916, p.4.
214 “However angry she may be with Great Britain, Ireland is bound by centuries of affection to France, and her faith makes her keenly sympathetic with unhappy Belgium. . . . The proposed Lloyd George settlement came to nothing over the number of Irish representatives to be left in the Imperial Parliament. The Nationalists demanded that the number should remain as it is now. The Unionists very properly insisted that this number should be radically reduced. The Lloyd George settlement is dead and buried.” (Daily Express, 1 August 1916, p.4.)
215 Globe and Traveller, 25 July 1916, p.3.
disloyal." \(^{216}\) And according to the conservative press there was no individual more disloyal than Roger Casement.

The *Daily Express* reported that the trial of Sir Roger Casement had been impartial. \(^{217}\) There was no doubt in the opinion of the paper that the verdict was supported by the evidence and that the sentence was appropriate and just. The paper found no credible evidence that Casement was an Irish patriot of long standing, but rather a British pensioner who betrayed his benefactor. He was portrayed as a traitor and an opportunist who developed an interest in Irish independence only after the onset of the war, and openly conspired with the German government to induce others to follow his treachery. The paper went on to cast derision on those that sought clemency for him, doubting that any would think well of a man who not only supported the paper of Belgium and other small nations such as Ireland, but also was a man whose diaries disclosed his sexual perversion and other evidences of immorality. "Perhaps it would serve to change the tone of the sentimentalists if they were permitted to have a look at Casement's diaries, which reveal him in the light of a moral degenerate, abandoned to the most sordid vices. They are unprintable, and their character cannot even be hinted at. Ireland does not make martyrs of such people." \(^{218}\)

The Casement trial and appeal continued throughout the summer months of June and July. The *Globe* reported the trial's proceedings and was generally careful not to pass judgment upon the Irish rebel until the guilty sentence was announced. (Casement had been labeled a traitor by the paper when he was captured off the coast of Tralee in late April). In an editorial at the end of the trial for high treason, the paper voiced its disgust at the 'deplorable' actions of Casement especially during England's time of peril. \(^{219}\) Following the Casement trial there was speculation that Casement would be spared the hangman's noose. S.G. Trust in a letter to the editor described Casement's trial as fair and the judgment upon his treasonous activities just. \(^{220}\) The *Globe* recounted the scene at Pentonville prison and the fact that he converted to Catholicism shortly before his execution. That there was no doubt as to the justice of the sentence and execution the paper did not question. \(^{221}\)

\(^{216}\) *Globe and Traveller*, 1 August 1916, p.3.

\(^{217}\) Casement was described by many English papers as a traitor prior to his trial. That no papers were prosecuted for contempt of court demonstrated the lack of English public empathy for Casement. Casement could not have received a fair trial in the English courts. (Edwards, O. Dudley and Fergus Pyle. *1916 The Easter Rising*, MacGibbon & Kee, Dublin, 1968, pp.253-254.)

\(^{218}\) *Daily Express*, 1 July 1916, p.1.

\(^{219}\) *Globe and Traveller*, 30 June 1916, p.3.

\(^{220}\) *Globe and Traveller*, 2 August 1916, p.6.

\(^{221}\) "His trial was exhaustive and conspicuously impartial, and that his guilt was brought home to him no intelligent person who has read the proceedings can doubt for one moment. If the sentence of the law had not been carried out in this instance it would have been impossible to execute it in any other, and we
The *Times* could not offer any alternative to Casement's execution. Despite admitting that clemency would soothe the Irish, Dawson felt that his execution was justified. The editor did not mention Casement's defence, i.e. he was a Irish citizen that was not under the jurisdiction of English law. He did note however that the Nationalist press, with an eye toward American opinion, was in favor of clemency, causing Dawson to state: “It is quite certain, however, that if Casement had been reprieved the Nationalist Press would have hastened to compare that clemency with the severity of the executions in Dublin, and would have raised a new campaign against Sir John Maxwell. Nothing that the Government could have done with Casement would have satisfied the whole of Ireland.”

The *Times* used the opportunity afforded by the damaging reports of Casement's homosexuality in other newspapers to comment on certain ethical breaches of press etiquette. Northcliffe felt that Casement's reputation should not have been demeaned for it was immaterial to the charge of treason. "But if there was ever any virtue in the pomp and circumstance of a great State Trial, it can only be weakened by inspired innuendoes which, whatever their substance, are now irrelevant, improper, and un-English."  

The religious press chose not to be critical of the prosecution of the war or of Asquith's regime in handling the rebellion, rather was concerned with winning the war. The *London Catholic Herald* devoted considerable attention to conscription and the Easter Rebellion during the spring and summer of 1916. It was a staunch supporter of the war effort, mindful that the defence of Catholic Belgium was sanctioned by the precepts of the Roman Catholic Church. In its view conscription was clearly supported by the church as a means to the successful conclusion to the conflagration. Since the Derby scheme (which would have drafted those men who were not married between the ages of 18 and 41) and indeed all conscription efforts during the war did not apply to Ireland, this paper felt that some Irish Catholics were avoiding their responsibility to the church. Often the paper published accounts of loyal Irish Catholics who were fighting in the war, citing figures of thousands of soldiers who volunteered.

---

222 *Times*, 4 August 1916.

223 *Times*, 4 August 1916, p.9. Soon after Casement's arrest diaries proporting to have been written in Casement's handwriting were circulated by British officials graphically recording incessant homosexual obsessions. However, Casement's 'black diaries' have been deemed forgeries by numerous apologists for the Irish rebel. However, recent research under the auspices of Professor W.J. McCormack suggests the diaries are genuine.

224 The Catholic Church's five criteria for sanctioned warfare are: “war must be declared by legitimate authority, for a just cause, it must be fought as a last resort, fought for a right intention, in the proper manner, that is without destruction of the innocent.” (*New Catholic Encyclopedia*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, Vol. XIV, 1967, p.803.)
The *London Catholic Herald* could find little justification for the Easter Rebellion. It condemned the use of force in the rising citing the Catholic Church's contemporary definition of lawful opposition\(^{225}\) expounded by Bishop Hoare. He sums up as follows the teachings of the Church:

1. No subject can lawfully obey any law; so-called, that is opposed to the natural law or the Divine Law;
2. it is not lawful to rebel, rebellion meaning the pulling down of the legitimate ruler, and the setting up one in his stead; and
3. it is sometimes lawful to oppose an existing law by force, but among the considerations required are two—(a) There must be a righteous cause, so that the resister will not, by his resistance, do more harm than good—there must be a real grievance and clear oppression; (b) there must by a strong probability of success, otherwise harm will preponderate.\(^{226}\)

While in agreement with almost all the English papers that criticized the uprising as a rebellion led by misguided men, the *London Catholic Herald* was careful not to criticize the rebels in general. "The rising in which they took part has no sanction from the teachings of the Church, but great numbers of the rank and file evidently acted in ignorance of the heinousness and paganism of their action."\(^{227}\)

The *London Catholic Herald* did support home rule for Ireland as a natural, evolutionary change in British politics. However, the Unionist criticism of Home Rule ('Rome Rule') interpreted this constitutional change to be Ireland's first step toward eventual separation from Great Britain. The paper apparently agreed with a type of dominion status for Ireland as a whole.\(^{228}\)

The paper's primary contention was that had Asquith's Liberal government enacted home rule instead of shelving it for the remainder of the war, the rebellion would not have been possible. "Though it be an inauspicious moment to point such a moral, it cannot be seriously contested that if Ireland had had her own Parliament these grave events would never have happened."\(^{229}\) The *London Catholic Herald* saw grave consequences for the delay of home rule. The church singled out certain groups that it held responsible for the rebellion. Primarily, the paper was a reluctant supporter of the Irish Parliamentary Party. While Redmond was a secular politician who the paper felt should have had closer

\(^{225}\) "Leo XIII's *Diuturnum Illud* (states that) resistance to a precept manifestly contrary to natural or divine law is justified, but the resistance suggested is merely passive—'not to obey the law'.” (New Catholic Encyclopedia. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, Vol. XII, 1967. p.451.)


\(^{228}\) "Religious differences, political differences, racial differences, have been healed in every part of the world. Are the religious and racial differences in Ireland never to be healed? Is the political and National quarrel between England and Ireland never to be brought to an end? We cannot believe it. But we do believe that unless it is brought to an end now on the lines to which the National Party can give its adhesion, it will break out with renewed bitterness. Ireland may suffer more in the future even than she has suffered in the past.

We dismiss as utterly unthinkable any talk of absolute separation between Great Britain and Ireland. Nature has forbidden it. The interests of the two peoples forbid it.

Ireland can have her share in the Empire and be as free therein as Australia is, or as Canada or South Africa; as free as England is herself or as Scotland is." (*London Catholic Herald*, 17 June 1916, p.3.)

connection to the church, the paper could not criticize his efforts as a recruiter for the British war effort. His brother, Willie Redmond, was fighting in France at the time. While condemning the exploits of the Ulstermen, the paper suggested that the rise of Sinn Fein was in large part a failure of Redmond and his fellow supporters to deliver Home Rule. "The Irish Party has lost touch, not only with a minority, but we are afraid with the majority of the Irish people. The Party is to blame for that."\(^{230}\)

In response to Maxwell's insistence that some Irish priests had been indirectly responsible for encouraging Sinn Feiners to rebel, the *London Catholic Herald* published numerous editorials on the alleged complicity of the Irish clergy. In an editorial entitled 'Irish Priests and Sinn Fein: Birrell's evidence before the Commission', the paper expressed the belief that some of its Irish bishops were acting in a secular, political manner that was against the wishes of the Catholic Church in England.\(^{231}\) The editorial continues to suggest that Sinn Fein drew a significant amount of its support from young Irish clerics who had become disenchanted with the prospects for Home Rule under Redmond and his colleagues. The paper opined that these clergymen were *de facto* supporters of the Germans, because they could not support a French government that oppressed its catholic citizens. The editors reminded their readers that the sermons from Limerick gave credence to the words of Mazzini, the Italian revolutionary, who once said, "often beneath a cassock you will find the heart of a revolutionary."\(^{232}\)

Bishop Dr. O'Dwyer of Limerick also received harsh words from the *London Catholic Herald* for giving belated approval to Sinn Fein's tyranny. Cardinal Logue, on the other hand, was portrayed as having a more levelheaded grasp of the condition in Ireland and the role of the priesthood in fostering restraint.\(^{233}\) This criticism of the English Catholic journal illustrated the fundamental divide between the English and Irish churches. The English church was eager to represent a united front in supporting the war perhaps in the attempt to gain legitimacy in the protestant nation. While in Ireland, many

---


\(^{231}\) Mr. Birrell pointed out that one of the strongest pamphlets against recruiting was written by the Bishop of Limerick. Dr. O'Dwyer is well-known as an "irreconcilable" who has never supported anything or any party. He has always been a mischief maker. When a priest is elevated to the episcopate he brings with him his virtues and also his faults, just as a student who is ordained to the priesthood carries with him his qualities and his defects. A wise, prudent and pious priest is an enormous force for good. But when a man is the reverse of all this he becomes a centre and source of evil and of trouble to the Church." (*London Catholic Herald*, 10 June 1916, p.2.)


\(^{233}\) "Speaking at Maynooth College on Wednesday afternoon, Cardinal Logue said the circumstances of the country were very lamentable. There was a danger that the good name of the priests of Ireland would be filched away through official misrepresentation. At the very start of the lamentable disturbances the priesthood were hooked into the question. Then the late Chief Secretary kicked off the ball by asserting in his offhand manner that he did not pay much attention to speeches of enthusiasts and priests. He (the Cardinal) was a pretty constant reader of newspapers, and he did not remember in all Ireland a priest making an imprudent speech except on two occasions." (*London Catholic Herald*, 24 June 1916, p.1.)

89
of the Irish bishops demonstrated their lukewarm acceptance of British control over their affairs.

In a 'special' report concerning Casement entitled 'The Lessons of Casement's Conversion' the paper exclaimed; "He (Casement) is convinced that the only safe religion to die in is that of the Catholic Church. With God and eternity alone before his eyes, he deliberately implores to be strengthened and prepared for his judgement with the saving Sacraments of the old religion; in that alone he places all his hopes."234

The Baptist Times and Freeman voiced its regret that Chief Secretary Birrell had been made the scapegoat for the Easter Rebellion. In the opinion of the paper, Birrell had given peace and stability to a rebellious country and was not fully to blame for the outbreak of hostilities. The paper reasoned that the Ulstermen, who armed prior to the war with the intent of resisting the will of the House of Commons, should also shoulder some of the responsibility.235

In a final analysis of the English press response to the Easter Rising, it must be kept in mind for British statesmen the rebellion and home rule negotiations that followed it were of secondary importance to winning the war. This would partially explain the attitude of Asquith during late June and July in allowing the Lloyd George settlement to lapse despite the protestations of the Irish Nationalist leaders. Asquith was faced with the dissolution of his war coalition when many Unionist ministers threatened to resign. Some Unionists protested the settlement that, in their opinions, would have severed part of the empire at a time when imperial unity was tantamount to the successful prosecution of the war.

The three main groups of papers in this study: radical, Liberal and Conservative hoped to reap some political capital from the disturbances in Dublin. The majority of the radical press, while generally sympathetic to the Irish rebels and understanding of the social conditions from which many sprang, interpreted the rebellion in terms of a national struggle for self-determination. Many socialist papers, such as the Labour Leader and the Daily Herald, opposed Britain's participation in the war from the beginning of the conflict and framed the rebellion in terms of an oppressed minority striking for better social and political conditions. The Irish in Britain, in response to labour's sympathetic support during the spring and summer of 1916 and the collapse of the Liberal Party, swelled the ranks of the British Labour Party after the war.

The Liberal press supported the constitutional efforts of John Redmond's party and decried the interference of the Unionists in resisting home rule. The Liberal press

235 "But it must not be forgotten that there were others also who armed and drilled, and the policy meted out to one must be meted out to all. Mr. Birrell has presented to the world for eight years a peaceful Ireland. A stronger policy would have spoiled this, and the more active interferences would have produced the bloodshed at an earlier date." (Baptist Times and Freeman, 19 May 1916, p.300.)
understood that severe repression of the rebellion, mass incarceration of the rebel rank and file, and lack of appeasement of Irish Nationalist demands would create an irreparable division between Ireland and Britain. Therefore they enthusiastically endorsed the efforts of Lloyd George to bring the Irish Nationalists and Unionists together. Liberal efforts to quell the political disorder in Ireland were beneficial to the successful prosecution of the war and were viewed as a temporary measure to expedite a smoother transition to home rule after the war. Their fair treatment of Augustine Birrell was less of an effort to exonerate him from blame (even though they did not believe that he should be made a scape-goat) than to explain that a man of his intellect and kind disposition was not well-prepared for the rigours and duties of the Chief Secretary of Ireland.

The Conservative English press, on the other hand, represented the party in opposition to the Liberal government and sought to portray Asquith and his subordinates as incapable of controlling Ireland especially in wartime. Northcliffe's Times and Daily Mail and the sensationalist Globe and Traveller were more concerned with swaying public opinion on the side of the conservatives. Northcliffe unleashed his venom on Prime Minister who he believed was losing the war for the allies. The criticism of Asquith's handling of seditious groups in Ireland and his prosecution of the war laid the basis, in Northcliffe's mind at least, for the transition of Lloyd George to Downing Street in December 1916.

Analysis of the English press in general demonstrates a general lack of knowledge as to the composition of dissident Irish organizations as evident by the insistence of the editors to refer to the Irish rebels under the heading Sinn Fein. In addition, while most of the radical and Liberal press condemned Maxwell's suppression of the rebellion, especially the executions of the rebel leaders, few papers realized the extent to which Irish Catholic opinion had been hardened by the British military's handling of the affair. The failure of the Lloyd George negotiations in the summer of 1916 simply reinforced the Irish impression that the British government was too divided to deliver home rule. By then, however, Irish Catholics demanded much more than a home rule that virtually guaranteed the partition of their country.
Chapter IV- Scottish Press Reaction to the Easter Rebellion

By Easter 1916 Scotland's war effort had witnessed some of the largest manpower losses from the British Empire.1 Scotland, unlike the south and west of Ireland, supported the epic struggle of the Great War with perhaps unexpected enthusiasm. Because Great Britain suffered relatively little loss of life as compared with France, the north of Britain was a constant source of Imperial strength. As compared with Australia where conscription was put to two referenda but was defeated or in Ireland where compulsory enlistment was never enacted, Scotland's effort was dramatic and pronounced. Scotland's total enlistments from the beginning of the war until December 1916 numbered 410,350 or 17.45% of the male population of the country. This figure was larger than the number of enlistments from England, Wales, or Ireland.2

Devolution for Scotland, Wales and Ireland had been a debated topic prior to the war, but the concept of "Home Rule all around" was not going to be a serious possibility until the latter quarter of the 20th century. There were calls to have a Home Rule Bill for Scotland included in the Irish proposal but this never materialized. Home rule for Ireland had been passed in 1912 under the guidance of Herbert Asquith and would have led to the establishment of a parliament in Dublin by 1914. However, in this eventuality, civil war between Unionist and Nationalist Ireland would have been a probability had not the war postponed this possibility. Prior to Easter 1916, the Government of Ireland Act (1914) had not been enacted, especially as it was envisioned in 1912 when the Liberals depended upon the support of John Redmond's Irish Parliamentary Party. The party that benefited most for the fight for Scottish home rule was the Labour Party. In 1910, Labour carried a mere 3.6 per cent of the Scottish vote; after the war in 1923 that percentage had risen to 35.9. Since the Irish Scots tended not to vote Tory and the Liberal Party was in disarray, the Easter Rising and the demise of the Liberal Party (which was allied with Redmond's nationalists) all added to Irish participation in Labour.3

Several observations can be made as to the manner in which the news of the uprising was conveyed to the Scottish public. First, due to the weekly or biweekly publishing restraints of small newspapers and in a climate of military censorship, some

---

1 "With Scottish regiments comprising twenty-two of the 157 battalions which made up the British Expeditionary Force, no part of the British Empire reacted more patriotically and few parts suffered more heavily. No official overall death toll of Scots was ever issued, but it is likely that Scotland lost nearer to 110,000 dead than 75,000, a fifth rather than an eighth of the total of 573,000 for the four nations." (Lynch, Michael. Scotland: A New History. Pimlico, London, 1992. p.422.)


reports of the uprising were published many days late. Secondly, evidence condemning Sir Roger Casement to be branded as a traitor and to be sentenced to death was omnipresent in the Scottish newspapers before the trial. The capture of a knighted officer in obvious and blatant treason against the British Empire was followed more closely than the notorious murder of the pacifist Francis Sheehy Skeffington by Captain Bowen-Colthurst. Again, as in the English press, none of these papers were held in contempt for branding him a traitor.

Although the Irish rebellion began on April 24, the majority of Scottish papers reported events relating to the uprising at least two to three days late. Despite the proximity of the two nations, readers as far away as the United States received word of the rebellion before much of the Scottish public. As a result of military censorship in Ireland and the fact that many of the telegraphic lines had been severed in Dublin, especially at the General Post Office that became the rebel headquarters, news of the events did not reach most Scottish papers until April 26. However, by April 25 reports of Sir Roger Casement's gun running exploit on Banna Strand had reached the Scottish newspapers, which was at least a full day into the revolt at Dublin.4 Perhaps what is significant about the interlude between the events and their reporting was that the uprising took Scotland by surprise, as well as the authorities in Ireland. Therefore, because of the uncertainty of the outcome, the fear that the rebellion might spread throughout the south and west of the island and the fear that Germany would assist the rebels, the military censor delayed the dissemination of information. In addition, written reports did not reach the readers of weekly newspapers such as the Leith Observer and the Oban Times until April 29.

Scottish newspapers in this study are categorized according to their editorial policies. The Glaswegian Forward was the more influential socialist paper in Scotland. Among the liberal newspapers were the Dundee Advertiser, Dunfermline Press and West of Fife Advertiser, Glasgow Record and Mail, Oban Times, and the Paisley Daily Express. The Unionist papers described here include the Glasgow Herald, Montrose Standard and Angus and Mearns Register, and the Liberal Unionist Inverness Courier, Jedburgh Gazette, Ross-shire Journal, and Scotsman. There were numerous independent ('neutral') newspapers that generally covered the country's provinces. Many of these independent papers, however, did not demonstrate a political bias. Some of these include the conservative Aberdeen Daily Journal, Edinburgh Evening News, and the Leith Observer. The Glasgow Bulletin while an independent paper was owned by the Unionist George Outram and therefore demonstrated a more conservative coverage. The

---

Glasgow Observer represents the Catholic Church in this chapter. The Glaswegian Bailie was a society journal.5

Within the purview of the Liberal press there was a general consensus that the rebellion would threaten home rule and that Sinn Fein's aims were to discredit the I.P.P. that had struggled for many years to influence the British Government to adopt the measure. The Glasgow Daily Record and Mail was generally supportive of the government's Irish policy. In its initial editorial on the rebellion, the paper expressed the opinion that the Sinn Feiners was a rebellious group and not representative of the whole of the Irish people. It believed that it was unfortunate that a small group of Irishmen should detract from the effort that Irish soldiers had been fighting for the "cause of civilization."6 The Glasgow Daily Record acknowledged the fact that even within the ranks of Sinn Fein there were those who tried to keep the rebellion from occurring, but they did not name who was responsible for trying to abort the Easter maneuvers.7 This was actually a fairly accurate account of the meeting of Patrick Pearse and Eoin MacNeill although no one was actually placed under arrest (unless the plight of Bulmer Hobson who was physically restrained is considered to be an arrest.) That this information was actually known in Britain and retold in many periodicals still did not deter the British from arresting MacNeill who actually attempted to thwart the uprising thereby making the hopeless rebellion even less likely to be successful. This reporting suggests a private source of information from Ireland. In the city with the second largest Irish population in Scotland, the Liberal Dundee Advertiser gathered the views of the Irish in that city where they found a strong "abhorrence" for the Dublin insurgents.8


6 "What has happened in Ireland is to be greatly deplored, but there is every reason why no exaggeration should be attached to it, especially for the sake of the Irish people, who will be the first to regret the outbreak of such serious disorder in their midst, and the first to contrast it with the magnificent valour of their troops, both Protestant and Catholic, in the Field. The evidence is conclusive that the rebels in Dublin are guilty of a scandalous project with which the people of Ireland have absolutely no sympathy, the people who, if Nationalists, see their views on the war expressed in the ardent patriotism of Mr. Redmond's loyal nationalism, and their tradition for courage sustained in the deeds of the V.C. hero, Private O'Leary, and the thousands who are emulating him." (Glasgow Daily Record and Mail 26 April 1916, p. 2.)

7 "At a secret meeting held on that day, it is stated the desperate project was mooted and met with condemnation at the hands of some of those who had hitherto been regarded as the stalwarts of the party. The hotbloods carried the day, and the final details were settled, the dissenting individuals being placed under arrest by their old colleagues in order that the success of the plot might not be prejudiced." (Glasgow Daily Record and Mail, 2 May 1916, p.5.)

8 "Interviewed by a "Dundee Advertiser" reporter, a prominent member of the United Irish League of Great Britain described the Dublin outrage as the most meaningless and stupid action that was ever attempted.
The Catholic *Glasgow Observer*'s editor Charles Diamond feared that the rebellion would threaten the establishment of home rule after the war. He explained that the Irish people should not be held accountable for the minority of rebels who did not sympathize with the constitutional methods of Redmond and his followers. Catholic ministers in Scotland and Ireland portrayed varying sympathies toward the insurgents, their eventual punishment, and the role Ireland was to take in the war. The attitudes of the Catholic priests differed as to the significance of the rebellion. No minister quoted in the Scottish newspapers, however, was sympathetic to the rebellion. In fact, they were extremely denunciatory in their assessment of the purpose and actions of the 'Sinn Feiners' and their movement. Not until harsh action taken by the British government and their appointed Commander-in-Chief General Sir John Maxwell in executing the rebel leaders and continuing to implement martial law in Ireland, do we notice public opinion begin to change. Soon after the first executions, there was a change in the attitude towards the British military by the Irish clergy. Generally, Catholic priests moderated their views from initial condemnation towards reconciliation. 

*The Scotsman*, a Liberal Unionist organ that is in no way affiliated with the Catholic Church, pursued a neutralist position throughout the period following the uprising. On the 17th of May, the newspaper reports mirror the general feeling amongst Catholic ministers and Irish officials toward the Government's suppression of the rebels.

The *Leith Observer* quoted a witness to the Wexford uprising on April 27 in which the town was controlled by a contingent of Sinn Feiners to the complete surprise of the police force there. The witness, on his way to Dublin with his wife, was forced to

---

The Sinn Fein movement, he contended, (always) been opposed to the Irish party and their policy." *(Duinnee Advertiser, 1 May 1916, p.8.)*

9 "The Irish people... will not manifest the slightest sympathy or approval with the madly criminal action of the pro-German plotters who resorted to insurrection in Dublin. Since the acceptance of the Irish people at large of the Home Rule Act, the vast mass of Irishmen everywhere are, and will hold themselves, rigidly loyal to the Empire with which they have concluded an act of partnership... With the action of the Dublin revolters, then, we can have no sort of complicity or even tolerance. Their action... was needless, foolish, wicked, and unjustifiable. Irish nationalists will... condemn it as unpatriotic folly: rash, blind, headlong, stupid and wrong." *(Glasgow Observer, 29 April 1916.; Gallagher, Tom. *Glasgow: The Uneasy Peace, Religious Tension in modern Scotland*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1987. pp.86-87.)*


11 "A letter signed by the Assistant Bishop of Cork, the Lord Mayor of Cork, the High Sheriff, and Chairman of Cork City Executive of the United Irish League has been addressed to the Lord-Lieutenant, Sir John Maxwell, and Mr. Asquith protesting against the continuance of arrests throughout the country and the further detention of those placed under arrest. The state of the country no longer warrants the continuance of those measures. Some of the deported have been released, given railway tickets, but no money to purchase food to sustain them while travelling. Those men removed from home and set at liberty should not be left to endure hardships and want while returning." *(The Scotsman: 17 May 1916 p.5.)*
turn back to his hometown that was also under ‘siege’ by the rebels. For at least four days, the witness and his family were virtual prisoners in their own house. The Sinn Feiners were initially combing the countryside for arms and other materials for the inevitable fight with the Irish authorities and with the British troops stationed in Ireland and those arriving from abroad. The witness was perplexed as to why the uprising in Dublin had occurred at all. In his estimation the rebels' seditious activities should have been halted by the police forces in the capital city a long while before the rebellion. John Redmond's volunteers were credited with restoring order in Wexford and thanks were forthcoming from this witness to the Wexford rebellion.12

During the rebellion, the Liberal Paisley Daily Express partially blamed the British Government for allowing the Ulster rebels to encourage sedition in Ireland. The paper did not differentiate between the Ulster rebels and those of Sinn Fein.13 George Outram's Bulletin14 was a conservative Glaswegian independent that reproduced pictures of the rebellion. Its editorial "Oursefs Alone" (in fact a more correct translation of Sinn Fein is 'We Ourselves') announced that the rebellion did not have much support from the people of Ireland. The treasonous activities in Ulster were cited as the main reason for the escalation of violence in Ireland as a whole. In the opinion of this paper, the Ulstermen would have revolted as well had home rule been imposed on the whole of Ireland.15

12 "Why was the drilling of the Sinn Feiners allowed in the back streets of Dublin all last winter? A huge Sinn Fein meeting was held about five miles from here on Sunday, 16th April. The police knew all about it, and they told me that they had warned the Executive Government over and over again, but no notice was taken, and most inflammatory speeches were allowed to be made and reported in the local papers of the Sinn Fein party. About three months ago I was speaking to a friend of mine at the -- shorthorn sales, and he told me that he took a most serious view at that time of what was going on under the very eyes of the Government in Dublin. Drilling in the streets, secret meetings behind locked doors, and Sinn Feiners marching through the Dublin streets armed, holding up the traffic as they pleased. On St. Patrick's Day they held up the traffic in Dame Street and College Green for nearly two hours." (Leith Observer, 20 May 1916 p. 6.)

13 "Both were out for a Government of their own creation. ... Although the Government in power perhaps believed that they were only making fools of themselves, demonstrating not with the intention of resorting to bloody strife, but with the object only of striking terror into the hearts of onlooking people by their drilling, gun-running." (Paisley Daily Express, 28 April 1916, p.2.)

14 The Bulletin was created during the war in 1915 and was primarily a picture paper with concise reporting. (Outram, George and Co. Ltd. The Outram Newspapers: The Glasgow Herald, The Evening Times, The Bulletin, the Glasgow Weekly Herald, Glasgow Herald, Glasgow, 1933. p. 8.)

15 "The Sinn Feiners have discovered by now that they must indeed act up to their name. The rising planned in conjunction with Germany was damped down at the beginning by the capture of Casement, and they must now carry on, "themselves alone," their mad enterprise. It was asserted that the rising came upon the Government "like a bolt from the blue," although they knew well that for months past the Sinn Feiners had been organising and preparing a coup by collecting munitions and distributing seditious literature.

Some critics of the Government condemned severely the policy of letting the rebels arm and make their preparations without molestation, but they must have forgotten the old story about people who live in glass houses. The mischief is not of recent growth, and if the Government allowed the Sinn Feiners to organise and armed movement, so also did they allow the Ulstermen two years ago." (The Bulletin, 28 April 1916, p. 2.)
The *Leith Observer* on May 6 announced the collapse of the Irish Rebellion as one destined to failure. Interestingly, Edinburgh native James Connolly is credited with the rebellion's direction. The writers of the paper clearly understood during this week that the Irish rising, the Zeppelin raids, and the Lowestoft bombardment were a concerted effort by the German government to upset the British war effort in France.\(^6\) The Leith paper would be well informed as to the activities of Connolly in Ireland: besides Connolly being an Edinburgh native, Leith was a labour stronghold.

The Scottish socialist paper, *Forward*, did not support Sinn Fein in general as the movement had been associated with capitalism in Ireland. Connolly was an extremely vigorous writer for *Forward*.\(^17\) Despite the contribution of Irish socialists like the Irish Citizen Army (I.C.A.) and especially James Connolly, Glasgow's *Forward*\(^18\) did not approve of the rebellion in Dublin. Apart from the participation of the I.C.A., the paper felt that the rebellion was nationalist in scope and not socialist. A section of the paper entitled "Catholic Socialist Notes" gives some understanding of the complaints that British socialists had with the rebellion.\(^19\) However, the Glasgow socialist paper's editor, Thomas Johnston, did petition for the release of the I.C.A. soldiers who were imprisoned after the rebellion.\(^20\)

Support for John Redmond, the Irish Parliamentary leader, at the beginning of the rebellion was strong in Scotland and internationally. Liberal Scottish papers such as the

\(^{16}\) "James Connolly, well known in Edinburgh and Leith Socialist circles in his younger days, and conspicuous in labour disturbances since, was the reputed leader, but it is not going beyond the facts to conclude that the scheme originated elsewhere, while his fine organising powers were utilised for the carrying of it into effect. . . . Last week was one of strange happenings in these islands, and it is quite recognised that the Irish rising, the Zeppelin raids, and the Lowestoft bombardment were closely allied to each other, and timed to take place simultaneously." (*Leith Observer*, 6 May 1916, p. 4.)


\(^{18}\) *Forward* was founded and edited by Thomas Johnston. The paper continued to be the main socialist voice in Scotland during the war. (Ferguson, Duncan. *The Scottish Newspaper Press*. Saltire Pamphlet #6, Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1946. p.30.)

\(^{19}\) "The Sinn Feiner dreams of a Green Isle dotted with coal mines and owned by Irish Capitalists; his sweet Auburn is a colliers' row. He attributes all the ills of Ireland to English rule, not to the Capitalist system. He would continue in Ireland itself the degradation and destruction of the Irish race that is such a horrible feature of our industrial centres.

The Irish race has a greater and nobler future. Instead of sulking alone in an Irish slum it must join with other workers in destroying slumdom, in destroying Capitalism, in winning physical and intellectual freedom. It is naturally qualified to supply soul and spirit to the rising democracy of Western Europe.

Every unbiased observer knows that Mr. Redmond and his party have made a dreadful mess of their political opportunities, but that is a small matter easier remedied than the entrenching and consecrating of a dirty selfish Irish Capitalism on the Irish people.

The Sinn Fein movement deserves no sympathy from Irish Socialists." (*Forward* 4 November 1916, p.1.)

Glasgow Daily Record published excerpts from letters expressing this support. The Scottish branches of the United Irish League in Motherwell, Partick, and Hamilton, among others were united in their support for Redmond and "deploring and condemning" the actions of the Sinn Feiners. These reports were placed alongside accounts from the meetings of the United Irish League in New York, and Mullinger, Westmeath and from the United Irish League, Ancient Order of Hibernians, Irish National Foresters from Birmingham, as well as Hibernian societies from New Zealand and Queensland. This unity was a common feature in the Scottish press. For his part Redmond tried to deflect the responsibility for the uprising from the shoulders of the British Government to Germany.

The Unionist press mirrored its English counterparts (Northcliffe) in criticising the censorship of news from Ireland. The Unionist Glasgow Herald, edited by the uninspiring F.C. Kitchen from 1909-17, commented on the military censorship at the beginning of the rebellion. "In regard to the censorship, while martial law prevails a military censor is absolutely necessary. But he will be directed, subject to the essential military requirements, to allow all possible latitude for the transmission of news." The Edinburgh Evening News began reporting on the Irish rebellion on April 26th. The initial policy for dealing with the rebels was with a firm hand. The chief instigator of the rebellion according to the paper was Germany. The paper noted the fact that Germany had been trying to foment trouble in Egypt, India and the United States as well as in Ireland. Part of the reason that the rebels were not supported during the rebellion was that the Irish people had much to lose for not supporting the war and appearing as loyal citizens of the United Kingdom. Economically, Ireland benefited

21 Glasgow Daily Record and Mail, 1 May 1916, pp. 2-3.
22 "What has Ireland suffered in the past which Poland, Alsace, Belgium, and Serbia have not suffered at the hands of Germany, and I may add also that portion of the soil of France, her old friend and ally, which is in the hands of Germany? What has been the record of Germany, but the suppression of nationality, of freedom and of language-in short, the suppression of all the things that for centuries Ireland has struggled? Take the case of Belgium. Has there not been there that same ruthless shedding of the blood of priests and people. That is part of Ireland's own history. Leave the question of principle out and consider the question only of the mere interests of Ireland herself? What did the situation demand? Neutrality? That was impossible. Hostility to the just cause of the Allies? Is there a sane man in Ireland who does not see this meant the drowning of the newly won liberties of Ireland in Irish blood?" (Glasgow Daily Record and Mail, 29 April 1916, p.3.)
26 "Is it surprising that the Germans got to work on a small section of disaffected Irishmen? Clearly they flattered the vanity of Sir Roger Casement and then used him, sending him to his ruin. So, too, with those Sinn Feiners, who have proved by their actions that they are a gang of dangerous homicidal lunatics." (Edinburgh Evening News, 27 April 1916, p. 2.)
similarly to the United States because, while they were not a neutral nation, conscription was never imposed during the war, and farmers could depend upon a steady demand for their products. Families depended upon the income generated from fathers and brothers in France and the pensions provided for widows when Irish soldiers were killed. Moreover, home rule was at stake, and the Irish were not willing to jeopardize the movement for which they had been agitating from the early days of Butt and Parnell.27

Commentary on the Easter Rising was marred by the mistaken belief that the rebellion was supported by German gold. In fact, with the exception of the Russian rifles that had been confiscated by the Germans on the eastern front and subsequently loaded on the Aud for distribution in Ireland, the German government did not supply the Irish rebels and in particular Sir Roger Casement with much support. The aid that was needed by the insurgents, namely German troops, machine guns and naval engagements was not forthcoming. Nevertheless this did not stop many Scottish papers from reporting that German gold or at least German-American money supported the Irish rebellion.28

The Unionist Montrose Standard described the intrigue of the German officers especially Captain Franz von Papen who it regarded as a German spy. It is apparent from an article in this small Scottish paper that the collusion of the Irish-Americans and Germans in disrupting the British war effort and planning of the Easter uprising was not as covert as the rebels and their German allies had believed. The paper described attempts to destroy the locks at the Welland Canal in Canada by Irish-American Fenians and, during the war, by German agents operating from America. The article also describes evidence of payments made by the German government to operations that were confiscated by American secret service agents during a raid upon the office of Wolff von Igel on April 18, 1916. Interestingly, the reportage of the actual rebellion in Dublin was relegated to page 8 in a small, two-paragraph article.29

In their continuation on the theme of Germany’s duplicity and culpability in the Easter Rising, the Montrose Standard’s editorials supported the opinion of Redmond that the Germans plotted the uprising. The Scottish paper quoted from the German Cologne

27 "Indignation at the amazing doings of the Sinn Feiners might be welling up like a flood in Ireland. Irishmen know full well what they stand to lose by questionable loyalty in the times of crisis. Not only is the granting of Home Rule affected, but the tens of thousands of tenant farmers- the backbone of agitation in former years- will themselves be alarmed for their security. Every Irishman worthy of the name is standing by the Empire to-day, and generous acknowledgement must be made of the fact." (Edinburgh Evening News, 27 April 1916, p. 2.)

28 "The Sinn Fein has ideals, and these may be worth fighting for, but it is impossible to regard the hooligans, who have been bought by Germany or by German-American-Irish money, as representing the true faith. A rebellion so engineered (sic) is a disgrace to the Irish race; the blessing of the Kaiser is enough to damn it for all time in the minds of decent people. The Sinn Feiners have ruined their cause. As the extreme right of a constitutional Nationalist Party they would have been tolerable, but as murderers in German pay, they deserve short shrift. " (The Bailie, 3 May 1916, p.9.)

29 Montrose Standard and Angus and Mearns Register, 28 April 1916, p. 7-8.
Gazette that impressed upon its readers the hope that the uprising in Dublin would influence Irish-Americans and American politicians to form "an augmented anti-British party among the American Irish" and "deflect President Wilson from his resolve in checking the barbarities of German submarine warfare." The Cologne Gazette was reproduced in the paper.30

The same day of the opening of hostilities in Dublin an interesting article entitled 'Ireland's Part, Appreciation of a "Splendid Loyalty"' appeared in the Scotsman.31 The article, written by Mrs. Flora O'Gorman of County Clare, had previously appeared in the New York Times. She cites a figure of 150,000 Irish volunteers who were serving in the British armed forces by 1916 as proof that Ireland was loyal to the British Empire.32 While the Edinburgh populace was reading this article the rebellion was entering its second day. However, the article does at least represent the belief that Ireland supported the war effort especially prior to the uprising. The majority of the people of Ireland did not support the uprising, partly because the island was economically benefiting from the war. Moreover, without conscription the majority of nationalist Irishmen stayed at home. The economic situation for many Irishmen and women was better than it had been in recent memory, most notably for families whose loved ones were serving in the war and receiving money from the military. For those benefiting from the war, the rebellion threatened this economic prosperity.

Mrs. O'Gorman alluded to Sir Roger Casement's failed attempt to raise an Irish Brigade from the Irish prisoners of war at Limburg. She stated that the German soldiers who witnessed his traitorous activity first-hand, despised the Irish soldiers who joined Casement. "I also learn from a German officer whom I happened to know before the war, and have since seen as a prisoner, that the most despised people in Berlin are those Irish traitors with the green harps on their German uniforms. There is no chance for them to get to the German front, the German officer told me, because nobody trusts them."33 The captured German officer did not understand the purpose of the Irish brigade because these Irish soldiers would not serve at the front in any case; ostensibly, at least, they were to go back to Ireland to fight for Ireland's independence from Great Britain.

30 "One must ask at a moment when means are being sought to relieve the tension between the United States and Germany, what impression the news of the disturbances in Dublin will have on the millions of Irishmen in North America. We must await news of the attitude they will take towards President Wilson's demands, and we must see what their influence will be on the North American political parties, which in the elections will have to reckon with this factor." (Montrose Standard, 5 May 1916, p. 4.)
32 This figure is quite accurate, as the estimated number of Irishmen serving with 'the military forces of the Crown' was 150,183 by April 1916. (Carthy, James. M.A. Bibliography of Irish History (1912-1921), National Library of Ireland, Dublin, 1936. p.XXI.)
The *Leith Observer* did not begin reportage of the rebellion until Saturday April 29, six days after its beginning on Easter Monday, April 24, because it was a weekly paper (printed on Thursdays, Fridays, or Saturdays during the summer of 1916). The *Observer* connected the capture of Sir Roger Casement with the start of the Easter Rising, believing that Casement was a leader of the insurgent forces. Blame, however, had been placed upon the Government in Ireland, namely Birrell and his under-secretary Nathan.34 The *Leith Observer* article condemned the traitorous Sir Roger Casement. "It will be noted that Mr. Lansing has decided that the matter of that arch-traitor, Sir Roger Casement, does not concern the United States, and he must stand his trial without their intervention."35 When Casement was captured the Scottish papers were eager to comment on his traitorous activity during the course of the war. However, no papers had actually stressed the fact that Casement was probably trying to stop the rebellion. Casement's activities had been well known to the British authorities, and they were reported here without much concern for his innocence and therefore compromising his ability to receive a fair trial.36

*The Bulletin* commented on Casement's arrival on Banna Strand near Tralee in a rather humorous and pointed editorial entitled "Hoisting the Jolly Roger".37 The editorial was a short historical recounting of the reluctance that Napoleon had about invading Britain before the French disaster at Trafalgar. But for the Germans, in the opinion of the author, to have contemplated the invasion of Ireland with simply a shipload of ammunition was pure folly. Clearly, the Germans did not place much faith in the success of an Irish

---

34 "We cannot help thinking, however, that the Irish Executive have somewhat been lax in safeguarding against the upheaval that has occurred. It is of course easy to be wise after the event, but it seems clear that the authorities in Dublin were not without signs and warnings of the trouble that was brewing, and the surprise is that they should have allowed the Sein (sic) Feiners so much scope. The avowed object of the adherents of Sein (sic) Fein is disloyalty, and it would have been well if their schemes had been kept more in check. We hope it is not too late to place this Irish party on its proper footing. Grievances against the authorities they may have, but this is not the time to put them to the test of steel and gunpowder. Surely the grievances could have waited for a more opportune time." (*Leith Observer*, 29 April 1916, p. 4.)


36 "It has been reported that he received about L.2500 as a retainer from the Kaiser, and was to receive much more if his plans were successful. His most remarkable effort was an address to Irish prisoners of war at Lemberg, where he tried to induce them to forewear their allegiance to King George, and join an Irish brigade in the German service. As soon, however, as he began to speak the soldiers discovered who he was, and a rush was made for him. If it had not been for the armed German guard in attendance upon him there is little doubt but that he would have been lynched. Of about 2,000 Irish prisoners it is said Casement was able to induce not more than fifty to join the nefarious enterprise. His name has been used freely by German agents the world over to spread sedition among the Irish race, and several specious manifestoes in his name have been issued by the German Foreign Office." (*Jedburgh Gazette*, 28 April 1916, p. 4.)

37 *The Bulletin*, 26 April 1916, p. 3.
insurrection. One needs only to remember the lack of support that the Germans gave to John Devoy in America, Roger Casement in Germany and the Irish Republican Brotherhood in Ireland. Casement, although he may have had an over-inflated view of his role in the uprising, was no fool. He knew that an uprising could not be successful without German troops, naval support, and much more firepower than was given to him. The ammunition and rifles that were being transferred onto the Aud were captured Russian guns and hardly a match for British rifles. The editorial writer understood that "And till they (the conditions favorable for a rebellion) exist the shipping of munitions is waste and rebellion a vain thing."38

Sir Roger Casement's trial did not commence until June 26th, but according to the press, and consequently public opinion, the prisoner was already guilty. In almost every article published where Casement's name is mentioned, he is identified as a traitor. Damning reports such as the Oban Times' article on April 29th, ensured that public opinion would have no doubt as to Sir Roger Casement's fate. News of the rebellion in Ireland did not reach the Oban Times' readers until April 29, because the newspaper was a weekly and therefore its reporting did not coincide with news of the uprising. This edition reported three articles pertaining to the topic; one entitled "Germans and Irish Anarchists" explaining the relationship of the German government and Sir Roger Casement. The report is by a Russian journalist working out of Copenhagen.39

By the time the final executions of the rebels in Dublin were taking place, the independent Liberal Oban Times supported the military crackdown of the disturbance. The paper rightly stated that the majority of the Irish population did not support the 'action' (the paper did not actually agree with the assertion that a full-fledged rebellion had occurred in Dublin). The paper echoed the sentiment of the majority of the Scottish papers that the rebellion had bordered on treason for in the Empire's hour of need, these rebels were betraying their brethren in Scotland, England and the Empire.40

---

38 Ibid.
39 "The Copenhagen correspondent of the 'Novoe Vremya' communicates a curious circumstance relating to the last debate in the Reichstag. 'Deputy Liebnecht, who generally causes the Chancellor (Bethmann Hollweg) very much displeasure, declared in his speech that he had documents in his possession proving an agreement in hard cash with the State Secretary, Zimmerman, and with Sir Roger Casement; by strength of that agreement English prisoners of Irish origin would be employed by Germany to bear a part in the war against England, composing individual Irish brigades." (Oban Times, 29 April 1916 p.5.)
40 "For the honour of Ireland, whose gallant sons are heroically fighting the common foe, side by side with their brothers of Scotland and England and the Empire, it is rightly claimed that this has been no Irish rebellion. The mass of the Irish people, contented and loyal, repudiate the frenzied folly of the section that has brought calamity and shame upon the country, and besmirched its good name. But for the very reason that the rising was the work of the insignificant bands of conspirators, it should never have been permitted to flourish without let or hindrance. ...The Sinn Feiners are the Ishmaels of Ireland. Their hand is against every man, and they feed mainly upon mock heroics. They stand apart from the mass of the people with ideals that are utterly alien to the genius and welfare of Ireland. We have just seen how these ideals work out in practice—the foul and wanton destruction of property on a scale to which they would set no limits.
The Dunfermline Press and West of Fife Advertiser, a Liberal organ, reported that the Scottish branches of the United Irish League were quick to support the stance that John Redmond had taken after the rebellion, namely that the rebellion and its leaders should be condemned for their actions. However, Redmond also called for the lenient treatment of the rebels. By May 6, the paper could not have known about the fifteen executions that had begun on May 3 and would continue until May 12.41

The significant change in Irish sentiment that initially followed Maxwell's mismanagement of the country and the growing sympathy for the executed rebels continued with the modification of home rule that was orchestrated by Lloyd George. Redmond had agreed in theory to the temporary exclusion of six predominately protestant Ulster counties as early as the Buckingham conference in 1914, but when it became apparent that the exclusion of the six counties might become permanent (as early as July 1916), the Irish Parliamentary Party leader suffered another blow to his popularity. The changing fortunes of John Redmond were evident by June 1916. Previously his popularity had taken a severe blow when he pledged Nationalist Irish support for the British war effort at Woodenbridge in 1914 and actively recruited Irishmen for the British army. (His position was further weakened by Lord Kitchener's insistence that Nationalist Irish soldiers would not be allowed to form their own army.) This prompted the split in the ranks of the Irish Volunteers and the National Volunteers of which the majority followed Redmond's Nationalist Volunteers. By 2 June 1916, Redmond's support was slipping away from him as reported in many Scottish newspapers.42 Moreover, the Irish attitude toward the war had turned decidedly negative, for in the minds of many Nationalist Irishmen, Redmond included, Nationalist Ireland's continued support for the war was predicated on the delivery of home rule after the war.43

Nor are the Sinn Feiners above accepting help from Germany. They have been plied with gold and provided with firearms from the country that made Belgium a heap of ashes and that is now busy oppressing the Belgian people day to day." (Oban Times, 13 May 1916 p.7.)

