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Preface

This thesis looks at developing European Nationalism, as seen in Ireland from the mid-nineteenth century until the end of the First World War, and in the Austrian Empire correlating with the reign of Francis Joseph, and the reception of these developments in the Irish press, specifically as presented in a liberal, provincial newspaper, the Cork Examiner, still current today.

This primary source is used in conjunction with various literary works and political pamphlets of the period, as well as historic standards of the present and the past, to examine, compare and contrast the nationalist variants of two imperial provinces: Ireland and Bohemia. This study highlights, via the medium of the press, the respective strategies of Irish and Bohemian, i.e. Czech nationalists, their successes and failures, and the position of their menaced - or menacing - minorities, Ulstermen and Sudeten Germans, respectively, in an era of mass literacy and general imperial decline. A number of key figures are occasionally cited to establish a national and international context, particularly so in relation to contacts held between the Irish and Czech peoples. Moreover, potentially influential newspaper-owners-cum-editors and their staff receive closer scrutiny regarding their political alliances as well as, when appropriate, their religious affinities, to establish the angle of their perspective and the frame of reference of their reports. And, finally, the study explores how discernible the question of Ireland actually was on a Continental scale, and in view of a World War.

The Great War marks an important time-span on which this work is based, the years 1914 to 1918 pivotal to nationalist aspirations in Europe - Pan Slav or Irish - but this study also takes into consideration the aspect of censorship involved at the time of World War, distorting the overall concept of free-speech and independent thought. Therefore, the epoch of mass movements inaugurating modern-day nationalism, beginning in the mid-nineteenth century and culminating in the First World War, provides the substratum of this study. Furthermore, the author has delved into the legacy of the Wild Geese and those associated with them in tracing the roots of Irish-Bohemian relations to substantiate the historic ties between these nations, and to accentuate the academic interest in the progression of these early ties up to their independent ‘statehood of small nations’ status of sorts.
The Cork Examiner, first published 1841, was founded, like many others at the time, when nationalist sentiment among the literate masses was globally detectable. Essentially provincial in intent, but drawing on national and international sources, this paper has not yet been subjected to intense academic research. In fact, the Irish press as such has not until recent times been exposed to a perceptible amount of academic attention.\(^1\) However, due to its tradition of lengthy personal columns for marriages, births and deaths, the paper is a popular source in tracing one's Irish ancestors who, particularly from the mid-nineteenth century onwards, left the south-western province of Munster on an epic scale. Archive material (complete from 1841 onwards) is made available to the general public in the form of microfilm at the Cork County Library, Cork City, Ireland.

This study begins by reviewing early contacts and their development between Catholic Ireland, a British colony, and Catholic Austria, an absolutist Empire, focusing especially on the historic Austrian province of Bohemia and the revolutionary citizens of Prague. The Irish province of Ulster, or rather six of its counties, and Munster, Ireland’s largest province and its most contentious county, Cork, provide the Irish frame of reference. Bohemia, like Ireland, was once colonized by dominant neighbours, nominally exposed to self-government and its path to ‘small state’ independence approximately as hazardous and haphazard as any approach taken to Ireland.\(^2\)

Some of these links, spanning centuries, proved to be foremost of military in value and later educational in design, both, however, religious in origin. There was a time in Ireland when parallels between this country and any insurgent East European nation were eagerly drawn. The second part of the nineteenth and the early twentieth century, vibrant with nationalist movements across Europe,

---

\(^1\) Marie-Louise Legg (University of London), general editor, Ireland: Politics and Society through the Press, 1760-1922, Primary Source Microfilm: “The Irish press was, until recently, a neglected source for historians and students of literature. Now, however, the role of newspapers has been increasingly emphasized for research into the development of Irish politics and society. Examples include Paul Bew, Vincent Comerford and James S. Donnelly, who have drawn attention to the importance of newspapers in studies of the famine, Fenianism and popular devotion. […] Their dependence on news from England which formed their main source after 1760 waned after the mid-nineteenth century. Post-Famine Ireland recognized the need for industrialization, and newspapers played a great part in the rise of nationalism.”

regardless if irredentist or otherwise, offer a stock of literature comparing the
struggles of oppressed peoples in distant empires with the plight of the Irish at
home. The Poles always figured largely in this context, as did the Hungarians on
several occasions of resistance to Austrian rule. For example, Arthur Griffith,
journalist and founding member of Sinn Féin, found a ‘Parallel for Ireland’ in his
publication *The Resurrection of Hungary*, however, not invoking the popular
revolutionary Louis Kossuth as symbol of successful nationalism, but the
farsighted pacifist Francis Deak who, through realistic measures, secured lasting
privileges for his people.

As regards Ireland and Bohemia - former colonies in former empires – it is
their common causes and ‘patriot-traitors,’ the quality and quantity of interest they
showed in each other’s destinies or, indeed, lack of it, that has been the object of
this study. How responsive had in fact the Irish been in the face of the advancement
of the Czech cause? And vice versa, did the Irish struggle deserve at least moral
support from a Czech perspective? The author found, to date, merely spasmodic
sympathies at the best of times, negation of nationhood aspirations at worst. It may
be said, perhaps, that the political, cultural and spiritual outlook of these people had
been ultimately defined by the outcome of the Battle of the White Mountain. One
nation, the Czechs, had supported and suffered for the Reformation, and the other,
the Irish, equally so for the counter reaction. Or did simply distance dampen the
spirit of solidarity for common aims? It has been the purpose of this paper to
highlight the positive and negative images these nations nurtured about each other,
in their respective historical dimensions, their political meanings and possible
intentions, culminating during the Great War and the redrawing of the map of
Europe.

In conclusion, given the historical and subsequent genealogical
associations, and considering especially the elite aristocratic and military ties that
converged to make an Irishman, Eduard Taaffe, Premier of the Austrian Empire

---

3 Griffith’s book strongly influenced nationalist debate between 1904 and 1921, proposing the
withdrawal of Irish elected representatives from Westminster, inherited from Deak's policy of non
co-operation with the imperial parliament in Vienna in the 1860s. The idea of the dual monarchy
was advocated by some Irish politicians as late as the 1920s. Griffith also expounds protectionist
economic views held by Friederich List, which influenced Irish government policy for several
pp.251ff.
and mediator of its peoples,\textsuperscript{4} it nonetheless appears that the geographical and confessional distance between Ireland and Bohemia at the time must have proved too great to allow satisfactory mutual monitoring of potentially supportive political movements, essentially nationalist and separatist in nature.

And finally, the author of this study, who is of both Irish and Austrian extraction, would like to submit, in the words of E.J.Hobsbawn:\textsuperscript{5}

To be Irish and proudly attached to Ireland – even to be proudly Catholic-Irish or Ulster-Protestant Irish – is not in itself incompatible with the serious study of Irish history. To be a Fenian or an Orangeman, I would judge, is not so compatible, any more than being a Zionist is compatible with writing a genuinely serious history of the Jews; unless the historian leaves his or her convictions behind when entering the library or study. Some nationalist historians have been unable to do so. Fortunately, in setting out to write the present book I have not needed to leave my non-historical convictions behind.

\textsuperscript{4} Eduard Graf Taaffe (1833-1895), 11th Viscount Taaffe and Baron of Ballymote, in the peerage of Ireland, born in Vienna and died in Ellischau/Nalžovy, Bohemia. Companion of the young archduke Francis Joseph, he entered public service in 1852, statesman, conservative social reformer, and provincial governor of Salzburg, Upper Austria and Tirol. 1867 and 1870/71 interior minister, 1867-70 minister of defense and public security, 1869/70 and 1879-93 prime minister and interior minister. He came to an understanding with the Feudal and Federal parties and his greatest achievement was that he persuaded the Czechs to abandon the policy of abstention and to return to the Reichsrat. It was on their support that his majority depended. His intention was to unite the nationalities of Austria, the Germans and Slavs as equally integral parts of Austria. In 1882 he lowered the limit of property qualification for elections, created the basis for efficient social legislation by introducing maximum working hours and health insurance. Opposition by radical Nationalist parties prevented him introducing universal suffrage. Cf. inter alia A.J.P.Taylor, The Habsburg Monarchy 1809-1918 (Penguin Books, 1990), Walter Kleindel, Österreich (Wien, 1978), and Österreich Lexikon (Wien, Österr. BV, 1995).

\textsuperscript{5} E.J.Hobsbawn, Nations and Nationalism since 1780 (CUP, 2000), p.13.
Introduction

Irish nationalism according to ethnic criteria is confined to a few centuries only, yet the task of delineating the focal areas of contention may prove daunting to the uninitiated reader. Therefore, the author offers here a short account in chronological order of the political and cultural movements that were the root of nationalism in Ireland, and which eventually lead to the opportunity to flourish initially as Free State and ultimately as Republic.

Political Nationalism

Ireland was subjected to varying degrees of English rule since the late 12th century. The Gaelic Irish resisted this conquest through military and other means, but as they were organised in small independent lordships they lacked a common political goal, such as an independent Irish state. Conflict over the English presence was exacerbated by the Protestant Reformation in England, which introduced a religious element to the Tudor reconquest of Ireland. Another important feature of future Anglo-Irish conflict was the continuing dispossession of Irish Catholic landowners in the Plantation of Ireland, Munster being the first case in point. The closest Gaelic lords came to waging an identifiably nationalist campaign against the English was the rebellion of Hugh O’Neill in the 1590s, known as the Nine Years War, which aimed to expel the English and make Ireland a Spanish protectorate. A more significant movement came in the 1640s, after the Irish Rebellion of 1641, when a coalition of Gaelic Irish and those remaining of Old English Catholic stock in Ireland set up an independent Irish state to fight the Wars of the Three Kingdoms. The Confederate Catholics of Ireland, also known as the Confederation of Kilkenny, emphasised that Ireland was a Kingdom independent from England, though under the same monarch. They demanded autonomy for the Irish Parliament, full rights for Catholics and an end to the confiscation of Catholic owned land. These Confederates, however, cannot be called nationalists, as they did not demand separation from the English monarchy, as opposed to its

6 A summation of Irish nationalist groupings and affiliations may be readily gathered from the internet lexicon database of Wikipedia, offering reliable primary and updated secondary sources, which the present author was thus able to acquire or at best refer to.
7 Cf. Nicholas Canny, Making Ireland British, 1580–1650 (Oxford University Press, 2001), and Micheál Ó Siochrí, Confederate Ireland 1642-49 (Four Courts Press, Dublin, 1999).
8 Thomas Bartlett, Kevin Dawson, Daire Keogh, Rebellion (Dublin, 1998).
Parliament, and continued to claim loyalty to Charles I. Also, they based their identity primarily on religion rather than ethnicity. Their cause was destroyed in the Cromwellian conquest of Ireland 1649-53. A similar Irish Catholic monarchist movement emerged in the 1680s and '90s, when Irish Catholic Jacobites supported James II after his deposition in the Glorious Revolution. The Jacobites demanded that Irish Catholics be a majority in an autonomous Irish Parliament, and confiscated Catholic land be restored, and that the Lord Deputy of Ireland in future be an Irishman. The Jacobites were conscious of representing the "Irish nation", but were not separatists and represented the interests of the landed class as opposed to all the Irish people. They were defeated by the armies of William of Orange in the so-called Williamite War in Ireland 1689-91. Thereafter, Irish government and landholding was dominated by the English Protestant Ascendancy. Catholics were discriminated against under the Penal Laws. This coupling of religious and ethnic identity, Roman Catholic and Gaelic, as well as a consciousness of dispossession and defeat at the hands of British and Protestant forces, came to be enduring features of Irish nationalism. The Protestant dominated Irish Parliament of the eighteenth century called for more autonomy from the British Parliament, particularly the repeal of Poynings Law, which allowed the latter to legislate for Ireland. These Parliamentarians were known as "patriots", as was, for example Henry Grattan, but they were essentially a colonial minority in Ireland.

The explicit origins of Irish nationalism began in the 1790s when Theobald Wolfe Tone founded the Society of the United Irishmen, to end discrimination against Catholics and to found an independent Irish Republic. Tone and most of the United Irish leaders were Protestants inspired by the French Revolution, and wanted a society without sectarian divisions, which they attributed to the British domination over the country. The United Irishmen led an armed uprising in 1798, which was repressed with great bloodshed. In the aftermath, the Irish Parliament was abolished altogether in the Act of Union of 1801 and Ireland was ruled directly from London. Two dominant forms of Irish nationalism arose from these events, one being a violent, radical movement, known as Republicanism, advocating the

---

use of force to found a Republic. This remained a minority opinion in the early 19th century, with groups such as the Young Irelanders who launched a small and abortive rebellion in 1848. The other nationalist tradition was considered moderate, using non-violent mass mobilisation to seek concessions from the British government. While both nationalist traditions were predominantly Catholic in their base, the hierarchy of the Catholic Church were opposed to republican separatism with its violent methods and secular ideology, while usually supporting non-violent reformist nationalism.

Daniel O'Connell was leader of the moderate tendency, which was initially effective in achieving reform, since the British government was less inclined to use force against a non-violent movement. O'Connell, head of the Catholic Association and Repeal Association in the 1820s, '30s and '40s, campaigned for Emancipation: full rights for Catholics and "Repeal of the Union", or Irish self-government. Catholic Emancipation was achieved, but self-government was not. O'Connell's movement was more explicitly Catholic than its eighteenth century predecessors and it enjoyed the support of the Catholic clergy, who had denounced the United Irishman and reinforced the association between Irish identity and Catholicism. O'Connell employed traditional Irish imagery such as the Harp and located his mass meetings at selected sites such as Tara and Clontarf, which had a special resonance in Irish history (similar to the Field of Blackbirds in Serb nationalism), a method which was copied with equal success by nineteenth century Czech nationalists in their Tabor version.

By the late 19th century, Irish Nationalism had become the dominant ideology in Ireland, with a major Parliamentary party in the British Parliament at Westminster launching a campaign for Home Rule. This period also saw the emergence of a militant republican movement called the Irish Republican Brotherhood, or more commonly called ‘Fenians’, with an offshoot named Clan na Gael in the United States.

---

14 Boyce, Nineteenth Century Ireland, pp.37ff.
The Great Famine of 1845-49 caused great bitterness among Irish people against the British government, perceived as having failed to avert the direct deaths of over a million people.\(^{17}\) However the political effects of this were not seen in Ireland for another generation. In America, Irish immigrants, many of whom had fled the famine, set up Clan na Gael in 1858, led by John Devoy, which organised Irish veterans of the American Civil War to attack Canada, with the intention of demanding a British withdrawal from Ireland. The Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB) was set up in Ireland at the same time.\(^{18}\) In Ireland itself, the IRB staged an armed revolt in 1867, but being heavily infiltrated by informers, the rising was a fiasco.

Mass nationalist mobilisation began when Isaac Butt’s Home Rule League, founded in 1873 with little following, adopted social issues in the late 1870s, especially regarding the question of land redistribution. Michael Davitt (a member of the IRB) founded the Irish Land League in 1879 to agitate for tenant's rights. The land question had a nationalist resonance in Ireland as many Irish Catholics believed the land had been unjustly taken from their ancestors by Protestant English colonists in the 17th century Plantations of Ireland, and in the 19\(^{th}\) century the Irish landed class was still largely an Anglo-Saxon Protestant group.\(^{19}\) However, the Land League also had roots in tenant associations formed in the period of agricultural prosperity in the 1850s and 1860s, seeking to strengthen the economic gains already made. Following the depression of 1879, these farmers were threatened with rising rents and eviction. In addition, small farmers, especially in the west, faced the prospect of another famine. At first, the Land League campaigned for the "Three Fs": fair rent, free sale and fixity of tenure. Later, they campaigned for the re-distribution of land from landlord to tenants.

Militant nationalists realized they could use the support for land reform to recruit nationalist support, the reason for the New Departure in 1879, when the IRB adopted social issues.\(^{20}\) Republicans from Clan na Gael, who were loath to recognise the British parliament, saw this an opportunity to recruit the masses to agitate for Irish self government: this agitation, known as the "Land War", became

---

\(^{17}\) F.S.L. Lyons, Ireland Since the Famine (Fontana Press, 1985).
violent when Land Leaguers resisted evictions of tenant farmers by force and the British Army and Royal Irish Constabulary (RIC) was used against them. This upheaval eventually resulted in the British government subsidising the sale of estates to tenants in the Irish Land Acts. It also provided a mass base for constitutional Irish nationalists in the Home Rule League. Charles Stuart Parnell, a Protestant landowner, took over the Land League and used its popularity to launch the Irish National League in 1882 to campaign for Home Rule.  

Although Parnell and some other prominent Home Rulers, such as Isaac Butt, were Protestants, Parnell's party was overwhelmingly Catholic. At local branch level, Catholic priests were an important part of it organisation. Home Rule was opposed by Unionists, mostly Protestant and from Ulster, under the slogan "Home Rule is Rome Rule." At the time, the British public would have seen this movement as radical and militant, but Parnell’s failure to support the 1887 plan of campaign, a militant agrarian programme launched by Davitt, cast him as an essentially constitutional politician, but not averse to using violent movements as a means of putting pressure on parliament, not unlike O’Connell before him. Coinciding with the extension of the franchise in British politics and thus the opportunity for most Irish Catholics to vote, Parnell's party quickly became an important player in British politics. Home Rule was basically favoured by Gladstone, but opposed by many in the British Liberal and Conservative parties.

Three Irish Home Rule Bills were put before the British House of Commons but were bitterly resisted by an alliance of Unionists and British Conservatives. Following the fall of Parnell in a divorce scandal, Home Rule was eventually won by John Redmond and the Irish Parliamentary Party and granted under the Third Home Rule Act of 1914. Irish self-government was limited by the prospect of partition of Ireland between north and south after the British government bowed to the threat of the Ulster Volunteer Force, the armed wing of Ulster Unionism, threatening civil war if Home Rule were granted. Nationalists, in turn, had formed their own paramilitary group, the Irish Volunteers, to ensure the passing of Home Rule. It looked in 1913 as if civil war was imminent, but the Home Rule plan was suspended on the outbreak of the First World War for its

---

duration. This led radical republican groups to argue that Irish independence could never be won peacefully.  

**Militant Separatism and Irish Independence**

In April 1916 some thousand dissident Volunteers launched the Easter Rising in Dublin and, in the Easter Proclamation, declared the independence of an Irish Republic. Although the Rising failed, Britain's drawn out execution of sixteen of the Rising's leaders, some of them injured and already dying, led to widespread public sympathy for militant republicanism. Recruiting was already at an all time low following disastrous campaigns in 1915 with great loss of life of Irish volunteers. While conscription for Ireland was being discussed, physical force republicanism became increasingly powerful and the dominant force in Ireland over the next seven years. Moderate nationalism, as represented by the Irish Parliamentary Party, was being eclipsed by a relative new-comer of isolationist policy, Sinn Féin. The small party, which the British had mistakenly blamed for the Rising, had subsequently been taken over as a vehicle for Irish Republicanism. The Parliamentary Party was discredited not only by its lack of support for the Easter Rising, but also by its continued support for Irish involvement in the First World War. In the General election of 1918, Sinn Féin won 73 seats, or nearly 70% of Irish representation. Thereupon, Sinn Féin MPs followed the ‘Hungarian principle’ advocated by its founder Arthur Griffith and refused to take their seats in Westminster, setting up their own Parliament in Dublin, called Dáil Éireann, and proclaimed the Irish Republic once more. In 1919 a guerrilla war broke out between the Irish Republican Army (as the Volunteers were now calling themselves) and the British security forces, the Black and Tans. The British attempted to solve the conflict through the introduction of Home Rule for 26 of Ireland's 32 counties under the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, but this settlement was no longer acceptable to Irish nationalists, who believed themselves to be the legitimately elected government of an independent Irish Republic. The fighting ended in 1921 with a truce and the subsequent Anglo-Irish Treaty:

---

26 Demobilised and now unemployed soldiers, named after their mismatched uniforms and infamous in Ireland for random acts of violence and general brutality towards the population.
partition of the island into the Irish Free State and Northern Ireland. Although the Second Dáil ratified the treaty and a subsequent general election consolidated their majority, this was not acceptable to many republicans. Consequently, the Irish Civil War broke out between the newly recruited National Army of the Free State, composed of pro-treaty Irish Republican Army\textsuperscript{27} members and other recruits, including many Irish veterans of the First World War, and those IRA members who did not accept the Treaty. The Free State government put down anti-treaty republican resistance by 1923, but the Civil War caused a permanent split in Irish nationalism, representing the continuation of the division that had always existed between conservative Catholic nationalists and radical Republicans. The Free State\textsuperscript{28} position was represented by Cumann na nGaedheal (later re-named Fine Gael), and the Free State, in its early years, was intensely conservative in social and economic spheres and fearful of republican subversion, government decisions heavily influenced by the Catholic clergy.

In 1927, Eamon de Valera formed Fianna Fail out of the defeated anti-Treaty IRA and entered parliamentary politics. Up until the late 1930s, street violence between pro and anti treaty groups was still common, especially between the faintly fascist pro Free State Blueshirts and the IRA. After the creation of a mainstream republican party in Fianna Fail, the militant IRA had little support left. The Free State was intensely nationalistic, one manifestation being the introduction of compulsory Irish language in education and for all civil and public servants. It was the goal of all nationalists to re-introduce Irish as the spoken language of the country, but this never achieved great success, the language becoming merely a token of Irish identity for Irish governments. In theory, after de Valera passed a new constitution in 1937, the Irish state was also committed to a United Ireland, i.e. the annexation of Northern Ireland. Articles 2 and 3 of the Constitution of Ireland stated that the territory of the Irish state included the entire island of Ireland. However, commitment to a United Ireland remained largely confined to rhetoric, de Valera's government interning and executing IRA members for armed attacks on the Northern state. The Irish Free State finally left the British Commonwealth in 1949 and declared itself to be the Republic of Ireland.


\textsuperscript{28} F.S.L. Lyons, Ireland Since the Famine, pp.471ff.
Irish nationalist organisations

The following is a list of nationalist organisations pertinent to this study, their names having become household words and frequently alluded to directly or indirectly in the various newspaper quotes cited in this paper. There follows a brief history of these organisations with regard to their relevance in this study.

19th century:
- Society of the United Irishmen
- Young Ireland
- Catholic Association
- Repeal Association
- Irish Republican Brotherhood – “Fenian Brotherhood”
- Clan na Gael
- Home Rule League
- Irish National League
- Irish Parliamentary Party
- Irish Land League

20th century:
- Irish Volunteers
- National Volunteers
- Irish Socialist Republican Party
- Irish Citizen Army
- Sinn Féin

The Society of the United Irishmen was a republican political organisation founded in the 18th century, seeking independence from Great Britain. Their first meeting in October 1791, in Belfast, passed the resolutions that England’s influence in the governing of Ireland was too great and thus required a cordial union among all the people of Ireland, and that the only constitutional mode by which this influence could be subverted was by a radical reform of Parliament, and that no reform was just which did not include Irishmen of every religious
persuasion. The society was formed largely by Protestants, its leading figures Theobald Wolfe Tone, James Napper Tandy, Henry Joy McCracken, Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Robert Emmet. The Orange Order, in turn, was founded in 1795 with the aim of promoting Protestant pro-British loyalism, as a reaction against the anti-sectarianism of the United Irishmen, which then went underground, as they had become determined to force a revolt. Having forged links with revolutionary France, a French fleet sailed for Ireland in 1796, under General Hoche. It spent days in sight of the Cork coast, but weather conditions meant it could not land. The British government hanged or transported the leaders in response. With more promises of French aid, the United Irishmen again instigated a rising in 1798, but the campaign failed and the insurgents defeated. Wolfe Tone returned to Ireland with a French fleet, was intercepted by the British Navy in Donegal Bay. Upon his capture he famously said, "From my earliest youth I have regarded the connection between Ireland and Great Britain as the curse of the Irish nation, and felt convinced, that while it lasted, this country would never be free or happy. In consequence, I determined to apply all the powers which my individual efforts could move, in order to separate the two countries." Wolfe Tone committed suicide in prison shortly afterwards. The Irish Parliament was closed, resulting in the Act of Union that created the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. This was due to British worries that the French would continue to use Ireland to attack Britain, and a recognition that the corrupt Protestant Parliament in Dublin had contributed to sedition in Ireland. The Orange Order, however, provided the Government with allies with local knowledge. The disarming of Ulster in 1797, after the United Irishmen had radicalised both Protestant and Catholic, saw thousands of Catholics driven from counties Antrim, Down and Armagh, with the murder and imprisonment of hundreds of Protestants suspected of United Irishmen sympathies. At Scullabogue in County Wexford scores of Loyalists and their wives and children were burnt alive in reprisal for atrocities by the Crown forces. Such massacres were exploited in the following years by loyalist politicians to cement the sectarian divide and to ensure the loyalty of Protestants to the English Crown. The fact that the majority of the 30,000 people killed during the rebellion were

30 Elliot, Wolfe Tone, pp.359ff.
31 Tony Gray, The Orange Order (Bodley Head, 1972).
victims of British and Loyalist troops was ignored. An attempt to revive the United Irishmen was made in 1803 by Robert Emmet, who was subsequently sent to the gallows. Henceforth, the British Government sought to avoid a repetition of the non-sectarian vision of Irish unity by repression of republicanism, along with tolerance of sectarianism. Catholics continued to be discriminated under the Union until Daniel O'Connell achieved Catholic Emancipation in 1829. Some Presbyterian members of the Society of United Irishmen became reconciled to Unionism when offered a share of power; others transferred their allegiances to Freemason societies, which became widespread in Ulster during the 19th century. The failure of the United Irishmen's vision to unite Protestant, Catholic and Dissenter in an independent Irish Republic, has left a legacy of religious division to the present day.

The next generation of idealists was Young Ireland, the movement having grown out of the weekly newspaper The Nation, calling for the restoration of Irish self-government by the repeal of the Act of Union. Established in 1842 by Charles Gavan Duffy, a Catholic journalist, and Thomas Davis, a Protestant graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, they were foremost a romantic movement. Originally followers of Daniel O'Connell and his Repeal Association, they split over his refusal to use violence and his reliance on the Catholic Church. When O'Connell's ‘Monster Meeting’ at Clontarf was banned by the British government, and O'Connell cancelled it rather than risk violence, Young Ireland opted to take a violent path themselves towards repeal. Their desire for rebellion was exacerbated by the tragic effects of the potato famine and the wave of rebellions sweeping over Europe in 1848. 32 William Smith O'Brien, 33 leader of Young Ireland, launched an attempted rebellion in July 1848, managing to rouse only 50 supporters, and the rebellion became mockingly known as 'The battle of Widow McCormack's cabbage patch.' The RIC easily suppressed it, and although resistance continued until 1849, the rebellion was effectively dead. The majority of the Irish were in no condition for an armed uprising, moreover, O'Brien, a social conservative, put no effort into enlisting the help of the peasant majority. The Catholic Church also opposed insurrection and especially disliked Young Ireland's Protestant leadership, such as O'Brien himself, a Protestant landowner who owned estates both in Ireland and Britain.

32 D.George Boyce, Nineteenth-Century Ireland, pp.121ff.
33 Comerford, The Fenians in Context.
The most lasting legacy bequeathed to nationalist movements globally, the peaceful mass movement – or monster meetings, as they became known in Ireland – was engendered by a man remembered as the Liberator, Daniel O'Connell, who had achieved Catholic Emancipation with pacifist means by 1829. A member of Ireland’s old impoverished Gaelic aristocracy, he had a seat in parliament and the support of the government. This allowed the repeal of the Tithe Bill, the passing of the Municipal Corporations Act 1840 and a revision of the Poor Laws. In 1840 O'Connell set up the **Repeal Association**, with a monthly subscription paid by all members. This was called the Repeal Rent, and very similar to the Catholic Rent. The campaign wasn't as clear as it was for Catholic Emancipation and O'Connell didn't have a coherent plan to carry out his campaign. The biggest problem was that Young Ireland had already revealed that they were willing to use violence. 34 O'Connell gathered support by holding more monster meetings, with around 100,000 in attendance. However, when the meeting at Clontarf was outlawed, O'Connell was placed under one year's house arrest and fined. Though the House of Lords soon overturned the verdict, O'Connell was discredited in Ireland. His campaign, however, led to a number of reforms, including the Maynooth Grant for a Catholic Seminary, and the Academic Colleges Act. Also the Devon Commission identified the problems with the leases on land. O'Connell moved abroad, where he died in 1847.

The **Irish Republican Brotherhood**, formed in the 1850s by James Stephens, its members referring to themselves as Fenians, rejected peaceful methods and became the chief group advocating armed revolt for Ireland’s independence during the latter half of the 19th century. They staged an ineffective revolt in March 1867, and although the IRB co-operated with Parnell’s IPP in the 1870s and 1880s during the Land War, it was also associated with a dynamite campaign in English cities in the 1880s. Its counterpart in America was organized by John O’Mahony and known as the Fenian Brotherhood (later Clan na Gael), which organized several raids into British Canada from 1866 to 1871 in an effort aimed at exchanging control of Canada for Ireland's freedom. 35 Stephens, one of the "Men of 1848," had established himself in Paris, and was in correspondence with O'Mahony in the United States and other radical nationalists at home and

abroad. A club called the Phoenix National and Literary Society, lead by Jeremiah O'Donovan Rossa, had recently been formed at Skibbereen, West Cork, and Stephens made this popular venture the centre of his preparations for armed rebellion. The object of Stephens, O'Mahony and other leaders of the movement was to form a league of Irishmen in all parts of the world against British rule in Ireland. The organization was modelled on that of the Jacobins of the French Revolution, even forming a "Committee of Public Safety" in Paris, with a number of subsidiary committees and affiliated clubs. The Fenians were soon organised in Australia, South America, Canada, and above all in the United States, as well as in the larger cities of Great Britain, such as London, Manchester, and Glasgow. The Fenians had more trouble gaining the support of the tenant farmers or labourers in Ireland because of their fears of reprisals. The early movement was also denounced by the Catholic Church. One Irish bishop famously declared that "Hell is not hot enough, nor eternity long enough" for the Fenians. The Irish People, a revolutionary journal, was started in Dublin by Stephens and advocated armed rebellion, appealing for aid to Irishmen who had received military training and experience in the American Civil War. In 1865, Irishmen who had borne arms flocked to Ireland, and the plans for a rising began. The government, well served by informers, took action: the Irish People was suppressed and several prominent Fenians sentenced to penal servitude. Stephens, escaped to France. The failed revolt the following year proved a serious setback to the IRB's hopes, with

---

36 As Irish immigration to America began to increase in the 18th century many Irish organizations were formed, one of the earliest being the Irish Charitable Society founded in Boston in 1737. Others were called the anti-Protestant Ancient and Most Benevolent Order of the Friendly Brothers of Saint Patrick, founded in New York in 1767, the Society of the Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick for the Relief of Emigrants in Philadelphia in 1771, and the Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick, New York 1784. In the later part of the 1780s, a strong nationalist rather than catholic character began to grow in these organisations, Celtic symbolism solidifying this sense of nationalism and was most noticeably found in the use of the name "Hibernian."

37 Comerford, pp.51ff.

38 The Irish were considered a foreign people within the American state by anti-Catholic Americans such as the Know-Nothing Party; their existence seen primarily as temporary camps of immigrants who planned to stay in America only as long as the British stayed in Ireland. Upon the British withdrawal from Irish soil, it was believed, the Irish would return to their native land. The Fenian Raids were an astounding example of immigrant activity in U.S. history and Irish nationalism became something of an exception in the American melting pot, where few immigrants concerned themselves with their mother country as the Irish did: for example, in March 1868, 100,000 Fenian supporters held an anti-English demonstration in New York. The 1880s saw the solidification in America of Irish ideological orientations, with most nationalist sentiment organised within Clan na Gael, rather than sectarian anti-Protestant organisations. The agrarian-minded found their ideological brethren in the Irish Federation of America. The third strand was connected to the union and socialist movement and found support with the Knights of Labor. Cf. David H. Bennett, The Party of Fear; From Nativist Movements to the New Right in American History (New York, 1990), John Higham, Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925 (N.Y., 1963).
numerous arrests in both Ireland and Britain. In the following years, leaders of the IRB courted support from ambassadors of nations they perceived as enemies of England, and looked for allies among other Irish national groups, this latter attempt at coalition building successful. Revitalised from about 1910, the IRB was the organising force of the Easter Rising of 1916, under the leadership of such men as Tom Clarke, Sean MacDermott and Padraig Pearse.

The majority of Ireland’s population were, however, prepared to let constitutional means redress their grievances. The Home Rule League, also called the Home Rule Party, was a 19th and early 20th century Irish political party campaigning for self-government for the whole island of Ireland. From the 1880s it was re-organised and known as the Irish Parliamentary Party, and regarded as the first professionally organised, whipped political party in British political history. The Home Rule League grew out of the Home Government Association, a pressure group formed in 1870 by Isaac Butt, a Dublin barrister, its members including the editor of the Cork Examiner, John Francis Maguire. In 1873, the association regrouped as a full political party, the Home Rule League, and in the 1874 general election, it won 59 seats. In this period it was not a political party but an alliance of home rule-leaning Irish politicians. Thus the party became divided between the less committed members of Parliament, many from an Irish aristocratic or Church of Ireland background, and other radical members around Belfast MP Joseph Biggar and Meath MP Charles Parnell. This radical wing decided to launch parliamentary filibusters to obstruct the passage of Parliamentary business, to the embarrassment of Butt and the frustration of successive British governments. In 1880 Parnell was elected chairman of the party, and in the 1880 general election, the party increased its number of seats. In 1882, renamed the Irish Parliamentary Party, the IPP under Parnell’s leadership, himself a Protestant, became more radical, middle class and Roman Catholic, squeezing out other political rivals, notably the Irish Liberal Party and the Irish Conservative Party. Charles Stewart Parnell was born in County

39 The objective of Clan na Gael was to secure an independent Ireland and to assist the Irish Republican Brotherhood in achieving this aim, and so was prepared to enter into alliances with any nation allied against the British; with the outbreak of the First World War in 1914, the Clan found its greatest ally in Germany. John Devoy, along with Roger Casement, brought together both the American and German support in the years prior to the Easter Rising. Clan na Gael became the largest financier of the Easter Rising and the Irish War of Independence. Imperial Germany aided Clan na Gael by selling them guns and munitions used in the Rising of 1916, hoping to distract Britain with an Irish uprising and affect a German victory on the Western Front. Cf. John Devoy, Recollections of an Irish Rebel (New York, 1929).
Wicklow, of gentry stock, son of John Henry Parnell, a wealthy Anglo-Irish landowner, and his American wife Delia Stewart, daughter of the famous American naval hero, Commodore Charles Stewart, stepson of one of George Washington’s bodyguards. Commodore Stewart's mother, Parnell's great-grandmother, belonged to the Tudor family and could claim distant relationship with the British Royal Family. John Henry Parnell was a cousin of one of Ireland's leading aristocrats, Lord Powerscourt, and also the grandson of a Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Irish House of Commons, Sir John Parnell. It was as a leader of Irish Nationalism that Charles Stewart Parnell established his fame, becoming popularly known as ‘the uncrowned king of Ireland.’

Parnell showed himself to be a skilled organizer, replacing Butt as chairman of the Nationalist Party, and in the mid 1880s, Liberal Party leader William Gladstone committed his party to support Irish Home Rule, introducing the First Home Rule Bill in 1886. The IPP also campaigned for Irish land reform, some of its members working closely with the Irish National Land League. Parnell was elected president of the Land League in 1879 and in 1880, together with John Dillon, he visited the United States to raise funds and awareness for the Land League, addressing the House of Representatives on the state of Ireland. The association with the Land League led various MPs, including John Dillon, Tim Healy, William O’Brien, and Parnell himself to serve periods in prison.

CE 31 January 1889
The Arrest of Mr. Wm. O’Brien, M.P.
His Departure for Dublin. Great Popular Ovation En Route.
Mr. O’Brien left Manchester at 9.40 this morning for Dublin […] and was conveyed across the Channel to Kingstown. […] The police made no attempt to prevent the people speaking to the prisoner as he left the steamer, but having entered the railway carriage he was isolated from the crowd by a strong cordon of Dublin police.

---

43 CE 1 February 1889, The Political Prisoners. […] Condition of Wm. O’Brien, M.P.[…] A Dublin correspondent says: - The following telegram from a magistrate at Clonmel has been received in Dublin this afternoon: - Dear Sir, - I am just after visiting Mr. Wm. O’Brien, who arrived at the prison here between two and three o’clock, and found him in an exhausted state and excited condition. He had been forcibly deprived of his clothes, and his hair and beard cut close. He told me he had resisted with all his strength, and would do so as long as he lived. He says he will not wear the prison clothes. Edward Hackett, Visiting Justice.
And in the same edition: Warrants for Messrs. Kilbride and Carew. M.P.sWarrants for the arrest of Messrs. Kilbride and Carew, members of Parliament, have been in the hands of the police for about
However, the agitation did lead to the passing of a series of Land Acts that over three decades changed the face of Irish land ownership, replacing large Anglo-Irish estates with tenant ownership. Parnell became a national hero, though his triumph was short-lived. It was officially 'revealed' that Parnell was the long term partner of Katherine O’Shea and father of three of her children, the wife of a fellow Galway MP, Captain Willie O’Shea, who initiated divorce proceedings after failing to secure a large inheritance due to his wife. After the divorce, Katherine became Parnell's wife, but under pressure from the religious wing of the Liberal Party, Gladstone reluctantly indicated that he could not support the Irish Parliamentary party as long as Charles Stewart Parnell remained its leader. The scandal soon crippled Parnell’s support. At a party meeting, Parnell challenged Gladstone's intervention with the question, "Who is the master of the party?"; Tim Healy, a notoriously waspish MP, responded with the legendary "Who is the mistress of the party?" putdown. As a direct consequence of the O'Shea divorce, the Unionist movement in Ulster gained strength, espousing Puritan values they claimed the Home Rule movement as 'morally wrong' and Unionism the morally correct and only viable option. Parnell was deposed as leader and fought a long and bitter campaign for re-instatement. He conducted a political tour of Ireland to regain popular support, attracting Fenian "hillside men" to his side. However, he lost the support of the Freeman's Journal, one of the leading national dailies of the time, the Cork Examiner never having played a great supporting role to begin with, accept in the aftermath of his untimely death. Following Parnell's fall in 1891, the party split into Parnellite and anti-Parnellite wings, but reunited in 1900 under the leadership of John Redmond and his deputy John Dillon. Around this time social...

---

44 Details of the release of political prisoners were equally published in detail, such as on CE 21 December 1889: Release of Mr. Wm. O’Brien, M.P. (Special telegram) Presentation of Addresses. Galway, Friday. Precisely at nine o’clock this morning Mr. O’Brien was released from Galway gaol after an incarceration of four months, inflicted upon him for a speech addressed to Mr. Smith-Barry’s Clonakilty tenants. A crowd assembled at the gaol cheered loudly. The hon. Gentleman was conveyed in the carriage of the Bishop of Galway to the latter’s residence, where he breakfasted and received an address from the Aloysian Society, to which he delivered a spirited reply. Next he drove to the Temperance Hall, where an enormous crowd had gathered, and where it had been arranged the presentation of the addresses would take place. […] Mr. O’Brien, on rising to reply, received a great ovation […].

45 Parnell had addressed a crowd in pouring rain at Creggs on the Galway–Roscommon border and contracted pneumonia. He returned to Brighton, where he died of a heart attack brought on by rheumatic fever. Though an Anglican, he was buried in Dublin's largest Roman Catholic cemetery, Glasnevin, now alongside Eamon de Valera, Michael Collins and Daniel O'Connell.