41 "We, the Irish people of Dunfermline, at public meeting assembled, renew our unabated confidence in Mr. John Redmond, M.P., leader of the United Irish Parliamentary party, and pledge him and party our unswerving support. We deeply regret, deplore, and condemn, in the strongest language possible the actions of those misguided men who have caused death, bloodshed, and incendiarism in Dublin. We call upon all Irishmen to support Mr. John Redmond and the Government to crush for ever such disloyalty." (Dunfermline Press and West of Fife Advertiser, 6 May 1916, p.3.)

42 "The rebellion inquiry disclosures have created an unfortunate impression here, and businessmen allege that the Irish leaders have lost the sympathy and support of the people." (The Bulletin, 2 June 1916, p. 2.)

43 "The popular attitude towards the war is fixed beyond change. Germany's aim and methods are hated. The war on Britain's part is regarded as a just war, but leading Nationalists, reiterating the views expressed last night by Mr Redmond and Mr Dillon, point out that the people responsible for what is described as a flagrant betrayal cannot expect from the victims of the betrayal the same measure of sympathy and support as had been freely given since August, 1914." (The Bulletin, 26 July 1916 p. 2.)
An interesting and amusing article was printed in the Bulletin that stated that a German had the right to inherit the Irish throne (which did not exist) through his descendancy of Brian Boru.\textsuperscript{44}

Nationalist Ireland turned from disdain for the rebels to support of their aspirations as a result of the conduct of the British following the rebellion. The execution of the rebel leaders, the transportation of many 'rebels' (many of whom did not participate in the rebellion) to British prisons, along with the failure to provide much of the destitute Dublin population with relief after the Easter Rising causing civil disturbances and food shortages had been cited as reasons for this change in nationalist sentiment. On 10 May the Bailie called for leniency in the handling of the situation in Ireland. The Bailie did not want to see a situation arising out of Dublin such as that which had happened 170 years earlier when the Scots were defeated at Culloden and the Duke of Cumberland had massacred the remaining highlanders.\textsuperscript{45} The Bailie must also have been aware of its Irish readership in making this observation.

The Bailie chose to report on the 'human angle' of the rebellion, issuing its commentaries on the careers of Casement, The O'Rahilly, Maud Gonne, and Countess Markievics (sic) whose husband the paper stated was not a count "but a Polish gentleman of small estate."\textsuperscript{46} The social journal recounted Maud Gonne's failed marriage with the

\begin{quote} \textsuperscript{44} "GERMAN HEIR TO IRISH THRONE?\
It is surprising in a way- especially in view of the oft-exhibited German deficiencies in the sense of humour- that at no time since the war began has anything been heard of certain Teutonic dynastic claims in Ireland. Nearly four years ago a Leipzig genealogist Dr. Roth, announced that the Duke of Anhalt was a direct descendent of the famous Brian Boru, and was consequently the true heir to the Irish Throne." In a book which he published (for a presentation copy of which he was cordially thanked by the Duke) Dr. Roth stated that so late as the seventeenth century the then Duke of Anhalt, Joachim II., held that he was entitled to be recognised as King of Ireland.\textbf{KING BETTER THAN DUKE.}

The eminent genealogist acknowledged that since then the claims had been allowed to lie in abeyance. This was a little awkward, seeing we have now reached the twentieth century, but Dr. Roth was not downheartened. He urged strongly, by letters and in the press, that the present Duke of Anhalt should take means to assert his dynastic claim and substantiate his title. "Ireland," he declared, "is a more majestic possession than Anhalt. It has ten times the population and a more fertile soil. King of Ireland sounds better than Duke of Anhalt." All of which is indubitably true.\textbf{WHAT WOULD IRELAND SAY?}

Unfortunately, however, for the Duke, there are certain practical difficulties in the way of securing recognition of his regal claims. Before the war his army consisted of a single regiment! What its strength is now can only be guessed, but on the whole no one either in Great Britain or Ireland will allow his sleep to be disturbed by fears of the Duke's heading an invasion for the purpose of "substantiating his title" to the Irish crown.

THE PASSER-BY." (The Bulletin 17 July 1916, p. 8.)\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{45} "It is not necessary to overdo the punishment. England will err if she resorts to another 'Bloody Assizes' or to the post-Culloden methods of Cumberland. Less vengeful methods will do. The lives of the instigators of this diabolical blunder are forfeit, and the summary justice of the Drum Head will keep us right while anger is still hot. A weak Government like ours may think it will show its strength by prolonging the agony of punishment. Therein will be error." (The Bailie, 10 May 1916, p.9.)

\textsuperscript{46} The Bailie, 17 May 1916. p. 7.
executed leader John MacBride and suggested that her husband's fight for Irish freedom is what ruined their relationship. This is an interesting conclusion; it is more likely the Maud Gonne was more incessant in her Irish nationalism that was MacBride. "But McBride it was and his fight for Ireland that won her, but it wasn't long until she had enough, and she left him."\textsuperscript{47}

However, some clergymen that were quoted in the Scottish papers censured the rebels, the rebellion and their movement. Throughout the rebellion and the executions, many Catholic priests of Ulster remained steadfast in their opinion of the role Ireland was to play in the British Empire. Some interpreted the causes of the rebellion to be idleness and even welcomed conscription to Ireland. Some Catholic ministers were slow to understand the significance of the uprising such as Michael Logue, the Archbishop of Armagh, who writing to the much reproduced London \textit{Times} said that he wished the British Government would conscript idle Irishmen into the forces.\textsuperscript{48}

The execution of the pacifist Francis Sheehy Skeffington by a Captain of the Royal Irish Rifles, John Bowen-Colthurst, is one of the most tragic and notorious incidents of the Easter Rising. Bowen-Colthurst, after an inquiry into the shootings of Mr. Sheehy Sheffington, Mr. Dickson, and Mr. MacIntyre was deemed to have been innocent by reason of insanity. \textit{The Bailie} reported that Captain Bowen-Colthurst was "'wrestling with his God' in prayer during the night, and about his appeal to the words of Scripture as authority for his awful deed. Surely here was evidence that his mental balance had gone altogether over to the wrong side."\textsuperscript{49} He eventually served twenty months under state care and was sent to Canada with a government pension, leaving the impression that there was no retribution for the murder of Mr. Sheehy Skeffington. Thus, the British government was able to avert another potentially damaging incident. In fact, there were no editorials condemning the actions of the insane British officer or any apologies given to Mr. Sheehy Skeffington's family. Knowing in retrospect that Mrs. Hanna Sheehy Skeffington was offered £10.000 by Prime Minister Asquith to forego an investigation into her husband's murder, this episode was especially damning to the British government.

While the majority of the Scottish newspapers, both Liberal and Conservative, was lamenting Birrell's apparent lack of effort in Ireland as Chief Secretary particularly during

\textsuperscript{47} \textit{ibid.}.
\textsuperscript{48} "The earnest hope that even now, at the eleventh hour, the Government will treat Ireland as on an equality with the rest of the United Kingdom by including this country in the general conscription. We have tens of thousands of able-bodied young men who are not engaged in any work for the war, and who would willingly serve if the shirkers and slackers were compelled to do the same." (London \textit{Times} 8 May 1916 p.7.)
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{The Bailie}, 14 June 1916, p. 8.
the inquiry into the causes of the rebellion when he admitted that he had underestimated the seriousness of Sinn Fein, the *Dunfermline Press* was much saddened by the departure of Birrell, especially under those circumstances. The Dunfermline paper reminded its readers that Birrell had ably represented West Fife as a member of Parliament for eleven years (from 1889 to 1900). This was the only Scottish paper highlighting the nation's connection with Birrell. Interestingly, the paper does not point out the fact that the representative for East Fife was the Prime Minister Asquith. However, the editorial concluded that he was deficient as an Irish administrator at a most critical time and failed to keep the republicans from armed rebellion. However, the paper did credit the Chief Secretary's ability in 1914 to keep civil war from breaking out between the Ulstermen and Nationalists. The *Inverness Courier* (which followed the beliefs of its owner and editor, James Barron, who was an independent liberal), however, focused on the inability of Dublin Castle to control Ireland and recounted Birrell's lax attitude towards threats of rebellion.

By the middle of May, the Glaswegian society journal, the *Bailie* blamed the Liberal Cabinet for the necessity of imposing martial law in Dublin and in general for the mayhem caused by the rebellion. An interesting corollary with the situation in Russia had been made between the lack of liberal rule in Dublin and the general belief that Russian government was oppressive. "Even Liberal members of the Duma are of the opinion that we've made a bad mess in Ireland, and if Cossack rule is now necessary in Dublin, the fault lies with the Cabinet, against whom the owner of destroyed property ought to raise an action at common law." The *Jedburgh Gazette* contented itself with publishing on May 5 and May 12 official pronouncements of the rebellion and information that was received from wire reports, because the paper's circulation was too small to warrant sending one of its correspondents to Dublin. However, despite little 'first-hand knowledge,' the paper did not hesitate to give its impression regarding the 'Future of Ireland' in an editorial on May 19. It is worth noting that this Scottish paper began its editorial with the word Englishman. "Englishmen, almost without exception, will hope that Mr. Asquith's visit to

---

50 "In fairness to Ireland it should be acknowledged that the recent revolt bore no resemblance to an Irish rebellion. The great majority of people in Ireland are loyal subjects of the Crown, and they have condemned the rising of the Sinn Feiners as whole-heartedly as any other section of the people in the British Isles." (*Dunfermline Press*, 6 May 1916, p.4.)
52 "Mr. Birrell has always been too soft and easy in his methods. If it be the case- the statement is not yet proved- that he allowed drilling to go on in the parks, and sham fighting to take place in Dublin itself, then he showed himself feeble and incompetent." (*Inverness Courier*, 28 April 1916, p.4.)
53 *The Bailie*, 17 May 1916, p. 5.)
Ireland may be fraught with good consequences for the future of that troubled country." The editorial called for the House of Commons to support the Prime Minister in his attempt to diminish the potential for division in Ireland. "This is no time to revive old controversies and reopen old wounds." There was justification for vengeance against the rebels, but caution was advised. The editorial continued to minimize the importance of the rebellion: "One side points with justified indignation to the slaughter of soldiers, police, and civilians in a riot entirely devoid of even the appearance of justification."54

The Ross-Shire Journal placed the current 'ministerial crisis' in perspective of the entire war. In its opinion, the home rule crisis needed to take a backseat to the war even as the Easter Rising threatened to end the implementation of the measure.55 Conservative newspapers such as the Chalmer family's Aberdeen Journal remained supporters of Asquith's administration throughout 1916, despite its apparent weakness in directing the war effort and the disagreements between the Prime Minister Asquith and Lloyd George.56 Describing the failed Lloyd George initiative, the paper believed that the Home Rule Act as it remained on the statute book would be inoperable after the war. The exclusion of Ulster was a foregone conclusion.57

The Bailie's commentary on the proceedings of the Hardinge Commission created to investigate the rebellion suggested that there were two main concerns among Scottish readers in May 1916. Great Britain's propaganda during the war tried to impress upon neutral nations (especially the United States) and the belligerents as well, the moral superiority of their cause. However, more often than not, insensitivity towards America's rights as a neutral nation characterized the British propaganda machine. Britain's overall goal was to have the United States join the Allies and end the country's trading with the Central Powers. The British government blacklisted those American firms who were conducting business with the enemy and this proved to be a political blunder with broad implications for the British propaganda effort. The brutal suppression of the Easter Rising

54 Jedburgh Gazette, 19 May 1916, p. 2.
55 "Several prominent Unionists appear also to have their difficulty at the present critical juncture of the war. Since both Mr. John Redmond and Sir Edward Carson seem, with whatever individual reluctance, prepared to accept a middle way, until the war is over and won, questions, which in peace times were proper subjects of disputation, and principles, which then seemed of paramount importance, must give way to the larger issue being fought on the battlefields of the world. A political disruption at such a juncture would be criminal, more particularly as the points of differences are not of first-class concern." (Ross-Shire Journal, 30 June 1916, p.4.)
57 "Even if the Lloyd George scheme now disappears, it is scarcely credible that the full Home Rule measure will be allowed to extend to Ulster when the Act is brought into operation after the war. The war, it has been constantly said, has changed and is going to change much. It has already left its mark on the Irish controversy, which is never likely to be the same again." (Aberdeen Daily Journal, 28 July 1916, p.4.)
revealed yet another propaganda weakness not because the American public sympathized with the Irish rebels and their methods of violently wresting independence from Great Britain, or with Germany's meddling in Ireland, but because the repressive conduct following Asquith's appointment of a military man to deal with a situation which was perceived by many civilians to be primarily a political affair. (Martial law throughout the south of Ireland hardly turned the Irish populace into supporters of Sir John Maxwell.)

The second concern for the Scots was that the Liberal government's handling of the rebellious climate prior to April 1916 in Ireland was fraught with incompetence and most, if not all, of the blame was leveled at Augustine Birrell.58

When Sir Roger Casement was found guilty of high treason on June 29, the public and Scottish press was quick to condemn the man to be hanged. An interesting article in the *Leith Observer* explaining what would have been Sir Roger Casement's punishment, had he been condemned in medieval times, was typical of the interest generated by the trial. Such was the interest of his case in this and other Scottish newspapers that a knight of Great Britain would become a traitor to the realm, that he was in fact being tried on a medieval case involving a traitor in the Angevin empire. However, the paper did not report Sir Roger Casement's execution on 3 August.59 With the exception of a few articles explaining his service as a British Consul, the Scottish press had few positive remarks about Sir Roger Casement. No editorials in the Scottish press questioned the wisdom of the British government for knighting an officer who was now on trial for high treason.

Two soldiers who had been shot at Lemberg, the camp in which Casement tried unsuccessfully to raise a regiment of Irish prisoners of war, Patrick Moran and William Devlin, had refused to join in Casement's exploit. The papers accused the German guards of executing these prisoners because they did not support Casement's attempts. These reports were printed on August 3; the same day that Casement was executed, to refute any sympathy that might arise from his death.60 The following day, the paper reported the

58 "The effect of that lamentable business has been felt more keenly in America than we generally appreciate, and the admissions of Mr. Birrell will not help matters much. The best that can be said about his statement at the Commission of Inquiry is that he has tried to be painfully honest, but his story reveals how ghastly has been our blundering in Ireland from the beginning." (The Bailie, 24 May 1916, p. 9.)

59 "In mediaeval times Sir Roger Casement's degradation from Knighthood would have been followed by a proclamation to the effect that the degraded Knight should henceforward be reputed as an 'infamous arrant knave.' Immediately afterwards would have come the final proceedings on the scaffold. Degradation from Knighthood was the severest punishment inflicted by the Court of Chivalry, and apparently was only resorted to in very extreme cases, for few instances can be found. First the sword-belt was cut so that the weapon fell; then the spurs were hacked off and thrown different ways; next the sword was broken and cast away; then followed the proclamation mentioned above." (Leith Observer, 25 July 1916 p.2.)

execution of Casement rather matter-of-factly, commenting on his conversion to Roman Catholicism.

It is perhaps not a coincidence that Captain Fryatt was executed a few days prior (1 August) to the execution of Roger Casement. In fact, the Germans may have timed the execution to correspond with 3 August so as to hasten the Irishman's fate. A martyred Casement certainly offered the Germans more propaganda value in the United States than Captain Fryatt who most Americans had neither heard of or had sympathy for the British citizen. For Scottish readers, the Fryatt case was simply another atrocity in a long list of German cruelties starting with the moral crusade of aiding "raped Belgium." "In our passionate indignation and astonishment at the murder of Captain Fryatt, we naturally ask ourselves what manner of men or beasts are they who could do this thing. It is incredibly diabolical and cowardly. The assassins, we conclude, must be akin to the gorilla or the cave-man." 61

When Captain Fryatt was executed for his alleged part in the ramming of a German submarine, Sir Edward Carson rose to question the Prime Minister on the responsibility for the execution. German sources said that Captain Fryatt had been awarded a gold watch for his part in sinking a German submarine. However, it was said that Mrs. Fryatt had the gold watch in her possession. Interestingly they did not refute the allegation that Fryatt had been awarded a watch for sinking a submarine, which would have proved his guilt. The Government through the Great Eastern Railway Company was to pay Mrs. Fryatt £250 in a life annuity. The German government was alarmed at the amount of criticism leveled at them by neutral countries following the execution of Fryatt. 62 The execution could not have come at a worse time for Casement who, if he had any chance of being saved from execution, certainly now would not escape the executioner at Pentonville prison.

In an article entitled "The End of a Traitor" the Oban Times approved of the execution of Sir Roger Casement. "At the very time when he was plotting against the nation which had favored and nourished him he was in receipt of the Government pension; and he chose the moment when his country was in the gravest peril which has beset it for a hundred years to intrigue with the enemies of the king." 63

Mr. Bernard Shaw publicly commented on the execution of Sir Roger Casement and this was criticized in many of the papers as bordering on treason. The Bailie offered its own opinion on Bernard Shaw's position. "Mr Bernard Shaw was 60 last week. So

61 The Bailie, 2 August 1916, p. 9.
62 The Bulletin, 1 August 1916, p. 2
63 Oban Times, 12 August 1916, p.7.
that he is quite old enough to know better.64 The Bailie made much of the Black Diary alleging the homosexual activities of Casement was circulated, according to the paper, in order to keep influential men from coming to his defence, namely President Wilson.65 Apparently, tall men are predisposed to high moral character. The article continued to cite the London Times who blasted those individuals who tried to defame Casement's character stating that Casement was on trial for treason only. "Who is responsible for the circulation of these inspired innuendoes?"66

The Scottish press response to the Easter Rebellion and the subsequent attempt to introduce a form of home rule for Ireland during the war was shaped by historical, religious and ethnic considerations. Much of what was reported in the English press was reproduced in Scottish papers as well. However, it was evident in the Scottish editorials that Scotland and Ireland share a common Celtic heritage and the sentiment that the Scots could understand the Irish temperament better than their English countrymen was inherent in their attitude towards Irish aspirations for self-determination. In particular, the Glaswegian press coverage accounted for its large Irish presence much more so than the Dundee press which also had a large Irish minority. Asquith and Birrell figured prominently in the discussions of the rebellion but no Scottish paper commented on the Scottish connection with the Prime Minister who was MP for East Fife. Birrell who used to represent West Fife was pitied as a minister who was generally not conditioned for the rigours of Irish political life.

Scotland was a nation aspiring for their own home rule status and the Irish struggle in many respects foreshadowed the debate over Scottish devolution. Scotland proved itself worthy of nationhood through two world wars; Irish Nationalists were trying to prove its loyalty during the first of these. Furthermore, Scots are a protestant people with direct ties to Ulster and therefore the desire to impart home rule for Ireland expressed a need that Ulster's Protestants have their religious liberties protected. Most of the Scottish press regardless of their political persuasion stated their support for the exclusion of some of Ulster's counties in the Lloyd George scheme. Scotland's own history of resisting the imposition of Anglicanism upon their soil had its counterpart in the struggle of Ulstermen to maintain their protestant identity in a predominately Catholic nation.

Overshadowing any commentary of home rule in the Scottish press was the necessity of keeping unity within the United Kingdom during the war. Scotland had little

64 The Bailie, 2 August 1916, p. 9.
65 "SIR ROGER CASEMENT- hope it isn't foul treason still to call him "Sir," . . . is said by some prints to have left a diary which stamped him as a monster of sexual moral depravity. I don't believe in this diary. Men nearly six feet two inches in height like Casement are never monsters of depravity, although unfortunately many of them are marvels of mental vacuity." (The Bailie, 9 August 1916, p. 6.)
66 ibid. p. 7
sympathy for the exploits of Roger Casement because of his associations with the enemy and attempts to exploit the Irish in German prisoner-of-war camps. There was not a groundswell of pity for the executions of the rebel leaders that were witnessed in Ireland or the United States and this can be explained by the expressed belief that rebellion threatened the effectiveness of the war effort. One needed only to observe the number of Scottish families who were losing their fathers and sons on the western front to understand this sentiment. There was nothing to be gained for Scotland by supporting a group who professed a hatred for British rule in Ireland.
Chapter V - American Press Reaction to the Easter Rebellion

Now there is an Irish nation in the United States, equally hostile, with plenty of money, absolutely beyond our reach and yet within ten days' sail of our shores. 1

Irish immigration to the United States in the aftermath of the potato famine of 1845-50 and a liberal American immigration policy thereafter created by 1916 a large population of Irish-Americans whose general political outlook was anti-British in varying degrees. Irish-American Catholics kept the tragedy of the famine alive in the minds of their descendents and, combined with a general Anglophobia that pervaded the American republic, Irish-Americans were characterized as an exiled nation whose hatred for Britain was intense. However, they were unable to influence American foreign policy that was favourable to the British Empire. This was due in part to their minority status as a Catholic immigrant group within a predominately protestant nation. According to the 1910 U.S. census, those of Irish descent, both catholic and protestant, numbered 4,504,360 out of a total American population of 91,641,195 (approximately 5% of the population). If one accounts for those first-generation Irish immigrants (Irish-born), the percentage of Irish-Americans residing in the United States decreased to approximately 1.5%. 2 However, this is a very conservative estimate of the total population of Irish-Americans and a rather misleading statistic because this does not account for the millions of Americans who were descendants of the Irish of previous migrations dating back to the colonial period (when most Irish immigrants were Ulster Scots). 3 Professor Francis Carroll proposed that Irish-Americans comprised as much as nineteen per cent of the American population by 1920. 4

Irish-American political strength and influence had reached a peak during the first Cleveland administration (1885-89). The election of 1884 was very close, and the Irish population in New York State voted solidly for the Democratic candidate. Cleveland won New York by only 1,149 votes, thereby assuring him the number of electoral votes to win the national election. The organization that most influenced the Irish vote in the state was Tammany Hall. Tammany Hall had been associated with the political corruption of local and state elections and was a constant target of reformers and critics. Contemporary Irish-American political strength was a serious consideration during most presidential and congressional elections. In the presidential election of 1912, Wilson did not enjoy an overwhelming electoral mandate over his Republican opponents Taft and Roosevelt. Roosevelt had taken the mantle of the liberal, progressive wing of the Republican Party and ran as the "Bull Moose" Progressive Party candidate. With the Republican Party split by the nominations of Taft and Roosevelt, the Democrats stood to benefit from the internecine political warfare. Although Wilson garnered a majority of the popular vote in only fourteen states, all of them in the south, he became president as a result of a resounding victory in the electoral college. Had the Republican Party not been split between Taft and Roosevelt, it is probable that Wilson would not have become the 28th president of the United States, a possibility that apparently was not lost on him.

One immigrant group that the Democratic Party could consistently depend upon was the Catholic Irish. In the 1912 Electoral College, Wilson carried most of the states that had the largest percentage of Irish settlement: New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Illinois. Most Irish-Catholic immigrants were members of the Democratic Party and

---

6 Robert La Follette, Senator from Wisconsin, lost the Republican nomination to Taft. Thereafter, many of La Follette's progressive followers supported Roosevelt.
7 Wilson was born in Staunton, Virginia on December 28, 1856. Since the Civil War, the Democratic Party had prevailed in the south in most presidential elections. Conversely, the Republican Party generally carried the Northeast.
9 Even though the Catholic Irish generally voted Democratic in national elections, they were still sophisticated enough to vote according to the issues of the day. In 1896, McKinley carried all states except the south, western silver states, Kansas and Nebraska. Some Irish Catholics did not agree with the fiscal policies of the 'Free Silver' Democratic candidate W.J. Bryan. Likewise, they chose to reject Bryan again in 1900. Many Irishmen were pleased by Roosevelt's promotion of the parity of labor with big business and voted for him in 1904.
remained loyal members in opposition to the nativist and anti-immigrant polity of the Republican Party. This explains, in part, the voting behavior of Irish-Americans during Woodrow Wilson's second presidential campaign. Despite the fact that Wilson did not intervene on behalf of Sir Roger Casement and other Irish political prisoners, many of whom had participated in the rebellion, the majority of Irish-Americans remained loyal to the Democratic Party in the 1916 presidential election. The question posed to many Irish-Americans in the summer of 1916 was whether their desire for Irish independence outweighed their loyalty to the Democratic Party.

Despite the Irish rebellion and the continued poor relations between Britain and Ireland, most Irish-Americans in 1916 still expected some form of home rule to be applied to Ireland when the war was over. In the same year as Wilson’s election, a new Home Rule Bill was introduced in Parliament. The Third Home Rule Bill was passed largely due to the Parliament Bill of 1911 that limited the veto power of the House of Lords, the body responsible for rejecting Gladstone’s second effort to introduce legislative self-rule for Ireland. The Home Rule Act was placed on the statute books in 1914 but was never enacted due to the Great War and the continued threat of civil war between the Nationalists and Ulster Unionists. After 1912, Irish-Americans flocked to join the United Irish League of America (U.I.L.A.) that was clearly recognized as the American wing of the Irish Parliamentary Party and supported the political efforts of John Redmond. The president of the U.I.L.A., Michael Ryan, gathered American support for the implementation of the Home Rule Bill.

Most Irish-Americans did not believe that extremists, such as Judge Daniel Cohalan (who supported the Republican Party) and John Devoy, spoke for the majority of Irish-Americans. At least three generations of Irish-American Catholics had supported the Democrats and had become entrenched in American politics. Even though in their hearts a rebellion against the hated English was desirable, the possibility of massive Irish-American involvement was slim. They understood full-well that their place in American culture was hard-fought and by 1916 bearing fruit. No precipitous action on their part that would endanger that position was warranted or acceptable for their well-being. Most Irish-Americans echoed John Redmond’s moderation through their voice in the U.I.L.A. The U.I.L.A.’s position was Irish independence within the British Empire, i.e. home rule. Although Irish-Americans voted for Wilson in overwhelming numbers, this should not be mistaken as approval for his pro-British sentiments. Other factors played their part as well in the election of 1916. Most Irish-Americans believed Wilson’s pledges to keep America out of the war more than his Republican counterpart, Charles Evans Hughes. Hughes became associated in the Democratic press with Theodore Roosevelt who did not hide his desire to intervene in the European conflict. Therefore, it would appear that Wilson’s
pledges of non-intervention influenced the voting patterns of Catholic Irish-Americans in November 1916 despite Wilson's reluctance to intervene on behalf of Roger Casement in August 1916.

Irish-American electoral strength, while concentrated in the northeastern cities, was felt in metropolitan areas throughout the Midwest and Pacific coast, most notably in Chicago, San Francisco, St. Louis, and Cleveland. While the political aspirations of Irish-Americans were not as influential in these cities as in the east, they could not be discounted. Likewise, while many of the editors of Midwestern and Western newspapers acknowledged Irish striving for independence from British domination, they abhorred German imperialism even more. Editors of the northeastern papers, on the other hand, were clearly associated with either pro-Irish or pro-British sentiments. Those papers associated with anti-British sentiments in this study are: John Devoy's New York Gaelic American, Patrick Ford's New York Irish World, William Randolph Hearst's New York Journal-American and San Francisco Examiner, Joseph Medill Patterson and Robert R. McCormick's Chicago Tribune, John McLean's Cincinnati Enquirer and Washington Post, James Elverson, Jr.'s Philadelphia Inquirer, Erie C. Hopwood's Cleveland Plain Dealer, Los Angeles Times and the San Francisco Chronicle. Those most associated with pro-British sentiments were Adolph Ochs' New York Times, Ogden Reed's New York Tribune, Joseph Pulitzer's New York World and St. Louis Post-Dispatch, New York Evening Post, Clarence Barrow's Wall Street Journal, Brooklyn Daily Eagle, Christian Science Monitor, Springfield Republican, and the Washington Times. Those papers whose editorial policy was neither clearly pro-British nor anti-British included Frank Munsey's New York Press, John F. Frost's Brooklyn Citizen, W.J. Curtis' Rochester Union and Advertiser, Hartford Courant, Boston Globe, John W. Holmes' Boston Herald, Boston Evening Transcript, James Keeley's Chicago Herald, Gardiner Cowles' Des Moines Register and Leader, William Allen White's Emporia Gazette, New Orleans Times-Picayune, and Henry Watterson's Louisville Courier-Journal. The newspaper editors most vehemently critical of Wilson's policies toward Ireland were Irish-American radicals such as John Devoy and Patrick Ford, editors of the New York Gaelic American and Irish World, respectively. Of the two editors, Devoy's pages spewed criticism of Wilson and his perceived pro-British bias on an


11 Patrick Ford died in 1913 but his paper continued to be associated with his name after his passing.

enormous scale. However, judging from the continued support of Irish-American Democrats toward Wilson, Devoy's influence appeared inconsequential.

In 1916 more Americans than ever received their information about the European war from major U.S. newspapers numbering approximately 2,600.\textsuperscript{13} Circulation figures for certain newspapers fluctuated daily and generally (if the paper had a Sunday edition) increased on Sunday, when more news from the entire week was printed. As well, it is not clear that circulation figures alone determined the paper's influence. For example, the Brooklyn \textit{Daily Eagle} claimed a circulation figure larger than any other evening paper in the United States "in its class" in 1916,\textsuperscript{14} however, other New York dailies were generally more influential because of their relationship to the presidency (i.e. the New York \textit{World}) or their national consumption (such as the New York \textit{Journal-American}, through the Hearst chain).

Table 2: Circulation Figures of Selected U.S. Newspapers in 1916 (unless otherwise noted):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Circulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston \textit{Globe}</td>
<td>242,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago \textit{Tribune}</td>
<td>376,067 daily, 602,479 on Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago \textit{Herald}</td>
<td>184,309 daily, 518,157 on Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland \textit{Plain Dealer}</td>
<td>140,091 daily, 184,552 on Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines \textit{Register and Leader}</td>
<td>100,000 in 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis \textit{News}</td>
<td>110,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis \textit{Tribune}</td>
<td>100,000 daily, 75,000 on Sundays in 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans \textit{Times-Picayune}</td>
<td>51,034 daily, 64,798 on Sundays in 1915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{13} Kobre, Sidney. \textit{Modern American Journalism}. Florida State University, Tallahassee, 1959. p.2.
\textsuperscript{15} The Chicago \textit{Tribune}’s circulation for 31 March 1916 was 359,651 (585,934 Sunday) and 30 September 1916 was 392,483 (619,023). (History of the Chicago Tribune, The Tribune Company, Chicago, 1922. p.113.)
\textsuperscript{16} The Chicago \textit{Herald}’s circulation for 31 March 1916 was 176,204 (519,854 Sunday) and 30 September 1916 was 192,414 (516,460 Sunday) (History of the Chicago Tribune, The Tribune Company, Chicago, 1922. p.113.) The paper claimed a daily circulation of over 200,000. (Chicago Herald front page, summer 1916.)
\textsuperscript{17} The Cleveland \textit{Plain Dealer}’s circulation for April 1916 averaged 137,395 (daily) and 185,216 (Sunday), June 1916 141,470 (daily) and 185,020 (Sunday), July 1916 141,409 (daily) and 183,419 (Sunday) (Cleveland Plain Dealer, editorial page, summer 1916.)
\textsuperscript{18} Circulation for the Des Moines \textit{Register and Leader} reached 100,000 for the first time in November 1917, but it was not until 1921 that the Sunday edition topped that mark. (Freidricks, William B. \textit{Covering Iowa: The History of the Des Moines Register and Tribune Company}, 1849-1985. Iowa State University Press, Ames, 2000. p.47.)
\textsuperscript{19} Circulation for January to June 1916 for the Indianapolis \textit{News} averaged 110,286 daily (56,528 for the city and county) (Indianapolis News, front page summer 1916.)
\textsuperscript{20} In 1910 the circulation of the Minneapolis \textit{Tribune} was 100,000 (daily) and 75,000 (Sunday). (Morison, Bradley L. \textit{Sunlight On Your Doorstep: The Minneapolis Tribune’s First Hundred Years, 1867-1967}. Ross & Haines, Inc., Minneapolis, 1966.)
During the critical period of April through August 1916 when Irish-American antagonism towards Britain was at an apogee, Wilson refused to be swayed by senators, newspaper editors, pro-Irish radicals, or Irish dignitaries (such as George Plunkett, father of the executed rebel leader Joseph Plunkett), to intervene in the release of Irish rebels imprisoned in England and Wales, or to act on behalf of Roger Casement. Therefore, Irish-Americans acting on behalf of Irish republicans sought the aid of the United States Senate. The Senate was more sympathetic towards Irish-American concerns than the president was to intervene in the Irish crisis of 1916. Some Senators were constantly frustrated by Wilson's lack of interest in Irish domestic affairs and his tendency to favor Anglo-American relations over Irish-American. Wilson's administration was not significantly different from prior administrations in their attitude towards Ireland. Wilson favored Irish home rule,29 but his enthusiasm for an Irish parliament did not extend to supporting Irish extremism. In fact, Wilson was strongly opposed to the separatist tendencies of many Irish-American extremists. His campaign against immigrant groups favoring their heritage over their newly adopted country (hyphenism) was characteristic of

22 The New Orleans Times-Picayune's circulation in 1915 was 51,034 (daily) and 64,798 (Sunday). (Dabney, Thomas Ewing. One Hundred Great Years: The Story of the Times-Picayune From its Founding to 1940. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, 1944. p.385.)

23 The New York Times' circulation was approximately 250,000 in 1914 and approximately 390,000 by 1918. This suggests that the paper had an estimated 320,000 readers in 1916. (Davis, Elmer. History of the New York Times: 1851-1921. J.J. Little & Ives, New York, 1921. pp.331-332.)


26 The Philadelphia Inquirer claimed a city circulation "greater than that of any other two morning newspapers in Philadelphia combined" (Philadelphia Inquirer, front page, daily 1916) Circulation was approximately 200,000 daily and 300,000 on Sundays. (Philadelphia Inquirer, front page, 30 April 1916.)

27 Sacramento Bee's circulation fluctuated between 30,704 in April 1916 and 30,489 in May 1916. (Sacramento Bee, front page summer 1916.)


his disdain for separatists in politics. Wilson was willing to befriend Americans of Irish descent like his personal secretary Joseph Tumulty but was unafraid to insult those Americans who he could say put Irish matters before American interests: e.g. the pro-German Jeremiah O'Leary or Judge Cohalan.30

Wilson abhorred American political corruption in general and Tammany Hall's influence in particular. Irish-American Catholics were associated with Tammany's corruption, and certain leaders such as Judge Cohalan were among Wilson's more vociferous critics. Wilson appointed many Americans of Irish descent to influential positions within his administration. For example, Wilson's personal secretary was the catholic Joseph Tumulty, and his Secretary of the Treasury was the protestant William McAdoo.

As far as Casement is concerned, it is highly probable that Wilson knew of the existence of the black diaries and attempts to defame the Irishman's character. In fact, if Wilson had not seen excerpts from the diary it would open the British Admiralty and American government to charges of incompetence. Since it appears that the aim of the 'smear campaign' was to keep American officials from interceding on behalf of Casement and since newspaper editors apparently knew of their existence,31 why did the President not know as well? Whether or not the black diaries influenced Wilson one way or the other is simply conjecture, because his only comment on the issue was: "It would be inexcusable for me to touch this. It would involve serious international embarrassment."32

James Stephens' adage "England's difficulty is Ireland's opportunity" was the rallying cry of the Irish-American extremists during the Great War. Since the outbreak of hostilities in August 1914, John Devoy and the Clan na Gael33 planned an Irish uprising. The Clan na Gael was the American counterpart of the Irish Republican Brotherhood (I.R.B.). Since August 1914, the Irish-American branch had been engaged in the destruction of public property in Canada and the seizure of explosives in the United States. The leadership of the Clan na Gael consisted of Irish-American extremists, such as John Devoy and Judge Cohalan, who were committed to Irish independence through violent

31 Observe the editorials of the Chicago Herald on July 22nd and of the Springfield Republican (a paper read daily by Wilson) on August 4th.
means if necessary. Prior to Easter 1916, they served as intermediaries between Sir Roger Casement who was attempting to raise an Irish brigade among Irish prisoners of war, the German government, and the I.R.B. The other main Irish organizations in the United States were the extremist Ancient Order of Hibernians (A.O.H.) and the moderate United Irish League of America (U.I.L.A.). The A.O.H. was strongly critical of American relations with the British Empire while the U.I.L.A. supported the parliamentarian efforts of John Redmond until his death.  

The failure of the United States to be drawn into the European conflict, (especially after the sinking of the Lusitania in 1915 with the loss of 128 American lives,) was a constant concern for the British cabinet. The cabinet periodically received American press resumes warning of American frustration with the British blockade of Germany. The cabinet rightly assumed, however, that such frustration would not cause America to abandon the Allies economically, dependent as they were upon the Allied trade. The pro-British bias of the American Ambassador to Britain, Walter Hines Page, was attacked by the Irish-Americans in the press and Congress. The British minister to the United States, Cecil Spring Rice, had miscalculated the extent of the effect of Irish opinion on Wilson. Ward explains that "Wilson's personal attack on hyphenated Americans (Irish-Americans) was not restrained by any consideration for the Irish or that they would defect from the party." The Irish needed the Democrats as much as the Democrats needed the Irish. Wilson divided the Irish into two factions- the "loyal" that he would not court and the "disloyal" that he shunned. By August, Spring Rice saw the execution of Casement as being a great blunder. "It is far better to make Casement ridiculous than a martyr."

Wilson saw the coalition between some Irish-Americans and German-Americans as a potential fifth column in the United States. From the start of the war, the German Imperial Government used the neutral United States as a base to strike against the British war effort. The German government's objective was to keep the United States from aiding the Allies with war materiel. Their attempts to manipulate the American press were somewhat successful and in their endeavor they were aided by British violations of American neutrality (blacklisting American companies who traded with Germany, opening

of American mails) and a blundering policy towards the Irish rebels. Wilson accused Germany of spying and supporting criminal intrigues set to undermine the very fabric of American nationhood, its industries, and worldwide trade. Numerous German documents and communiqués fell into the hands of U.S. authorities and gave intricate details of these clandestine actions. Among these were memoranda and banking records of Captain Franz von Papen-German military attaché and his secretary, Wolff von Igel. German agents who were accused of sabotage often gave testimonies that revealed the handiwork of the German government. Much of this was conducted from the office of Germany's ambassador to the U.S. Count von Bernsdorff who with his subordinates enjoyed diplomatic immunity. Unfortunately for Irish-Americans and the Irish rebels, communication between the United States, Germany, and Ireland was not as secret as the planners of the uprising had believed. When American Secret Service agents raided Von Papen's 'office', the Agency was already aware of the genesis of an Irish uprising.39 British naval intelligence had extensive knowledge of Sir Roger Casement's plans for gunrunning to western Ireland.40 The Irish Coast Guard knew that Casement's ship was headed for Tralee to unload its munitions. The exact date of the deployment was uncertain mainly due to the conflicting information coming from Devoy; however, well before Easter 1916, the British navy had been alerted to the possibility of Casement's expedition. Casement's capture was a foregone conclusion if he were to set foot near Tralee. (Casement arrived by German U-boat U-19.) Only the German Captain Spindler, through his ability to deceive an English captain into thinking he was Norwegian, was able to postpone for a while the inevitable capture of his vessel, the Aud, loaded with guns and ammunition for the Irish rebels.41

Devoy's Gaelic American accused the Eastern Press establishment of being almost conspiratorial in its condemnation of the German-Irish alliance and of the Easter Rising of April-May 1916. There was little doubt that the majority of the American press was pro-Ally. The often cited press report by the Literary Digest stated that 105 leading editors of American papers favored the Allied cause while only 20 supported the Central Powers. That was in 1914, before the outrage of the Lusitania caused 240 neutral editors to swing into the allied camp.42

41 He was later forced into Queenstown Harbour where he promptly scuttled the ship to avoid its capture. (Spindler, Captain Karl. The Mystery of the Casement Ship. Kribe-Verlag, Berlin, 1931. pp.112-126.)
The Irish tended to settle in northeastern cities in the United States throughout its historical migration and especially following the Diaspora as a result of a series of famines in Ireland. In cities such as New York, Boston and Philadelphia, the Irish influence was pervasive in their development. Irish-born citizens of New York numbered 275,102 (8%) in 1900, 203,450 (4%) in 1920, however, the population of New York City with Irish blood was incalculable. The first newspaper in New York to reach a mass audience throughout the United States was Joseph Pulitzer's New York World. The World followed in the footsteps of Pulitzer's first paper, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. From their beginnings, both papers had fiercely independent editorial stances, and pandered to no political party, although by 1916 the paper and the New York World strongly supported Wilson. In 1916, Pulitzer's New York World was considered by the British Government as the official voice of Wilson's administration. It was well known that Wilson was reluctant to discuss political issues with the press and that he trusted only a few newspapermen with matters of state. In 1915, World reporter Louis Seibold first revealed the state department's interest in the intrigues of German agents in the United States. This led to the capture of certain documents in the possession of Franz von Papen concerning plans for the rebellion and particularly Casement's gunrunning exploits. That Wilson concurred in the leakage of certain secrets to Seibold reflected his trust in the World and especially its editorial staff. The chief editorial writer from 1911 to 1923 was Frank I. Cobb who was "intensely pro-Ally, not merely for reasons of natural sympathy for Britain and France, but because, like Wilson, he believed that German imperialism was the chief barrier to the advance of peace and civilization." Cobb continued to support Wilson in the 1916 election. His editorials reflected the concern that a vote for Hughes would bring the United States into the war and that the Republican

---

44 “The POST and DISPATCH will serve no party but the people; will be no organ of "Republicanism," but the organ of truth; will follow no caucases [sic] but its own convictions; will not support the "Administration," but criticise it; will oppose all frauds and shams wherever and whatever they are; will advocate principles and ideas rather than prejudices and partisanship. . . .” (Rammelkamp, Julian S. Pulitzer's Post-Dispatch. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1967. p.41.)
45 Ross, Charles Griffith. The Story of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. St. Louis Post-Dispatch, St. Louis, 1953. p.3.
46 Joseph Pulitzer Sr. died in 1911 but even before his death he was incapacitated by strokes and no longer directed the publication of his papers which were taken over by his sons and experienced employees.
candidate was associated with pro-German elements in the country.\footnote{Barrett, James Wyman. \textit{Joseph Pulitzer and the World}. Vanguard Press, New York, 1941. p.351.} Also important to the success of the \textit{World} were the sketchings of Rollin Kirby who served as a political cartoonist for the paper for 18 years from 1913-1931. His cartoons were instrumental in publicizing the corruption of Tammany Hall.

The \textit{World} considered Carson as much a traitor as was Casement. "If the British government is at a loss to know what to do with Sir Roger Casement, it might take him into the Coalition Cabinet. In justice it can do no less for him than it did for Sir Edward Carson...The promotion of Sir Edward Carson to the Cabinet has been the greatest obstacle to quiet and order in Ireland during the war. It hampered John Redmond and the Irish Nationalists in their efforts to control their Irish supporters."\footnote{New York World editorial. (Rochester Union and Advertiser, 29 April 1916, p.4.)}

Joseph Pulitzer's greatest challenge in the circulation war to dominate New York's readership came from William Randolph Hearst following his purchase of the New York \textit{Journal-American}. Hearst paid his editors and journalists outrageously high salaries, and soon Pulitzer's best newspapermen began to defect to Hearst. While Hearst supported the Democratic Party's political agenda, he became highly critical of anyone in power, partly because he believed that criticism sold more newspapers than praise and because he wished to become President of the United States. He was accused of being pro-German during the war. But while he defended the Germans against unfair attacks in the American press, he felt no allegiance to or sympathy for their cause. He was virulently anti-British and a constant detractor of President Wilson because of what he perceived (and probably correctly) to be Wilson's pro-British foreign policy. He, more than any other owner of a major national chain of newspapers, supported the Irish cause. This came naturally to him for a number of reasons: his wife was an Irish-American, he had an interesting proclivity for rebels fighting to establish an independent nation (observe his support for Cubans during the Spanish-American War), he hated English snobbery, and above all he was an American patriot who wanted to keep America out of the war.\footnote{Swanberg, W.A. \textit{Citizen Hearst: A Biography of William Randolph Hearst}. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1961. pp.294-295.} He once boasted that if he ever became President he "would send to the Court of St. James an Irish-American."\footnote{Swanberg, W.A. \textit{Citizen Hearst: A Biography of William Randolph Hearst}. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1961. p.256.}

After he openly supported Roger Casement and sided with the pro-German leader of the 'American Truth Society', Jeremiah O'Leary in his attack on Wilson, his papers were banned in Canada, Britain and France.\footnote{Swanberg, W.A. \textit{Citizen Hearst: A Biography of William Randolph Hearst}. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1961. pp.300-301.} The New York \textit{Journal} and New York \textit{Evening
Journal were part of the Hearst chain which included the San Francisco Examiner, Boston American, Chicago American and Chicago Examiner. 55

Adolph Ochs owned the New York Times. Ochs supported the Republican McKinley but his allegiance seemed to have shifted to the Democratic Party by 1912. His support for Republican candidates prior to 1912 was in part due to the fact that the Democratic frontrunner during these years was William Jennings Bryan whom Ochs distrusted to lead the country. Wilson's sound foreign policy coincided with Ochs support for internationalism that recognized that the longer that the Great War continued the more likely the United States would enter on the side of the Allies.56 Despite their German Jewish ancestry the Ochs family was vehemently anti-German, and the war brought out this hatred. Adolph's brother, George, changed his last name from the German Ochs to a more American Oakes and was from then on known as George Ochs-Oakes. Most of his family did not go to this extreme fearing that George was trying to cover up his Jewish ancestry more than the German.57

Adolph Ochs had no foreign correspondents in Europe prior to 1914, and therefore he received his information from the London Times and Daily Chronicle. This fact caused many of the paper's detractors to assert that the New York Times was slanting its news stories in favor of the Allies, because it was being 'bought off' by Northcliffe. (At the beginning of the war, the Times was subjected to a Senate investigation to this effect from which it was exonerated in full.)58 Ochs utilized the Foreign Service of the London Times until 1914 when a dispute with Northcliffe forced Ochs to send his own correspondents to Europe. While this allowed his paper to publish the English and German cases for war, the Times' editorial stance blamed Germany for the war from at least December 1914 onwards.59 "On August 23, 1914 the Times published in its entirety the British white paper, a compilation of official correspondence leading up to Britain's decision to enter the conflict. The next day it featured Germany's version of events." George Ochs also edited the Times' Current History.60

The New York Tribune was a Republican paper that was edited by Whitelaw Reid (an unsuccessful vice-presidential candidate with Harrison in 1892) from 1872-1905 and he continued to publish the paper until his death in 1912. The paper endorsed American neutrality prior to 1917. For a time, the famous reporter Will Irwin carried the credentials of the New York Tribune in 1915. Irwin is most notable for breaking the story of the Battle of Ypres (albeit a few months after the battle) which circumvented the British censor and brought him respect and a working relationship with Lord Northcliffe. The story was published in the United States in the Tribune and in Britain in Northcliffe's London Times. He witnessed parts of the Battle of Verdun in 1916 but made no mention of the Irish uprising.

After the rebellion had been suppressed and the process of understanding its causes was undertaken (with the apparent goal of blaming those in authority), the Tribune presumed that the war had made the Sinn Fein movement stronger and that they were responsible for the poor recruiting in Ireland. The government, the paper concluded, was responsible for the rise of sedition in Ireland. "To the very last the policy of the government was one of watchful waiting."63

Oswald Garrison Villard was the owner of both the New York Evening Post and the influential liberal journal Nation (The Nation's editorials and letters to the editor were mainly reproductions of some of those found in the Evening Post). He was the grandson of 'The Liberator', William Lloyd Garrison, and shared much of his grandfather's liberal views. He was a pacifist and a supporter of Progressive politics, especially women's suffrage and civil rights for blacks. Although Villard owned the Post he allowed its editorial commentary to be directed by Rollo Ogden who was a firm supporter of Wilson and his pro-British sentiment. The paper supported Wilson's campaigns in 1912 and 1916.64

Villard, because of his paternal German ancestry and respect for German culture, was accused of being pro-German prior to 1917 although his publications were pro-Ally. Because he was a pacifist and determined to keep the United States out of the war, Villard was attacked for being a supporter of the Central Powers although he stated publicly that the German Emperor was the person most responsible for the outbreak of hostilities in

---

63 New York Tribune (Winnipeg Evening Tribune, 9 May 1916, p.4.)
The opinion that Villard was pro-German was shared by the Allies as well. The Post’s European correspondent, Stoddard Dewey, reported that the Allies considered the paper to be "the most pro-German paper in America." Accusations that Villard was pro-German were unfounded and directly conflicted with Villard's pacifism. Villard was a member of many German-American societies, the most notable being the Carl Schurz Memorial Committee. Villard gave a speech in Stockbridge, Massachusetts in 1915 in which he clarified his position concerning the war. He commented on the nature of German-American patriotism and whether loyalty to Germany necessitated dismissing one's loyalty to the United States. Villard postulated that Carl Schurz "would have been dismayed to find that some among them had been seduced into using their power in American politics for foreign ends." Villard drew the ire of George von Skal, a German propagandist who was accused of aiding German agents expelled for espionage. Von Skal maintained that Villard's opinions concerning Schurz were wrong and that the statesman would have supported Germany in this war. Von Skal wanted Germany to be treated fairly in the press and not blamed for starting the war. However, Villard was anti-British in that he felt American neutrality was being compromised by British censorship of news from Europe and being violated by the opening of American mail. He broke off correspondence with the president when it became apparent that despite Wilson's assurance that 'he kept us out of the war'; the United States would be brought into the conflict. As early as April 1916, Villard had become convinced that Wilson would not live up to his campaign promise and stopped interviewing the president.

The Evening Post insisted that the English policy in Ireland had been too lax in allowing sedition to continue in Ireland. "Let it freely be conceded that the existence of these conspirators and revolutionaries in Ireland is a reproach to English rule. It is a severe indictment of British policy in Ireland that ever since Cromwell's day there have been bands of Irishmen ready to risk all in striking at England. This inveterate and inherited national hatred, this settled and sullen distrust, this smouldering desire for wild

---

67 After a highly successful career as a Brigadier General during the Civil War, and editor of the Detroit Post and St. Louis Westliche Press, Schurz held many important political positions as U.S. Senator for Missouri, Secretary of the Interior and later edited the New York Evening Post.
and blind vengeance, are the bitter fruit of mistaken statesmanship, persisting through the centuries. The manifestations of this spirit have usually been acts like those of madmen; but its existence, through all the generations, has been a standing proof of English government folly."71

Even though Rollo Odgen called for sterner measures in dealing with the insurgents, he stopped short of supporting wholesale execution of the rebel leaders. "If the English are wise, they will not listen to cries for wholesale executions of the "traitors," but will rather treat them, for the time being, as amiable lunatics who are most in need of restraint and time for a cure."72 Even though the British government was justified in executing the rebel leaders, he believed that placing them "in the Tower" instead of shooting them, would lay a firmer foundation for the necessary change in Ireland's government and status within the empire.73 The paper contended that although Casement was guilty, his execution was a 'government folly' and Asquith's ministry had missed the opportunity to make a magnanimous gesture to Ireland.74

Among the many newspapers owned by Frank Munsey was the New York Press that he purchased in 1912.75 The Press was a Republican paper edited by Ervin Wardman.76 It belittled the significance of the rebellion upon the British war effort, as it did not divert British troops from the trenches in Flanders and France.77 The paper accepted the executions of the rebel leaders but felt sorrow for them. "And yet it is the way of humankind to look with philosophic composure upon the deaths of many men in the Dublin fight, but to feel deep compassion for the fate of the hysterical schoolmaster and his irresponsible associates."78 In 1916, the Press was merged with the New York Sun and Evening Sun.

The Press considered Casement to be insane and expected Britain to not be foolish enough to make a martyr of him. "It is better business to turn the laugh on his supporters

74 New York Evening Post, 3 August 1916, p.8.
75 Frank Munsey was a New Englander whose publishing career began in 1882. He founded a number of magazines and purchased a number of regional newspapers (Baltimore News and New York Star.) In 1916 the Press absorbed the New York Sun.
76 The German war machine plotters must have been mad to think that such a puny, miserable affair as the whole thing was - North Sea raid, west coast attack and Dublin outbreak- could achieve anything but to make laughing stocks out of the victims who were sent to such folly and to arouse Ireland more than ever to send her men and to shed her blood in the cause which is the cause of all civilization, to which no people have been more devoted, could be more devoted, than the men of Ireland. (Mott, Frank Luther. American Journalism: A History of Newspapers in the United States Through 250 Years. 1690 to 1940. Macmillan Company, New York, 1947. pp.637-638.)
by taking the position that their leader is merely cracked, as undoubtedly he is."79 In an editorial entitled "Casement in History", Wardman commented that history will judge Casement by the point of view of the 'chroniclers'. By the Irish he would be lauded as a patriot or as a martyr but by the English he would be derided as a traitor. For the editor of the Press, Casement was to be respected because he accepted his fate with courage.80

On 4 May 1916, the New York Evening Telegram proposed that the rebellion was fomented by Larkinites and that Sinn Feiners were dupes of the "internationalists, syndicalists and nihilists" who sought to subvert the nationalist movement in Dublin.81 The Evening Telegram discounted the belief that Casement was insane when he plotted against the British Empire. "Was he demented last September when he was in Munich arranging for this and other outrages?"82 In a report from Dublin, nationalist interest in Casement was minimal. This questioned the belief that Casement's death would create another martyr on the scale of Emmett. "As an element in Irish politics Sir Roger had no existence. The importance attached to his connection with the Sinn Fein revolt both in England and abroad is not quite understood in Ireland."83

The Wall Street Journal's owner in 1916 was Clarence Barrow. He was a supporter of Wilson's foreign policy and understood that allied trade was making the United States a rich and powerful country. He supported Wilson's declaration of war in 1917 and felt that "Germany had to be stopped."84 The Journal's editorials dealt primarily with the effect of the Irish rebellion upon the economic interests of America and little with the historical complexities of the Anglo-Irish relationship. "Investors in securities are not concerned with what the grandfathers of the present English did to the grandfathers of the present Irish. But they are most particularly concerned in anything that really affects the British Empire and the British Empire's credit."85

Across the East River from Manhattan, the Brooklyn Daily Eagle agreed with the British view of the rebellion: it was fostered in Germany, it was a blow to home rule, and the rebels were misguided. Quite a bit of American support for Irish home rule involved vigorous support for the allies while, at the same time, many editors were Anglophobic. The Brooklyn Daily Eagle was one such newspaper. It was critical of British attacks on

81 Evening Telegram, 4 May 1916, p.8.
82 Evening Telegram, 27 April 1916, p.8.
83 Evening Telegram, 25 May 1916, p.2.
America's rights as a neutral nation yet understood that the best chance for home rule to be granted to Ireland would be in the aftermath of an allied victory. The *Eagle* reminded its readers that its 'special war correspondent,' Henry West Suydam, had predicted the rebellion and its German connection at least three months before the outbreak of hostilities. "As far back as January 21, he wrote: "The Irish Volunteers, who are the armed members of the Sinn Fein party, maintain their organization as a threat. This threat of armed rebellion, however strong or flimsy it may be, was directly responsible for the exclusion of Ireland from conscription." On February 18, Mr. Suydam stated it was his opinion that Ireland had failed to answer England's call for men. "Germany is still working to provoke an Irish insurrection." This was the positive statement that came over the wires on February 21. "Gun-running from the United States to Queenstown is common gossip," continued Mr. Suydam's dispatch. "Pro-Germans carry concealed weapons in Dublin without interference."87

The Brooklyn *Citizen* 's company president, John Frost, supported Redmond and his efforts to deliver home rule for Ireland and believed that he still retained the support of the majority of Irish people. The revolt was aimed, the paper believed, at the Nationalist Party.88 The executions were judged to be unwise: "The question to be decided was not what the conspirators deserved, but what upon the whole the interests of the country demanded." Many papers, especially in the Northeast, recalled the clemency of Presidents Lincoln and Johnson towards the defeated Confederates. Reconciliation between the North and South was expedited as a result of a wise political choice and moderating voices urged this as the proper course of action for Britain in dealing with Irish rebels.89 This logical argument was extended to Casement's situation as well. The paper contended, even up to the date of his execution, that he was insane. To the *Citizen*, Casement represented much more than a treason conviction.90

86 "Suydam, Henry (West), newspaper corr.; b. Bklyn, May 19, 1891; student Princeton; Attached, 1914-17, to German, Austro-Hungarian, Turkish, British, Belgian, and French armies, and twice to British fleet in North Sea; reported campaigns at Dardenelles, Galicia, Somme, Ancre, and Verdun; reported Irish, Russian, and Chinese revolutions, interviewing leading statesmen; studied conditions and traveled in 30 countries of Europe, Asia, and the Far East; acted as escort for 50 British and French citizens sent into war zone at Gallipoli. (Died.) Dec. 11, 1955." (Who Was Who in America, volume III, 1951-1960, Von Hoffman Press, St. Louis, 1966. p.835.)


88 "To speak of it as a revolutionary movement is of course absurd. No person familiar with the conditions in the Green Isle at the present time will do so. Never in more than a century has Ireland been farther removed from anything resembling revolutionary activities than she is to-day, when all her representatives in Parliament, with a single exception, are ardently loyal, and when more than two hundred thousand of her sons are in arms for the cause of the empire." (Brooklyn *Citizen*, 26 April 1916, p.6.)

89 Brooklyn *Citizen*, 4 May 1916, p.6.

90 "Nations, it should be borne in mind, do not honor their heroes either for their success or the prudence of their measures, but largely because of the constancy of their devotion to the national ideal. . . . Casement alive and in prison either for life or a limited term would have been quite harmless, but in his
Patrick Ford's Irish World from the beginning of its reporting of the uprising linked America's spirit of rebellion with the current situation in Dublin. Its front page cartoon on May 6 illustrated a defiant George Washington championing the Irish cause with the caption reading "The Irish Insurgents Acting on the Principle Which Won American Independence."  

In an interesting jab at British censorship the Democratic Rochester Union and Advertiser jokingly remarked, "It will be interesting to read the real story of the outbreak in Ireland. But it won't be possible to do it until the war is over." The paper asserted that while the rebellion will fail the rebels could not be considered traitors as "Ireland owes nothing to the British Empire." The rebels revoluted at the worst time possible, according to the paper, because English soldiers were trained and ready for suppressing an Irish revolution.

Unlike many New York State papers, the Rochester Union and Advertiser initially justified the British execution of the rebel leaders with the opinion that "no government, situated as is the British government at the present time, would be likely to be more lenient with rebels." In addition to 'punishing' the rebels, the paper protested against the leniency shown the Ulster 'rebel', Sir Edward Carson. By the time that the thirteenth rebel had been shot (Thomas Kent on May 9th), the executions were viewed as pointless because they ceased to 'teach the Irish rebels a lesson' but became vengeful and cruel. "Had the government been contented with executing three or four of the leaders, the Irish people, who were not generally in sympathy with the rebellion, would not have felt that it had done more than was necessary to protect its sovereignty over the island and would not have been won over into sympathy with the rebels as martyrs."  

Charles Hopkins Clark who was Editor-in-Chief from 1900 to 1926 wrote the Hartford Courant's editorials. He was a supporter of the Republican Party and Theodore Roosevelt, albeit disappointed by Roosevelt's decision to form the Progressive 'Bull Moose' Party that split the Republicans in 1912. The Courant reminded its readers that grave he is a most eloquent exponent of the passions and aspirations which prevent Ireland and England from forgetting the animosities of the past and going forward to the better days ahead in the bonds of a common loyalty." (Brooklyn Citizen, 3 August 1916, p.6.)

91 Patrick Ford died in 1913 but the paper continued to be associated with his name.
92 Since the Irish World was a weekly, its first substantial reporting on the rising was on May 6. Its April 29th issue stated that it had only scant news from Ireland due to British censorship. (Irish World, 29 April 1916, p.4.)
93 Irish World, 6 May 1916, p.1.
94 Rochester Union and Advertiser, 26 April 1916, p.4.
95 Rochester Union and Advertiser, 4 May 1916, p.4.
96 Rochester Union and Advertiser, 12 May 1916, p.4.
the Sinn Feiners who demanded complete independence from Britain did not represent the mainstream of Irish opinion. "Most Irishmen are undoubtedly aware that Ireland is better off as a part of the British Empire than it could possibly be as a little, weak and disorganized independent nation." The Courant believed that by incarcerating the rebels until they could cause no more trouble (after the war when Home Rule would be implemented), the release of this small band of followers would have no influence on a stable Irish government. Casement offered Britain the chance of diminishing the damage done by the Dublin executions upon Anglo-Irish relations. Casement, as a martyr, would simply cause a settlement after the war to be more difficult to achieve. "It is easy to put a rope around his neck and kill him, but that would not dispose of him."

Philadelphia's newspapers were responsive to an Irish population that numbered 98,427 (8% of the city's population) in 1900, and 64,590 (4%) in 1920. The Philadelphia Inquirer's editor-in-chief was Charles Heustis. Its publisher was James Elerson, Jr. who continued the paper's support of the Republican Party. The Inquirer was concerned that British censorship was disguising the true sentiment of the Irish people toward the war. "The truth is, however, that little or nothing is certainly known of the conditions which have prevailed in Ireland since the opening of the war, and the mere fact that they have been so sedulously concealed by the veil of secrecy which a strict censorship has drawn raises a suspicion that they have not been entirely satisfactory." Its editorials considered the executions to be "an appalling blunder" which would create a long legacy of bitterness.

No other city in the United States was more closely associated with Irish Catholicism than Boston, Massachusetts, with a large number living in the southern part of the city. The Irish-born citizens of Boston numbered 70,147 (13%) in 1900, and 57,011 (8%) in 1920. The Boston Globe was a strong supporter of Wilson's administration in 1916. Its traditional readership was Irish and therefore represented the alliance between the Democratic Party and the majority of Irish America. The paper's

---

98 Hartford Courant, 27 April 1916, p.8.
99 Hartford Courant, 5 May 1916, p.8.
103 Philadelphia Inquirer, 27 April 1916, p.10.
editorial director, James Morgan, had a common history with Wilson and felt perhaps an unconscious bond with the southern President. Morgan's Kentucky family was divided and shattered by the Civil War in the same way as Wilson's Virginia clan. Morgan continually praised Wilson's ability to keep the United States neutral and repeated this point at the height of the furor over the executions in June 1916 when he stated that the United States wanted "none of Europe and its whirlpool of blood." At the beginning of the rebellion, the Globe's editorials severely criticized British censorship for creating an environment of suspicion and a 'world of rumor' and mirrored Wilson's complaints that the British Government, by controlling the information coming from Europe, continued to violate American neutrality.

The Boston Herald was managed by John Holmes, owned by New England financiers and industrialists, and edited by Robert Lincoln O'Brien from 1910-1928. The Herald announced that the plans for the uprising were hardly secret. Every reader of American papers knew that Casement was attempting to raise an Irish brigade. Devoy's bitter accusation that Wilson betrayed Casement to the British was devoid of any logic since Casement's activities were hardly a covert operation, and certainly Wilson did not sympathize with the Irishman's adventure.

The Boston Evening Transcript was heralded as an established paper in its eighty-seventh year. Its conservative and respected editorial position derided sensationalism in the press. Its circulation was low, perhaps only as many as 30,000 readers at any time.

110 "The strictness of the censorship in all countries has been one of the most important developments of the present war. Its ramifications are endless. Private letters from Canada to the United States are opened. Diplomatic correspondence is not immune. Letters being carried from one neutral Nation to another do not escape inspection and even seizure." (Boston Globe, 29 April 1916, p.6.)
112 "Two accusations are brought against President Wilson by disappointed conspirators in New York. First, it is alleged he knew that Sir Roger Casement was endeavoring to organize in Germany an expedition to Ireland for the purpose of creating a rebellion. This charge, we believe, is true. We should be sorry if it were not, because the President would have been a dunce if he had not known. Secondly, it is alleged that he, or some one acting under his instructions, betrayed the conspiracy to the British government thus insured its defeat. This charge is declared untrue of the state department, with the President's authority, and doubtful this is the simple truth. The President could not have betrayed any thing since nothing had been entrusted to him in confidence, and there is ample reason to believe that he gave no official information concerning the affair, inasmuch as the preparation of the expedition in Germany was a matter of secrecy." (Boston Herald, 29 April 1916, p.10.)
throughout its history.\textsuperscript{114} In an editorial entitled, "Traitor or Madman!" the \textit{Evening Transcript} concurred with Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's assertion that Casement was insane.\textsuperscript{115} Casement's treason was viewed as dependent upon one's interpretation of history. "All treason became virtue if it succeeded. It is, therefore, even to this day, not an intrinsic but a relative offence- not a crime in itself, but a crime made such by the peril of the power conspired against. The founders of our American republic were all traitors against the British king. To us, they are demi-gods."\textsuperscript{116}

The \textit{Evening Transcript}'s editorials considered the rebellion to be pointless and rejected any parallels drawn between the Irish rebels and American patriots in the war of independence. In the recent outbreak, Stephens' adage that 'England's difficulty is Ireland's opportunity' had been interpreted to mean not Ireland's opportunity but Germany's, as the Irish were duped by the German government to do its bidding.\textsuperscript{117} Birrell was blamed for allowing the separatist movement to go unchecked, and was criticised for his hands-off approach to quelling sedition: "a less easy mind, would have put the extinguisher upon this insurrection before it burst into flames."\textsuperscript{118}

Previous supporters of the British became disillusioned with its treatment of the Irish rebels. In an unsigned letter to the editor from Lynn, Massachusetts, the author lamented, "The events of the past week have come as a rude awakening to many like myself, who thought that the leopard had changed his spots, and have been pro-Ally and pro-British through the war."\textsuperscript{119} Not all Irish-Americans were willing to place Irish interests before American ones.\textsuperscript{120}

The usually pacifist \textit{Christian Science Monitor} changed its position during the war and advocated siding with the Allies. This was in large part due to the fact that Frederick Dixon, a British newspaperman, edited the paper in 1916. The foundation for the Boston paper's extensive Foreign Service was created during Dixon's tenure as

\textsuperscript{114} Kobre, Sidney. \textit{Modern American Journalism}, Florida State University, Tallahassee, 1959. p.131.
\textsuperscript{115} \textit{Boston Evening Transcript}, 25 April 1916, p.12.
\textsuperscript{116} \textit{Boston Evening Transcript}, 30 June 1916, p.10.
\textsuperscript{117} \textit{Boston Evening Transcript}, 1 May 1916, p.14.
\textsuperscript{118} \textit{Boston Evening Transcript}, 4 May 1916, p.14.
\textsuperscript{119} \textit{Boston Evening Transcript}, 9 May 1916, part 2, p.11.
\textsuperscript{120} "The attempt of the 'Friends of Irish Freedom,' a purely pro-German organization presided over by Victor Herbert, to influence the Republican and Progressive national conventions into adopting resolutions favoring the 'Irish republic,' is very warmly denounced by that very earnest, loyal American of Irish birth, Patrick Egan, formerly United States minister to Chili... 'Pro-German Irish voters are absolutely negligible quantity. America first is creed of every Irish citizen who truly loves his motherland." (\textit{Boston Evening Transcript}, 19 June 1916, section 3, p.2.)
The severe condemnation of the rebellion and Casement was evidence of the pro-British stance during Dixon's editorship.\footnote{122}

The Springfield (Massachusetts) Republican began as a liberal paper under Samuel Bowles.\footnote{123} The editor in 1916 was Waldo L. Cook whom Wilson described as "a fine old chap... who understood my position from the beginning and who has sympathized with me throughout this whole business."\footnote{124} Wilson read the Republican's editorials to gauge American public opinion. The Springfield Republican doubted the wisdom of Senate resolutions which were designed either to compel the president to speak on behalf of Casement or to persuade the British government to spare his life. Since Casement was not an American citizen the paper reasoned that the United States had no right to meddle in British justice. "Any kind of interference by our government in the case of Sir Roger Casement would be ill-advised. Whatever one's personal sympathies may be, whatever one's opinion may be as to the action the British government ought to take, the Casement affair is one that does not call for our government's interposition... Legally speaking, there never was a clearer case of treason in time of war."\footnote{125} Cook's editorials mirrored Wilson's own opinion on Casement: "It would be inexcusable for me to touch this. It would involve serious international embarrassment."\footnote{126} The Republican's attitude did not seem to be influenced by accusations that Casement was a homosexual as it disagreed with the attacks upon his character: "It is impossible to think of him as base in character..."\footnote{127}

The Washington Post was officially non-interventionist but backed preparedness. Its owner and editor John McLean was cognizant of the economic and political power of German-Americans in Congress and in his hometown, Cincinnati,\footnote{128} but was also


\footnote{122} "The late leaders paid, however, the penalty of their acts at a moment when the immediate effect of their action was in doubt, and when it might be held that it was necessary that examples should be made. The wretched little rebellion is, however, now at an end, and if it should be proved that Sir Roger was the man who organized it, really the worst punishment which could be meted out to him would be the terrible effects of his own futility as a revolutionary. The knowledge of the fate of the men whom he inspired with his crazy projects will surely be more bitter than any other punishment he could endure." (Christian Science Monitor, 26 May 1916, editorial page.)

\footnote{123} Samuel Bowles (1797-1851), founded the Springfield Republican in 1824. His son, Samuel, supported the newly formed Republican party, the presidency of Abraham Lincoln but opposed the nomination of Grant in 1872. (Garraty, John A. and Mark C. Carnes, eds., American National Biography, volume 3, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999. pp.300-302.)


\footnote{125} Springfield Republican, 24 July 1916, p.6.


\footnote{127} Springfield Republican, 4 August 1916, p.5.

\footnote{128} The Washington Post's sister paper was the Cincinnati Enquirer.
sensitive towards America's cultural ties to Great Britain. Therefore the paper did not support either the Allies or the Central Powers prior to 1917. The paper was accused of being anti-British, but this accusation was baseless. The *Post* preferred to report both sides of the war in as much as it could, given the British censorship of European news. During August 1914, the *Post* printed accounts of the war from both German and French papers (New York *Staats-Zeitung* and New York *Courier des Etats-Unis.*). The paper tacitly supported Hughes in the 1916 election but editorially did not endorse either candidate, especially after the death of John McLean, on 9 June 1916. The paper thought executing Casement unwise. "The execution of Casement would accomplish little or nothing in dampening the spirit of rebellion in Ireland. On the contrary, it would inflame that spirit, if the past is any criterion of judgment. Casement, as a prisoner, kept out of mischief until the end of the war, would be practically forgotten; Casement executed in the Tower would become a martyr, enshrined in Irish hearts, his faults forgotten, his mad exploit idealized and his example emulated." "Casement's death is not needed to strike terror into the hearts of would-be Irish rebels. They have been fed on terrorism from infancy, and if they are bent upon rebellion the fear of death does not deter them."

The Washington Times was an evening paper and part of Frank A. Munsey's crumbling newspaper empire which he sold in 1917 to Arthur Brisbane. Munsey was a supporter of the moderate (progressive) Republicans and Theodore Roosevelt. The paper's position on international affairs was strongly pro-British. The Washington Times seemed to be an apologetic paper for Britain. The paper continually referred to the rebellion as inspired and made by Germany. They stated that Britain's rule in Ireland had been benevolent since the famine. They agreed with Britain's harsh suppression of the uprising and railed against Americans who sympathized with the Irish rebels. "England has adopted a new and enlightened attitude toward Ireland. They have let the old hatreds rankle; but they (Irish-American migrants of the 19th century) are hating a generation of Englishmen that has passed along." The *Times* was in accord with the opinion

131 Washington Post, 26 April 1916, p.5.
132 Washington Post, 3 August 1916, p.4.
134 ibid. p.556.
professed at this time by Theodore Roosevelt that Casement was a traitor. The paper stopped short of lauding the executions. They felt that the rebels were 'misguided and insane'.

Clinton T. Brainard edited the *Washington Herald*. He believed that the executions would not cause much disaffection in Ireland. "England was compelled to put to death those traitors to Great Britain, who took advantage of her hour of stress to ally themselves with their enemy, traitors to the cause of Ireland in its ascendancy and traitors to their fellow countrymen fighting the battle of civilization. The putting of the conspirators to death is not likely to rekindle the flame of Ireland."

The paper conceded that Casement was guilty but contended that he could not have been held responsible for his actions due to insanity. "This sadly deluded man never had a chance for life except in a madhouse, and that probably would have been the fate selected for him but for the defiant attitude and misdirected efforts of friends of the cause his rash exploit was supposed to represent. They made it difficult, of not impossible, for the British government to spare the life which Casement, by his acts, had deliberately forfeited."

The northeastern newspapers discussed the origins of the Easter Rising and found numerous causes. They were equally divided, however, in regards to the main instigators of the insurrection. Some placed the major blame on German intrigues and the

---

136 "Two years ago Carson and the Ulstermen were openly talking of armed resistance to the Imperial Government, and some extremists among them were not obscurely hinting that they would under certain circumstances not look askance at a possible understanding with the Emperor of Germany. Under these circumstances I wish your people had not shot the leaders of the Irish rebels after they surrendered. It was a prime necessity that the rebellion should be stamped out at once, and that the men should be ruthlessly dealt with while the fighting went on; but Carson himself had just been in the cabinet, and he and the Ulstermen about two years previously had been so uncomfortably near doing the same thing, and yet had been so unconditionally pardoned, that I think would have been the better part of wisdom not to exact the death penalty in the case of any of these rebels who had surrendered. I don't include Casement, whose case was wholly different." Roosevelt's letter to Arthur Hamilton Lee dated June 7, 1916. (Morison, Elting E. *The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1954. p.1055.)


138 "It has never been at all plain to Americans why Ulster should not be given its own separate government, independent of the rest of Ireland, and the three other provinces federated together under a Dublin parliament. Of course, it would be better for Ireland to continue a great unity, if only the Irish themselves would agree to live in harmony, with mutual respect for the differences of opinion on religious and political questions. But they seem determined not to do so, and it is dangerous business to attempt forcing a good thing on people who think they know it is not good." (Washington *Times*, 17 May 1916, p.8.)


cooperation of Casement. They pointed to the evidence discovered in the papers of von Igel, the gun running of the Aud, and the capture of Casement after being deposited on Banna Strand by a German U-boat. Many papers simply concluded that the rebels were "dupes" of the Germans. Others placed equal blame on the Sinn Fein movement, the most recent organisation to wear the mantle of past Fenian separatism. They pointed to the well organised, well drilled, albeit poorly armed Irish Volunteers. A few newspapers emphasized the failure of Dublin Castle rule and the lax administrative policies of Birrell and Nathan while few actually came to their defence. Curiously, few of the northeastern newspapers placed responsibility squarely at the feet of Carson although they frequently contrasted his treasonous exploits with those of Casement.

The consequences of the rebellion were debated extensively in the northeastern press. The greatest impact that the rebellion had in the opinion of these papers was its deleterious effect upon Anglo-Irish relations. The suppression of the uprising, the prolonged period of martial law, the executions of the rebel leaders and the martyrdom of Casement were discussed at length. The executions were considered pointless because the rebel leaders must have known full well the risks should their efforts fail. The executions were not considered to be necessary to prevent future revolts. While some papers such as the Christian Science Monitor severely criticized the exploits of the rebels and Casement during the genesis of the uprising, both during and after the executions most papers changed their position in favour of the kind of leniency that Botha extended to his countrymen after the De Wet rebellion.

While the executions and other aspects of the repression of the rebellion garnered the most attention of these papers, other consequences were discussed. The effect of the rebellion on home rule was generally felt to be negative. Many papers, such as the Brooklyn Citizen, supported Redmond and his party. Other papers felt that the rebellion sounded the death-knell for the home rule movement and pointed to the failure of the Lloyd George initiatives to rescue Irish public opinion from the republicanism of Sinn Fein. Even though they could have not have known that Sinn Fein would carry the post-war elections in Ireland, they perceived that the opportunity to hold Ireland firmly in the empire was slipping. In 1916, the United States was almost united in its expectations of non-intervention in the European conflict. America benefited from the trade with the Allies as well as the Central Powers and would have wished it to remain so. Moreover, the rapid fall in Irish enlistments and the failure of conscription was not lost on the American voter during the election of 1916.
The Irish-born citizens of Chicago numbered 73,912 (4%) in 1900 and 56,786 (2%) in 1920. The Examiner absorbed the Chicago Herald on 2 May 1918 to become the Herald/Examiner and a part of the Hearst chain. From 1914 to 1918, however, paper's editor was the English-born James Keeley who directed its pro-Allied stance. Keeley supported home rule and did not fear that Britain would break its promise of home rule for Ireland whose support of the war effort had been significant. He, therefore, welcomed Lloyd George's proposal as a step forward in Home Rule's implementation.

The Chicago Herald was privy to the attempts to defame Casement's character in circulating the black diaries and expected him not to be executed, rather convicted of insanity and condemned to an asylum. When Casement's execution was reported, the Herald explained that had Casement not been put to death, Asquith's ministry would have been brought down. "The Asquith ministry may have saved itself, but it has made a grave blunder. The blood of Casement will cry aloud for years, and the answering voices will not be for peace or harmony." The owners of the Chicago Tribune were Robert R. McCormick and his cousin Joseph M. Patterson, who were supporters of the progressive movement and Theodore Roosevelt. Its editorials reflected a Republican political stance and had supported preparedness since the beginning of the war. However, the paper did not support American entry into the conflict until the Germans announced unrestricted submarine warfare in February 1917. (Robert's brother Medill accompanied an "observation

---

143 "Nothing shows more clearly the fact that England has come to trust Ireland than the failure to pay attention to the hints of trouble or to take measures of rigorous suppression. England did not act in advance because she is England, and because she didn't believe there was real danger. The flickering out of the uprising, after it has failed to enlist more than a small portion of Irish sympathies, coupled with the staunch adherence of the great Irish leaders to the empire, will in turn prove that Irish good faith is equal to England's trust." (Chicago Herald, 1 May 1916, p.6.)
144 Chicago Herald, 7 July 1916, p.4.
145 "Casement has long shown many signs of a diseased and irresponsible mind. It is unnecessary to recite clinical details. The general conclusion is confirmed by the unprintable record made by Casement himself in his diary of acts and practices which by universal consent prove a depravity for which the only fit place of residence is among the criminal insane." (Chicago Herald, 22 July 1916, p.4.)
146 Chicago Herald, 4 August 1916, p.4.
148 History of the Chicago Tribune. The Tribune Company, Chicago, 1922. p.84.
“tour” of the war’s battlefields and saw the ruins of the Battle of Verdun in 1917. The paper condemned the rebels and their cause especially during the war when Britain's national honor was at stake. The rebels "are not helping the cause of Ireland. They are not advancing their land toward freedom. They are confirming what remains of stubborn English Tory opinion in the conviction that Ireland never can be treated safely except as a subordinate."151

Commenting on James Larkin's disruption of a Chicago meeting at Cohan's Grand Opera House, the Chicago paper ridiculed Larkin for 'hiding in America' when the necessary movement came to strike a blow for Ireland's independence. "Mr. Larkin, we believe, had a good deal to do with starting the trouble in Dublin. Sir Roger Casement also had something to do with it. If one wished to note a difference between Casement and Larkin it might be said that Casement went to Ireland when the time for effort came."152 The paper agreed with Casement's assertion that he had not committed treason against the British Empire as "he had never been of it, but merely held in it."153 The paper warned that Ireland will never be content while martyrs like Casement are being made by the British. The Irish rebels did not commit treason because they were "traitors to nothing. They owed spiritual allegiance to nothing." Casement's execution would be a great blunder. "Justice says hang him for a crime committed against an empire which commits a greater crime in punishing him."154

The failure of the Lloyd George plan was expected to create an explosive situation in Ireland. "To us in America it must seem the nemesis of British procrastination. With our federal system it is hard for us to understand why British statesmen could not have worked out an imperial federal system which would have satisfied the bulk of Irish opinion and preserved all that was necessary of imperial control. . . . Justice to Ireland is blocked by selfish interests which happily for England and the world are losing their control. They have brought this day by years of obstruction to Irish amelioration and political freedom, and still put their blind and stubborn selfishness before the welfare and even the safety of the empire."155

Edward D. Starr owned the Detroit Free Press. It historically had been a staunch supporter of the Democratic Party but did not support Bryan's free silver policies.156 The Detroit paper refuted the belief that Casement was insane. "If Sir Roger Casement is insane, his infirmity has come upon him recently. There must be a good deal of method in his madness, too, else the Germans would scarcely have aided and abetted him to the extent of a shipload of munitions for the rebels he had engaged thoroughly, even in the capital city of the country. If lack of faithfulness to Great Britain is an evidence of insanity, there are some members of the royal house now serving in the German army who must be raving maniacs."157 The Free Press began to sympathize with Casement's plight after he was captured. It became clear that after the execution of the rebel leaders, Casement's life represented an opportunity for Britain to return to its politically wise policy of leniency towards Ireland. The paper reproduced Yeats' letter to Asquith which stated that the execution of Casement would have an "evil effect" upon his countrymen and in America. Yeats described the "execution of 15 Irish leaders as a greater shock to American opinion than the sinking of the Lusitania."158 When Casement was executed the paper opined that the "hanging of Roger Casement is a political and moral blunder unmatched in the long list of incredible blunders that have marked and marred the history of England's attempt to govern unhappy Ireland."159

The Detroit Free Press considered the rebellion to be an attack upon the Nationalist party and their efforts to bring a constitutional solution to the Irish problem. "It (insurrection) will tend to recreate in the United Kingdom and in parliament a prejudice against home rule, which has been brought near by scores of years of work in the face of repeated discouragements, many of a nature similar to this most recent setback."160 The paper championed the Nationalist Party and reminded its readers that Redmond's party was loyal to Asquith and the war effort. "The friendship between the Liberals and the Nationalists has been close and long continued, and the head of the government by grace of this coalition unquestionably feels he owes something to his allies and to the country

157 Detroit Free Press, 26 April 1916, p.4.
158 Detroit Free Press, 28 July 1916, p.3.
159 "Today, in every country in the world where the news of his glorious end has penetrated, hundreds of thousands of fervid prayers are welling straight from the hearts of loyal Irish people for the repose of Casement's brave soul. In the long history of the world there is no finer record than Ireland's struggle for freedom. In the many pages of brave deeds and great sacrifices that have marked her undying fight against oppression and injustice there is no more glorious chapter than that brought to a fitting but sad conclusion by the barber hangman at Pentonville prison on the morning of August 3, 1916. Just time will render this true verdict on the life and actions of Roger Casement, patriot, hero, and martyr." (Detroit Free Press, 4 August 1916, p.4.)
160 Detroit Free Press, 28 April 1916, p.4.
from which they come."161 The paper held the government responsible for the rebellion and lamented the tendency to make Augustine Birrell a scapegoat for the failed Anglo-Irish policy.162

Lloyd George’s proposals were viewed as temporary. "It is a proposition for a modus vivendi, to hold good while the war continues and throughout what is now considered the empire’s inevitable reorganization period which is to come at the conclusion of the conflict."163 Public support for complete independence, the paper surmised, was widespread before the rebellion but had remained a hidden sentiment because of the war.164

The Irish-born citizens of Cleveland numbered 13,120 (3%) in 1900, 9,478 (1%) in 1920.165 The Cleveland Plain Dealer was a supporter of the Democratic Party and Woodrow Wilson. In 1917 it bought the Leader and became the only morning newspaper in Cleveland.166 Its managing editor was Erie C. Hopwood. The paper gave the impression that the rebellion was actually a riot, one that the Metropolitan Police could not control. The initial reports of the rebellion on 26 April stated that the troops’ fire routed the Dublin mobs but explained that details were sketchy due to censorship.167 Cleveland’s Irish-American organizations claimed to speak for Cleveland’s estimated 9,000 citizens of Irish descent when they supported the rebels’ strike for independence.168 When more details of the rebellion became clearer, it appeared that the

161 Detroit Free Press, 13 May 1916, p.4.
163 Detroit Free Press, 26 June 1916, p.4.
164 “It is not right to judge the sentiments of a people on the subject of independence by the numerical alignment. Revolutionists are always in a hopeless minority and it is not until they have won a few substantial successes against their oppressors that the more careful, "safe and sane" element begin to lend them any measure of support. It was so in our revolution. The proportion of even the best spirited people who are willing to risk their all in a desperate attempt at national independence is small indeed. That the sentiment of the people of Ireland as a whole and almost solidly in the south and southwest, where the English influence was slight, was with Casement and the Sinn Feiners there can be no doubt in the minds of any who know the facts. In a large section of the country there was no attempt made to recruit for the British army and the ardent desire of the people, where they gave the matter a thought, was for a quick and overwhelming defeat of the hated English. That this was so we have as proof, if proof were needed, the predicament of John Redmond. Thousands of Irishmen believe he has sold his country to the English and Augustine Birrell, the former Irish secretary, admitted that the Irish "leader" dared not set his foot in his own country for fear of being shot. Recruiting figures since the war started show how little pro-British sentiment there is in the country." (Detroit Free Press, 16 July 1916, p.4. For analysis of recruiting figures since August 1914 see Lee, J.J. Ireland, 1912-1985. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989. pp.23-24.)
167 Cleveland Plain Dealer, 26 April 1916, p.1.
168 The resolutions were signed by John Walsh, president of the Irish Nationalists; Martin L. Sweeney, county president of the Ancient Order of Hibernians; J.P. Mooney, president of Rodger (sic) Casement
papers were receiving false information from Ireland. The paper reported that John MacNeill had been shot and that 10,000 rebels seized Dublin and outlying areas. Jeremiah O'Leary who apart from being President of the American Truth Society was director of the United Irish Societies of Cleveland, was quoted as contributing $100,000 to Casement and his gun-running exploits.169 This contribution seems extremely doubtful.

On 28 April, the Plain Dealer's first editorial concerning the rebellion clearly understood that the uprising was not supported by the majority of Dublin's citizens and reminded its readers of the loyalty of the thousands of "Irish Volunteers (who) are fighting in the British armies, and many Irishmen have distinguished themselves by deeds of valor against the Germans." However, the editorial continued to point out that it was unclear what were the true sentiments of the Irish people, because while they appeared to be loyal, Britain had not extended compulsory service to the island.170 Comparisons of Dublin's rebels were made with American patriots. The American Revolution, however, the paper asserted, was successful because it had the support of the majority of the American colonists while the Dublin revolt failed because the Irish people did not want it to succeed.171

The executions of the rebel leaders did not receive editorial commentary until 7 May. The paper reported James Connolly's execution on 4 May even though it was not until the 12th that he was actually strapped to a plank and shot. It at first erroneously stated that MacDermott, Ceannt, and Plunkett had been sentenced to three years' imprisonment instead of being executed. On 6 May, however, the paper announced the executions of Joseph Plunkett, Edward Day, Michael O'Hanrahan and William Pearse. The following day the announcement of John MacBride's execution was reported to be of special interest to Cleveland's readers as MacBride was a cousin of Dr. Frank Corrigan who was a "member of the surgical staff of St. Alexis hospital" in Cleveland.172 The
editor of the paper accepted the 'retribution' meted out for some of the leaders of the rebellion because they had committed treason but questioned the sagacity of killing Pearse's brother Willie.\textsuperscript{173}

The trial of Roger Casement occupied the columns of the Cleveland \textit{Plain Dealer} during the summer of 1916. Most of the reporting was reproductions of the commentary at his inquest at Bow Street. The paper was clearly in favor of having Casement tried and hanged for treason\textsuperscript{174} and shared former President Roosevelt's sentiment that Casement's was a case separate from the executed rebel leaders.\textsuperscript{175} In fairness, however, the paper considered Casement's defence: that he was not subject to the laws of England because he had committed the alleged crimes outside of England, that he was being tried by a medieval statute that was 500 years old, and that he was not tried by his peers (because he was an Irishman not an Englishmen). Nevertheless, since he received a pension from the British Government, the paper opined that he could be considered a British subject.\textsuperscript{176}

After Casement was executed, the paper stated that they were not in favor of his gunrunning but stated as a matter of fact that England had created another Irish martyr.\textsuperscript{177}

The Cincinnati \textit{Enquirer} believed that the rebellion illustrated that the Irish people wanted separation from Britain. In an article written by the National Secretary of the Friends of Irish Freedom, John D. Moore explained that home rule did not satisfy the Irish people and delays in implementing the bill had decreased optimism for the scheme. "Moreover, it completely shatters the carefully constructed myth that the mere passage of a mock home rule bill had transformed Ireland into an integral part of the British

\textsuperscript{173} "Would it have been wiser for England to have extended similar mercy to the boyish Pearse? For Casement, the man who deliberately chose the side of his nation's enemy and who did his utmost to bring disaster to England, there need be no sympathy, and none is felt. But for Pearse and McDonagh (sic), and perhaps for one or two of their devoted comrades who have paid the supreme penalty of their folly, there is deep sympathy, even in England. Shooting schoolmasters, sculptors and poets does not meet the twentieth century demand for retribution." (Cleveland \textit{Plain Dealer}, 7 May 1916, p.12.)

\textsuperscript{174} \textit{ibid.}


\textsuperscript{176} "Sir Roger Casement, who is to die on the gallows as a traitor, claims that he has been convicted of an impossible crime. He cannot, he says, be a traitor to a land whose sovereignty he does not recognize. He is an Irishman, and he holds that he could commit no treason save by striving against Ireland.

There is some logic in Sir Roger's contention. He has not, in fact, been tried by a jury of his peers. He has been tried in a civil court of a nation which he considers alien to if not hostile to his own land. His claim will arouse much sympathy. . . .

One seeming weakness in Sir Roger's logic is the fact that he had served long and ably in the British service and has accepted British honors. . . .

However the logic of the case may be judged, there must be something inherently abhorrent in the hanging of an able and efficient public man under the provisions of a statute of the fourteenth century. It is not in accord with the spirit of modern enlightenment of which England aspires to be one of the world's leading exponents." (Cleveland \textit{Plain Dealer}, 1 July 1916, p.10.)

\textsuperscript{177} Cleveland \textit{Plain Dealer}, 5 August 1916, p.6.
Empire." The attitude of the Enquirer toward home rule was different from its sister paper the Washington Post. The Cincinnati paper explained that the Irish wanted complete separation while the Washington paper was more restrained in its assessment of Ireland.

Indianapolis News blamed the British government for allowing the outbreak of hostilities to occur. "The English government has been weak in its dealing with the conditions out of which this outbreak was born - but its weakness was that which always marks and must mark free governments." When the official government inquiry into the causes of the rebellion reached its verdict, the paper agreed that the government in allowing Ulster defiance to continue only encouraged the southern radicals to do the same. German aid in the rebellion could only be meager, thereby using the Irish "to strike at England". The Germans cared little for Irish independence, the paper concluded, and the Irish insurrection only harmed the home rule movement. Because the rebel leaders were shot, the only possible outcome in Casement's treason trial was that he was to be found guilty and hanged. The paper had little sympathy for Casement, because he helped plan the rebellion in the midst of war and sought the aid of England's enemy. "This made Sir Roger's treason of the worst sort." That Casement should have been punished but not hanged became the paper's position but only after reporting the Irishman's execution.