46 Boyce, Nationalism in Ireland.
legislation was pressed for and passed in Ireland's interest: a Local Government Act (1898), a Town Tenant's Act, Housing of the Working Class Act, Department of Agriculture Act, Technical Instructors Act, a New University Act (1908), and three Land Acts (1903, 1906, 1909). The Local Government Act abolished the old landlord-dominated Grand Juries and replaced them by forty-nine county, urban and rural district councils, managed by Irish people for the administration of local affairs. The councils proved popular as they established a political class capable of running Irish affairs. It also stimulated the desire to attain Home Rule and manage affairs on a national level. A consequence of this was that the councils were largely dominated by the IPP. Following the December 1910 general election and the passing of the Parliament Act limiting the veto power of the Lords, the party achieved Home Rule, promising self-government under the Third Home Rule Act 1914. However, the outbreak of World War I led to its suspension. Redmond's Irish National Volunteers helped enforce the Home Rule Act in the face of opposition from the Ulster Volunteer Force, by responding to his call that in order to implement Home Rule they should support Britain’s war effort by joining the Irish divisions of the British Army. Unlike their unionist counterparts, they were not permitted their own officers and served under English commanders. The Volunteers were formed in response to the formation of the Ulster Volunteer Force by Edward Carson and James Craig in 1913. With armed men in Ulster threatening force to counter Home Rule, a similar force was considered prudent to pressure on Britain in the other direction. To this end Eoin MacNeill published an article ‘The North Began,’ arguing for the necessity of such a force, and on November 11, 1913 at Wynn's Hotel in Dublin, eleven prominent nationalists sat down to plan the formation of the Volunteers, among them Padraig Pearse, Eamon Ceannt, and Sean MacDermott. Attendance at their first public meeting at the Rotunda in Dublin was beyond what anyone expected, well over the 4,000-person capacity, with a further 3,000 spilling onto the grounds outside. Over the following months the movement spread throughout the country with thousands joining every week. The leadership of the Volunteers was heavily influenced by the radical IRB, but this had a major drawback when the leader of the IPP, Redmond, demanded that the Volunteers accept his appointments to the Provisional Committee, effectively placing the organization in his control. Although moderates were prepared to go

47 D.D Sheehan, Ireland since Parnell (London, 1921).
48 Boyce, Nineteenth-Century Ireland, pp.237ff.
along with the idea to prevent Redmond from forming his own organization that would draw away their support, the IRB was opposed as it would end their control of the Volunteers, but were unable to prevent the motion being carried in Redmond's favour. Shortly after the formation of the Volunteers, British Parliament banned the importation of weapons into Ireland, but the Ulster Volunteers were able to get away with it nevertheless. Many commentators of the time found amusing the fact that "loyal" Ulstermen were arming themselves and threatening to defy the British government through force, whereupon Pearse famously replied that "the Orangeman with a gun is not as laughable as the nationalist without one."

Thus Roger Casement and Bulmer Hobson worked together to coordinate a gun running expedition to the port of Howth, north of Dublin. The plan worked with Erskine Childers bringing nearly 1,000 rifles to the harbour and distributing them to the waiting Volunteers without interference from the authorities. However, when the Volunteers returned to Dublin they were met by a large patrol of the Dublin Metropolitan Police and the British Army. The Volunteers escaped largely unscathed, but when the army returned to Dublin they fired on a group of unarmed civilians who had been heckling them, the massacre causing enlistments in the Volunteers to soar. In 1914 the majority of Volunteers supported the War effort and the call to restore freedom to "small countries" in Europe and formed the National Volunteers. A minority believed that efforts were best applied to restoring freedom in one small country in particular and retained the name "Irish Volunteers", led by MacNeill, and called for Irish neutrality. The National Volunteers kept some 175,000 members, leaving the Irish Volunteers with an estimated 13,500. This split meant the IRB were back in control, while the National Volunteers, who joined the British army in large numbers, ceased to exist. Following the split, the remnants of the Irish Volunteers were often referred to as the Sinn Féin Volunteers, after Arthur Griffith’s political organization. The term began as a derogatory one, but soon became ubiquitous in Ireland. Although the organizations had overlapping memberships, there was no official connection between Griffith's then moderate Sinn Féin and the Volunteers. The stance of these Volunteers was not always popular, and a 1000-strong march led by Pearse through the city of Limerick on Whit Sunday, 1915, was pelted with rubbish by a hostile crowd.49 The official stance was that action would only be taken if the British authorities at Dublin

Castle attempted to disarm the Volunteers, arrest their leaders, or introduce conscription to Ireland, however, the IRB was determined to use offensive action while Britain was tied up in the First World War. Pearse issued orders for three days of parades and manoeuvres to veil a general insurrection. MacNeill discovered the real intent and attempted to stop all actions by the Volunteers. He succeeded only in putting the Rising off for a day, and limiting it to about 1,000 participants, virtually all within Dublin. The Rising failed and large numbers of the Volunteers were arrested, even ones that did not participate in the fighting. Another important element in the rising was the small but efficient number of combatants recruited from the **Irish Socialist Republican Party**. Founded in 1896 by James Connolly, its aim was to establish Ireland as a workers' republic. Connolly spent many years in the United States to return to Ireland in 1910, finding his party had been revived in 1909 with the new name Socialist Party of Ireland, but fell into inactivity again when Connolly was more inclined to see revolution as proceeding from 'one big union' than from a revolutionary party, and became involved in the Irish Transport and General Workers’ Union and the union-based Irish Citizen Army. Following Connolly's execution by the British for his role in the Rising in 1916, and the 1917 February Revolution in Russia, the party was once more revived and in 1921 it became the first Communist Party in Ireland. The **Irish Citizen Army**, or ICA, was a group of trained volunteers established in Dublin to defend worker's demonstrations from the police. The army rose out of the Lockout of 1913. The dispute began over the recognition of this union founded by James Larkin, when William Martin Murphy, an industrialist, locked out some trade unionists. In response, Larkin called an all out strike on Murphy's Dublin United Tramway Company. The conflict involved 400 employers and 25,000 workers,
causing most of Dublin to come to an economic standstill. The lockout was marked by rioting between the strikers and the Dublin Metropolitan Police, in which two men were beaten to death and hundreds injured. After six months the workers returned hungry and defeated, and the harsh treatment given to the strikers by the Dublin Metropolitan Police convinced Connolly and others that it was necessary to organize the workers to defend themselves. The Citizen Army had been armed with hurling sticks and bats. Reorganised in 1914 and, after James Larkin left for America, the party became James Connolly’s personal army of trained socialists. Connolly had served in the British army in his youth and knew something about military tactics, and Captain Jack White, responsible for training, offered 50 pounds towards the cost of shoes to workers so they could train. The ICA was armed with Mauser rifles bought from Germany. This organisation was the first to offer equal membership to both men and women and trained them both in the use of weapons. The army was based around the ITGWU union building, Liberty Hall. Other members included playwright Sean O’Casey, aristocratic activist Countess Markievicz, and popular Dublin intellectual Francis Sheehy-Skeffington. Skeffington and O'Casey left the ICA when Connolly moved towards the radical nationalist group, the IRB, where he was inducted into their Supreme Council in preparation for the rising. The surviving ICA members were interned until 1919. Though many of them later joined the new Irish Republican Army, the Citizen Army remained in existence until the 1930s.

The Sinn Féin movement, an amorphous propaganda movement of Gaelicised young men and women, crystallised around the campaign of Arthur Griffith and William Rooney, both active in Dublin's nationalist clubs at the beginning of the 20th century. Griffith was a newspaperman with an impressive network of friends in the Dublin printing industry, and his propaganda newspapers, the United Irishman and Sinn Féin, channelled the energy of the ‘self-help’ generation into a political project based on the Austro-Hungarian dual monarchy of 1867 and the theories of the German nationalist economist Friedrich List. Tapping into the growing self-awareness of an Irish identity, reflected in movements like the Gaelic Athletic Association, the Gaelic League and in the founding of the Abbey

---

54 Brendan Clifford, Connolly and German Socialism (Athol Books, 2004).
Theatre, Griffith created a federation of nationalist clubs and associations to compete with John Redmond's Irish Parliamentary Party, to embody the aspirations of 20th century nationalists. Griffith declared the Act of Union illegal and, consequently, the Anglo-Irish dual monarchy which had existed under Grattan’s Parliament and the Constitution of 1782 was still in effect. Sinn Féin attracted minimal support and by early 1915 it was insolvent. It was paradoxically rescued by the mistaken belief at Dublin Castle that it had been behind the 1916 Rising. Any group that disagreed with mainstream constitutional politics was branded 'Sinn Féin' by British commentators, the term 'Sinn Féin Rebellion' used also by the Irish media. Surviving leaders of the Rising under de Valera took over the party, de Valera replacing Griffith as president. It nearly split between its monarchist and republican wings at its 1917 Ard Fheis (conference) until, in a compromise motion, it proposed the establishment of an independent republic. Though boosted by the anger over the execution of Rising leaders, public sympathy did not give Sinn Féin immediate electoral advantage. It was only after the Conscription Crisis that support decisively swung behind Sinn Féin. The party won 73 of Ireland's 106 seats in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland parliament at the general election in December 1918, many of the seats it won uncontested. As these seats were often uncontested under dubious circumstances, it has been difficult to determine what the actual support for the party was in the country, accounts ranging from 45% to 80%. On 21 January 1919 Sinn Féin MPs assembled in Dublin's Mansion House and proclaimed themselves the parliament of Ireland, Dáil Éireann; they elected an Aireacht (ministry) headed by a Príomh Aire (prime minister). The state was declared to be a republic, but no provision was made for a head of state. This was rectified in August 1921 when the Príomh Áire (also known as President of Dáil Éireann) was upgraded to President of the Republic, a full head of state.

Cultural Nationalism

A typical feature of Irish nationalism from the late 19th century onwards has been a commitment to Gaelic Irish culture. The Gaelic Athletic Association was formed to promote Gaelic games at the expense of "English" sports such as

56 There had been a notion of instating a Catholic member of the German Hohenzoller family as King of Ireland.
association football, rugby and cricket. The Gaelic Athletic Association, or GAA, was and still is an organisation focussed on promoting Gaelic games, such as hurling and camogie, Gaelic football and handball, and rounders. The organisation also promotes Irish music and dance and the Irish language as an integral part of its objectives, based on the traditional parishes and counties. Michael Cusack, its founder, was a teacher at Blackrock College, Dublin, and in 1877 he set up the Civil Service Academy to prepare students for examinations into the British Civil Service. Pupils at the popular academy were encouraged to get involved in all forms of physical exercise, eventually re-establishing hurling as the national pastime. Cusack and several other enthusiasts formed the Gaelic Athletic Association in 1884, in Thurles, Tipperary. Soon after, Archbishop Thomas Croke of Cashel gave it his approval and became its first patron, to be joined later by Michael Davitt and Parnell. It was Croke who introduced the rule that forbade members of the GAA from playing "foreign and fantastic games" such as tennis, cricket, polo and croquet. In 1886 County Committees were established as the units of representation for the new All-Ireland championship. Later, new rules for Gaelic football and hurling were drawn up by the Association and were published in the United Irishman newspaper. The year 1887 saw the first All-Ireland Championships being held in both codes of sport, and 12 of the 32 counties entered.

Another developing force in Ireland at the time was an intellectual movement calling itself the **Gaelic Revival**. Concerned that Ireland was becoming too Anglicised, organisations for the promotion of the Irish language were formed, including the Gaelic League, or “Conradh na Gaeilge.” The Gaelic League was an organization for the purpose of keeping alive the Irish language, spoken primarily in those most westerly regions known as the Gaeltacht.

---

60 The Cork Examiner offers an entertaining letter to the Editor on an incident in the Gaeltacht, popular for its summer schools:
CE 16 February 1916. Ballingeary Arrest. Dear Sir – An incident recently occurred in Ballingeary which if it has an element of tragedy, has also a large element of comedy. **An Englishman (Professor Chevasse) wearing the Irish kilt**, and refusing to speak but the Irish language, was arrested by **an Irish policeman wearing the English uniform, and ignorant of the Irish**
League was founded in Dublin in 1893 by Douglas Hyde, a protestant and a Unionist from Roscommon, with the aid of Eoin MacNeill and others. It developed from the earlier Gaelic Union and became the leading institution promoting the Gaelic Revival. The league's newspaper was An Claideamh Soluis, "The Sword of Light," and Padraig Pearse its most noted editor. Though apolitical in intent, the League soon attracted Irish Nationalists of different persuasions, much like the GAA had done. It was in the Gaelic League that many future political leaders met, laying the foundation for groups such as the Irish Volunteers. Indeed, most of the signatories of the Easter Rising were members of the Gaelic League. In summary, although most of the cultural nationalists were actually English speakers and their organisations had little impact on the actual Irish speaking areas, where the language continued to decline, these organisations attracted large memberships and were the starting point for many radical Irish nationalists, also of the early twentieth century, such as Sir Roger Casement.

It would be difficult to imagine the rapid spread of nationalist ideas in the latter half of the nineteenth century without the medium of the press. Through various Education Acts under British Administration the general population had reached a relatively high degree of literacy and by the turn of the century the mutually beneficent relationship between press and politics had been firmly established, profiting also by the developed transport system of road and rail, steamships and the telegraph.

A history of newspaper publishing in Ireland

Newspapers have been published in Ireland since the mid seventeenth century, the oldest newspaper in the National Library's collection being An

language, lest he might injure the realms of England. To add to the humour of the situation, the Irish soldiers are helping England in her battles to preserve the rights of small nationalities, including their language, whilst an Englishman in his campaign to preserve the Irish language is fined by a bench of Irish magistrates. To prevent such an incident from occurring again, I am writing to ask the Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary to send at least one Irish speaking policeman to Ballingearry. This is the more necessary as during the season of the Irish College in July and August at Ballingearry the students are supposed to speak nothing but Irish, and in doing this they may get into trouble if there is no policeman there who knows the Irish language. This incident moreover would lead one to think that a movement should be set on foot to make knowledge of the Irish language compulsory for candidates for the Royal Irish Constabulary.

Yours truly, James O'Leary, P.P., Ballingeary.

61 Irish Education Act (1878), University Education Act (1879), Education Endowments Act (1885), Education Act (1892). Cf. F.S.L. Lyons, Ireland Since the Famine.

Account of Chief Occurrences in Ireland, published in February 1660 by Sir Charles Coote, and which ran for a few issues only. The Newsletter, published in Dublin in 1685 and appearing twice a week for seven months, comes closest to the modern concept of newspaper publication. In 1699 Cornelius Carter published the Flying Post, which ran for 25 years, marking the beginning of the era of continuous newspaper publication. Cork, Limerick and Waterford all published newspapers in the first few decades of the eighteenth century, and The Belfast Newsletter, first published in 1737, is one of the oldest continuously published newspapers in the world. In the eighteenth century, production was usually limited to a few hundred copies, due to the restrictions of printing technology, and circulation was very low compared to modern times. Dublin Castle, the seat of Crown Administration in Ireland, was, like most authorities, was very sensitive to critical reports, and it was common for publishers to be fined or imprisoned. In the last decades of the eighteenth century the press became more critical of the Administration and its corrupt practices, and to counter this development an increasingly repressive policy in relation to newspapers was formed through the Press Acts of 1784, 1785 and 1798, which made the printers and publishers more liable for prosecution. The Acts also increased the stamp duty payable on newspapers and increased the tax on advertisements, which had the effect of increasing the cost of production and making newspapers more expensive. As publishers were dependent on the revenue generated from advertising, it was hoped that the increased cost would deter advertisers and the opposition newspapers would no longer be financially viable. Several newspapers, such as the Volunteer Journal and the Dublin Evening Post, continued to publish critical accounts nonetheless. The Administration also had more direct means of controlling the newspapers by simply bribing publishers, or by paying for the publication of official proclamations and notices in certain newspapers. The Freeman's Journal under Francis Higgins and The Dublin

---

*The Freeman's Journal* was the oldest (moderately) nationalist newspaper in Ireland, founded in 1763 by Charles Lucas, identified with radical 18th century Protestant politicians Henry Grattan and Henry Flood. In the 19th century it became more nationalist and Catholic in tone and became the leading newspaper in Ireland throughout this century. Contemporary sources record it being read to the largely illiterate population by priests and local teachers gathering in homes, being mentioned in contemporary literature as symbolising Irish newspapers for most of its time. By the 1880s it had become the primary media supporter of Parnell and the IPP. On the nationalist side some preferred The Nation, founded by Thomas Davis, while others, including radical supporters of Parnell, read the United Irishman. The Anglo-Irish establishment, in contrast, read the then Irish unionist The Irish Times. The collapse of the IPP in 1918, and the electoral success of Sinn Fein, saw the appearance of a more radical nationalism. The Journal ceased publication in 1924, when it was
Journal under John Giffard were two of the most notorious newspapers under indirect Castle control towards the end of the century.

At the time, newspaper readers were almost exclusively the Protestant gentry, the literate class. Gradually newspapers came to be published on post days, and circulation began to spread outside the larger towns. The majority of news was copied from the London newspapers, although newspapers carried a lot of local news during times of political agitation. In general, the main items of Irish interest at this stage were births, deaths and marriage notices, advertisements and commodity prices. The other useful types of information published in the newspapers were political notices, such as declarations by the Lord Lieutenant.

The 1798 rebellion and the economic effects of the Napoleonic war had a dampening effect on newspaper publishing. After the 1840s, circulation figures began to increase due to a variety of reasons, firstly, papermaking processes had changed which significantly reduced the price of paper, and changes in printing technology had increased the production capacity and reduced costs, making newspapers cheaper. Secondly, the abolition of stamp duty and taxes on advertisements in the 1850s also reduced the price of newspapers. The Education Acts in the latter part of the century spread the use of the English language and improved literacy levels and thus created a widening readership. The type of news coverage also changed as journalism developed as a profession and modes of transport and communication improved. In time there was more Irish news content, and less copy from the London papers. In the mid-nineteenth century the number of political and radical newspapers expressing the opinions of particular organisations increased. The Nation, published by the Young Irelanders in 1842, was the first truly nationalist newspaper. The Nation was founded by three young barristers, Charles Gavan Duffy, John Blake Dillon and Thomas Davis, all central figures in the group later known as Young Ireland. On its first day of publication the print-run of 12,000 copies was sold out, and within a short time The Nation had a higher print circulation than any other newspaper in Ireland.

At this time there was not a nationalist press as such, although many papers were sympathetic to some level of Catholic emancipation, and many newspapers gave extensive coverage to O'Connell and the Emancipation movement, as was
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64 Daniel O'Connell published his own newspaper, The Pilot.
the policy of the Cork Examiner. Again the Administration reacted by suppressing radical publications and imprisoning those involved their publication. The nationalist press as such did not fully develop until the late 1870s. The growth of the Nationalist Party in Westminster increased awareness of the national culture at a time when literacy was spreading among the masses, and in turn the newspaper became an important tool for both unionist and nationalists to spread the word. In a few towns and counties, newspapers were funded by the Nationalist Party to provide a balance to the existing newspaper, which was usually unionist in outlook. Charles Stewart Parnell, leader of the Nationalist Party, owned *United Ireland* and used it to express the views of his party. *The Freeman's Journal* and a large section of the provincial press, including the Cork Examiner, became very supportive to the Nationalist Party cause.

The success of Parnellism as a national phenomenon was dependent in the first instance on developments that pre-dated Parnell’s rise to prominence; particularly a remarkable rise in literacy levels and advances in mass communication. By the mid 1870s an extensive railway system had been established throughout Ireland along with electric telegraph. [...] The telegraph, which enabled the publication of speeches within a day of their being delivered, greatly stimulated the growth of both public oratory and the provincial press [...]. While these developments worked to promote the political integration of the community in Britain generally, in Ireland during the Land War they had a similar, though more special, role of assisting the mobilization and integration of the agrarian agitation, and especially in facilitating ‘Parnellism’ as the medium through which the political world was made comprehensible to the largely peasant population that had thrust itself onto the political stage in 1879, motivated in varying degrees by fear of famine and the protection of living standards.65

In the 1880s, Parnell's political ideals were overshadowed by his involvement with Kitty O'Shea and the ensuing divorce case, and many of the papers turned against him. At the turn of the century, Gaelic newspapers began to promote Irish language, culture and sport. *Fáinne an Lae*, for example, was a popular bi-lingual newspaper published by the Gaelic League, as well as *An Claidheamh Soluis*.

As the twentieth century began, newspapers were divided over support for Home Rule and Independence. Later newspapers divided over support for the Anglo-Irish Treaty. Newspapers were often suppressed and the offices attacked or

---

65 James Loughlin, ‘Constructing the political spectacle. Parnell, the press and national leadership, 1879-1886,’ in G. George Boyce and Alan O'Day (eds.) Parnell in Perspective (Routledge, ), pp. 221/2.
burned, and unique backfiles destroyed. The first decades of the twentieth century saw the demise of one of the oldest Irish newspapers, the *Freeman's Journal*, whereby *the Irish Times* and the *Irish Independent* became the major daily papers.

**The Irish Provincial Press**

Marie-Louise Legg has compiled an exemplary collection of data on Ireland’s nineteenth century provincial press, which offers not only fact and figures pertaining to individual newspapers and their proprietor, but also provides detailed insight into the role of the newspaper business and the impact of literacy in general on Irish society of the time.\(^{66}\) The first part of the book looks at the Irish press when Ireland was recovering from the Famine. It was the abolition of newspaper taxes in 1855, concurring with a revival of nationalism, which led to the large-scale spread of newspapers, whose proprietors were often prominent in the Tenant League. The national impulse towards sobriety and industry, the raison d’être of the Cork Examiner, promoted the reading room movement, thus furthering the influence of the newspaper and shaping its content at the same time. The book also examines the press before the beginning of the Land War, a time when newspapers ostentatiously demonstrated their allegiance to either the Catholic or Protestant faith, and political movements became increasingly polarised. Finally, from the Land War to the death of Parnell, the reading matter of provincial Ireland is examined, especially regarding the coercive legislation that tried to control the press. The author concludes that far from being militant, ‘many provincial newspapers demonstrated that the majority of people in Ireland wanted to be credited with a good character, and their foremost wish was to be free from the dependence on others that had been forced on them by the Famine.’\(^{67}\) Ideas that created the Fenianism of the 1860s do not hold true for this period when, far from rebellion, the press in general demonstrated a wish for an accommodation with Westminster.

The place of the Irish language in the formation of an independent nation, and the importance of knowledge of Irish history, which had been discussed by


\(^{67}\) *Legg*, Newspapers, p.24.
Thomas Davis in *The Nation* in the 1840s, and would be again in newspapers like the *Connaught Patriot* in the 1860s, were in general put aside.\(^{68}\)

Tenant right was acknowledged to be the main political issue, but it was paralleled by pressure for free trade and the industrialisation of Ireland.\(^{69}\) In 1852, the proprietor of the Cork Examiner, and liberal member of parliament, John Francis Maguire, organised the ‘Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of all Nations’ in Cork, hoping that ‘the exhibition would open a new era by showing the world what Ireland could do.’\(^{70}\) Maguire believed the country had become so ‘imperialised’ that it no longer had the confidence necessary to succeed. While most Irish politicians complained the government enacted legislation tightening the grip of Westminster, Maguire said that Irishmen were the worst offenders in their failure to remedy the situation, and the result of this surrender of their own power was a ‘system of slow but effectual suicide’.\(^{71}\) The Cork exhibition was only one of several national efforts during the 1850s to change the public image of Ireland in Westminster from that of an uneducated, dangerous country to one with important industrial and cultural institutions.\(^{72}\)

The feelings of dislocation and loss which are discernible in the press and in the fiction of the 1840s and 1850s are constants in Irish literature going back to the eighteenth century, but at the half-century they can be linked not only with changes brought about by the Famine, but also with increased levels of emigration, which were additional motives for atonement. The sins that were believed to have caused this disaster were debated both in Britain and Ireland. The Irish provincial press wrote of a need for the Irish people to seek redemption through self-improvement […]\(^{73}\)

The palpable ‘evidence’ of God’s wrath, as well as the years before and after the Famine, formed the moral background for the founding of two popular revivalist movements, the Total Abstinence Society and the extension of the work of the Repeal Association. Depending on publicity for success, education, specially reading, was included in the programme of societies for social improvement and

---

\(^{68}\) Idem.

\(^{69}\) In 1850, politicians’s election addresses published in the local press advocated free trade and ‘cheap food for the industrious poor’, *Legg*, p.25.

\(^{70}\) *Legg*, p.25.

\(^{71}\) *CE* 11 June 1852.

\(^{72}\) The Irish Industrial Exhibition in Dublin in 1853, the visit of the Queen and Prince Albert in the same year, the statutory provision for a National Gallery of Ireland in 1854 and the 1855 Public Libraries (Ireland) Act are other examples, *Legg*, p.26.

\(^{73}\) *Legg*, p.26.
political change. This included the founding of new reading rooms and libraries throughout the country.

Rather than continue to press Westminster for reforms in the constitutional relationship between the two countries, many in Ireland now believed that economic changes must be made to create a strong and productive nation, worthy of respect. The press found a natural place in providing the necessary encouragement to improve education, and publicity for industrial enterprise.\(^\text{74}\)

The local press could be politically and financially supported by the development of towns, with its markets, shops, roads and railway stations, and with the publication of articles and advertisements in support of parliamentary and local elections. Advertisements for the sale of estates, for tenders for Boards of Guardians and Grand Juries, as well as for emigration agents and railway and steamship timetables, were dependent on the provincial press and were also the basis of its rapid growth at this time.

Increased urbanisation encouraged the growth of the provincial press after 1850, especially with improved transport links. Limited only by legislation demanding capital to purchase stamped paper and to provide sureties against libel, the constants underlying the growth of the provincial press between 1850 and 1865 were the size of the town and the growth of literacy. Mid-nineteenth century census figures are inexact, but in 1850, outside Dublin no town had more than 100,000 people, Belfast and Cork had more than 75,000 people, and Belfast had 4 papers in 1850 and Cork 3. The greater towns of County Cork: Bandon, Clonakilty, Mitchelstown, and Midleton, all came under the influence of newspapers published in Cork city, an effect similar in the hinterlands of Dublin, Waterford and Limerick.

After the abolition of stamp duty in 1855, nationalists became editors and active in literary circles. […] Their readers were the ‘respectable’ wage earners, the skilled workers and urban lower-middle class described by Comerford in his study of those who were active in Fenianism in the mid-1860s. They were part of the increased numbers of newly literate in the census figures of 1861. These were the National School masters, the town shop-boys, sailors, shoemakers and tradesmen who figured in the constabulary reports on Fenian activity in the 1860s. The demands of this new readership were an essential part of the changing press over the next twenty years.\(^\text{75}\)

Although it is difficult to classify the readers to whom newspapers claimed to appeal, most papers would cite commercial readership to attract the advertising

\(^{74}\) \text{Legg, p.27.} \\
^{75}\) \text{Legg, p.41.}
revenue essential to underpin the successful paper. There were numerous variations on the commercial theme, with local events and industry, certain groups of readers, all having their attraction. Protection lingered in Ireland much longer than at Westminster, particularly when allied to nationalism, as was advocated by some newspapers well into the 1860s. Cork, as the third most important town in Ireland and the largest port on the southwestern coast, made all Cork papers of the period concentrate on commerce, especially after Cork opened a National Exhibition in June 1852. The Cork Examiner in 1865 said that ‘It has taken the initiative in the recent industrial movement in the South and is the chief organ of all new undertakings which spring from it.’ By 1867 the paper said it had ‘made the Irish industrial movement a speciality.’

The political issue dominating the early 1850s was land reform, through tenant right and the three Fs: ‘fixity of tenure, fair rents and free sale.’ The 1852 conference which founded the Tenant League was actually organised by newspaper owners: John Gray of the Freeman’s Journal, Gavan Duffy of The Nation, and Frederick Lucas of The Tablett, with John Francis Maguire of the Cork Examiner and James M’Knight of the Banner of Ulster as strong supporters.

John Francis Maguire was a product of the mid-century Irish middle class. Born in 1815, the son of a Cork merchant, he was called to the Bar and founded the Cork Examiner in 1840. A close friend of Father Mathew (he wrote his biography), Maguire was later credited with the introduction of linen manufacture in Cork and building the Cork Spinning Mill with 1200 spindles. The entry of the Cork Examiner in the 1851 Newspaper Press Directory encapsulates the change that had taken place in the politics of the paper after the death of O’Connell. Although in 1851, the paper said that it had backed repeal, it also said that it was ‘now the advocate of the “Tenant Right League” and lends its warmest support to the advance of Irish agriculture, Irish commerce and manufactures.’

Gavan Duffy once stated that the greatest supporters of Young Ireland had been ‘the reading men’, the tradesmen, clerks, and shopkeepers educated in the reading rooms of the Repeal Association, and, indeed, increasingly after 1840, people bought books, subscribed to circulating libraries, read newspapers in public.
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76 Legg, p.47.
78 Legg, p.54.
houses, listened to others reading newspapers aloud, rented newspapers and went to reading rooms and newsrooms.\textsuperscript{79}

Thomas Hogg, the secretary of the Leeds Mechanics’ Institute told the Select Committee on Newspaper Stamps of the popularity of newspaper reading. ‘Certainly … [at present] there are many of them who prefer to go to a public house, where they can have a sight of the paper…’. But if the supply were larger at mechanics’ institutes they would go there for preference, although one of the advantages of the public house was that readers could ‘talk and discuss the subjects of the day, which is not allowable in a public news-room’.\textsuperscript{80}

In his history of the teetotal movement,\textsuperscript{81} Brian Harrison points out the numerous prominent British teetotallers who also involved themselves in mechanics’ institutes, Sunday schools, educational voluntarism, ragged schools, a free press, and public libraries. And when James Grant attributed the growing taste for reading in Ireland to teetotal principles, he was only partly right: self-improvement for patriotic reasons was a major factor. The repeal movement enrolment certificate stated that ‘Our first principle is to preserve and increase the VIRTUE of the people.’\textsuperscript{82} And in 1844 the Repeal Association adopted rules for the establishment of repeal reading rooms that were to ‘afford a source of rational occupation for the leisure hours of the industrious classes, where they may be instigated to increased patriotism, temperance, and virtue’.\textsuperscript{83}

Father Mathew was a guiding light in this movement. A contemporary observer of his work defined it as wider than temperance alone: ‘His object in establishing the temperance rooms was to afford the teetotal a place of meeting for the purpose of weaning them from the public house, supplying them with good books, [and this] had been accomplished in many parts of the country that had at this moment libraries in which were to be found the Sacred Bible, historical and geographical works and works of all kinds for the improvement of the operative.’\textsuperscript{84} John Francis Maguire started the Cork Examiner in 1841 as a teetotal newspaper, and, as an increasing number of ‘respectable’ members of society in various towns established reading rooms, these in turn made the provincial press more generally available. Literacy, albeit in English, was one of the aims of the movement, as in its

\textsuperscript{79} Legg, p.58.  
\textsuperscript{80} Idem.  
\textsuperscript{81} Brian Harrison, Drink and the Victorians (London, 1971).  
\textsuperscript{82} Legg, p. 59.  
\textsuperscript{83} Idem.  
\textsuperscript{84} Idem.
prospectus, the Cork Examiner claimed to be read in ‘various reading rooms throughout Ireland and to some extent in Manchester and other English towns’. Even after the death of Father Mathew the commitment to self-improvement through reading rooms continued in many of the towns where his influence had been strong, such as when James Grant had described Cork as ‘an intellectual place. Its inhabitants are a reading people’.

Britain’s prime Minister at this time, William Gladstone, believed that the freedom of expression as a safety valve was acceptable in Britain, where the press did not threaten public order. However, this policy could not be translated to Ireland, where the behaviour of both landlords and tenants was uncertain, and Gladstone never supported those who advocated revolution. Just as he did not care for Mazzini and Kossuth, disturbed by their popular acclaim when Garibaldi visited London, Gladstone’s fear of the masses and his horror of revolution were accompanied by his concern about the condition of Ireland, where the people were believed to be ill-educated and imperfectly led. This can be especially seen in the four years after 1866 when there was an increase in social unrest. Habeus corpus had been suspended between 1866 and 1869 and, after its restoration, an increasing number of landlords, agents and their servants were attacked. The winter of 1869-1870 saw another rise in agrarian disorders, with Irish landlords protesting at the decline of law and order, and using their connections to influence politicians in Dublin and Westminster. And as James Loughlin points out in his study on Parnell and the press, “the relationship between the press and politics was symbiotic and mutually beneficent,” and just as the growth of the provincial press in Britain “had stimulated political activity in the more settled political conditions prevailing there,” this also occurred in Ireland, which was “in the throes of a national crisis, and to a greater degree.” Loughlin, explaining the relationship
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85 Legg, p.60.  
86 Idem.  
87 Legg, p.110.  
88 CE 27 May 1867: House of Commons – Tuesday Night. Habeas Corpus Suspension Act (Ireland). Lord Naas moved the second reading of the bill. Mr. Maguire – Sir, it is quite impossible that the grave proposition now before the House will be allowed to pass without some remark on the part of Irish members. […] Parliament was opened on the 5th of February with the usual Speech from the Throne, and in that speech her Majesty was made to state that the measures taken by the Government had “rendered hopeless any attempts to disturb the general tranquility.” Then follow these words: - “I trust that you may consequently be enabled to dispense with the continuance of any exceptional legislation for that part of my dominions.” Here is a formal announcement from the Throne that the continuance of the Suspension Act is no longer necessary and that the time had come when the constitutional liberties of the country could be safely restored.  
89 James Loughlin, “Constructing the political spectacle,” p.225.
between the press and politics, refers to M.J.F. McCarthy, a *Freeman’s Journal* reporter during the Land War, who wrote:

> Print had become for the first time an actuality for the Catholic peasants and part of their everyday life, speaking to them in a thrilling, palpitating language, intelligible – and there lay the marvel – yet different from anything previously known, for it enabled them to hear their friends at a distance talking to them in accents of power about the wondrous doings of the Land League.\(^{90}\)

McCarthy is describing “the central role played by the press in establishing the ideological context of the agrarian struggle and in creating a sense of participation for the Irish peasantry in great national events.”\(^{91}\) Besides giving a sense of participation in national activities the press also created “a link between the humblest member of the league and the supreme leader, Parnell.”

McCarthy observed that for the impressionable younger generation educated in the national schools ‘the newspapers were their evangel, Mr.Parnell their saviour, and his lieutenants their apostles’. Parnell’s activities, he estimated, caused the newspapers ‘to be read by ten people for the one who had read them before’. For his part Parnell was always keen to facilitate the press. Under this stimulus it is hardly surprising that the number of nationalist papers rose remarkably. Between 1880 and 1886, in fact, they increased by 25 per cent, from 41 to 55.\(^{92}\)

A clear relationship can be traced between the Irish press published in America and the press in Ireland, with many Irish provincial papers claiming to circulate in America and Canada, and appeals for Irish causes being printed in both Irish and American papers.

It is worth noting that this link across the Atlantic could work both ways. Louis Schoenfeldt, a former reader on the Irish Times, introduced a ‘Mr.Smith’ to the British Consul in New York. ‘Smith’ hoped to work for the British government as a paid informer. He told the consul that he had lectured in Dublin about the Polish rising, and that immediately he had advertised the lectures, he was patronized, by the National Brotherhood of St.Patrick, who had invited him to lecture in the provinces to promote the cause of Ireland through its supposed resemblance to Poland. Laudatory reviews of the lectures subsequently appeared in newspapers in the Cork Southern Reporter, the *Cork Examiner* and the Kingstown Journal.\(^{93}\)
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\(^{90}\) Ibid.

\(^{91}\) Ibid.

\(^{92}\) Ibid.

\(^{93}\) Legg, p.110.
The Irish post office was put under pressure to seize newspapers preaching treason and copies were even sent to the government Law Officers, asking if the editors could be prosecuted, as in 1867, during the Fenian rebellion, when Dublin Castle received reports and letters from local officials and private citizens urging the seizure and prosecution of particular newspapers.\textsuperscript{94} Also landlords and members of the gentry called on the government to take action against the press, particularly the press supporting the Land League. However, the Irish executive was well aware that many reports of branch meetings and resolutions of the League were bogus, the so-called resolutions drafted by men in public houses! This was not new, as the Catholic Association had worked in a similar way. There were, for example, a number of reports of bogus meetings passing bogus resolutions in the Cork Examiner in 1888, and the Crime Special Branch reported that United Ireland had admitted that there had been a bogus meeting in County Clare.\textsuperscript{95}

Contradicting the hysteria of local landlords and members of the Cabinet, Dublin Castle intelligence cited earlier thought that, with some notable exceptions, most newspapers were believed to have little or no influence on their readers. The exceptions were the Derry Journal, the Leinster leader, the Roscommon Herald, Nationalist and Leinster Times, The People (Wexford), and the Cork Examiner. [...] The readers of the provincial papers were not those who believed their estates to be threatened by the Land League. They read papers from Dublin and London. The increasingly nationalist press was read by those who really were threatened by agrarian violence, though they expressed it less vociferously: the local people who kept farms and shops and who were dependent on each other for survival.\textsuperscript{96}

Events between the start of the Land War in 1879 and the death of Parnell in October 1891 created a series of confrontations between the authorities and the press when demonstrations on land issues were opposed by successive governments in attempts to bring Ireland under control.\textsuperscript{97} The issue of land dominated the decades between 1840 and 1910, appearing in the press in different guises: the Tenant League, the creation of a Gaelic past, the rise of Fenianism and the founding of the Land League, de facto, the interests of the farming community were all-important. Evidence of the national issue is contained in newspaper reports of land sales, evictions, outrages, tributes to good landlords and attacks on bad landlords.\textsuperscript{98}
ones, and publicity for branches of the National League. ‘Parnellism brought nationalists together and the Land war provided the opportunity for action. Unifying the separate parts of Ireland convinced nationalist readers of the contribution that they could make towards the creation of a national identity.’

The Irish provincial press should not, therefore, be considered as subsidiary or inferior to the national press. It performed an essential role in the development of the idea of the nation and in understanding its parts and varieties. With the founding of the Gaelic League, the longing for past values and institutions that was embodied in so many mid-century papers, was re-invented in Dublin. This, and the creation of the Dublin-based Irish National League, were evidence of the increasing centralisation of institutions that characterised the period after 1880 and which, in the development of nationalism in the early twentieth century, nurtured the germ of a tension which came to a head in the Civil War.

As R.V.Comerford has pointed out, ‘Political mobilization, the rise of popular nationalism, linguistic uniformity and increased ease of communication, all go hand in hand.’ By the 1890s, literacy was no longer just a skill to keep a man from drink, it was the passport to entry into the modern world. In towns, newspapers were read more at home and less in the public reading rooms, and newspaper proprietorship and journalism were recognised as professions in their own right. The Church, also, saw the potential of the press as a means by which a Catholic nation could be consolidated. ‘The issues of land ownership, the spread of literacy and mass communications, and the influence of the Roman Catholic Church, which was itself involved in founding newspapers, were cornerstones of the new Catholic Irish state.’

The Cork Examiner

Cork Examiner (1841-to date)
Monday, Wednesday and Friday; 1868 daily.
1851 6d.; 1857 3d. and 4d.; 1858 4d. and 5d.; 1864 2d. and 3d. 1868 1d. and 2d. Liberal.
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99 Legg, p.174.
101 Legg, p.175.
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103 CE 19 December 1861. To John Francis Maguire, Esq. Sir - As St. Stephen's day is near at hand, I know your attention has only to be called to it, that you may in your truly liberal paper remind the merchants and traders of the city to have their places of business closed on that day. I have the honour to be Sir, your obedient servant, A Draper.
Circulates Cork City and county, Kerry, Waterford, Tipperary and Limerick, in Dublin; in various reading rooms throughout Ireland and to some extent in Manchester and other English towns.