The Republican Indianapolis Star was owned by John Shaffer who also owned the Rocky Mountain News. The Star believed that the executions would only create martyrs and hoped that Britain would have continued its traditional policy of leniency as

178 Cincinnati Enquirer, 28 April 1916, p.2.
179 "What both sides should realize is that the Irish question should be taken out of the realm of theory and given the status of concrete action. Almost any solution of the home rule problem would be better than the present truce, leading to discontent on both sides. If the Ulster counties were excluded permanently and Ireland should set up a government of its own, surely there should be enough statesmanship among the Redmond followers to win the Ulster counties eventually to the cause of complete home rule. The Nationalists should not fear the test. They should take the first step, trusting to time for the final solution." (Washington Post, 26 July 1916, p.4.)
182 Indianapolis News, 1 May 1916, p.6.
184 Indianapolis News, 3 August 1916, p.6.
185 As well he owned the Denver Times, Chicago Evening Post, Louisville Herald, Terre Haute Star, and Muncie Star. (Rocky Mountain News editorial page 6, 29 April 1916, p.1.)
illustrated by Botha's clemency of De Wet.186 As to Casement's guilt the paper did not disagree, but it considered his execution to be an "act of wrath".187

W.J. Murphy was the publisher and owner of the Minneapolis Tribune from 1891 to 1918. He supported the Republican Party.188 The editor of the paper from 1915 to 1921 was the "wise and scholarly" John Scudder McLain.189 The paper criticised the executions and reasoned that Britain had lost an "opportunity" to show clemency and distance themselves from the Germans who continued to execute 'rebels' like Nurse Cavell. It inferred that since the United States was the proving ground for the propaganda war, Great Britain had alienated its American supporters. "But in executing her Sinn Feiners, Great Britain has hurt- and hurt extremely- many of her sympathizers who have been won towards her by her humanitarian reputation of the more recent past."190 Two days later, the paper warned that not only did Britain lose the sympathy of Americans by executing the rebels but also may have created a movement much more dangerous than the relatively contained and unpopular Sinn Fein.191 The Minneapolis paper hoped Britain would reprieve Casement even though he was justly convicted of treason.192

The Minneapolis Journal's concern was that the rebellion would destroy the home rule settlement. "It is a grievous crime these men committed, to present a dagger to Britain's heart in the hour of her surest travail. It was all the more grievous, because the English and Irish peoples had at last come to an agreement, long striven for, under which

186 Indianapolis Star, 6 May 1916, p.8.
187 "In this case the quality of mercy was severely strained and there need be little doubt that when the passions of this terrible war have died away and the scroll of gifted Irishmen who have been put to death for efforts to realize their imperishable dream of independence is once more unrolled before the contemplative gaze of humanity, there will be few in Britain as well as elsewhere to regard these latest Irish executions as anything but a weak and foolish surrender to the hysteria of war." (Indianapolis Star, 4 August 1916, p.6.)
190 Minneapolis Morning Tribune, 11 May 1916, p.6.
191 Minneapolis Morning Tribune, 13 May 1916, p.4.
192 "Sir Roger Casement clearly deserves execution. His guilt has been established beyond the shadow of a doubt. And yet it is more than likely that the British government will make a serious mistake in killing the celebrated Irish leader. It has not been shown that he accepted aid from Germany; and there is much to indicate that he is a sincere and high-minded, if pathetically misguided, idealist. The cold-blooded execution of a man whose chief fault lay in his worship of an impracticable ideal is always a deep shock to sensitive people. The British government could well afford to lock Casement up in a tower for the rest of his life. This it will probably not do; the fact that it committed itself to a policy of execution with the Sinn Feiners binds it towards an inflexible maintenance of the same course. ... Surely, clemency to Casement would be in order if for no other reason than to express a little contrition over the earlier fiasco and to assuage the feelings of many disinterested people who were horrified at the ruthlessness of that grim slaughter." (Minneapolis Morning Tribune, 30 June 1916, p.8.)
they could live side by side in mutual good will and interrelated prospects."193 The paper compared Casement's death to the execution of Fryatt in the propaganda war. "With Casement dead, the Germans have a retort for the universal denunciation of their murder of Captain Fryatt. The two cases are not in any respect parallel, but parallels will be forced nonetheless. . . . If the British Government had had the sagacity to commute Casement's sentence, it would have left the Fryatt case standing naked and alone, comparable only to the murder of Edith Cavell, and execrated by civilized men everywhere."194

The Des Moines Register and Leader supported the progressive Republicans prior to the war and sided with moderate Republicans during the war. The paper was published by Gardner Cowles and edited by Harvey Ingham. Ingham wanted the United States to remain out of the war, and he favored a peace platform that did not stress preparedness. He in fact backed disarmament and believed that Hughes would keep the United States neutral. He criticized Wilson in 1916 as being disingenuous towards intervention and ridiculed Wilson's campaign slogan "He kept us out of the war".195 However, he became a reluctant supporter of Wilson after 1917 when America entered the war and became an advocate for American involvement in European affairs as illustrated by his support for the League of Nations. He hoped that the League of Nations would ensure that another war would be avoided.196 The paper favored leniency for Casement and compared his insane idealism to Don Quixote. Casement was described as "an anachronism, belonging properly in the days of chivalry, when as a knight errant he would have performed many deeds of valor and won high renown."197 The Des Moines paper commented on how far Redmond's star had fallen because he did not vehemently condemn the executions. "Today, it is doubtful if he could be elected court bailiff or justice of the peace."198

St. Louis had a relatively large Irish-born population numbering 19,421 (3%) in 1900 and 9,244 (1%) in 1920.199 The St. Louis Post-Dispatch was Joseph Pulitzer's first major newspaper in the United States. As has been said in conjunction with the New

197 Des Moines Register and Leader, 28 April 1916, p.6.
198 Des Moines Register and Leader, 19 May 1916, p.6.
York World, the paper was fiercely independent in its editorial stance.\textsuperscript{200} Joseph Pulitzer II continued the publication of the Post-Dispatch in 1912, and Oliver K. Bovard and George S. Johns directed the editorials. In 1916, Johns was responsible for the commentary on the editorial page.\textsuperscript{201} Johns was a classmate of Wilson's at Princeton and shared Wilson's cautious attitude toward involvement in the Great War.\textsuperscript{202}

"What penalties will be imposed for rebellion in Dublin? If they are no more severe than the penalties imposed for rebellion in Ulster, we shall next see some of the new plotters made Cabinet officers, as Mr. Carson was, or Sir Roger Casement put in command of British armies, as Gen. French was."\textsuperscript{203} Johns refuted the accusation that the American government was responsible for Casement's capture. "Our Government is not a spy for either entente or Teuton."\textsuperscript{204} The paper favored the implementation of home rule for the whole of the island.\textsuperscript{205} The Lloyd George proposal was considered a "poor, patchwork thing."\textsuperscript{206} He condemned Asquith's reticence to implement home rule apparently because complaints from a few English Unionists and agreed with Redmond's withdrawal of support for the carved-up legislation.\textsuperscript{207}

The Emporia Gazette was owned by its influential editor William Allen White. He was a progressive newspaperman who supported the Republican Party, despite the fact that his father was a Democrat (his influence here can be traced to his mother, who worshiped Abraham Lincoln). He supported Roosevelt, even during the 1912 campaign (which split the party and began to dilute the effectiveness of the progressive political platforms which he publicized) when he hoped the former president would not run for a third term (or at least until 1916). He supported the Republican candidate in 1916 even though Hughes was not as progressive as Roosevelt.

On international affairs he was a pacifist but agreed with Wilson's foreign policy of preparedness. By 1916, he supported nationalizing the nation's munitions plants and the creation of an army of 500,000 troops, in case the United States was drawn into the

\textsuperscript{200} "The POST and DISPATCH will serve no party but the people; will be no organ of "Republicanism," but the organ of truth; will follow no caucuses [sic] but its own convictions; will not support the "Administration," but criticise it; will oppose all frauds and shams wherever and whatever they are; will advocate principles and ideas rather than prejudices and partisanship..." (Rammelkamp, Julian S. Pulitzer's Post-Dispatch. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1967. p.41.)

\textsuperscript{201} Markham, James W. Bovard of the Post-Dispatch. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, 1954. p.95.

\textsuperscript{202} Markham, James W. Bovard of the Post-Dispatch. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, 1954. p.79.

\textsuperscript{203} St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 26 April 1916, p.14.

\textsuperscript{204} St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 29 April 1916, p.6.

\textsuperscript{205} St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 1 June 1916, p.16.

\textsuperscript{206} St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 8 July 1916, p.6.

\textsuperscript{207} St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 27 July 1916, p.14.
But he continued to mirror the isolationist stance of most Midwesterners (who were becoming wealthy selling horses and foodstuffs to the Allies) and most progressives (who sought to utilize Wilson in reaching a diplomatic solution and peaceful end to the conflict.) During the Lusitania crisis he supported Wilson's 'wait and see' policy towards intervention with a telegraph to the president stating that "Running amuck with the rest of the world will accomplish nothing for humanity." The Emporia Gazette showed little interest in the Irish rebellion. It confined its reporting of the rebellion to what effect it would have upon Americans living abroad. The Gazette reported "Senator Kern’s resolution to inquire regarding the safety of American citizens in Ireland." The Midwest press had a greater understanding of the complexities of the rebellion. The role of the Ulstermen and Carson took equal blame to that of Sinn Fein separatists and German intrigues. British procrastination and the general laxity of Dublin Castle were noted although Birrell was seldom made the scapegoat of a failed Anglo-Irish policy. The consequences of the rebellion included the demise of home rule helped as these papers saw it by the weakness in the British coalition cabinet’s support for the Lloyd George initiative. The Cincinnati Enquirer went so far as to predict that Ireland would never stand for anything short of full independence from the British Empire. That stood in stark contrast to the position of its sister paper, the Washington Post, although John McLean owned both. The primary interests of these papers, however, were the executions of the rebel leaders. Most of the papers thought the executions a lost opportunity for England to justify its claim to be the savior of small nations. The Detroit Free Press went so far as to say that the executions were worse than Germany's sinking of the Lusitania. Similarly, these papers considered Casement's execution to be a great moral blunder; some would say even an act of wrath. Both Minneapolis newspapers pointed out that Casement's execution denied Britain a propaganda victory over the Germans who wantonly executed Nurse Cavell and Captain Fryatt.

The owner and editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal was Henry Watterson whose political persuasion was Democratic. He supported Wilson in the 1916 election

212 "There was an over-all pattern to Watterson’s views on foreign policy, which consisted of three basic tenets. The first was a genuine belief in isolationism. He distrusted anything that smacked of foreign entanglement. In the second place, Watterson professed a hope for world peace. Although he believed there was a natural proclivity for war in all men, he encouraged those movements that had universal peace as their ultimate goal. For if Watterson was an isolationist and an advocate of peace, he was, above all,
not because he believed Wilson was a particularly good president or that he thought Wilson could truly keep the United States out of the war, but because he thought Hughes was a supporter of Germany and therefore "in league with the devil."213 Even when submarine crises forced many Americans to urge war, he agreed with Wilson's 'wait and see' policy.214 After the declaration of war in April 1917, his isolationist policies were outweighed by his patriotism and his paper became a firm supporter of Wilson and American involvement. In the final analysis it appears that his fear of having to come to the rescue of Europe every time they got into a scrape dominated his view of American foreign policy (a sentiment that he expressed as a 'violation of our national sovereignty').215

The paper complained about Ambassador von Bernsdorff's activities in the United States stating that Wilson should have sent him back to Germany in 1915 when his embassy was accused of clandestine activities in the United States.216 Watterson expected the repercussions of the rebellion to be minimal after the dismissal of Birrell, who he considered to be a victim of the difficulties of ruling Ireland.217

Charleston News and Courier was a pro-Ally paper and a supporter of Wilson's foreign policies and the League of Nations. Robert Lathan edited the paper.218 The paper viewed the Irish rebellion as a feeble attack upon the British Empire and correctly noted that the majority of Irishmen did not openly support the uprising. "If Canada, Australia, Ireland, India, and South Africa had been bound to England only by the physical force of England, they could, at any time during the past year and a half, have freed themselves from English domination. They remained loyal because they wanted to, because it was to their interest to do so." The paper explained that since the rebellion would be put down quickly the British could deal leniently with Casement and the other rebels.219 Since the rebellion was limited to Dublin and the Irish people did not rise to support the separatists, the paper expected Britain to understand that Ireland was loyal. "When the war ends and Ireland renews her demands for the freedom that she had practically won when the war nationalist. It was this third tenet which dominated Watterson's views on foreign policy. As long as national honor was not involved, he would not risk one soldier's life. . ." (Wall, Joseph Frazier. Henry Watterson: Reconstructed Rebel. Oxford University Press, New York, 1956. pp.296-297.)

217 Louisville Courier-Journal, 5 May 1916, p.4.
219 Charleston News and Courier, 28 April 1916, p.4.
began, she can assert, that in the moment of the Empire's peril she was tried and was not found wanting. Her plea will hardly be denied. The paper's predictions were prophetic in one aspect, they were all wrong. When the executions shattered Lathan's wishful thinking, he was perplexed why Britain needed to deal harshly with the rebels.

Lathan met Casement's execution with the same degree of perplexity. "The execution of Sir Roger Casement has surprised and shocked the people of the United States. It will be remembered long and it will not be lightly excused. No matter to which side their sympathy or their reason inclines them in regard to the issues of the Great War, America will not fail to make known the horror with which this dark tragedy has filled them.

The Miami Herald was owned by Frank Barker Shutts and edited by Frank B. Stoneman. Stoneman had never been to Europe prior to the war and showed little understanding of European affairs beyond an appreciation of English culture. The Herald was Democratic in politics and nationalistic in international affairs in the sense that it promoted preparedness and argued for going to war if American trading interests were disrupted. However, the paper advocated neutrality after the Lusitania disaster but warned Germany "that if they knew what was good for them they would avoid trouble with the United States."

The paper condemned the Sinn Fein movement because its secrecy threatened the openness of democracy. "Any political movement that holds itself aloof and secretly, which hides its name and the name of its members, which places itself under the control of irresponsible outsiders and follows the instructions of unknown authorities, is a dangerous organization to any state or to any country."

The New Orleans Times-Picayune affected a neutral stance on the issue of American involvement in the war. However, because of New Orleans' ties to the French

\[\text{220 Charleston News and Courier, 2 May 1916, p.4.}\]
\[\text{221 "The swift collapse of the rebellion in Ireland, due to the refusal of the great majority of the people of Ireland to have anything to do with the movement, should have convinced the British Government of the needlessness of the stern policy it has followed in regard to the captured leaders. There was no need to make examples of these men because the people of Ireland required no such lesson. The great mass of them had already demonstrated their loyalty to the Empire... The revolt itself did little harm to the empire and, because Ireland as a whole stood aloof from it, it would probably have done little harm to Ireland. But the aftermath of the revolt may well do great damage to both the Empire and to Ireland. Not only in Ireland but in England also there is strong condemnation of the summary executions... The British Government has committed a blunder serious enough already and sure to be doubly serious unless the Government abandons its policy at once." (Charleston News and Courier, 13 May 1916, p.4.)}\]
\[\text{222 Charleston News and Courier, 4 August 1916, p.4.}\]
\[\text{224 Miami Herald, 5 May 1916, p.4.}\]
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nation and sympathy for Catholic Belgium, it tended to be pro-Ally.225 Editorials in April and May expressed the opinion that the majority of Irishmen were not in favor of the rebellion and that since Ireland did not control the seas around the island, it had no chance of keeping Britain from putting down the revolt.226 It criticised Asquith for not coming to Ireland during the midst of the rebellion and for allowing the military authorities to create martyrs of the rebel leaders. If he had personally intervened, perhaps Sheehy Skeffington would not have been murdered it reasoned.227 The paper agreed with Sir Conan Doyle's assertion that Casement had gone insane. "It may be said for Sir Roger Casement and the other leaders of the revolt that they simply did what Sir Edward Carson and his fellow Ulsterites then threatened to do, if the British government attempted to put the Home Rule Bill into effect. The argument possesses much logical force, but matters of this sort are seldom settled along the lines of strict logic. Besides, it may be urged that Sir Edward Carson and his fellow Ulsterites only threatened to do what Sir Roger Casement and his co-conspirators actually did."228 When Casement was found guilty of treason the paper agreed with the verdict but hoped that he would not be executed.229

In a sermon by Father Carra at St. Patrick's Cathedral, he prayed for the souls of the executed. "They were not rash dreamers; they were not violent disturbers. Without one selfish motive they sacrificed their lives and all for what they deemed a holy cause; whatever we may judge of the means they adopted in last resort to execute their purposes, these purposes were noble, vitalized by Catholic principles, and therefore they are as worthy of commemoration as the many civic heroes who since the days of Boussuelt elicited funeral discourse in a Catholic church, especially in a church built by Irish generosity to Ireland's apostle, and in a land where liberty sprang from revolution."230

Lloyd George's success as a negotiator with British labour prior to the war encouraged Americans in the expectation that he would be able to persuade Ulster to accept the implementation of Home Rule during the war. Ulster was viewed by the New Orleans paper as the stumbling block in the Lloyd George negotiations. "For, at each previous stage of the negotiations, Ulster's irreconcilable attitude has constituted the main, if not the only, barrier to a settlement."231 Lloyd George was hailed initially as the

228 New Orleans Times-Picayune, 16 May 1916, p.8.
230 New Orleans Times-Picayune, 29 May 1916, p.5.
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politician who was successful in delivering home rule where other ministers, such as Gladstone or Parnell had failed.

The editorial policy of the San Antonio Express was set by Monte M. Harris who was not kind to the British government or the rebel leaders. "The blame for the riot runs as much to the mistakes of fools as to the murderous acts of traitors."232 The paper was in favor of Home Rule as the best means to solve the current problems in Ireland and to improve the relationship between Ireland and Britain. "Denied home rule, Ireland will never know safety nor prosperity nor due process."233 The paper compared the executions of Nurse Cavell and Captain Fryatt with Casement's execution. "To put to death a woman because of humane aid of an enemy in war time, or to put to death an officer because of success in actual warfare on the seas, are, of course, very different matters from an execution for high treason; but when the execution must be publicly inflammatory and perilous in its effects, rather than admonitory and protective and exemplary, certainly it is 'grave unwisdom' on the part of the authorities at fault and highly repugnant to disinterested men who realize its waste and futility."234

The southern press placed the lion's share of the cause of the Easter Rising on the ineptitude of the British government, in particular the laxity of Castle Rule and the indifference to Irish affairs shown by Asquith and the coalition cabinet. The intrigues conducted by the German foreign office through its embassy in Washington were described with the suggestion that Wilson should have expelled Ambassador von Bernsdorff in 1915. The Miami Herald was the first to suggest that the Sinn Fein movement was clandestine, and the New Orleans Times-Picayune pointed out that Carson and the rebellious Ulstermen were no less traitorous than Casement.

Southern newspapers gave particular attention to the consequences of the rebellion for American-British and Anglo-Irish relations. The failure of the British authorities to deal leniently with the rebels and Casement shocked the people of the United States. Father Carra eulogized Casement and the rebel leaders at St. Patrick's Cathedral in New Orleans. Most papers saw the loss of home rule as more serious than their Midwestern counterparts. To the end, the San Antonio Express considered home rule to be the best means to right the relationship between Ireland and Britain. Lastly, Casement's execution was compared to the deaths of Nurse Cavell and Captain Fryatt. This moral failure was not lost on the southerner.

---

232 San Antonio Express, 5 May 1916, p.6.
233 San Antonio Express, 27 May 1916, p.6.
234 San Antonio Express, 4 August 1916, p.6.
The Denver Post was owned by Harry Heye Tammen and Frederick Gilmer Bonfils (who also owned the Kansas City Post) who were Democrats. Their lives and the history of their papers resemble a western dime novel: they had been shot, libeled and indicted for fraud and financial scandals. The Denver Post's coverage of the rebellion was disappointing: it offered little editorial commentary and was content to reproduce articles from wire reports and other newspapers.

Denver's Rocky Mountain News became a Republican organ in 1913 when John Shaffer added the paper to his newspaper chain which included the Chicago Post, Indianapolis Star, and three others. Shaffer was a religious conservative whose ideals clashed with the frontier mentality of Denver. James H. MacLennan, an immigrant Scot, edited the paper. Edward Carson was blamed for the rebellion, and the Asquith government was also culpable for not being able to control its citizens. The paper understood the necessity of executing the rebel leaders as the British Empire was currently fighting for its very life, but hoped that it would not have done so. Shaffer's Indianapolis Star shared in this sentiment that "Executions have never yet pacified Ireland and perhaps they never will." It did not support the Lloyd George settlement as it stood its one virtue being that it was 'temporary'. The paper did not want to see the industrial North become separated from the agricultural South.

The Portland Morning Oregonian supported the Republican Party. Citing numerous examples of Irish heroes like Emmett and the Manchester martyrs, who had been revered for generations as patriots, the Portland paper hoped the British would spare Casement. Comparisons of Casement's sentencing with the treatment given Carson pointed out how the British government needed to be consistent in treating its rebels.

---


238 "Lawlessness begets lawlessness. If the Asquith ministry had clapped Sir Edward into the cell now occupied by Sir Roger Casement early in the game, martial law would not be necessary at this day in the bubbling island and the enemy would not be taking comfort from the revolution." (Rocky Mountain News, 29 April 1916, p.6.)


240 Indianapolis Star, 6 May 1916, p.8.


243 Morning Oregonian, 2 May 1916, p.12.

244 Morning Oregonian, 18 May 1916, p.10.
California's capital paper the Sacramento Bee commented little on the rebellion. The paucity of comment is perhaps surprising considering that the paper was controlled by Charles Kenny McClatchy who was interested in the Irish Land League struggle. His verdict on Casement was similar to other papers that stated that he would probably die on the scaffold because of the example set by the military tribunal in Dublin who shot the other rebel leaders. However, the paper pointed out that if Casement was to be executed a similar fate should await Carson. "The spectacle of Sir Roger Casement on the gallows, with Sir Edward Carson in the Cabinet of Great Britain, is one which could parallel almost any historical example of rank inconsistency and gross injustice."246

San Francisco had a significant Irish population numbering 15,963 (4%) in 1900, 18,257 (4%) in 1920.247 The San Francisco Examiner was the original property of George Hearst who bought it for the purpose of publicizing his political career that landed him a U.S. Senate seat from California. William started working on the paper after he was expelled from Harvard and later inherited it from his father. George wanted William to pursue another career than journalism, but his son adamantly wanted to become a publisher. William next bought the New York Journal and later renamed it the American during allegations that he encouraged the assassination of McKinley in 1901. He started a national chain with newspapers in Boston, Chicago, San Antonio, and other cities, with the hope of gaining votes for his failed political ambitions. He became a congressman from New York but failed in his bids to become mayor against George McClellan, Jr., governor and president. The paper was democratic, although Hearst was a brazen critic of Wilson.248

Hearst's hatred for Britain was evident in his interpretation of events leading to the rebellion. In an article during Easter week 1916, he reproduced Yeats' condemnation of the manner in which the coalition government had handled the home rule issue, fearing that the government might renege on partial self-government for Ireland. The poet understood that the rebels would be eulogized as "courageous," and that the rebellion would create Irish "bitterness" toward Britain which would "live for generations."249 The


246 Sacramento Bee, 13 July 1916, p.6.


rebels attained an almost mystical aura for Hearst. The roll-call of executions described the rebels as hallowed martyrs: the "scholarly, unselfish, and lovable Pearse, John McBride (sic) who was "done to death", and the dead who "will command success from their graves."250 The paper reported a dramatic shift away from the support of Irish-Americans towards the British war effort as a result of the executions. The Hearst syndicate hoped that the execution of "Irish scholars, poets, patriots and martyrs" would keep America out of the war.251 Casement's stature as an Irish hero grew in Hearst's eyes as the date of his execution approached. Hearst compared Casement as a hero to contemporary Irishmen and Americans as Robert Emmet was to subsequent revolutionaries.252 The paper warned eight days before Casement's execution that "England faces eternal infamy in putting Casement to death."253

The San Francisco Chronicle was owned by the de Young family and was Republican in its political stance.254 The Chronicle feared that the rebellion would cause Britain to rescind its promise of home rule as long as it held that Ireland could not be trusted in time of war and feared that there existed an Irish alliance with England's enemies.255 Its editorials stressed that the rebellion was ill timed because it had no chance of success and therefore would destroy the good relations then established between Britain and Ireland in the rapprochement of recent years.256

The executions were viewed as a folly of the British government and a lost opportunity to win the "goodwill of the Irish people."257 The main objection that the Republican paper had to the military tribunal was that the executions were conducted in private and undertaken expeditiously, without due regard to repercussions by the Irish populace. Never more prophetic words were spoken by the paper than when their

250 San Francisco Examiner, 8 May 1916, editorial page.
251 "Among Irishmen in America there were, up to a few days ago, many who, if not loyal to England, were at least loyal to the cause of the Empire and wished it to be victorious in its war.
To-day, we think that the Irishmen in America who are not burning with resentment against the British Empire and praying for its defeat and humiliation are very, very few. We hope that the American people will never again be deluded to the point of willingness to waste American wealth and shed American blood in the contemptible role of catspaws to pull England's chestnuts out of the fire and ashes of a selfish and unsuccessful war, fought under the pretense of protection of the independence of little peoples and of the rights of neutrals and of the humanities." (San Francisco Examiner, 23 May 1916, p.20.)
252 Hearst's letter to the Editor of the Examiner, 2 July 1916, p.1.
255 San Francisco Chronicle, 29 April 1916, p.20.
256 San Francisco Chronicle, 2 May 1916, p.20.
257 San Francisco Chronicle, 5 May 1916, p.18.
editorial stated: "The aftermath of the Irish rebellion threatens to give the British Government far more trouble than the actual uprising itself."258

The Chronicle ridiculed the findings of the Hardinge Commission convened to determine the causes of the rebellion in its editorial, "Fixing of Reponsibility Upon Secretary Birrell Is Merely a Solemn Farce." The editorial began by stating that "British royal commissions are not taken seriously even by the British. They are usually appointed for the purpose of pigeon-holing a question, of finding a scapegoat, or absolving the Government from the responsibility of action in an awkward situation."259 The editorial points out very important factors in contemporary Irish history that the commissions had ignored but were crucial to understanding the causes of the rebellion. The paper disagreed with the commission blaming Birrell for the rebellion and absolving Wimborne even though Wimborne had been Lord Lieutenant longer than Birrell had been Chief Secretary. The commission explained that arms used during the rebellion should have been confiscated but did not directly condemn the Ulstermen and the Larne gunrunning as the instance when lawlessness began to be tolerated. And the Chronicle considered Carson to be as much a traitor and outlaw as Casement.260

The Los Angeles Times was owned and edited by Harrison Gray Otis, a Republican who was critical of labor's influence in politics.261 In 1910, his publishing house was destroyed by a dynamiting campaign by two Irish-American anarchists (McNamara brothers) who wanted to nationally publicize the anti-unionist stance of Otis and end his publishing career.262 Distance from the actual events of the rising caused facts to be confused. On 25 April 1916, Sir Roger Casement was referred to as Sir Robert and on the 29th Larkin was credited with maintaining a "Reign of Terror in Dublin" even though he was in Chicago at the time.263 The paper was not favorable to the rebellion, portraying it as "a tragi-comedy of almost Gilbertian characteristics"264 and continued to condemn the rebels even after the executions created a groundswell of sentiment for them.

258 "It all comes of England having used the war as an excuse for putting off the establishment of home rule. That measure received the sanction of the British House of Commons not once but more than half a dozen times, yet the Irish were treated like the militant suffragettes and asked to accept a truce, as though they have been at war with England and not merely using constitutional means to obtain the right granted to Canada, to Australia, and South Africa." (San Francisco Chronicle, 12 May 1916, p.20.)

259 San Francisco Chronicle, 5 July 1916, p.18.


264 Los Angeles Times, 1 May 1916, p.4.
perhaps because of the Los Angeles Times' experiences with Irish-American terrorism.265

Sir Roger Casement was described as "not the first man to fail by reason of an attack of cold feet. His next trouble may be (a) sore throat."266 The paper had little sympathy for Casement but questioned whether in this modern age of "enlightenment" a man should be hanged "under the provisions of the statutes of the fourteenth century."267

One is struck by the penchant of the western papers for concern about Anglo-Irish relations. Unlike the newspapers previously reviewed the western papers did not consider much the role of Germany in the instigation of the rebellion. The cause of the rebellion in their view was solely within the Anglo-Irish relationship. Ulstermen, Larne gunrunning and the traitorous activities of Carson were no less than that of Casement. Casement's relationship to Germany is seldom mentioned as a major cause of the rebellion. The ineptitude of Birrell and the Castle Government, the indifference of Asquith's coalition cabinet were high in the estimation of these papers. In fact, the San Francisco Chronicle said that Birrell had been made a scapegoat and the Hardinge Commission did little more than sweep the complicity of the cabinet under the rug.

The western papers also saw the consequences of the rebellion largely in terms of the Anglo-Irish relationship. The Rocky Mountain News echoed the ambivalence of the Indianapolis Star to the executions which "never yet pacified Ireland and perhaps they never will."268 Two newspapers pointed to the double standard applied to Carson and Casement's traitorous activities. Casement's treason was compared to that of American Revolutionaries, in other words, he was considered to be a freedom fighter, not a traitor. In addition to Hearst's biases and hatred for English snobbery, he reproduced two of Yeats' commentaries on the rising. Among them were Yeats' condemnation of the coalition government and its handling of the home rule issue and his eulogy for the courageous rebels. Hearst's bravado reached a particularly high note when he declared that "England faces eternal infamy in putting Casement to death." The Los Angeles Times could be forgiven for taking a distinctly different view of Casement and Larkin as

265 "The Dublin fiasco was the offspring of misconceived emotional patriotism resulting in an opera bouffe rebellion, which Great Britain ruthlessly punished by a resort to the methods of the Cromwellian and Williamite periods. England has of late years been making atonement to Ireland for the commercial legislation by which, in a former century, the energies of the people of the Green Isle were curtailed, but, in the swift punishment of the Dublin leaders, she has not considered that when a country has been misgoverned for centuries there will pass into the hearts of the people a hatred that it may take more than a generation to eradicate, and that such hatred will find expression from time to time in such pathetic incidents as the Sinn Fein revolution." (Los Angeles Times, 14 May 1916, p.4.)

266 Los Angeles Times, 8 May 1916, part 2, p.4.


268 Indianapolis Star, 6 May 1916, p.8.
the paper had fallen victim to Irish terrorism when its publishing house was fire-bombed by labor activists six years prior to the Easter Rising. While the Times had little sympathy for Casement it did ridicule as antiquated the fourteenth-century decree under which he was condemned.

The American papers in general demonstrated the pervasive Anglophobia that characterized the democratic republic. Of all the countries in this study, the United States had the most sympathy for the Irish rebels. It hoped not only that home rule would be imparted to Ireland but also many papers expressed the expectation that eventually Ireland would be independent of the British Empire. This was partly the expectation of generations of Irish-American Catholics whose stories of British atrocities (especially the famine) were kept fresh in the minds of their descendants of the Irish Diaspora. Many American papers expressed the connection between the Irish rebels and American patriots in an effort to legitimize the rebellion and evoke sympathy for an oppressed race. The British suppression of the rising and subsequent executions threatened to severely damage Anglo-American relations dimming British hopes that the United States would enter the war on the side of the Allies. In addition, Wilson’s re-election prospects could have been affected by the perception that the president was anti-Irish as evident of his lack of support for Roger Casement. However, it would appear that the American Irish reacted more strongly to domestic pressures in continuing to support Wilson and the Democratic Party in the presidential election.

Few papers endorsed a policy of American entry in the war by 1916 and both presidential candidates professed a non-interventionist platform throughout their campaigns. But in the West and Midwest where there was the strongest isolationist sentiment, the editors of those papers (which the notable exception of the Englishman James Keeley’s Chicago Herald) expressed the most vociferous condemnation of British policy in Ireland. The southern papers focused on the issue of home rule as a legitimate method of redressing Irish Catholic grievances but as well hoped to keep the U.S. out of the war. The eastern press attempted to draw a fine line between support for Irish home rule while condemning the recent rapprochement between radical Irish-Americans and the German government.269

Chapter VI- Canadian Press Reaction to the Easter Rebellion

Prior to 1911, Canadian national politics had been dominated by a Liberal Party that was able to unite the liberal French-Canadians with their counterparts in British Canada under the leadership of Wilfred Laurier. Laurier, a Montreal native and representative of Quebec East was the political embodiment of the connection between French Canada and the remainder of the nation. However, in 1910 a section of the French-Canadian independents, who had formerly served under Laurier, led by Henri Bourassa opposed Laurier's attempts to pass a reciprocity treaty with the United States and build a navy that would augment the British Empire. Therefore, Laurier was defeated in the 1911 national elections by the conservative Robert L. Borden. Independent Liberal opposition to Laurier in 1910 determined to work against Bourassa and those who opposed Laurier. Borden's conservatives pledged their support for Britain in 1914 and forced through a conscription bill in 1917 that most Quebec nationalists abhorred.

In 1914, Laurier refused to enter into a wartime coalition with Borden and therefore represented a majority of French Canadians who did not view the war as their fight. Despite this, the Liberal and conservative editors of the major Canadian newspapers in this study were united in their support of the British Empire's declaration of war on 4 August 1914. Not surprisingly, Canada's newspapers appeared from their coverage of the Easter Rising to be united in condemning the actions of the Irish rebels. However, Canada was not a united nation in many respects, and the Canadian press was divided along traditional conservative and liberal lines. Certainly the most vociferous opposition to the war came from Henri Bourassa's Le Devoir.

In 1908, Canadian editors formed the Canadian Press Association that collected wire reports (mainly Associated Press) for distribution throughout the country. Therefore, when war broke out in 1914, the Canadian Press Association served as a conduit for the dissemination of news that could be easily controlled by the government. Censorship of European communiqués was characterized by a combination of voluntary scrutinization by editors and of expurgation by the government's Chief Press Censor, which was established at the beginning of the war.1

---

Table 1: Circulation figures of selected Canadian papers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Circulation (summer 1916- unless otherwise noted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto Globe</td>
<td>88,517 (March 1916)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto Evening Telegram</td>
<td>88,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Province</td>
<td>45,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg Evening Tribune</td>
<td>36,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the Liberal newspapers in this study was the Toronto Globe. The Liberal politician George Brown who served as Canadian Prime Minister for part of 1858 founded the Toronto Globe in 1844. Brown was active in the Orange Order in Canada and this was the first major paper founded by an Orangeman in the New World. Since the Globe's creation in the 1840s, the paper highlighted the protestant-catholic rivalry in Canada and the influence of Quebec's Catholics in national politics. Sectarianism in Canada was of a different nature than in Britain or Ireland. While Roman Catholics represented the largest single religious group in Canada, unlike Australia or Canada's neighbor to the south, the Irish were not the largest single catholic group. The Canadian Irish Catholic had to compete with the Scots Catholic and especially French Canadians in Quebec for influence within the church.

Since 1915, the Globe had been edited by T. Stewart Lyon, who would continue in that position until 1925. The Scottish connection begun by Brown would continue under Lyon. The Toronto Globe began its reporting of the Irish rebellion on 27 April. The liberal paper agreed with the assertion that the rebellion was a strike not against the British Empire, but specifically against Redmond and the Irish Parliamentary Party that

---

2 Globe, 1 May 1916.
3 The Toronto Evening Telegram had a circulation of approximately 88,239 between April and July 1916. The circulation for April averaged 88,976 Toronto Evening Telegram, 4 May 1916, p.10- for May averaged 88,728, ibid. 30 May 1916, p.8; for July averaged 87,014, ibid. 21 July 1916, p.10.
4 Circulation for the Vancouver Province was approximately 45627 between April and June 1916. Circulation for 27 April was 45,535, Vancouver Province, 28 April 1916, p.1; for 1 May was 45,244, ibid. 2 May 1916, p.1; for 8 May was 45,140, ibid. 9 May 1916, p.1; for 1 June was 44,962, ibid. 2 June 1916, p.1; for 14 June was 46,369, ibid. 15 June 1916, p.1; for 29 June was 46,514, ibid. 30 June 1916, p.1.
5 The Winnipeg Evening Tribune's circulation for March 1916 was 35,565 Winnipeg Evening Tribune, 24 April 1916, p.4; for April was 35,630 ibid. 9 May 1916, p.4; for May was 35,020 ibid. 13 June 1916, p.4; for June was 36,317, ibid. 4 July 1916, p.4; for July 1916 was 37,804, ibid. 4 August 1916, p.4.
7 In 1921 the Rom(an) Catholics numbered 3,389,636; the Presbyterians 1,409,407; the Methodists 1,159,458; Anglicans 1,407,994; the Baptists 421,731; the Lutherans, 286,458; and the Congregationalists 30,730; Mennonites 58,797, Greek Church 169,832, and Jews 125,197. (Ridgway, Athelstan, ed. Everyman's Encyclopedia, volume three, J.M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., London, 1932. p.301)
supported Britain's war effort. "In Ireland the small body of extremists who have followed the erratic ways of Sir Roger Casement represent not so much hatred of Britain as hatred of the Irish party which has committed the unpardonable crime of justifying the constitutional fight for Home Rule."9

The Globe was eager to reassure its readers that the Canadian-Irish were loyal to Canada and the British Empire. The paper contrasted the attitudes of Irish-Americans with the loyalty of their fellow countrymen. "While some doubt exists as to the real strength of the Irish-American pro-German element in the United States, there is no doubt whatever as to the loyalty of Irish-Canadians. . . . In the United States the Irish immigrant has had no correcting influence. He lives in the past when he thinks of Ireland. Not so his compatriot in Canada."10

The Globe continued its support for Irish home rule throughout the summer of 1916. The liberal journal understood well the benefits of Canada's continuing as an independent country within the Empire and believed from the beginning of the rebellion that nationalist Ireland had proven itself loyal and deserving of self-determination. "Ireland, on the outbreak of war, and now following the obscure rising in Dublin, also has given proof of the magical effects of beneficent legislation by surrendering herself wholeheartedly to the task of aiding Britain in her just war with Prussianism."11 The paper believed that England would never rule Ireland better than the Irish themselves because the Saxon can never understand Celtic reasoning and culture.12

The Globe did not support the partition of Ireland. "To talk about North and South being irreconcilable because of differences in racial qualities and in religious beliefs is to talk nonsense. They must learn to live together and to work together and to play together in the same social order and in one national unity, as Scotland learned, and as Canada must also learn."13 The paper proclaimed near the end of June that neither the nationalists...

---

9 Globe, 27 April 1916, p.6.
10 Globe, 6 May 1916, p.6.
12 "Another thing is plain—government from Downing Street never can succeed in Ireland. Experience has proved, all kinds of experience, that the typical English mind never did and never can understand the Irish character, or sympathize with Irish aspirations, or govern in Irish institutions and life. . . . Let it be laid down now for Ireland, what has been tested and put to the absolute proof in Canada, in Australia, in New Zealand, and in South Africa, that all free peoples of the British family of nations, whether their blood be Saxon or Celtic, must be given the right and must take the risk of governing themselves. . . . On one point all sound Canadian opinion would agree: the future for Ireland, as for Canada, is within and not without the circle of the British Commonwealth. They are fools as well as rebels who strike for what they ignorantly call 'Irish Independence.' No one member of the British group of Islands is or can be 'independent' of the others. 'Independence' is the foolish word of the inexperienced. Inter-dependence is the sounder and the stronger policy, alike for Great Britain and Ireland and for all the nations of Britain's democratic faith." (Globe, 20 May 1916, p.6.)
nor the unionists favored the exclusion of Ulster. Because the Lloyd George settlement would 'temporarily' exclude six Ulster counties, the *Globe* could not endorse the scheme. To exclude Ulster's counties, especially since the settlement was viewed by all Irish parties as expedient simply for pacifying Ireland and as a war measure, would be disastrous for the future of Ireland.\(^\text{14}\) The failure of the Lloyd George settlement, the paper believed, was Redmond's apparent willingness to compromise on the status of Ulster. Redmond, it was feared, lost the support of nationalists when he agreed to the temporary exclusion of Ulster's counties. "To all intents and purposes the Irish party, under Mr. Redmond's leadership, had become a wing of the Coalition Government."\(^\text{15}\)

The *Globe* explained that constitutional nationalist agitation was responsible for destroying the last vestiges of feudalism in Ireland. English feudal rule in Ireland was based upon the three bases of "the Land, the Church, and Castle Government."\(^\text{16}\) However, those who supported Carson and other Unionists were continuing feudalism in Ireland.\(^\text{17}\) The liberal paper was disgusted by the findings of the Hardinge Commission that fixed the responsibility upon the shoulders of the former Chief Secretary for Ireland. "Why, it may be asked, should Mr. Birrell be made a scapegoat for conditions within the knowledge of the whole Cabinet? The fact was brought out at the Commission that his repeated warnings, and demands for an effective military force, passed unheeded. Mr. Birrell is the victim of a failure for which all his colleagues are collectively responsible."\(^\text{18}\)

Joseph Atkinson had edited the *Toronto Star* since 1899.\(^\text{19}\) After the 1911 defeat of Liberal Prime Minister Wilfred Laurier and the split of the party, the *Star* became politically independent yet still reflected the liberalism of its editor.\(^\text{20}\) The *Toronto Star* praised the efforts of Carson and Redmond in deploring the rebellion and neither seeking political advantage out of the situation or at the expense of the other. "It is satisfactory to note that Mr. John Redmond and Sir Edward Carson are standing shoulder to shoulder in repudiation of the criminal irreconcilables- shoulder to shoulder, not as Nationalist and Unionist but simply as Irishmen. Sir Edward Carson has seldom taken a line that becomes him better than he is taking in his refusal to seek to make party capital out of the

\(^\text{14}\) *Globe*, 23 June 1916, p.4.

\(^\text{15}\) *Globe*, 26 July 1916, p.6.

\(^\text{16}\) Gladstone disestablished the Church of Ireland in 1869, and the Wyndham Land Act did much to redress the grievances of the Irish farmer, but Castle Government still controlled Ireland.

\(^\text{17}\) *Globe*, 26 May 1916, p.4.

\(^\text{18}\) *Globe*, 6 July 1916, p.4.


deplorable affair. Mr. Redmond's reprobation of the trouble-makers was only to be expected, and was in accord with the fine spirit he has shown ever since the commencement of the war.\textsuperscript{21}

Its founder, the Hon. Senator Hewitt Bostock, owned the \textit{Vancouver Province}.\textsuperscript{22} Bostock led the Liberals in the Canadian Senate and opposed many members of his party, including Laurier, who did not support the Military Service Act that established mandatory conscription in 1917. The paper was responsive to its Irish readership as it sympathized with the Irish Nationalist frustration with home rule and the political uncertainty created in the wake of the rebellion. Walter C. Nichol edited the \textit{Vancouver Province} in 1916.\textsuperscript{23} The \textit{Province} became a daily newspaper in 1898 and established itself as a prominent paper in a town whose population did not exceed 15,000.\textsuperscript{24} The \textit{Vancouver Province} did not favor executing Casement, because they believed that he wanted to become a martyr for the Irish cause. Instead, the paper recommended that he be placed in an insane asylum (whether he was mentally unbalanced or not; the \textit{Province} did not believe that he was insane) to prove that his exploits were not only treasonous but idiotic and senseless. "To imprison him as a criminal lunatic would make not only Sir Roger but the whole German cause ridiculous. Ridicule kills far quicker than a bullet."\textsuperscript{25} When Casement was hanged on 3 August, the paper agreed that the execution was a just penalty for his crime for he had endeavored to allow Germany to invade Ireland. "No doubt there will be some who will cry that Casement is a martyr to Irish liberty, but if a deliberate attempt to impose German rule on Ireland is conceived to be in the interests of liberty, no amount of argument will convince such people that Casement was a criminal."\textsuperscript{26} The \textit{Province} agreed with the assertion that the rebellion was a German plot and that the result of a victorious revolt would have been the establishment of a German satellite state.\textsuperscript{27} Upon the collapse of the rebellion that was not supported by the Dublin populace, the paper asserted that Ireland has proven its loyalty once again to the Empire.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Toronto Star} in the \textit{Ottawa Evening Journal}, 2 May 1916, p.5.
\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Vancouver Province}, 26 April 1916, p.6.
\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Vancouver Province}, 3 August 1916, p.6.
\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Vancouver Province}, 28 April 1916, p.6.
\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Vancouver Province}, 2 May 1916, p.6.
The Irish Chief Secretary Augustine Birrell was described as injudicious. He underestimated the intensity of the Ulstermen in resisting home rule and could not understand that if he allowed Ulster to threaten rebellion then the remainder of the country would follow Carson's example. "And having allowed Ulster to drift he had to allow the rest of Ireland to drift, to allow the smouldering fires to spread through the damp undergrowth until they reached the standing crops and would have set them ablaze but for the timely intervention of Germany."29

This liberal paper championed Lloyd George as the best man to settle the home rule crisis created by the suspension of the Home Rule Act and heightened by the rebellion. Lloyd George, more than any other politician in Asquith's cabinet, was respected by both the nationalists and unionists (namely Balfour and Bonar Law) and supported by the powerful influence of the Northcliffe press.30

The Manitoba (Winnipeg) Free Press was purchased in 1897 by the liberal politician Clifford Sifton.31 In 1897, Winnipeg already had a liberal paper, the Evening Tribune, owned by R.L. Richardson, and the announcement that the Free Press would change its politics from conservative to liberal caused a backlash in Richardson's editorials. Initially, the attacks were aimed at the new editor and former correspondent of the Toronto Globe, Arnott J. Magurn, who was described by Richardson as "the henchman of the Minister of the Interior" (who was Clifford Sifton).32

The Winnipeg Evening Tribune had been published and edited by Robert Lorne Richardson since 1889.33 Even though Richardson was a Liberal MP, his paper did not blindly endorse the economic policies of Liberal governments. When issues such as high government expenditures, a national tariff and the exploitation of the Yukon territory conflicted with Richardson's own views he criticized the government in his paper. This 'maverick' attitude motivated Clifford Sifton to purchase the former conservative Free Press in 1897 as a rival newspaper of the Winnipeg Evening Tribune to represent the liberal voice of western Canada.34

---

29 Vancouver Province, 2 May 1916, p.6.
30 Vancouver Province, 12 May 1916, p.6 and 26 May 1916, p.6.
The Winnipeg Evening Tribune downplayed the significance of the rebellion upon the world stage. The uprising was described as a "mere passing minor event." According to the paper, the uprising as one of the many failed attempts by Germany to disturb the British war effort. "Germany has about reached the end of her tether in the concoction of devilish designs. She has failed in India, Mexico, the United States, Chili, and she has failed in Ireland. Her greatest failure of all must surely be at hand."35

The Evening Tribune certainly did not sympathize with Sir Roger Casement. After his capture, the paper believed that since German money and the lure of 'notoriety had undoubtedly bribed Sir Roger Casement' that he should be forgotten.36 His hanging was just and deserved.37

Among the conservative newspapers the Montreal Star was Canada's "largest English-language daily." The Tory politician Hugh Graham (Lord Atholstan) owned it in 1916.38 This paper favored a stern response to the rebellion and expurgating the Nationalist party of seditious elements. The paper praised the condemnation by Carson and Redmond of the uprising. "But the great thing now is to get the poison extirpated with as little loss of time or of life as possible, and to keep constantly in mind that there are no sterner enemies of this teacup rebellion than the Nationalist party in Parliament (sic) and out of it."39

The editor of the Ottawa Evening Journal in 1916 was Philip Dansken Ross.40 While the paper described itself as conservative it was very careful to no to inflame Irish

35 Winnipeg Evening Tribune, 27 April 1916, p.4.
36 Winnipeg Evening Tribune, 27 April 1916, p.4.
37 "The act of His Majesty in taking from the traitor, Sir Roger Casement, the title of knighthood, and the consummating act of the British Government in hanging Casement in accordance with the laws of the land, is British justice. It is the proper enforcement of law that shows no distinction between rich and poor, or between men of high and low degree, as popularly classified by society. Even more deserving of death was Casement, the arch-traitor, the contemptible conspirator with the Prussian enemies, than the menials who were shot at the palls of this plotter-in-chief. Influence- even the influence of the greater powers in the world- counts for naught in staying the British hand of stern justice. The British tradition is equal justice for all. The Mother Country is upholding it, and setting a splendid example to the Dominions and the rest of the world. Undermine the general faith in equal law and punishment for rich and poor alike, and not only are the foundations of a nation shaken, but actually destroyed. Without justice, anarchy prevails. Let us at all times uphold the cause of justice. Britain not only upheld the majesty of the law, but acted justly in hanging the traitor, Casement." (Winnipeg Evening Tribune, 4 August 1916, p.4.)
In the Ottawa Journal, 31 May 1916, p.6.)

The Ottawa Journal favored firm treatment of the rebel leaders. The paper felt that the executions should not only serve as punishment for beginning a revolt aimed at the British Empire but to warn others who might contemplate a similar action. The Journal did not agree with the assertion that the rebel leaders were dupes of the German government. They were patriots, albeit misguided ones.

The Journal believed that there was a silver lining to the rebellion. The vigorous suppression of the rebellion by the British army might convince foolish Ulstermen of the futility of defying British law. In addition, the lack of support for Sinn Fein in southern Ireland had proven that nationalist Ireland is loyal to the British Empire and therefore deserves home rule.

The Journal feared that the rejection by the Unionists of the Lloyd George scheme would invariably lead to the dissolution of the coalition cabinet. Despite the support of Carson and Redmond, it appeared to the Journal that the Lloyd George proposals did not please the nationalist or unionist population of Ireland. It was the strength of the nationalist politicians, namely Redmond in the south and Joseph Devlin in Ulster, and the prestige of Carson among the Ulster Unionists that convinced their supporters that the Lloyd George proposals needed to be adopted to ensure peace and stability throughout Ireland. In the end, it seemed obvious that the Unionist members of Asquith's cabinet had destroyed the settlement. "The chief stumbling block seems to be Lord Lansdowne.

43 "Such men were not meanly selfish, were not bought by German gold, were not even dominated by personal ambition. They were, according to their lights, patriots. It was only that their lights had been mis-colored. The very fineness of such natures would render them susceptible from early youth to feelings of fierce resentment at English domination and of hatred of the English people in connection with Irish history." (Ottawa Evening Journal, 31 May 1916, p.6.)
45 "In the Asquith cabinet there are five very powerful Unionist members who seem profoundly opposed to Home Rule even as an experiment, or Home Rule even with the exclusion of a great portion of Ulster. These members are Rt. Hon. Arthur Balfour, First Lord of the Admiralty; the Earl of Selborne, President of the Board of Agriculture; Lord Robert Cecil, Minister of War Trade; and the Marquis of Lansdowne, minister without portfolio. Their apparent rejection of the Lloyd-George proposals may not in itself constitute a want of confidence in the government of which they are a part, but, under British precedent, it is hard to see how it can avoid leading to a break-up of the coalition." (Ottawa Evening Journal, 27 June 1916, p.6.)
an absentee Irish landlord, aged 71. With all due respect to his services in the past the old gentleman should have been relegated to a nursery long ago." 47 The Canadian press was familiar with the "absentee landlord." Lansdowne had served as Governor-General of Canada from 1883 to 1888 but left that post for India. Apparently, the conservative paper viewed his departure for India as a slight upon Canada's honour.

The founder and editor of the Toronto Evening Telegram since 1878 was John Ross Robertson. 48 Robertson entered politics as an independent Conservative and a devoted Orangeman. But his talents brought him to focus on his newspaper career, establishing the Canadian Associated Press that created the first transatlantic reporting service. Robertson's paper led the way in endorsing Borden's conscription act of 1917. The Telegram lambasted those who opposed conscription, especially the nationalistes in Quebec. This strong stance for the conservative Prime Minister was good for business: the paper's circulation rose to 100,170 by the end of May 1917. 49 When news of the rebellion reached Toronto, there was little doubt in the minds of the Telegram's readers as to their stance on Irish home rule when its editorial proclaimed in bold print: "KEEP HOME RULE ISSUE AWAY FROM CANADA UNTIL AFTER THE WAR". This conservative journal feared that home rule would be given to Ireland and as a result would spread to Canada and politically disrupt the Dominion status of Canada and jeopardize its relationship with Britain. "The Home Rule issue is a "root of bitterness" in the soil of Canada's life." The paper believed that the war forced Carson and the Ulster Unionists to accept home rule when they had successfully resisted the imposition of the law upon Ulster's soil. 50

The Telegram held Asquith partially to blame for the revolutionary atmosphere in Ireland. The Prime Minister, the paper opined, appointed inferior statesmen to administer Ireland. "Lord Aberdeen coddled and encouraged every British-hating element in Ireland. Suggestions that German submarines had bases on the south coast of Ireland, declarations that there was danger of revolution in Ireland, were greeted with Rt. Hon. Augustine

50 "Ulster Unionists in Ireland and their sympathizers in this country are against the large pretensions and small deceits of the anti-Ulster press and politicians. These smooth tricks are all part of a game. The purpose of that game is to make Home Rule part of the established fabric of the British Empire, so that Sir Edward Carson and his followers may be placed in a false position when the war is over and Ulster Unionism is called upon to fulfill its convenant of resistance to Home Rule. " (Toronto Evening Telegram, 27 April 1916, p.12.)
Birrell's merry quips and jests in the British House of Commons." Moreover, Asquith was responsible for impoverishing the citizens of Dublin to such an extent that active revolution seemed like an agreeable solution to their economic situation. In fact, the paper believed that the "revolutionists are less to blame for the disorders in Ireland than is the Asquith Government." This is the first severely anti-Irish commentary. The paper criticized Lord Aberdeen's and Chief Secretary Birrell's association with Irish nationalism.

The Telegram disagreed with the comparison between the Ulster covenanters and the Sinn Feiners. "The Ulster covenanters may be extremists, but they are not allies of Germany, traitors to human liberty, incendiaries and murderers of the Sinn Fein tribe." The Telegram hoped that Irish-American pressure upon the British government to spare Roger Casement would not be successful.

The French-Canadian press was generally conservative and introverted in nature that mirrored the majority of its readers. French-Canadians did not consistently support the British war effort after the euphoria of the declaration of war in 1914 had subsided. Vocally discontented French-Canadians were numerous in Quebec, and relatively few (in comparison to British Canada) volunteered to fight in the war. French-Canadians and Irish nationalists had a similar kinship in their relations with the British Empire. Both groups had national aspirations. The French-Canadian national movement was not as well organized or effective as the Irish home rule movement had been, and the French-Canadian press naturally admired the Irish struggle for self-determination. Most of the press did not support the war and continued to view the current conflict in ways that would affect them directly. The most important of these papers was Le Devoir. Le Devoir's first issue was 10 January 1910. "In the first issues of the paper its platform was very carefully set forth in five major areas: the complete autonomy of Canada, loyalty

---

51 Toronto Evening Telegram, 1 May 1916, p.8.
52 Toronto Evening Telegram, 22 May 1916, p.8.
53 Toronto Evening Telegram, 29 April 1916, p.18.
54 "Among English Canadians there was great skepticism from the first about the French-Canadian desire to serve. Officials in charge of recruiting soon reported that the number of French Canadians volunteering for service was far less than the count of English-Canadians enlistment for the same period. Because of previous hostility to the Nationalists, English Canadians were quick to suspect them of trying to foil the recruiting drives and thereby ruin the Canadian war effort. Much of the English-language press noted that conscription might be the only means of getting the French Canadians to do their share. Bourassa retaliated in Le Devoir on a number of occasions, arguing that the enlistment figures were inaccurate and revealed nothing about French-Canadian participation." (Murrow, Casey. Henri Bourassa and French-Canadian Nationalism, Opposition to Empire. Harvest House, Montreal, 1968. p.87.)
to British ideals and to Great Britain as the historic ruler of Canada, provincial autonomy, minority rights throughout Canada, and bilingual public services and laws."56

Henri Bourassa, a former liberal politician who championed the separatist Quebec cause, owned Le Devoir.57 Bourassa believed that Canada had an obligation to support Britain and France, however, his 'endorsement' was hardly the call-to-arms that the conservative government desired from French-Canada.58 Bourassa claimed to represent those French-Canadian nationalists (Québecois nationalistes) who were not persuaded by the call to come to the aid of France; moreover as disgruntled members of the Dominion, they would not shed their blood for the British Empire.59 Many nationalistes resisted the call to defend France as the anti-clerical sentiment and liberalism following the French Revolution had alienated the religiously conservative French-Canadians. Bourassa was in many respects the spokesman for the preservation of French-Canadian culture in Quebec. The two pillars of French-Canadian conservatism were the French language and the Catholic Church. In this respect, the nationalistes mirrored the cultural revival of the Irish language and the Catholic Church that had spawned so many Irish nationalists and republicans.

Bourassa's conservatism threatened many British-Canadians who saw this French-Canadian national revival as a threat to the unity of Canada.60 In order to understand the British Canadian hostility towards Bourassa it must be understood that Canadian troops were dying in great numbers on the western front and few of these troops were French-Canadian. Canadians had been fighting in France since the beginning of 1915. They fought in the major campaigns of the war after February 1915, for example they endured the first gas attacks of the war.61 The unity of the British and French cultures in Canada was strongest during the administration of Prime Minister Wilfrid Laurier. Laurier was a French-Canadian who understood the importance of continuing his countrymen's influence in national politics and the cooperation with British Canadians in forging a dual

Canadian identity. (Laurier who was Prime Minister from 1896 to 1911 is the longest continuously serving Prime Minister in Canada's history.) Bourassa saw in the Liberal Prime Minister's administration many threats to French-Canadian conservatism. Bourassa had withdrawn from the Liberal party during the Boer War decrying the support that Canada was giving to the British Empire. Bourassa was also alarmed by the erosion of influence that the Catholic Church held in the politics of Quebec when Laurier endorsed the separation of church and state in Canada. During World War One, Bourassa became to focal point of the French-Canadian opposition to conscription in 1917.

Bourassa began his political career as a liberal during Laurier's administration. Bourassa, even as a supporter of a fellow French-Canadian Prime Minister, was a maverick politician. He broke with Laurier concerning Canada's support of Britain in the Boer War and became an independent in February 1900.62 His anti-imperialist stance would continue throughout his political career, would be tested during the war and become apparent in his interpretation of the Irish independence movements.

Bourassa's criticism of Laurier focused on the Prime Minister's support for the allocation of funds to build Canadian battleships for the British navy. (The conservatives favored adding these ships to the British navy while the Liberals hoped Canadian officers would command them.) Bourassa chose to oppose Laurier over naval build-up and perceived erosion of Canadian economic sovereignty in the proposed reciprocity treaties with the United States. The issue that split the Liberals in two and allowed Borden's conservatives to triumph in 1911 was the Commercial Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. Reciprocity treaties with the United States had not been successful in the past for fear of American domination of North American markets and (what seems now) an unrealistic fear of American annexation of Canada.63 But economically speaking the supply of Canadian raw materials to the United States seemed an overwhelmingly tempting prospect. (The treaty involved the importation of Canadian raw materials without demanding the opening of Canada to American manufactured goods. America would, as well, lower the duties on some Canadian manufactured goods.)64 The liberal Winnipeg

---

63 The American Speaker of the House of Representatives, Champ Clark, demonstrated how real the expectation of American annexation was in Canada. "We are preparing to annex Canada," he said, and the day was not far off, "...when the American flag will float over every square foot of the British North American possessions clear to the North Pole." (Murrow, Casey. Henri Bourassa and French-Canadian Nationalism, Opposition to Empire, Harvest House, Montreal, 1968. p.76.)
64 Murrow, Casey. Henri Bourassa and French-Canadian Nationalism, Opposition to Empire, Harvest House, Montreal, 1968. pp.75-76.
Evening Tribune and the conservative Ottawa Evening Journal reproduced the opinions of Henri Bourassa.\(^65\)

Despite the fact that Canada was the largest supplier of war materiel for the United Kingdom prior to America's entry into the war in April 1917,\(^66\) French-Canadians were not persuaded to come to the aid of Britain or their cultural homeland, France. French-Canadians were the most explicit group within Canada to voice their support for the Irish rebels. While the Canadian Irish tended to pin its hopes for Irish home rule upon the

\(^{65}\) "Mr. Henri Bourassa, editor of Le Devori, (sic) makes no attempt to disguise his dislike of Britain's course of dealing with the Irish rebels. The heading in his latest article was 'The Vengeance of England,' part of which reads: 'Long before the so-called traitorous Pearse and his unfortunate companions now called rebels and criminals, we have heard of the torture of the Flemish by the Duke D'Aulbe, Silvio Pellico and the irredentist Italians, the victims of jails and imprisonment by Austria, the Poles and the Lithuanians scourged by the brutal knout of Russia, and the blood-thirsty sabre of Prussia, the Alscieis-Lorrains crushed under the heel and the juggernaut of junkerdom."

"We know also of the Acadians forced from their hearths, the burning and deportations from their own country in 1837, and the ravaging and destroying done by the soldiers of Colbourne."

"Knowing all this, can we approve, we French-Canadians, in the midst of the persecutions that is also taking place in Ontario and Manitoba, where today our language is proscribed, our nationality considered as something deterrative to the community, and . . . (cut off) years that they have borne the incessant wrestling with their enemy."

"We begin to measure the base hypocrisy of the English philanthropy, that talks of the victims of other nations, and forgets how they themselves have preyed with blood-thirsty cruelty."

"The Irish are an example where this has never ceased, and they offer as testimony their martyrs to the cause, in fact, the two words Irish and Martyrs are synonymous of each other."

"For to understand Ireland and the Irish, their sentiments and their rights, and also the internal factions, it is sufficient only to glance at the records of our own Canadian history."

Mr. Bourassa makes only passing reference to the base treachery of the Sinn Feiners who conspired with the brutal Prussians to deal a blow at the British Empire and her Allies. Whatever may be thought of the severity of the punishment meted out to red-handed, misguided rebels in Ireland, civilization will never condone the crime of attempting to strike a dirty blow below the belt. Mr. Bourassa is obsessed with the idea that he and his compatriots in Quebec are being persecuted because Ontario and Manitoba declare for the English language as the official medium of instruction in the provincial or national schools.

Mr. Bourassa, by his anger at Britain and his attempt to fan the flames of prejudice against the Empire among his compatriots does not serve either Quebec or Canada. His ambitions to make Canada a half-and-half, nondescript sort of independent nation will never be gratified. He is only bringing trouble upon himself and his province. No good to either will result. Mr. Bourassa surely understands today that Quebec is not all Canada, but only a province within the Dominion. That province enjoys more special race and religious privileges today than any other section of this continent, Canadian or American. By the constitutional recognized course of civilized government Quebec has been informed as to where it stands.

It is a sorry spectacle that leaders of a faction in Quebec should select the present period in which to vent a dislike of Britain. Britain has no desire to interfere in matters strictly Canadian. Canada is well able to look after her own troubles. There is, we believe, very general regret, that Great Britain's courts should be bothered settling any internal disputes in this country. Canadians have reached that stage of nationhood where they should be able to define as well as make all the laws for the Government of the Dominion. In pursuing that course we should not be less British, but more so. Freedom is the very basis and foundation of the Empire.

No country under the sun is so free as the one that permit Mr. Bourassa to use language today that is intended to promote both dissension and disharmony." (Winnipeg Evening Tribune, 27 May 1916, p.4; Ottawa Evening Journal, 1 June 1916, p.6.)

\(^{66}\) ibid. p.85.
efforts of Redmond and his followers, *Le Devoir* expressed a true hatred for Britain's influence upon them.

Canada was able to pass a conscription act in 1917 despite the opposition of influential French-Canadians such as Laurier and Bourassa. Unlike the criticisms heaped upon the Australian Irish who many blamed for the defeat of the two Australian attempts to impose conscription and the American Irish who Wilson believed almost cost him the 1916 presidential election; the Easter Rebellion seems to have had little effect upon the Canadian Irish support for the war. This is due in part to the fact that Catholicism was the largest religious plurality in the Canada and the different nature of Irish immigration to Canada. As compared to the United States, where British atrocity stories were kept fresh in the minds of the American Irish Catholic, the Canadian Irish were less combative.
Chapter VII- French Press Reaction to the Easter Rebellion

To understand the outlook of most French newspapers during the period of April through August 1916, it is necessary to focus on the historical relationship between Ireland and France prior to the war and relate that to the change that occurred when Great Britain ceased being France's antagonist and became its most valuable ally in their fight for survival against the German Empire. As a catholic nation and a traditional enemy of England, France had supported Irish-Catholic rebellions.\(^1\) Prior to the French Revolution, the nature of that assistance reflected the desire to place a ruler sympathetic to France on the thrones of Scotland and England. Their support for Scotland in their wars against England and more significantly, France's backing of the catholic Jacobites was traditional. Revolutionary France nearly succeeded in landing troops in Ireland in 1796 with the country relatively undefended. French troops did land in 1798 ('The Year of the French') but by then the British had garrisoned the island. After the French Revolution, Napoleon had tentative plans to invade the country and create a French satellite, however, the French naval disaster at Trafalgar made this possibility unrealistic. Nevertheless, after all rebellions in Ireland failed to dislodge the British, the kinship of two catholic nations continued to define their relationship. That relationship changed temporarily in 1914. The British Empire was France's ally in the war and 'was in no position to make dramatic gestures in favour of Irish self-government.'\(^2\) Nevertheless, it is evident that by the editorials and opinions of the Easter Rising, France still harboured sympathy for catholic Ireland, and the British repression following the rebellion drew new (although somewhat moderated) criticism of the Anglo-Irish situation.

French criticism was softened for a number of reasons. First and foremost, France needed to win the war and support from the British Empire was crucial in expelling German troops from their soil. In February 1916, a new German offensive on the western front had begun, and it was obvious that by the summer the Battle of Verdun had produced unprecedented French casualties. Consequently, the conscription issue was foremost in the minds of French commentators. The French feared that the Irish rebellion would surely distract British attention from a successful prosecution of the war and perhaps delay America's entry into the conflict. France viewed Ireland as a potential but poorly utilized source of troops for the western front. French preoccupation with British recruitment initiatives resulted in numerous articles in the French press expressing the

\(^1\) Especially during 1691-1798. The French supported the 1798 rebels with troops and Napoleon threatened to invade Ireland until his naval forces were destroyed at Trafalgar in 1805. (Edwards, Ruth Dudley. *An Atlas of Irish History*, 2nd ed., Routledge, London, 1986, pp.69-70.)

opinion that the British Empire was not providing its fair share of troops for the defence of the western front. (The British Parliament voted in the spring of 1916 to impose mandatory conscription in England, Scotland and Wales. However, Ireland was not included in the conscription bills during the war although the Government threatened to extend the draft to the island. Prime Minister Asquith had expected mandatory conscription to falter in Parliament, but surprisingly, there was little opposition to the measure in Britain.\textsuperscript{3} The British Parliamentary vote was 328 for and 36 against mandatory enlistment.) The 1916 uprising destroyed any hope that conscription could be realistically imposed upon Ireland.

Several themes permeated the French interpretation of the uprising. The French believed that the Germans and their Irish-American counterparts planned, funded and botched the uprising. First of all, Sir Roger Casement's abortive attempt to raise an Irish brigade in Germany was believed to have been funded by the German government. There was no doubt by the French that Casement was sent by the Germans to begin the rebellion, not to stop it. The Zeppelin raids on Lowestoft and Yarmouth and the appearance of "a German cruiser squadron" on the eastern coast of England coinciding with the Irish uprising were reported as an effort to distract British attention from the western front. The second theme was that Ireland was continuing in a long tradition of rebellion against a nation that had oppressed the Irish people for centuries. Despite the fact that France was allied with Britain during the Great War, it did not blindly support the British policy towards Ireland. Neither did it support the "absurd economic and political ideas of Sinn Fein", that was described as a "scrubby, political branch of the Gaelic League."\textsuperscript{4} The third theme concerned the poor administration of Ireland by Mr. Birrell who they believed was an atheist who never spent any time in Dublin. The papers wondered if Birrell and his undersecretary, Matthew Nathan, were qualified to direct the political affairs of the troublesome island. \textit{L'Echo} stated that the rebellion was a threat to the implementation of home rule after the war, and the best form of Irish government is one comprised of Irishmen. The evidence that the paper provided is the fact that the uprising in Cork was stopped before it could begin by the appeal of the Bishop of Cork who threatened the Sinn Feiners with excommunication if they rioted.\textsuperscript{5}

Numerous articles appeared in the French press commenting on Anglo-Irish relations. A history of repression was recounted to explain the Irish Nationalist stance.

\textsuperscript{3} "The debate has demonstrated that the number of opponents was tiny and that the nation, resolved to conquer, was ready for all sacrifices to insure and hasten victory." (\textit{La Dépêche}, 9 May 1916, p.2; Taylor, A.J.P., \textit{English History 1914-1945}. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1965. pp.53-54.)

\textsuperscript{4} \textit{Le Echo}, 5 May 1916. p.2

\textsuperscript{5} \textit{ibid.} I have found no reference to this episode in the Cork newspapers.
against conscription, and the press condemned the Ulstermen for bringing Irish domestic issues to a fever-pitch. The press' particularly harsh treatment of Sir Roger Casement stemmed from two opinions concerning the humanitarian-turned-rebel. His collaboration with the Germans was well known by the time he was captured, and from the beginning of his incarceration he was labeled a traitor. Moreover, his pre-war humanitarian efforts in Africa, which exposed Belgian atrocities and implicated the Francophone colonial system there, brought the press to brand him a liar and in league with the Germans as early as the turn of the century.6

In order to understand the interpretation by the French press of the rebel's actions, one must also take into account the reorganization of the French political system prior to the war. From 1897 to 1904, the Dreyfus Affair7 dominated the political affairs of France. The 'affair' polarized French politicians between Leftists (Socialists, some liberals) and Nationalists (monarchists, some supporters of the church) who both criticized the 'Third Republic for not being either democratic or conservative enough. Socialists, some of them led by Jean Jaurès, the editor of L'Humanité until his assassination in 1914, publicized his disappointment concerning the Third Republic's handling of the affair. The Socialists became associated with an anti-clerical movement within the government which culminated in the separation of the Catholic Church and the French Republic in 1905.8 The Nationalists (of which Charles Maurras9 and Leon Daudet's10 L'Action française newspaper espoused the radical nationalist viewpoint which included the restoration of the monarchy) abhorred the anti-clericalism of the socialists and decentralization of the republic. In 1914, the war overshadowed the internecine fighting

---

6 This was well before his "conversion" to radical nationalism (around 1912 at the height of the Ulster Crisis) following the passage of the third Home Rule Bill. (Gwynn, Denis. The Life and Death of Roger Casement. Jonathan Cape, London, 1930. p. 209.)

7 Alfred Dreyfus was wrongly accused of selling military secrets to the Germans in 1894. He was convicted and sentenced for life on Devil's Island. In the minds of many French intellectuals, such as Émile Zola who defended him in a pamphlet entitled J'accuse!, he was a victim of anti-Semitic officers who needed a scapegoat for lapses of French security. Even after a statement implicating Dreyfus was found to be a forgery and was exposed in the press, Dreyfus was not released. By the time of his second conviction, Dreyfus became the focal point of feuding socialists and conservatives. He was finally released in 1904 and rehabilitated by the military. (Tannenbaum, Edward R. The Action Francaise. Die-hard Reactionaries in Twentieth-Century France. John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1962. pp.23-27.)


9 Charles Maurras was born in Martigues on 20 April 1868. As a result of the Dreyfus Affair he founded the Ligue de la Patrie française in 1898 in order to protect left-wing threats to French conservatism. In 1908, he and Leon Daudet founded l'Action française to voice the propaganda of the right-wing movement of the same name. (Grimal, Pierre, ed. Dictionnaire des Biographies. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1958, pp.993-994.)

10 Leon Daudet had enough personal fortune from family (he married the grand-daughter of Victor Hugo) and his writings that he was able to fund l'Action française. (D'Amat, Roman et R. Limouzin-Lamothe, eds. Dictionnaire de Biographie Francaise. Tome Dixième, Librairie Letouzey et Ane, Paris, 1965. p.263.)
between socialist and nationalist politicians within the Third Republic, and the newspaper editors agreed to uphold *l'Union Sacrée* and minimize discord within the press until at least the Germans were defeated.

French freedom of the press was impeded by the government's desire to control the information coming into the country. The so-called 'Jacobin model' of censorship\(^{11}\) was characterized by military scrutiny of information regarding the French conduct of the war, fabrication of news reports from the front, and in extreme cases, suppression of opponents and critics of the war effort. In fact, news emanated from only a few sources (the Havas news agency had a virtual monopoly on information reaching the newspapers)\(^{12}\) making press censorship very effective in molding public opinion. Press control was so pervasive in the major cities and provinces of France at the beginning of the war that "the censorship took great care to filter all the news related to the local situation so well that the way that the Toulouse people reacted to the drastic change in their habits and the conditions of existence barely appeared in the local press."\(^{13}\) Consistently throughout the war, the French press complained of military censorship. *Le Croix*, the right-of-center catholic paper that supported the war effort, periodically left sections of its front page blank with a notice that the censor had exercised its authority to suppress numerous communiqués.\(^{14}\)

Prior to the war, *L'Action française* cloaked its conservatism with the traditional connection between the monarchy and the church. Charles Maurras, who supported the restoration of the monarchy, defended the socialist's anti-clerical influence in French government and denounced the Separation Law of 1905 which disconnected the church with the official functions of the state. The most influential catholic paper in France, *Le Croix*, was politically aligned with the radical nationalists.\(^{15}\) Its editorial position, directed by Paul Feron-Vrau\(^{16}\) in 1916, was similar to that of *L'Action française*.

The French press was not immune from printing sensational reports concerning the uprising. Among the information reported by *Le Croix*, which had no basis in fact, was that the British authorities he discovered large reserves of German manufactured

---


\(^{12}\) ibid. p.21.


\(^{14}\) 'Aujourd'hui, la censure exige la suppression de deux de nos articles: . . . ' (Le Croix, 2 May 1916, p.1.)

\(^{15}\) *Le Croix* was founded in 1883 and by 1896 had established a national circulation of 180,000. (Larkin, Maurice. *Church and State after the Dreyfus Affair*. Macmillan Press, London, 1974. p.67.)

\(^{16}\) Paul Feron-Vrau was born in Lille on 17 May 1864 and attended Jesuit schools. He criticised the separation of the church and state through his paper. (D'Amat, Roman, ed. *Dictionnaire de Biographie Française*, Tome Treizieme, Librairie Letouzey et Ane, Paris, 1975. p.1059.)
ammunition and another ship that had been captured near Cork, containing a hundred machine guns. Fantastic reports abounded in the French press (apparently reproductions of English rumors) that Austrian officers had been active in the Dublin suburb of Ballsbridge manufacturing bombs and that they were currently incarcerated in Dublin Castle.17

Le Croix and the conservative paper, L'Echo reported Pope Benedict's hope that the rebellion would come to a quick end and that peace would be restored. A telegram to the Archbishop of Armagh, was returned, these papers wrote, with the message that the "military and civil authorities crushed the insurrection and returned Ireland to order and tranquillity."18 The Pope was pleased at the lack of involvement of Irish priests in the actual fighting. "The loyalism of the mass of the Irish Catholics since the beginning of the war has caused the Vatican satisfaction; one can therefore make sure that the Pope will unite with eagerness the English government's efforts to crush the insurrection and return tranquillity to Ireland."19 L'Echo apparently believed that Pope Benedict supported their position and was willing to denounce his neutral standing.

L'Action française was founded in 1899 as a nationalist paper with the goal of creating a new royalist political party.20 In 1908, Léon Daudet and Charles Maurras made L'Action a daily. Editors Daudet21 and Maurras guided the paper through the war.22 Daudet was credited with most of the editorial work during the war but the driving ideological force of L'Action, since its inception, had been the rabid nationalist Charles Maurras. Maurras formulated the political ideology of 'integral nationalism', the French anti-Semitic, anti-clerical forerunner of the fascism of the 1920s and 30s.23 During the Dreyfus affair, L'Action became the most vociferous propounder of French nationalism. However, during World War One, the paper ceased its criticism of the Republic for sake of the war effort (union sacrée).24

---

17 Le Croix, 9 May 1916, p.7 These stories were common throughout the initial reportage of the rebellion. (Edwards, O.Dudley and Fergus Pyle. 1916: The Easter Rising, MacGibbon & Kee, London, 1968. Appendix II, p.254.)
18 L'Echo, 3 May 1916, p.1; Le Croix, 4 May 1916, p.1.
19 L'Echo, 29 April 1916, p.1
From the beginning of the rebellion, *L'Action française* determined that the rebellion had been created in Germany in order to divert Britain's attention from the war.\(^{25}\) One casualty of the Easter Rebellion, the paper surmised, was the ability to impose conscription upon Ireland.\(^{26}\) The remainder of the coverage of Daudet's paper simply reproduced reports from English newspapers such as the *Times* and *Daily Mail*.

The conservative paper, *L'Echo* was founded in 1883 as a nationalist organ.\(^{27}\) Henri and Paul Simond edited it during the war, and Maurice Barrès\(^{28}\) contributed numerous articles and illustrations to the paper.\(^{29}\) *L'Echo* described the Sinn Fein movement initially as one that was not violent. Its history of the movement characterized Sinn Fein as part of a cultural renaissance that was committed to nationalist ends and headed by Arthur Griffith and Eoin MacNeill. Griffith's newspaper, *Sinn Fein*, became the voice of this cultural movement. However, the paper explained, Sinn Fein became infiltrated with individuals who advocated violent methods of creating an independent Ireland. At the beginning of the war, when it became apparent that Mr. John Redmond commanded the allegiance of the Irish Volunteers, a small section broke off in opposition to the Irish Parliamentary Party (I.P.P.) leader's support of the British war effort. This group, along with members of Connolly's Irish Citizen Army, was mistakenly lumped together under the designation of Sinn Fein. Shortly before the uprising the Citizen Army and the Irish Volunteers joined forces and acted upon their violent proclamations. *L'Echo* provided its readers with a short history of the Sinn Fein and Irish Citizen Army movements. The article concluded with the assertion that their faith and cause of liberty were misguided and would only end in the death and imprisonment of its followers.\(^{30}\)

The French papers had asserted in April and May 1916 that the rebellion was partly the fault of a neglectful British administration in Ireland. Jean Herbette.\(^{31}\) *L'Echo's*
correspondent, reasoned that Birrell’s acquiescence towards rebellious activities such as open drilling and marching was necessary because any other policy would have started a rebellion at an earlier date. However the paper blamed Birrell for not being in communication with his administration in Dublin and losing touch with the undercurrents of rebellion as he spent too much of his time in London. The conclusions of the Royal Commission on the Irish Rebellion reaffirmed L’Echo’s previous assertion that Birrell’s apathy toward nascent revolutionary movements and lack of suppression encouraged Sinn Fein and the Citizen Army to rebel. L’Echo’s editorial writer Jean Herbette, placed the responsibility for the rising on the German government. However, he understood that the Ulstermen (a minority in Ireland) created a situation wherein lawlessness could continue in the country.

The paper reported that John Redmond stated that the rebellion was plotted in the United States by a group of German supporters. Redmond asserted that Germany organized and funded the plot. The papers’ evidence of German complicity in the rebellion was an assertion from the New York Times that Irish-Americans were well aware of the planning of the uprising and the time when it would be carried out. In addition, the paper reproduced an article from a Turkish newspaper that their German allies had reported that militarily Ireland was ready for an uprising. This Turkish newspaper article was dated 10 April 1916, and the official report originated in Berlin.

The French preoccupation with Irish-American political power was central to the importance placed upon the Irish uprising. It was feared that the German propaganda machine would cause the Irish-Americans to delay or extinguish any attempt by Americans to enter on the allied side. L’Echo reminded its readers that German plots to stir up trouble had occurred in many places: India, Canada, Transvaal, the United States and now in Ireland. German intrigue in the United States could have led, it was feared, to pressure by Irish-American politicians to urge the entrance of America into the war against Britain and to aid Ireland in its pursuit of independence. The French had demonstrated concern that the American reaction would keep them out of the war. Reporting from Geneva, L’Echo produced a report concerning German-Irish relations in the United States. The paper reported a meeting of the New York Irish to proclaim that Ireland should be considered a “belligerent state and central powers ally.” They thanked Germany for the assistance rendered during the Irish rebellion and “have even compared this assistance with that

---

32 L’Echo, 27 April 1916, p.1.
33 L’Echo, 4 May 1916, p.1.
35 L’Echo, 27 April 1916, p.1.
36 L’Echo, 30 April 1916, p.4.
which France gave in the eighteenth century to the insurrection" of the American colonists.37

*L'Echo* estimated that at least 250,000 expatriate Irish (many of whom had settled in Scotland or England) were fighting for the Allied armies. Ireland, whom the French paper refers to as a nation that has always been a friend to France, had provided approximately a half million soldiers to the Allied war effort, and despite the rebellion was a loyal supporter of the United Kingdom. However, several factors began to strain Irish support in the southern portion of the island. Primarily the inability of the British ministers to deliver home rule to a united Ireland, severely tested this loyalty. Irish volunteers in the British army dropped significantly following the uprising. Most of this failure to draw Irish recruits can be attributed to the fact that by 1916 Ireland had sent the bulk of these young Irishmen willing to volunteer and that war weariness was settling in. Moreover, the repression by Sir John Maxwell of the rebellion, and the fact that a large proportion of those arrested had not even participated in the uprising, was not a wise recruiting tactic.38

*L'Echo* made a great deal out of John Dillon's agitation in the House of Commons. The deputy leader of the I.P.P. openly criticized Sir John Maxwell’s bloody and repressive regime in Ireland. Mr. Dillon told the House of Commons that even his seventeen-year-old son had decided to enroll in the army, but after being insulted by British officers in Ireland, he decided against enlistment. Meanwhile the leader of the I.P.P., John Redmond, sat silently as his colleague criticized the British suppression of the rebellion.39

The conservative *Le Figaro* held a similar view of the cause of the Easter Rebellion. H. de Villemessant founded *Le Figaro* in 1854.40 The paper reflected the right-wing leanings of its editors, the writers Alfred Capus41 and Robert de Flers. The editorial writer for *Le Figaro*, by the nom de plume 'The Iron Mask', was concerned that the French needed to keep America in the allied camp. The editorial recounted the German plots in America, South Africa, India and Canada to incite rebellion and disrupt the British

---

war effort. The Irish rebellion was characterized as another failed insurrection that was fomented by Germany.42

Lloyd George's43 appointment as chief mediator in the Irish negotiations was hailed by Le Figaro's editorial writer A. Fitz-Maurice (obviously a man of Irish ancestry) as a wise move, because Lloyd George was a Welsh politician who was respected by conservatives and liberals.44 However, near the end of June the French papers were pessimistic that Lloyd George's solution to the Irish question would be successful. Their main concerns were the separation of Ulster from the rest of the island and consequently the protection of the large Catholic population in the North.45 Support for Sinn Fein had not waned and in contrast appeared to be strengthening. As reported in Le Matin, despite a ban upon public demonstrations in Dublin, a procession of 2000 men protested the continuation of martial law, acclaimed the Irish Republic and mourned the executions of the rebel leaders.46 The assurance that Home Rule would temporarily exclude Ulster and that legislative independence of Ireland from Britain would be immediately implemented did not impress the French papers as a solution to the Irish question. Fitz-Maurice understood the negotiations to be a mere finger in the dike, and the temporary compromise would have to be addressed following the war.47

Le Matin48 was founded in 1883 as an independent republican paper edited by Gaston Leroux. Leroux, the author of the Phantom of the Opera, was an accomplished journalist and romantic playwright. As a journalist for Le Matin he was well traveled and acquainted with European politics, especially following his travels to Berlin and St. Petersburg.49 Le Matin asserted that the Germans had little expectation for the success of the Easter Rising. The lack of meaningful German assistance seemed to confirm this assertion. That tacit support, the papers opined, "was to constrict and discredit the English ministry." In the same report the Prussian War Minister is reported to have hoped to send a hundred German soldiers under the direction of "a capable German officer." The

---

42 "Since the beginning of the war, the veritable demonic error of Germany consists in them underestimating their adversaries..." (Le Figaro, 27 April 1916, p.1.)
43 Interestingly, as Secretary of the Exchequer his actions were instrumental in creating the current Home Rule crisis. His budget was rejected by the House of Lords and the subsequent Parliament Bill of 1911 allowed for the Third Home Rule Bill to be placed onto the statute books because the House of Lords could not block its implementation, only delay its implementation.
44 Le Figaro, 7 May 1916, p.1.
46 Le Matin, 20 June 1916. p.3.
program was obviously rejected because of the fear that in the event of a failed rebellion the German Army's prestige would be harmed.\textsuperscript{50} If the bombing of Lowestoft was any coordinated effort, it was poorly planned: it took place on the wrong side of Britain to have any military value to the Irish whatsoever. The Germans realized this, of course, because the Lowestoft bombing, despite all of the analysis to the contrary, was not a German plot to cause a disruption of the British control of Ireland. In fact, the French papers were dismayed at how little the Germans had aided the Irish, a small boat filled with ineffective Russian rifles was hardly the precursor to a German invasion of the island.

\textit{Le Matin} at the beginning of the rebellion reported that the German press continued to give false reports to the Americans. The attempt was to raise the hopes of Irish-Americans and therefore stir up hatred for the British. "The German press begins to attend to the Irish business. Prudently it knows that the traitor bribed by Berlin has been taken and fears a final fiasco. Nevertheless, by its comments, it attempts to sow the agitation among the Irish of America and defiance of neutrals. ... It adds to the news some details, for example, the mutiny of a part of the garrison of Dublin. It wants to make one believe that there are riots not only in Ireland, but also in London even. The teutonic propaganda takes the opportunity to spread improbable accounts of riots that would even spread to Trafalgar Square."\textsuperscript{51} \textit{Le Matin} was extremely well informed about domestic American affairs and that the United States already knew of the plans for an insurrection in Ireland after the American secret service had confiscated the papers of Wolff von Igel, the German 'military attaché' in New York. "... From a telegram from New York, the United Press learns from Washington that papers seized from von Igel, attaché to the German embassy, had contained details of plots on Dublin."\textsuperscript{52} The American government intervened in the case of Jeremiah Lynch, former Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, after he was convicted of participating in the uprising, in order to keep him from being executed.\textsuperscript{53} The Easter rebellion had a dramatic effect on the American opinion concerning the British promise to deliver Home Rule. The French understood that the specific issue that concerned most Americans was the extent to which the British suppressed the uprising.\textsuperscript{54}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{50} \textit{Le Matin}, 14 May 1916, p.3.; \textit{Le Croix}, 15 May 1916, p.7
\item \textsuperscript{51} \textit{Le Matin}, 28 April 1916, p.1.
\item \textsuperscript{52} \textit{Le Matin}, 29 April 1916, p.3.
\item \textsuperscript{53} \textit{Le Matin}, 21 May 1916, p.3.
\item \textsuperscript{54} "The French Ambassador, J.J. Jusserand, summarized Spring Rice's dispatch in a telegram to the French Ministry on May 21, adding that the rigorous measures in Ireland had caused the turn in American opinion. Jusserand, in another telegram on May 25, said that Lansing's mails note had been written to please the Irish Americans inflamed against Britain. "The executions in Ireland," Spring Rice wrote in his Telegram No. 477 of May 26. . . "have very greatly added to the bitterness of the Irish voters here, and any
\end{itemize}

\normalsize
The French were aware that British violation of American neutrality rights was causing grave American concern and that the one element in American domestic politics who could cause the United States to remain neutral during this war were the isolationist Irish-Americans. The French dismissed Casement's arms running as simply another 'puerile attempt' of the Germans to raise the hopes of radical Irish-Americans for the independence of Ireland. The French commentator feared that a rebellion might inflame those who chose to remain neutral and sway a majority of Irish-Americans to press their representatives to intervene in the matter. At this time, it must be pointed out, the French papers did not know that in fact an uprising was taking place in Ireland.55

Further calls for the immediate implementation of Home Rule criticized the continuation of the Viceregal colonial system in Ireland. Le Matin's analysis of the contemporary situation in Ireland revealed the Nationalist opposition to British governance. "A government of foreigners in Ireland cannot succeed since it is not at all sustained by National sentiment. Even a Viceroy and a Secretary of State as amenable to the aspirations of the majority of the Irish people as were Lord Wimborne and Mr. Birrell, have not been able to establish in Ireland a stable regime."56

L'Humanité offered little editorial commentary on the rebellion and simply reproduced reports from English papers. L'Humanité, a socialist journal, was founded and edited by Jean Jaurès from April 18, 1904 until his assassination by a demented nationalist, Raoul Villain on July 31, 1914.57 Jaurès attempted to influence French politicians to avoid war in the summer of 1914 but his efforts were in vain.58 L'Humanité continued its separatist tradition after Jaurès' assassination and remained a pacifist organ during the war.59 An interesting article appeared on 27 July describing Casement as a man (from 1889 to 1913) who was interested in the consolidation and development of the British Empire, not its destruction, which is the opposite view of many

---

55 "The idea of sowing the rebellion by sending a similar individual with a loaded ammunition ship, was all simply comical. But one hoped obviously to create incidents that Teutonic propaganda could have then largely exploited. The final purpose was not to help Ireland, but to stir up the Irish of America. Irish immigrants in the new continent have never consented to create a partnership with the German-Americans. If Casement had succeeded, it would have made them believe that a real revolution had flared in their homeland." (Le Matin, 26 April 1916, p.1.)

56 Le Matin, 14 May 1916, p.3.


French papers who asserted that he was a convert to German militarism as early as the end of the South African War.60

The French press was fairly united in their condemnation of Sir Roger Casement as an agent of the German government and traitor to the British Government. L'Echo reported the capture of Sir Roger Casement on April 25. He was described as a traitor and the "ancient consul who betrayed his country." Casement believed that as an Irishman being tried in English courts, it was certain that he could not receive a fair trial. A short history of Casement's career was printed as much to educate the French readers about the case as to associate him with Germany's inciting of rebellion. In the press, Casement's culpability was not questioned, simply stated.61 The socialist La Dépêche de Toulouse62 took the opportunity to deprecate Sir Roger Casement's humanitarian work in the Belgian Congo, going so far as to say that Sir Roger Casement, during the time period of 1901-1906, was a de facto "Germanophile." Sir Roger Casement's associate in the Congo Reform Association, Mr. E.D. Morel, published anti-French accusations that France was in the habit of torturing Negroes. According to the leftist Le Dépêche's reports, the extended purpose of these diatribes against France and Belgium was the expectation that a discredited King Leopold would be denounced as a colonial tyrant, and England and Germany would therefore be able to divide the Congo between them.63 Le Croix reported that Sir Roger Casement was already well known in Belgium. As a consular for the Congo Reform Association he uncovered human rights abuses in the region around Boma, the capital of the Belgian Congo. The paper asserted that he was in fact an agent for the Germans who had been eyeing the region for takeover.64

A second purpose of the Casement escapade, the paper maintained, was not only to create an uprising in Ireland but also to upset the Irish in America. The French press was concerned with the effect that an uprising or other German intrigues involving the Irish would have upon Irish-Americans. Much German propaganda was circulated in America at the beginning of the war concerning British neglect in Ireland and the long history of Anglo-Irish difficulties had been reprinted in American papers. Le Croix commented on the German press' reportage of the uprising, namely, that the extent of the uprising and its importance was exaggerated. The catholic Kölnische Volkszeitung

60 L'Humanité, 24 July 1916, p.3.
63 La Dépêche, 12 May 1916, p.1.
64 Le Croix, 27 April 1916, p.2.
(Popular Gazette of Cologne) commented that a dead Casement would "constitute a danger infinitely greater for England than a live Casement." While the Munich press opined that Casement's capture would undoubtedly result in his execution, the paper consoled Casement's associates with the realization that Casement's death will be for the highest ideal. Le Croix sneered that this high ideal was nothing more than treason.

Not surprisingly, the French press reaction to the Easter Rising was dictated by the current status of the Anglo-French conduct of the war. French newspapers whether socialist, nationalist, conservative, catholic or independent saw the predicament of France in much the same way: Britain needed to provide more of its share of the manpower and nothing must be allowed to alienate the United States of America.

The Easter Rising, at least the probability of an Irish insurrection, was predicted in the French press two weeks prior to its outbreak on the strengths of reports from Germany's Turkish allies and the discovery of the plans for an Irish uprising among the papers of Wolff von Igel. With the rebellion, fear of the loss of the contribution of Ireland's volunteers to the British contingent, suddenly became a possibility for the French. Even before the harsh British repression of the rising there was a sharp decline in Irish enlistment. The failure of the Lloyd George initiative to implement home rule led the French to predict a further weakening of Irish support.

Among the most widely read socialist newspapers in France were the L'Humanité and La Dépêche de Toulouse. They drew particular attention to the role of Casement as a German agent. Their disdain for Casement included the deprecation of his humanitarian activities in the Belgian Congo. These papers believed that at the turn of the century Casement was already a German agent employed to file false reports about Belgian atrocities and implicating French colonials. La Dépêche was the only socialist organ to cast an eye toward the effect of the rebellion on Irish-American sentiment. It opined that Irish-American political strength might at the least prolong America's neutrality and at the worst pressures the American government to enter into a war against Britain.

Among a few newspapers with an independent editorial policy, Le Matin was prominent. Le Matin did not give credence to the assertion that Germany had a major role in the origins of the Irish uprising. Germany did not supply weapons of any consequence, did not provide troops or officers, and did not coordinate a Zeppelin bombing to support the insurgents. The only advantage that accrued to Germany was the opportunity to engage in a propaganda operation complete with numerous false reports of Irish success designed to influence American opinion. At best, Casement was nothing

---

65 Le Croix, 2 May 1916, p.1.
more than a gunrunner for the Germans. *Le Matin* saw only one significant consequence to the rising. It doomed home rule: a significant setback to favourable Anglo-Irish relations that was a necessity if Irish contribution to the war was to be secured.

Chief among the nationalist newspaper was *L'Action française*, a French paper that had promoted the ascendancy of the French monarchy. For this organ, Germany and Irish-Americans had fomented the rebellion, as they were the only true source of funding for the operation. The rebellion had the expected result for the Germans; a British garrison diverted to control Ireland meant its absence from the western front. Lastly, the rebellion meant that conscription already applied to Great Britain would not be extended to Ireland.

Two conservative newspapers, *L'Echo* and *Le Figaro*, had similar editorial responses in relation to the Irish uprising. Both placed the cause of the rebellion at the feet of the Germans. The Easter Rebellion was simply another German intrigue as had been fomented previously in South Africa, Canada, and India. Sinn Fein's role in the uprising was diminished: they were misguided dupes allowed to march and drill by a neglectful Castle administration. Both papers also indicted that the primary consequence of the rebellion was its destruction of the prospects for home rule. Irish-American hatred of England was resurrected which equated to the promotion of American neutrality.

The catholic press as represented by *Le Croix*, placed the responsibility for the rising solely on Germany's intrigue for propaganda value. False reports of large caches of German ammunition and a second ship with one hundred machine guns were circulated within its pages. *Le Croix* reproduced Pope Benedict's message to the Archbishop of Armagh at the height of the rebellion.  

67 *Le Croix* assumed that the Pope urged Archbishop Logue to support the military in its efforts to suppress the insurrection and restore peace.

---

67 Cardinal Logue was sent a telegram "requesting information as to the situation and expressing his hopes that that noble and dear country should be spared further sanguinary conflicts." (Miller, David W. *Church, State and Nation in Ireland 1898-1921*. Gill and Macmillan, Dublin, 1973. p.323.)
From their initial defeat at the Battle of the Marne (September 1914) until the Easter Rising of 1916, the German military had been involved in a war of attrition on the western front. It had become obvious that their latest attempt at breaking through the French lines at Verdun, while bleeding the French army white, was not going to be the decisive turning point of the war. While the Germans did not sustain as many casualties as did the French, they could not replace them either.  

The British blockade was already being felt at home, and there was little chance that the German navy would be able to break it as the Battle of the Jutland would prove in early June. Therefore, the Germans resorted to submarine warfare careful not to inflame American opinion and force them into the war. Covert warfare, however, could be fought on many fronts. Already the Germans had encouraged or actively fomented rebellions in South Africa and India and aided German agents and Irish-Americans in an effort in blowing up Canada's Welland Canal. The Irish Rebellion was simply one of many German attempts to disrupt the British war effort which on the grand scale of the war turned out to be little more than a distraction from the carnage on the western front but, for the Irish, a defining point in their history.

The Germans had little to lose by aiding Irish separatists in Dublin. If the Dublin rebels were successful in the revolt, it would surely cause Britain to divert troops from the western front. In fact, Germany had very little to do with the actual planning of the rebellion. The Germans sent Casement back to Ireland with nothing more than a boatload of obsolete Russian rifles. If the rebels were to fail as the Germans believed they would, and if the British authorities suppressed the rebellion with undue severity, then the Germans hoped to achieve a propaganda victory in their fight to keep the United States out of the war. This fact proved to have a profound effect upon the desire to strike a blow against the British Empire in Ireland. The Irish Republican Brotherhood, true to the old adage that England's difficulty is Ireland's opportunity, used the European conflict as an opportunity to strike a blow for Ireland's independence.

In 1916, there was no other nation more eager than Germany to aid in this cause but not because the German had any real sympathy for Irish republicanism. (Throughout its history, Ireland had sought military help from other European nations for its independence from England. Spain and France had been the two European nations that

---

1 By the end of March there were 89,000 French and 81,607 German casualties at Verdun. (Gilbert, Martin. The First World War: A Complete Story. Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1994. p.237.)
had lent the most support for Ireland's rebellions.\(^2\) German princes had lent minor support to Ireland dating back to 1487 when 2000 German soldiers under the leadership of the pretender Lambert Simnel began an unsuccessful struggle for the English crown.)