Advocates 1851 Strongly the repeal of the Act of Union,\textsuperscript{104} is now the advocate of the ‘Tenant Right League’\textsuperscript{105} and lends its warmest support to the advance of Irish agriculture, Irish commerce and manufactures.\textsuperscript{106} Though mainly a political organ, still its columns are much devoted to literature, and its reviews of books are very frequent; 1867 Reform and tenant-right. It has made the Irish industrial movement a speciality. To literary reviews it devotes a large space, and pays much attention to dramatic and musical criticism and to sporting events. 1872 It was the leading advocate of the tenant cause in the south of Ireland, and has adopted the Home Rule Movement, but it most earnest in its endeavours for the promotion of industrial enterprise in the south.

Proprietors 1851 John Francis Maguire MP Barrister at Law; 1872 Executors of the late John Francis Maguire; 1877 B.Britton; 1888 P.Corcoran; 1889 George Crosbie; 1892 P.Corcoran.

Advertisement 1865 it has taken the initiative in the recent industrial movement in the South and is the chief organ of all new undertakings that spring from it.

The Cork Examiner was called into being to rival the views spread by the \textit{Cork Constitution},\textsuperscript{107} a conservative Southern paper, favouring the Union. The

\textsuperscript{104}Already in 1841, the Repeal movement received strong support from Maguire: CE 30 August 1841. Repeal of the Union – Counties League Fund. A numerous and highly respectable Meeting of the Parishioners of Cove, was held at Fitzpatrick’s quay, on the 20th inst., for the purpose of collecting subscriptions for the protection of such electors as may be harassed for their fidelity to the cause of their country, and for the nomination of Repeal Wardens. [...] The meeting was addressed with much force and eloquence by the Chairman, Wm. Drew, esq., and the Rev. Messrs. O’Sullivan, Murphy, and Magrath. Mr. Rich. Barnett Barry, who attended with Mr. Reynolds, being loudly called on, spoke in brief but soul-stirring language, and proposed a vote of thanks to the Liberator, which was carried by acclamation. Mr. Reynolds was next complimented by a resolution, which being also carried by acclamation, that gentleman continued to address the meeting for nearly two hours, in the course of which he ably and eloquently advocated the rights of Ireland.

\textsuperscript{105}T.F. O’Sullivan, The Young Irelanders (The Kerryman Ltd., Tralee, 1944): The Tenant Right League, formed in the City Assembly House, William Street, Dublin, in August, 1850, brought Northern Protestant and Southern Catholic together, on the same platform, and promised to do much to kill sectarian bitterness.

\textsuperscript{106}CE 13 September 1841. Irish Manufacture. “With pleasure do we record the fact, that a Catholic Clergyman of this city has, within the last few months, directed his energy and zeal to the reviving of this almost extinct question of Irish interest. – We can now do little more than allude to the fact, and inform the well-wishers of the movement, that ultimate and permanent success must await the exertion of this truly good and benevolent Clergyman, who is adopting the surest, because the most practical means of carrying out his patriotic object. With his deep knowledge of the misery of the poorer classes, impressed daily, hourly, on his mind, by the shocking scenes of distress which on all sides are unfortunately to be witnessed by the Ministers of Religion – with his persevering energy in the cause of charity and country, he cannot fail in working out good for the destitute inhabitants of our City. With the sincerest pleasure, shall we recur to this highly important subject in a future post, when we can be enabled fully to develop the simple and practical mode of operation, by which the decayed manufactures of our Native Land are sought to be restored. May God prosper the good work!”

\textsuperscript{107}Legg, p.189: \textit{Cork Constitution} (1822-1924) Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday, 1872 daily, 1851 6d.; 1857 3 ½ d. and 4 ½ d.; 1864 2d. and 3d.; 1869 1d. and 2d. Conservative. Circulates Cork county and Towns and principal towns in Kerry, Limerick, Waterford and Tipperary and partially in rest of Ireland. Advocates 1851 Interests of agriculture and commerce. A political and religious journal attached to Church of England principles. The tone of his journal is decidedly aristocratic
Cork Examiner serves here as the prime source of information and comment on developing Irish nationalism and its Bohemian, i.e. Czech variant, in the Austrian Empire. The history of the newspaper begins in 1841 when John Francis Maguire, the son of a local businessman, decided the ordinary people needed a voice, in particular to counteract publications like the Cork Constitution, which served landed interests and southern Unionists. Maguire was a man of strong beliefs and strong feelings about what made good journalism, and, as he informed the House of Commons as representative of Dungarvan and Cork at Westminster (1852 and 1865 respectively), he was not a journalist ‘who stabbed in the dark or slandered a foe under the cloak of anonymous writings.’ In fact, he told them he would rather die ‘than degrade the honour of his chosen profession.’ Newspapers should have an educational function, he believed, to perform a public service and expose abuses. And so on 30 August 1841 he 'boldly launched upon the waves and this has perhaps caused it to become a favourite in the messrooms of the Sister Isle, not less than the attention paid by it to the state and all prospects of military affairs. All general new and the intelligence [of the] surrounding districts; 1883 Interests of agriculture and commerce [is] the only Conservative daily paper south of Dublin. All general news and all the intelligence which affects the surrounding districts, are carefully reported in the Constitution. 

108 John Francis Maguire (1815-1872) was a journalist and politician, born in Cork, called to the bar in 1843. 1841 he founded the Cork Examiner in support of Daniel O'Connell. He was an MP for Dungannon from 1852 to 1865 and in 1865 MP for Cork. He supported nationalist policies on the land question, disestablishment and reform of the Poor Law. He made three visits to Pope Pius IX in Rome and published a book on the pontificate which prompted the Pope to name him Knight Commander of St. Gregory. He was Lord Mayor of Cork four times, published six books, among them the very popular 'The Irish In America' which was written after a six month trip to America and Canada. Publications: The Industrial Movement and Ireland, as illustrated by the National Exhibition of 1852 (Cork, 1853); Rome: its ruler and its institutions (London, 1857); Father Mathew: a biography (London, 1863); The Irish in America (London, 1868). He died in Dublin on November 1st 1872 and was buried in Cork.

109 The Unionist community in Cork was relatively prosperous and committed to the Unionist cause. Their views were reflected through the local unionist organ, the Cork Constitution (1822-1924), which once trumpeted that "The Cork Constitution is read daily and exclusively by people representing a greater purchasing power than all the readers of all the other papers published in Munster". Cf. Richard English and Graham Walker (eds.), Unionism in Modern Ireland (Macmillan, 1996), p.95.

110 CE 30 August 1841. [...] Our space is closely contracted, nor can we, at present, add more to the foregoing instances of the grievous inequality in the existing representative system in Ireland, compared with that of Great Britain. We promise, however, not to lose sight of this most important topic. It shall be resumed from time to time, and in such a manner as to send deep conviction to every mind, that, after more than seven centuries of iron bondage, Ireland still continues a protracted victim to the fell spirit of conquest – that in general, British legislation is dictated in that spirit – that, in general, it is a mischievous mockery – and that nothing short of self-legislation – nothing but a Parliament, sitting in Dublin, can make Ireland what Nature had intended – a Nation, great, happy, and free – a Nation blest by God, but hitherto cursed by Man – a Nation in which, for centuries, stern oppression had held the riot ascendency of spoliation and carnage. “Sending like blood-hounds from the slip, Woe, want, and murder o’er the land.” We feel bound to say, that the few details above given, on the comparative state of our Franchise, are taken from one of Mr. O'Connell's late public letters. His authority will not be easily questioned. – Long may he exercise the resources of his mighty mind – and may he soon and completely prosper in his glorious and bloodless vindication of Ireland’s cause!
the Cork Examiner’. He said that his new journal would stand or fall ‘mainly upon the honesty with which its columns are devoted, not to private and personal ends, but to the welfare and interests of the whole community,’ basically in support of Catholic Emancipation and tenant rights work of Daniel O’Connell. 111 J.F.Maguire (1815–1872), a member of the educated, urban, Catholic middle class, and eldest son of John Maguire, a merchant of Cork, established the Cork Examiner as an organ of O'Connellite nationalism. He was called to the Irish bar in 1843, the same year he married Margaret, the daughter of Robert Bailey of Cork, with whom he had seven children. Although initially unsuccessful in contesting the borough of Dungarvan as a Repealer of the Act of Union in 1847 and 1851, he won it for the new Independent Irish Party, built upon the Tenant League of 1850. This seat he held until 1865, after which he represented Cork City until his death. Maguire had endeavoured to keep the Independent Irish Party alive as a bargaining power with the transient governments of the 1850s, eliciting abortive land bills based on the league's original demands, and minor concessions in the Catholic interest. However, following the early demise of his party, he sat as a Liberal from 1859. Spiritually, Maguire embodied the strong Catholic element in O'Connellite nationalism, acting as defender of contemporary papacy and its threatened temporal power, as published in Rome and its Ruler (1856), for which Pope Pius IX awarded him the order of St Gregory. 112 Politically, Maguire pressed for land reforms as a Liberal, voicing the growing self-confidence of Irish Catholicism within a Protestant Empire. To this end, Maguire joined other O'Connellite MPs in the National Association of Ireland, established 1864, 113 to offer a moderate alternative to unconstitutional Fenianism at home, and awaken British Liberals to the Irish problem in the 1860s. 114 Having spent six months travelling in North America to assess for himself the lifestyle of Irish emigrants, Maguire published his findings in another book, Ireland in America (1868), arguing that industry and order were the true characteristics of the Irish once liberated from injustice, an endeavour which

113 Nicknamed ‘Cullen's Association’ because of its domination by Paul Cullen, the enigmatic Archbishop of Dublin.
114 Steele, footnote 1: ‘Maguire obtained in 1865 a select committee of inquiry into Irish land law for which he had first asked two years earlier. As its chairman, he was unable to secure agreement on even a modest diminution of landlord rights (Parl. papers, 1865, 11.343) but the question was back on a Liberal government's agenda.’
also influenced Gladstone’s opinion on the nation. And although the Examiner was less influential than Sir John Gray’s Dublin Freeman's Journal, also of the O'Connellite tradition, Maguire was closer than Gray to Gladstone, as one of the three Irish Catholic Liberals he trusted to convey the reactions of their countrymen to his reforms. When Gladstone’s Land Bill of 1870 fell short of expectation, Maguire enrolled in the Home Government Association of Isaac Butt and canvassed for the home-rule candidate at the Mallow by-election, signalling the end of the attempt to reconcile O'Connellite nationalism with British Liberalism. However, upon his death soon after, Queen Victoria and other political opponents contributed to the national subscription for Maguire's wife and children, who had been left in straitened circumstances.

Locally, Maguire was also prominent in the civic life of his native Cork, serving as mayor in 1853 and in 1862–4, and using his parliamentary influence to promote the construction of a naval harbour in the port and attempting to introduce the linen industry into the south of Ireland. In order to facilitate the post-famine recovery of the Irish economy, Maguire sought help from the government to secure a mitigation of the Irish poor law, cutting to six months the qualifying period of applicants for relief. Literary, although possessing more industry than talent, Maguire also wrote on The Industrial Movement in Ireland (1852), to coincide with the Industrial Exhibition; a biography of the Cork ‘apostle for temperance,’ Father Mathew: a Biography (1863) to further the cause of teetotallers; and on a fictional note, a three-volume novel, The Next Generation (1871), and the posthumously published Young Prince Marigold and Other Fairy Stories (1873).

Late twentieth century historians have reassessed the work of the Independent Irish Party and the National Association of Ireland and have thus at least marginally conceded their legitimacy in the national struggle and benefitted

115 Ibid: ‘Although Maguire gave priority to the land question, he played a full part in agitating for disestablishment of the Anglican church in Ireland. His Commons motion on the state of Ireland in March 1868 provided the occasion for Gladstone's declaration against the church.’ Cf. also Lord Derby, A Selection from the Diaries - 1869–1878, ed. J. R. Vincent, 1994, 81–2; In his correspondence with Gladstone, Maguire depicted himself as a spokesman not for ‘Fenians … [but for] honest and logical nationalists’, as he said when insisting that only ‘irremovability’, the real meaning of tenant-right, would still endemic agrarian unrest and demonstrate that ‘national improvement and redemption’ were possible under the union (Maguire to Gladstone, 7 Oct 1869, BL, Add. MS 44422).

116 He died in Dublin on 1 November 1872 and was buried in St Joseph's cemetery, Cork.

the reputation of John Francis Maguire as a result. The Cork Examiner under George Crosbie, and later his sons, continued in the policy and sentiments of its founder, and is still available under its contemporary title, The Irish Examiner. In its first editorial, Maguire gives a stirring address to the public, defining the stand his paper was going to take on Repeal:

CE 1 September 1841
Editorial
To the Public

Addressing, as we thus do, the public for the first time, we cannot but feel most deeply impressed with the serious importance of the occasion, and shall therefore seek more to put with a simple declaration of principle, than to strive after more harmony of style or [illegible] elegancies of phrase. […]

Then, regardless of all else save the liberty of our Country, […] the happiness and prosperity of our children, shall we, from this our first venture upon the stormy waves of political life, be untiringly devoted to one great – and paramount object – the service of Ireland!

Believing from conviction the most certain that Ireland has little to expect from the honesty or the gratitude of her English mistress, we cannot disguise from ourselves this plain and simple truth – that the full realization of Irish liberty is about to be consummated by the united energy of her sons, by their courage in the hour of pressing danger, by their vigilance in the moment of seeming security, but above and beyond all, by their firm and unbroken union. Our decree shall be to advance the march of peaceable, and strictly constitutional agitation;118 to awaken men’s minds to a right knowledge of the passing events, pregnant as they are with the deepest interest to the individual no less than the community; and regularly to excite them to a constant activity in seeking for the secure possession of those rights, so long and cruelly withheld from them by the cold, selfish, and tyrannical policy of the English nation. […]

From the constitution of the Imperial Parliament, Ireland can have no hope; from the overwhelming majority of Conservatives and Orange Representatives in the House of Commons, Ireland can have no hope; […] from the wild anarchy of Chartist violence,119 Ireland can have no hope; from the dominant power of the wealthy landlord of the wretched Catholic vote, Ireland can have no hope; - then,

118 Similarly, CE 3 September 1841. [The] Tories are again in power! It rents asunder the veil shrouding the past, and summons before the senses visions of cruelty, of persecution, of tyranny and blood. It anticipates the march of time, and hurries into being a multitude news of fears and terrors, that would, but could not be dispelled. The finger of the past points ominously to the future. [In fine], the question at this hour is not – how came the Tories into power; - but rather – how are the people of Ireland to push them from that power again? Take wisdom then from the councils of your triumphant and exulting enemies – turn the very instrument of their victory into the ready weapon of their defeat. To the Registry! – To the Registry! – To the Registry!

119 CE 10 September 1841. No Chartism for Ireland!“Such is the spirit of O’Connell’s emphatic admonition to the people of this country, who now, under the wise and steady direction of his Leadership, are making one glorious and constitutional struggle for the restoration of their national independence. – Such is the feeling of every true friend to Ireland, who has been reared upon the new school of constitutional agitation, which teaches resolution without violence, energy without bloodshed – liberty without anarchy and wild confusion. Adopting the system of the English Chartists, Ireland must soon be involved in all the horrors of a civil war. Pursuing the present wise but determined course, Irishmen must eventually succeed in achieving full independence for their native land..”
we say, that, looking to England, the seat of all authority, and therefore of legislative power, and there reading nought but aversion to our country and hostility to her religion, with a constant desire to trample on the one and to degrade the other, we centre our hope on one measure alone, and cry out with Ireland's glorious leader: “Hurrah for the Repeal!”

The Cork Examiner began as an evening paper, coming out three times a week and it cost four old pence. It was from the beginning intent on reaching the masses and its cost was kept as low as possible, considering the overheads at the time.

CE 15 September 1841
To our Subscribers and the Public

Having, in our Address to the Public, stated our determination of enlarging the size of The Cork Examiner, we now beg leave to inform our readers that arrangements have been entered into by which The Examiner will not only be one of the very largest but the Cheapest Journals in Ireland. The Examiner will appear in its new form about the first of October.

The Cork Examiner, like all Irish papers at the time, drew a large section of its foreign reports from various British newspapers, frequently such Dáilies as the Daily Telegraph and the Daily Chronicle, but also the Times; quoted sources are also Reuter’s Agency and the Press Association. It was, in fact, only a few years prior to the founding of the Cork Examiner, that in 1848 the New York News Agency was founded, using the telegraph to supply information to newspapers, and was subsequently renamed the Associated Press (AP). When John Maguire died in 1872, Thomas Crosbie, long-time editor of the paper, became owner of the business. Thomas Crosbie, whose family was to own and run the Cork Examiner for 129 of its 160 years, joined the newspaper a year after it was founded, aged

---

120 The paper urged for repeal of the Union from its first week of publication and never faltered in bringing its earliest messages repeatedly to the public’s attention: CE 10 September 1841. “Instead of the benefit of British laws, the Union gave us martial law, and coercion acts, in abundance. For the long and uninterrupted period of twenty years, after the passing of the Union, the Irish people had been kept wholly out of the law, and the constitution! Oh! But Catholic Emancipation was granted. Yes – after thirty years of hard and bitter struggle. It came rather late – and as matter of necessity. It was yielded only, when the Irish people, to a man, rose up to break their chains, and proclaim aloud to England and Europe their determination to be free. In the present instance, let a similar demonstration be made, and the infamous act of Union will be given to the winds of heaven.”

121 CE 8 October 1841. Varieties. Foreign.“A political brief dated May 22, 1841, decides the question of mixed marriages in Austria, and orders that when the couple will not consent to educate their children in the Catholic religion, the curate shall merely lend a passive assistance. The Emperor has ordered the execution of the brief. – Leipzig Gazette.”
fifteen. It was during his time that high speed telegraph machines were installed and an office was opened in London. The enlisting of special correspondents Philip Gibbs and Ash Mead Bartlett during World War I also raised the status of the paper. Thomas Crosbie died in 1899, leaving the paper to his son George. Since then the newspaper company has been owned and controlled by the Crosbie family. In March 1996, the Cork Examiner changed to the Examiner, and in April 2000, the Examiner became the Irish Examiner, a nationally orientated paper with a blend of international, national, regional and local news. The paper has survived 160 years.

A brief history of Cork City

_Statio Bene Fide Carinis_, a safe harbour for ships, is the motto on the coat of arms of this port city, situated on the banks of the river Lee, on the South West coast of Ireland and the second largest city in the Republic of Ireland. The name of the city derives from the Gaelic ‘Corcaigh’ which means marshy place, originally referred to as Corcach Mór Mumhan, the great marsh of Munster. Cork is actually built on islands surrounded by the Lee, and still subjected to instances of flooding. The waterways between the islands have been built over to form some of

---

122 CE 18 May 1864: ‘Telegraph to America. The necessary arrangements for another attempt to lay a submarine telegraph between Ireland and North America have been made, and the Atlantic Telegraph Company are more sanguine than ever that the experiment to be undertaken in the spring of 1865 will be a complete success. By the time that the Atlantic Telegraph Company is ready for its grand enterprise a second and entirely different line of telegraphic communication between Europe and America will approach, if not reach, its completion. This is the line running across Siberia, thence connecting with Russian America, thence passing through British Columbia, and ultimately reaching our Pacific States. The most difficult portion of this telegraph, that through Siberia, is now, according to a recent despatch, completed as far as Irkutsk, the capital of Eastern Siberia. Mr. Collins, a citizen of the United States, to whom the Russian Government has given for a period of 36 years the exclusive right of working this telegraph through the Russian dominions, has now obtained from the British Government the right of way through British Columbia. The Western Union Telegraph Company of the United States are prepared to assume the construction of the line, and capitalists are ready to supply the money for carrying out the undertaking. It is intended to continue the telegraph northward along the western coast of British America to Behring's Straits, which will be crossed by a submarine cable 40 miles long, thence along the coast of Arctic Russia to the mouth of the Amoor River, at which point the Russian government have agreed to meet the line and connect it to their own. The new line will not be far from 4,200 miles in extent, and, when completed, it will unite Europe, Asia, and America, principally by land.

123 Various reputable websites offer detailed histories of Cork City, created by local authorities, historians and librarians, the most critically acclaimed being inter alia [http://www.localhistories.org/cork.html; http://www.corkpastandpresent.ie; http://www.corkcorporation.ie and http://www.corkcity.ie.], offering also a plethora of primary sources, to which the present author is highly indebted.
the main streets of present-day Cork.\textsuperscript{124} Home today of 123,000, the city expanded to varying degrees during its thousand years of development.\textsuperscript{125} According to tradition, Cork was founded by St. Finbarre in the 7th century, when he built an abbey there.\textsuperscript{126} Little is known factually about Finbarre or Bairre, as the extant lives were composed long after his death and contain mythical and folkloric elements. His abbey thrived for 250 years, a golden age in Cork City’s history, when dignitaries and scholars from all over Europe came here to learn in what was a setting of overwhelming peace.\textsuperscript{127} The second phase of development, the actual origins of the modern city, begins with the invasion of the Vikings in about 820.

The Vikings and the monastic community eventually arrived at a form of peaceful coexistence, the seafaring and trading abilities of the Vikings in fact proved to be a boon to the monastery which they provided with wine, salt and other commodities. In 914 A.D. there was a massive raid on Munster from Scandinavia and it is conjectured that some members of this raiding party expropriated the existing Viking community. Following their defeat at the battle of Clontarf in 1014, the Norse survivors continued to live in the separate communities they had established in Cork, Dublin, Limerick, Waterford and Wexford. By the 12th century the descendants of the original settlers had intermarried with the native Irish and had become known as the Ostmen or Eastmen. They had established Cork as an important trading centre and its importance was enhanced with the coming to power in the 12th century of the MacCarthys of Desmond\textsuperscript{128} who established Cork as their capital. The MacCarthys built a residence and fortress near Cork. In Latin this fortress was called ‘vetus castellarum,’ an exact translation of the Irish sean dún, or old fort, and may be identified with the present-day Shandon area of Cork. The Ostmen of Cork acknowledged the overlordship of the MacCarthy kings of

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{124} Colin Rynne, The archaeology of Cork city and harbour: from the earliest times to industrialisation (Cork: Collins Press, 1993), and The Industrial archaeology of Cork city and its environs (Dublin, 1999).
\textsuperscript{125} The Cork Examiner Jan. – Nov. 1985, for a series of articles on the history of Cork city published every Wednesday).
\textsuperscript{127} Charles Smith, The ancient and present state of the county and city of Cork: containing a natural, civil, ecclesiastical, historical and topographical description thereof (Cork, 1893).
\textsuperscript{128} County Desmond was a historic county on the south-western coast of Ireland, partitioned between modern-day Cork and Kerry in 1606. Desmond is a Gaelic name originating from “Deas-Muhan”, Southern Munster (the name of the province itself derived from the Celtic goddess Muma). After the Anglo-Norman invasion, the title and holdings of the “Earl of Desmond” were awarded to Maurice Fitzgerald in 1329. Cf. Charles Smith, The ancient and present state of the county and city of Cork (Cork, 1893).
\end{flushright}
Desmond but would appear to have retained some form of autonomy. Ostman Cork was not fated to have a long history. In 1177, the Ostmen of Cork suffered a fate common to many conquered peoples before and since. Their property was confiscated and they were expelled from the city of Cork, when the city was taken by an invading army of warriors, the Normans. 129

1169 is one of the most famous dates in the history of Ireland. In that year Normans from Wales landed at Bannow Bay in Wexford and began the Norman conquest of Ireland. With their superior military technology and organisation, the Normans made inroads against the Irish and Hiberno-Norse and in 1171 many of the provincial kings took an oath of fealty to Henry II of England, including Dermot MacCarthy, King of Munster. At the council of Oxford in 1177, Henry II granted the kingdom of Cork to Robert Fitzstephen and Milo Cogan, but he reserved the city of Cork for himself. Prince John, Lord of Ireland, visited Ireland in 1185 and granted a charter 130 to Cork City, which made Cork a corporate town with powers of local government. This status has been retained by Cork since that time to the present day.

A wall was built up around the perimeter of the city and remained for 500 years after the Norman occupation. Coins were minted in Cork 1295 and 1304 under royal authority and the city built a thriving trade with many English ports. There is little information on trade between Cork and Europe, though there are some references to trade with France, the import being wine. 131 However, this prosperity began to decline during the Gaelic and Gaelicised Anglo-Norman resurgence of the mid 14th century and Cork’s prosperity suffered further devastation with the arrival of the Black Death in 1349. Further impoverished by the need to defend itself from attack by the native population outside the city, it

130 ‘John, the Son of the King of England, Lord of Ireland, & c. Greeting, I have granted and given, and by this my Charter confirm to the citizens of Cork, and the ground on which the city is now for my benefit, to encrease the strength of the citizens. This is to them and to their heirs. To Hold of me and my heirs, and to remain in Frank burgage by such customs and rent, as the Burgesses of Bristol in England pay yearly for their burgages; and to secure my city of Cork, I grant this to the same my citizens of Cork, all the Laws, Franchises, and Customs of freight on whatsoever sails. And firmly commanding that the aforesaid my citizens of Cork, and their heirs and successors as is aforesaid, and have all the laws and franchises, and frank customs of Bristol. And as those were wont to be used and written in my Court and in my Hundred of Cork, and in all business. And I forbid that any wrong or hinderance be given to the aforesaid laws and franchises, which gifts from us are given and granted. In testimony, & c. ’ Smith, The ancient and present state of the county and city of Cork.
131 O’Sullivan, The economic history of Cork city.
was also severely damaged by a fire around 1354. The period of decline continued well into the 15th century. In 1491 a man named Perkin Warbeck arrived in Cork, claiming to be the rightful king of England, and in 1492 he tried to overthrow Henry VII. The mayor of Cork and several important citizens went with Warbeck to England but when the rebellion collapsed they were all captured and executed. After the attempted rebellion, Cork became known as ‘rebel Cork’.

The fortunes of the city did not improve during the course of the 1500s: a turbulent century marked by the Desmond rebellion, the impact of the Reformation and the beginning of the Elizabethan wars. The first truly zealous Protestant Bishop of Cork appears to have been Mathew Heyne, appointed 1572. He caused great consternation among the population by burning the venerated statue of St. Dominic in 1578. The Papacy made a shrewd appointment in 1580 by appointing Dermot Creagh as Roman Catholic Bishop of Cork. Fired by zeal for the Counter-Reformation, Creagh used the disaffection caused by the Munster plantation to woo back the population to the old faith. He succeeded to such an extent that in 1603 some of the leading citizens of Cork burned Church of Ireland bibles and service books and attempted to restore the mass in the city’s churches. By the end of the 16th century, the old merchant patriciate was once again predominantly Roman Catholic. These merchant families who controlled the civic government of the City were inspired also by priests who returned from the Counter-Reformation seminaries of Europe. This was in marked contrast to the settlers who had come to Cork during the Munster Plantation and were loyal to the Anglican tradition. A poisonous religious divisiveness had been added to a society already fissured along lines of ethnicity and class.

Sir Walter Raleigh and Edmund Spenser were two notable denizens of Cork City during the 16th century. Raleigh lived in the suburb now known as Tivoli, where cedars said to have been planted by him still stand. Cork was his headquarters in a long series of military services against the MacCarthys, the Desmonds, the Roches and the Barrys. The poet Spenser was

---

132 Very little contemporary evidence has survived on the plague in Cork, but evidence from other Irish and European sources reveal that between 25% and 35% of the population, estimated to have been around 2,000, died. The Black Death had relatively little impact on the Gaelic Irish in the rural areas, which further tilted the balance of power against the city. Cf. inter alia Patrick O’Flanagan et al, Cork: history and society: interdisciplinary essays on the history of an Irish county (Dublin, 1993).
133 Dr. Henry Alan Jefferies, Cork: historical perspectives (Dublin, 2004).
134 Smith, The ancient and present state of the county and city of Cork.
landowner and sheriff of Cork in 1597 and it is said that he wrote part of the 'Faerie Queen', in a lane off North Main Street.  

As the 16th century came to an end, Cork's citizens incurred the wrath of their rulers for trading in munitions and firearms with the French. These weapons were then being bartered in return for cattle and hides. One significant commercial development from this time was the export trade in beef, preserved by salting and packed in barrels. Cork was to achieve pre-eminence on an international scale during the next two centuries in this branch of commerce. At the start of the 17th century living conditions in Cork amounted almost to destitution. The defeat of the Irish at Kinsale in 1601 and the Flight of the Earls in 1607 meant that the Crown's authority in Ireland was absolute, and colonial outposts such as Cork were no longer needed. The insurrection of 1641 had further disastrous consequences for Cork's inhabitants. In 1664 many were expelled and forced to surrender their possessions and property. Some were allowed return in 1648, but another general expulsion took place in 1649 under Cromwell.  

The population in 1659 of the city proper was recorded as being 1,089, and of these 409 were classified as Irish. By this time erection of houses had begun outside the city, and the population of the 'Liberties' was 4,826, of which 3,219 were Irish. These 'Liberties' were added to the City following a charter of James I, naming the entire area the 'County of the City of Cork'. By the standards of the time, Cork was a large and important town.  

Cromwell's reign of terror came to an end in 1660 with the restoration of the Stuarts to the English throne. Throughout the country, recovery from the depredations of the Cromwellian regime was quite swift. By 1660 over 183,000 cattle had been exported to England. Following an outcry from British breeders, Parliament passed the Cattle Acts of 1663 and 1666. The first prohibited the import of cattle from Ireland into England from 1 July to 20 December each year and the second prohibited absolutely the import of cattle, sheep, swine, bacon and pork into England from Ireland. Ironically, as a result of the embargo Irish trade began to

---

135 Gina Johnson, The laneways of medieval Cork (Cork, Cork City Council, 2002).
136 O'Sullivan, The economic history of Cork city.
137 Mark MacCarthy, ‘Geographical change in an early modern own: urban growth, economy and cultural politics in Cork, 1600-1641. In JCHAS, Vol. 106, 2001, pp.53-78; and ‘Turning a world upside down: the metamorphosis of property, settlement and society in the city of Cork during the 1640s and 1650s.’ In Irish Geography, vol.33, 2000, pp.37-55. Orders expelling the Irish from Cork City were made in 1651 and 1656, but the fact that orders for expulsion were made several times may indicate that none of the expulsions was entirely successful.
flourish, firstly with mainland Europe and then with North America and the West Indies. This export trade developed in Kinsale but grew to such proportions that the harbour could not adequately accommodate the calling ships. The trade shifted to Cork with its safe sheltered harbour. In 1688 10,000 cattle were slaughtered in Cork, and the city had become a recognised port-of-call for transatlantic shipping going westward and supplies of butter, beef, pork, could be loaded on vessels as provisions for their crews.139

This increase in business saw the city's first bank, Hoares, open in 1680. Huguenots, escaping religious persecution in France, settled in Cork shortly after 1685. These refugees set up woollen mills and they were also expert goldsmiths and silversmiths.140 Despite the Williamite siege of 1690 resulting in the destruction of the city's wall, economically Cork continued to flourish. By 1750 the number of cattle being slaughtered annually exceeded 100,000. Another important event at this time was the establishment of the Cork Butter Market. In 1769, finding that the butter trade was in decline, merchants appointed officials to inspect and brand the butter, thus guaranteeing its quality. The Market and the Committee of Merchants had a great deal of influence on the commercial life of the city for the next century and a half.141

The accession of the Catholic James II as King of England in 1685 served to heighten the fears of Protestants in both England and Ireland, and William of Orange, ruler of Holland, and his Mary, daughter of James, were invited to become rulers of England. James fled to France to seek help and landed at Kinsale in 1689, hoping to use Ireland as base from which to regain his crown. The Catholics of Cork rallied to the Jacobite cause and a Williamite army, under the control of the Duke of Marlborough, was dispatched to Cork. The siege of Cork was soon over and Marlborough agreed to show clemency to the inhabitants and the garrison.142

139 O’Sullivan, The economic history of Cork city.
140 Their contribution to the development of Cork City has been acknowledged with part of the modern city named the Huguenot Quarter and French Church Street. Cf. Alicia St.Leger, Silver, sails and silk: Huegenots in Cork (Cork, 1991).
141 The building in which the business was conducted was situated near the Church of St. Anne, Shandon, and is still open for visitors today.
The 18th century witnessed a major expansion in the economy of Cork. The unrivalled ability of Cork Harbour to shelter the biggest fleets assembled during the American War of Independence and later during the Napoleonic Wars was a major factor in the expansion of the provisions trade. However, poverty was still widespread among the lower classes and food riots during periods of food shortages were quite common. The records bear witness to the scourges of drunkenness and violence that had their roots in privation and poor living conditions. Nevertheless the relative prosperity of Cork and indeed the rest of Ireland in this century owed much to the political stability of the country, a stability that disguised undercurrents of dissension and dissatisfaction. These feelings were largely due to the resentment at the concentration of all political power and most economic power in the hands of the minority Ascendancy class. The eruption of the 1798 rebellion brought havoc to some parts of Ireland affected by the outbreak, while Cork City was relatively untouched. The United Irishmen had been active in the city for some time and the military authorities took severe action against its members: many were transported or shot by firing squads in a field on the edge of the city. F.S.L. Lyons offers a summary on the practicalities of an Irish ‘economy’ at the turn of the century:

But perhaps it is on an over-simplification to speak of ‘an economy’. Historians have lately begun to suggest that there were really two economies – a maritime and a subsistence economy, increasingly differentiated since the eighteenth century. The former, it is argued, existed mainly along the eastern coastal fringe from Belfast to Cork (with offshoots in Limerick and Galway) and in this there had developed a cash economy tied to that of England by trade, traffic of people and growth of credit – in short, an outward-looking community which was a part, even if a peripheral part, of a wider world. At its back, and supplying it with its cheap labour and some of its essential foodstuffs, was the rural, subsistence economy on which – by the time of the Famine – depended about three-quarters of the population [...].

On another innovative level, The Sirius, the first ship to cross the Atlantic Ocean westwards under steam power, left Cork for New York on April 3, 1838. This momentous event was celebrated on both sides of the ocean, and signalled the

---

143 The economic development of Cork in the 18th century was mirrored by the physical development of the city during the same period. After the partial destruction of the city’s walls during the Williamite siege, the city began to expand rapidly in the area outside the walls and began to take on a recognisably modern configuration. By 1790 the outline of the city centre as we know it today is clear. Cf. Pettit, This City.
beginning of a new era.\textsuperscript{146} The Atlantic could now be crossed in a much shorter time, and the duration of the voyage was a lot easier to estimate. This event also initiated a decline in the Cork beef trade that had flourished for so long. This new technology meant that the demand for salted meat was greatly diminished; there was no need for food to last for the months, maybe years that it took a sailing ship to complete long voyages. Other factors, such as advances in mechanical refrigeration also contributed to the decline. Cork did not really develop or share to any great extent in the industrial revolution of the late 1700s and early 1800s when industrial towns developed all over England and Europe.\textsuperscript{147} Neither did Cork harbour possess a monopoly on sea trade in Munster, the neighbouring port in Co.Waterford was well able for international traffic and the oft dire results of foreign exchange - which provided many newspaper stories over the years. For example, in 1846, when the Cork Examiner cites the Waterford Freeman with reports on murder by two Italian Sailors, who in fact turned out to be Austrian:

\begin{quote}
CE 29 May 1846
We learn that about one o'clock this morning two sailors, natives of Genoa, accompanied by two women of bad character, hired a car from the deceased (a man named Keane) in John-street, and drove along the Quay to Mary-street, where they took up two other women, named Keane and Power, and put down the two in whose company they originally were. They were then driven out the Cork road, a little beyond the Manor Castle, where they alighted. The driver immediately demanded his fare, which was refused. He drove back again into town, and having informed the owner of the car what had happened, he put up the horse and car, and they both proceeded to the place where he had dropped his passengers. The fare was again demanded, but refused, and some blows were struck, and one of the sailors immediately plunged a stiletto into Keane's bosom, who fell dead on the spot. The other sailor, a powerful and athletic man, attempted also to stab the owner of the car, a man named Elliott, but he warded the blow from off his breast, the knife passing through his arm. Elliott escaped as quickly as possible, and gave the alarm at the Broad-street police station, and Sergeants Keely and Spillane, with their men, were on the spot in a few minutes afterwards. They found Keane dead, but still warm. They then proceeded at a rapid pace for some distance along the Cork road, but not succeeding in finding the parties they sought, they proceeded into town by another direction, by Barrack-street, and succeeded in arresting there the two women who were on the car. Following up the track they had thus struck upon, they traced their game through the Mayor's Walk, down by the back of the gaol, Sergeant's-lane, &c., and succeeded in arresting both parties in the neighbourhood of Broad-street. On searching the prisoners a knife covered with blood was found.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{146} Sean Pettit, This City of Cork, 1700-1900 (Cork, 1977).
\textsuperscript{147} It's character hasn't altered considerably in the 20th century either, in that it remains commercial and residential rather than industrial.
CE 21 December 1846

**Austrian Justice.** It will be remembered that at the last Waterford assizes two Austro-Italians, belonging to the Anna of Trieste were acquitted of the murder of Keane, the carman, the jury agreeing that it was in self-defence the homicide was committed. It was believed that one of the Austrians, the small man, in particular, gave the fatal stab to Keane. The men returned to Italy, but not by the ship Anna, as she sailed previously to their liberation. On the arrival of the two sailors in Trieste they were imprisoned for the murder of the Irishman, and brought to trial. The small man was found guilty, and sentenced to 5 years’ imprisonment.

Ireland in general had remained basically a rural community. In 1841 Ireland supported a population of over 8 million, of which about 3 million depended on potatoes and milk for their subsistence. Reports of an outbreak of potato blight began to circulate in the autumn of 1845 and by the winter it was clear that half the crop was unusable. The Cork Relief Committee was set in March 1846 and organised the distribution of maize, known as Indian meal, to the poor. As the maize had to be paid for, the committee also started schemes to employ people to earn money for food. The economic doctrine of laissez-faire hampered government relief measures throughout the period of the Famine, as the following reports and letters in the Examiner show.

CE 16 September 1846

The workmen and labourers employed by Mr. Fitzgerald, Rocklodge, near Cloyne, refused to allow him to send his corn to Cork, or to market, and stated that they would give him the price he demanded for it. To this step they said they were compelled by the loss of their potatoes, and the dearness of provisions.

We have heard rumours of intended risings in various parts of the country, but trust that the activity of the local authorities and the advice of the clergy, and other influential friends of the people, will be sufficient to keep them quiet until relief and employment can be afforded.

A party of Dragoons left Cork yesterday for Youghal.

The Clashmore Mills were attacked by a mob, and flour taken from them.

CE 8 October, 1846

Sir, - On yesterday morning the 7th instant, on my way to the Union-house in company with my three destitute children, so as to receive some relief in getting some Indian Meal porridge, to our great mortification the two sides of the road were lined with police and infantry-- muskets, with screwed bayonets and knapsacks filled with powder and ball, ready prepared to slaughter us, hungry victims. Gracious heaven, said I, are these what Lord John Russell sent us in lieu of Commissary officers with depots and granaries full of flour and meal under their control, to alleviate the wants of the destitute poor, such as that great statesman Sir Robert Peel had done?

Sir, I have heard a great deal of vain boasting, and philanthropic acts which were to be done by Whigs and Liberals if they were in power. But I, say, if the
Devil himself had the reins of Government from her Britannic Majesty he could not
give worse food to her subjects, or more pernicious, than powder and ball.

I am Sir, yours truly,
Another Victim of the Whig Administration.

When the committee’s measures proved inadequate, religious
organisations, notably the Quakers,\textsuperscript{148} and philanthropic individuals such as the
renowned Father Mathew, set up soup kitchens.\textsuperscript{149}

CE 21 June 1847

Father Mathew and the Poor of Cork. It is now some four weeks since the
Cork District Relief Committee suspended it operations. The food depots of the
city were supported by, and were under the entire management of this body, and
should, as a matter of course, be closed when its functions terminated. Father
Mathew, seeing the amount of destitution relieved by those establishments, and the
vast misery that would ensue should they be closed at such a season, took on
himself the entire responsibility of the southern depot, which, since that time, he
has kept open at his own private cost, aided by the casual charities sent him by the
benevolent. A reporter from this establishment visited the depot on Saturday last,
when there were between five and six thousand individuals, of both sexes, old and
young, congregated in the large yard attached thereto, all eating with an avidity
seldom surpassed, the wholesome and substantial food which had just been
dispensed to them. Father Mathew has had erected three new boilers, in addition to
the two already erected by the committee, in consequence of the vastly increased
number of poor relieved. The gates are kept open every day till one o’clock, when
all who seek relief are indiscriminately admitted. The food distributed is composed
of the best Indian meal made into "stirabout," and constitutes a wholesome and
nutritious article of dietary. The expense entailed by this establishment is
enormous, the consumption of Indian meal amounting daily to near one ton-and-a
quarter which, with the staff required for the making and proper distribution of the
food, costs over £130 per week.

\textsuperscript{148} Richard Harrison, Cork City Quakers: a brief history 1655-1939 (Cork, 1991).
\textsuperscript{149} CE 26 February 1847. M. Soyer and the Soup Establishments for Ireland. We learn that the
Government have resolved forthwith to despatch M. Soyer, the \textit{chef de cuisine} of the Reform Club,
to Ireland, with ample instructions to provide his soups for the starving millions of Irish people.
Pursuant to this wise and considerate resolve, artificers are at present busied day and night,
constructing the necessary kitchens, apparatus, &c, with which M. Soyer starts for Dublin direct to
the Lord Lieutenant. His plans have been examined both by the authorities at the Board of Works
and the Admiralty, and have, after mature consideration, been deemed quite capable of answering
the object sought. The soup has been served to several of the best judges of the noble art of
gastronomy at the Reform Club, not as soup for the poor, but as a soup furnished for the day in the
carte. The members who partook of it declared it excellent. Among these may be mentioned Lord
Titchfield and Mr. O'Connell. M. Soyer can supply the whole poor of Ireland, at one meal for each
person, once a day. He has informed the executive that a bellyfull of his soup, once a day, together
with a biscuit, will be more than sufficient to sustain the strength of a strong and healthy man. The
food is to be "consumed on the premises." Those who are to partake enter at one avenue, and having
been served they retire at another, so that there will be neither stappage nor confusion. To the infant,
the sick, the aged, as well as to distant districts, the food is to be conveyed in cars furnished with
portable apparatus for keeping the soup perfectly hot. It would be premature to enter into further
details. M. Soyer has satisfied the Government that he can furnish enough and to spare of most
nourishing food for the poor of these realms, and it is confidently anticipated that there will soon be
no more deaths from starvation in Ireland.
CE 25 October 1847

Sir, We are only at the termination of a frightful famine, and to all appearances at the commencement of a worse one. Good God, are we again to witness the dreadful scenes that have only just passed over us, are we again to behold our poor fellow-creatures moving like mere shadows through the streets, falling on the high roads from hunger and starvation, and dropping down at our very doors? Are our exemplary clergymen and liberal gentlemen to place their lives in jeopardy as they have heretofore done, in visiting the sick cabin of the poor man, extending with their own hands relief, and endeavouring to afford consolation before the soul had taken its departures from the entirely starved and emaciated frame? I just now want to draw public attention to a disgraceful practice that was carried on during the period of awful distress, when nothing should sway people from relieving the destitute, the practice of proselytizing, a new accompaniment of famine. The duties that devolved on the priest were indeed laborious, inasmuch as they had to combat against famine, disease, and death, on the one hand, and on the other, against those proselytizers, (justly termed soul-jobbers). In every locality where this nefarious system worked, the proselytizing school consisted of about a dozen of the poorest children of the place, a Bible master or mistress was procured to diffuse knowledge to hungry stomachs. The pottage pot was superintended and conducted by the female proselytizer, and its salubrious contents distributed every day after five or six hours of lecturing, charitable donations were lavished in purchasing up bibles, paying the master or mistress so much per week, and as a matter of course, adding a little to their own private funds.

Is it not melancholy to know that all this was in operation when famine and disease desolated the land. Now another year's famine is impending; and I ask what will be done with those two traffickers, the proselytizer and the corn merchant? I can tell you they are ripe for another opportunity, and that will very shortly be at hand. In the mean time public opinion ought to be brought to bear on them. Their very names should be set forth on the wings of the press as individuals base and degraded, to an extent, unmatched in any other country calling itself civilized.

I am, your's &c.

Macroom, October 18th, 1847. A. D. F.

However, the enormous scale of the problem overwhelmed all efforts at amelioration. and the winter of '46/47, 'Black 47' in folklore, was the worst in

---

[^150]: CE 16 March 2000. *Famine took heavy toll on caring Protestant ministers*. No priests died in the famine, an embittered Bull McCabe tells the parish priest in the film version of John B Keane’s The Field. The immortal but bitter line could not be applied to the Protestant clergy, according to a new book. Famine fever claimed the lives of 40 ministers in 1847 alone, President Mary McAleese heard yesterday as she launched Mapping the Great Irish Famine. The President said the Church of Ireland was deeply involved in the relief effort. When the Rev Patrick Pounden, Rector of Westport, died of famine fever contracted in relief work, it was revealed he was giving more than half his stipend to the local relief committee. He and many others choose to mortgage their lives for their fellow human beings, President McAleese said. This demonstrated how decency crossed all barriers of class, faith and position. [...] The President said the magnificent response of the Society of Friends should never be forgotten. Both Protestant and Catholic clergy established soup kitchens where the poor could obtain a daily meal [...]. The social impact of the Great Famine was immediate, with the population falling by about 20% between 1841 and 1851. Poor cottiers and labourers were the main casualties. As they disappeared, so did their hovels and their garden plots along with a sharp decline in the use of the Irish language.
living memory. In 1848 the crop failed again, but by 1849 the very worst was over and deaths from starvation began to decrease. However, famines are usually accompanied by disease, and typhus, ‘yellow fever’ and dysentery claimed the lives of many more thousands in Cork city.

CE 15 March 1847
Cork Union Fever
The fever, which afflicts the lower classes, is beginning to reach the upper, as we have long warned the public. We regret to hear that Mr. Lawrence is at present ill with fever; and that Mr. Burke, the Commissioner, is also afflicted with the same disease. The necessary contact with the unfortunate people that crowd the gates of the Workhouse has been the undoubted cause; and in all probability will be the cause of greater danger to the guardians, if something be not done to prevent it.

Between 1845 and 1851 the population of Ireland decreased by about 2 million. Historians and demographers estimate that a million died and another million emigrated, either to England, or more popularly, to the United States, where the memory of evictions, starvation and ships laden with food leaving the country ensured the myth of ‘perfidious Albion’ continued among the Irish-Americans who sought to break the connection with England by whatever means.

CE 5 April 1847
Emigration
The quays are crowded every day with the peasantry from all quarters of the country, who are emigrating to America, both direct from this port, and "cross channel" to Liverpool, as the agents here cannot produce enough of ships to convey the people from this unhappy country. Two vessels-- the Fagabelac and Coolock-- were despatched this week, the former with 208, the latter with 110 passengers. There are two other ships on the berth-- the Wansworth for Quebec, and the Victory for New York; both are intended to sail on Tuesday next. There are nearly 1,200 passengers booked in these vessels. An extensive agent here has gone to Liverpool, with the view of chartering ten large vessels to take out upwards of 1,300 families which are about leaving one estate in Ireland-- partly at the expense of their landlord, and partly at their own. When a ship is put on the berth here, she is filled in a day or two, and the agents say if they had 100 ships, they would not be sufficient to meet the demand.151

It was also the United States that transported much-needed foodstuffs to Ireland, as reported, for example,

151 CE 19 May 1847. Sufferings of Emigrants in New York. The paupers who have recently arrived from Europe give a most melancholy account of their sufferings. Upwards of eighty individuals, almost dead with the ship fever, were landed from one ship alone, while twenty-seven of the cargo died on the passage, and were thrown into the sea. They were one hundred days tossing to and fro upon the ocean, and for the last twenty days their only food consisted of a few ounces of meal per day, and their only water was obtained from the clouds. The miseries which these people suffer are brought upon themselves, for they have no business to leave their country without at least a sufficient quantity of food to feed them while making the passage. (New York Sun).
CE 5 April 1847
The United States frigate Macedonian, laden with benevolent contributions for the poor of Ireland, sailed from New York for Cork, on the 15th instant. Her cargo consists of 30 packages of clothing, 210 tierces of rice, 6 tierces of peas, 1,132 bags of oats, 1,115 bags of corn, 2,103 bags of beans, 1,047 bags meal, 122 barrels of beans, 8 barrels of rye, 7 barrels of potatoes, 84 barrels of corn, 4 barrels of beef, 6 barrels of pork, 13 barrels of flour, 5,178 barrels of meal, and 10 chests of tea. This is quite a large cargo, and will be received with much joy by the people for whom it is intended.

By way of interest, it is noted that during the worst of the famine years, the death of Daniel O’Connell, the Liberator, figures prominently in the Munster paper:

CE 5 July 1847
O’Connell is Dead!
This is the sad proclamation which it is our painful duty to make this day. O’Connell, the veteran leader of Ireland, the advocate of universal freedom, is no more! He breathed his last, at Genoa, on the 15th of this month, in the 72d year of his age. Full of years, full of honours, and full of woes, the Illustrious Liberator of Ireland yielded up his soul to his Creator, by whom he was endowed with great intellectual powers and exalted attributes, to carry out the wise and merciful intentions of Providence in favour of a stricken land and an enslaved race.

It was his anxious hope that he might be allowed to reach Rome, the centre of the Catholic World, and kneel at the feet of the Pontiff who now fills the Chair of Peter. But that hope was frustrated by fate; and in the city of Genoa-- far, far away from the home of his affections, and the theatre of his glory, the Liberator expired. This is a sad and terrible announcement for this afflicted country, torn as it is by dissension, and decimated by famine and pestilence. O’Connell dead! --the only man to whom all turned with a feeling approaching hope, in the midst of national distress and national despair. He dead! --the only man who could right the sadly-tossed vessel, or infuse life and energy into the despairing crew.

In the ten years after the Famine the city's population rose by 6% as destitute peasants streamed into the Marsh and Main Street areas. Slums sprouted in these places as the poor replaced the middle classes who moved out to the new suburbs of Montenotte and Tivoli. Between 1851 and 1891 the county's population fell by over 200,000 - a figure higher than the city's current population. This depletion of people contributed to the region's industrial decline.152

Regarding education and the arts, Cork Library was founded in 1792 and in 1803 Rev. Thomas Dix Hincks was instrumental in setting up the Royal Cork Institution. A keen educationalist, he published many pamphlets on educational and

---

152 The last city slum was only cleared in 1968, as the corporation gradually erected housing for the poor. MacCarthy, ‘Geographical change.’
religious subjects. In 1816 the Cork Philosophical and literary Society came into being, the precursor of the still-thriving Cork literary and Scientific Society.\textsuperscript{153}

There were also many small literary clubs in the city, perhaps the most notable being 'The Anchorites'. Among the members or 'Anchorites' were J.J.Callanan who was one of the first to give adequate translations of Gaelic poems, and William Maginn who founded 'Frasers Magazine' in London in 1830. This, the forerunner of 'Punch', became the leading English monthly. Maginn had many Cork men in his circle, included was Thomas Croker whose 'The Fairy Legends and Traditions of the South of Ireland' ran into several editions and was translated into German by the brothers Grimm.\textsuperscript{154} With regard to literacy and the education of the majority of the population, primary schooling in the latter half of the nineteenth century was basic but continuing to expand, there being a distinct difference between the education of children in urban and rural areas.\textsuperscript{155}

Reading, spelling, writing and arithmetic, with a little geography, remained the staple on which most boys and girls were reared, though in the senior classes grammar, more advanced geography, and, where appropriate, needlework or agriculture, could be added. Other subjects, including Irish from 1879 onwards, could be taught on a voluntary basis and out of regular school hours [...], physical training [...] was confined almost entirely to kindergarten classes [...]. The Irish Education Act of 1892 was intended to impose a measure of compulsion, combined with the abolition (total or partial) of fees for all children between the ages of three and fifteen who attended state-aided elementary schools. Such compulsion, however, was initially aimed only at the larger centres of population and although School Attendance Committees had been established within two years of the Act in eighty-eight out of the hundred and eighteen places where it was to have been applied, it is probable that they functioned efficiently in only half of these; how little the legislation was may be judged from the fact that Dublin, Cork, Waterford and Limerick had done virtually nothing to implement it. As a result of the Local Government Act of 1898 the system was extended to the countryside, but by the turn of the century it was operating in only forty-three rural districts. The great obstacle to compulsory attendance, and one that was not really overcome until after British rule had ended, was that many local authorities simply refused to use the Act so long as denominational, non-vested schools were excluded from its scope. Nevertheless, compulsion or no compulsion, regular school attendance improved fairly steadily over the years until by the 1890s it had passed the sixty per cent mark, rising to just above seventy-five per cent in 1908. And on this basis was built the virtual elimination of illiteracy. Without this revolution, the foundations of a modern Irish state could not have been laid. [...] It is important, however, not to exaggerate the charges made against the National Schools and in particular not to

\textsuperscript{153} Ian D’Alton, Protestant society and politics in Cork, 1812 – 1844 (Cork University Press, 1980).
\textsuperscript{154} This literary tradition has been maintained into the 20th and 21st centuries by writers like Sean O’Faolain, Frank O’Connor, and Patrick Galvin.
\textsuperscript{155} Lyons, Ireland Since the Famine, pp.87ff.
saddle them with the sole responsibility for the dramatic decline in Irish as a language of everyday use in the second half of the nineteenth century. No doubt the heavily Anglicised bias of the system did contribute to that result, but so also did the fact that economic betterment and social advancement of all kinds depended upon mastering the tongue of the foreigner. There was not, in fact, as is often supposed, a planned, coherent policy for the extermination of Irish ready formed in the minds of the Commissioners. On the contrary, not only did Irish become an optional subject before the Gaelic League had begun its campaign for the revival of the language, but in 1904, when ‘Irish-Ireland’ pressures were much more insistent, the board made an important concession in deciding to allow the teaching in Irish-speaking and bilingual districts of both Irish and English to all classes, and the teaching of other subjects through the medium of either language. This opened the way for a forward policy and in Donegal, Mayo, Galway, Kerry and Cork, some twenty-seven schools took advantage of the opportunity, a figure which had increased to 240 before the work of the Board came to an end in 1922; and if the schools where some Irish was optionally taught are added to this number then the whole total was 1,900 by the time the old regime staggered to a halt.  

A Letter to the Editor in 1841 comments most favourably on the institutions of learning the city of Cork provides for its most humble classes:

CE 20 September 1841
To the Editor of the Cork Examiner.

Sir – As a stranger in quest of sight-seeing, I ventured to explore a few days since, that part of your “fair city” where St. Patrick’s Schools are situate. I was attracted by the situation, which is so imposing, I was informed they are as yet in their infancy, and that the Committee have established them on a basis that will be the means of diffusing blessings to thousands yet unborn. How happy for the poor but honest labourer, as he reaches his cabin to gain strength for to-morrow’s trial, to hear his child, as it climbs up his knee, repeat the moral lesson it has been taught during the day, and enlighten the mind of its parent! That mind which a savage spirit of persecution doomed to a long night of darkness! Thank heaven, that spirit is now passed away – and the children of fatherland will yet deserve the name which was bestowed on them in a happier age – Insula Sanctorem et doctorem. – Apologising for thus trespassing on your space,

Your’s Viator, Imperial Hotel, Friday Evening.

\[156\] Lyons, p.89: ‘The original aim of the schools, as one of the earliest Commissioners, the Protestant Archbishop Whateley, had expressed it in an unfortunate phrase that has never been allowed to die, was to make of every pupil ‘a happy English child’. To this end Irish history was virtually ignored and Irish music and poetry might have never existed. This constituted an important difference between the National Schools and the Christian Brothers schools. In the latter attention was paid to such matters, especially history, and this partly explains why the latter were so often nurseries of the new nationalism. Even the strictly vicarious revolutionary ardours of the English poets were suspect [and] banished from the National Schools. Small wonder that Patrick Pearse, a real revolutionary whose revolution began in his own small but immensely influential school, St.Enda’s, should have condemned the whole system as a ‘murder machine’, lacking the two essentials he found necessary to true education – freedom and inspiration.’
In 1845 Sir Robert Peel carried through two measures, the Maynooth Act and the Provincial Colleges Act, establishing three new colleges at Cork, Galway and Belfast. Theoretically undenominational, the so-called ‘godless colleges,’ the first two served the largely Catholic hinterlands of the south and west, while the Belfast college met the Presbyterian demand for higher education. The Catholic University proper was founded at Dublin in 1854, reorganised in 1882 as University College Dublin (UCD), and lead, temporarily, under the guidance of the Jesuits. In Cork city, the Crawford School of Art and Gallery dates from the 1880s, both it and Queen’s College owed much to the activities of the Royal Cork Institution which was founded in the early 1800s.

CE 17 October 1879

Cork Literary and Scientific Society. The President’s Inaugural Speech.

The session of 1879-80 of the above Society was inaugurated last evening, when the President for this year, Thomas Crosbie, Esq., delivered his inaugural address. At eight o’clock, the hour at which the proceedings commenced, the large Assembly Room of the Imperial Hotel was well filled with ladies and gentlemen. The president was warmly received when he made his appearance on the platform, accompanied by the following gentlemen: - Dr. O’Connor, President of the British Medical Association; Dr. Sayers, America; [...] The President, who was received with applause, then delivered the following inaugural address: Ladies and Gentlemen, - We open this evening the forty-sixth session of the Cork Literary and Scientific Society. That means in other words that your association has lasted for forty-five years. It is a long time to look back upon; it is especially so in connection with the comradeship of a number of men having no tie of interest, no bond of union, no impelling motive beyond the common desire for self-improvement or intellectual recreation. [...] 

And similarly:

CE 8 November 1879

To all persons who take an interest in the advancement of art in this country, the Exhibition of the Irish fine Art Society (now open in the Round rooms of the Opera House of this town) cannot fail to be most interesting. The
society was founded in November, 1870, and its career since that date has been most successful, and the rapid growth of a small society, funded merely to increase the art culture of a few individuals, shows that there is a strong art feeling in the country; only needing public sympathy and support or its greater development. If Ireland has lain somewhat open to the reproach of not attaching due importance to the study and position of art, the reproach applies less to Cork than to any other part of the Island. Cork can boast, perhaps, the very best school of art in Ireland.

CE 10 October 1879
Cork Musical Society

The annual meeting of this society, held on Wednesday evening under the presidency of Sir John Arnott, affords a very gratifying record of progress. It was financially successful, as there was shown, as a result of the year's working, a balance to credit, while the account of its musical labours was no less satisfactory. Two regular concerts were performed by the society; in addition to which it gave a complimentary concert to a distinguished member, Miss Lucy A. Hackett, who is at present in London, and promises to have a very brilliant career. The members of the society showed their appreciation of the services of their accomplished conductor, Dr. marks, by assisting in their individual capacity, nominally, but, as a matter of fact, en masse, in a concert of his; and in like manner they formed the staple of the concert given in honour of the visit of the British Medical Association. The officers of the society were all re-elected for the ensuing year, the operations of which we may reasonably hope will be in every respect as fortunate as those of the past year.

The Gaelic Athletic Association became and remains immensely popular in Cork, and the Gaelic League was established in Cork in 1894.

As regards industrialisation and modernisation, public transport in the shape of railways and electric trams helped to extend the city's boundaries in all directions. Most efforts to increase economic development in the second half of the nineteenth century, however, failed. They were hampered by fundamental clashes of interest between artisans and the employers and by religious differences between the employers themselves. As regards the municipal government, the Protestant gentry, aristocracy and professional classes had dominated Cork Corporation since the late 17th century. In the early 19th century and up to the first local elections after the reforming legislation of 1840, Cork Corporation was effectively controlled by members of ‘The Friendly Club’, a clique that consisted exclusively of members of wealthy Protestant families. The wealthy Catholics chafed at being excluded from political power and campaigned against their exclusion at both national and local levels. The Municipal Corporations

160 Ian D’Alton, Protestant Society.
(Ireland) Act of 1840 marked the end of Protestant domination of Cork Corporation,161 the local elections held in October 1841 returned a Catholic majority that elected a Catholic mayor.162

CE 27 October 1841

The New Corporation of Cork

The struggle, if we can call it such, has now passed, and the world may see by its result, how false were the exaggerations of those who prophesied that rain and destruction would follow from a removal of the barriers, so long setting bounds to the tide of democratic change and innovation. Alarm, terror, and consternation seized upon the Conservative mind, when, for the first time, was broached the daring doctrine – that the great body of the citizens, no matter what their religious creed, no matter what their political opinion, should have the full power of electing those who were to be entrusted with the control of their local affairs, with the management of their money, for the good and advantage of the public. It was looked on as a doctrine heretical in the abstract, and tending inevitably to anarchy and revolution in its practice. – Well, after a bold fight between the two antagonist parties, the supporters of antagonist principles, we at last find the momentous change effected, and without the least approach to what were considered as its certain concomitants.

Never, perhaps, in the history of Ireland, was there a more complete and perfect overthrow of an iniquitous and indefensible system – based upon tyranny, exclusion and injustice – than that affected by the election of Monday. The old and blackened pile, the stronghold of corruption, whose date may be traced back to times of violence and blood, and whose walls have been defended, generation after generation, by those to whom every unholy passion had given the valour of desperation – this frowning contrast to the free spirit of enlightened days and liberal institutions, has tumbled into hopeless ruin, leaving scarce a fragment of

161 CE 22 October 1841. To the Protestant Citizens of Cork. Fellow Citizens – The Revision of the burgess Roll is closed. […] Nearly two hundred years have passed over since your accession to corporate power. I shall not at all advert to the unfortunate circumstances which led to that alteration; the blind bigotry and senseless infatuation of former times induced the Legislators of those days to create Corporate bodies and invest them with what they called “rights and privileges” expressly designed and calculated to exhalt the favoured class, whilst the other was not only to be depressed but extirpated. The fearful history of those two centuries cannot be read without dismay, or even contemplated without horror. The persecution, the jobbing, the legalised robberies, the monopoly, and the exclusiveness of these chartered worthies, are now, thank Heavan, at an end, and in at all alluding to them, I am actuated by no sectarian or uncharitable feeling, convinced that the rational and well-disposed portion of your body are equally delighted with myself, at their final and complete termination. […] I greatly fear that the humble station I hold in Society may prevent you from paying that attention to my advice to which it would otherwise be entitled; it is offered you, however, with great sincerity, I am, dear Protestant Fellow Citizens, Your humble servant, Mathew Roche. Bleazebezy’s-street, 16th Oct. 1841.

162 CE 15 October 1841. The Coming Mayor. Long since, have we hailed with joy and satisfaction the decision of the public voice, announcing that Thomas Lyons should be the first Mayor of Cork under the Municipal Reform Act […] the first Liberal Mayor of Cork […] Thomas Lyons is the most upright, unswerving, and dauntless of our patriots – one who clung to O’Connell, and the Repeal agitation, when others (and they were not a few) shrank back […]. He never shirked the question; he did not admit the justice of Repeal, in the abstract, and regard its practical agitation with a well-assumed horror, with a maudlin respect for the safety of the Constitution! And religious dread of anarchy and democratic violence. No; from first to last, ab ovo usque ad mala, he cried out for Ireland’s liberty – and therefore, in our mind, is Thomas Lyons the wisest choice of a people, who are devoted, heart and soul, to the ennobling question of Repeal!
pillar, mullion, architrave, or wall, as a silent evidence of its deformity. [...] Looking on the list of those selected by their fellow-citizens to test, as it were, this experiment in self-government, we will find that the honour, credit, influence, worth, charity, usefulness, and patriotism of Cork, are all there represented. Where, we proudly ask, amongst these men, are to be discovered that low and vulgar rabble, that nameless herd, without character, credit, or respectability, such as we were told would have filled up the Corporate offices of the City? They are no where to be found. On the contrary, we defy any community to equal, we will not say excel, in every solid virtue, that can render man valuable to society, the gentlemen upon whom, so deservedly, the favour of their fellow citizens has fallen. [...] The contest is now over; right is victorious over might; freedom has triumphed over tyranny – and, with the power of a defeated foe, has vanished our and the people’s hostility. – From hence forward, the public are to be the judges and rewarders of merit.

The change in the political power structure did little to help Catholics or Protestants among the working class who continued to enjoy poor housing, unemployment and poor wages. While the trade union movement put down strong roots in Cork during the century, much of the political energy of the working class went into the great national question of self-government for Ireland. ¹⁶³

The Young Ireland Movement, inspired by the events in continental Europe, also made an imprint on the county and city of Cork. The Cork Examiner gave regular and lengthy press coverage to the weekly meetings of the Desmond Confederate club which spread the principles of the Young Ireland Movement, yet vaguely condemning the idea of resorting to violence and contending that the freedom of the country was to be worked out entirely by moral force and passive resistance.

CE 12 January 1848

The priesthood of Ireland [...] ought to denounce any man who became a soldier in the service of the English government, a hired shedder of blood, before whom the profession of the very hangman was honourable. It was a matter of shame to them that nearly half the English army was formed of Irishmen, and every man in Ireland ought immediately to enter into a form resolution never to take up arms for the English government. They ought to cease returning members to Parliament [...] and then they should assemble their own Parliament at once, and proceed to make laws for Ireland. [A speaker] believed that their parliamentary representation would have as little to do with the gaining of their independence as the colonies of America – he even believed it possible that the colonies of America might have a great deal more to do with it (loud cries of “hear, hear”, and loud cheers). [...] People were horrified at the atrocities of the French revolution, yet the

¹⁶⁴ In 1830 the Irish made up 42% of the regular army, this had been reduced to 25% by 1871. Cf. The Oxford Illustrated History of the British Army, David Chandler (ed.), (OUP, 1994).
blood that was shed there, and which he believed to be a necessary consequence of that revolution, did not amount to so much as the waste of human life which took place in Ireland during the past year. He contended that every country had a perfect right to gain its freedom by the effusion of blood. [Another speaker] believed like Mr. Mitchell (cheers) that they should not have an immediate insurrection, but he contended that the people of Ireland should be prepared against the hour when the necessity for arms should arise (cheers).

The importance of the Irish language, Irish traditions and Irish literature was a central issue at the Club’s meetings:

CE 16 January 1848
The Desmond Confederate Club.

The Confederate Club of this city met, as usual, on Monday evening. The Secretary of the committee for education announced the formation of classes for the study of Irish History, the Irish language, and drawing […] Of late, however, a great degree of attention was devoted to the revived cultivation of Irish literature, to which the first impulse had been by Thomas Davis. [The President, Mr. Lane] alluded to the history of Wales, when that country had the same relation to England, that Ireland was placed in. At this period it was the aim of the English government to extinguish the native music of Wales, its language and traditionary poems, which handed down to the Welsh the achievements of their ancestors. In Ireland the same spirit led them to adopt the same means, in order to tread out the distinctive nationality of the people. In their jealousy and fear, nothing was thought beneath this Vandal rage that was connected with the old memories of the Irish race. Carew in this very country collected and destroyed all the manuscripts he could find, feeling that in these the peasantry had an estate not less dear than their possessions were to the wealthy.

Other, more pragmatic, issues were also expounded by the Confederate Club, such as Irish Manufactures:

CE 9 February 1848
The Desmond Confederate Club. Irish Manufactures.

[…] Mr. F. Power then proposed and Mr. Dwyer seconded a resolution expressing the determination of the club to devote themselves to the advancement of Irish manufactures, and it was agreed that the members of the Club should take the earliest opportunity of having a meeting of the citizens of Cork convened, to forward this most important object. Mr. Isaac Varian, Secretary of the club, read for the meeting a resolution [binding] themselves never to purchase or wear any article of foreign manufacture when one of Irish manufacture could be had for the same price, and of equal value.

Yet, in contrast to the Cork Examiner’s supportive reporting stands its rival, the Cork Constitution, writes on meetings of the Confederacy Committee in a decidedly antipathetic tone:

CC 26 January 1848
Tom Foolery

Yesterday, the members of the ‘Desmond Confederation,’ Young Ireland Club, Castle street, had an immense piece of tri-colour bunting floating in the breeze from their building, with the view of fraternising with their mercurial brethren in France, now luxuriating in the excesses of revolution and anarchy. In the evening the windows were illuminated, and a large placard conspicuously placed bore the words – ‘France is Free, and example to the World.’

In May, the Examiners reports encouragingly on the formation of a repeal club in Macroom (Co.Cork). A large number of patriotic tradesmen and a few other gentlemen attended:

CE 1 May 1848

It is to be distinctly understood that this is not solely a Confederate Club; on that account, it is called “The Macroom National Club”. It recognizes both sections of Repealers, and will endeavour, in its own sphere, to bring about a union […] never to desist from what they have undertaken until the odious act of union be repealed.165

On 12 May 1848, the Cork Examiner reported on another meeting of the Citizens Club, having been reformed, and on this occasion held for the enrolment of members. Proposed, among others, was a Mr. Walter White, ‘a sound Protestant’ whose name was received with applause. Later on a resolution was carried in which it was resolved that

we have witnessed with no ordinary delight and satisfaction the many decided declarations in favour of National Independence that are emanating from the influential and intelligent portion of the Irish Protestants, and on our parts we wish to reiterate our unequivocal abhorrence of religious ascendancy, and our determination to resist, by every means, any attempt that may be made to interfere with the religious freedom of any portion of our fellow countrymen.

And while the Cork Constitution reported 23 May, 1848, on the inhabitants of Hanover street who were kept in continual terror one Saturday evening, by a

165 The Cork Constitution, of course, by nature belittling the efforts of the repealers, as may be seen in a report on the jocular mood of proceedings at a Police Office, when a young lad came before the bench (Mr.Bagnell presiding) to complain of a constable abstracting a pike-head: CC 9 May 1848:

Mr.Bagnell - Who are you, Sir?
Complainant – My name is M’Auliffe.
Mr.Bagnell – Are you the Orangeman? (Laughter).
Complainant – I sell oranges.
Head Constable Condon – He’s one of our Young Ireland pikemen.
Mr.Bagnell – Which of the constables do you complain against?
Complainant – Constable Cudmore; he came and took my property.
Mr.Bagnell – And pray, Sir, for what purpose had you this weapon?
Complainant – I got the pike to protect my property.
Head Constable Condon – That’s what you all say […]
number of Young Irelanders and ‘Other would-be heroes,’ who amused themselves firing balls at the store of the late glass-house, the Cork Examiner, a day later, jubilantly records the release of O’Brien and Meagher, ‘Protestant and Catholic seemed to vie with each other in doing honour to the immortal patriots who were ready to victimise themselves for their Country’s redemption.’ And in a report on the Citizens Club it is noted:

CE 24 May 1848
The fraternization of all true and earnest nationalists in our City, happily dictated by the triumphant success of popular movements on the Continent has been rendered complete and lasting by the despotic and abortive attempts of Government to crush the rising liberties of the people in the persons of our leaders.

In contrast, in Letter to the Editor of the Cork Constitution, it is stated:

CC 24 June 1848
Sir,
Your Evening Contemporary, in his publication of Tuesday, speaks of the formation of a Confederate Club here, under the presidency of a Mr. M. P. England, and states that the ‘sticklers for Protestant ascendancy’ will join the ranks of these mischief loving ‘Patriots’. – Permit me to contradict this statement. The respectable portion of the Catholic inhabitants, as well as the entire Protestant population, having nothing whatever to say to this miserable effort of an ‘expiring faction’. It is an attempt made by a few desperate politicians who have ruined their humble fortunes by attending through life to public affairs, and neglecting their own. They have now nothing to lose, and prefer using their exertions – powerless though they be – in producing a state of anarchy and confusion […] Your very obedient servant, Black Monday, Bandon, June 22nd, 1848

CC 11 July 1848
Sir,
Referring to your remarks in last Saturday’s Paper, you are quite correct in saying that ‘no better plan for schooling the disaffected could be devised, than the present clubs’ which are ‘covering the country.’ Never did the rebels plan an insurrection better than they are doing at present; hundreds of thousands, all armed, are already said to belong to them; and ‘unless they are instantly put down the days of Ireland are numbered.’ – In a conversation which I had with a President of one lately, who supposed that I was friendly to the cause, he told me that they were fast enrolling members, and would very soon be in a position to enforce what they required. Are the Protestants to fold their arms and wait until a sanguinary insurrection commences? If the Government do not at once put it down, they are traitors to the protestants of Great Britain and Ireland, and I would respectfully suggest either that the Protestants forthwith unite, and of course arm likewise to repel the expected rising; or, if this be not done, then I say, to save their lives and their properties, let them unite with the rebels. Either of these two pans they must adopt and that speedily, or depend upon it before many days it will be too late.
An Old Orangeman,

I would be glad to know if the Orange Society is in existence in Cork, as I have heard nothing of it since it was disbanded in William the Fourth’s reign.
Fortunately for the aggrieved gentleman, the project failed and the instigators were banished by transportation. However, another insurrection was well under way by 1867. This time under the banner of the ‘Fenians’. The Rising in the south west of Ireland originated with The Phoenix Society, a thriving literary and political group founded by Jeremiah O’Donovan Rossa in 1856. Born at Rossscarbery in County Cork in 1831, he had grown up as an Irish speaker in an area still predominantly Gaelic in culture. Of petty bourgeois stock, he set up business as a grocer in the town of Skibbereen where he founded his society. The impact of the visit of James Stephens of the American Fenian Brotherhood upon O’Donovan and his band of enthusiasts was immediate and powerful.

They were swept into the secret republican organisation and from that moment the organisation began to spread rapidly. Even at this early stage, however, it was by no means so secret as its leaders liked to assume. Within a few months of Stephen’s mission to County Cork the local parish priests were warning their flocks against becoming involved in the movement and the Nation newspaper – since Gavan Duffy’s departure to Australia in the hands of a journalist from Bantry, Alexander Martin Sullivan – was emphatic in separating its brand of constitutional nationalism from what it took to be the politics of the Phoenix Society. When this pointed attack on extremism was followed immediately afterwards by the arrest of several Phoenix men in Bantry and Skibbereen it was easy to jump to the conclusion that Sullivan had been in touch with the authorities, and Stephens at once spread the story that he was a ‘felon-setter’, that he had pointed out members of the society to the police. There was no convincing evidence to substantiate the charge (the arrests were in fact based upon word received from a priest and from an informer), but a more damaging indictment it would have been impossible to make and there can be little doubt that Stephens used the incident to destroy Sullivan’s known ambition to rebuild the constitutional party.166

The Phoenix trials did not have the desired effect, giving it instead priceless publicity and it continued to grow, though it was always difficult to establish just how many separatists, there actually were at any time.

Had Britain been involved in a war things might have been otherwise, but so long as she remained at peace an American Fenian attempt upon Ireland could never be more than a bow drawn at a venture. Nevertheless, even though the odds against them were so heavy, the Irish-American veterans of the Civil War moved restless to and fro between the United States and Ireland, bringing prospect of rebellion steadily nearer. There were not very many of them – perhaps no more than 150 – and the police were able to follow their activities in meticulous detail,

166 Lyons, Ireland Since the Famine, p.126, and in a footnote refers to A.M.Sullivan’s own account in New Ireland (London, 1877), a work which went through many editions and became almost the political testament of the new generation of constitutional nationalists.
but they supplied the essential fuse for what had long been an explosive situation. […] Planned originally for February [the attempt] was made on the night of 5-6 March 1867 which, with the ill-luck that so often seemed to dog Irish rebellions, chanced to be a night of bitter cold and heavy snow. There was no coherent plan of operation, nor perhaps any policy other than the desperate hope that the insurgents might hold out long enough to be accorded belligerent rights by the USA and thus precipitate that long cherished Anglo-American war which had become so embedded in Fenian mythology. Groups of brave, unorganised, miserably armed men turned out in Dublin, Cork, Tipperary and Limerick, and to a lesser extent in Clare, Waterford and Louth. [In] the Dublin area it is possible that as many as two thousand men were involved in this hopeless endeavour, with perhaps twice that number in county Cork and some hundreds elsewhere. Defeat was followed, as usual, by widespread arrests and heavy sentences for those convicted. Public opinion in Ireland, which had been apathetic, if not hostile, towards the rising was sensitive on the subject of punishment. To this the government was not unresponsive, in that all death sentences were commuted, but imprisonment for long periods and in harsh conditions was the lot of most of the leaders. [For] years to come ‘amnesty’ was to be a means of keeping the cause of irreconcilable republicanism vivid in the minds of the people.167

John Devoy recalls in his memoirs168 the Fenian Rising in Cork March 1867 rather colourfully, as would be expected:

“Rebel Cork” did its best on the night of March 5, 1867, but its best, owing to lack of arms, amounted only to attacks on some police barracks, all of which, except one, failed. I was told by Corkmen after my release, […] that 4,000 men turned out in the city, but they had less than fifty rifles and no American officer of rank or experience was assigned to the command […]. Curtis’s History of the Royal Irish Constabulary, apparently written for the sole purpose of puffing the Peelers and giving them entire credit for putting down the Rising, begins every account of a skirmish with the statement that “a large body of well armed Fenians” attacked the police barrack and were gallantly repulsed by the policemen. There was no “large body of well armed Fenians” anywhere in the Rising of 1867. The Fenians were almost wholly without arms everywhere and the wonder was that they turned up at all. It was generally said that the men were told that arms would be distributed after they turned out, but I could never find proof of this. The idea seemed to be that the arms captured from the police would enable them to hold out until a shipload, with a covering force, was landed from America. The shipload was sent, but arrived off the Irish coast too late to be of any use, and the vessel was obliged to return to America. The police “reward” for the defence of their barracks in 1867, were thereafter styled the “Royal Irish Constabulary”.169

The general political and economic climate of the country, however, was construed as being relatively positive, if not actually prosperous, especially in

---

167 Idem, pp.136/7.
168 John Devoy, Recollections of an Irish Rebel (New York, 1929).
169 Devoy, Recollections, ch.xxix.
CE 6 March 1867
All day yesterday, a number of sensational rumours were afloat in the city, and as night approached the suspense and excitement appeared to grow wider and more intense. **It was whispered that a general rising was appointed for last night under the leadership of Irish American Officers, and that hundreds of young men in the city were leaving in groups for a rendezvous at a little distance. As usual, the strangest and most exaggerated stories were bruited abroad. [...]** The telegraph wires were cut a little outside the city and the transmission of the parliamentary debate then proceeding was interrupted [...] At midnight, however, everything was perfectly quite.

CE 7 March 1867
With profound sorrow we have today to record the outbreak of an insane and criminal insurrection in the South of Ireland. The blow had fallen suddenly and unexpectedly. While the country was presenting the most peaceful aspect; while its criminal records seemed to indicate a steady, progressive involvement in the morals of the people, an absence of violence, a respect for law, a regard for the rights of property, affording ground for the most favourable auguries of the future of the country, there was concealed beneath the fair surface a vast mass of disaffection ready to break into open rebellion at the signal. [...] That it has the slightest chance of attaining even a temporary success, a momentary advantage, no sane man will for a moment imagine, but we look forward with pain to the disastrous consequences to the country – the terrible retribution which the insurgents have drawn upon themselves, and which they will infallibly be made to suffer.