From the beginning of the war, the Germans had allied with Irish-Americans who sought to use the war as an opportunity to strike for Ireland's freedom. The Germans and the Irish Republican Brotherhood had many powerful allies in their struggle for independence. In the United States there was a largely sympathetic Irish-American population eager to see home rule implemented in Ireland during the war. Much to the dismay of the British government there existed an 'Irish nation' beyond the grasp of the British navy. Sir William Harcourt, the UK Home Secretary from 1880 to 1885, had echoed this sentiment. The neglect that the Irish people had suffered under the laissez-faire administration of Lord John Russell (1846-1852) during the famine had led to the great migration from Ireland to (mainly) the shores of the United States. In some fashion, the British were reaping this poor harvest in 1916 from an Irish-American population who were hostile to American involvement in the war and specifically on the side of the British. This anti-British sentiment found fertile ground with many American supporters who repeated the Anglophobia of American politics. Some time had past since this great migration, however, and much American assimilation had occurred to dull the Irish memory of the Great Famine, yet this bitter memory still left an enduring legacy. British observers of the American public were preoccupied with gauging to what extent this Anglophobia and Irish-American anti-English sentiment would translate into the American desire to remain neutral. Into this fray was thrown the executions of the Easter Rebellion leaders (and a few individuals whose role was actually minor in the uprising) in May 1916 which was another issue that continued to hamper relations between America and Britain. The Irish-Americans differed, however, as to the means of attaining an Irish nation. A minority led by the aging Irish Republican John Devoy advocated violence from the safety of a neutral America. The majority of Irish-Americans by the spring of 1916 still backed the Irish parliamentary leader, John Redmond, who had secured Home Rule for Ireland albeit one that was postponed until the Allies might defeat Imperial Germany.

Germany had supplied the Irish Republican Brotherhood and their Irish-American Clan-na-Gael counterparts with powerful allies as well. The German ambassador to the United States, Count Johann von Bernsdorff, supported the efforts of Irish-American Republicans to foment a rebellion in Ireland during the war. Germany's assistance in this political intrigue ranged from German members of the foreign staff such as auxiliaries like

Franz von Papen and Wolff von Igel, to the Austrian Ambassador Constantin Dumba (who had been expelled from the US in 1915 for unneutral activities), and to individuals in the offices of the Amerika-Hamburg Line. These German and Austrian spies had been pursuing not only support for an Irish rebellion but had since the beginning of the war been attempting to disrupt the Canadian war effort by attempting to destroy the locks of the Welland Canal connecting Lake Erie to Lake Ontario.

As soon as the guns of August 1914 had blasted on the Western Front, the Irish Republican Brotherhood, supported by their German and American allies, sent Sir Roger Casement on a mission to gather the resources with which to start an Irish rebellion. Sir Roger Casement's vision of recruiting a brigade composed of Irish prisoners of war in German prison camps to fight in Ireland was in the end almost completely unsuccessful. The Northcliffe press and T. St. John Gaffney supplied two differing accounts of Irish prisoner-of-war support for the brigade. The British press developed the idea that Sir Roger Casement's scheme was not only treasonous but also entirely farcical. According to the British account of Sir Roger Casement's recruitment at Lemberg prisoner of war camp, the Irish soldiers, upon hearing this proposal for the 'Irish Brigade', had to be restrained by their German guards from physically harming the Irish patriot. Moreover reports during the trial of Sir Roger Casement in June and July 1916, were circulated stating that not only were these Irish prisoners of war mistreated following their refusal to join the 'Irish Brigade' but also were deprived of their daily rations. That many allied prisoners of war were fed better than some German citizens is a fact that need not concern us at this point, but it is clear that the successful British blockade played its part in this scenario. T. St. John Gaffney (who was the American Consul-General in Munich until his dismissal in 1916) supplied the conflicting account of Sir Roger Casement's treatment by the Irish prisoners of war. Interestingly, Mr. Gaffney defended the Belgian government against the charges of human rights abuses lodged by Sir Roger Casement following his investigation of native working conditions in the Belgian Congo in 1904 (Casement's allegations stated that the Belgians had been amputating the hands of the Congolese natives who were disruptive).3 The American Consul's opinion concerning Sir Roger Casement's mission was that wherever the distinguished Irishman traveled in Germany, he was treated with kindness and respect by the German citizens and by the Irish prisoners of war.4


4 "He said that shortly after he official declaration of the Government on the Irish question appeared in the German papers, he received numerous letters from Irish soldiers who were imprisoned in different German camps approving of his action and roundly denouncing the British government. Several of these
In 1914 and again in 1915, German and Irish agents had attempted to bomb the Welland Canal in southern Ontario to disrupt the Canadian war effort for Great Britain. Knowledge of these activities and the exact details were confiscated by American authorities from the 'office' of Wolff von Igel in 1916. The Germans kept meticulous details of their activities during the war, and the Americans, and later their British allies, were the main recipients of the German breach of security. This discovery was of supreme importance to the British in anticipating the arrival of an arms ship from Germany destined for Irish rebels in Dublin by Easter 1916. The arrest of Casement was therefore a foregone conclusion, as the American authorities knew better than the Irish rebels when Sir Roger Casement and the gunrunning ship The Aud would arrive off the coast of Tralee. One criticism that was introduced by the American press, citing Wilson's perceived pro-British leanings was that the American authorities shared the information confiscated from von Igel's office with British naval intelligence. This criticism nevertheless was a moot point because the British knew all of this information prior to Casement's arrest as they had broken the German code at the beginning of the war and had been intercepting most telegraphic communication between Germany and the United States.

Moreover, the captain of The Aud, Karl Spindler had suspected that the British already knew of his presence in Tralee Bay. Had it not been for the disguise of The Aud as a Norwegian trawler and the unprofessional and naive behavior of the English captain of the Chatter II who, when invited onto the Norwegian trawler even drank whisky with the German captain, (and all before breakfast), Captain Spindler would have been immediately convinced that he was falling into a trap.\(^5\) Circumstances allowed Captain Spindler to believe that he could break through the English blockade off the coast of

---

Ireland. Firstly, while the English most certainly knew of the arrival of an arms ship, they did not know exactly when it was to arrive. When Professor Eoin MacNeil in Dublin called off the rebellion, the English authorities had assumed that it was for the failure of Sir Roger Casement to persuade the German government to provide arms and troops. Secondly, Captain Spindler had gone to great lengths to avoid the British North Sea Squadron, even to the extent of sailing north of the Arctic Circle, the Faroe Islands and far to the west and north of Ireland. With 'favorable' weather conditions to hide the covert activity (namely fog and inclement weather), the British ships which had been patrolling the west of Ireland had little idea from what direction The Aud would come.6

The German press during the war, in a fashion similar to that of the allied press, was censored by a combination of imposed government censorship and self-regulated bias by the newspaper editors. In many ways the German press was less inaccurate than the Allied press in describing the victories at the front. Newspaper editors were especially sensitive to the charge by the Allies that the German war machine had committed numerous human rights abuses, especially in Belgium. That the German army committed crimes against the Belgian people there is substantial evidence, however, the British propaganda machine had exaggerated the extent of the war atrocities. Nevertheless, the troubled relations between England and Ireland throughout the past 700 years were recounted with vigor in the German press, and there was certainly a wealth of English atrocities committed against the Irish.

Both Allied and Central powers manipulated their press during the Great War. Often the written word coming off the press did not correspond with the realities at the front. "The news that emanated from World War I came to be so widely denounced, so severely censored," that little from the press could have been believed.7 "Post-World War I critics centered their attack on two points: on censorship, which for the most part they accepted as a necessity during the war itself, but which many felt all along to be unreasonably severe and often stupidly directed; and on the spirit of the news, which they came to regard as naive and warped by idealistic fervor only after the sophisticated post-bellum era had set in."8 German newspaper editors were cognizant of strict military and government censorship in which little criticism of the war effort would be tolerated.

Many of the German dailies, since they could not place their correspondents in enemy territory, relied upon reports from neutral nations concerning news about their enemies. Much of the information gathered from England that was reproduced in the

---

German papers was from reports printed in neutral Holland’s newspapers. For example, the *Berliner Tageblatt* and Vorwärts reproduced reports from the Dutch newspaper *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*. The *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*’s correspondents in London reported commentary from many English papers such as the ‘ultra-conservative’ *Morning Post* that ascribed “the Irish riots to the fact (that) the Liberal government played with fire” (an allusion to Home Rule). We may congratulate us and Ireland that the bill was not implemented when war was declared.” In addition, Northcliffe’s *Daily Mail* stressed that “Redmond and his supporters remained loyal to England.”

However the Germans were concerned that the military censorship would produce a false impression as to the extent of the rebellion. The *Berliner Tageblatt* supplied an easy remedy to this problem in advocating the British government to allow American correspondents to travel to Ireland and free from censorship formulate an opinion for themselves.

When the German people first read of the Easter Rebellion in the national dailies, the papers needed to educate their readers concerning the role of the Sinn Fein movement in Ireland. The German editors had to rely upon fragmented reports from Dublin as did the remainder of the world and as a result whatever factual information eluded the British military censor was supplied in general by the British. Initial German reports conveyed the hope that the Easter Rising would be successful and that it was supported by the majority of the Irish people throughout the island. When it became apparent, however, (by May 3rd or 4th) that the rebellion had not achieved its objectives, the Germans moderated their expectations of a successful coup. The British military, led by General Maxwell, provided the German propaganda apparatus with numerous examples of human rights’ abuses. Since the war being waged at this point concerning Ireland was one of words, the obvious target of this propaganda campaign was towards neutral America. After the executions of the Easter Rising’s insurgent leaders, the Germans utilized this event to its fullest potential. Interestingly, the case of Sir Roger Casement was of little value to the German press by August 1916. Casement’s trial and sentence of execution was of supreme propaganda value but it had run its course by late 1916. In addition, on 27 July the Germans executed Captain Fryatt and any moral ground that might have been gained by manipulation of the Casement affair was lost. In the German press, the

9 *Berliner Tageblatt* 28 April 1916, morning edition, no pagination.
10 *Berliner Tageblatt* 28 April 1916, morning edition, no pagination.
11 *Berliner Tageblatt*, 27 April 1916, p.4.
Casement affair gained considerable attention. However, the American press, while reporting on Fryatt's execution, had little editorial commentary. The Fryatt-Casement connection was not a concern for American readers.

The socialist press of which Vorwärts, the official newspaper of the Social Democratic Party, was not very critical of the German connection in the rising. Most German papers expressed the viewpoint that Germany's role in the planning and execution of the rebellion was minor. Vorwärts warned its readers about believing the English press reports concerning the Irish uprising. "Actuality one has still to be careful about the reports from Reuters, the 'Times' and the 'Daily Mail' as they obviously follow a certain political intention. They are mainly intended to positively influence the Anglophile American population in favor of England. Therefore one can certainly expect that during the coming days the English capitalist press will tell all the well-known horror stories that they similarly told in 1871 about the Paris commune fighters and at the beginning of the current war in Belgium: the mutilations of English officers and soldiers, slaughtering of little children, terrible murdering and arson, looting, robbery from the museums, and etc."

Erroneously Vorwärts believed that the city center of Dublin was held by as many as 10-12,000 rebels and that they controlled the Bank of Ireland and Trinity College. The rebels did control at one time "two train stations in the center, St. Stephen's Green (sic), numerous public buildings, and the main Post Office." Vorwärts was correct in assuming that Trinity College was a garrison vital to the fighting, however, the students holding the college sided with the British not the Irish rebels. The socialist paper believed that brawling students would naturally be protesting against the government.

When the full extent of the executions of the insurgent leaders in Dublin reached Germany, newspapers such as the Berliner Tageblatt and Vorwärts commented that with the exception of Ulster the executions would surely accelerate the introduction of Home Rule for the Irish people. The executions had proven that the old regime in Ireland was a failure and that "a foreign government cannot succeed in Ireland (that) is not rooted in Irish soil." The Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant stated that the purpose of Prime Minister Asquith's mission to Ireland was to implement Home Rule for the island with the

12 Vorwärts had a pre-war circulation of 165,000 but its circulation fell to around 70,000 during the war. This drop in circulation was not due to fundamental opposition to the war, but to a split in the socialist party between some that supported the war effort and those who opposed it. (Fischer, Heinz-Deitrich (Hrsg.). Deutsche Zeitung des 17. bis 20. Jahrhunderts, Verlag Dokumentation, München, 1972. p.337,340.)
13 The German Social Democratic Party was divided between those socialists who supported the war effort, as did Vorwärts and those who sympathized with Karl Liebknecht who opposed the S.D.P.'s involvement.
exclusion of Ulster. "The introduction of Home Rule in Ireland with special measures in Ulster is as certain as the sun rising tomorrow."\textsuperscript{15}

The German papers during July 1916 focused their reporting on Casement's trial and appeal and speculated whether Casement would be executed. Vorwärts expected the Americans to intervene on the side of Casement.\textsuperscript{16} The second issue that preoccupied the German editors was the arguments for the implementation of Home Rule. Immediate expectation that Lloyd George was going to be able to solve the Irish Question soon dwindled and Lloyd George's promises during the negotiations remained unfulfilled.

The Liberal German papers in this study are the Berliner Tageblatt, Frankfurter Zeitung, and the Vossische Zeitung. Georg Bernhard was the editor of the Vossische Zeitung in 1916.\textsuperscript{17} He was born on October 20, 1875 in Berlin and founded the Berliner Morgenpost. From the end of 1913, he was an editor of the Vossische Zeitung. In 1914 he joined with Hermann Bachman and they were directors (owners) of the paper. From 1920-1930 he was the editor-in-chief of the Vossische Zeitung. Politically he supported the Social Democratic Party which was formed in 1863 but continued to be a revisionist socialist.\textsuperscript{18}

The military court of John Maxwell responsible for the execution of the rebel leaders, was compared in a deliberate reference to the Spanish Duke de Alba's so-called "Blood Court" in Brussels during the Dutch Wars of Independence. The headline in which the executions were reported, "Blood Court Against Sinn Fein" began the article explaining the fates of Joseph Plunkett, Edward Daly and Willie Pearse. The German paper erroneously believed Connolly had died in the fighting.\textsuperscript{19}

In an effort to educate the German people regarding the Sinn Fein movement, the Berliner Tageblatt printed two paragraphs in the April 26th issue explaining that the English had been trying to suppress news from Ireland about opposition groups to the Irish Parliamentary Party. Rudolph Mosse founded the Berliner Tageblatt in 1871 and by 1914 it had a circulation of approximately 230,000 in 1914.\textsuperscript{20} The editor of the

\textsuperscript{15} Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant, Berliner Tageblatt, May 14, 1916, no pagination- morning edition.
\textsuperscript{16} Vorwärts, 22 July 1916, p.3.
\textsuperscript{17} The circulation of the Vossische Zeitung was approximately 60,000 in 1916. (Becker, Werner. Demokratie des Sozialen Rechts: Die politische Haltung der Frankfurter Zeitung, der Vossischen Zeitung und des Berliner Tageblatts 1918-1924. Musterschmidt, Gottingen, 1971. p.22.)
\textsuperscript{18} (Neue Deutsche Biographie, Zweiter Band, Duncker & Humblot, Berlin, 1953. pp.117-118.)
\textsuperscript{19} Vossische Zeitung, 6 May 1916, p.4.
\textsuperscript{20} By the end of the war, its circulation rose to approximately 275,000, the second largest circulation of any German paper. (Becker, Werner. Demokratie des Sozialen Rechts: Die politische Haltung der Frankfurter Zeitung, der Vossischen Zeitung und des Berliner Tageblatts 1918-1924. Musterschmidt, Gottingen, 1971. p.41-42,44.)
Berliner Tageblatt during the war was Theodor Wolff. Censorship of news from Ireland had led to speculation on the part of the German authorities as to the extent of the rebellion. Why else, they reasoned, would the English suppress information if the rebellion had not been successful? British censorship of the Sinn Fein movement had been severe, and only until the uprising did many of the German people hear of the movement. Sinn Fein had gained popularity in Ireland during the war for opposing the recruiting efforts of John Redmond. In fact, Sinn Fein had increased its membership following the threat of extending compulsory recruiting to Ireland. The Berliner Tageblatt was a victim of censorship during this period: it did not publish from Wednesday, 2 August through Sunday, 6 August 1916.

The Frankfurter Zeitung was founded by Leopold Sonneman and Heinrich Bernard Rosenthal who wanted to create a paper to express the political liberalism of southern Germany. During the war, its circulation reached approximately 100,000. The Irish uprising supplied the Germans with much ammunition in the propaganda battle. While the British press was eager to cry foul of the Germans in Belgium, the Germans returned the favor concerning Ireland. While the British were painting the Irish as unswerving supporters of the Allied war effort, the German press used the uprising as an opportunity to express the reality that Irish-British relations throughout the war were hardly cordial. The Frankfurter Zeitung expressed the belief that 700 years of misrule in Ireland was a predetermining factor for the uprising. The Frankfurter Zeitung noted a certain irony in the fact that the British were blaming the uprising on German intrigue.

21 Wolff was also instrumental in founding the German Democratic Party at the end of the war. (Schwarz, Gotthart. Theodor Wolff und das „Berliner Tageblatt“ Eine liberale Stimme in der deutschen Politik 1906-1933. J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1968. p.79.)

22 “Since the beginning of the war English censorship has carefully suppressed all governmental reports about the mood in Ireland. Only recently have some reports about the growth of the "Sinn Fein" movement come over the channel. Therefore the events in Dublin which were reported in the House of Commons were surprising. "Sinn Fein" is not only an established organization, but also a party with a quite revolutionary agenda. It has not only been a strong opponent of Redmond's home-rule policies, but also has been fighting for complete independence of Ireland from English rule and exploitation. The behavior of the official Irish nationalist party during the war, and especially the (very unsuccessful) appearance of Redmond as a recruiter for the hated English army no doubt brought many new supporters to "Sinn Fein". Even those Irish who are not openly supporting them (Sinn Fein) are, nonetheless, strongly sympathetic with them and especially with their (Sinn Fein's) point of view, namely, that England's unjust war does not concern the Irish people. The magnitude of the uprising in the capital and the need to strengthen the garrison with troops from outside in order to put down the uprising, is met with the approval of large segments of the population (for Sinn Fein).” (Berliner Tageblatt, 26 April 1916, p.1.)


24 The liberal paper was founded by Leopold Sonnemann in 1866. For a good history of the Frankfurter Zeitung prior to the war see Geschichte der Frankfurter Zeitung, Volksausgabe. Frankfurt am Main, 1911. pp.144-145.
while it should have been plain to any unbiased observer that 700 years of English abuse of the Irish people was the underlying cause.\textsuperscript{25}

Many German papers, while supporting the rebellion, distanced themselves from responsibility for fomenting insurrection. The \textit{Leipziger Tageblatt} stated that "Our hearts are with them, but of course it is foolish to say that the Irish rebellion was fomented by us."\textsuperscript{26} Many German papers did not overestimate the chance for the uprising’s success. The Socialiist \textit{Leipziger Volkszeitung} warned its readers: "The news reports from England indicate that the uprising in Dublin is more serious than the government has admitted so far. But one has to be cautious to jump to conclusions about the political situation in England."\textsuperscript{27} However, many German newspapers hoped that the rebellion would be a success. The Germans until 4 May made the most of any hopeful sign, and maintained that the prospects for military success looked excellent. The \textit{Berliner Tageblatt}, for example, declared on 29 April that there was "no doubt that Redmond’s supporters are fighting in large numbers in the ranks of the so-called Sinn Feiners."\textsuperscript{28} The \textit{Berliner Tageblatt} surmised that censorship was masking a people’s rebellion in the "Emerald Island."

On May 2, 1916, when the German papers began reporting about the failure of the uprising, a number of common themes began to emerge in the \textit{Frankfurter Zeitung}. Primarily the Irish relationship with England continued to be one of a colony fighting for its independence. The emergency of the war could not mask the tumultuous relationship between the two islands. Similarly, the rebellion represented the point at which most Irishmen began to doubt the English sincerity of granting Home Rule. The resumption of violence as the primary method of obtaining independence had begun. Secondarily the English opinion that the uprising was planned and financed by German gold was discredited. "With these expressions, the English officials will convince nobody, least the Irishmen themselves." The Germans characterized the British justification for entering the war and their subsequent propaganda as protectors of civilization as hypocritical. The German press scoffed at the notion that the British were fighting to protect the Belgians/small nations from aggression. "The statements of the press show clearly how marginal is the truth of the assertion that England fights against Germany for the freedom of suppressed people." Thirdly, sympathy for the rebels’ cause of expelling the English tyrant from Ireland was shared by Germany as well as the United States (numbered among

\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Frankfurter Zeitung}, 26 April 1916, p.1.
\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Glasgow Herald}, 1 May 1916, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Leipziger Volkszeitung-Organ for the Interest of the Entire Working People}, 28 April 1916, p. 2.
its "citizens are Irishmen whose fathers had to flee from the country oppressed by foreign tyranny".) Fourthly, the French began expressing their sympathy for their Catholic brethren in Ireland. This commentary expressed the hope that the Irish rebellion would weaken the Entente.29

In the opinion of the Berliner Tageblatt, the Times was calling for the dismissals of Augustine Birrell and the "political washout" Viceroy Lord Wimborne in an effort to dismantle the coalition government and discredit the liberal policy in Ireland. The German paper's prediction of the future of the island following this rebellion was actually very astute.30

The impasse concerning the implementation of Home Rule which had been created by the inability of the Nationalists and the Unionists to agree upon the details of the legislation, was to be solved by Lloyd George whom Asquith appointed in late May, 1916. Great expectations arose with the appointment of "the Welsh Wizard." The German papers reported that the English press expected Lloyd George to solve the problem of Irish administration, because the Welshman had sympathy for the Celtic race.31

From the end of June through July until his execution in early August 1916, the Casement trial dominated the German papers concerning Irish news from England about Ireland. Vorwärts and the Berliner Tageblatt reproduced Reuters' reports stating that Casement did not commit high treason in England but outside of the Empire and that he was not officially supported by Germany.32 The wisdom of executing Sir Roger Casement was doubted in the liberal paper's article entitled 'A English judgement about Sir Roger Casement' from a German translation of the English socialist New Statesman.

"Sir Roger Casement is a highly romantic and in many respects a noble figure. His cleverness may sometimes fail but his patriotism, his high personal abilities and his altruistic devotion to what he sees as his duty are beyond doubt. He is just made of the material of which saints and legends are made. . . . For the moment, the ridiculous

30 "But even if peace is superficially restored with gunpowder and lead (bullets), what will be won politically? Nothing. The people of Ireland know now that even the achievement of its self-administration even in a limited sense as the liberal Home Rule policy is promising, has become a utopia. The liberal era is dead and the Home Rule Bill is dead. What will be in the future is a Curzon-Carson ministry. On its agenda would be the solution of the Irish problem with machine guns. Is it a wonder then that instead of striving for the unattainable goal of self rule the thought of achieving Irish independence from the hated British rule through violence is becoming increasingly attractive. The government knows full well the mood there. It was manifested when Ireland was exempted from the first, limited military service bill." (Berliner Tageblatt, 29 April 1916, no pagination.)
melodrama of his landing on the west coast of Ireland may hold back his name from the calendar (for the saints) but the laughter will last only as long as he is living. Alive he may be a harmless Don Quijote (sic). Dead he will be a saint and a new Irish grievance against England, who for Sinn Fein would be worth thousands of soldiers. No doubt that he is guilty of treason . . . . Actually, we were not surprised to hear that Casement’s friends are doubting his mental health.”

The Center Party was represented by the catholic Kölnische Volkszeitung that was edited by Julius Bachem, a writer and politician. The initial proposals provided by Lloyd George concerning the Irish settlement alarmed Catholic bishops from Ulster. The Kölnische Volkszeitung reproduced the opinion of the Catholic Bishop of Londonderry and Cardinal Logue that the proposals were unacceptable to them. “It would be much better to be another fifty years under English rule that accepting these proposals.” The Irish bishops understood correctly that the temporary exclusion of the Ulster counties would have been permanent. Foreshadowing the violence in Ulster that has plagued Northern Ireland since its creation, the bishops stated that they were concerned about the future of Catholics within a Protestant enclave. “Both sides, Catholic and Protestants, are fearing a damaging of the interests of their own minority in the separated part, respectively in the bigger part of Ireland . . . It casts interesting spotlights on the intentions of the British government trying to solve the Irish question.

A front-page report in the Kölnische Volkszeitung opined that Casement had been hanged “like a common criminal! In the rest of civilized Europe criminals are not hanged even if they are sentenced to death. But in England it is different, at least when it comes to Roger Casement.” The paper did not sympathize with his actions and was fully aware of the ramifications of his acts and the penalty when he was apprehended. “He did not want and did not expect mercy.” Now Ireland had another martyr to add to its long list of those patriots who fought for Irish independence from England. “That is what Casement wanted . . . Casement is dying at the moment when Home Rule for Ireland seems to be

---

33 This is a remarkably accurate rendering of the New Statesman’s opinion. (New Statesman, 29 April 1916, p.74.; Berliner Tageblatt, 1 May 1916, no pagination.)

34 Bachem was born on July 2, 1845 in the Ruhr Valley, he died January 22, 1918 in Köln. He worked as a writer for the Kölnische Volkszeitung; together with Hermann Cardauns he became associated in 1914 with the political sections involved with government’s rights and social questions. He was a representative in Cologne, from 1875-1890 and then 1876-1891 he was also a delegate to the national government. Thereafter he worked and lived in the Rhineland. He was the government consultant about the Catholic crisis (Kulturkampf). After that he was associated with the Görres Company. His political stance was centrist. (Neue Deutsche Biographie, Erster Band, Duncker & Humblot, Berlin, 1952, pp.493-494)

35 Logue stated forcefully in opposition to Lloyd George’s proposals that “It would be infinitely better to remain as we are for 50 years to come, under English rule, than to accept these proposals.” (Miller, David W. Church, State and Nation in Ireland 1898-1921, Gill and Macmillan, Dublin, 1973. p.337.)

more distant than ever.” The article concluded with the sentiment that this “noble of nations will continue to struggle and produce more martyrs for the cause.”

The conservative papers in this study are the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, and the *Preussische Kreuz-Zeitung*. The *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* was purchased by the Prussian Chancellor Otto von Bismarck in 1862 and became the official voice of the Prussian state and later the German Reich. In an editorial entitled “England’s Irish Disease” written for the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* by Erich Lilienthal, the history of relations between England and Ireland were recounted.

---

39 “The history of the "non-militaristic England" consists of a chain of wars of conquest and military suppressions of rebels and the unwillingly submission of peoples for the benefit of the English dominion. England was always liberal towards its colonies and dominions when it was convinced that the colonies were dependent on the mainland, and it was always cruel and brutal when the interest of the subservient peoples went in another direction than the interest of the mainland.

The bigger the danger threatening England from one of its colonies the more ruthless the English reacted. During the Indian uprising, during the suppression of the Egyptian riots and on many other occasions England has never taken anything humanitarian into its considerations. But against no other country has England been so cruel than against the oldest colony in its history, against Ireland. Ireland is much too close to England and it is much too dangerous to be permanently dealt with only under colonial considerations. For almost 8 centuries England has been plundering the Irish Island. In every decade of this long period bigger and smaller riots have been suppressed and still today the Irish mother is fearing her noisy children with the name Cromwell.

Ireland, one of the most fertile countries of the world, had in 1845 8,295,061 inhabitants and in 1901 4,456,546. In 1817 1,500,000 were sick with typhoid fever due to hunger. Before the onset of the great famine in 1846 Ireland had about 8 million inhabitants, but could well have fed 16 million if it had been allowed to use its surplus of wheat, barley, and oats for itself. But the grain had to be sold abroad in order to pay rent to the English landlords. But as the potato, the only food left to the Irish, failed in 1846, 1847, 1848, and the rent had to be paid to England under all conditions, the Irish peasants had no choice than to sell their grain and simply to starve to death. Almost a quarter of the population died of hunger, typhoid fever, or immigrated to America. The aftermath of these conditions was of course that the hatred toward the English grew immensely and broke out in innumerable revolts and anarchic attacks. The giant increase in the number of emigrants to America during this and the following years contributed to the fact that today there are almost as many Irish in the United States as in Ireland itself. The Irish emigrated with only a few exceptions, not to the British colonies, but to the United States where there existed a very unfriendly feeling toward England which of course was strengthened by the Irish immigrants.

For centuries, the Irish continued to hope for liberation from the English yoke and in 1861 they founded the Sinn Fein league in America which made preparations for an Irish revolution. When the tension between United States and England reached its peak during the war of secession, it seemed to the Irish the best time to strike; and in 1865 the Irish Republic could have been declared in Dublin. But the plan was betrayed and failed. Nonetheless, intense and bloody fighting occurred in and around Dublin where innumerable attacks occurred.

Now the machine guns are again rattled by the English infantry on the old, blood-soaked soil of Dublin. Hurriedly England increased the Irish garrison. Around Dublin there are a lot of English troops, and Asquith is telling the parliament that the whole matter will amount to nothing and that peace will be restored soon. After almost one thousand years, these are the remaining spasms of Irish independence. England is still hated by the Irish as it has been for centuries. Once again hope has been revived in Irish souls for freedom from English domination in order that Ireland could grow to become a strong and free society which would live by the talents and gifts lying in its people and soil.

The Irish, who today came together as the Sinn Feiners, have certainly shown not for the last time that Ireland is alive now and wants to exist in the future.” (*Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 29 April 1916 p.2.)
Judge Pagenkopf opined in a letter to the editor of the *Nordeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* entitled "Ireland and Land Reform" that the rebellion militarily may have been limited to the city of Dublin, and not even supported by the majority of Dubliners, however, the majority of the Irish people in the southern part of the country had shown that their support for the English war effort was less than enthusiastic. The letter continues with a brief history of the unsuccessful Irish land reform since Gladstone stating that the gap between the rich land-owning English and the majority of the Irish people is a political question that Home Rule has yet to address. If this political situation continues to be ignored by the English, Judge Pagenkopf inferred that more revolts would lie in the future.  

The *Preussische Kreuzzeitung* was founded and financed by Otto von Bismarck and he periodically contributed articles to the paper. When Sir Roger Casement was captured, few German newspapers expected him to escape the hangman's noose. The *Preussische Kreuzzeitung* reproduced a report from the *Hanover Courier* that offered the opinion that Sir Roger Casement would meet the same fate as Karl Hans Lody. Casement did not: Lody was executed by a firing squad, Casement was hanged. In fact it was believed erroneously that Casement shared the same cell previously occupied by Lody in the Tower of London. Casement was interned at Brixton Prison and while being interrogated by Basil Thomson and Captain Hall, he was confined for a period in the Tower until he was transferred back to Brixton Prison on May 15th. The *Preussische Kreuzzeitung* continued to summarize Casement's humanitarian efforts in the Congo and Putamayo, Brazil, taking pleasure in the fact that a decorated and famous knight had committed treason against the King. The explanation was offered that Casement had been...

---

40 "The bloody revolt in Ireland which is not at all restricted to Dublin as the English government and press tried to make us believe, but is spreading to various places in the interior of the country, has drawn the general interest once again to the emerald island and the sad domestic situation. Even though the events since the beginning of the war: the Casement case, the low response to recruitment, and the exclusion of Ireland from general military conscription, have shown how little sympathies for England are in Ireland, the open revolt has shown the world now that a significant part of the Irish people is directly hostile, and the arrogant England which wants to rule over all people is not secure in its own house. As in the present war, England has always masterly understood how to cover its own true intentions and its own interests, pursued with brutal violence, under the guise of humanity, morality, and religion." (Nordeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung, 11 June 1916, p. 2.)


42 Karl Hans Lody was sent to the United Kingdom to collect information concerning the Grand Fleet at Rosyth Naval Base in the Firth of Forth and in London to ascertain the extent of the British anti-aircraft defenses. He was arrested on October 2, 1914 in route to Queenstown. Lody was found guilty of spying for the German government and executed by firing squad in November 1914. (Andrew, Christopher. *Her Majesty's Secret Service: The Making of the British Intelligence Community*, Viking Penguin, New York, 1986, pp. 183-84.)

fighting injustice in Africa and South America and quite naturally Casement was fighting to free Ireland from English tyranny.44

The 3 May 1916 special edition Preussische Kreuzzeitung carried a long report concerning the rebellion stating that the Irish government was naive to not expect a rebellion. The threat to Home Rule posed by Sir Edward Carson and his English conservative allies alarmed the radical members of nationalist Ireland who rebelled in the hope of delivering a united and independent Ireland. The remainder of the article proceeded to give a short history of the Sinn Fein movement and an even longer one highlighting the turbulent 700-year relationship between Great Britain and Ireland. Events such as the Protestant Plantation in northeastern Ireland, Oliver Cromwell’s execution of the Irish people (quoted from Thomas Babington Macaulay), the implementation of the punitive Penal Laws and the attempt by Daniel O’Connell to repeal these laws, the deaths of a million from starvation and disease during the 1840’s, and the emigration of millions from 1850 to 1911 were described in detail to illustrate the historical cruelty inflicted upon the Irish people by the British. Not only was the Irish nation nearly destroyed by this cruelty and neglect, but also the Gaelic culture of Ireland was nearly erased. The revival of the Irish language that had nearly been replaced by the English language was at the forefront of Irish intellectual efforts to conserve Irish “literature, art, music, and customs.”

“Never has a country been more shamelessly and mercilessly exploited by another to which it belongs politically than Ireland (has been) by the English parliament, which (in turn) has been taken over by the interests of the rich.” The article concludes that current Irish politics are just a continuation of this disgrace. English hypocrisy is clear: while it claims to fight on behalf of preserving the autonomy of the small nations (Belgium and Serbia), England has yet to grant Ireland any semblance of political equality. “Truly an irony on Grey’s words in his Parliament speech from 3 August 1914 (is): ‘Ireland is the only bright light in this dreadful situation.’”45

“The German press, after 4 May, characteristically and wisely dropped their discussion of the military prowess of the insurgents and the extent of their popular support. Instead, the executed and imprisoned rebels won quick canonization as martyrs.”46 The Preussische Kreuzzeitung characterized the insurgents’ strategy of fighting in fixed positions against superior English forces and artillery as “insanity” and

44 Preussische Kreuzzeitung, 29 April 1916. p.3 - morning edition.
45 Article entitled “As England Treated Ireland” (Preussische Kreuzzeitung, 3 May 1916, p.1.)
expressed the belief that the only way to defeat the English garrisoned in Ireland was to use guerrilla tactics.47

The Germans hoped to use the executions in Dublin as a way to keep the United States from entering the war. The Preussische Kreuzzeitung educated its readers as to the extent that the Irish-German coalition in the United States was utilizing this event as propaganda to that end. The war had forged an interesting alliance between the Irish and Germans in America. One section of Irish-Americans was dedicated to the Irish Parliamentary Party led by Redmond while others supported Germany in their fight against England. The paper cites Jeremiah O'Leary's American Truth Society as an organization created to counter English war propaganda.48

The Preussische Kreuzzeitung suggested that the timing of Roger Casement's execution could not have been worse. At a time when it appeared that Redmond and his moderate nationalists were ready to compromise on Home Rule, the execution would only serve to complicate the political situation by inflaming those sections of his party that were more radical than the Irish Parliamentary leader. The article continued to explain that the English feared a living Casement while Captain Fryatt's execution was understandable and forthright.49

Vorwärts and the Leipziger Tageblatt are examples of German socialist organs with limited discussions about the origins and consequences of the Irish rebellion. The papers denied that the German military was guilty of any complicity with the rebels in the instigation of the rebellion. Nonetheless, they were sympathetic to the rebels' motives. These papers represented the socialists' view that the executions would accelerate the implementation of home rule. While they expected Casement to be executed, the socialist writers anticipated that Irish-Americans would pressure their government to intervene with the British authorities on his behalf.

The Berliner Tageblatt, Frankfurter Zeitung, and the Vossische Zeitung represented the liberal German press. Like their socialist counterparts, they also denied that the Irish uprising was the result of German intrigue, rather they pointed to over 700 years of British oppression as a far more logical explanation. In perhaps the strongest denunciation of the rebels' executions the liberal press compared the British to the Spanish Duke de Alba and his notorious 'Council of Blood.' The liberal press came to Birrell's defence. In the opinion of the Berliner Tageblatt, Birrell's and Wimborne's dismissal was a simple ruse to make them scapegoats for the failure of the coalition government.

48 Preussische Kreuzzeitung, 16 May 1916, p.1
They also believed that the executions would ensure the immediate implementation of home rule and expressed sympathy for the Lloyd George initiatives. Casement, on the other hand, could not be convicted of treason because Germany in no way supported him. The centrist *Kölnische Volkszeitung* indicated that the home rule proposals were unacceptable to catholic clerics because it did not guarantee the safety of Catholics in Ulster.

The *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* and the *Preussische Kreuzzeitung* agreed with their liberal counterparts that the Irish rebellion was the culmination of 700 years of British oppression. The conservative papers defended the Fryatt execution and expected Casement to share the same fate. They recounted Casement's humanitarian exploits in the Congo and South America and as he fought for justice on behalf of other oppressed peoples he was fighting now for his own.

Overall, the German press sought to exploit the British suppression of the rebellion and the execution of Roger Casement in particular in order to prove the righteousness of the German cause in the war. The 1916 uprising proved to be a unifying episode for Germany and an improvement of their morale. Germans were united in their call to paint the British government as hypocrites, exposing the claim that Britain was fighting this European war on behalf of small defenseless nations against German imperialism.

Interestingly, the German government did not use the historical parallel of the De Wet rebellion50 in South Africa and the 1916 rebellion for propaganda purposes although the similarities of an oppressed minority fighting British imperialism were as applicable as was the plight of Casement.

---

50 Refer to the South African section.
Chapter IX- The Dominions’ Press Reaction to the Easter Rebellion, 
Australia, New Zealand and the Republic of South Africa

The first Irish Catholics to migrate to Australia were convicts who came with the first fleet in 1788. Despite their initial characterization as Australian convicts, the Irish in Australia made great strides in becoming prominent figures in the country's politics and religious hierarchy. For example, Irish Catholics were prominent in the Australian Labor Party and shaped Australian labour politics. The Australian Irish rose to the highest positions within the numerous states. For example, Charles Gavan Duffy became Victoria's premier in 1871. In addition, the Australian Irish dominated the Australian Catholic Church. Cardinal Moran, the first Australian cardinal, was one of many Irish clergymen who dominated Australia's bishoprics. Irish-Australians preferred to be considered as Australians primarily and Irish immigrants secondarily. However, the Irish, upon immigration or transportation to this British colony, were cognizant of their minority status culturally, religiously, and economically within a society whose citizens were predominantly protestant and of British descent. Apart from those Irish Protestants from Ulster, who were instrumental in shaping Australian political life prior to Easter 1916, the Australian Irish were overwhelmingly working class, poorly educated, and Catholic. Their social status reflected the common perception that the Catholic Irish were a cultural group apart from the Protestant ascendancy in Australia and the majority of Australians. There were comparatively few Irish emigrants going to Australia. Only 4% of Irishmen and women immigrated to Australia in the forty-year period prior to the Easter rising. Apart from the three hundred Irish who rebelled at Castle Hill near Sydney in 1804, many of whom were members or sympathizers of the United Irishmen who had been deported for their part in the unsuccessful 1798 revolt, the vast majority of Irish immigrants settled peaceably in Australia.

There were 1.1 million Catholics in Australia in 1933 and they were overwhelmingly of Irish descent. In 1916, there were no accurate data about the proportion of Irish people living in Australia, however, it is certain that the majority of

3 Ned Kelly, who was hanged on November 11, 1880 for his part in killing numerous police officers in Victoria and robbing banks, was a folk-hero to many Irish-Australians in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries who were fighting discrimination, poverty and police brutality (many lawmen were Irish immigrants as well), and was a reminder that Irish Catholics did have a long journey to travel for acceptance. (Brown, Max. Ned Kelly: Australian Son. Angus & Robertson, London, 1987.)
Catholics were Irish.5 The significant minority of Germans living in Australia in 1916 tended to emigrate from protestant areas and the massive influx of Italians and other southern European Catholics, was not to occur until after World War Two. Accordingly, the words "catholic" and "Irish" were often synonymous in Australia in 1916.

Historically, Irish-Australians have therefore dominated the Catholic laity and clergy of Australia prior to the 1940s. From colonial times, the English Roman Catholic hierarchy sought to appoint English Benedictines as bishops. However by the late nineteenth century, many Australian bishops were of Irish descent. For example, the first Australian cardinal, Patrick Francis Moran,6 the third Archbishop of Sydney who died in 1911, was the nephew of the Archbishop of Dublin, Paul Cardinal Cullen who died in 1878. Indeed, Cullen's friends and relatives dotted the bishoprics of the British Empire. Among the influential Irish-born Australian bishops during World War One were Patrick Joseph Clune, Archbishop of Perth since 1913,7 Daniel Mannix,8 and James Duhig.9

The Australian Catholic Church played a fundamental role in shaping the attitudes of the Irish immigrant. Unfortunately for the Australian Irish, many of the prejudices of the Old World were transplanted to the new. The mass of Irish emigrants leaving Ireland during the late 1840s and early 1850s did so under extreme duress, and the enduring legacy of this forced emigration made "the descendents of those who landed in America hereditary enemies of Great Britain."10 Since relatively few of the Irish who emigrated during the 'Great Famine' came to Australia, the legacy of the forced migration upon the psyche of the Australian Irish was less intense as compared to that of the Irish-American. However, in 1916, the negative effects of the migration and the lasting impression of British neglect were never far from the Irish-Australian's consciousness. In the nation's newspapers, the "tale of their wrongs was told over and over again in the pages of the Catholic Advocate (Melbourne) and of Freeman's Journal (Sydney). This had the

5 According to the 1911 census, there were 921,000 Catholics out of a total of 4,500,000 Australians. (Robson, L.L., Australia and The Great War: 1914-1918, Macmillan, Melbourne, 1969. p.12.)
9 Duhig was born in Limerick and ordained in 1896 at the Irish College in Rome. He was Coadjutor Archbishop of Brisbane until 1917 when he became Archbishop. (Who Was Who, vol.6, 1961-1970, Adam & Charles Black, London, 1972 p.323.)
effect of reminding the Irish-Australian from where they came and more importantly under what conditions they immigrated.\textsuperscript{11}

Prior to 1916, Australian political affairs had been heavily influenced by Catholic Irish politicians, such as Charles Gavan Duffy,\textsuperscript{12} and as a political force they were most powerful in New South Wales, Victoria, and Queensland.\textsuperscript{13} Not surprisingly, since the Australian Irish had predominantly come from the lower social and economic strata of Australian society, the Australian Catholic church and Australian Irish leaders encouraged them to form labour unions and support the Australian Labor Party.

The Irish-Australians continually contested the establishment of British domination over them in Australia. The creation of Catholic schools wholly independent from state funding, and the avoidance of the potential pitfalls that state funding might have upon the curricula of the schools, were the most evident expressions of this struggle. In the words of Australian historian Patrick O'Farrell, "the contest between Irish-oriented minority and English-oriented majority, far from being divisive, became the main unifying principle of Australian history. What held this country's people together, and a constructive and productive social and political relationship, was a continuing debate, always vigorous, often bitter, and sometimes even violent, about what kind of country this should be."\textsuperscript{14} Australia was to become a more egalitarian, pluralistic, and open society than the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.\textsuperscript{15}

Australia's religious community in 1916 resembled an inverted pyramid as the majority of the citizens were Anglican, the next largest group were Presbyterian and almost all of the rest were Catholic. The Irish Catholic was thus in a minority creating an identity that felt threatened by the protestant majority. In Canada, in contrast, the plurality was Catholic and therefore created a contrasting identity for the Irish in that Dominion. As a result, the Protestant community in Australia tended to influence religious issues more than the Catholic. Religion had tended to be a divisive factor in Australian society.\textsuperscript{16}

\begin{enumerate}
\item Gavan Duffy was editor (with Thomas Davis and John Blake Dillon) of the Irish nationalist publication \textit{The Nation}. He immigrated to Australia in 1855 and helped found the \textit{Catholic Advocate}. In 1871 he became Prime Minister of Victoria. (Nairn, Bede, Geoffrey Serle and Russel Ward. \textit{Australian Dictionary of Biography.} 1851-1890, vol.4, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1972, pp.109-113.)
\item O'Farrell, Patrick. \textit{The Irish in Australia.} New South Wales University Press, Kensington, 1987, p.11.
\item The sectarian nature of Australian society was due in part to the makeup of the immigrants. The Irish of Australia had generally been singled out as a disloyal section of society especially when religious conflicts arose. The secularization of primary schools in the 1870's represented one such sectarian outbreak in Australian history. Australian Catholics paid for their establishment of catholic schools. The
\end{enumerate}
While as a whole, Australian society was generally secularized, during the Easter rebellion and the two conscription crises in 1916-1917; religion and religious leaders were at the forefront of the debates.

The continuous issue that shaped the development of Australian society had in part their expression in the nation's press. By 1914, most of the national and provincial newspapers were overwhelmingly supportive of Australia's war effort, but numerous papers were indifferent to the war. Anti-imperialist newspapers such as the Sydney Bulletin strove to create an Australian identity separate from perceived British cultural stagnation. For example, the editor of the Bulletin, James Edmond, "failed to urge support for the war, noted that it was to the Kaiser's credit that he had kept the peace for twenty-six years, and expressed pity for him as a 'poor, misfortunate Old Young-Man-in-a Hurry ... all his life, a well-meaning mass of incongruous ambitions and scattered ideals.'" These comments did not please the majority of Australians or the Labor Government then in power. Henry Ernest Boote, editor of the Australian Worker opposed Australia's involvement in a European conflict. Boote's editorials in early August 1914 urged neutrality. When Australia entered the war, the labour newspaper declared against sending Australian soldiers to the battlefield. Urging that the war was a result of capitalist intrigues; 'military ambition, trade rivalry, high finance, the desire for territorial expansion and the lust for gold,' it believed Australia should not participate in such a fight. However, Boote's comments in 1914 did not represent the majority of Australians.

main reasons why Catholics paid to have their children educated in catholic schools was religious and cultural but economic factors also played a role. Since, as has been stated earlier, the Catholics of Australia were overwhelmingly Irish, it must also be pointed out that "the Catholic Church in Australia has been more Irish even than it was in America, more Irish than any church outside Ireland itself." (Clark, Colin. Australian Hopes and Fears. Hollis & Carter, London, 1958. p.196.)

17 However, on religion the Bulletin tended to unleash diatribes against all clergy of whatever denomination and also against religious notions of morality. The paper cannot be seen as friendly to the Roman Catholic Church.

18 Edmond was born in Glasgow, editor from 1903 to 1914. (Nairn, Bede and Geoffrey Serle, eds. Australian Dictionary of Biography, vol. 8, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1981. p.413.)


In 1914, Australians were wholeheartedly in favor of joining Britain in the allied cause. When Prime Minister William Hughes declared, 'The gravest crisis in our history is faced by a unified people,' he was echoing the common sentiment of the Australian populace. The Australian Irish shared the general euphoria after the declaration of war, but there were a number of events that concerned them. European war avoided a probable civil war in Ireland between the Nationalists and Unionists and delayed the implementation of Home Rule. Australian Irish response to the suspension of the Home Rule Act in 1914 for the duration of the war mirrored public opinion in southern Ireland. They were disappointed by the suspension of home rule, but events on mainland Europe in August 1914 caused Australian eyes to focus on the war.