CE 8 March 1867
The great majority of the Fenian prisoners are in personal appearance, mere youths. No doubt to their want of experience may be attributed their participation in a dangerous and palpably hopeless movement. [...] The gentry in several localities are quitting their country residences in alarm and flying to the large towns and out of the country for safety. Others are arming their tenantry. [...] There need be no further apprehension of danger from the Fenian rebellion [a] conspiracy, which has hung like a gigantic shadow over the country for the last four years, chilling enterprise and retarding progress. [The] idea had been instilled into their minds by emissaries from the United States until it became a cherished article of belief [...]. Each succeeding manifestation of disaffection in Ireland since the beginning of the present century has been less vigorous and formidable than that which preceded it and we may fairly assume that in the twelve hours insurrection that has closed we have seen the last Irish rebellion.

The 1880s were a period of great rural instability with impoverished families being evicted in their thousands and, at a local level, agitators committing
vicious reprisals on extortionist Landlords and their agents. Eventually a leader emerged who inspired all of the Nationalist movements to work together in a peaceful pragmatic way: Parnell was elected MP for Cork in 1880. There was a growing awareness amongst the urban, English-speaking populace of their cultural distinction from Britain and Parnell's Nationalist Party made significant progress towards achieving its goal of Home Rule for Ireland. However, the general poverty of the majority of Irish people called for more practical measures closer to home:

By 1890 the moment seemed ripe for another step forward, and Balfour proposed to seize the chance by bringing in an ‘heroic measure’ which would include some system compelling reluctant or uncooperative landlords [to sell]. The Act he did introduce was delayed and obstructed in Parliament [and] it was not until 1891 that, in a slightly altered form, it became law. Yet if the Act of 1891 did not justify all Balfour’s hopes of affecting a revolution in land purchase, it did mark a significant new departure in quite a different direction. Its purpose was not only to create a race of peasant proprietors in the future, but also to relieve existing poverty in the poorer districts of the west and south of Ireland. [These] districts were ‘congested’ in the official jargon, not because perhaps half a million people lived there, but because too many of them were trying to scratch from bog or stony mountain land a living which at best precarious and sometimes non-existent. In 1891 [this] produced an area of just over 3 ½ million acres and a population of about half a million spread over parts of the counties of Donegal, Leitrim, Roscommon, Sligo, Mayo, Galway, Kerry and Cork. [From] an administrative point of view the most valuable contribution of the CDB [Congested Districts Board] was the tradition it built up of meticulous investigation of conditions in the smallest subdivisions – the Poor Law Unions – of the various congested districts. This not only secured for the government far more accurate and detailed information than ever before, it also made for intelligent application of existing resources. These were expended in a multitude of different, but generally constructive, projects – the encouragement of cottage industries, the building of roads, bridges and harbours, the stimulation of a fishing industry, the provision of expert advice on the raising of crops and livestock, above all, perhaps, land purchase and resettlement.

So progressive was, in fact, the climate, that in 1901 the Mayor of Cork, Edward Fitzgerald, proposed Cork should stage an international industrial exhibition in the following year. The idea was enthusiastically received by all sections of Cork society, and the site chosen was an area of parkland near the Cork County Cricket Grounds. Exhibition halls were built and a house on the grounds named the Shrubberies was renamed the Mansion house during the exhibition.

171 Maura Cronin, Country, class or craft: the politicisation of the skilled artisan in 19th century Cork (Cork University Press, 1994).
172 Lyons, Ireland Since the Famine, pp.204ff.
Exhibitors from across the globe came to display their industrial, agricultural and artistic wares. The success of the exhibition surpassed all expectations and after it was closed late 1902, a similar exhibition was staged in 1903, graced even by a visit from Edward VII and Queen Alexandra.\footnote{Pettit, This City of Cork. A hundred years later, Cork was the European City of Culture 2005.}

However, in the years following Parnell’s death the discomfiture of the parliamentary party and the disillusionment of the electors seemed complete. Its seemed the parliamentary movement had failed through excessive reliance on English parties, and so the time had come to think of self-reliance. This could mean different things to different people, but to nationalists disgusted by the squabbles of the Home Rulers it meant a return to the conception of Ireland as a nation, with an individual identity. Such a conception could be expressed culturally, economically and politically, and in time new organisations evolved, stressing one aspect more than another. By the turn of the century, however, small groups of patriots formed clubs and societies dedicated to the discussion of ways and means of ‘resurrecting’ a sense of Irish nationality.

Many of these pioneers were influenced by the language revival and practically all of them looked back to a political tradition that owed far more to Wolfe Tone or the Fenians than it did to Isaac Butt or Parnell. The societies were numerous and were located chiefly in the larger cities – the Celtic Literary Societies of Dublin and Cork for example, [but] they soon began to have an influence out of all proportion to their number or size. This was partly due to personalities, but partly to an exceptionally favourable combination of circumstances. The revolutionary tradition of 1798, the tradition which pointed to Ireland’s destiny as an independent sovereign republic, celebrated its centenary in 1898 and inevitably there was great excitement. Every kind of nationalist paid homage to the United Irishmen including, no doubt, many who would have recoiled in horror from any re-enactment of Tone’s insurrection. But, though most of the pious exhortation was froth, not all of it was.\footnote{Lyons, p.247.}

\textbf{Excursus: William O’Brien}

constitutional outlook. William O’Brien (1852-1928) was an Irish nationalist, journalist, agrarian agitator and social revolutionary, associated with the campaigns for land reform in Ireland during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, as well as his conciliatory approach to attaining Home Rule. He was born in Mallow, County Cork, on his mother's side descended from the distinguished Norman family of Nagles, giving their name to the nearby Nagle Mountains. He was also linked with the statesman Edmund Burke, as well as with the poet Edmund Spenser. The Nagles, however, no longer held the status or prosperity they once had. Thirty-eight years earlier Thomas Davis was born in Mallow, and O'Brien's advocacy of Irish independence was in the same tradition of his fellow-townsman. O'Brien was brought up in an environment of religious tolerance, which strongly influenced his later views for the need of such tolerance in Irish national life. Financial misfortune caused the family to move to Cork City, where he became newspaper reporter for the Cork Daily Herald, the career which attracted attention to him as a public figure. O'Brien's political ideas, like most of his contemporaries, were shaped by the Fenian movement and the plight of the Irish tenant farmers, his elder brother having participated in the rebellion of 1867. O'Brien also became actively involved with the Fenian brotherhood but resigned in the mid-1870s, because of his belief in the inevitable failure from any attempt at separation by force of arms. In 1878 he met Parnell at a Home Rule meeting and was soon appointed editor of the Irish Land League’s journal, The United Irishman. His association with Parnell led to his arrest and imprisonment with Parnell, Dillon and other nationalist leaders in Kilmainham Gaol, 1881. Here he drafted the famous Land War ‘No Rent Manifesto,’ a rent-withholding scheme personally led by O’Brien, escalating the conflict between the Land League and Gladstone’s government. Even as MP in the House of Commons, O’Brien was frequently imprisoned for his support for various Land League protests, as in 1887 when O’Brien helped to organise a rent strike near Mitchelstown, County Cork. After an 8,000-strong demonstration led by John Dillon, three estate tenants were shot dead by police, this event becoming

176 CE 10 December 1881. The Staff of United Ireland (Special telegram) London, Friday Night. Two members of the staff of United Ireland – Mr. O’Keeffe, the general manager, and Mr. Donnelly, the foreman printer – arrived in London this morning, having eluded the service of the warrants which had been issued for their arrest. Arrangements have already been made for the production of the paper here should it become necessary.

177 From 1883-1885 O’Brien was elected MP for Mallow. He later represented Tyrone South in 1886, North East Cork 1887-1892, and Cork City 1892-1895 and 1901-1918, in the House of Commons.
known as the Mitchelstown Massacre. 1889 he escaped and flew to America, then to France, eventually returning and serving four months in Clonmel and Galway gaols,\textsuperscript{178} where he began to write an acclaimed novel, a Fenian romance with a land reform theme set in 1860, When We Were Boys. In 1890 he married Sophie Raffalovich, daughter of the Russian Jewish banker, Hermann Raffalowich, domiciled in Paris. His wife brought considerable wealth into the marriage, enabling him to act with political independence and providing finances to establish his own newspapers. By 1891 he had become disillusioned with Parnell's political leadership and after Parnell's death and the ensuing split within the IPP, he remained aloof from either side of the Party. He retired from parliament in 1895, settling for a while with his wife near Westport, County Mayo, enabling him to experience at first hand the hardship of the peasantry in the West of Ireland, trying to eke out an existence in its rocky landscape. 1898 O'Brien established the United Irish League (UIL) at Westport, with John Dillon present. Its programme included agrarian agitation, political reform and Home Rule, coinciding with the passing of the Local Government (Ireland) Act. The UIL was designed to reconcile the parliamentary fragments existing since the Parnell split, its branches sweeping over most of the country, dictating the terms for reconstruction not only of the party but the nationalist movement in Ireland. The movement was backed by O'Brien's new newspaper, \textit{The Irish People}.

CE 18 November 1905
United Irish league.

[...] The Chairman, in opening the proceedings said that since their last meeting, some events of first rate importance took place [...] . There was in the first instance, the resolution proposed by the County Council of Cork. He need scarcely say that the Cork County Council was the most important body in the country. From its area, and its population, and its number of Parliamentary representatives there was no county of perhaps one half of the importance of Cork in any other part of Ireland.

\textsuperscript{178} Upon his release, O'Brien was invited by his friend and supporter, the Archbishop of Croke. CE 27 December 1889. Mr. Wm. O'Brien, M.P., the Guest of Archbishop Croke (Special telegram) Thurles, Wednesday. Mr. Wm. O'Brien is the guest to-day of his illustrious friend and admirer – Archbishop Croke. [...] Archbishop Croke said – It is not necessary for me to make any formal introduction to you of the much loved and patriotic Irishman who I am proud to have at my side here to-day (cheers). He is well known to you as a tried and trusted representative of the Irish race at home and abroad [...] . Mr. William O'Brien then said – [...] We are living in memorable times; we are living in trying times. The whole world to-day is ringing with the name of Tipperary – ringing with the infamous deeds of Mr. Smith-Barry and his syndicate (groans), and, above all, ringing with the fame of the calm and steady and magnificent courage of the men of Tipperary (great applause).
[The] proposal of Most Rev. Dr. O’Dea, Bishop of Clonfert, who invited, or suggested that the chairman of the Irish parliamentary Party and Mr. Wm. O’Brien and Mr. John Dillon, with another friend of Mr. O’Brien should meet and confer on a course of policy before the National Convention, which, he understood, was fixed for next month. […] He would say with perfect truth there that night that there was not a man in Ireland more anxious for National unity and a pledge-bound party than Mr. William O’Brien, and he might say the same for himself, and, further, he might say that he was prepared to make any sacrifice at the present juncture to bring about what they all desired. He had stuck to Parnell through the days of the Parnell split, and he knew what dissension meant, and he and his friends would do anything in this world to avoid it, but if it were a matter of principle, he said to all concerned that if they were determined to try and hunt out of public life Mr. William O’Brien, he (Mr. Roche) and men like him would take a leading part in the contest for that was a thing they would not tolerate. […] He would say further that if they succeeded in hunting out Mr. O’Brien from public life they would have accomplished something disastrous to the National cause, because they knew he was the soul of the Irish Party […].

Around 1900 O’Brien was the most influential and powerful figure within the nationalist movement, although not formally its leader. The UIL was the largest organisation in the country, comprising 1150 branches and 84,355 members. The result was to affect a quick defensive reunion under John Redmond of the discredited IPP factions, largely fearing O’Brien’s return to the political field. O’Brien intensified the UIL agitation for land purchase by tenant farmers, pressurising for compulsory purchase, and resulting in the calling of the 1902 Land Conference, an initiative by moderate landlords for a settlement by conciliatory agreement between landlord and tenant. After six sessions all tenant’s demands were conceded, endorsed through a new policy of conciliation. He followed this by campaigning for social legislation, orchestrating the Wyndham Land Purchase Act (1903) through parliament, which effectively ended landlordism, solving the age old Irish Land Question. O’Brien left the Irish Parliamentary Party in November 1903 for five years, retiring his parliamentary seat. His Cork electorate however, insistently pushed through his re-election eight months later. He then embarked on implementation of the Act in alliance with MP D.D. Sheehan’s Irish Land and Labour Association (ILLA), the new organisational base for O’Brien’s political activities. Whereupon the Dillonite section of the IPP published continual denunciations in the party’s newspaper, the Freeman’s Journal, then took over the UIL by means of its new secretary, Dillon’s chief lieutenant, Joseph Devlin MP, Grandmaster of the Ancient Order of Hibernians. O’Brien rejoined the Parliamentary Party in 1908. During negotiations for additional funding of land
purchase, Redmond called an UIL convention, claiming the bill over-burdened the British Treasury and ratepayers. Over 3000 delegates attended, but Devlin had the hall filled with 400 of his militants, so when O'Brien and his followers tried to speak in favour of the bill, they were batonned into silence. The bill was eventually passed far short in its financial provisions.

CE 9 October 1908
Editorial

[…] It is notorious that Irish disturbances or disquiet is under existing circumstances specially injurious to the influence and strength of the Government, yet it is to be put forward not merely as credible but indisputable that **experienced Ministers have taken the most effective measures to perpetuate and aggravate existing tendencies to disorder**. Turpitude of this degree might conceivably flourish “somewhere east of Suez,” but **one would be slow to impute it to the ministry of a Balkan State**. Surely a friendly Liberal Government is not to be deprived of credit for a measure of humanity and reasonableness which would not be denied to the Servian regicides. And as to the Irish Party, let men, - they prize their own honour and value their own intelligence, place themselves in the position of Irish representatives and see how they would like the charges levelled against them by former colleagues. **Why should the Irish Party or any section of Irish Nationalists endeavour to mar Land Purchase or experience regret at its success or a furtive delight at the prospect of its breakdown?** Such monstrous suppositions are the outcome of morbid imaginations. Have the Irish Party and Mr. Redmond given up indication of sympathy with this great agrarian transformation? They supported the measure in the House of Commons at all events. **And as to the Land Conference, the famous gathering that now divides public attention with the Berlin Conference of an earlier date, who, it may be asked, represented the tenants’ cause on that occasion?** It is only five years since, but the public memory is short and it may be well to recall the circumstances that Mr. John Redmond, then and now leader of the Irish nation, was the principal delegate on the tenants’ side, his co-workers being Messrs. William O’Brien, Timothy Harrington, then Lord Mayor of Dublin, and T.W. Russell, representing the Ulster tenants. Fair play is a jewel, and it may be asked is Mr. Redmond or those other gentlemen to be deprived of all credit for the results of the Land Conference, or are they to be suspected of a felonious design to wreck where they could not rule?

As an outcome of the "Baton-Convention" O’Brien felt himself again driven from the party. He foresaw that the IPP, undermined by the AOH, was on a radical path that would frustrate any All-Ireland Home Rule settlement. As a counter measure he established a new League, the All-for-Ireland League (AFIL), building on the conciliation achieved with landlords under the 1903 Land Act, believing all moderate unionists could still be won over. But for many nationalists the adoption of a conciliatory approach to the hereditary enemy involved too great a deviation from traditional thinking. The AFIL’s political objective was the attainment of a
United Ireland parliament with the consent rather than by the compulsion of the protestant and unionist community, under the banner of the “three Cs”, for Conference, Conciliation and Consent as applied to Irish politics. During the 1913-14 parliamentary debates on the Third Home Rule Bill, O'Brien opposed the IPP's coercive "Ulster must follow" policy, and published in January 1914 concessions to enable Ulster join a Dublin parliament. The Ulster Volunteers had already armed to resist likely “Rome Rule”, Redmond's Irish Volunteers arming likewise.

CE 21 March 1913

At a recent meeting of Dublin Unionists the speeches made by Messrs. Wm. O'Brien and T.M. Healy in disparagement of the Home Rule Bill were quoted by different speakers to help the cause of Unionism. The “Cork Constitution” – the Southern organ of Unionism – also finds Mr. Wm. O’Brien a useful vehicle for supplying material with which to denounce the Ancient Order of Hibernians, and in a recent issue mention in a leading article that “Mr. William O’Brien, M.P., has publicly characterised it (the Hibernian Order) as a sort of bastard Roman Catholic Orange Society.” It is, therefore, evident that the leaders of the All for Ireland movement are extremely useful to Unionist orators and Unionist journalists and that when Home rule has to be attacked or the Ancient Order of Hibernians reviled in gross language, the opponents of Irish Self-Government have only to fall back on utterances of the kind quoted to supply their requirements to the full.

William O'Brien and his followers abstained from the final vote passing the Third Home Rule Act 1914, denouncing it as a "partition deal", after Sir Edward Carson, leader of the Ulster Unionist Party, forced through an amendment mandating the partition of Ireland.

CE 10 July 1914

Editorial

[…] The Government’s narrow majority on the closure motion (which was largely brought about by the O’Brienites going into the Unionist lobby) has served as a basis on which to build up all kinds of doleful rumours and is cited as evidence of the rapid disintegration of the forces that make up what Unionists like to describe as the “coalition”. […] One does not like to write in terms which would adequately describe the conduct of the O’Brienites in placing the Government in jeopardy at such a critical time, but their action must necessarily bring its Nemesis, and the alleged Home Rulers who voted with the Unionists will yet have to rend an account of their stewardship. When the day of reckoning comes their treachery will not be forgotten by the Nationalists of Cork city and county.

O'Brien saw the outbreak of World War I as an opportunity to preserve at any price the unity of Ireland, by uniting the Green and Orange in a common cause, declaring himself on the side of the Allies and Britain's European war effort. He
said if Home Rule was to have a future, it would depend upon the extent to which the Irish Volunteers, in combination with the Ulster Volunteers, did their part in the firing line in France. He was in favour of an Irish Brigade and stood on recruiting platforms, encouraging voluntary enlistment in the Royal Munster Fusiliers.

O'Brien had warned of the danger of a potential republican eruption, culminating in the IRB 1916 rising, although he accepted the rebellion and the ensuing changed political climate in 1917 as the best way of ridding the country of IPP and AOH stagnation. During the anti-conscription crisis in April 1918, O'Brien and his AFIL joined Sinn Féin in the mass protests in Dublin. He believed Sinn Féin in its moderate form had earned the right to represent nationalist interests, and so stood aside putting AFIL seats at the disposal of Sinn Féin, its candidates returned unopposed in the 1918 general elections.179

CE 19 November 1918
Editorial
Ireland and the General Election

[…] The Nationalists of the city of Cork are to meet to-morrow night to select candidates for the constituency, if in the meantime an agreement on national unity has not been reached. Mr. Wm. O’Brien, who has decided voluntarily to go down and out – a course which many will regard as a wise precaution – has issued another valedictory address, which may be described as his expiring blow at the Nationalist Party.

In the years leading up to the war, political life in Ireland centred on the struggle to achieve Home Rule. John Redmond's once nationally popular Home Rule Party experienced a decline in electoral support and was overthrown in Cork, eight years before it was defeated in the rest of Ireland. It lost eight of its nine Cork seats in the General Elections of 1910, defeated by the All-For-Ireland League. On September 28 1914 Asquith’s Home Rule became law, but its provisions were immediately suspended for the duration of the war. As the war was expected to be over in a matter of months, both John and his brother William Redmond, among other nationalist leaders, called for support for the war. However, the more radical wing of the Volunteers opposed the war, leading to a split in the Irish Volunteer Movement180 in Cork as in the rest of the country. Support for the war was

179 Additional information, primary and secondary sources, as well as links on William O’Brien may be gleaned from the online encyclopedia, Wikipedia.
180 When it appeared that Home Rule would be achieved, Unionists in Ulster formed a militia called the Ulster Volunteers to fight anyone who might try and coerce them into a democratic self-governed Ireland dominated by a Catholic majority. The Irish Volunteers were founded in the South
generally widespread in Cork, many men volunteering, especially from the ranks of the Redmonite Volunteers.\textsuperscript{181} For a time divisions between nationalists and unionists appeared to be forgotten.\textsuperscript{182} Cork experienced the horrors of war when the Lusitania was sunk off the Head of Kinsale on May 8 1915. The treatment of the leaders of the 1916 Rising and the attempt to introduce conscription to Ireland in 1918 caused widespread outrage. Members of the Cork City corps of the Irish Volunteers occupied Saint Francis Hall during the Rising but no actual violence occurred in Cork. In the general election of 1918, of 45,000 votes cast in Cork over 40,000 were for the two Sinn Féin candidates James Joseph Walsh and Liam de Roiste.\textsuperscript{183} The Sinn Féin MPs resolved to abstain from Westminster and instead form an Irish Parliament with its own government in Dublin. Violence ensued,\textsuperscript{184} and two murders in 1920 were a foreboding of even worse atrocities. In Cork the Lord Mayor, Tomas MacCurtain, was shot dead at home in Blackpool in front of his wife by a party of armed men, their faces blackened. Later, policemen arrived and tore the house apart in search of arms. As well as being Lord Mayor, MacCurtain was also Commandant of the Mid-Cork Brigade of the IRA. The official police story was that MacCurtain had been killed by his own side, but the coroner's jury gave a different verdict. They found that he had been murdered by the RIC, officially directed by the British Government. MacCurtain's deputy Terence MacSwiney\textsuperscript{185} was made Mayor, being also a Commandant in the IRA, he

\textsuperscript{181} CE 12 May 1917, under Deaths:  Previously reported missing, now reported killed in action in France on the 7th July, 1916, John Ahern, aged 19 years, Royal Sussex Regiment, late of Irish National Volunteers, [...]. And on 17 May 1917, Private Joseph Ahern, Sportsmen's Battalion, Royal Fusiliers, missing since November, 1916, now reported killed. Before joining the colours he was a member of the Irish National Volunteers.

\textsuperscript{182} The Cork Examiner, 20 June 1917, under Deaths:  2nd Lieut. Moss Aherne, R.A.F. He was well known in Youghal, and has been successfully through the great battle at Messines Ridge. On the eve of the fight he wrote to a friend: "We are ready to go over the top at any moment. The men of the Ulster Division are on our right, and there is a healthy rivalry between them and the Southerns as to who will reach our objective first. The North and the South are one on the field. Would that that were so in Ireland."

\textsuperscript{183} Colman O'Mahony, In the shadows: life in Cork 1750-1930 (Cork, 1997).

\textsuperscript{184} The Anglo-Irish War (also known as the Irish War of Independence) was a guerilla campaign mounted against the British government in Ireland by the Irish Republican Army under the proclaimed legitimacy of the First Dáil, created in 1918 by a majority of Irish MPs. It lasted from January 1919 until the truce in July 1921. Michael Collins was the main driving force behind the independence movement. The Irish Republican Army which fought in this conflict is often referred to as the Old IRA to distinguish it from later organisations that used the same name. Cf., inter alia, Lyons, Ireland Since the Famine, pp.471ff.

\textsuperscript{185} Terence MacSwiney, Principles of Freedom (1921), dedicated to the Soldiers of Freedom in Every Land, Foreword: "It was my intention to publish these articles in book form as soon as possible. I had them typed for the purpose. I had no time for revision save to insert in the typed copy
was arrested on August 20th 1920 by the crown forces for being in possession of a police cipher and two documents likely to cause offence to his Majesty. He went on hunger strike in protest at the continuing arrest of democratically elected public representatives. MacSwiney was then transported to Brixton Gaol, where his hunger strike attracted worldwide attention. 300,000 Brazilian Catholics petitioned the Pope to intervene on his behalf. British newspapers pleaded for his release, but the Prime Minister Lloyd George refused. MacSwiney's death was preceded by that of Michael Fitzgerald, one of the Cork Prison Ten. MacSwiney died after 74 days, and the day of his funeral was declared a national day of mourning by the Dáil. Less than two months after his death Cork was destroyed by Auxiliaries of the British Army, the Black and Tans. On December 11th 1920, following an ambush by the IRA that resulted in the death of an English officer, the Black and Tans began burning the city. Two houses at Dillon's Cross were set alight and fire soon spread to the centre of town. Firemen had their horses slashed by the Auxiliaries, who refused to let the flames be fought. The Black and Tans got drunk and began to loot the city, burning down the City Hall and city library, Patrick Street was a wasteland. The total damage was estimated to be £3,000,000. Westminster denied the fire was started by the police or their affiliates and suggested it was the people of Cork that had burned and looted. A British Labour Party Commission sent to the city to investigate the burning were arrested by Auxiliaries and threatened with shooting. The war soon ended as pressure mounted on Lloyd George; he eventually agreed to meet a Sinn Féin delegation and a Treaty was signed. During the War of Independence Cork was one of the major centres of the conflict, and many of the most famous figures during that war came from Cork. And during the early days of the ensuing Irish Civil War, the anti-treaty IRA controlled Cork city. It took over the Cork Examiner and used it to promote its side of the conflict.186

186 Cf. various authors in the Cork Examiner Jan. – Nov. 1985, series of articles on the history of Cork City.
1. Ireland and the Austrian Empire in the 17th and 18th Centuries

The historical ties between these unequal societies were primarily established by the continuous conquest of Ireland by England and the subsequent forced exodus on numerous occasions of native Irish leaders to the Continent. Before holding up these connections to closer inspection, it is appropriate here to review the conditions that caused the most legendary of these departures – the infamous ‘Flight of the Earls’ and the memorable migration of the ‘Wild Geese’ – and examine their motives and incentives to settle within the demesne of the Austrian Empire.

1.1. Anglo-Irish Ascendancy

“The deviser of the settlement of Munster perhaps thought that the civil example of the English being set before the Irish, and their daily conversing with them, would have brought them by dislike of their own savage life to the liking and embracing of better civility. But it is far otherwise, for instead of following them, they fly the English, and most hatefully shun them, for two causes: first, because they have ever been brought up licentiously and to live as each one listeth; secondly, because they naturally hate the English, so that their fashions they also hate.”

Edmund Spenser

Michael McConville relates the context of this complaint in his book on the Ascendancy of the Anglo-Irish. He offers a clear account of the rise and the eclipse of the elite Protestant oligarchy he himself descends from, and reconstructs how, after centuries of absolute power, on the eve of a world war, thousands of Protestants of all classes in their enclave of north eastern Ulster, felt compelled to sign a Solemn Covenant to reject Irish Home Rule, including armed resistance.

The original Munster Plantation was the first English venture into colonialism, predating the founding of the New England settlements in North America by fifty years. The preceding four centuries of English involvement in Ireland, begun in the late 12th century when Ireland was invaded by Henry II and his associate Strongbow (the Earl of Pembroke), had been basically opportunist, or developed haphazardly through lethargy, indifference or incapacity. The Munster

---

1 The poet Edmund Spenser, prominent landholder of the Second Munster Plantation (late 16th century) and clerk of the Munster Council, to the queen, Elisabeth I, on his impressions of the native Irish, an outlook shared by all future generations of Anglo-Irish. Cf. footnote below, p.66.
enterprise was planned, giving ample consideration to the problems that settlers would face where the original inhabitants could be assumed hostile. This hostility was no doubt fostered by the procedure followed by all these communities: eviction of the Irish, distribution of land, construction of the first buildings, clearance and cultivation. ‘The ease with which these radical disruptions of the way of life of an ancient society were effected, demonstrated yet again the fundamental weakness, disunity, of Gaelic Ireland. Tribal rivalry and sectional feuding still took as much precedence as resistance to armed confiscation of the source of the race’s wealth.’

Despite precautions against the wild Irish, the settlers were eventually massacred or, like Edmund Spenser, just able to escape with their lives but not their livelihood. James Fitzmaurice, the Earl of Desmond’s cousin, was a formidable soldier and a political realist and he had identified a unifying cause that could bring together those opposed to the new settlements: he linked the elimination of the settlements with the restoration of the Catholic Church. The ensuing guerrilla warfare and the slaughter by both sides of non-co-operative civilians lasted until 1573, when Fitzmaurice, trapped with a few followers, was starved into surrender. In 1579 Fitzmaurice was in Rome, persuading the Pope to provide troops for a Catholic crusade in Munster. He had already been rebuffed by the French and the Spanish. Pope Gregory was more accommodating, and so, fortified by a papal blessing, banner and a military formation they set off – only to be conscripted into the army of King Sebastian of Portugal to invade Morocco, where almost everyone was killed in action. This curious incident not only illustrates the difficulties and misunderstandings accompanying military co-operation at the time, but also the difficulties encountered by many an Irish exile determined to liberate his countrymen. Wolfe Tone in the late eighteenth century was over-ambitious in his assessment of French assistance, and Roger Casement equally mistaken in the early twentieth century, placing his reliance upon Germany.

It was a monarchical and aristocratic age, and few societies in it were more monarchical and aristocratic than the conservative Gaelic Irish. It was not until the late eighteenth century, when influences of first the American and then the French Revolutions were felt in Ireland, that the notion of national republicanism as an alternative to hereditary kingship was first thought about.

---

3 Idem, p.27.
Four hundred and fifty years since the Norman landing on the Wexford coast had inaugurated the English in Irish affairs, three-quarters of Ireland was for all intents and proposes, English. The Dublin Pale and coastal towns like Waterford, Cork, and Galway (“Neither O nor Mac shall strut nor swagger through the streets of Galway”: a municipal ordinance, 1581)\textsuperscript{5}, as well as the city of Kilkenny, had for centuries been English-speaking and English-administered under English law. Ulster’s immunity at this time from English interference was due to its geography: it was shielded by lakes, bogs, swamps and mountains that were difficult to penetrate. The dominant families in Ulster were the O’Neills of Tyrone, and the O’Donnells of Tyrconnel. Hugh O’Neill, Earl of Tyrone, was one day rescued from a vengeful uncle by Henry Sidney, and raised in Penhurst, Kent. Exposed to the customs and modes of thinking in one of the gathering-places of English power, the boy absorbed a great deal of information, which he later used in the most successful campaign ever fought against the English by Gaelic Ireland, an enterprise that only failed by the thinnest of margins, but its failure completed the disintegration of the Gaelic order.

This ‘Flight of the Earls,’\textsuperscript{6} the escape of the last Irish chieftains of Ulster at the turn of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, did not bring about tremendous social change, as the changes were already too advanced. But the withdrawal of Ireland’s greatest Gaelic leaders was a clear sign that the Gaelic order, which had lasted for two thousand years, was beyond hope. Its cultural legacy persists to the present, but for over three hundred years after the earls’ flight the dominant force in Irish affairs was English, applied by the Anglo-Irish, with religion rather than race becoming the new badge of conformity.

The south of Scotland was nearer to the north of Ireland than any part of England, and since there had always been two-way traffic across the North Channel, the “English” that would settle the confiscated lands abandoned by the Gaelic leaders were actually Scottish. The Irish were not ignored altogether, but they would have done worse had their services not been required to provide the manual labour necessary for the next intended Plantation. Draperstown and

\textsuperscript{5} Protestant vigilance was, of course, met with Catholic wit. On a gate leading into the Protestant town of Bandon, West Cork, were once written the words: ‘Turk, Jew, Heathen, Aetheist/ All may enter except a Papist.’ To which had been added: ‘He who wrote this wrote it well/ For the same is written on the Gates of Hell.’

\textsuperscript{6} The descendants of Hugh O’Neill still live in Spain. One of the sons of Graf O’Donnell von Tyrconnel, an Austrian nobleman, was posted as missing when serving in Russia as an officer in the Wehrmacht in 1942, idem, footnote 4, p.70.
Saltertown were named after the London guilds that sponsored them, and the imposition of a new society upon an older one was set in motion. However, there is little evidence to suggest that the native Irish of Ulster paid much attention to English land practices or English agricultural procedures. They were cattle graziers, and they continued this tradition. But many were offered employment in Anglo-Scottish enclaves and subsequently interbred - until Irish frustrations broke out into the massacre of 1641. The hatreds nurtured by varying adherences to three rival interpretations of the Christian religion added immeasurably to the sorrow. On the Catholic side, the Society of Jesus promoted throughout Europe a campaign aimed at the restoration and preservation of Catholic values, infusing a new fanaticism into worldly disputes. The Thirty Years War on the Continent and its ideological extension to Ireland took some time. On the Protestant side, the zealots were English Puritans and Scottish Calvinists, the latter being a powerful force among the Ulster planters. ‘Their inspiration was less the Jesus of the Sermon on the Mount, the advocate of loving one’s neighbour, than the wrathful and vengeful Old Testament Jehovah who smote His enemies’.

As in the Munster settlements, many Ulster colonists had taken native Irish wives but their offspring had been absorbed into the imported culture and shared the views of the Protestants concerning the dangerous untrustworthiness of the Gaelic Irish. However, even though the Old English mistrusted the Gaelic Irish, they were co-religionists and Protestant pressure affected them both. It was during this time that thousands of Irishmen, north and south, joined the continental armies, becoming the founders of the distinguished military line of the Wild Geese, who for the next century and a half fought in every army in Europe. Those Gaelic Irish who stayed demonstrated in 1641 how serious the threat of the remaining warriors was. The familiar scenes of destruction of the Munster settlements were re-enacted in Ulster. Planters were massacred, houses and crops burnt. The numbers killed were probably exaggerated by contemporary and subsequent propagandists, but they were still high, perhaps 10,000, and they were entered into the tenacious memory of the Ulster Protestant community. Old enmities did not stay latent. The Old English demanded a general liberty of conscience, Catholic officials, restitution of lands confiscated for reasons of religion, and the independence of the Irish parliament. The Gaelic Irish, however, wanted their lands back, and the

---

7 Idem, p.77.
8 Idem, p. 80.
fostering of their native language and traditions. It is interesting to note that Oliver Cromwell’s republican administration of Ireland preceded the first independent Irish Republic, established by the government of John Costello in 1948, by three hundred years, albeit with constitutional differences. Cromwell’s politics, like those of his contemporaries, were governed by religious beliefs. He had overthrown a monarchical system and suppressed Anglicanism and Presbyterianism. But the deviation from scripture he held in most contempt was Catholicism, and when he was finished, an almost depopulated Ireland was ready for distribution. Cromwell was also the first to partition the country on the basis of religion into twenty-six and six counties, respectively. Eventually, the English decided that they needed a king more in sympathy with the national ethos, and William of Orange, a Dutch monarch of Huguenot extraction, who was married to Catholic-Scottish King James’s daughter Mary, and who at the time was the leading spirit in the League of Augsburg, seemed the fitting choice. James left for France and several thousand Irish Protestants left for England. In the north, Protestant settlers seized the unsecured towns of Derry and Enniskillen. The Protestant governor of Derry had already decided to surrender it to the Jacobites but was prevented by the Apprentice Boys. The city was under siege from April until the end of July, but the half-starved garrison’s courage and endurance became another evocative memory in Ulster Protestant folklore. The Irish campaign was a tiny component in a complex struggle between alliances of major European powers that would exploit or abandon Ireland according to their broader interests, but the fate of Ireland for the next century and a half, and the fate of its northern province until the present, was determined at the Boyne.

James’s analysis of the psychological importance of Dublin as a political symbol was reinforced by the reaction of his international enemies, or more properly those of Louis, when news of William’s victory at the Boyne was passed throughout Europe. What they celebrated was a minor military triumph that they imagined to be more decisive than it was. But their rejoicing made it plain that they regarded the acquisition of the Irish capital as an integral part of the prize. The celebrations in London were considerably muted by an almost simultaneous defeat of the combined English and Dutch fleets off Beachy Head by the French, which rather cancelled matters out, but no such disabilities hamstrung the revels in Austria and Spain. These included the singing of *Te Deums* in Austrian and Spanish cathedrals, a ceremonial Catholic manifestation of thanksgiving that the Irish Protestants among the victors doubtless found as offensive to their convictions as the defeated Irish Catholics found it to theirs. But then both parties had thought
that they had been fighting an insular religious civil war with insular religious objectives.9

Having lost the battle, the Irish Catholics were to suffer the most comprehensive subjection in their history. There were thirteen civil articles in the Limerick peace treaty, of these five theoretically safeguarded the future status of Irish Catholics, and nobody was to be asked to compromise his religious beliefs by taking an oath of supremacy. Another outcome of the Boyne was the disappearance from the Irish scene of the Old English community. ‘In the century ahead, in which religious disabilities were shared indiscriminately by all Catholics, the Old English merged in common hardship with the Gaelic Irish.’10 By the time a sentimental Gaelic nationalism developed in the nineteenth century, the two strands of Irish Catholic origins had become indistinguishable. The **Penal Laws**, 11 responsible for this merger, included the ban on weapons, supplemented by a restriction upon assembling for offensive or indeed any other purposes. No Catholic was permitted to own a horse worth more than five pounds, and education, which might encourage able children to question their inherited subservience, was dealt with by making it an offence for Catholics to run schools in Ireland or to send their children for schooling abroad. And if somehow they overcame these obstacles by private tuition, Catholic children would find themselves unable to take degrees or to compete for scholarships at the only university in Ireland, Trinity College Dublin. Many Irish youths were sent off to recatholicised Bohemia, but the chief sufferers from the Penal Laws were what were left of the Catholic upper and middle classes, as the peasantry did not aspire to any of the privileges against which sanctions were being enforced. ‘Underpaid, appallingly housed, with no legal safeguards against capricious eviction, compelled by the tithe laws to contribute one-tenth of their produce to a church to which they did not belong, sustained by a diet of potatoes and little else, they were probably the most depressed rural class in Europe outside Tsarist Russia.’12

---

9 Idem, p.117.
10 Idem, p.120.
11 The Statutes of Kilkenny of 1366 deprived the native Gaels of many of their natural rights, but by the end of the 16th century many English settlers had become “ipsis hibernicis hiberniores”, and so further measures were continually being enacted to keep settler and seditionous native apart. These laws of segregation, later based on religion and basically apartheid in nature, were commonly known as the Penal Laws. A severe code of penal legislation was enforced by the British government in the early eighteenth century, in direct violation of the Treaty of Limerick, to further concentrate power in the hands of the Protestant Ascendancy.
12 Idem, p.125.
But there were plenty of contemporary Anglo-Irishmen, who saw themselves as moderate and enlightened. France, the ally of the Irish Catholics, was treating its Huguenots with far more severity than Irish Protestants were treating Irish Catholics. Though the parallel is inexact, there are also many similarities between the society that developed in eighteenth-century Ireland and the apartheid regime in twentieth-century South Africa.¹³ In one important respect Ireland was quite liberal, in that any Catholic who chose to cross the line could do so by becoming a Protestant. Within its own boundaries there was a flexibility in the Anglo-Irish social organization which distinguished it from the almost immovable structures prevalent in England and, even more so, in continental Europe.

The common interest of the Anglo-Irish lay in their continued monopoly of power in a country in which they numbered a quarter of the population, and since the sum included the concentration of Protestant settlers in the north, the demographic odds in the south were heavily stacked against them. Therefore, if this minority were to maintain its dominant position it should make full use of every source of talent available. As a result, there was within the Protestant community a high degree of social mobility. The education of the poor but able boy would be encouraged and financed by a wealthier patron, landlord or country rector. Irish nationalism was still unheard of and was to remain so until the last two decades of the eighteenth century. Protestant self-confidence, on the other hand, was not a monopoly of the landed upper class; it was shared by all in a separate Irish Protestant nation. The Protestant poor were better off than the Catholic poor, and their opportunities of moving up the social scale, as for example James Connolly and others did, were enhanced by commerce being controlled by an increasingly prosperous Protestant middle class. A general feeling of solidarity, analogous to Free Masonry, held Protestants together. Protestant employers gave precedence and advancement to Protestant staff, and though the Protestant Work Ethic had not yet been defined, its effects were believed to be observable. The badge of loyalty in the South, and to a lesser extent in the North, was membership of the Church of Ireland. However, many were not happy with these unstable conditions and in the

---

¹³ The topic of a paper written by the present author in 1985, for the teacher-training course Fachdidaktik Geschichte.
first half of the 18th century, a quarter of a million Ulster dissenters immigrated to the American colonies.  

The first serious suggestion that Ireland would benefit from a university came in 1547 from Archbishop Browne of Dublin. The first stone of the new college was laid 13 March 1593. Divinity, unsullied by Catholicism or Dissent, took precedence. The study of the Irish language was an early preoccupation, partly because of its usefulness in a country where it was the tongue of the majority, partly because the translation of the bible into Irish was seen as a promising vehicle for conversion to Protestantism. And before long, the Anglo-Irish concluded that they were not only Irish, but that they were the Irish nation.

The idea that a community of immigrants, few of whose families had been in the country for more than a hundred years and many for less, should arrogate to itself the name of the Irish nation, while another Irish nation, the Gaelic component of which had been in Ireland for over two thousand years, was still there and three times as numerous as the newcomers, has its absurdities. But there was a certain logic behind the thinking. The Gaelic Irish and the others assimilated by them were identifiably a people, with a common language, religion and customs. They were in residence on one island. But they did not meet, and never had met, the definition of a nation as people organised as a state. They had been unified for the first time as a result of English conquest and occupation […]. In the meantime, the nation consisted of the sum of its citizens who accepted in full the obligations prescribed by the state and who enjoyed its benefits.

In 1718, the Declaratory Act of the English parliament empowered it to pass legislation applicable to Ireland. Basically, this meant the power to stifle Irish competition with English industry and trade. In future, all trade had to be routed through England, and the ‘Irish nation’ took cumulative offence, inspired by a new line of thought as a consequence of the American War of Independence. ‘This concept of nationalism, Anglo-Irish generated, was the root of the Home Rule politics which after Catholic Emancipation came to attract the electoral support of nearly all Catholic Irishmen in the second half of the nineteenth century. It lasted until the middle of the First World War.’ Of course by then, for reasons of self-

---

14 They were the Scotch-Irish of American history. Six of the signatories of the Declaration of Independence were Scotch-Irish, as were six early United States presidents including James Monroe and Andrew Jackson. Woodrow Wilson, elected as 28th U.S. President in 1913, descended from the same stock. Interestingly, he was never as seriously moved by Irish claims for self-government of small nations as he was for similar Czecho-Slovak demands. Cf. H. Blethen, (ed.), Ulster and North America : Transatlantic Perspectives on the Scotch Irish (University Alabama Press, 2001), James E. Johnson, The Scots and Scotch-Irish in America (In America Series, Reprint edition, 1992).
15 Idem, p.173.
16 Idem, p.174.
preservation, the Anglo-Irish had changed their minds and were stoutly against the implementation of a theory they themselves had advocated. However, in January 1783 Protestant Ireland’s legislative independence was formally recognised. Sir Jonah Barrington, one of the chroniclers and representatives of the era, sums up the distinguishing characteristic of contemporary Irish high society as “that glow of well-bred, witty and cordial vinous conviviality.” A young Anglo-Irishman who did not share Barrington’s appreciation of the new prosperity and the manner in which its fruits were distributed, was Theobald Wolfe Tone. He was the descendant of a Cromwellian settler/soldier, had been to Trinity and qualified at the Bar, and began to reflect seriously upon the corruption of the society in which he found himself. Impressed by the recent French Revolution and interested in its adaptation to Irish conditions, he wanted to unite all Irishmen, reform the parliamentary system, and get rid of English interference once and for all. Tone’s first steps in politics were radical, but legal in becoming the secretary of the Catholic Committee. Only two major hindrances now remained to Catholics, they could neither become members of parliament nor hold senior offices of state, unless they denied their religion. While working for the Catholic Committee, Tone founded the Society of United Irishmen, which cut across all religious, social, and ethnic divides. The early membership was predominantly Protestant, with a large element of Northern Presbyterians. But there were plenty of middle-class Catholics, Dublin and Belfast merchants and lawyers, landed gentry, including Lord Edward Fitzgerald (a son of the Duke of Leinster), several small farmers, and a growing number of the Catholic peasantry. For generations most of the Catholic clergy had been trained in France, (the link to Bohemia is practically never mentioned by historians) but the anti-clerical revolutionaries had now made this impossible. Because of the illiteracy engendered among the Irish Catholic peasantry by the Penal Laws, the role of the Catholic priest in rural Ireland was a crucial one: he was often the only educated, sometimes the only literate, Catholic within his parish. Negotiations between United Irishmen and Republican France began, and a military organization, directed from Dublin, was set up. Muskets and pikes were distributed, the Northern Presbyterians to the fore in these activities. A flare-up of

17 Idem, p.179 (Barrington bestows much of the same sentiment upon the Viennese in his memoirs, Personal Sketches, published 1827).
18 In the mid-nineteenth century the British government made a calculated concession and gave a grant for the foundation of a Catholic seminary at Maynooth.
the animosity between Catholics and Protestants in the North led to a sectarian affray in Armagh, subsequently known as “The Battle of the Diamond.” One of its outcomes was the formation of a body to protect Protestant interests, the Orange Order. It began its campaign to maintain the laws and peace of the country with a series of attacks on Ulster Catholics. Orange Orders soon sprang up all over Ulster, Leinster and parts of Munster. Most of the Ulster Presbyterians remained United Irishmen. In 1796 Tone moved to Paris and towards the end of the year the French allocated a 15,000-strong army and forty-three ships for the invasion of Ireland: on the south-west coast of Ireland, in the middle of December. The Catholic Bishop of Cork and the Catholic Earl of Kenmare refused to be ‘freed’ by French anti-clericals and rallied the peasantry to the defence of the status quo. Therefore, the greatest demonstration of loyalty to the crown at the time came from the Catholics of Munster, and the greatest spectacle of treachery came from the Presbyterians of Ulster. When Napoleon Bonaparte assumed control of France, Ireland fell in the scale of French strategic priorities.19

1.2. The Ascent of the Austro-Irish

Out of Charlemagne's empire came the empire of Austria. Before his time, the history of the Austro-Hungarian lands is one of early tribal life, followed by conquest under the later Roman emperors, and then the migratory movements of its own people and of other people across its territory, between the days of Attila and the Merovingians. Its very name (Oesterreich) indicates its origin as a frontier territory, an outpost in the east for the great empire Charlemagne had built up. Not until the sixteenth century did Austria become a power of first rank in Europe. Hapsburgs had long ruled it, as they still do, and as they have done for more than six centuries, but the greatest of all their additions to power and dominion came through Mary of Burgundy, who, seeking refuge from Louis XI. of France, after her father's death, married Maximilian of Austria. Out of that marriage came, in two generations, possession by Austria of the Netherlands, through Mary's grandson, Charles V., Holy Roman emperor and king of Spain. For years afterward, the Hapsburgs remained the most illustrious house in Europe. The empire's later fortunes are a story of grim struggles with Protestants, Frederick the Great, the Ottoman Turks, Napoleon, the revolutionists of 1848, and Prussia.

Francis W. Halsey20

19 When the 1916 Proclamation was drafted, some of Tone’s aspirations had already become reality, Catholic Emancipation had existed since 1829, successive Land Acts had returned much of the property of Ireland to the people of Ireland, and a romantic, Gaelic nationalism had developed. Tone was unsuccessful in getting his ideas accepted in his own lifetime, but they became the philosophical root of the constitution of the present Republic of Ireland.

Extremely close connections, particularly on a strategically elite level, existed between Old Ireland and the Old Austrian Empire, specifically Bohemia. In the following, the historical development of these affiliations are to be looked at, having been divided according to the two main categories delineating their inherent nature: the military, and religious orders and universities, due to their mutually supportive functions at the time.

1.2.1. In the Austrian Army

“The more Irish officers in the Austrian service the better; our troops will always be disciplined, an Irish coward is an uncommon character and what the natives of Ireland even dislike from principle, they generally will perform through a desire for glory.” These words were spoken in acknowledgement of the services of the Wild Geese and their descendents by Francis Stephen of Lorraine, Roman-German Emperor, and husband of Maria Theresia – who also lent her name to the highest military accolade to be gained in the Austrian Army. Initially, these 14,000 Irish soldiers and nobles who left Ireland after the Treaty of Limerick was signed in 1691, when Patrick Sarsfield surrendered to representatives of King William of Orange, sailed to France and Spain. They went off to fight other Catholic countries’ wars in the hope of gaining support for the invasion of Ireland. Some of these nobles entered the services of the Imperial Austrian Army where they distinguished themselves greatly. Their services to Habsburg Austria ‘far surpassed the importance and duration of the role played by similar “Wild Geese” in France or Spain,’ according to Bertie Ahern, present Prime Minister of Ireland, as quoted in a recent publication by the Heeresgeschichtliches Museum Wien, on the occasion of an exhibition entitled “The Wild Geese – Irish Soldiers in the Habsburg Service.”

Articles contributed to the exhibition catalogue by Declan Downey and Christoph Hatschek offer detailed and precise descriptions of the careers of the most notable Irish figures in Austrian history, their reasons for coming, their integration and advancement, and how this was furthered not only through military connections but also religious institutions and, of course, marriages - within their own circles and those of their host country.

In ‘The Military Order of Maria Theresia and its Irish Members, From its Foundation to the End of World War I,’ Christoph Hatschek traces the career of a successfully integrated Irishman who distinguished himself as a navy pilot for Imperial Austria. On the occasion of his thirtieth birthday, 17 August 1917, Emperor Charles I conferred decorations upon Austrian officers, promoting them to knights of the military Order of Maria Theresia, at the biggest ceremony of World War I at his summer residence. Four commander’s crosses and twenty knight’s crosses were awarded to the officers, among them a young naval lieutenant named Gottfried Banfield (1890-1986), one of the last “Wild Geese” in the service of the Habsburgs. He descended from an Old Irish family, his grandfather, colonel Mumb of Mühlheim, was a commander of an infantry regiment at Solferino in 1859, and his father, Richard Banfield, was a battery commander on the battleship Archduke Ferdinand Max in the battle of Lissa in 1866. Gottfried Banfield was born in Castelnuovo in Italy and spent his first years at Pola, the main naval base of the Austrian Monarchy. He attended Military High School at St.Pölten and then Naval Academy at Fiume, graduating as naval cadet in June 1909. After serving on board several warships of the Austrian navy, he was promoted to naval acting sub-lieutenant in 1912. In the same year he began a pilot training at the aviation school at Wiener Neustadt, receiving his navy pilot commission in 1913. When the Great War broke out, Banfield served at the aviation-base of Pola and took part in the night-fights of the Austrian navy-pilots and attacks against the Italian navy at Ancona in 1915. His bravery had him appointed commander of a new navy-air force base at Trieste, and because of his successful victories in the air he was nicknamed “Eagle of Trieste.” Gottfried Banfield was nominated for the highest military decoration in the Austrian army, and on 17 August 1917 Banfield became the last knight of the Military Order of Maria Theresia, the only Austrian navy pilot awarded this decoration during World War I.

In his article “Wild Geese and the Double-Headed Eagle, Irish Integration in Austria c.1630 – c. 1918,” Declan Downey notes that by the late nineteenth century, the traditional migration of the Irish to the Continent had changed in direction towards the New World: the United States of America, Australia and Argentina. Nevertheless, some Irish families maintained links with their relatives in Europe. An awareness of the Austro-Irish familial connections can be seen in the

---

22 Idem, pp.31ff.
23 Idem, pp.61ff.
letters between Joseph Nunan, an Irish barrister who worked in the War Reparation Commission in Vienna around 1922, and Charles Gavan Duffy, in charge of foreign affairs for the Irish Free State. Apparently on Nunan’s initiative, Gavan Duffy asked for financial help from the Irish Government for relief work in post-war Austria. Both men felt Ireland was honour-bound to help Austria regarding what Nunan described as ‘this ancient hospitality’, by accepting Austrian refugees. What exactly did this ancient hospitality entail? The mechanisms of military, diplomatic and administrative services allowed the Irish to integrate with the Habsburg state and society. Its multinational character was favourable to the advancement of foreigners and so, through personal merits and professional achievements, the Irish became distinguished and ennobled and in a position to intermarry among the aristocratic and even princely families of the empire. Examples of such men who prospered in the Austrian Empire include Walter Butler of Roscrea, colonel-proprietor of the first Irish infantry regiment in Austria, who assassinated the illustrious imperial commander Albrecht von Wallenstein in 1633. ‘This deed made our country and nation, otherwise quite unheard of here, most infamous and well-known’, commented an Irish Franciscan in Prague. This notoriety was rewarded with the Wallenstein estates of Friedberg in Bohemia and the title of Reichsgraf or imperial count, and thus began the line of the Irish-Bohemian-Magyar House of Butler zu Pardany und Erdőtelek. Another Irishman of note during the Thirty Years War was Oliver Wallis or Walsh of Carrickmines, Co.Dublin, whose military prowess and diplomatic skills earned him estates in Bohemia, the title of Baron, and marriage to a Countess. And with the advance of the Ottoman Empire into central Europe began the successful career of Count Francis Taaffe, third Earl of Carlingford, whose family connections to the Imperial court lasted until 1919. When King Jan Sobieski of Poland and Prince Eugene of Savoy led the forces that routed the Turks and lifted the siege of Vienna, Francis Taaffe of Ballymote, Co.Sligo, was at the forefront of the charge that captured the standard of Kara Mustafa.24

24 Cf. Halsey (ed.), Seeing Europe, an essay by Bayard Taylor, on a visit to the imperial armory: ‘The last wing was the most remarkable. Here we saw the helm and breastplate of Attila, king of the Huns, which once glanced at the head of his myriads of wild hordes before the walls of Rome; the armor of Count Stahremberg, who commanded Vienna during the Turkish siege in 1529, and the holy banner of Mohammed, taken at that time from the grand vizier, together with the steel harness of John Sobieski of Poland, who rescued Vienna from the Turkish troops under Kara Mustapha; the hat, sword and breastplate of Godfrey of Bouillon, the crusader-king of Jerusalem, with the banners of the cross the crusaders had borne to Palestine and the standard they captured from the Turks on
The next wave of Irish immigration saw exiled Jacobites being rapidly assimilated into eighteenth-century Austria. Foremost among these men was Count Maximillian Ulysses von Browne who forced Frederick the Great to a standstill at Prague in 1775. Needless to say, the Feast of St. Patrick had by this stage become well established in court circles, where even the Emperor Joseph II was familiar with the Gaelic language and etiquette. While touring Europe, Dublin-born tenor Michael Kelly, gives the following account of his audience with the Emperor:

I found him with half-a-dozen general officers, among whom were Generals O’Donnell and Kavanagh, my gallant countrymen; the latter said something to me in Irish, which I did not understand, consequently made him no answer. The Emperor turned quickly on me, and said, ‘What, O’Kelly, don’t you speak the language of your country?’ – I replied, ‘please your Majesty, none but the lower orders of Irish people speak Irish’. The Emperor laughed loudly. The impropriety of the remark, made before two Milesian Generals, in an instant flashed into my mind, I could have bit my tongue off.”

Excursus: Count Laval Nugent-Westmeath, k.k. Feldmarschall

Laval Nugent (1777-1862) is regarded as the greatest Irish name in the history of Austrian defence and preservation in the nineteenth century. Not only did he serve against Napoleonic forces, being promoted to the rank of major general at the age of twenty-five, but in 1848, aged seventy-one, Nugent campaigned in Lombardy and helped suppress rebellion in Hungary. He was promoted by Emperor Franz Joseph, received the Order of the Golden Fleece, and, finally on a more personal note as Irishman, had the honour of having the title Lord Grand Prior of Ireland restored to the family name in 1860. The name Nugent appears prominently, though somewhat negatively, in the Cork Examiner throughout 1848, as well as being admiringly remembered by the same paper in 1866. These articles serve to illustrate the subtle change in the perception of Austria and the people who fight for liberty, as well as those who kill them to suppress it. The Cork Examiner lauded the actions of continental insurgents and Irish rebels in ’48, but took a more conservative approach to politics in ’66/67, when Fenians upset the status quo for the walls of the Holy City. I felt all my boyish enthusiasm for the romantic age of the crusaders revive as I looked on the torn and moldering banners which once waved on the hills of Judea, or perhaps followed the sword of the Lion-Heart through the fight on the field of Ascalon. What tales could they not tell, those old standards cut and shivered by spear and lance! What brave hands have carried them through the storm of battle, what dying eyes have looked upward to the cross on the folds as the last prayer was breathed for the rescue of the holy sepulcher.

25 Die Wildgänse, p.68, and footnotes 52 and 53, pp.74/75.
26 Idem, pp.115-119.
“twelve hours”, and Nugent was finally given credit for upholding the same, albeit in a foreign country. Of course, these articles also show the continued deep involvement of Irishmen in Austrian affairs at a time when the necessity of immigration from Ireland had passed, but was by no means over. As an example, the following excerpt from an article of the Cork Examiner mentions Nugent and foreboding facts on the Austrian Empire, and the beginning of the growing political role of Czechs in bringing down the Empire some seventy years later:

CE 31 May 1848
The Empire of Austria

The iniquitous and ill-constructed Austrian empire is likely to fall to pieces […]. The reforming tendencies of the Imperial ministry, under the control of the National Guard and the people, have struck with horror the old Austrian nobility. To some such feeling of repugnance the Emperor gave way, in quitting the capital so precipitately. His nobles, like those of France in the first French revolution, are following him. Prague is their Coblenz. Thither they are going in crowds, protesting against the new state of things, and protesting, above all against the democratic absorption of the Austrian empire into a German Confederation. They are trying to form a union with the Czechs and other Slavonic races who, less civilised than the other portions of the empire, may be supposed to entertain the stronger feudal attachment to the imperial and aristocratic cause. They wish to make a Vendee of the districts of the Bohemian Czechs. Their game is a desperate one – and shows how desperate is their danger from the growing spirit of Austrian liberty. **It is a melancholy thing to see Nugent and Radetzky laying waste the fields and towns of Northern Italy, for a dynasty which is falling to pieces** – for a King who has fled from his throne […]. Northern Italy is gone […]. The Hungarians have a government of their own with the Archduke Stephen at its head; the Bohemians are also determined to establish a Bohemian Government, independent of that of Vienna, and we should hope the Tyrol will contrive to remember the treachery of the Emperor Francis and the lost battles of the too loyal Hofer and the deserted Tyrolese.

Finally, Nugent was not the only Irishman fighting revolutionary forces in Northern Italy. Another Irish officer in the Austrian service whose name is withheld, acting a leading part in a recent battle between Italians and Austrians near Verona, sent a letter to his brother in Dublin describing the incident, dated May 27. Excerpts from the rather lengthy and detailed letter exemplify that this captain had Irish comrades, emphasise the unquestionable loyalty of Irish officers in the Austrian army to the Emperor, and highlight England’s shifting loyalties.

CE 12 June 1848
My dearest brother – Ever since my last letter we have been doing duty in this fortress. The 6th of this month is the only day that merits particular mention. ‘Twas about noon when, sitting in my room, I thought I heard the report of cannon
[...] I entered the barracks, and a few minutes afterwards the order came that our regiment should turn out. The Piedmontese had attacked our lines in their entire extent [...]. As the elder captain in the battalion (already the 4th in the regiment)! I took the command. A short time after our Brigade-General came, asked for the Lieutenant-Colonel, and as he was not to be found, ordered me to lead the battalion out of the fortress [...]. We passed the gate and directed our march towards St. Lucia. Two companies of sharpshooters had valiantly defended it against a thousand times more numerous enemy, and we were at last obliged to retreat [...]. We were forced to change our position. I formed with my company a chain of tirailleurs – the battalion retreated some hundred yards to reform its ranks – I heard the cry “Our Lieutenant-Colonel is shot – O’Connor!” A grape shot had struck him to the ground, and he breathed his last. I took the command [...]. Two imperial princes joined us – we advanced – [...]. You know, of course, that our Emperor is at present at Tyrol. I hope that we will be successful. Our army is brave and strong, but that of the enemy has the advantage in numbers. The population is against us – the Almighty alone knows the result. [...] Why don’t the English come to our assistance? Have they forgotten their old faithful ally?

1.2.2. Religious Orders and Universities

Most students were from the regions of the Bohemian crown [...]. Almost 30% were foreigners, one third of them were Irish [...]. In the course of the whole period 1651-1783 one can observe a steady increase in student numbers from the crownlands and a decrease from foreign parts, only the numbers from the new Irish students remained steady or rose [...]. Only 28% of the students finished their medical studies at Prague [...]. A substantial number of foreign students seem to have used Prague only as an interim university: not so the Irish, they mostly stayed.27

Despite the obvious dangers of crossing Europe during the Thirty Years War, Irish students were eager to attend Catholic Continental universities, notably in Prague, which not only offered placements but also career opportunities after the Battle of the White Mountain, and, even more importantly, was decidedly the cheapest to attend. Reference is made in the above mentioned exhibition catalogue to the Franciscan Monastery in Prague and its contribution in the education and assimilation of Catholic Irish on the Continent. For a more detailed study on the subject, a Festschrift to mark the 650th anniversary of the founding of Prague University28, offers an in-depth analysis of the seemingly well-trodden path leading the Irish middle and upper classes to Bohemia, in search of education, careers and possibly support for Irish concerns at home.

28 Robinson-Hammerstein, p.65.
In the article “The University of Prague, the common good and Irish medical students as refugees in an early eighteenth-century Prague,” Helga Robinson-Hammerstein writes about the crucial part of the intellectual elite, the role of “speaking well” (as the essential precondition of good conduct and “civility”) and the avoidance of chaos in society by means of the regulating influence of geometry, which were by the beginning of the seventeenth century ‘tacit assumptions defining the empowering function of the university everywhere.’ This included the universities of Prague and Dublin. Confessional differences had no influence on the assumptions about what would serve the common good, and in Bohemia as in Ireland, or indeed any area of the continent, the promotion of “professionalisation” by means of university education to preserve the common good did not exclude the nobility and gentry in favour of the bourgeoisie. In fact, the hierarchically conceived and structured social life of the period not only offered resistance to uncontrolled modernisation, but also to overt secularisation. In the Lutheran land of Hesse-Darmstadt, for example, the university was needed to aid social control and secure its survival as a territorial state. Early seventeenth century Bohemia had similar needs, and in Prague the university developed “state creating” forces of its own, where revolutionary change was initiated by the leading university professors of the day. The university wished to ‘serve the common good’ in quite a different type of state, and so, between 1609 and 1618, the Carolinum played the lead role in securing the power of the Bohemian Estates, which advocated an elective head of state, expelling the Jesuits in 1618. The Battle of the White Mountain put an end to this experiment. Similarly, because the dominant social groups in Ireland were instable, with the Old Irish, Anglo-Irish and New English making up a variety of possibilities of colonial order, Irish society was also constantly verging on chaos - more so than perhaps anywhere else in “civilised” Europe – and thus the university was seen as the crucial stabiliser and “civiliser” of late Elizabethan and early Stuart Ireland.

The principle of *cuius regio eius religio* was applied in most parts of Europe at the time, and so the law-abiding society in Ireland had to be Protestant. Students at Trinity College were not required to swear the oath of allegiance abjuring the Catholic faith until the mid-seventeenth century, when an Irish university, envisaging a Protestant understanding of the public good, was unlikely to prove

29 Idem, pp.44-80.
acceptable to Catholic Irish families. In Bohemia around the same time, the university had to be Catholic. Regarding the daily life of students in Prague, foreign or otherwise, they did not live in bursas, sharing instead the houses of professors, traders and other town families who hoped that their children would pick up the good manners which would raise them from the level of the “uneducated populace.” Utility, virtue and civility were listed in early documents as the aspirations of the new university and the openness displayed by the populace in general towards students from distant countries was proof enough of those lofty ideals.\(^30\) Emperor Ferdinand III had reserved the right to fill chairs and influential positions in the secular faculties, and even if he never actually exercised this privilege, a principle had been stated. Besides the straightforward *cuius regio* regulation, not only religious observance was regulated by these means but much more to the point, the material existence of the university itself. Another feature of the Bohemian socio-cultural climate was the fact that Bohemia coped without fuss with the influx of religious refugees. Following the Bohemian Revolt of 1618-1620, there was a deliberate policy of settling the country with those willing to put into practice the Habsburg idea of a Catholic common good. Another reason for such a civilised reaction to foreign scholars was that their presence was seen as part of the already established scholarly *peregrinatio* that enhanced the international reputation of any university.

Before the Irish students arrived in Prague to constitute a major component of the university population, others had already established a favourable reputation for them: the Franciscans and their college that trained priests and missionaries for the homeland, and, of course, the Irish regiments. And as W.E.H.Lecky’s observations show, it was on continental Europe that the real history of Irish Catholicism developed at the time, with Bohemia playing a pivotal role. The Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception in Prague had been established in 1629 by two Franciscan Brothers, Fr. Fleming and Fr. Geraldini. Although the College was closed as the result of the reforms of Emperor Joseph II in 1786, it had been active for over one hundred and fifty years. An Act of Parliament which prohibited foreign education in 1695 was ignored by the Irish Catholics - after all, one great task which the Franciscans in Prague had set themselves was the training of priests for Ireland, a training which involved among other programmes a close

\(^{30}\) Robinson-Hammerstein, p.52ff.
study of the Irish language in order to better serve the spiritually deprived community at home (vying successfully with the equally zealous Protestants already at work for Irish souls and no less fluent in the vernacular). The Franciscans in Prague never forgot their community at home, as records of Fr. Anthony Bruodin show. They were adamant in reminding young Franciscans of the land they had left behind - and which they were going to serve again, regardless of the unfavourable circumstances they could expect, and they never tired in calling attention to the suffering of their co-religionists in Ireland. This sense of a Catholic community oppressed at home, but able to contribute substantially to the common good of the host country by a selected few, was also present in the military and diplomatic circles of the Austrian Empire, in which several Irish families were traditionally prominent. The Taaffes, although almost completely integrated in Austria, never forgot their homeland; Nicolas Taaffe retained his title even if not all his lands in Ireland. In the Austrian Empire he had been made Field Marshal and Count, as well as serving as Chancellor to Emperor Leopold, but he was still concerned about the “Catholic Question” in Ireland, and in 1766 he published a tract entitled ‘Observations on Affairs in Ireland’, calling for generous treatment of Catholics in Ireland.31

**Excursus: William James MacNeven, Doctor in Exile**

Another article in Migrating Scholars significant to this study is entitled ‘Doctors in Exile. William MacNeven O’Kelly (1713-1787) and William James MacNeven (1763-1841),’ by Davis Coakley and Zdenek Kalvach.32 William MacNeven O’Kelly was from Ballynahown, near Aughrim in County Galway, and became one of the most influential medical figures in Prague in the eighteenth century. He was made director of medical studies in Charles University from 1754 to 1784, and his nephew, Doctor William James MacNeven, also from Ballynahown, was subsequently educated in Prague and Vienna and went on to become one of the leaders of the 1798 rebellion in Ireland. He was, at a much later date, a distinguished medical professor in New York and an obelisk on Broadway honours his memory. Records show that in June 1786 MacNeven began the homeward journey to Ireland with this brother Hugh. MacNeven had been thirteen
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31 Robinson-Hammerstein, p.59.
32 Idem, pp.81-115.
years out of the country and was leaving behind very dear friends in Prague. Once in Dublin, he built up a successful private practice and seemed assured of a brilliant career in medicine. MacNeven was a frequent guest at the home of state physician Dr. Robert Emmet, developing a close friendship with one of the physician’s sons, Thomas Addis Emmet. Due to his own experience of exile on account of religion, MacNeven took an active part in the affairs of the Catholic Committee, endeavouring to advance the rights of Catholics in Ireland. And, as prominent member of the Committee, MacNeven was befriended by Wolfe Tone. After the unsuccessful rising, MacNeven was one of those imprisoned in Kilmainham Gaol. Following his release in 1802, by which time Ireland and Great Britain had been brought closer through William Pitt’s Act of Union in 1800, MacNeven set out on a walk across Europe to Bohemia, to visit relatives in Prague and to renew his contacts with Irish officers serving in the Austrian army before returning to France. In fact, the exiled leaders planned to put together an Irish brigade in the French Army in order to invade Ireland, hoping to enlist the support of Irish officers in the Austrian army should the time come. When another rebellion, this time orchestrated by the younger brother of Thomas Addis, Robert Emmet, failed in 1803, Thomas Addis Emmet and MacNeven made an effort to persuade Napoleon to send an expeditionary force to Ireland. He himself joined the French Army as captain in the Irish brigade, but after only a few months it became clear that, despite promises made to the contrary, there would be no expedition, and the brigade disbanded. Only the New World still held some promise for MacNeven, to where both he and Thomas Addis Emmet emigrated and both had extraordinary, successful careers. Following MacNeven’s death, an obelisk was erected in 1865 in the Protestant Churchyard of St. Paul’s, Central Manhattan, facing Broadway, with inscriptions in Latin, Irish, and English. These pay tribute to his ability as a chemist and his skills as a medical teacher, but also his patriotism and his outstanding service to America. **His life in Prague and Austria falls under “years in poverty and exile.”**

---

33 Robert Emmet (1778-1803): Of all heroic martyrs found in Irish history, none compares in popularity with the romantic martyrdom of Robert Emmet. His was one of the greatest speeches made from the dock by a condemned prisoner. He ended it thus: "Let no man write my epitaph......Let my memory be left in oblivion and my tomb remain uninscribed until other times and other men can do justice to my character. When my country takes her place among the nations of the earth, then, and not till then, let my epitaph be written.” Quotation taken from Boyce, Nineteenth-Century Ireland, p.26.
Identifying and sanctifying nations was popular in a Europe caught up in nationalist frenzy. Since the 1830s there had been hardly one ‘submerged’ peoples anywhere in Europe that had not had in its midst romantic intellectuals, resurrecting its folk speech, folk ballads, customs and costumes, celebrating in epic verse its mythical past, and founding societies and schools, theatres and publishing houses, to spread its cult. Railways and wood-pulp paper helped the popular propaganda reach the masses. Nationalist agitation among subject peoples had first been directed toward cultural, rather than political, ends, and until it turned to politics and disturbing public order, little or no attention was paid to it by respective governments. Developing nationalist activity put a variety of hitherto neglected peoples unto the European map, particularly during the three decades after 1871. Russifying decrees of the Tsar's government, for example, accentuated the nationalism of Lithuanians, and Finns. Within the Grand Duchy of Finland, political pressure of the Finnish-speaking peasants induced the Swedish-speaking elite to concede statutory equality of Finnish with Swedish in the law courts, in the administration and in the university. Another specifically nineteenth century feature was the quickened tempo and fiercer manifestation of nationalism among subject peoples already known to be nationalist, such as the Czechs and Irish. Their nationalism in turn was strengthened by their desire to emulate the successes of Germans, Italians and Magyars. Furthermore, they could use the new popular journalism and in most countries the new democratic franchise, guaranteeing them freedom of press and speech, to give their grievances unprecedented airing and to create difficulties for their oppressors. The older secondary sources on the period in question have been selected according to their past popularity and present accessibility. Naturally, credibility is the ultimate criterion to the historian; however, it is also important to consider the influence that these findings had on their readership, which contemporary influences helped shaped these works. The role of national – if not indeed religious – stereotyping still played a vital part in the
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1 Hobshawn, Nations and Nationalism since 1780 (CUP, 1990). Cf. also an interesting article by Professor Gerhard Rempel, formerly of the Department of History, Western New England College, a rather controversial scholar, whose ideas, nonetheless, coincide quite readily with the present author's at this one instance: ‘The awakening of submerged nationalities’ (18.12.1995), unfortunately no longer available online, except through direct correspondence with the aforementioned historian.
construction of ideas and the reconstruction of past events in the highly industrialised, rationalised and civilised society of nineteenth century Europe. Secondary sources for this study include a historical work by Liberal MP H.A.L. Fisher, who wrote a history of Europe beginning with Neolithic man and concluding with Stalin, Kemal, Mussolini and Hitler. Fisher speaks as a contemporary in his work, focusing on the value of Liberty, and indicating that after gaining ground through the nineteenth century, the tides of liberty receded over Europe in the third decade of the twentieth century. The present study offers some of his views on the developing nationalities of Central Europe and the British Isles, as he partly experienced them for himself. His outlook, essentially learned and intended as objective as possible, appears to the modern reader as frequently tilted in favour of the virtues of enlightened Protestantism, the point of view that dominated the British Empire at the time. In order to balance Fisher’s work, the earlier publication of a near contemporary, C.A. Fyffe, is primarily drawn upon to broaden and deepen the picture of national and international political progression in Europe. The received opinion on this era in modern standards is acknowledged, among others, through the imperturbable insights of A.J.P. Taylor. 
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3 C.A. Fyffe, barrister-at-Law, Fellow of University College, Oxford, and Vice-President of the Royal Historical Society, his work, A History of Modern Europe 1792–1878, first published 1889 in three volumes, and later reissued by Henrietta Fyffe in 1895 in one popular volume. Cf. also CE 17 July 1891. The Charge Against Mr. Charles Allan Fyffe.Mr. Justice Matthews, charging the Grand Jury at the Guildford Assizes yesterday, referred to the charge against Mr. Charles Allan Fyffe, the eminent historian and Liberal candidate for Devizes, of indecent conduct with a boy. He said that what first struck one was that the act was improbable, seeing that the charge was made against a man of mature years. Everything must depende upon the trustworthiness of the prosecutor, and the cardinal feature was whether the boy was a consenting party. The Grand Jury found no bill.

4 Alan John Percivale Taylor (1906-1990), began his post-graduate work in Vienna, his mentors in this period the Austrian-born historian Alfred Pribham and the Polish-born historian Sir Lewis Namier. Their opposing influences can be seen in Taylor's writings on Austria-Hungary until the publication of his 1941 book The Habsburg Monarchy 1809–1918. Taylor's earlier writings reflected Pribham's favourable opinion of the Habsburgs; his later writings show the influence of Namier's unfavorable views thereof. During WW II he befriended Ed. Benes, and was later to claim that he advised Benes to embark upon the expulsion of the entire German population of Czechoslovakia after the war. Taylor held fierce Germanophobic views, accusing the Germans of waging an endless Drang nach Osten against their hapless Slavic neighbors since the days of
as guide and guaranty and a particularly useful source of critical insight into late nineteenth and early twentieth century Austrian history, comfortably combining his insights into Austrian history with his knowledge of English-Irish relations. As regards Irish history, numerous historians are called upon, F.S.L.Lyons and D.George Boyce, among others.

There has been a surge of interest in the Austrian Monarchy since the events of 1989, and it can be difficult to find historical works devoid of some element of nostalgia. This cannot be said of Taylor’s The Habsburg Monarchy, first published in 1941 at a time when his originally favourable view of the Austrian Empire had already changed to a rather critical one. Thus his assessments are not overly generous in analysing the structure and qualities of the Habsburg lands. Although the early negative judgements of the monarchy as ‘Völkerkerker’ have been revised in general, new interpretations risk distorting historical reality by overemphasizing the good and glossing over the bad aspects, particularly regarding the nationalities question, so pertinent to this study. A.J.P. Taylor basically wished to put across that the Habsburg monarchy was a territorial and political vehicle enabling the Habsburgs to amass prestige and power, and from 1815 to 1914 they spent about a hundred years defending this structure against the odds, fighting forces bent on undermining their hegemony in a diverse territory. They regarded themselves as holders of the crown of the Holy Roman Emperor, as protectors of Christendom, and ultimately as German princes within a monarchy that was mostly Slav in character.

How did their English counterparts view their role in an Empire only marginally Anglo-Saxon? Considering the formative experience of the English people, the Germanic occupation followed by assimilation or conquest of Celtic regions, their ruling classes were, particularly regarding their treatment of Ireland, ‘arrogant, greedy, fond of power, and of dominion all over the world.’

There has been more than one parallel in Europe to this situation of a stronger people learning to be a ‘nation’ by dominating weaker, more ‘backward’ ones; the closest is the rise of Austria through subjugation of Slav territories on its

---


mountainous south and south-east, and then of the Slav kingdom of Bohemia. Nationalism in Europe owes to a background of this kind a great deal of its domineering temper; it helped to mould the modern militarist state, ambitious of triumphs such as England sought in the Hundred Years’ War, and in later times in imperialist expansion outside Europe.⁷

Every national movement of the nineteenth century owes much to the inspiration of antiquity. The Serb went back to Stephen Dushan in the fourteenth century, the Italian to Dante and Virgil, the Bohemian to Czech ballads of reputed antiquity, the Irishman to Erse. Korais, a Corfiote schoolmaster, had the brilliant thought that the literature of ancient Greece might be translated into a tongue intermediate between the august original and the argot of the common speech. By creating a new language this industrious scholar helped to call into being a new nation.⁸

The resurrection of Greece, though it little altered the balance of power in Europe, was the first successful blow administered to the autocratic government of Europe by Congress; here the Ottoman Empire received its most sensible wound; here ‘the modern spirit of nationalism, afterwards destined to govern Italy and Poland, Bohemia and Ireland, and to bring the Austrian Empire to the ground, won its first romantic and resounding triumph.’ In the earliest Greek as in the latest Irish phase of nationalism, the human types recur: ‘Kolokotrones and Michael Collins, Korais and Arthur Griffith, Canning and Lloyd George, the fighting conspirator, the literary dogmatist, the liberal statesman.’⁹

The Revolution of 1789, deeply as it stirred men's minds in neighbouring countries, had occasioned no popular outbreak on a large scale outside France. The expulsion of Charles X. in 1830 had been followed by national uprisings in Italy, Poland, and Belgium, and by a struggle for constitutional government in the smaller States of Northern Germany. The downfall of Louis Philippe in 1848 at once convulsed the whole of central Europe. From the Rhenish Provinces to the Ottoman frontier there was no government but the Swiss Republic that was not menaced; there was no race which did not assert its claim to a more or less complete independence. Communities whose long slumber had been undisturbed by the shocks of the Napoleonic period now vibrated with those same impulses which, since 1815, no pressure of absolute power had been able wholly to extinguish in Italy and Germany. […] This was especially the case with the Slavic races included in the Austrian Empire, races which during the earlier years of this century had been wholly mute. These in their turn now felt the breath of patriotism, and claimed the right of self-government. Distinct as the ideas of national independence and of constitutional liberty are in themselves, they were not distinct in their operation over a great part of Europe in 1848; and this epoch will be wrongly conceived if it is viewed as no more than a repetition on a large scale of

⁷ Idem, pp.1/2.
⁹ Fisher, p.882.
the democratic outbreak of Paris with which it opened. More was sought in Europe in 1848 than the substitution of popular for monarchical or aristocratic rule. The effort to make the State one with the nation excited wider interests than the effort to enlarge and equalise citizen rights; and it is in the action of this principle of nationality that we find the explanation of tendencies of the epoch which appear at first view to be in direct conflict with one another. In Germany a single race was divided under many Governments: here the national instinct impelled to unity. In Austria a variety of races was held together by one crown: here the national instinct impelled to separation. In both these States, as in Italy, where the predominance of the foreigner and the continuance of despotic government were in a peculiar manner connected with one another, the efforts of 1848 failed; but the problems which then agitated Europe could not long be set aside, and the solution of them complete, in the case of Germany and Italy, partial and tentative in the case of Austria, renders the succeeding twenty-five years a memorable period in European history.\textsuperscript{10}

‘It was the special weakness of the Austrian Empire and the strongest argument against innovation that to the grievances of individuals and of classes there was added the factor of racial discord.’\textsuperscript{11} When the constitutional question was raised in Austria every race began to claim for itself a position of safety in the Austrian state. The Court was powerless in the face of these developments. The control of army and foreign policy was granted to Hungary, and to the Bohemians the promise of an independent legislature and local institutions.