The Australian Catholic Church was officially neutral as to the extent of Australia's continuing involvement. However, certain Catholic bishops were quick to voice their approval of Australia's declaration of war. Archbishop Robert William Spence of Adelaide supported the war and Archbishop Michael Kelly of Sydney became a vice-president of the conscriptionist Universal Service League. He appeared on the platform at recruiting meetings and said he was proud that Irishmen had rallied to the British flag.

The main organ of the Australian Catholic Church, the Catholic Press, was in favor of Australia's declaration of war against the Central Powers, in favor of Home Rule for Ireland, but opposed to compulsory overseas military service. Since the Catholic Press sympathized with the Labor Party, it encouraged its readers to fall in line behind the policies of Prime Minister Hughes until his expulsion in November 1916. The Catholic Press did not officially support the Labor Party, but since most of its readers were Irish Catholic and members of the laboring classes, this alignment was expedient.

It has been said of the Australian press that 'the American press is free, the British press is half free, (and) the Australian press is quarter free.' Many Australian newspaper articles written under the numerous censorship acts sometimes did not represent the views of the author. On October 28, 1914 a statute passed by the Australian parliament, the War Precautions Act, ensured that for the duration of the war the government had the ability to censor material being transmitted into the country and being printed in Australian newspapers. This act mirrored the British Defence of the Realm Act.

---

(D.O.R.A.) in that it was vague and caused some dissatisfaction with newspaper editors who were never quite sure what news was printable. However, the largest problem facing newspaper editors was the fact that by the time news from Europe reached Australia, the accuracy of the accounts was dubious. Australian historian L.L. Robson has noted that "in many cases the news from home and abroad bore little resemblance to the actual events and their implications." While this may be an overstatement, it is certain that the victories of the Allies in the war were stressed more than the defeats. While this may be a criticism of the Australian press, no belligerent's reportage during World War One was wholly true and objective. It seems that a genuine criticism of Australian censorship during the war was the complaint that 'blunders and inconsistencies' were common in the final written articles.

Censorship of the Australian press was not uniform and depended upon the political persuasion, level of circulation, and perceived threat towards the war effort. For example, anti-conscription papers such as the Australian Worker, the Barrier Daily Truth, and the Sydney Truth were sometimes affected by the government censors. However, during the first conscription crisis of 1916 even those newspapers in favor of conscription, most notably The Sun, complained of undue censorship of their material.

It was understood by the Australian press that the aim of censorship of the news from Ireland was to 'prevent neutral countries from receiving a false impression of events.' It was more likely that in the case of the Irish rebellion, British censorship was imposed to keep the Germans ignorant as to the extent of the uprising or to keep the Irish in Ireland or Britain from becoming involved. But censorship, more often than not, allowed rumor to be rampant in Australian dailies that the uprising was more widespread than was actually the case. At the beginning of the Easter Rebellion, Irish Secretary Augustine Birrell's statement in the House of Commons that the 'situation is well at hand,' was, of course, taking liberty with the truth. But it was important that Australians as well as other countries received a British impression of events. The conservative press, such as the Sydney Morning Herald or the Melbourne Age tended to reproduce British

---

27 This was true in Britain as well where censorship manipulated the press during 1914-18. (Robson, L.L. Australia and The Great War, 1914-1918. Macmillan, Melbourne, 1969, p.5.)
29 The paper was the voice of the Australian Workers' Union and did not support conscription. (Mayer, Henry. The Press in Australia, Lansdowne Press, Melbourne, 1964. p.27.)
31 ibid. p.254.
33 The Sydney Morning Herald was edited by T.W. Henry and had a circulation of approximately 100,000 throughout the war. (Mayer, Henry, The Press in Australia, Lansdowne Press, Melbourne, 1964. p.11.)
reports while the more radical newspapers, like the Bulletin were more critical of British censorship of the news concerning Ireland.\textsuperscript{35}

Many Australian newspaper editorials condemned the actions of the rebels in Dublin because it threatened home rule,\textsuperscript{36} or was treason against the Empire (especially since it appeared to be supported by Germany), and occurred during the struggle of civilization against the 'German Hun'. The Australian Irish were typical of the great majority of Australians in deploring the rebellion. However, the executions of the rebel leaders, imprisonment of their followers, and the continuance of martial law changed the Australian Irish expectation that home rule would be granted to Ireland. Two Referenda campaigns in 1916 and 1917 for the imposition of conscription for compulsory overseas service gave the Australian Irish the opportunity to voice their discontent concerning British rule in Ireland. The Australian Irish overwhelmingly rejected conscription in Australia for a variety of domestic reasons, yet the Easter Rebellion was in the forefront of their minds. This is not to say that the Australian Irish were disloyal Australians, in fact the Australian Irish viewed voting against conscription as the best course for Australia. Moreover, the Australian Irish believed they were voting as Australian citizens not as recent arrivals from Ireland.

When news of the uprising began appearing in the Australian press, influential and well-respected newspapers such as the Age and the Sydney Morning Herald were quick to condemn the uprising as futile. These papers made clear that the Australian Irish were not sympathetic to the actions of the Irish rebels. Indeed, the most extreme denunciations of the rebels in Dublin came from the Australian Irish. For example, the United Irish League of Melbourne cabled to Great Britain their support of the Irish Parliamentary Party and repudiation of the Sinn Fein rebels. The League was especially critical of the 'loafers' in Dublin whose Irish brothers were dying on the fields of Flanders while they stayed at home and tried to sabotage the war effort. "Brave Irish soldiers," the Age reported, "are dying at the front that their country may prosper. Their nobility of sacrifice should blame

\textsuperscript{34} The Age had a circulation of approximately 110,000 throughout the war. (Mayer, Henry, The Press in Australia, Lansdowne Press, Melbourne, 1964, p.11.)

\textsuperscript{35} "The Irish horror, which Berlin knew could have no real chance of success, is probably intended as a reply to numerous American Notes; and as such it must be sorrowfully admitted that it has a sporting chance of making the polite WILSON doubtful of the support of several millions of American-Irishmen whose natural instincts led them to favor the Allied cause. Obscured as the whole outlook is by the instructions of a dull War Office and the absurdities of the censorship, Australia knows enough now to realise that things have got very black." (Bulletin, 4 May 1916, p. 6.)

all wreckers of Ireland's future.37 More significantly for Australia as a whole, the League was quick to dispel the fears of the protestant majority that this rebellious spirit was representative of the Australian-Irish populace. In their opinion, the 'insignificant minority' of Sinn Feiners were destroying the peace and putting the promise of Home Rule in jeopardy. Most editorialists at the beginning of the uprising sought to educate the Australians to the 'real' enemy of the Irish and to place Ireland firmly within the hold of the Empire.38

The Lord Mayor of Melbourne, Sir David Valentine Hennessy, repeated the severe condemnation of the Sinn Feiners in Victoria.39 Hennessy restated the support of Australians to the war effort and their pride in being members of the British Empire.40

37 Age, 27 April 1916, p.6.
38 "We venture to predict that it will be found, when the present outbreak is suppressed, the rebels belong almost exclusively to the Sinn Fein Society. . . . These desperate fanatics are no more representative of the Irish people than the arch-murderer Deeming was of the good citizens of Victoria. We have no doubt but that true Irishmen and Irishwomen all over the world to-day will more passionately execrate the Dublin traitors than any of their Saxon kin. Nor do we doubt but that the people of Ireland now there resident will lend their eager assistance to crush the rising and to bring every Judas soul to book.

Not a true citizen of the Empire but will withhold from them the least scintilla of commiseration, or wish them naught but a stern jury and a short shrift, for they have betrayed their country in its hour of need, and done their utmost to inspirit Germany and to promote the cause of murderers of women." (Age, 27 April 1916, p.6.)

Sir,- The action of the Sin (sic) Fein Society, which represent only a small section of the Irish people, will arouse in every Irish heart a sense of horror and disgust unequalled since a few members of a secret society committed the Phoenix Park outrage, and murdered Burke and Cavendish. I can well remember the feeling in Ireland at that time, on the eve of a settlement of Irish question. The news had an effect I will never forget, and was regarded as a national calamity, with far-reaching consequences, and certain to be construed as the outcome of national feeling.

At the particular juncture, when the fortunes of Ireland as an integral portion of the British Empire are at stake, and the chivalrous feelings of a people proverbially sympathetic are aroused by the unspeakable horrors of German barbarity, I can well imagine how the generous heart of Ireland will reprobate the action of a few whose conduct would leave a lasting stain on her historic fame and heroic sacrifices in this terrible war. It would be an insult to our people to suggest either complicity in or sympathy with such a sad event. I am sure a few days will make abundantly clear the extent and insignificance of the event, and afford the Irish people at home and abroad an opportunity of showing in unmistakable terms their fidelity to duty and their resolute determination to prevent a few fanatics from sullying the national character and estranging the friendly relations created towards the Empire by the passage of better laws and the consummation of the legitimate and earnestly desired establishment of Home Rule for Ireland.

Yours, &c.,

JOSEPH McMAHON.
George-street, East Melbourne, 26th April." (Age, 27 April 1916, p.7.)

39 Born in Melbourne on 15 June 1858 to Irish parents from Waterford, Hennessy was a strong supporter of the war effort. "In 1912 he was elected lord mayor, remaining so for a record successive five terms. During World War I he distinguished himself as a 'superpatriot', appearing regularly on recruiting platforms ... Hennessy was knighted in 1915. ... He died suddenly of bronchial pneumonia on 16 June 1923." (Nairn, Bede and Geoffrey Serle, eds. Australian Dictionary of Biography, volume 9, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1983. pp.262-263.)
40 "FEELING IN VICTORIA.

THE LORD MAYOR OUTSPoken.

At the reception to Anzacs at the Town Hall yesterday the Lord Mayor was very outspoken in his denunciation of the Sinn Fein rising. Australians generally, he said, would deplore and deplore such a rising, which he quite believed had been engineered by the traitor Casement. Fast and furious justice
The Victoria Irish were one of the first to publish public support for the Irish soldiers on the front which were clear signs of the Irish people's support of the war effort.41 A day after the letter from N.M. O'Donnell42 was published voicing Irish sympathy for the Empire, the Age accused O'Donnell of being in league with Sinn Fein and desirous of severing Australia's connection with the Empire. It contrasted the opinions of the Irish rebels, who did not let the unifying sentiments of fighting a common enemy cloud their judgement of the British, with the Australian Catholic opinion that such men did not represent Ireland.43

It was hoped that the rebellion would not endanger home rule. One way to ensure that home rule would remain on the statute book, it was believed, was to show uncritical support for the Irish Parliamentary Party and to condemn strongly the rebellion. But,

should be meted out to the rebels; if he had his way he would tie millstones around their necks, and throw them into the sea. (Cheers.) Britlishers were proud of their flag, and the present was no time for dissension. He was glad to see that various Irish organisations in Victoria had repudiated the Sinn Fein. Victorians trusted that the leaders would speedily be brought to book and deported." (Age, 29 April 1916, p.7.)

41 "ATTITUDE OF VICTORIA IRISH. PROMPT REPUDICATION OF SINN FEIN REBELS."

It was decided by the United Irish League of Melbourne, at a hastily summoned meeting held at Celtic Club last evening, to cable the following message to Mr. John E. Redmond, the accredited leader of the Irish Race:

Redmond, Commons, London.
1. The Irish in Victoria view with abhorrence the outbreak in Dublin of futile and meaningless rebellion, and sympathize with the Irish National party in its cruel struggle against the criminal efforts of an insignificant minority to thwart the noble objects of peace and reconciliation which had almost been accomplished.
2. Such fanatics betray gross ingratitude for benefits Ierland (sic) received through long agitation and generosity of the Irish abroad, as well as for valuable help rendered by the British and other democracies.
3. Brave Irish soldiers are dying at the front that their country may prosper. Their nobility of sacrifice should blame all wreckers of Irelands future.
4. The guilt of this horrible bloodshed at Dublin be on the heads of the misguided leaders of the outbreak.

N.M. O'Donnell." (Age, 27 April 1916, p.6.)

42 O'Donnell was the President of the Celtic Club 1907-09 and organiser of Melbourne's Gaelic League. He remained a supporter of Redmond after the rebellion and was a moderate nationalist until his death in 1920. (Nairn, Bede and Geoffrey Serle, eds. Australian Dictionary of Biography, vol. 11, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1988, pp. 60-61.)

43 "SINN FEIN IN MELBOURNE.
A STARTLING ASSERTION.
That there are members of the Sinn Fein ("Ourselves") Society in Melbourne Dr. N.M. O'Donnell, of North Melbourne, has no doubt. He stated yesterday that he did not know such men personally, but he judged from remarks they had made, and of which he had learned, that their interests were in common with those of the Sinn Fein Society in Ireland. Such men dissociated themselves from any activities of Irish bodies in Melbourne, and constituted a small exclusive "nest." He knew of instances where men who were believed to have sympathies with the object of Sinn Feinism being asked to march in St. Patrick's day processions, but they refused on the grounds that the processionists stopped outside of Parliament House on the way to the Exhibition and sang God Save the King. Such men, however, could in no way be associated with Irishmen and the Irish cause. They were individuals who believed that no constitutional changes would ever be made in favor of Ireland, and who gave up all hope of Ireland ever receiving what they regarded as justice from the British Parliament." (Age, 28 April 1916, p.7.)
inevitably, blame was apportioned for the rebellion. According to the letters and editorials, the intrigues of the Unionists created an unstable environment in which rebellion was likely.**44**

---

44 "THE SINN FEIN REBELS.
ITS AIMS AND OBJECTS.
RELI OF FENIANISM.
BY P. W. G.

...From the moment the British Cabinet extended implied sanction to the arming of Ulster and the flouting of constituted authority it opened the way to all the latent elements of lawlessness and disorder in every extreme section of the populace to create a national conflagration. ... The one bright spot in regard to this latest disturbance is that it would command as little sympathy from the vast bulk of the Irish people as it did from the representatives of the United Irish League in Melbourne." (Age, 29 April 1916, p.4.)

"IRELAND IN THE WAR.

In order to estimate the outbreak in Dublin at its true importance it is necessary to go back to the last weeks of July, 1914, when negotiations were in progress between all the great Powers, and to contrast the opinions then held of Irish affairs with the actual record of the Irish people in this war. When that is done it is not difficult to justify both the optimism and the disappointment attributed to Mr. Birrell in our report of his statement in the House of Commons. The Dublin riots and the attempt at gun-running are serious incidents, because they show members of an irreconcilable sect of Irishmen have been able to conspire with each other and with the German Government to start a revolt by which they gained control of part of the capital, and might have been able to foment risings in other parts of the country. ... It is beyond question that the state of Ireland was one of the facts on which the German Government founded the belief that England would not enter the war. The Chancellor knew that his work of adjustment was not yet complete, but he believed, with his colleagues, that England had difficulties enough of her own to prevent her from helping her friends. He had before him the facts supplied by his own agents, by Sir Roger Casement, and by the gun-running which had been tried with success in the north and with less success in the south. The British newspapers were filled with grave warnings of disorder, the German newspapers, under the heading of the "Battle of Dublin," announced that for the second time within a year citizens of Dublin had lost their lives in conflict with the forces of the Crown, officers relying in the precedent of the American War of Independence, were resigning their commissions, the King himself in his invitation to the conference at Buckingham Palace had openly referred to the danger of civil war, and urged the necessity of avoiding disaster. We know how closely these events were watched in Berlin from references in the Belgian Grey Book, and from the presence of foreign representatives at reviews of the citizen army. We can imagine with what incredulity the Germans must have read Sir Edward Grey's statement that there would be no need to keep a single British soldier to keep order in Ireland or to guard the Irish coasts.

But neither he nor Mr. Redmond could have anticipated the enthusiasm with which Irishmen threw themselves into the cause of the Allies. It was not merely the knowledge that Home Rule was on the Statute Book that caused the rush of recruits, though Mr. Redmond felt himself trebly armed when he returned after fulfilling his undertaking on September 20, 1914. ... It is not to be suggested that recruiting in Ireland has gone on without interruption, or that Mr. Redmond has had a unanimous following as the champion of a united people. The old cry that "England's difficulty is Ireland's opportunity" has been repeated even outside the ranks of Sinn Fein. ... But nothing, not even the continued incapacity of the British authorities to understand the Irish character, could prevent Irishmen enlisting or the Irish regiments from covering themselves with glory. Almost every Irish regiment has suffered so severely that it has been reconstituted with the recruits of Mr. Redmond's campaign. The 2nd Munsters perished at Etreux on August 27, 1914; on December 22 a new 2nd Munsters was attacking trenches at Festubert, and on May 9, 1915, was the only "one in the brigade whose men succeeded in storming the enemy's breastworks." Australians will not forget how Irishmen fought at the Gallipoli landing, how the First Irish Division of the new army came under fire, and with them stormed the heights of Anafart without apprenticeship in trenches or experience of shells; nor will any Englishmen forget how the Inniskillings protected the retreat of the army in Salonica, and fell in their thousands at Lake Doiran. Of the way the newly-formed Irish Guards fought at Ypres the King has spoken in his St. Patrick's Day message. They showed that "the shamrock still stands for courage and loyalty and endurance in adversity." When it is remembered that Ireland has given more than a hundred thousand men like these, and that Irishmen have flocked to the colours from every district in England and every part of the dominions, we
When the Australian Press reported the first round of executions of the rebel ringleaders, the Australian Irish Community reverted to their mistrust of British rule. An added dimension complicating public perception of the executions was the fact that Australian citizens, including the Irish Catholics, felt that as members of the British Empire their voices should be listened to concerning the execution of the remaining rebel leaders and imposition of martial law. When the numerous telegraphs from the Australian Catholic Church pleading for clemency for the remaining rebels were ignored by British Prime Minister H. H. Asquith and General Maxwell in Dublin, the Australian Irish community reacted with a sense of betrayal. "It was the execution of the rebels which infuriated the Irish Catholics and brought about an almost total reversal of their sentiment towards Britain's war. To Irish Catholics everywhere the difference in treatment meted out to the Carsonites and that dealt to the Easter rebels was conclusive evidence that there were two laws, and that no matter how much the Irish might support Britain's war against Germany, Britain's attitude to Ireland was unchanged and unchangeable."45

Churchmen contributed their opinion to the debate. No one was to receive as much attention in Australia following the Easter Rebellion than the Irishman Daniel Mannix, who emigrated from Maynooth College, Antrim in 1912. Mannix, the Coadjutor Archbishop of Melbourne, quickly began voicing his opinion of British rule in Ireland (apparently far enough away from the British Isles to do so forcefully). His opinion of the uprising was on the surface denunciatory of the Sinn Feiners but he swiftly condemned the conspiracies and alleged traitorous activities of the Unionists in their gunrunning prior to the war. It was the Unionists who started the 'ball rolling' and therefore should have been punished. He touched a sensitive nerve by pointing out that the Liberal British government punished the Irish rebels while the 'traitors' in Ulster escaped without being brought to trial. Mannix stated that to condemn the extreme Nationalists while allowing the Unionists to break the law was a gross injustice. The culmination of this 'double standard' was the fact that two years prior to the uprising Unionist leader Sir Edward Carson was preaching sedition and by 1915 he was a member of the British Cabinet.

Catholic bishops, such as Archbishop Carr condemned the Easter Rebellion as "an outburst of madness, an anachronism and a crime."46 Even Daniel Mannix was initially

---

46 Sydney Morning Herald, 28 April 1916, p.7.
critical of the rebels' actions. However, he did not blame the Sinn Fein rebels for creating the climate of rebellion. The Unionists, and more specifically Sir Edward Carson, according to Mannix, openly defied the government's plan to implement Home Rule and therefore preceded Pearse and Connolly in rebellion. He condemned every section in Ireland as culpable: the Ulstermen, the Liberal Government, the Irish Parliamentary Party, the Conservative Party and the Sinn Feiners. In retrospect, his "snow-ball effect" theory was historically accurate but popular criticism focused on condemnation of the radical nationalists in Dublin. In West Melbourne at St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church, Daniel Mannix voiced his opinion that the agitation of Ulstermen from 1912-1914 led to rebellion in 1916.47

Dr. Mannix had witnessed first-hand the threats of civil war from Edward Carson and Protestant Ulstermen. His sympathies lay with the nationalists and the Irish Parliamentary Party. When the Easter Rebellion broke out in April 1916, he was determined that the Australian public knew who he felt was guilty. In his view, the Liberal government was mainly to blame for allowing the Ulstermen to preach sedition that led to the uprising. He took an early opportunity to remind people that the British had laid the seeds of discontent.48

When Mannix heard the news of the executions of the rebels he sobbed to a worker in the presbytery, "Michael, they've shot some of them."49 However, the sympathy he felt towards the rebels caused great alarm to the majority of Australians. Readers of the Argus in 1916 noted that Mannix was told to "shut up in wartime." The

47 "I wish to trespass on your time [at the Children of Mary's Floral Fete] to say a few words on two subjects that are in the minds of you all. It is needless for me to say how deeply pained I am by what has just happened in Ireland, and how grieved I am for the lives that are lost. The Archbishop has already spoken on this matter, and I am sure that he has truly voiced the feelings of the Catholic body here. (Applause). This outbreak is truly deplorable. ... The Carsonites, of course, had no opportunity of coming into collision with the forces of the Crown. They got a free hand, though some of them boasted that they were intriguing with the German enemy. They were assured, on the authority of Mr. Asquith, that the British army would never point a gun at them; their leader, instead of being sent into prison, was taken into the British cabinet. The hot-blooded young men who have not taken up arms began, I suppose, to ask themselves how Ireland was to stand when this war in defence of small nations was over. To truckle with treason is never safe for any government. (Applause). ... Before condemning the misguided leaders of this movement to be shot they should remember that leaders of another movement were taken into Cabinet. (Loud applause)." Advocate, 6 May 1916, p.25. (Robson, L.L., Australia and The Great War: 1914-1918, Macmillan, Melbourne, 1969, pp.62-63.)

48 "We must not lose sight of the facts of the situation. People must expect to reap what they sow. And knowing, as I do, what has been going on in Ireland before and since the outbreak of war, I am not altogether surprised at the lamentable things that have occurred. They are the natural, regrettable sequel and response, as it were, to the campaign of armed resistance and civil war which the Carsonites have been allowed to preach and prepare for in the past few years... I am quite clear in my own mind that the British Government, by its failure to deal with the treason of the Carsonites and, by its shifty policy in regard to Home Rule, has, unwittingly, I suppose, led up to the result which we must all deplore. I hope ... that those who are already calling out for executions will first pause and try to fix the responsibility for this outbreak." (Tribune, 4 May 1916 p.2.)

protestant readers of the *Argus* interpreted the Coadjutor Archbishop's response to the Irish uprising as pure treason and there were calls to have him deported in July 1916.50

Other Catholic bishops, while supporting the British suppression of the rebellion, also could not condone the executions. Archbishop Kelly of Sydney,51 and Archbishop Duhig of Brisbane52 were united behind Dr. Mannix's statements that the Ulstermen were the first instigators of rebellion and that the executions of the Sinn Fein rebels were unjustifiable.

From the Australian Irishman's point of view the treatment of the rebels seemed to point to an inescapable conclusion. For their disloyalty the rebels were given serious punishment. Commentators pointed to the manner in which the South African rebels were quickly repatriated after the Boer War and the lack of reprisal for the Ulstermen who were able to arm themselves and threaten civil war prior to 1914. As the Archbishop of Brisbane, James Duhig53 stated: 'people are already contrasting the wholesale death sentences on the Irish revolutionary leaders with the clemency extended to rebels and mutineers elsewhere in the Empire,54 'It is not too strong to suggest that for many of the respectable Australian Irish, the British reaction to the Irish rebellion gravely damaged, if it did not destroy, an innocent world-view based on trust of Britain and the virtues of her


51 "ARCHBISHOP KELLY'S VIEW.
THE PRECEDENT IN ULSTER.
SYDNEY, Wednesday.

At the Hibernian Australasian Catholic Benefit Society's conference to-day Archbishop Kelly referred to the Sinn Fein revolt in Ireland. He said the Ulster people were the first offenders, and they were not punished. In that the Sinn Feiner had a precedent. They had only followed in the footsteps of Ulster. Let there be no Ulster people nor Sinn Feiners, but let King George open the Irish Parliament on the College Green before the year ended, and let all Ireland unite in the establishment to the country as a nation. Now that the Sinn Feiners had surrendered, let them be treated no worse than Ulster rebels, one of whom was put in the British Cabinet." (Age, 2 May 1916, p.7.)

52 "HASTY EXECUTIONS.
ARCHBISHOP DUHIG'S REGRETS.
BRISBANE, Wednesday.

Archbishop Duhig this evening sent the following telegram to Dr. N.M O'Donnell, of Melbourne: "Congratulations on Celtic Club's cable to Mr. Redmond, urging clemency. Assure you Irish Queenslanders, who have loyally, and generously supported the cause of the Empire and the Allies, grievously disappointed and saddened by the hasty executions. The Imperial Government should know we believe General Maxwell's execution policy is calculated to do an immense injury to recruiting, at a most critical time, and is certain to be used for enemy propaganda purposes. People are already contrasting the wholesale death sentences on the Irish revolutionary leaders with the clemency extended to rebels and mutineers elsewhere in the Empire." (Sydney Morning Herald, 11 May 1916, p.7.)

53 James Duhig was born in Limerick county on 2 September 1871 and educated in Catholic schools in Limerick, Middlesborough and Brisbane. He attended the Irish College in Rome and was ordained on 19 September 1896. While agreeing with Mannix in condemning the executions, Duhig believed that Ireland should remain part of the Empire. (Nairn, Bede and Geoffrey Serle, eds. *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, volume 8, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1981pp.356-359.)

Indeed, Ireland was promised Home Rule in 1914 only to have that promise denied to them months later. In 1916, the Australian Irish came to assume that despite many thousands of Irish and Australian Irish deaths upon the battlefield, Ireland's reward for loyalty was martial law.

In the months following the executions of the rebels, many Australian Irishmen began to abandon their support for the Irish Parliamentary Party and John Redmond. They did not, however, abandon Irish constitutional politics for Irish extremism. Their abandonment was more disillusionment with the failure of Redmond to secure Home Rule than an attraction to Irish extremism. His actions not only confused members of his own party but also expatriate Irishmen living in Australia. According to the Australian Irish, Home Rule was on the statute book and it would take an unacceptable move on the part of the British government to recant from that promise. It was hoped that Home Rule would be implemented now. The United Irish League of Melbourne urged Redmond not to compromise with the British Cabinet on the issue of home rule.

Part of the difficulty in explaining the perceived Australian Irish disloyalty towards the Empire is that the Australian Irish, more than any other cultural group of Australia, identified themselves with the national cause of Australia in the war. This identification contrasted with the views of the majority of the Australian population who did not distinguish between imperial and national interests. After the Easter Rebellion's suppression, the Australian Irish no longer felt a great affinity with the cause of the Empire. This distinction between Australian and Imperial interest in 1914-1918 was, in the minds of some Australians, bordering on treason. The majority of protestant

56 "LABOR LEAGUE PROPOSAL. PROTEST AGAINST DELAY IN GRANTING HOME RULE. SYDNEY.- The East Woollahra branch of the Political Labor League has agreed to request the central executive to convene a meeting to discuss resolutions asking the Federal Government to communicate with Mr. Asquith protesting against the delay in granting self-government to Ireland, and the extreme measures taken by General Maxwell to suppress Irish democrats, also asking the Minister of Defence to ascertain whether Australian soldiers, while on leave, volunteered and fought against the Irish militant workers, and, if such be the case, to inform the Imperial Government that such action on the soldiers' part is not in the best interests of a self-governing Dominion like Australia." (Age, 27 July 1916, p.5.)

57 "THE HOME RULE QUESTION. The following cable gram was dispatched last evening to Mr. John Redmond by Dr. N. McDonnell (sic) on behalf of the United Irish League of Melbourne:-

(1) The Irishmen of Victoria denounce the gross violation of the provisional agreement. The Home Rule Bill, won constitutionally after a hundred years struggle, is no mere scrap of paper whose terms can be consistently reduced, mutilated, or repudiated by the British Cabinet whilst it pleads equal justice for other small nations.

(2) We consider the execution of Casement would intensify the horror excited overseas by the Dublin executions.

O'DONNELL." (ibid.)
Australians, considered that, in this war, imperial and Australian interests were indistinguishable.

However, the conscription crises of 1916 and 1917 were matters of national concern. The Australian Labor Party's split in January 1917 and the rejection of the two referenda were mainly the result of the working class' concentration on domestic matters. Mandatory overseas conscription would deplete the countryside of field hands thus jeopardizing the harvest, compromise pacifists' religious beliefs, and force anti-capitalists to fight a war that they opposed. A small majority of Australians saw mandatory overseas conscription as straining their imperial loyalties too far. No longer would the people vote in favor of conscription out of overwhelming loyalty to the Empire. Two years of senseless and bloody warfare in which approximately 7,000 Australian infantrymen died in the Somme offensive had taken its toll on the sympathies of the Australians towards the war effort.58 There was a growing lassitude towards Australia's involvement in a European conflict. Agrarian workers, Irish urban workers, the Australian Catholic church, anti-imperialists, and socialists joined with the majority of the Labor Party in denouncing Prime Minister and Labor Party leader Hughes' attempts at conscription.

The test of the Australian Irish's loyalty to the British Empire was not long in coming. Prime Minister Hughes called for a nationwide referendum on compulsory overseas military conscription to take place on 28 October 1916. Why the Prime Minister requested a referendum in the first instance is a puzzling question. In order for this and other referenda to pass, the majority of the voters of the six states and two territories, and at least four out of the six states were required to approve it. Prime Minister Hughes had the power to call up its citizens in defence of the homeland. Hughes' time in London seemed to cause him to lose touch with the changing sentiments of Australians. "The Prime Minister returned to Australia on 31 July 1915 after his triumphant progress in Britain; but many in the Labor movement, already angered by Hughes' abandonment of the Prices Referendum in October 1915, felt that he had turned his back on them as he hob-nobbed with dukes and duchesses in England. Thus the poison of Easter Week and its aftermath seeped into the Australian body-politic, other fissures were already opening in the nation's social and political fabric."59

Even though the Irish in Australia were a minority, they were large enough to demand that their religious and political concerns be considered seriously. Their votes were instrumental in tipping the balance in favor of Australia's rejection of overseas

conscription. However, the voting power of the Irish in Australia had never been strong enough to promote their political aspirations. The Irish vote had been divided on national matters and only on a few issues, such as the conscription crises, had they voted as a block. Australian Irish politics had been encumbered by the fact that the Irish as an electorate have been "too small, too dispersed, too ill-disciplined, to get their way."60

The sentiments of the Australian Irish were absolutely clear to Prime Minister Hughes. The 'disloyal' Australian Irish were certain to vote against conscription as convincingly as their Irish brethren resisted British attempts to impose conscription in Ireland. The issue of loyalty was so sensitive that some Catholic clergy felt compelled to be outspoken critics of Daniel Mannix's fight to reject compulsion. In 1914, the Catholic bishops were united in showing their support for the war: "Archbishop Michael Kelly in Sydney considered it a just war and lent his active support at recruiting meetings. Archbishop Carr in Melbourne urged his people to 'join heartily with fellow citizens in defence of the mother country'."61 Most Australian Catholic clergy, although favourable to conscription, tended to remain silent on compulsory overseas service because many viewed it as a secular issue.62

After the Easter Rebellion, Australian opinion towards the Irish community began to change. The Australian Irish were wrongly accused of being in league with the Sinn Fein rebels in Dublin and grouped together as traitors to the Empire. Mannix's opinion that 'our loyalty is freely questioned' was shared by a majority of the Australian Irish.63 The Australian Irish had a growing awareness that the majority of Australians was questioning their position as 'loyal subjects of the Crown' by October 1916. These attitudes manifested themselves in the first referendum campaign on conscription in late 1916.

Since the Irish Catholics comprised approximately 11% of the Australian population by 1916, their block vote was not the deciding factor of the rejection by the Australian people of the first proposal for compulsory overseas military service.64 "Catholics, as the archbishop had pleaded mildly in 1916, had perhaps got credit for more than their share in the referendum result; the anti-conscription poll had been around

1,200,000, and he took it that the 200,000 would have gone near exhausting the Catholic vote. So a million or so Protestants and others might fairly be given most of the credit. However, it must be noted that the majority of Protestants voted for conscription and a minority of Protestants plus the Catholics rejected the call for conscripted recruits. Without the 11% of the Australian Irish population voting in a solid block against conscription, Australia's involvement in the war would have been radically altered.

One cannot disregard the sentiments of the Irish-Australians when they voted an overwhelming 'no' in the referenda. The rejection of the first proposal for overseas military service was due to many factors including the role of the Australian Labor Party, Australian Catholic Church (most notably the activities of the Coadjutor Archbishop of Melbourne, Daniel Mannix), and the backlash against the negative campaigning of pro-conscriptionist politicians in New South Wales. The effect of the psychological legacy of Easter 1916 upon the outcome of the two referenda is debatable, but one factor is certain. The execution of the rebel ringleaders reopened old wounds that the Irish immigrants to Australia had hoped to leave in Ireland.

When the issues of the Easter Uprising in Ireland and Australian conscription forced the Irish in Australia to take sides they accordingly agreed with the right wing of the Australian Labor Party (A.L.P.), in which there were many Catholic politicians. The Australian Catholics' politicians voiced their concern about the execution of the rebels and voted most heavily as a block against conscription. In fact, the appeals of the Irish-Australian politicians were more effective than even Daniel Mannix in rallying the Irish voters around rejecting conscription.

---


66 "Results of the Referendum of 1916

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.S.W.</td>
<td>356,805</td>
<td>474,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>353,930</td>
<td>328,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>144,200</td>
<td>158,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>87,924</td>
<td>119,236*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>94,069</td>
<td>40,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>48,493</td>
<td>37,833*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed. Territories</td>
<td>2,136</td>
<td>1,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,087,557</td>
<td>1,160,033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Soldiers' votes are included: they voted 72,399 'yes', 58,894 'no'.

*South Australia and Tasmania were strongly protestant states. Evidently, religion was not always a deciding factor.

Many Irish Australian Catholic papers opposed conscription, such as the Catholic Press (Sydney) and the Freeman's Journal. Initially the Freeman's Journal supported the measure but by October, "mindful of the divided state of Catholic opinion and the opposition to conscription by the Hibernian Australasian Catholic Benefit Society, which had a share in the paper, (it) shifted to a policy of neutrality." 68

The A.L.P. showed signs of splitting over the issue of conscription in 1916. Approximately two-thirds of the A.L.P. members strongly opposed the call of their leader, Prime Minister Hughes, to endorse conscription. Some Labor newspapers, such as the Australian Worker, vigorously attacked compulsory overseas service as soon as a call for a referendum was announced on August 30, 1916. Australian Worker's editor H.E. Boote strongly petitioned the women's vote by publishing graphic illustrations of the gruesome realities of war culminating in William Robert Winspeare's historic poem 'Blood Vote'. 69 Attempts to restrict the newspaper's message against conscription were successful as, "censors repeatedly struck out vital passages of the Australian Worker's messages to the masses." 70 However, efforts like Boote's fight against conscription influenced a majority in New South Wales to vote 'against' in the referendum.

While the agitation created by the Easter Rebellion's suppression and the executions of the rebels obviously affected the outcome of the 1916 and 1917 referenda, it appears that these outside forces had little or no effect upon Catholic army enlistments. In 1916, while the debate over conscription was reaching a crescendo, Catholic army recruits were 19.4% of the total enlistments. In 1917, when the second referendum was defeated by an even larger margin than in 1916, Catholic enlistments stood at 18.8%. During the last year of the war, Catholics still volunteered in large numbers, with only a 1.6% decrease in enlistment from the previous year. 71 Therefore, despite the fact that many of the Catholic hierarchy were vehement in calling upon the rejection of conscription, those


69 Winspeare was born in Durham, he moved to New South Wales and became a radical journalist and editor of the International Socialist. This poem was actually written by E.J. Dempsey who was a journalist for the pro-conscriptionist newspaper, the Evening News. Winspeare simply signed his name to Dempsey's poem. (Nairn, Bede and Geoffrey Serle, eds. Australian Dictionary of Biography, vol. 12, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1990. pp.542.) Dempsey, who was perhaps concerned about keeping his position on the Evening News nevertheless was concerned that his Irish name would affect the impact of the poem upon Australian society.


Catholics willing to volunteer for the army were not strongly affected by Daniel Mannix's message.

The legacy of the Easter Rebellion of 1916 and the agitation of the two conscription crises of 1916 and 1917 carried on to affect Australian political life for many years afterwards. For example, the chief beneficiary of the publicity surrounding these debates was the now appointed in his own right (May 1917) Archbishop of Melbourne, Daniel Mannix. The publicity in 1916 and 1917 had the effect of branding the Archbishop as a traitor to the British Empire. In 1920, when the Archbishop tried to land in Cork, he was abducted by the British Navy who thought that his presence in Ireland would be dangerous. However, the effects of the Easter Rebellion upon the minds of the Australian Irish seem to have been significant only in the short term. It appears that the Australian Irish voted against conscription as a emotional response to the Easter Rebellion and as working-class Australians, some being members of the ALP, who reflected those Australian nationalists' desire to remain at home.

The Australian press was not particularly hostile to Ireland. While many did not approve of the methods of Sinn Fein in jeopardizing home rule, they believed that home rule needed to be implemented and supported Lloyd George's efforts. Australians would not deny the Irish the same benefits that they enjoyed as members of the British Empire, especially since Australia had control over its own affairs (as evident in their rejection of conscription.)

II. New Zealand

Since the beginning of its history as a British colony,\textsuperscript{73} New Zealand has had the closest cultural ties than any of the Dominions in the empire with the United Kingdom. This strong affiliation that New Zealanders preserved in their hearts for their homeland might seem odd considering that the Dominion is also the furthest in distance from Great Britain.\textsuperscript{74} This is partly explained by the nature of the immigrant to New Zealand. The country was not settled as a refuge for those escaping religious persecution like the American colonies or had a reputation as a penal colony like its neighbor to the west. In addition, the majority who settled in the islands was relatively educated, middle class and overwhelmingly British. Ninety-eight per cent New Zealand's population in 1916, excluding the native Maori, claimed the United Kingdom as their homeland.\textsuperscript{75}

The New Zealand Irish, unlike the Irish in Australia or the United States, were not a large minority.\textsuperscript{76} Estimates of the number of the New Zealand Irish hovers around 14\% of the total population in 1916.\textsuperscript{77} The Otago gold rush or the promise of land lured most of the Irish who immigrated to New Zealand between 1840-1880.\textsuperscript{78} Many of the Irish miners came from Australia or America in search of wealth but those in search of a better life outside of Ireland were assisted by the New Zealand Company which maintained offices in Dublin and Belfast.\textsuperscript{79} The Irish, who immigrated to New Zealand's south island, settled largely on the west coast away from the population centres of Christchurch and Dunedin.\textsuperscript{80} As much as thirty per cent of the west coast were Irish.\textsuperscript{81} This is a

\textsuperscript{73} New Zealand was annexed in 1840 and created a crown colony the following year.
\textsuperscript{74} New Zealand is approximately 11,000 miles from Great Britain.
\textsuperscript{76} While the percentages of the number of Irish in New Zealand and Australia were similar, there were approximately 150,000 Irish in New Zealand while there were an estimated 921,000 in Australia.\textsuperscript{77} This represents the total population of Irish settlers in 1916 and from previous migrations. An estimated 13\% of New Zealanders were Irish in 1867. (May, Philip Ross. The West Coast Gold Rushes. Pegasus Press, Christchurch, 1967. p.273.) In 1916 those New Zealanders who were born in Ireland numbered 37,380 or 3.4\% of the total population. (Fraser, Malcolm. Report on the Results of a Census of the Population of the Dominion of New Zealand (15th October, 1916) Marcus F. Marks, Government Printer, Wellington, 1920. p.44.) Roman Catholics and other Catholics numbered 151,605 (14.17\% of total) in 1916. (ibid. p.55.)
peculiar settlement pattern for the Irish as they generally tended to settle in population centres such as the American seaboard cities of Philadelphia, Boston and New York or in Australia's two largest cities, Sydney and Melbourne. Nevertheless, nearly three of every four New Zealanders of Irish birth in 1916 were living in or near the two largest metropolitan areas of Auckland and Wellington on the North Island. Nearly fifty per cent of New Zealand's Catholics\textsuperscript{82} lived in the largest city; Auckland and twenty per cent lived in its capital, Wellington.\textsuperscript{83}

As one might expect with such a homogeneous British population, the main religion among New Zealanders was Anglican. For example, there were four times as many Anglicans as Catholics in the country.\textsuperscript{84} Unfortunately, religious bigotry and Protestant-Catholic rivalry were not uncommon throughout the Dominion's history. As in Australia, New Zealand Irish Catholics tended to be segregated from the Protestant majority and were suspected of disloyalty in times of Fenian activity elsewhere in the empire. For example, in the same year as the Easter Rebellion, the Protestant Political Association was formed to limit Catholic influence in politics and society.\textsuperscript{85} The New Zealand Catholics response to sectarian conflicts in New Zealand was similar to their Australian brethren: Irish Catholics in both countries formed their own schools and societies and raised money to build their churches.

Nevertheless, New Zealand's national politicians\textsuperscript{86} chose to stress the unity of New Zealanders during the war. Prime Minister William Massey formed in August of 1915 a wartime coalition with Labour's leader Joseph Ward. New Zealand was the first Dominion to introduce conscription in November 1916.\textsuperscript{87} (The coalition supported the

\textsuperscript{82} Considering that 98% of the non-Maori population was of UK extraction in 1916, the terms Catholic and Irish are used interchangably. Estimating the Irish Protestant population of New Zealand is difficult utilizing the data from the 1916 census.
\textsuperscript{86} New Zealand had three political parties in 1916. The Liberals were the first major party in New Zealand's politics until Labour's rise transformed the country into largely a two party system in the 1920s. The Liberals dominated New Zealand's national politics under Premiers John Ballance and Richard John Seldon until the 1911 national election when some right-wing Liberals defected from the party and joined with conservatives to form the Reform Party. William Massey led the Reform Party to victory in 1911. (Oliver, W.H. and B.R. Williams, eds. \textit{The Oxford History of New Zealand}. Oxford University Press, Wellington, 1981. p.210.) The Labour Party was formed during the war under the leadership of Joseph Ward mainly as a response to declining national prosperity. Their political base was largely agrarian rather than socialist.
Empire's war effort by sending 110,386 New Zealanders to fight in the war.\textsuperscript{88} The reaction of New Zealand's Prime Minister to the outbreak of hostilities in Dublin was similar to that of other Dominion politicians. Massey, who was a Protestant Ulsterman,\textsuperscript{89} was surprised by the rebellion but eager to profess the opinion that this 'disloyalty' was not a true barometer of Irish sentiment. "The news had come to me as a shock and disappointment. But it must not be imagined for a moment that a majority of the Irish people are disloyal."\textsuperscript{90} Nevertheless, the Prime Minister expected the British government to severely punish the rebels and the 'traitor' Sir Roger Casement.

The three New Zealand papers cited here (Christchurch's \textit{Weekly Press}, Otago \textit{Daily Times} and the Wellington \textit{Evening Post}) can be characterized as independent of any political party, and supportive of the British war effort. The New Zealand press relied upon the Reuters news agency for European war dispatches. The delay of news concerning the Irish rebellion in reaching New Zealand was due in part to its geographic isolation from Europe and the effective work of the British censor in filtering damaging stories. Moreover, these three New Zealand papers offered little editorial analysis of Anglo-Irish relations and tended to focus more upon what effect the rebellion would have upon weakening the Empire's prospects of winning the war.

Christchurch had a significant Irish population in 1916. The population of the metropolitan area of Christchurch was 92,733\textsuperscript{91} and 14.51\% of the total Irish Catholics lived in Canterbury Province. The Christchurch \textit{Weekly Press} was established in 1865 and edited in 1916 by the Englishman Arthur Henry Bristed.\textsuperscript{92} The \textit{Weekly Press} claimed 'the largest circulation in the Dominion.'\textsuperscript{93} Since it was a weekly newspaper, the news of the Easter Rising was not reported until 3 May, it being too late to appear in the previous 26 April issue. Nonetheless in the 26 April issue there was an illustration of

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize
\begin{enumerate}
\item Refer to the front page, daily 1916, Christchurch \textit{Weekly Press}.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Casement in the Limburg camp attempting to recruit Irish prisoners of war for an Irish Brigade.  

The New Zealand Irish mirrored the Australian Irish in sending cables to Mr. Redmond reaffirming their loyalty to the I.P.P. and abhorrence towards the 'riots in Dublin.' Editorials followed recounting the loyalty of the Irish in the war effort. An editorial by J.M. Twomey, an New Zealand-Irish Liberal politician writing for the Weekly Press, expected that since the 'Sinn Fein Society' was defeated in the rebellion, Ireland would be pacified and continue to supply troops for the war effort. "If we remember the evil influence of the Sinn Fein Society, I think that in working so assiduously, and in placing 200,000 soldiers in the field, Ireland has done wonders." Moreover, Twomey did not believe that the Irish executive had been negligent in dealing with rebellious elements in the country. "I do not think the Government ought to be blamed. They knew this society existed, but as it was guilty of no overt act, they thought it better to let sleeping dogs lie, as any other action might militate against recruiting."  

The Otago Daily Times of Dunedin was founded in 1861, while Otago was witnessing a gold rush, and became the first daily newspaper in New Zealand. The population of the capital of Otago province, Dunedin was 68,716 in 1916. A large portion of the 10.35 per cent of New Zealand's Catholics who lived in Otago in 1916 was

---

94 The caption below the illustration read:  
THE VOICE OF THE TRAITOR.  
"Sir Roger Casement, C.M.G. and renegade" says "The Graphic," "has sounded the very depths of vileness since he sold himself body and soul to the enemy. Not content with being a traitor himself, he must needs tempt others to follow his bad example, and his masters, with cold and calculated cruelty, sent him on a tour of the German prison camps to recruit for an 'Irish Brigade' among the Irish prisoners. So far he has met with very little success, in spite of the bribes he offered—a German farm, a German wife, and three marks a week, or, alternatively a free passage to America, employment there and £20 down. At Limberg (sic), where most of the Irish are interned, after the men had given him a quiet hearing, they kicked him round the camp, giving him, as our informant and eyewitness put it, "the soundest beating he ever had in his life." In the sequel the German guard charged with fixed bayonets, and many of the men had their wounds reopened, "but," says the man from Limberg (sic), "it was worth it." (The Graphic in Christchurch Weekly Press, 26 April 1916, p.38)  
95 See resolution sent to Redmond by the New Zealand District Hibernian Catholic Benefit Society from Auckland. (Christchurch Weekly Press, 3 May 1916, p.43.)  
96 Jeremiah Matthew Twomey was born in Inchee, Kilgarvan, Ireland in 1847 and educated at the national school, Cork. He immigrated to New Zealand in 1874 and joined the staff of the Wellington Tribune the following year. His reporting career continued with stints on numerous New Zealand newspapers: the Wellington Argus, Evening Post, Wanganui Herald, Timaru Herald, and Christchurch Press, and from 1880 he became the proprietor of the Temuka Leader and the Geraldine Guardian. (Scholefield, G.H. A Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, volume II. Whitcombe and Tombs, Ltd., Wellington, 1940, p.410.)  
descendents of the gold rush. The *Otago Daily Times* was also a pioneer in creating an international news gathering agency by helping to establish the New Zealand United Press Association (1879). Commentary concerning the rebellion reflected the paper’s editor James Hutchison’s lack of understanding of the contemporary Irish situation. Sinn Fein was reported to be ‘more or less hostile’ to the ‘Imperial cause’ (Britain) and the rebellion was undoubtedly fostered by Germany. However, unlike Christchurch’s *Weekly Press*, the *Otago Daily Times* and Wellington’s *Evening Post* mirrored the English Tory press' assessment that the Irish executive was negligent in dealing with sedition in Ireland and needed to ‘stamp out the danger’ before the ‘plot’ could have ‘been brought to maturity’. The Dunedin paper called for the dismissals of the Chief Secretary and Lord Lieutenant after it became clear (to Hutchison at least) that the rebels were armed by Germany and led by a ‘feeble schoolmaster’. Likewise, the *Evening Post* blamed the Irish executive’s negligence in underestimating the chances for the rebellion.