Regarding Britain, Fisher holds that in the long controversy with France, Britain experienced continual anxiety from the grievances of Ireland. So it was during the war of the American revolt, and again when the ideas of the French Revolution, alighting first among the educated Protestants of the north of the island, spread among the downtrodden and passive Catholics in the south. Of all European peoples, the ignorant and priest-ridden Irish Catholics were most remote from the innovating ideas of the French Revolution. But when men are told that they are being wronged, disenfranchised in their own country, and when they are invited in the name of liberty and equality to throw off an alien yoke and take their lawful share in the ruling of their native land, then, no matter how conservative they may be, the appeal will go home. In Ireland, the Protestants of the north led by the infamous Wolfe Tone, called upon Catholic compatriots to claim the right to sit in the Parliament of Dublin.\textsuperscript{12} The Catholics made their claim and were refused,

\textsuperscript{10} Fyffe, p.408.
\textsuperscript{11} Fisher, p.921.
\textsuperscript{12} Jackson, p.10/11: ‘This, subordinate, Irish parliament had been in intermittent conflict with Westminster from the ‘Glorious Revolution’ through the 1780s and 1790s, by which time a form of legislative independence had been wrested from London. These contests were generally over
rose in rebellion and were crushed.\textsuperscript{13} Then English Prime Minister, William Pitt, seeing many difficulties and dangers resulting from the existence of two Parliaments under one crown, carried out the Legislative Union of 1800, under which a hundred seats in the House of Commons and thirty-two in the House of Lords were accorded to Protestant Irishmen. The constitutional change, though violently resisted by the Protestant patriots of the Dublin Parliament, and carried out only by extensive bribery, was for the moment effective. Fyffe had argued the above point similarly, centring on Pitt’s project for the Legislative Union, which is here described as an admirable undertaking.

Ireland had up to this time possessed a Parliament nominally independent of that of Great Britain. Its population, however, was too much divided to create a really national government; and, even if the internal conditions of the country had been better, the practical sovereignty of Great Britain must at that time have prevented the Parliament of Dublin from being more than an agency of ministerial corruption. It was the desire of Pitt to give to Ireland, in the place of a fictitious independence, that real participation in the political life of Great Britain which has more than recompensed Scotland and Wales for the loss of separate nationality. As an earnest of legislative justice, Pitt gave hopes to the leaders of the Irish Catholic party that the disabilities which excluded Roman Catholics from the House of Commons and from many offices in the public service would be no longer political autonomy, and they were accompanied by an increasingly assertive, if not always coherent, elaboration of the Irish viewpoint. The Irish melded notions of natural right with legal and constitutional arguments centring on the incomplete nature of the Anglo-Norman conquest of Ireland, the sovereign state of the kingdom of Ireland and the English origins of the predominant, Protestant, section of the Irish people. Their arguments had a lasting impact. The most celebrated ideologue of this ‘patriot’ school was William Molyneux, whose Case of Ireland Stated (1698) was wielded throughout the eighteenth century in defence of the claims of the Irish parliament. Charles Lucas, the key patriot leader of the mid-eighteenth century, was a devotee of Molyneux, as was Henry Grattan, the father of the constitutional settlement of 1782-83. In fact Molyneux was also prepared, in a throw away line, to argue that a union would be an equally satisfactory means of representing the interests of the Irish nation. But this did not, of course, feature in later patriotic glosses. Many of Molyneux’s arguments were resurrected in the late 1770s and early 1780s when, in the context of Britain’s engagement in the American War of Independence, there was an efflorescence of Irish patriotic anger. At first this assumed an economic form, and highlighted the remaining British restrictions on Irish manufacturing and trade. But after the lifting of some of these economic constraints in 1779, the patriots’ campaign took on a more explicitly political and constitutional colouring. Their agitation eventually bore fruit in 1782-83 in a series of British concessions that were hailed in Ireland as a discrete ‘constitution’ and as ‘legislative independence’, but which in fact fell miserably short of this claim.

\textsuperscript{13} Jackson, p.12: ‘There were certainly profound social fractures: the intersection of mounting Catholic prosperity with the painfully timid progress of Catholic relief opened up some deep resentments. In addition the revolutions in America and France provided inspiration and political ideas to Irish Catholic (and Presbyterian) radicals in the 1790s, and these fed into the popular rising of 1798. Perhaps 30,000 people, mostly insurgents, died in this bloody attempt to overthrow British rule and to establish an Irish republic. But it is important not to equate the social and political ideals of the insurgents with the whole of Catholic Ireland. Catholics were well represented in Crown forces, such as the militia, who were active in suppressing the rebels, and the Church was, of course, hostile to the rising.’
maintained. On this understanding the Catholics of Ireland abstained from offering to Pitt's project a resistance which would probably have led to its failure. A majority of members in the Protestant Parliament of Dublin accepted the price which the Ministry offered for their votes. A series of resolutions in favour of the Legislative Union of the two countries was transmitted to England in the spring of 1800; the English Parliament passed the Act of Union in the same summer; and the first United Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland assembled in London at the beginning of the year 1801.

And thus it was how Ireland entered upon the nineteenth century, and remote though it was from the rest of Europe, it was not isolated enough to prevent talk of sedition and secession from spreading to her shores, under the steadily growing popular notion of the nationhood of autochthon peoples. Ireland gave little serious trouble during the Napoleonic wars, according to Fisher, but the Irish question, which proved proverbia lly fatal to British statesmen, also closed Pitt’s ministry. Pitt had seen that it was essential for the success of the Union that Catholic Irishmen should be returned to the Parliament of Westminster. He believed that Catholic Emancipation was just and safe, the Catholic vote, dangerous in Dublin, would be harmless in the Protestant atmosphere of Westminster. But the King, out of respect to his coronation oath, opposed the issue; Pitt thereupon resigned, and never again presumed to press his policy.

Fyffe had added a further dimension to the state of the Catholic Church in Ireland at the time by drawing parallels with Napoleon’s concurrent Concordat:

Far more distinctively the work of Napoleon's own mind was the reconciliation with the Church of Rome affected by the Concordat. It was a restoration of religion similar to that restoration of political order which made the public service the engine of a single will. The bishops and priests, whose appointment the Concordat transferred from their congregations to the Government, were as much instruments of the First Consul as his prefects and his gendarmes. The spiritual wants of the public, the craving of the poor for religious

---

14 Jackson, p.12: ‘William Pitt [used] the opportunity created by the rising to force through a measure of union between the British and Irish parliaments. Here, again, a number of key elements within Catholic Ireland were prepared to acquiesce in the policies of the Crown. Pitt had originally planned to abolish the Irish parliament and at the same time to equalise Catholic civil rights. But while part of his strategy was realised - the Dublin parliamentarians obligingly voted themselves into oblivion - Protestant interests in Britain soon scuppered any thoughts of Catholic relief, and the newly propertied and powerful Catholic interests remained unaccommodated. It is possible that the British state, suitably reformed, might have lastingly embraced these interests; but reform was too late in coming and too dilatory in its impact to attain this end. It is not too fanciful to see the different Catholic protest movements of the nineteenth century, which culminated in Home Rule, as being rooted in this lasting disparity between wealth and representation. Nor is it overly fanciful to see Home Rule as being partly rooted in Pitt’s failure to replace an Irish parliament founded on Protestant privilege with a United Kingdom parliament accessible to all.’

15 Fyffe, p. 95.
16 Fisher, pp.831/832.
consolation, were made the pretext for introducing the new theological police. But
the situation of the Catholic Church was in reality no worse in France at the
commencement of the Consulate than its present situation in Ireland.\(^{17}\)

Fyffe also holds that the near coincidence in time between the French
Revolution of 1830 and the passing of the English Reform Bill suggests
erroneously that the Reform movement should be viewed as part of the great
current of political change that affected the continent of Europe. However, ‘the
conditions peculiar to England usually preponderate over those common to
England and other countries, exhibiting at times more of contrast than of
similarity.’ A Reform of Parliament had been acknowledged to be necessary years
before, Pitt proposed it in 1785, and but for the outbreak of the French Revolution
would probably have carried it into effect. The development of English industry
between 1790 and 1830, accompanied by the rapid growth of towns and the
enrichment of the urban middle class, rendered the design of transferring the
representation of the decayed boroughs to the counties alone, obsolete, and made
the claims of the new centres of population too strong to be resisted. ‘In theory the
representative system of the country was completely transformed; but never was a
measure which seemed to open the way to such boundless possibilities of change
so thoroughly safe and so thoroughly conservative.’ The House of Commons
continued to be drawn mainly from the territorial aristocracy, and Cabinet after
Cabinet was formed with scarcely a single member who was not himself a man of
title. The widespread misery in England after 1832, the result of the excessive
increase of population and the failure of law and philanthropy to keep pace with the
exigencies of a vast industrial growth, were quietly borne, proving the success of
the Reform Bill as a measure of conciliation between Government and people.

But the crowning justification of the changes made in 1832, and the
complete and final answer to those who had opposed them as revolutionary, was
not afforded until 1848, when, in the midst of European convulsion, the monarchy
and the constitution of England remained unshaken. Bold as the legislation of Lord
Grey appeared to men who had been brought up amidst the reactionary influences
dominant in England since 1793, the Reform Bill belongs not to the class of great
creative measures which have inaugurated new periods in the life of nations, but to
the class of those which, while least affecting the general order of society, have
most contributed to political stability and to the avoidance of revolutionary
change.\(^{18}\)

\(^{17}\) Fyffe, p.99.
\(^{18}\) Fyffe, p.372.
There was a history of popular agitation in Ireland well before a demand for Home Rule was ever formulated, brought about by the general economic rise of Irish Catholics, the popularisation of democratic ideas through the revolutions in America and France, and the ‘frustratingly slow demolition of the penal laws.’ This created a movement for full emancipation’ from religious disabilities, lead by Daniel O’ Connell, Catholic lawyer and landowner from County Kerry, the Catholic Association, the driving force for reform.

O’Connell was a vibrant, eloquent and histrionic figure whose personality and achievements made a lasting impression on Catholic Ireland, and indeed more widely on Catholic Europe. He emerged as a master of theatricality, whether in terms of his dress, his speech or his manner. O’Connell’s public appearances in the 1820s and after came to be carefully stage-managed: he was regularly decked out in his trademark emerald green suit, and installed in magnificent carriages or on elaborate platforms. His concern for public presentation stretched in the end to a wig, which gives an eerie and unconvincing impression of youthfulness to his later portraits. All Ireland knew of his ferocious political energy: all Ireland knew of, or believed in, his epic prodigality and promiscuity. In almost every sense he was (or was thought to be) larger than life: more eloquent, more sarcastic, more sentimental, more loving, more rebarbative, more pious and more wayward than his contemporaries. His extraordinary personality seized Catholic Ireland in the 1820s, and its hold has never been completely relaxed. Later generations borrowed much from his organisational achievement, but he also bequeathed a sense of political style and theatre to some unlikely heirs in the Irish national tradition, such as Charles Stewart Parnell and Eamon de Valera.

19 Daniel O'Connell (1775- 1848), member of the Irish Catholic aristocracy and by legislation denied status, opportunity and influence. In 1791 Maurice O'Connell, head of the O'Connell clan, adopted Daniel and paid for him to attend the best Catholic colleges in Europe. In 1794 O'Connell enrolled in Lincoln's Inn, London and became interested in politics, influenced by the ideas of Tome Paine, Jeremy Bentham and William Goodwin. By 1798 O'Connell was fully committed to religious tolerance, freedom of conscience, democracy and the separation of Church and State. He became involved with the United Irishmen, inspired by the French Revolution, but he opposed the insurrection and advocated using parliament to obtain political and religious equality. By 1815 he was leader of the Catholic emancipation movement. In 1823 O'Connell formed the Catholic Association, making it a mass organisation by inviting the poor to become members for a shilling a year. Catholic priests were recruiting agents. They eventually campaigned for the repeal of the Act of Union, the end of the Irish tithe system, universal suffrage and a secret ballot for parliamentary elections. O'Connell warned the British government that if reform did not take place, the Irish masses would start listening to the violent men. By 1826 the Catholic Association supported candidates in parliamentary elections. As a Catholic, O'Connell was not allowed to take his seat in the House of Commons. The Roman Catholic Relief Act of 1829 granted Catholic emancipation but the Catholic Association was outlawed and forty-shilling freehold suffrage in Ireland eliminated. British Radicals adopted the tactics used by O'Connell: the Chartists organized and applied the pressure of public opinion while implying that if this was not successful, the movement might resort to violence. William Cooke Taylor, Patrick Maume, Reminiscences Of Daniel O'Connell: During The Agitations Of The Veto, Emancipation, And Repeal (Classics of Irish History: University College Dublin Press, 2005), Fergus O’Ferrall, Daniel O’Connell (Gill's Irish Lives: Gill & MacMillan, 1981), Maurice R. O’Connell, Daniel O’Connell: The Man and His Politics (Irish Academic Press, 1990); additional information and links available online at wikipedia.

20 Jackson, p.12.
21 Jackson, p.13.
O’Connell created strategies and institutions which later Home Rulers would put to good use: mass membership and closely bound to the Catholic clergy; language larded with a vision of Irish Catholic history and burning with Anglophobic zeal, and direct political combat with the Protestant ascendancy, at the general election of 1826 seizing a number of parliamentary seats for the Catholic cause. But his crowning achievement was the great relief measure of 1829, granting Catholics access to parliament and public office, which secured him the popular title of ‘Liberator’. But O’Connell also fathered the later Home Rule movement in a more obvious way, rejuvenating the emancipation movement as a campaign for the repeal of the Act of Union in the 1830s. When agitation at Westminster had failed to produce results, O’Connell mobilised his forces in Ireland: the Catholic Association was reborn as the Loyal National Repeal Association (1840), with mass demonstrations assuming a greater significance. ‘Between March and September 1843 an unprecedented series of ‘monster’ meetings were held, attracting audiences of around half a million people, and peaking at Tara, County Meath, (the ancient seat of the High Kings of Ireland) in August where 750,000 gathered to hear the repeal message, amid the evocation of history and ancient wrongs. There were, however, tensions within the movement itself on the questions of political violence, on the one hand, and cultural nationalisms, on the other. The Young Irelanders were more proactive than

23 CE 6 September 1841. A great meeting for promoting the Carlow Indemnity Fund and the nomination of Repeal Wardens for the Town and Parish of Mallow, was held Yesterday (Sunday), in the Chapel Yard—an immense multitude assembled on the occasion. The Rev. Dr. Collins, was unanimously called to the chair, and Mr. William Williams, was appointed Secretary, and the following Resolutions were unanimously adopted: [That] impressed with the necessity of affording protection for the free and unrestricted right of the Elective Franchise; and finding that the honest Electors of Carlow have subjected themselves to persecution, by their efforts to rescue the country from Tory domination, we feel ourselves called upon forthwith to collect subscriptions to preserve them from the tyranny of their heartless exterminators. [That] having observed the melancholy effects which have been produced by the Clearance System, adopted by many of the Landed Proprietors, we feel the necessity of a Legal Enactment, which, without interfering with the Rights of Property, would secure to the tenant the enjoyment of the advantages arising from his improvements, and to the Landlord, a punctual payment of his rent. [That] experience having proved that the exercise of the power of Legislation by a Foreign Parliament, has disgraced our Country, subverted its Liberties, and reduced it to the condition of a Tributary Province, we feel it our bounden duty to Petition the Imperial Parliament, for the restoration of that Legislature, of which we were unjustly deprived. [That] in accordance with the instructions of our illustrious countryman, Daniel O’Connell, we recommend the following Gentlemen to act as Repeal Wardens for the Town and Parish of Mallow, and that they be empowered to prepare a petition for a Repeal of the Act of Union: Rev. D. Collins, P.P., Rev. J. M’Carthy, Dr. Curtin, Mr. John Canty, Mr. Wm. B. Williams, Mr. Jas. Roche, Mr. Robert O’Connell, John Moriarty. [That] this Meeting cannot separate without recording their sense of gratitude and unbounded confidence in Daniel O’Connell, the victorious Leader of the Irish Liberal Party.
O'Connell regarding the question of native culture, taking steps to a national literature and resuscitating the Irish language. O'Connell took an ambiguous attitude towards the dominant Protestant minority, ‘veering from occasional conciliatory efforts’ towards righteous anger.

In contrast the Young Irelanders, drawing on the enlightened republicanism of the 1790s, had a more inclusive definition of the nation. [...] The Young Irelanders, however, saw repeal as embodying their minimum terms, and some, such as John Mitchel, veered into full-bodied revolutionary republicanism. O'Connell, like later Home Rulers, was not above [...] raising the threat of violence in his orations, but was otherwise a strict constitutionalist. For example, he called off a ‘monster’ meeting planned for Clontarf in October 1843, which had been banned by the government. But the Young Irelanders, unlike their master, were not prepared to exclude the possibility of force from their strategies. This divergent thinking brought a split in the repeal movement in January 1846. Divisions on force and federalism, the onset of famine in Ireland, and the death of O'Connell in January 1847 served to beach a movement that had in fact been drifting since the Clontarf debacle.

2.1. The Revolutionary Years 1848/49

The Revolutions of 1848 and '49 erupted first in Sicily and then, triggered by the revolution in France, soon spread to all of Europe. These upheavals have been cast as the consequences of a variety of changes enveloping Europe in the first

24 CE 15 January 1844. Catholic Meeting in Mallow. A large and highly respectable meeting of the Catholics of the Borough and parish of Mallow was held in the Parish Chapel after last Mass on yesterday, when a strong resolution and memorial to the Queen were adopted, the meeting was presided over by Thomas Punch, Esq., P.L.G., Lavella-house

25 Jackson, p.16. Cf. also CE 15 July 1844. Military Outrage in Mallow. On yesterday a party of the 33d Regiment, who were billeted in Mallow on Saturday, attended Mass, accompanied by an officer. They were kindly ushered into the end gallery, facing the altar, and several of the inhabitants vacated their seats to afford them accommodation. The officer went to the west gallery, nearly over the altar. The Rev. Justin M'Carty, the patriotic and exemplary Curate, exhorted those who did not as yet receive the Sacrament of Confirmation, to be diligent in their attendance at Chapel during the ensuing week, as the Bishop is to visit this parish on Sunday, 21st Inst. The exhortation which was a lengthened one, was listened to with great apparent reverence by the officer, until the Rev. Gentleman addressed those from the rural districts (who generally occupy the aisle of the chapel) in the vernacular tongue, to the same purpose. Up starts the officer immediately; he darts out of the chapel, then into the end gallery, and beckoned the men out, thus depriving the brave fellows of the privilege of attending their religious duties. The noise of the firelocks and the tramp of the men caused great annoyance to the congregation. I heard one of those poor fellows say within ear-shot of his officer - "is it because we are soldiers that we are compelled to insult our religion?"

26 CE 24 January 1844. National Tribute – Mallow. To the Editor of the Cork Examiner. Sir. -The Tribute of National gratitude to Ireland's faithful leader, amounts in this town to ninety five pounds, although the highest contribution was only ?. The collection is not yet concluded, so that we will still augment the sum, and thus prove to Ireland's foes that the more they persecute O'Connell the warmer our attachment grows. The Whig M.P., for the Borough did not subscribe one farthing, which will be remembered at the next Election. Yours, &c. A Repealer.

27 Idem, p.17.
half of the 19th century: bourgeois reformers and radicals seeking to change their governments, new technology changing the way of life of the working classes, and the popular press promoting political awareness of new concepts such as nationalism and socialism. Although the revolutions on the European Continent were put down quickly, there was horrific violence on all sides. Tens of thousands were tortured and killed, the immediate effects of the revolutions short-term, but with lasting legacies. Widespread recession based primarily on crop failures, left peasants and the poor working classes starving. Only Britain and Russia were spared such rebellions at this time, Russia because there was as yet no bourgeois or proletarian class to initiate a revolution, and the United Kingdom because the potentially disruptive middle classes had been pacified by enfranchisement in the Reform Act of 1832. Also the agitation of the Chartists that followed came to a head with the petition to Parliament in 1848, and the repeal of the protectionist agricultural tariffs, called the Corn Laws, in 1846, defused proletarian animosity. The United States, in comparison, remained profoundly isolated, increasingly involved in its own imperialist policy of expansion. Revolution was also far from the minds of those in Ireland, struggling and dying through the Famine, the one exception being William Smith O’Brien’s Young Ireland uprising of ’48, in some of the most impoverished parts of the country. The Young Irelanders found that the only remedy for Irish wrongs was physical force, among them, William Smith O’Brien, Protestant landlord and MP, Thomas Davis and John Mitchel, Protestant middle-class graduates of Trinity; and Charles Gavan Duffy and Thomas Meagher, middle-class Catholics. Davis was also a poet with romantic views about the restoration of Ireland’s Gaelic glories and Mitchel was a skilled polemicist who hated everything English. His paper, the United Irishman, published advice about the best way to kill English soldiers, and encouraged readers to get themselves guns, and tear down Dublin Castle. (He was, in due course, transported to Australia.). The Cork Examiner published a note on ‘The Lesson of the Revolution:’

28 Jackson, p.18: ‘The Young Ireland movement foundered after their abortive uprising of July 1848, but members of the movement contributed to the foundation of a revolutionary secret society, the Irish Republican Brotherhood or Fenian movement (1858), which sustained the tradition of armed insurrection through another failed revolt in 1867.’

29 The national flag, a tricolor of green, white and orange, was first introduced by Thomas Francis Meagher during the revolutionary year of 1848, as an emblem of the Young Ireland movement. But it was not until the Rising of 1916, when it was raised above the General Post Office in Dublin, that the tricolor came to be regarded as the national flag. Gary R. Forney, Thomas Francis Meagher (Xlibris Corporation, 2001).
CE 13 March 1848
Except the thing itself, the mind of the timid public is scared by nothing so much as the word “revolution.” It is suggestive of historic horrors, and convulsive in all its associations. It is confounded with rebellion, and conducive to anarchy. It is perilous to property, and antagonist to religion. Social order and public morals topple in the dust, and the fierce democracy, wielding its sinewy power, puts high and holy things under its foot, and makes confusion worse confounded. [...] A revolution, in itself, is only good or bad according to the intentions of the promoters, and the results of its actions. Revolution is but a reaction upon tyranny; a turning upon abused power [...] Revolutions are born of abuses, and become formidable only from the opposition and doggedness of tyrannical authority. Concession and reform stop a revolution in its first progress, and a fair and just meeting the legitimate demands of the people extinguishes it altogether. The Catholic Bill of '29 and the Reform Bill of '32 were both, strictly speaking, “Revolutions.” [...] But public opinion and the will of the nation were the only barricades erected, and the only explosions we had, proceeded from the artillery of reason and the democratic outspaking of the nation. We know no perfectibility in British laws that should argue unchangeability, like those of the Medes and Persians. We are not to cry out in this age, like the Barons of old, “Nolumus leges Angliae mutan.” Organic reform, when needed and demanded, must either proceed from a wise administration, or the people will affect them themselves. This is just now the case in France [...] ³⁰

When the Young Irelanders are arrested, the indignation at a gross injustice, under a headline heavy on ink and intent, must give way to patience and prudence:

CE 22 March 1848
(Evening Freeman Office)
Arrest of Smith O’Brien on a Charge of Sedition!!!

We stop press to announce that Smith O’Brien has been arrested! This is the means the English Government takes to conciliate Ireland. Other despotisms yield to the voice of public opinion and concede rights to their people. England arrests the friends of liberty, and starves the people. These are her concessions. Shall it be so forever? [...] This is the first step towards awakening a spirit that will strike down the domination of England. Let us use the occasion aright. [...] Patience, prudence and firmness are the virtues of the hour. Irishmen practice them.

³⁰ A deputation of Irish residents went to present an address to the French Government in Paris. Welcomed by Mons. Lamartine, who replied: CE 22 March 1848. “Citizens of Ireland! I regret that the entire members of the Provisional Government are not present. [...] Ireland has taken for its motto the noble words of a martyr, whose memory you recall – ‘Let no slavish hand inscribe an epitath on my tomb; let it remain unhonoured till Ireland is free.’ These words have become a truth for your country; it has been the harbinger of your religion’s independence, and soon will be, I hope, that of your complete constitutional freedom. O’Connell, whose great name you have also called to mind, has taught the world the most energetic, and, at the same time, the most prudent means for the recovery of their rights, and he has created that which he has styled – borrowing the word from Liberty itself – peaceful agitation. Peaceful agitation has for years made Ireland the admiration of the world.
O’Brien continued with preparations for a rising but found no support from a people preoccupied with famine, and met with total opposition from the Catholic clergy.

CE 3 April 1848:
House of Lords, The Catholic Clergy.

The Marquis of Lansdowne, in reply to Lord Beaumont, expressed extreme satisfaction at the successful working of the Irish Arms Act, passed in the last short session of Parliament, and at the exertions which had been made by all classes in Ireland, jurors and witnesses, but especially the Roman catholic clergy, to preserve peace and order, and to prevent or suppress disturbance. […] Lord Stanley, who had early in the session grounds for imputing some degree of suspicion to the conduct of the Irish clergy, rejoiced, with every other member of the House, at so gratifying an indication of an altered spirit. He congratulated their Lordships upon the faint echo which the revolutionary turmoil of other countries had met with here; and after a short allusion to the state of Ireland, remarked upon the imperfection of the law, which afforded no means of discriminating between the more severe penalties of high treason and the fine and imprisonment with which alone sedition could be visited. A most painful alternative was thus imposed upon those who desired to preserve the tranquillity of Ireland. Lord Monteagle joined Lord Lansdowne in eulogising the conduct of the Irish clergy.

The 1848 Rebellion was a fiasco. In July 1848 O’Brien, Terence Bellew McManus, James Stephens and about forty followers engaged the Irish Constabulary at Boolagh Commons, Co. Tipperary, in what became known to posterity as the ‘Battle of the Widow McCormack’s cabbage patch.’ Another large wave of emigration began. This time the relatively successful and prosperous tenants left in their thousands. They were an asset to their new countries and a serious loss to their country of origin. ‘As in the days of the Wild Geese, at the end of the Famine the most vigorous of the Catholic stock of Ireland put their energies into furthering the interests of countries other than Ireland.’ The Examiner continued throughout 1848 to draw attention to the plight of the imprisoned Young Irelanders, raising funds and spirits, and moreover, offering a platform for the union of Repealers.

CE 19 April 1848
The Nationality of Ireland

Why is the loyalty of Irish rank, property and intelligence mute? Be warned to be silent is to be indifferent. To be indifferent is to be lost. We know no medium between Irish neutrality and Irish hostility. Fret us with the one and disgust us with the other – and we, the people of England, cast you [sic] forever. – Times

---

31 Boyce, Nineteenth Century Ireland, p.118.
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The generous ardour of the times, on behalf, and for the behoof of the unthinking Celt – No cold medium knows
He bids him go to Hell – to hell he goes.
The Times must have Ireland in his own way, and according to his own conditions, otherwise Ireland is nought. He’ll none of her. For “were her jesses even his dear heart strings,”
- he’d whistle her off,
And let her down the wind to prey at fortune.
This is the dilemma to which we are reduced – we must either succumb to England and English domination, and thus bear all the present ills our flesh is heir to – or, if we insist upon home Government, we must count the cost, and abide the peril of being “cast off forever!” What an alternative of ill! “We can’t be happy with her, or without her.”
Was ever nation in such humour wooed,
Was ever nation in such humour won?
“To be always in extremes and always wrong,” is the character of little great minds. The Times is but a puffed, yet puny, imitator of a mighty talker, in his day – we speak of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, man of celebrity in America as well as Europe, whose imagination was more powerful than his judgment, and whose prejudices on many things were equal, to both. In 1830, Coleridge thus spoke, “If any modification of the Union takes place, I trust it to be a total divorce, a vincula matrimonii. I am sure we have lived a cat and dog life of it. Let us have no silly saving of one crown and two legislatures, that would be preserving all the mischiefs, without any of the goods, if there are any, of the Union.

The Austrian Emperor, ‘the tyrant of Europe,’ has granted numerous demands of the people. Surely Enlightened England must follow suit?

CE 26 April 1848
England and Austria – A Contrast
Austria, having learned by experience the weakness of tyranny, is looking again for the power conferred by the people’s confidence. While England, in the madness of a demented minister’s infatuation, is rushing into despotism, and enacting ‘gagging’ acts, which strike at the very foundations of constitutional right and constitutional liberty, Austria, the despised, effeted tyrant of Europe, is renewing the title to existence among the nations. There is an instructive contrast between haughty England, intoxicated with excess of power, trampling on the people and their most sacred privileges, and Austria, made wise by experience, seeking in her hour of danger shelter under the wings of popular liberty.
Austria decrees ‘freedom of speech’ to all her people. England decrees that ‘open and advised speaking’ shall be henceforth a felony, punishable by transportation for life, and the confiscation of all property.
Austria decrees freedom of the press. England subjects the conductors of the press to transportation for daring to publish aught against a tyrannous minister.
Austria establishes the right of petition. England permits her subjects to beg redress only in measured phrase.
Austria renders sacred the right of citizens to meet in public and discuss their grievances. England menaces with her cannon such of her subjects as meet in numbers to seek redress.
Austria has learned wisdom – England, too, may grow wise. […]
‘Entire liberty of conscience and religion! Away with you – you, who stand between the Irish Protestant patriot and his country, and threaten him with the airy phantom of Catholic ascendancy. Your occupation’s gone. He will not be deterred from his duty and the prosecution of his dearest interests by your knavish cry of wolf. He will not dread that in this country a less liberal policy would be pursued than is proclaimed in Austria. ‘Entire liberty of conscience and of religion’ is the creed of civilisation, of common sense, of the nineteenth century – of Austria, the reputed bigot of the Catholic Christian world, and will, of course, be the first law of regenerated Ireland’s new constitution. – Freeman’s Journal.

The reform movement in England, begun in 1832, to appease a nation displeased with the social and political developments of the country, have been ongoing and followed closely by the Irish press. Various agitating bodies are seen to adhere to the basic programme of Daniel O’Connell’s ‘peaceful agitation,’ and thus offer continuous inspiration nearer home, in contrast to the violent programme to be observed abroad.

CE 8 May 1848
The Revolution at Home

Whilst the nations of the continent of Europe are working out their revolutions after their own fashion, let it not be supposed that the spirit of a mighty change has not already sprung into existence in England as well as Ireland. The radical evils of both are the same, and the tone and temper of our discussions, as to their speedy reform, will now bear neither temporising nor shirking. The spirit of the reform movement in England must be studied deeply by Irishmen, for the same wasting iniquity of aristocratic rule has brought countries to their present condition, and a radical and sweeping change of the representative principle must lead to the certain results demanded by the nation […]. The state of the Continental countries looks by no means pacific. Italy, Austria, Poland, Russia, must involve France or England. Foreign war, or the home movement, either or both, must work in the cause of Ireland. The spread of the democratic principle at home, or the employment of the army abroad, is for the independence of our country.

Before taking a closer look at political dissent within the continental Empires and their portrayal in the Irish press, it is appropriate here to call attention to the inherent differences not only between the reactionary policies of Great Britain and Europe, but also between the two great German speaking nations, the Austrian and the German, especially as they were perceived in the British Isles. This is not only a matter of national stereotyping, images, negative or otherwise, spawned from the age-old and universal friction between neighbouring states. There is a discernible difference to be found in the perception of the German-Austrians and the Germans proper in the British press, and moreover in the Irish
press, and therefore the present author offers a brief look here at the essential deviations between the two nations, leading to their resulting depiction in print.

2.1.1. Germany

It was the Reformation and ensuing peasant wars that emitted the first impulses of German national formation, and in the struggle to throw off the papal yoke the community of interest, by way of language and ethnic characteristics, was first articulated in literary form. The term ‘German nation’ was widely employed from the Reformation onwards, but a centralized state based on the whole of German nationality failed to materialize for some time to come, feudal fragmentation remaining and consolidated for centuries. In principle, the secession from the Catholic Church promoted the evolution of a national consciousness.33

Bourgeois progress and national unification were increasingly understood as an entity. Representatives of the Enlightenment and German classical literature, philosophy and music, who drew strength and gained profound insight in large measure from the historical upheavals which were maturing during the eighteenth century and attained their revolutionary solution in 1789, promoted national thinking and education and guided German national culture to its apogee even before the internal social forces in Germany had grown sufficiently to be capable of effective action leading to a revolutionary transformation of society. […] Herder’s notions that it was primarily the ethical, linguistic and cultural factors which formed the basis of nationhood provided, with the widely acclaimed ‘cultural nation’ (Kulturnation), a concept which attempted to define the complicated historical realities existing within the German-speaking area – as, incidentally, was also the case with numerous east European peoples who still did not possess their own states.34

The ascendancy of bourgeois society impelled the formation of the German nation, the founding of the Zollverein in 1834 marking the turning point. The revolution of 1848/49 was the most important attempt to constitute the German nation on a democratic basis, making bourgeois democracy the essence of the nation. As regards German expansionist policy, the fact that East Prussia and Schleswig were not affiliated to the German Confederation of 1815, while Bohemia and Moravia, predominately Czech, were, gives food for thought. The refusal of Czech liberals to attend elections to the German Assembly of ’48 shows the overwhelming difficulties involved regarding the German Confederation as

34 Idem, p.155.
territorial framework for the nation-state to be created. However, the Cork Examiner was usually prepared to cast the Germans in a favourable light, regardless if compared with their Austrian or Bohemian neighbours. In fact, in the years 1848 and '49, when Prussia is acknowledged as a military force to be reckoned with, Bavaria ensures a balanced approach to the Germans in general. The almost consistent respect the paper pays to Germany up to 1914 cannot be equalled at any stage by either the Austrian Empire or its Bohemian province.

CE 8 May 1848
Germany and the Northern States.

Ten lines in the Austrian official paper, the Vienna Gazette, have given quite a new turn to the question of the Germanic unity, the solution of which is reserved to the German Constituent Assembly, which is to meet at Frankfort on the 18th of May next. The Vienna Gazette declares that Austria cannot accept beforehand, as obligatory for her, the resolutions of the forthcoming Parliament at Frankfort. This declaration has produced an immense excitement in the German press. The Vienna Gazette, however, in using this language, does not go against the public mind in Austria. It expresses sincerely the opinion of Bohemia, which does not wish to be melted into the German unity, and also of a great portion of the inhabitants of Vienna. Ferdinand, Emperor of Austria, has given his subjects a new constitution.

The Cork Examiner’s attention swings regularly to the plight of Bohemia, where national awareness forbids their consolidation into a German nation, where they would remain politically powerless and culturally meaningless. However, the paper holds the views put forward by Fisher and his contemporaries that the Czechs are by nature a subject peoples, and while appropriating national rights for Ireland, the Cork Examiner does not seem inclined to extend this right to Czechs, or any other Slav peoples for that matter. The international development of racist attitudes in general in the nineteenth century, may have played a certain role in defining the status of Slavs in relation to the German nation. Although the term ‘white nationalists’ had not yet been coined, the Southern and Eastern Europeans have had a history of cultural conflict with their Nordic neighbours.

35 CE 13 March 1848: We learn from the English journals that the Prussian Ambassador in London has declared to Lord Palmerston, that his Government would remain a neutral if not indifferent spectator of the revolution which has been accomplished in France. […] The enthusiasm of the population of Berlin did not permit Frederick William to change his disquietudes into menaces.
36 CE 17 March 1848: Our letters from Munich give a glowing account of the festivals and illuminations that had taken place there in consequence of recent political events. The troops and the citizens were so anxious to bedeck themselves with ribbons of the national colours, blue and white, that several of the shops had been closed to prevent the destruction of property by the crush of people in search of cockades and favours. The movement in Munich may henceforth be considered as the first instance on record, we believe, of successful ribbonism.
CE 12 May 1848

Austria

The internal situation of this vast empire continues critical, and the fermentation among the diverse nationalities which form the dominions of the house of Hapsburg is every day increasing. We had yesterday a little riot. A charivari was given to the Archbishop and to the President of the Council of Ministers, Count of Ficquelmont, and the German banner was torn from their houses. The fact in itself has perhaps not a great importance, but it shows that the antipathy so profound in Bohemia against the melting of Austria in the great unity of the Germanic empire is also profound and general in our capital. […] The Slavonic population in Bohemia and a portion of the Viennese population require the formation of a Slavonic nationality, without any union with Germany. The Czechs in Bohemia refuse to be considered as forming a component part of the German population, and forget the history which shows that Bohemia was at all times a fief of the Germanic empire, and that the Czechs were not the primitive occupiers of the country, the atochtonic population of which was almost exclusively German. The Czechs of Bohemia repudiate a moral fusion with Germany; they claim for themselves a separate existence, under the protection of the Emperor of Austria.

The Meeting of the German National Assembly, May 18, 1848, was reckoned to be another watershed in European politics.

To the mass of patriots it was enough that Germany, after thirty years of disappointment, had at last won its national representation. Before this imposing image of the united race, Kings, Courts, and armies, it was fondly thought, must bow. Thus, in the midst of universal hope, the elections were held throughout Germany in its utmost federal extent, from the Baltic to the Italian border; Bohemia alone, where the Czech majority resisted any closer union with Germany, declining to send representatives to Frankfort. In the body of deputies elected there were to be found almost all the foremost Liberal politicians of every German community; a few still vigorous champions of the time of the War of Liberation, chief among them the poet Arndt; patriots who in the evil days that followed had suffered imprisonment and exile; historians, professors, critics, who in the sacred cause of liberty have, like Gervinus, inflicted upon their readers worse miseries than ever they themselves endured at the hands of unregenerate kings; theologians, journalists; in short, the whole group of leaders under whom Germany expected to enter into the promised land of national unity and freedom. No Imperial coronation ever brought to Frankfort so many honoured guests, or attracted to the same degree the sympathy of the German race. Greeted with the cheers of the citizens of Frankfort, whose civic militia lined the streets, the members of the Assembly marched in procession on the afternoon of the 18th of May from the ancient banqueting-hall of the Kaisers, where they had gathered, to the Church of St. Paul, which had been chosen as their Senate House. Their President and officers were elected on the following day. Arndt, who in the frantic confusion of the first meeting had been unrecognised and shouted down, was called into the Tribune, but could speak only a few words for tears. The Assembly voted him its thanks for his famous song, “What is the German's Fatherland?” and requested that he would add to it another stanza commemorating the union of the race at length visibly realised.
in that great Parliament. Four days after the opening of the General Assembly of Frankfort, the Prussian national Parliament began its sessions at Berlin.  

Anglo sympathies with the German people were generally high at this time, foremost in recognition of their cultural heritage, but also their democratic strivings. The Cork Examiner, consistent in its distinctively favourable reports and editorials on the German nation, asks of its readers:

CE 17 July 1848

Was ist des Deutschen Vaterland? – “Where is the German Fatherland?” It is at this moment “at sea” – and promises to be so for a long time. The great German people, surging and murmuring, from the Danube to the Rhine, is to be put under the regency of a weak old man – an absolutist of the House of Hapsburg – the Archduke John. Diverse nations and races, struggling to establish their nationalities and forms of government and kept asunder by all the diversities of political dissent are bid look to this central old man, and expect the satisfactory arrangement of the powers and principalities of the Fatherland, under its auspices. And a distracted old man he is, - and a bewildering dignity it is with which he is invested. The Germanic Senate want him in his proper place at Frankfort; the Emperor of Austria, sick and weak at Innspruck, and afraid of the mad students of Vienna – sends him to face them or cajole them; while the Hungarians, Zechs and Croats call outrageously for his archducal interference at Pesth and Agram […]. Vienna is in the tumult of arranging the first meeting of the Austrian constituent assembly – a motley congregation of legislators, many of them peasants, and the majority speaking different Germanic, Scelavonian, and bastard dialects. Effusa est in curiam omnis barbaries – the barbarous democracy have rushed into the Aulic Senate-house. As Hungary rebelled against Austria, the ban of Croatia has rebelled against Hungary. Southern Hungary, with its Scelavonians, Raizes and Illyrians is in a turbulent state.