The *Otago Daily Times* characterized the insurgency as a senseless action by a minority of Dubliners considered to be undesirables by virtue of their disloyalty to the Empire. This ‘riff-raff’ was contrasted with the majority of Irishmen throughout the world who were disgusted by the small band of Sinn Feiners who had dishonoured Ireland and caused the destruction of their homeland’s capital in the name of liberty.

Hutchison supported the executions of Pearse, Clarke, and MacDonagh as a just punishment for fomenting the rebellion and leading others to join in their crime against the Empire. Such men were viewed as having only a ‘insensate hatred of British rule.’ The editor dismissed the assertion made by various American newspapers that such justice would damage the relations between the United States and Britain. Despite the paper’s preference for capital punishment being for the rebels, it feared that the military authorities would succumb to a typical British foible. "Vengeance should not enter into the question. Justice no doubt will be done, and we may expect it to be justice tempered with

---

101 *ibid.* p.11.
103 *Otago Daily Times*, 27 April 1916, p.4 and 28 April 1916, p.4.
104 *ibid.* 28 April 1916, p.4.
105 *ibid.* 29 April 1916, p.4.
106 *ibid.* 2 May 1916, p.4.
107 *ibid.* 19 May 1916, p.6.
108 *ibid.* 3 May 1916, p.4.
mercy.” With the arrival of more news, it became clear to the Otago Daily Times that the number of rebels was greater than had been previously reported. Taking this into account, Hutchison tempered his initial call for wholesale executions while defending their justification for the Sinn Feiners. Hutchison’s concerns reflected, for a New Zealand editor, an unusually sensitive reaction to American opinion. The paper would have had a significant Irish readership and Hutchison seems responsive to it.

While acknowledging that Casement had a distinguished humanitarian career in the British consular service, it did not make his ‘traitorous’ activities any less objectionable. His guilt was substantiated and made more onerous by his efforts to persuade Irish prisoners to fight against the Empire. Hutchison also discounted the suggestion that his execution would create another Irish martyr, for in the editor’s view martyrdom and treason were mutually exclusive. Dunedin’s readers received the impression that Americans were in favour of Casement’s execution. In its announcement of Casement’s death, two days after the event, it chose only to reproduce the New York Evening Post’s favourable opinion of the hanging, even though the majority of America’s news media disapproved. Similarly, the Wellington Evening Post reported the New York World’s statement that “Casement deserved his death,” and declined to acknowledge other American opinions.

In the Evening Post’s analysis of the Lloyd George proposals for the implementation of home rule, Hutchison favoured the establishment of a Parliament in Dublin without Unionist representation. While the settlement was not optimal, given the necessity for the Empire to address the war, it was nonetheless an expeditious solution to the Irish question.

109 “The Government of the United States is not concerned with the means adopted by Great Britain to deal with active sedition within her own borders. It recognises that the suppression of internal disorder and the punishment of traitors are the business of the British Government alone, for the adequate discharge of which that Government is responsible to the British nation.” (ibid. 5 May 1916, p.4.)

110 “Nothing has happened as yet surely to justify the criticism that the authorities are acting with undue severity towards the rebels. On the other hand, while the nation has no wish to hear of a long list of executions, and, we can well believe, has no liking for trials that are not conducted in public, it is decidedly anxious to hear that salutary measures have been to blot out such a menace as the Sinn Fein movement in Ireland... These men took up arms in the most treacherous way against their countrymen, carrying their disloyalty to British rule to the most extreme point in co-operation with the active and unscrupulous enemy of their nation. There can be no question of vindictiveness on the part of the authorities in dealing with traitors of this character. It is their business dispassionately to see that the impressiveness of the punishment meets the gravity of the crime.” (ibid. 8 May 1916, p.4.)

111 ibid. 1 July 1916, p.4.

112 ibid. 5 August 1916, p.8.

113 Wellington Evening Post, 5 August 1916, p.6.

114 “Moreover, it will afford the Nationalists an opportunity of justifying, within the limits of the jurisdiction of the Home Rule Parliament and of its executive, the faith of the Liberals of the United Kingdom in their ability to conduct their own affairs in a spirit of tolerance and justice to all classes and creeds in Ireland. It is for them, in short, to demonstrate to Ulster by their government of the rest of
The Wellington *Evening Post* was established in 1865 by Henry Brundell, an Irish immigrant and edited by Joseph Parker in 1916. Wellington's population of 95,235 contained nearly twenty per cent of the total Irish Catholics in New Zealand. Not unexpectedly, the *Evening Post* decried the 'meagerness of Irish news' imposed by the British censor for allowing the Empire's enemies to spread false reports as to the extent and nature of the rebellion. Despite the fact that Asquith had "hoped to allow some latitude in the transmission of news," such censorship provided the opportunity for the Irish-American propaganda apparatus to flourish. It was feared that Sinn Fein was sending reports of the rebellion to the United States. 'If the cables are really open to the rebels for the transmission of coded messages, the effect of the censorship is to give them a monopoly of the Irish news service.'

The *Evening Post* could be counted among those newspapers that expected Lloyd George's proposals for implementation of home rule to be successful. The unified support of the nationalists and unionists in the war and the shock of the rebellion had created an environment in Ireland conducive to compromise that did not exist prior to the war. The paper contrasted the failed Buckingham Palace Conference in 1914 with the willingness of nationalist and unionist politicians in 1916 to support the Lloyd George initiative. "It is interesting to recall now that the members of that conference were Mr. Asquith, Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Birrell, and Lord Crewe on the one side and Mr. Balfour, Mr. A. Chamberlain, Lord Lansdowne, and Lord Cawdor on the other. Of these Mr. Birrell has dropped out and Lord Cawdor is dead. The other six are now members of the same Cabinet, and one of them is now the official mediator between the Irish parties for the purposes of a peaceful and permanent solution of their differences."

New Zealand newspapers suffered significantly at the hands of British censorship and gave its readership little in the way of an in depth analysis of the causes or significance of the Easter rebellion. The rising was written off as the foolish act of a small group of Dubliners unrepresentative and unreflective of Irish sentiment. What little news or editorial analysis of the Easter rising contained in the New Zealand news media appear to have been along the line of official, albeit, censored British communiqués. Little concern

Ireland that it is an unworthy suspicion which has produced the necessity for her exclusion from the scheme of Home Rule." (ibid. 10 July 1916, p.4.)

---


118 ibid. 29 May 1916, p.6.

was raised for the effect of the executions on Irish or American opinion which is not the case in Australia. Casement was dealt with summarily and little sympathy was given to the leaders of the rebellion. With more than 100,000 New Zealand already committed to the war, the unity of the Empire was paramount.
III. South Africa

South Africa's historical development from the termination of the South African War (1902) to 1916 had been regarded by many affiliates of the international press as a paradigm of the course that British and Irish politicians should pursue in defining the Anglo-Irish relationship in the aftermath of the Easter Rebellion. The British liberal press and Irish nationalist editors drew numerous comparisons between Ireland's agitation for home rule and the Afrikaners' resistance to British control of South Africa.\(^{120}\) They believed that there were many lessons to be learned from the success of British statesmen in bringing the Boers into the imperial fold and that relevant cases could be applied to Ireland.

The most striking difference between South African and Irish politics in 1916 was home rule. The Boers were in control of the destiny of their nation; Irish leaders clearly were not. South Africa had attained home rule with the Act of Union on 31 May 1910. To most South African Boers, including their leading politician Louis Botha,\(^{121}\) Dominion status had come as a surprise and many wondered how they could have attained this semi-autonomous status so quickly after being defeated eight years earlier. Ireland's measure of

\(^{120}\) The Irish played a direct role on both sides of the conflict during the South African War (1899-1902). Many individuals associated with events leading up to the Easter rebellion had previously served in the South African War. General Gough, who refused to militarily enforce home rule on the Ulstermen and 'mutined' at the Curragh on 20 March 1914, had been defeated by the Boers at Blood River Poort on 17 September 1901. (Williams, Basil. Botha, Smuts and South Africa, Hodder & Stoughton, Limited, London, 1948. p.42) General French commanded cavalry in South Africa (ibid. p.43) and as head of the Home Forces in 1916 was as culpable as Birrell for not stamping out the nascent separatist movement prior to the rebellion (however, a more convenient scapegoat, was the chief secretary). (O'Brien, Leon. The Chief Secretary, Augustine Birrell in Ireland, Chatto & Windus, Ltd., London, 1969. pp.165-166.) Erskine Childers who ran guns for the Irish Volunteers at Howth and Captain J. White who founded the Irish Citizen Army both fought for the British Army in South Africa. On the Boer side, direct Irish support for the Afrikaners resulted in the creation of two Irish brigades. (The story of the two Irish Brigades is recounted in Davitt, Michael, The Boer Fight For Freedom, Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York, 1902. pp.317-325.) The first brigade was formed by the initiative of Major John MacBride who served under the Irish-American Colonel John Franklin Blake, a West Point graduate. (Blake's account of his involvement is the autobiographical, Blake, John Y. Fillmore. A West Pointer with the Boers: Personal Narrative of Colonel J.Y.F. Blake, Commander of the Irish Brigade, Angel Guardian Press, Boston, 1903.) The second Irish Brigade was organised by Arthur Lynch in 1900, an Irish-Australian reporter for the Parisian Le Journal, who the following year was elected MP for Galway. However, he was not allowed to sit in Parliament because of the involvement in the war. (Davitt, Michael. The Boer Fight For Freedom, Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York, 1902. p.324.)

\(^{121}\) Some British newspapers had suggested President Botha for the chair of an imperial conference to determine the status of Britain's colonies after the war and especially to propose an 'imperial solution' for the Irish question. Botha, perhaps would have supported the Nationalist cause, if his personal life was any indication: he was married to Annie Cheere Emmet, collateral descendent of the 1803 Irish rebel, Robert Emmet. (Williams, Basil. Botha, Smuts and South Africa, Hodder & Stoughton, Limited, London, 1948. pp.19-20.) However, Botha died in his bed on 27 August 1919 before such a conference could be seriously considered. (Meintjes, Johannes, Imperial Policy and South Africa, 1902-1910, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1955. p.5)
home rule was sitting on the statute books, perhaps to be implemented, but almost certainly with a stipulation that Ulster's protestant counties would be excluded. At best, the Irish home rule was a starting point in determining the role of Ireland within the United Kingdom.122

The fear that South African Boers would break away from the empire diminished after the 1910 Act of Union and this confidence in South African unity was strengthened by Botha's suppression of De Wet's Rebellion in 1914.123 Conversely, Dublin Castle did not take warnings of Irish rebellion very seriously during the war, and the Easter Rebellion took both South Africa and Ireland, not to mention the British authorities, by surprise. The 1916 rising created more problems for the Anglo-Irish relationship and raised serious questions for the empire. Might not Ireland break away completely after the war if not so wisely treated as had been South Africa in 1910? Was Ireland to be considered in the future to be a Dominion like Canada or Australia, a colony like India or a political unit (a nation within a nation) like Scotland or Wales? The idealistic liberal view of a nation that chose to remain within the British Empire was therefore strongly contrasted with the reality of Ireland which had been coerced at times, intimidated at others, treated with 'kindness' by the Conservatives but held firmly within the British state nonetheless.124 South Africa's loyalty during the war and its suppression of the De Wet Rebellion were heralded as results of wise British statesmanship in granting dominion status to South Africa. Had Ireland been given similar consideration might not the Sinn Fein rebellion have been averted as well? The nationalist press editors in Ireland and the liberal press editors in Britain believed that had home rule been enacted in 1914 as stipulated by a law currently on the statute books, Irish republicans would have been appeased.125

The first comparison to be taken from the South African experience was the leniency shown the Boers with the harsh treatment of the Sinn Fein rebel leaders. The

---

122 Irish home rule did not satisfy any of the major political groups in the island. Nationalists understood that they continued to have little control over their economy or military in a home rule parliament. The act certainly did not appease Republicans who wanted complete separation from Britain nor the Ulster Unionists who interpreted home rule to be the first step in a slippery slope towards their isolation from Britain.

123 Louis Botha and Christiaan De Wet had both been guerrilla fighters during the South African War. Their careers after the war were a dramatic contrast. Botha rose to become the first Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa in 1910. De Wet, however, never acknowledged the Boer-British rapprochement and when war broke out between the British and German empires in 1914, De Wet chose to rebel in protest of South Africa's campaign in German South Africa. Botha, despite being heralded by the British press as the great South African statesman, was viewed by many of his Boer compatriots as a traitor to his countrymen.


125 They were not so sanguine as to whether this would have led to civil war between the Ulster Unionists and Irish Nationalists; however it was generally clear that Ulster could not have been coerced into accepting the scheme.
rebuke of the British Government by C.P. Scott's *Manchester Guardian* found many sympathetic readers in South Africa. Botha's lenient treatment of the South African rebels who supported De Wet's rebellion (*opstand*) in 1914 was in sharp contrast to the British treatment of Irish rebels. When compared with the cost of the Irish rebellion of 1916 in terms of lives and property damage, De Wet's rebellion of 1914 had little long-term effects upon South African politics. Only 124 Afrikaner rebels died and 5,000 were taken prisoner. A mere nineteen of Botha's men were killed and in all only a thousand South Africans were wounded during the fighting. The most significant difference between the two rebellions, however, was the fact that Botha chose not to execute the *opstand's* leaders. For example, De Wet was tried and found guilty of high treason but released after serving an 18-month sentence, and the other leaders were released after serving similarly short prison terms. The only government-ordered execution was that of Jopie Fourie, a Boer hero of the South African War, who was directly responsible for 12 of the 19 government soldiers killed in action. In Ireland, Botha's precedent was not emulated. Fifteen rebel leaders were executed between 3 May and 12 May 1916, and Casement was hanged for high treason on 3 August.

For South Africans, the most significant Irish execution was that of John MacBride, who was shot on 5 May. His reputed last words that "he had looked down the barrels of British rifles before in South Africa" demonstrated his pride in being a thorn in the side of the British Empire. South Africa did not have a large Irish Catholic population in 1916. At any time during the twentieth century, Roman Catholics never constituted more than five per cent of the nation's population. Therefore, South African editors did not have to tailor their policies to conform to an Irish readership. The *Cape Times* offered no editorial commentary on MacBride's execution. Rather, news of the former pro-Boer Irish Brigade leader's death was reported by Reuters' South African Press Agency: 'Loyalists in Ireland are not surprised at the execution of Major McBride

---

126 The *Manchester Guardian* was the first British newspaper to appeal to the "example of General Botha in South Africa as an example which we, who have applauded it, may well follow." (*Manchester Guardian*, 4 May 1916, p.4; Edwards, O. Dudley and Fergus Pyle. *1916: The Easter Rising*, MacGibbon & Kee, London, 1968. p.258.)

127 The Easter Rebellion claimed approximately 500 killed- the majority being civilians but many were British forces (132). 2,500 were wounded in the fighting (400 being British soldiers or Irish policemen). (Edwards, Ruth Dudley. *An Atlas of Irish History*, 2nd ed., Routledge, London, 1991. p.75.)

128 While in prison, De Wet was treated with the respect expected of an old man with his war record. (Rosenthal, Eric. *General De Wet*, Unie-Volkspers Beperk, Cape Town, 1946. pp.191-192.)


(sic), who fought on the side of the Boers in South Africa, and was always a pronounced enemy of England."132 Two days later, an article in the Cape Times entitled 'When McBride (sic) Was in South Africa' recounted his experiences as a major under the direction of Colonel Blake in Natal protecting Boer supply lines and the presentation of a green flag for the Irish Brigade to MacBride from Maud Gonne at Ladysmith.133 The executions, continuation of martial law in Ireland and the incarceration of alleged Irish rebels (many of whom had not participated in the rebellion) was contrasted with Botha's rehabilitation of the Boer rebels. Botha demonstrated the political wisdom that characterized his premiership and received praise by Dominion politicians for quelling the rebellion with relative ease and with few long-term consequences for the unity of South Africa. Botha's opinion of the clemency extended to the rebels illustrated his sincerity: "This is no time for exultation or recrimination. Remember we have to live together long after the war is ended."134 While the Cape Times was hesitant to call for wholesale executions of the Irish rebel leaders, it did, however, favour severe punishment for Eoin MacNeill, whose irresponsible leadership the paper viewed as most responsible for the rebellion.135

There was little reason for the Cape Town paper to champion Sinn Fein's cause. The paper had been a strong supporter of the British control of South Africa and its editor was a product of the colonial system. Established in 1876, the Cape Times remained independent of South Africa's political parties but generally supported British hegemony of the Cape colony. (Only once in its history, for fifteen months during the South African War, could the political persuasion of the paper have been characterized as anti-British.136) During the Easter Rebellion, Maitland Park137 edited the paper, an expatriate Scot who had previously held a similar position with Calcutta's Allahabad Pioneer.

---

132 Cape Times, 8 May 1916, p.7.
133 Cape Times, 10 May 1916, p.7.
135 "Just two months ago, after inspecting 1,600 Sinn Fein Volunteers in College Green, he declared that in raising, training arming and equipping the Irish Volunteers, the men of Ireland were acquiring the power to obtain the freedom of the Irish nation. Yet when his dupes took him at his word, and rose in revolt, Professor John McNeill (sic) appears to have realised that discretion was the better part not only of valour but of patriotism." (Cape Times, 3 May 1916, p.6.)
136 This was during the editorship of Saxon Mills, a former reporter for London's Daily News. Consequently, the circulation of the paper reached an all-time low because of its criticism of the British conduct of the war. (Shaw, Gerald. Some Beginnings: The Cape Times (1876-1910). Oxford University Press, Cape Town, 1975, p.114.)
Maitland previously threw his influence behind the former raider and subsequent Prime Minister of the Cape Colony (1904-1908) Dr. L.S. Jameson in his efforts to unite the British and Afrikaners under the Union of South Africa. Maitland's editorship of the paper spanned nineteen years during which he supported efforts to strengthen the British Empire's hold upon South Africa.

The *Cape Times* demonstrated that Botha's political wisdom had been valued by his Boer countrymen by reproducing favorable opinions of the South African Prime Minister from two Orange Free State journals: one written in Afrikaans, the other in English. The two Bloemfontein journals reminded its readers of the exemplary policy of leniency toward the rebels by the South African government following De Wet's rebellion. The Free State Afrikaner paper *Vriend des Volks* expressed the belief that "... it is flattering to us Dutch Afrikanders that the action of the Union Government is represented as worthy of imitation, but it would be a greater consolation if it were suggested that the policy of the Government, as a whole and not in part, should be followed."

Death is the just doom of the rebel. In South Africa the fate of those Irish rebels will not go unnoticed. There are many Nationalists who had been hoping that the British Government would have got away with comparatively light sentences. If this had taken place, the Nationalists here would have had another grievance against General Botha. As it is, there are men walking abroad in South Africa, or at the worst comparatively comfortable in prison, who today must be thanking their stars that they did not come within the grip of the British authorities. They owe their lives to the generosity of General Botha, and we have no doubt that, in their inmost hearts, they are profoundly thankful that their great countryman was in the position he was to temper justice with mercy.

However, not all South African newspapers shared the views of *The Friend* or the *Cape Times* on Botha's leadership. The Afrikaner newspaper *De Burger* (published in Cape Town) rejected the assertion that Botha's treatment of De Wet and the other rebels was exemplary or worthy of imitation by the British authorities. To this journal, De Wet was not a rebel but a hero betrayed by his former Boer ally. *De Burger* rejected the comparison between Botha and Redmond, stating that Redmond truly represented his followers while Botha had "broken away" from his people and that the South African Prime Minister's policy towards De Wet was "cruel, harsh, and vindictive."

The *Cape Times* countered *De Burger's* 'ignorant' opinion that Botha's treatment of the Afrikaner rebels was exceptionally oppressive by pointing out that under Botha only "one rebel..."
leader suffered the penalty of death in South Africa: some fifteen of the Sinn Fein leaders were executed in Ireland."
The truth is that the general principles underlying the policy of the British Government and the Union Government in their attitude towards the suppression and punishment of rebellion, are identical. A wide distinction has been drawn in both cases between the leaders and the rank and file: and, even in regard to the former, punishment has been inflicted always from deterrent and never from vindictive motives. In the carrying out of these principles the Botha Government can certainly not be accused of greater rigour than the British Government.143

When the dust had settled after the Easter Rebellion and the executions of its leaders, the task of assigning blame for the outbreak of hostilities began in the Dominion's press. The Cape Times' and The Friends' analysis of contemporary Irish history seemed to affirm the Irish Nationalists' belief that the Ulstermen had created the politically unstable environment prior to the war. The Cape Times championed Redmond during the rebellion describing him as the man who kept civil war from engulfing Ireland.144 To The Friend the culprit for encouraging Sinn Fein was clear: the Free State newspaper believed that Edward Carson was to blame for the rebellion. (This opinion was eagerly reproduced in Dublin's Freeman's Journal.)

There was constitutional government in Great Britain and Ireland and whatever the provocation that there might have been, Sir Edward Carson placed himself wholly out of court by raising forces in opposition to those of the King. There is no getting away from this simple truth, and there is equally no doubt that the then Liberal Government failed in its duty in permitting the Ulster Volunteers to arm, to mobilise and to take the action that they did. It is futile, too, for Ulstermen and their friends to say that their rebellion was not against the King, but against the Government, for that is precisely the argument that was and is used in this country.145

Press reactions throughout South Africa following the Easter Rebellion fell along two lines. With the experience of the South African War and De Wet's rebellion fresh in the collective memory, it was tempting to draw comparisons between these conflagrations. South Africans could easily understand the Irish desire for self-rule, but the press contended that full independence for the island was not as desirable as that afforded within the Empire under home rule. In their view, membership in the Empire had served South Africa well with stable government and relative economic prosperity as the results. Moreover, the recent experience with the Boers and De Wet had demonstrated the wisdom of clemency toward rebel factions that newspapers held out as examples of a wise policy for the British authorities in Ireland to emulate.

143 ibid.
144 Cape Times, 3 May 1916, p.6.
Chapter X - Conclusion

In the final analysis of the Easter Rebellion it is imperative to recall that the events in Ireland occurred in the middle of the most catastrophic war by that time. While the rising distracted the world's attention for a period from the western front, it could not be described as a focal point in any country's history save Ireland. Despite early proclamations by some newspapermen that the Irish uprising did not deserve the designation of a rebellion and compared it to a street brawl, the world's press generally understood that that event would have far reaching consequences for Anglo-Irish relations. When news of the rebellion and the subsequent executions reached the shores of the Dominions and the United States, the international press feared the death of home rule and the return of British repression. Therefore, the international press viewed the Lloyd George negotiations with interest not only for the stability of Ireland but whether the Irish Rebellion would affect the European war.

Few Irish catholics owned mass-circulation dailies in 1916. There were exceptions, however, within Ireland such as William Murphy's Irish Independent or O'Brien's Cork Free Press. However, many Irishmen did staff newspapers within the Empire and while many may have not agreed with the rebellion they could have sympathy for the national cause of home rule.

The English language was the natural conduit by which news of the rebellion flowed. Most of the reports in French and German papers were simply translations of English newspapers, most notably Northcliffe's London Times and Daily Mail. American commentary on the rebellion could therefore readily assimilate British reports into their editorials, which was vital in influencing the public's perception of the events.

The battle for world opinion would be waged in newsprint. The newspaper had become the staple for mass communication and enjoyed a sophisticated infrastructure with news agencies such as Reuters, Havas, Associated Press and the Canadian Press Association reaping the benefits of the transatlantic cable. Yet in many ways the newsprint media had yet to develop into its role as the arbiter of world opinion. More newspapers existed in 1916 than ever before, and most espoused the narrow interests of their owners. The terms conservative, liberal, religious, labour, socialist, and nationalist had significant meaning when applied to any newspaper and dictated its readership.

International press reportage of the Easter Rising is best understood, therefore, within the context of the editorial policy of the newspaper at hand. In England dissatisfaction with the conduct of the war was the purview of the Tory press while the Liberal organs supported Prime Minister Herbert Asquith's administration to a degree. The eyes of America were trained on the lowlands of Belgium and the trenches of Verdun.
in hopes of catching a glimpse of the turning point of the war. Canada and the other members of the British Empire outwardly seemed solidly behind the British war effort while inwardly tussling with the issue of whether they were independent nations or merely guaranteed their freedom as a Dominion. The events in Ireland were presented and their significance discussed within the context of their meaning for the war.

The Easter Rebellion might easily have been merely another in a long line of futile attempts by the Irish to throw off English domination had it not been the subject of extensive coverage by the world press that made it cause célèbre. The news media, anything but unbiased in its coverage, portrayed the uprising largely within the editorial policy of the paper. By 1916, most newspapers were held either in the hands of powerful and wealthy owners or as organs of political or religious organizations. Few were large organizations free from outside control. In England, for example, Lord Northcliffe controlled the Times and Daily Mail, while his counterpart in the United States arguably was the politically ambitious William Randolph Hearst who owned the San Francisco Examiner and New York Journal-American. In Berlin the Social Democratic Party could count Vorwärts among its supporters, while in France Le Croix trumpeted the views of the Roman Catholic Church and Le Figaro maintained its egalitarian views of long standing.

Sinn Fein found its struggle on the front pages of papers throughout the world. In countries of the British Empire such as Canada and Australia, they were portrayed as lamentably foolish, even mentally unstable, a refrain repeated often in the British press. As well, New Zealand's geographical isolation made it easy for damaging reports of the British suppression to be minimized in the press. France was involved in a fight to the death with Germany and despite its historical connection with Ireland as a catholic nation and enemy of England, it demonstrated little sympathy for Irish rebels, especially Roger Casement, who the French believed were agents of Imperial Germany. The German press, on the other hand, appeared to lose interest in "Der Prozess gegen Casement," and any propaganda advantage was lost upon world opinion with the execution of Captain Charles Fryatt. By contrast, influential Irish expatriate papers such as John Devoy's Gaelic American and the family of Patrick Ford's Irish World heralded the uprising as the event that would secure Irish independence. They voiced unqualified support for the rebellion while Devoy provided liaison with agents of Imperial Germany and assistance in the organization of public demonstrations amongst Irish-Americans and German-Americans. However, the Irish immigrant press, such as Ford's Irish World and Devoy's Gaelic American, was less able to influence mainstream American into acceptance of the rebellion, rather it was sensationalist papers such as Hearst's Journal-American or San Francisco Examiner who preyed upon the anti-British sentiment of the American republic.
Certainly moderate Irish-Americans were more concerned during 1916 with Wilson's diplomacy with Germany and prospects of reelection. Scottish newspapers were perhaps the most even-handed in their reports of the events of Easter week. Scotsmen carried a relatively greater share of the burden of the Great War to the fields of Flanders, yet were sensitive to the Celtic nationalist sympathies of both nations. The Glasgow Daily Record and Mail was quick to analyze the motivations of the Irish belligerents and the socioeconomic antecedents that justified their actions.

Coverage of the Easter Rising in the English press was channeled largely through newspapers that could be generally characterized as liberal, conservative or socialist in their editorial policies. Among their commentaries, one can find a wide spectrum of opinion encompassing all the political, religious, socioeconomic, and domestic issues facing a nation at war. The conservative press used the uprising to discredit Asquith and his subordinates, particularly the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Augustine Birrell who resigned shortly after the rebellion. The British Conservative press chose to vilify Asquith over the executions and while demonstrated little sympathy for Irish rebels, especially since the rebellion threatened a united war effort. The liberal press targeted Carson and his Unionist allies as the individuals most responsible for the rebellion and was careful not to make Birrell a scapegoat. In general, the liberal press reportage condemned the executions of the rebel leaders, the indiscriminate arrests and incarcerations of Dubliners, and the prolonged imposition of martial law. The parallel between the Irish uprising and De Wet's Rebellion with the short imprisonment of its rebel leaders was first cited by the Manchester Guardian as an example of South African leniency worthy of being applied by Asquith in Ireland. Amongst the conservative press, such as Northcliffe's Daily Mail, there were some editors who wanted Lloyd George to succeed. Their condemnations were selective and directed against certain individuals, not against the system as a whole. The socialist English press seemed to be better informed and sympathetic to the motivations of Sinn Fein and vociferous against those who executed the rebel leaders. The Irish in Britain did not forget the socialists' attitudes and joined the Labour Party's ranks after the war.

The Scottish press mirrored its English counterpart in many respects. Both were concerned with the Liberal v. Conservative infighting in the coalition cabinet concerning the Nationalist/Unionist disagreement about the implementation of Irish home rule. The Scottish differed, however, in the emphasis of the Celtic connection between the Irish and the Scots and the effect that Irish home rule might have on a similar bill for Scotland's self-determination. Augustine Birrell had also been an MP of West Fife from 1889-1900. After his resignation, the Scottish liberal press chose not to crucify him but rather to blame Sir Edward Carson for his part in the gunrunning at Larne that signaled Ulster's
determination to keep home rule from the province. Nonetheless, while Scottish press support for the rebels was meager, there was fear that the executions would jeopardize home rule.

The Scots viewed the Irish home rule fracas with some concern. Scottish attempts to reinstate a parliament in Edinburgh would not materialize until much later in the century; however, it was apparent that the Scots had a sufficient understanding of the historical effects of Anglo repression. They supported Lloyd George's efforts in negotiating home rule with an eye upon their similar prospects in the future. Nevertheless, there was a consensus among Scottish papers that the war must result in an allied victory and all other concerns were secondary to the successful termination of the Great War. This explains in part why the Scots showed little sympathy for Roger Casement. There was the concern, however, that Casement would become an Irish martyr. Therefore, in areas with large Irish populations such as Glasgow and Dundee, the Liberal papers were cognizant of their Irish readership and less denunciatory of the rebels, especially after they had been defeated. For example, the Glasgow Daily Record was adept at pointing out that not all Irish Volunteers wanted the rebellion to begin without more international support.

In Ireland, the execution of the rebel leaders and the continuance of martial law throughout the country created a political environment where Sinn Fein politicians gained the support of Catholic Ireland. It was apparent to Nationalist politicians that their support was slipping from them as early as June 1916 and despite Nationalist protestations that the Lloyd George initiative should not lapse without serious consequences for future UK-Irish relations, Prime Minister Asquith allowed the last chance for peace to disintegrate. The Liberal English press generally opposed Asquith's Irish policy throughout the summer of 1916. The Liberal press and the conservative Northcliffe supported Lloyd George's attempt to introduce home rule during the war and there was a consensus of opinion among the British press that home rule was an expedient war measure. During the Lloyd George negotiations London's Daily Chronicle compared a cross-section of Britain's newspapers to demonstrate the support for home rule among the Unionist and Liberal press. When it became apparent that Asquith's own coalition had doomed the prospects, the Manchester Guardian warned that the British risked losing the support of the Irish after the war. Therefore, despite the failure of Lloyd George to deliver home rule, the war minister received kudos for his efforts while Asquith was universally blamed as a weak administrator.

The English socialist press, on the other hand, opposed Asquith's Irish policy from the beginning. The socialists were more in tune with contemporary Irish concerns, and it appears that the Irish after the war deserted the Liberal Party for a more sympathetic Labour Party. This desertion hastened the fall of the Liberal Party some years afterwards.
and added to the ranks of Labour. The papers that demonstrated an especially high level of reporting as they attempted to augment the news with proper analysis were the socialist and Liberal presses. The New Statesman and the Manchester Guardian printed George Bernard Shaw's opinions of the likely impact that the executions of the rebel leaders and Roger Casement would have upon the Irish people. He came to the defence of Roger Casement not because he believed that Casement was innocent of committing the crime of gunrunning but he disagreed as to whether this constituted treason against England since Casement was Irish.

The Irish press response to the rebellion highlighted the political and socioeconomic divisions in the country between Nationalists and Unionists and exposed the internecine conflict within Redmond's party amongst his followers and the independent nationalists such as William Murphy and William O'Brien. Nationalists and Unionists were temporarily united in their questioning of the political sagacity by executing the rebel leaders, knowing that they would be canonized as martyrs in republican ideology. They did not agree, however, on the best course for Irish home rule. Unionists condemned calls for home rule without the security of Ulster's exclusion from the scheme. The European conflict had probably averted a civil war between the two groups over home rule and British ministers were well aware that Ulster's Unionists could not be coerced into a united Ireland with its parliament in Dublin. The independent Nationalists also criticised Redmond's leadership throughout the home rule negotiations fearing that Ulster's partition would become a permanent feature of the country's landscape since it appeared to them that the Nationalist leader lacked the resolve to force through home rule with Ulster's inclusion.

The international press coverage of the Easter Rebellion and its aftermath prophesied that Ireland after the war would become an inferno. The growing popularity of Murphy's Irish Independent soon after the rising was one warning that the Irish public had already forsaken Redmond and the constitutional efforts of the I.P.P. It also demonstrated how far Redmond's enemies were willing to travel to open the Pandora's box of Irish republicanism in order to ensure a future for themselves in a post-bellum Ireland. It was ironic, nevertheless, that Murphy called for James Connolly's blood but it was his newspaper that became the beneficiary of Connolly's agitation.

In general, newspaper owners and their editors were less able through the First World War to influence the course of the war. Gone were the days when newspaper owners could manipulate their government's actions such as Hearst had done in creating the Spanish-American War. However, Northcliffe believed that he could create policy and took the credit for forcing Asquith from office in December 1916. There were two groups who could still affect the dissemination of information in the media. Military
correspondents at the front still had the power to shape the news, but unfortunately they were absent from Dublin in 1916. The other group was the military censors who had the power to extract damning news that might compromise the integrity of the government or jeopardize the security of the military. The relationship of the government to the press varied from country to country and this depended partly on strength of the censor. In Germany, the government seemed to have more control over the press judging by the uniformity of the newspapers. In France, the political parties had achieved a political truce and there appeared to be uniformity as well in regards to Irish matters. In the United States that did not have a military censor in 1916, however, the relationship between the press and the presidency was strained. Wilson avoided press conferences whenever possible although he did grant interviews with his 'unofficial voice,' the New York World. However, in Britain, the Asquith government was the least influential in swaying the opinions of the country's newspapers and likewise the editors were less able to influence the government. This difficulty for the British Prime Minister was partially solved when the newly appointed Lloyd George bought the Daily Chronicle.

The British military's suppression of the rebellion and the inability to implement home rule during the war reinforced the world's perception that the Irish Catholics were a persecuted race that would only be satisfied when they had control over national affairs. While this was the general consensus, the sophistication of news coverage for a nation's press depended on a continued connection with Ireland. For example, in the two countries with negligible Irish settlement, France and Germany, their analysis tended to be broader and recounted the 700-year struggle between the English and Irish as an explanation for the current home rule impasse. Press coverage in the Dominions outlined the difficulties involved in settling the Irish question and they tended to interpret Irish matters from an imperial perspective. Since Canada, Australia and New Zealand continued to share a common imperial bond with Ireland, their press coverage was more adept at analyzing the difficulties facing Ireland in 1916. Irish immigration to the United States on the other hand began to curtail in the 1880's and as a result the American mindset toward Ireland remained in a virtual time warp. Constant reminders of the conditions from which the majority of Irish Catholics had to emigrate during the famine reinforced the American perception that Ireland's development ceased in the nineteenth century. For example, less interest was engineered in the American press concerning the position of the Ulster Unionists and the Americans tended apply a colonial scenario to the Lloyd George negotiations. Some papers in the British press, such as the English conservatives and the Scottish Unionists failed to grasp the gravity of the Irish situation following the rebellion. Many British commentators could not understand that the 1916 uprising would prove to be the only successful rebellion in Irish history from one point of view. The majority of the
Irish Catholics would soon be united in their insistence that Ireland would be free from British control.
Appendix

Irish Newspaper Affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Editor (Owner)</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belfast Evening Telegraph</strong></td>
<td>Unionist</td>
<td>Andrew Stewart (W. &amp; G. Baird)</td>
<td>Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cork Constitution</strong></td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Henry Tivy (News &amp; Sons)</td>
<td>Cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cork Examiner</strong></td>
<td>Nationalist</td>
<td>(T. Crosbie &amp; Co.)</td>
<td>Cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cork Free Press</strong></td>
<td>Ind. Nationalist</td>
<td>William O'Brien</td>
<td>Cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Express</strong></td>
<td>Unionist</td>
<td>(Dublin Express &amp; Mail Ltd.)</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Derry Standard</strong></td>
<td>Liberal Unionist</td>
<td>(J.C. Glendinning)</td>
<td>Londonderry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeman’s Journal</strong></td>
<td>Nationalist</td>
<td>William Brayden (Gray Family)</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Galway Express</strong></td>
<td>Unionist</td>
<td>George S. Nicholls</td>
<td>Galway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irish Independent</strong></td>
<td>Ind. Nationalist</td>
<td>Tim Harrington (William Martin Murphy)</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irish Times</strong></td>
<td>Unionist</td>
<td>John E. Healy (Arnott, chairman)</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kerry Advocate</strong></td>
<td>Nationalist</td>
<td>(Kerry Press, Ltd.)</td>
<td>Tralee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limerick Chronicle</strong></td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>(J.A. Baldwin)</td>
<td>Limerick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Editor (Owner)</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Mail</td>
<td>expatriate</td>
<td>(Old Hall Publishing)</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist Times &amp; Freeman</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>(in practice the Baptist Church)</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Call</td>
<td>Socialist</td>
<td>E.C. Fairchild</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Chronicle</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Robert Donald</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Express</td>
<td>Unionist</td>
<td>Ralph Blumenfeld (Beaverbrook)</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mail</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>(Northcliffe)</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily News</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>A.G. Gardiner (Cadbury)</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe &amp; Traveller</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>(Dudley Docker)</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Herald: National Labour Weekly</td>
<td>Socialist</td>
<td>George Lansbury</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Leader</td>
<td>Socialist</td>
<td>Fenner Brockway</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Guardian</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>C.P. Scott</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>anti-capitalist</td>
<td>H. W. Massingham</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Age</td>
<td>Socialist</td>
<td>A.R. Orage</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Statesman</td>
<td>Fabian</td>
<td>Clifford Sharp</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Witness</td>
<td>anti-capitalist</td>
<td>Cecil Chesterton</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Table</td>
<td>imperialist</td>
<td>Philip Kerr, Lord Lothian</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Geoffrey Dawson (Northcliffe)</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Dreadnought</td>
<td>Suffragist</td>
<td>Sylvia Pankhurst (East London Federation of the Suffragettes)</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scottish Newspaper Affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Editor (Owner)</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen Daily Journal</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>(Chalmer Family)</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bailie</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>(A.F. Sharp &amp; Co.)</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bulletin</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>(George Outram)</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee Advertiser</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>(J. Leng &amp; Co.)</td>
<td>Dundee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunfermline Press &amp; West of Fife Advertiser</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>(A. Romanes &amp; Sons)</td>
<td>Dunfermline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Evening News</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>(Edinburgh Evening News Ltd.)</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward</td>
<td>Labour/Socialist</td>
<td>Thomas Johnston</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Daily Record &amp; Mail</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>(A. Forbes)</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Herald</td>
<td>Unionist</td>
<td>F.C. Kitchen (George Outram)</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverness Courier</td>
<td>Liberal Unionist</td>
<td>James Barron (Carruthers &amp; Sons)</td>
<td>Inverness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jedburgh Gazette</td>
<td>Liberal Unionist</td>
<td>(W. Easton)</td>
<td>Jedburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leith Observer</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>(Leith Printing &amp; Co.)</td>
<td>Leith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montrose Standard &amp; Angus &amp; Mearns Register</td>
<td>Unionist</td>
<td>(Balfour &amp; Co.)</td>
<td>Montrose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oban Times</td>
<td>Ind. Liberal</td>
<td>(D. Cameron)</td>
<td>Oban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paisley Daily Express</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>W.A. Lockheed</td>
<td>Paisley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross-shire Journal</td>
<td>Liberal Unionist</td>
<td>(Ross-shire P.&amp;P. Co.)</td>
<td>Dingwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Scotsman</td>
<td>Liberal Unionist</td>
<td>John P. Croal</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Editor (Owner)</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston Evening Transcript</td>
<td>conservative</td>
<td>(Boston Transcript Company)</td>
<td>Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Globe</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>James Morgan</td>
<td>Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Herald</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Robert Lincoln O'Brien</td>
<td>Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Daily Eagle</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>St. Clair McKelway (until 1915)</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Citizen</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>(John F. Frost)</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston News &amp; Courier</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Robert Lathan</td>
<td>Charleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Herald</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>James Keeley</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Tribune</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>(McCormick &amp; Patterson)</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Science Monitor</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Frederick Dixon</td>
<td>Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati Enquirer</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>John McLean</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Plain Dealer</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Erie C. Hopwood</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Post</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>(Harry Tammen &amp; Frederick Bonfils)</td>
<td>Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines Register &amp; Leader</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Harvey Ingham (Gardner Cowles)</td>
<td>Des Moines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Free Press</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>(Edward D. Starr)</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporia Gazette</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>William Allen White</td>
<td>Emporia, Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Telegram</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>James Gordon Bennett, Jr.</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaelic American</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>John Devoy</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford Courant</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Charles Hopkins Clark</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis News</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>(Delavan Smith)</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis Star</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>(John Shaffer)</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish World</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Patrick Ford (until 1913)</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal-American</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>(W.R. Hearst)</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville Courier-Journal</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Henry Watterson</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Times</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Harrison Gray Otis</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Herald</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Frank B. Stoneman (Frank Barker Shutts)</td>
<td>Miami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>Editor (Owner)</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis Journal</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>H.V. Jones</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis Tribune</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>John Scudder McLain</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans Times-Picayune</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>(Times-Picayune Company)</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Evening Post</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Rollo Ogden (Oswald Garrison Villard)</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Press</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Ervin Wardman</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Tribune</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Ogden Reid</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York World</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Frank I. Cobb (Pulitzer)</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Inquirer</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Charles Heustis</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Morning Oregonian</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Harvey W. Scott, until 1910</td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Union &amp; Advertiser</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>W.J. Curtis</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain News</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>(John Shaffer)</td>
<td>Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Bee</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Charles Kenny McClatchy</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio Express</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Monte Harris</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Chronicle</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>(de Young family)</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Examiner</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>(W.R. Hearst)</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Waldo L. Cook</td>
<td>Springfield, Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Post-Dispatch</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>George S. Johns (Pulitzer)</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Street Journal</td>
<td>capitalist</td>
<td>Clarence Barrow</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Times</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>(Frank Munsey)</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Herald</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Clinton T. Brainard</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Post</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>John McLean</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Information concerning these papers was compiled from the papers themselves and from Mott, Frank Luther. American Journalism: A History of Newspapers in the United States Through 250 Years, 1690-1940, Macmillan Company, New York, 1947.*
### Canadian Newspaper Affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Editor (Owner)</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>T. Stewart Lyon</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Devoir</td>
<td>Nationaliste</td>
<td>Henri Bourassa</td>
<td>Montreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba Free Press</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Clifford Sifton</td>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal Star</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>(Hugh Graham)</td>
<td>Montreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa Evening Journal</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>P.D. Ross</td>
<td>Ottawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto Evening Telegram</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>(John Ross Robertson)</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto Star</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Joseph Atkinson</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Province</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Walter Nichol</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg Evening Tribune</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>R.L. Richardson</td>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Information concerning these papers was compiled from the papers themselves and from Craik, W.A. *A History of Canadian Journalism II: Last Years of the Canadian Press Association, 1908-1919.* Ontario Publishing Company, Ltd., Toronto, 1959. Appendix B.*
### French Newspaper Affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Editor (Owner)</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L'Action française</td>
<td>Monarchist</td>
<td>Léon Daudet</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Croix</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>Paul Feron-Vrau</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Dépêche de Toulouse</td>
<td>Socialist</td>
<td>Arthur Huc</td>
<td>Toulouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'Echo</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Henry Simond</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Figaro</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Alfred Capus, Robert de Flers</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'Humanité</td>
<td>Socialist</td>
<td>Jean Jaurés until 1914</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Matin</td>
<td>Independent Republican</td>
<td>Gaston Leroux</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### German Newspaper Affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Editor (Owner)</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allgemeine Zeitung</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Bastian Schmid</td>
<td>Munich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berliner Tageblatt</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Theodor Wolff</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurter Zeitung</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Rudolph Kirchner, Walter Kamper</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kölnische Volkszeitung</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Julius Bachem</td>
<td>Cologne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipziger Volkszeitung</td>
<td>Socialist</td>
<td>(Leipzig Volkszeitung Company)</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>(founded Otto von Bismark)</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preussische Kreuzzzeitung</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Hans Wendland</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorwärts</td>
<td>Social Democrat</td>
<td>Friedrich Stampfer</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vossische Zeitung</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>(Hermann Bachmann), Georg Bernhard</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Australian Newspaper Affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Editor (Owner)</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>(founded Charles Gavan Duffy)</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Age</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>(Syme family)</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argus</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>(Melbourne Argus Company)</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Worker</td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>Henry Ernest Boote</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>James Edmond (until 1914)</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Press</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>(in practice R.C. Bishop)</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman's Journal</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>(in practice R.C. Bishop)</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Nationalist</td>
<td>Sir Hugh (H.R.) Denison</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Morning Herald</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>T.W. Henry</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribune</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>(in practice R.C. Bishop)</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Zealand's Newspaper Affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Editor (Owner)</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evening Post</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Joseph Parker</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otago Daily Times</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>James Hutchison</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Press</td>
<td>Populist</td>
<td>Arthur Henry Bristed</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### South African Newspapers Affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Editor (Owner)</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cape Times</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Maitland Park</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Burger</td>
<td>Nationalist</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Friend (English)</td>
<td>Populist</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bloemfontein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vriend des Volks (Dutch)</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bloemfontein</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Newspapers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen Daily Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'Action française</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bailie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist Times and Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belfast Telegraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berliner Tageblatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Evening Transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Globe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Herald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Daily Eagle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston News and Courier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Herald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Tribune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Weekly Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Science Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati Enquirer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Plain Dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork Examiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork Free Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Croix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Chronicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Burger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Dépêche de Toulouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derry Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines Register &amp; Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Free Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Devoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee Advertiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunfermline Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'Echo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Evening News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporia Gazette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Telegram</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Le Figaro
Forward
Frankfurter Zeitung
Freeman's Journal
Freeman's Journal
The Friend
Gaelic American
Galway Express
Glasgow Daily Record and Mail
Glasgow Herald
Glasgow Observer
Globe
Globe and Traveller
Graphic
Hartford Courant
Herald: National Labour Weekly
L'Humanité
Indianapolis News
Indianapolis Star
Inverness Courier
Irish Independent
Irish Times
Irish World
Jedburgh Gazette
Kerry Advocate
Kölner Volkszeitung
Labour Leader
Leipziger Tageblatt
Leipziger Volkszeitung
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