German communities in east European countries were no exception to the admiration bestowed upon their nation, most noted the Germans in Bohemia. They inhabited the highly industrialized areas of Bohemia - not unlike the Protestant settlers of Ulster - and their fate among revolting Czechs was kindly looked upon by the Examiner, the paper highlighting their plight untainted with comparison to Ulster folk and their singular traditions.  
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38 CE July 17 1848: Some of the ultra-Dublin papers make a great fuss about the display of the twelfth of July. The exhibition to our mind, was only a sorry affair. The prestige of Orange valour is gone. Its glory has evaporated. The delusion which made Orangemen exists no longer […].
2.1.2. The Sudetens of Bohemia

When and where from had the German minority, the so-called Sudetens, come to Bohemia, and why was their influence on the country in indirect proportion to their numbers? Clearly, Bohemia had established an ‘Ulster’ of its own. Geographically, the Sudetengau encompasses an area of 27,000 sq. kilometres in Bohemia, Moravia and Sudeten Silesia (the latter, being part of Silesia which in 1763, after the Seven Years War between Maria Theresia of Austria and Frederick the Great of Prussia, had remained part of Austria). The word ‘Sudeten’ refers to a mountain range covering north of Bohemia and Moravia as well as part of Sudeten Silesia. The term "Sudeten Germans" has been in use since the beginning of the twentieth century to describe over three and a half million Germans in the three provinces which used to be known as the lands of the Bohemian Crown. According to their own history (and the view prevailing in the Cork Examiner of 1848), before a Slav tribe invaded the central regions of Bohemia and Moravia, these lands had been inhabited by Celtic Germanic tribes called the Boii, the Marcomanni and the Quadi. All at events, in the 12th and


13th centuries, both sides agree that Bohemian dukes invited German farmers, miners, craftsmen, merchants and artists to settle in these lands in order to develop them, particularly the largely uninhabited mountainous frontier regions. For more than 700 years Germans and Czechs lived together peacefully, or at least without the open aggression the Irish showed towards their industrious, colonizing neighbours that ended in massacre and reprisal. There were tensions and conflicts in Bohemia also, of course, for example, the Hussite wars in the 15th century, but they were fought for religious and social reasons, rather than on racial grounds. It should be mentioned that some regions within the Sudetenland were inhabited exclusively by German-speaking people who had no contact with Czechs, such as the southern part of Moravia. In fact, they were indistinguishable in every respect from the neighbouring Austrians. Bohemia and Moravia had for centuries been part of the "Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation", and Emperors such as Charles IV and Rudolf II had their seat in Prague. Charles IV founded the first German university there in 1348. In 1526 the lands of the Bohemian Crown, including the regions in which the Sudeten Germans lived, came under the rule of the Habsburgs. It is from this point onwards that the complex history of the lands of the Bohemian Crown becomes entwined with the equally troubled history of Ireland. The mid-nineteenth century revolutions convulsed also these two nations in their geographically limited field of contention. However, when disturbances first arose between them, it is noted that the Examiner printed comments that tended to favour the German minority.

einheimischen böhmischen Recht – dem Untertanen in Erbpacht, und zwar in schriftlicher Form zur Verfügung gestellt. Der Untertan gewann so die Sicherheit, dass er auf “seinem” Boden dauernd sesshaft bleiben durfte [...]” (not unlike the settlement of the land question in Ulster, granting the tenants similar security of tenure.)

The Revolt at Prague. The rumour was spread on the night of the 13th that there would be a general attack on all the German inhabitants of the town. Great fright was caused by this, and whole families might be seen to fly through the gates out of the town, leaving their all behind.

Letters from Croatia and Bannat confirm the sanguinary atrocities at Weisz-Kereben on the 20th, which sustained a fearful engagement of 14 hours against the insurgent Raizes and Servians. The German population encountered the attacks most heroically.

The Sudeten Germans were among those who enthusiastically elected members to the first German parliament at Frankfurt, which their Czech compatriots ostensibly declined. And following the October uprising:

A deputy of German Bohemia, district of Liebmariz, stated that he had received an address from the Central German Club of Toepliz, exhorting the assembly not to leave Vienna, and that other districts were about to send similar addresses, together with declarations of confidence in the present ministry. He added that the German districts of Bohemia were resolved to apply to Frankfort in case government and order could not be established in Austria.

Until 1918 the Sudeten Germans were part of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, and after the end of World War I, resulting in the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian multi-national empire, the nearly seven million Czechs demanded a state of their own in which the Sudetenland was incorporated.

2.1.3. The Habsburg Monarchy

Habsburg rulers continually defined themselves as German princes amid a Slav majority, an imperative in the face of rising German nationalism per se and growing military expertise and might, specially in 1866, 1871, or during the First World War. A.J.P. Taylor’s interest in the Habsburg monarchy is well documented, and his work of the same name remains a standard for the understanding of past Austrian politics in the Anglo-Saxon world. The Austrian Empire developed along somewhat different lines than the British Empire, especially as regards their peasants, and it was the difference in royal tactics, begun primarily under Joseph II, that the Austrian monarchy came closer in aspects to Ireland itself, or rather in Taylor’s term, a collection of Irelands! It was Joseph II who had made peasant-
clearance impossible. Maria Theresia had carried out a register of all land, differentiating between noble and peasant holdings, or dominical and rustical land in the legal jargon of the time.\textsuperscript{42} Joseph II forbade the acquisition of ‘rustic’ land by the nobility and gave ‘rusticalists’ security of tenure, his motive being to prevent the increase of ‘dominical’ land, which paid less taxes and in Hungary none, thus in effect preserving loyal peasantry, even though Robot, the labour rent, survived until 1848. (Peasant tenants on ‘dominical’ land had to wait until then for security of tenure.) Thus the peasant class attained a level of security that elsewhere in Europe was achieved only by the French Revolution. Peasants still sold their holdings and left the land, especially after 1848, but they could sell only to richer peasants, not to the nobility. Wherever Habsburg rule ran, peasant communities survived and with them the peasant nations. Thus the Habsburg Monarchy preserved two classes elsewhere in Europe on the decline, ‘great aristocrats, who made the empire more conservative than the rest of central Europe, and the landholding peasants, who made it more it more radical. Both classes made a balance against the urban capitalist, elsewhere the predominant figure of nineteenth century liberalism.’\textsuperscript{43} In an age of Liberalism and reform, the nobles defended their privileges, claiming traditional rights over social reform.

Even in Bohemia the imperial nobility, which had been imported by the Habsburgs, cloaked their hostility to social reform in a display of Bohemian patriotism, and in the anterooms of the Hofburg the descendants of German, Scottish, or Spanish adventurers ostentatiously exchanged the few words of Czech which they had laboriously learnt from their stable boys. Bohemian politics of the nineteenth century received their first rehearsal.\textsuperscript{44}

From the battle of the White Mountain, ‘Austria’ was embodied in the territorial aristocracy, the ‘Magnates’, who, even when German, thought of themselves as Austrians. In Bohemia, home of the greatest of these estates, they were especially removed from local feeling, as these lords were Habsburg creations from the Thirty Years War. ‘The Austrian Empire was a vast collection of Irelands, except that – unlike the Irish landlords, who had at any rate a home of origin in England – the Austrian nobility had no home other than the imperial court.’\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{43} Taylor, p.22.
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\textsuperscript{45} Idem, p.25.
The Monarchy enabled the aristocrats to exploit their peasants, and in return the aristocrats sustained the Monarchy. The reforming work of the monarchy threatened the aristocratic position [and as] a result the aristocracy, in the nineteenth century, had to defend their traditional privileges against the Monarchy, although these were the creation of the Monarchy. Like the Irish garrison, these landowners, alien in spirit and often in origin, took on liberal and even national airs [...] The great landowners, despite their occasional Frondes, remained to the end the hard core of the Habsburg Monarchy.46

From the time that Maria Theresia established a central Chancellery at Vienna, there was another class claiming to be essentially ‘Austrian’, the bureaucracy. These people who worked the imperial organization had no single national or even class origin, ranging from aristocrats, to Hungarians and, some, like Kolovrat, even Czech. Most of them were Germans from urban communities without titles, and belonged, in the Austrian phrase, to the ‘second society’. As the bureaucrats had no sympathy with local patriotism or aristocratic privilege, their ideal was a uniform Enlightened Empire, and like Joseph II, their supreme example, they were not nationalist. German, inevitably, was the language of local administration, and as the imperial bureaucrats had a cultural as well as a centralizing task, viz. spreading Enlightenment, this meant the extension of German, seeing no other language of culture existed for them. German as such was considered a class-name, meaning a trader, like shopkeeper, merchant, handicraft-worker, or moneylender. From this it extended to the urban arts, writers, schoolteachers, clerks and lawyers. Thus the conflict between the centralizing monarchy and the provinces was here a conflict also between the urban middle classes and the territorial aristocracy, appearing so often as a conflict between German domination and national diversity. Even the classical liberal demand of representative government strengthened the German position. The German minority paid in taxes twice as much as a Czech or an Italian, five times as much as Pole, and seven times as much as a Croat or Serb. Restricted suffrage based on taxation, the universal liberal programme, inevitably returned a parliament predominantly German. Throughout the Empire, the revolutionary events of the nineteenth century meant the intrusion into politics of ‘the masses’. The traditional, or ‘historic’ nations were purely class nations, for example the Hungarian gentry, the German traders. There were no assimilations, there was no Austrian amalgam, and therefore every widening of the political society increased

the national complexity of the Empire. The nations who appeared on the political stage in 1848 were the creations of writers and existed only in imagination, in fact, they were nations in which there were more writers than readers.

The early national movements were created and led by writers, principally by poets and historians; and their politics were those of literature rather than life. The national leaders spoke as though they had the support of a conscious, organized people; yet they knew that the nation was still only in their books. One of the Czech pioneers remarked at a meeting with his fellow writers in Prague: ‘If the ceiling were to fall on us now, that would be the end of the national revival.’

As H.A.L. Fisher pointed out in his delineation of Irish mobilization, these leaders mobilized rights, not supporters. Just as the Jacobins had used the Rights of Man to inspire revolutionary armies, in the Habsburg Monarchy the national leaders thought that an accumulation of rights would prove irresistible. The German nationalists claimed the inheritance of the Holy Roman Empire, and likewise the Hungarians claimed all ‘the lands of St.Stephen’ as a Magyar national state, and the Czechs lay claim to all ‘lands of St.Wenceslaus’. The majority insisted that the historic unit meant a national unit, the minority demanded a redrawing of the province on national lines. The German majority in Styria, for example, asserted against the Slovene minority the provincial unity which the Czech majority asserted against the Germans of Bohemia. And just like the defensive reaction of the Protestant Ascendancy in Ireland in securing their positions, so too did the Germans seek to maintain their monopoly of state employment, while others were trying to break into it. ‘The national struggle was a struggle for jobs in bureaucracy.’ Modern, nineteenth century, Austria, was a centralized state, with a more developed bureaucracy than any other in Europe:

The Austrian bureaucracy was fairly honest, quite hard-working, and generally high-minded, it probably did more good than harm. It was also slow, manufactured mountains of paper, regarded the creation of new bureaucratic posts as its principal object […]. Hartig, one of Metternich’s closest colleagues, expressed the general view: ‘Administration has taken the place of government.’ [The] greatest bureaucratic zeal went into the struggle against ‘dangerous thoughts’. The Empire of Francis I was the classic example of a police state. There was an official, lifeless press; correspondence, even the correspondence of the imperial family, was controlled; the censorship was a nuisance rather than a tyranny. Though foreign books and papers were forbidden, the educated classes
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knew what was astir in the world, and, long before 1848, there was a clear radical programme, not on paper, but in men’s minds.49

The revolution in France acted as a catalyst for liberal and national uprisings throughout Europe, perhaps least surprisingly in the multi-ethnic construction of the Austrian Empire:

CE 1 March 1848:
The news of the events at Paris has caused consternation at Vienna difficult to be described, not only in high quarters, but in every class of the population. A grand council of all the ministers was immediately held. Couriers were dispatched in all directions. Count le Flahaut, the French ambassador at the Court of Vienna, is said to have fainted on hearing the news of the abdication of the King. He started the next day for England. Thirty thousand different troops are to advance to Italy without delay. The greatest excitement prevailed at Milan on the 26th ult. […] The movement of troops in Germany is incessant. Twenty-six battalions of the Prussian Army have been ordered to the Rhine. The Duke of Saxe-Coburg and his Duchess, the Princess Clementine of Orleans, arrived on Saturday evening at the Palace of Brussels from England, but the next morning set out again for Germany.

In Austria this forced the hand of Prince Metternich, the architect of reactionary government, who, having failed to reach a suitable compromise, resigns and goes into exile in England.50

CE 1 March 1848:
The resignation of Prince Metternich is certain, and the circumstances under which it took place are extraordinary. The Prince had declared himself decidedly favourable to concessions in Lombardy, as well as in Bohemia and Hungary. With regard to Lombardy he advised prompt and ample concession. His views met no support, and at the last Council, at which he assisted, failing to make an impression, he signified that he had arrived at too advanced a period of life to grapple with the difficulties which he foresaw would arise from an obstinate persistence in coercive policy. He did not, however, resign formally at the moment. The same evening the Prince went to the theatre. During the performance some insignificant expression to the effect of “We must get rid of these ministers” was caught up by the house, and repeated, all eyes being directed to the venerable statesman, who soon after rose much affected, and at once gave effect to his previously expressed intentions.51

49 Taylor, p.44,
50 Cassell’s Chronology of World History, p.394.
51 CE 22 March 1848. (From the Standard) The steamer from Hamburgh has just arrived in the River, with the evening papers of the 16th inst. There is a postscript, dated Vienna, the evening of the 14th, stating that a collision had taken place between the students and armed burghers and the troops of the line, and that after a considerable struggle the former had obtained possession of the arsenal and some other military posts of the city. This was immediately followed by the resignation of Prince Metternich, and the Emperor then caused public notice to be given to the people that he was ready to make all the concessions required, including the freedom of the press from all censorship. The other particulars are not stated in detail, but the arrangements may be judged to have given perfect satisfaction to the people, for at the date of the latest accounts the city was
It is interesting to note the increasing relevance of the Bohemian Province in Austrian affairs, and the stance taken by the Czechs, which, though similar in intent to the Irish, proves to be singularly more violent.

CE 22 March 1848
Dissolution of the Hungarian Parliament.
The news from Vienna (up to the 10th) communicates but little additional information. Agitation and distrust are still prevalent. [In] Bohemia all is on the qui vive […] A letter from Prague of the 9th describes the feverish and revolutionary state of public opinion in Bohemia and shows that a fearful outbreak is by no means improbable. A deputation has been sent to Vienna to pray for reforms, but no favourable issue is expected.

However, the reforms are surprisingly forthcoming, and it the freedom of the press which receives the most praise, placating the provinces for the present, highlighting also the lack of liberty regarding one’s own press in the Empire.

March 24
(From the Morning Chronicle of Tuesday)
[…] The Emperor of Austria has granted the liberty of the press to his subjects. We doubt if the Austrians yet credit it themselves. On the Neue Burg Thor of the city of Vienna there is an inscription in golden letters, ‘Justitia regnorum fundamentum,’ the chosen motto of the present Emperor of Austria. We have seen the Bohemian sneer and the Hungarian lash his four steeds abreast into a furious gallop as he passed under it with an ill restrained curse upon his lips, and yet the motto stands, and he will doff his sheepskin cap as he recognises the sublime truth of the hither to ill placed device.

Broadcasts of events in Hungary offer a glimpse at the hub of Viennese political life: the coffee house, which in a time of censorship was the only public place of congregation where foreign newspapers were not prohibited:

CE 17 March 1848
From the Austrian capital we have received the following intelligence, which under existing circumstances, possesses peculiar interest: -

Vienna, March 6. - The arrival of the mail from Hungary this morning has caused great excitement – Daume’s coffee house was crowded to excess and a gentleman was at once placed on one of the billiard tables for the purpose of reading aloud the Pressburg Gazette, which had just been received. Events in Hungary have taken a serious turn, so much so, that the Archduke Stephen has arrived here to ask for new instructions, suited to the extraordinary and unexpected circumstances. An address has been forwarded by the State of Hungary to the Emperor, of so unusual a character that the sensation it has created cannot be illuminated, and a general rejoicing had succeeded to the collision. – It was also quiet in Berlin at the date of the latest accounts.
matter of surprise. It demands the strict maintenance of the ancient Hungarian Constitution and the appointment of a separate Ministry, the members of which shall be responsible to the people of Hungary. Vienna, nevertheless, remains quiet and popular attention seems exclusively directed to the Exchange as the great decline in the public funds and other State securities, as well as the difficulty of obtaining change for bank-notes, have caused much uneasiness.

In the second half of the nineteenth century the masses no longer accepted their humble role, whether in the British nor in the Austrian Empire. After 1848, when continental towns began to grow at an ever-increasing rate, Czech peasants poured into Bohemian towns and submerged the German ‘islands’. The towns took on the nationality of the countryside, and mass literacy, a product of the towns and of the industrial system, spread to the countryside, and in turn created peasant nationalism. The international aspect of this process is seen when the academics were shouldered aside and the last national leaders in Ireland as well as the Habsburg monarchy were priests, the enemies of the French revolutionary ideas from which the national movements had sprung. The Bohemian Diet, while composed of great landowners, simply played at Czech patriotism, and in 1846 it demanded the restoration of its rights as they had existed before the battle of the White Mountain and the Revised Ordinance of 1627. A.J.P. Taylor argues that the heirs of the aliens who had been instated in Bohemia by Habsburg absolutism were demanding the rights of the Czechs they had supplanted, just like the English owners of Irish land posed in the eighteenth century as the defenders of an Irish independence. These Bohemian aristocrats understood nothing of Czech nationalism, and when the doctrine of the Rights of Man broke into the Habsburg Empire, peasant discontent was still unconscious. When, in fact, a revolution occurred in 1848 it was in a town with more than 100,000 inhabitants, such as two serious revolutions in Austrian Italy: Milan and Venice. There were three such towns north of the Alps: Vienna, Budapest, and Prague. The revolutions of 1848 were not, however, the result of the Industrial Revolution, but were actually caused by its absence, industrial development having been proved to remedy social discontent, not cause it. For example, the city of Cork lost most of its industry at this time, and despite the tragic effects of the Famine, was prepared, in theory at least, to grasp at the new revolutionary ideas spreading from Europe. Vienna was never so revolutionary as when it was least industrialized, and though the

52 Taylor, pp.63ff, and Hobsbawm, pp.80ff.
53 Taylor, pp.63ff.
‘proletariat’ of landless labourers existed, there were no capitalists to employ them. Thus the Viennese proletariat provided a revolutionary army, and, lacking its own leaders and found them in the students of the university, another sure sign, according to Taylor, of economic and political backwardness.\footnote{Idem, p.64.} Though the university students were the field officers of the revolution, they had not the maturity to provide responsible leadership and, except for the medical students, they were all bureaucrats in the making. Neither Prague nor Budapest had the revolutionary character of Vienna, both small in comparison, Prague with a population of just over 100,000, Budapest just under. But events in Hungary often stimulated imitation in Bohemia, and on 11 March, the radical intellectuals of Prague formulated their programme. The Bohemian Diet did not even attempt to compete. This meeting, in the concert hall of a café (the Wencelaus-Baths), was attended by both Czechs and Germans, both politically inexperienced, and its original demands were for the usual liberal ‘freedoms,’ suppression of censorship, and the like.

At the last moment a Czech intellectual, Brauner, added from his sick-bed demands more relevant to Bohemian conditions: abolition of the Robot; equality of Czech and German in schools and in the administration, Silesia, Moravia, and Bohemia – the ‘lands of the Crown of St.Wencelaus’ – to have a common central chancellery and a parliament for general affairs, meeting alternately at Prague and Brno. Thus casually a sick man’s impulse launched the national question in Bohemia and its overlap with historic claims.\footnote{Idem, p.67.}

Vienna opinion had already been stirred by the Hungarian agitation at Bratislava, only forty miles away, and on 3 March Kossuth came openly to Vienna to incite the crowds. The Diet of Lower Austria demanded Metternich’s resignation and this demand was taken up by the streets. Metternich resigned and old Austria fell with him. The Court and revolutionaries alike accepted the remodelling of the Habsburg Empire in accordance with the wishes of the ‘master nations’. Here the Vienna liberals assumed the Empire was a German state, playing the chief part in a new liberal Germany, and pressed as strongly for elections to the German national assembly in Frankfurt as for a Constituent Assembly in Austria. The contradictions of this Imperial policy culminated in Bohemia. Prague intellectuals were no longer content with autonomous Bohemian administration and the individual ‘freedoms’. They wanted their own March Laws. The second meeting at Prague on 29 March
was now purely Czech, demanding the unity and independence of the 'lands of St. Wencelaus,' Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia, with a single parliament and a government responsible to it. Though while Hungarians were revolutionizing a historic constitution, Czechs appealed to a tradition that ended 1620. The Magyar minority included all the propertied and educated inhabitants, and even the German bourgeoisie were being rapidly 'Magyarized'. In contrast, the Czech majority in Bohemia were only awakening from cultural unconsciousness, challenging the Germans, a fully conscious historic people. And not content with this cultural struggle in Bohemia, Prague was demanding Silesia and Moravia as well. The Imperial reply of 8 April granted the equality of Czech and German at Prague. But the Germans of Bohemia were only a small part of the problem.

The Czechs lived under the shadow of German nationalism and, alone of all the Slav peoples, had the Germans as only rivals. National Germany, too, claimed a legacy of history – the legacy of the Holy Roman Empire, in which Bohemia had been included; and all German nationalists assumed that Bohemia would be part of the new German national state. [Of] the six representative Austrians invited by the committee to join it, one was Palacky; and his letter of refusal of 11 April first announced the claims of the Czech nation to existence. [Still], he did not demand an independent Czech national state and he repudiated the idea of a Russian universal monarchy [...] Palacky found a third solution, neither Russian nor German: the Austrian Empire should be transformed into a federation of peoples, where all nationalities should live freely under the protection of the Habsburg power. This was the programme of Austro-Slavism.  

However, as the breach between the Court and Vienna widened, Court favour towards the Czechs increased. On 29 May, Leo Thun, Governor of Bohemia, refused to take orders from the Vienna government and set up a provisional government of Czech and German moderates in Prague. Following the Pan-Slav Congress in June, Bohemia figures again prominently in the Irish press. In keeping with the novelty of decentralized administration and home government, the Czechs momentarily achieved the ultimate goal of the submerged peoples of nineteenth century Europe – home rule:

CE 9 June 1848  
There is also very cheering intelligence from Bohemia, late a province of the Austrian empire. Count Leon Thun on the 29th ult. made known to the National Committee of Prague that he and the other chiefs of administration in the country had resolved to have a Provisional Government for Bohemia. Bohemia has thus declared herself independent of the German empire. Prague is swarming with

---

56 Taylor, p.74.
deputies from the Sclavonian tribes, who are determined to establish a name and nationality for themselves. These people detest the idea of centralisation – of losing themselves in some monster power. The poor Poles have the same feeling. They want no union with nations by whom they have been always cruelly treated. At this moment they have actually turned to the side of Russia, in sympathy with its Sclavonic hostility to German amalgamation.

The Slav Congress at Prague in June had limited the Congress to Austrian Slavs, but welcomed other Slavs as guests, intending to plan further cooperation between Austrian Slavs. This plan was ended by the riots in Prague on 12 June. The Congress had, perhaps, increased the political excitement. The street fighting in Prague was the first battle against the revolution, and the revolution was defeated. The majority of Czech moderates welcomed the defeat of the Prague radicals, as they continued to set their hopes in Austroslavism. The victory of Windischgrätz was welcomed more openly, of course, by the Germans. The Frankfurt Assembly, irritated by the refusal of Bohemian constituencies to elect deputies to Frankfurt, condemned the Prague riots as a Czech ‘blood-bath’. The meeting of the Constituent Assembly allowed the Habsburg dynasty to repair the breach between Vienna and itself, and when Archduke John came to Vienna to open the Assembly and was subsequently elected Regent of Germany, the Emperor and the imperial family returned to Vienna. The question whether to receive the Hungarian delegation was debated in the Assembly from 17 September to 19 September and was the first public discussion in history of the ‘Austrian question’. When imperial troops were sent to the assistance of Jellacic this provoked in Vienna the October revolution, aimed at destroying the Austrian Empire and substituting a national Germany and a national Hungary. This would have reduced Vienna to a provincial town, a programme that did not appeal to the middle-class liberals, conscious of the benefits of being citizens of an Imperial capital. They were repelled by the support that the Vienna masses gave to this programme. As it turned out, a Hungarian army advanced ever so slowly towards Vienna and then timidly withdrew. The Court fled to Olomouc in Moravia, the dynasty keeping contact with both sides in case of a radical victory, and the Constituent Assembly was removed to Kromeriz in Moravia to continue its constitutional labours. Czechs and Germans shed their radical wings, the Czechs remaining Austroslavs, the Germans loyal Austrians.
Palacky, with rare intellectual honesty, would have liked to devise new provinces, each with a single national character. This was rejected by the other Czechs who would not give up ‘historic’ Bohemia, despite its German minority; and the Germans, though claiming their national rights in Bohemia, would not surrender the Slovene districts of Carinthia and Styria. [The] constitution of Kromeriz made one concession to national minorities within the provinces: it devised subordinate ‘circles’, with local Diets and local autonomy. For the men of Kromeriz supposed that national ambitions would be satisfied with schools and local government in the national tongue; they had no vision of a nation wishing to decide its own destinies.57

The consistency shown in civil reporting by the Cork Examiner on matters relating to the German nation proper, does not apply in general to articles on Austria. Depending on the angle of intent, the Cork Examiner makes few allowances for imperial tactics in this era of revolt, not overtly siding with revolutionary Czechs either. There appears no clear concept for the paper to follow. The multicultural Austrian Empire was simply perceived as the opposite of its distinctly German neighbour state in spirit, tradition and goals. If at all cordial in communicating events in the patchwork empire then only if in agreement with similar Irish views of the period. Austria received more indulgent treatment in direct relation to the waning of German popularity a few decades later, the civilized image of Germany beginning to crumble in the 1870s and Austria’s image of despotism being replaced by a pleasant bonhomie. How was dissent initially established in the conglomerate Austrian Empire? Peopled by diverse races, this hub of hubbub was still believed to be on solid ground in the early nineteenth century. After all, it would partake in dividing Europe after Napoleon’s fall, and the German War of Liberation had sowed the seeds of an all-German loyalty, which hereafter transformed the politics of the modern world.

As yet, however, there was no such nation, but only a hot ferment of national feeling by the help of which a nation under strong political direction might ultimately be built. [It] followed that the liberation of Germany could not be effected without active help from the Austrian Empire. Now the Austrian Empire was in the main a non-German power, which had steadily reduced its commitments in the west. [It] had seen the disappearance of the Holy Roman Empire, not without a sentiment of relief, and it was more interested in securing a hold on northern and central Italy, and consequently upon the Vatican, than in resuming the dangerous and ungrateful task of sheltering Germany from French aggression in the west.

The detailed settlement of Europe was left to a congress summoned for November to Vienna. Here the aristocracy of the old regime, light-hearted in the moment of their great release, surrendered themselves to an orgy of brilliant

57 Taylor, p.87.
dissipation. As Paris danced after Thermidor, and London after the 1918 Armistice, so through that autumn and winter Vienna while the Corsican was safe in Elba and the officials were working out the structure of a new Europe [...]. The new map was shaped by statesmen for whom revolution emanating from France was the greatest of all dangers to the well-being of mankind.

Talleyrand’s formula of legitimacy summed up the spirit of the settlement. It was legitimacy which restored the Bourbons to France, saved Saxony for the Wettins, and confirmed the power of the royal house of Sardinia. No respect was paid to nationality or the wishes of the populations concerned. In all essentials, therefore, the statesmen who drew up the settlement at Vienna were sharply opposed in aims and principles to the artificers of the Europe [of the 1920s]. The Peace Treaties of 1920 constituted a democratic settlement made possible only by the downfall of those very monarchies to which the Congress of Vienna had entrusted the policing of Europe. The settlement of 1920 created new Republics, redistributed frontiers, accepted the dissolution of the old Austrian Empire, and built up a Europe on that principle of self-determination which had been preached by the French revolutionaries, but was afterwards long lost to view. To the congress of Vienna the principles of President Wilson would have been anathema. Guided by Metternich, Talleyrand, and Castlereagh, it held that the well-being of Europe was to be secured not by compliance with the assumed wishes of the peoples concerned, but only by punctual obedience to legitimate authority.

Fyffe had already noted the idea that Austria was gladly relieved of its German obligations, seeing that their religious differences affected not only their inner state but also their foreign policies:

While the Protestant communities of Northern Germany identified their interests with those of the rising Prussian Monarchy, religious sympathy and the tradition of ages attached the minor Catholic Courts to the political system of Vienna. Austria gained something by its patronage; it was, however, no real member of the German family. Its interests were not the interests of Germany; its power, great and enduring as it proved, was not based mainly upon German elements, nor used mainly for German ends.

---

58 Fyffe, p.172: ‘In order to relieve the antagonisms which had already come too clearly into view, Metternich determined to entertain his visitors in the most magnificent fashion; and although the Austrian State was bankrupt, and in some districts the people were severely suffering, a sum of about L10,000 a day was for some time devoted to this purpose. The splendour and the gaieties of Metternich were emulated by his guests; and the guardians of Europe enjoyed or endured for months together a succession of fetes, banquets, dances, and excursions, varied, through the zeal of Talleyrand to ingratiate himself with his new master, by a Mass of great solemnity on the anniversary of the execution of Louis XVI. [211] One incident lights the faded and insipid record of vanished pageants and defunct gallantries. Beethoven was in Vienna. The Government placed the great Assembly-rooms at his disposal, and enabled the composer to gratify a harmless humour by sending invitations in his own name to each of the Sovereigns and grandees then in Vienna. Much personal homage, some substantial kindness from these gaudy creatures of the hour, made the period of the Congress a bright page in that wayward and afflicted life whose poverty has enriched mankind with such immortal gifts.’


60 Fyffe, p.80.
Eleven distinct languages were spoken in the Austrian monarchy, with countless varieties of dialects, and of the races represented by these linguistic elements the Slavic population was the largest, numbering about ten million, against five million Germans and three million Magyars; ‘but neither numerical strength nor national objects of desire coloured the policy of a family which looked indifferently upon all its subject races as instruments for its own aggrandisement.’ The destiny of the old dominions of the Hapsburg House had been fixed in the course of the Thirty Years’ War, the conflict of the ancient and the reformed faith had become a conflict between the Monarchy, allied with the Church, and every element of national life and independence, allied with the Reformation. Protestantism, dominant in almost all Habsburg territories, was not put down ‘without extinguishing the political liberties of Austrian Germany, the national life of Bohemia, the spirit and ambition of the Hungarian nobles.’ The desire of the Emperor Ferdinand ‘rather a desert than a country full of heretics,’ was fulfilled in the subsequent history of his dominions. In the German provinces, except the Tyrol, the old Parliaments and liberty disappeared; in Bohemia the national Protestant nobility lost their estates, or retained them at the price of ‘abandoning the religion, the language, and the feelings of their race, until the country of Huss passed out of the sight of civilised Europe, and Bohemia represented no more than a blank, unnoticed mass of tillers of the soil. Two powers alone subsisted in the Austrian dominions, the power of the Crown and the power of the Priesthood; and as no real national unity could exist among the subject races, ‘the unity of a blind devotion to the Catholic Church was enforced over the greater part of the Monarchy by all the authority of the State.’ Fisher had also drawn attention to Bohemia, the Czechs belonging to those nationalities that were not consulted regarding their ideas on self-determination at the Congress of 1815. ‘The Italians and Czechs chafed under the Austrians, the Belgians under the Dutch, the Poles under the Russians and Prussians, the Serbs and Greeks under the Turks.’ But it was not only the denial of national rights that was tormenting European peace, there was also a stern repression of opinions. All the means of Papal control, such as the Jesuits and the index of Prohibited Books, were brought into play. In fact, in Italy the clericals, supported by Austrian arms, directed the schools, controlled the Press, and publications. The same shocking conditions could be said to hold true.

61 Fyffe, p.83.
for Spain also. But, fortunately, in ‘half-Protestant Germany intellectual
debasement was happily incomplete.’ The University of Göttingen enjoyed relative
immunity from government interference and ‘offered a welcome spectacle of
academic liberty. Elsewhere after 1820 academic repression, under directions from
Vienna, was the order of the day.’

Fyffe holds that Vienna had grown out of its ‘old careless spirit.’ The home
of a population notoriously pleasure loving, good-humoured, and indifferent to
public affairs, had now taken on a more serious character. The death of the
Emperor Francis, who had been as fixed a part of the order of things as the river
Danube, was not unconnected with this change. By his death the State had lost an
ultimate controlling power and this loss was palpable to the entire world. The
imbecility of the Emperor Ferdinand, the antiquated formalism of Metternich and
the system that seemed to be incorporated in him, made Government an object of
general satire and contempt. Censorship was exercised with grotesque stupidity, the
aim of Government being to isolate Austria from the ideas of other lands, and to
shape the intellectual world of the Emperor's subjects into the form prescribed as
suitable for the members of a well-regulated State. The works of Lord Byron were
excluded from circulation, when custom-house officers and market-inspectors so
chose, the leading writers of modern times in history and political literature lay
under the same ban. Native production was much more effectively controlled, for
whoever wrote in a newspaper, or lectured at a University, or published a work of
imagination, was expected to be agreeable to the constituted authorities, or was
reduced to silence. Quiescent, but ready to unite against the Government when
opportunity should arrive, there stood the ‘unorganised mass of the middle ranks,
certain political associations and students' societies, a vigorous Jewish element, and
the usual contingent furnished by poverty and discontent in every great city from
among the labouring population.’ There was enough military force to keep the
capital in subjection, but the foresight and the vigour necessary to cope with
revolution were nowhere to be found among the holders of power. Metternich
once banished, the first popular demand was for a Constitution. His successors
devoted their studies to the Belgian Constitution of 1831, and after some weeks a
Constitution was published by edict for the non-Hungarian part of the Empire,
including a Parliament of two Chambers: the Lower chosen by indirect election, the

---

63 Idem, p.877.
64 Fyffe, p.401.
Upper consisting of nominees of the Crown and representatives of the great landowners. These provisions favouring the Crown and the Aristocracy displeased the Viennese and agitation recommenced. Unpopular officials were roughly handled, the Press grew ever more violent and more scurrilous. The students of the University became the most important political body of the capital. Their principal rivals in influence were the National Guard drawn from the middle class, the workmen as yet remaining in the background. ‘Neither in the Hall of the University nor at the taverns where the civic militia discussed the events of the hour did the office-drawn Constitution find favour.’

As the revolts of 1848 spread across Europe, the Cork Examiner bestowed upon Italian resistance higher accolades than those given begrudgingly to their Czech counterparts. According to Fyffe, the plain of Northern Italy had always been ‘an arena on which the contest between interests greater than those of Italy itself has been brought to an issue,’ and in 1848 the real turning point lay in the fortunes of a campaign in Lombardy than in any single combination of events at Vienna or Berlin. The Austrian Monarchy depended on the victory of Radetzky's forces over the national movement, and if Italian independence should be established, and the influence and example of the victorious Italian people against the Imperial Government in its struggle with separatist forces be felt, it was scarcely possible that any policy could save the Empire of the Hapsburgs from dissolution. And on the prostration or recovery of Austria the future of Germany in great part depended. ‘The Parliament of Frankfort might then in vain affect to fulfil its mandate without reckoning with the Court of Vienna,’ though the Liberals of Northern Germany themselves had little sympathy with the Italian cause. Their inclinations went with the combatant who was a member of the German race and paid homage for the moment to Constitutional rights.

CE 3 April 1848
Hunting out the Austrians Red Hussar

The old consecrated memories of the glories of Italy are revived by the crusade against the Austrians. The prints of Austrian invasion are deep in the soils of Naples, and Parma, and Romagna, Modena and Piedmont, and lastly at Ferrara. But the footprint of the tyrant is being washed out in blood. The war against the Austrian invader is now a war to the knife, and nothing less will satisfy the people of heroic Italy than the utter annihilation of every vestige of his iron rule over that sunny land.

---
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Bohemia, nonetheless, remained in the news most prominently, with steady reports on its revolutionary progress and successes. According to Fyffe, this forgotten and obliterated nationality in Europe,

had preserved in their language, and in that almost alone, the emblem of their national independence. Within the borders of Bohemia there was so large a German population that the ultimate absorption of the Slavic element by this wealthier and privileged body had at an earlier time seemed not unlikely. Since 1830, however, the Czech national movement had been gradually gaining ground. In the first days of the agitation of 1848 an effort had been made to impress a purely constitutional form upon the demands made in the name of the people of Prague, and so to render the union of all classes possible. This policy, however, received its deathblow from the Revolution in Vienna and from the victory of the Magyars. The leadership at Prague passed from men of position and experience, representing rather the intelligence of the German element in Bohemia than the patriotism of the Czechs, to the nationalist orators who commanded the streets. An attempt made by the Cabinet at Vienna to evade the demands drawn up under the influence of the more moderate politicians resulted only in the downfall of this party, and in the tender of a new series of demands of far more revolutionary character. The population of Prague were beginning to organise a national guard; arms were being distributed; authority had collapsed. The Government was now forced to consent to everything that was asked of it, and a legislative Assembly with an independent local administration was promised to Bohemia. To this Assembly, as soon as it should meet, the new institutions of the kingdom were to be submitted. Forgotten and obliterated among the nationalities of Europe, the Czechs had preserved in their language, and in that almost alone, the emblem of their national independence. Within the borders of Bohemia there was so large a German population that the ultimate absorption of the Slavic element by this wealthier and privileged body had at an earlier time seemed not unlikely. Since 1830, however, the Czech national movement had been gradually gaining ground. In the first days of the agitation of 1848 an effort had been made to impress a purely constitutional form upon the demands made in the name of the people of Prague, and so to render the union of all classes possible. This policy, however, received its deathblow from the Revolution in Vienna and from the victory of the Magyars. The leadership at Prague passed from men of position and experience, representing rather the intelligence of the German element in Bohemia than the patriotism of the Czechs, to the nationalist orators who commanded the streets. An attempt made by the Cabinet at Vienna to evade the demands drawn up under the influence of the more moderate politicians resulted only in the downfall of this party, and in the tender of a new series of demands of far more revolutionary character. The population of Prague were beginning to organise a national guard; arms were being distributed; authority had collapsed. The Government was now forced to consent to everything that was asked of it, and a legislative Assembly

67 CE 10 April 1848. The Allgemeine Zeitung reports that Count Stadion, Governor of Bohemia, has tendered his resignation, but it remains undecided whether the Emperor will dispense with his services.

68 CE 19 April 1848. Bohemia. The Emperor of Austria has conceded a multitude of reforms for his Bohemian subjects. The constitution of the Bohemian Diet, or parliament, is to be improved by an increase of representation, the national feelings of the people are to be conciliated in many ways,
with an independent local administration was promised to Bohemia. To this Assembly, as soon as it should meet, the new institutions of the kingdom were to be submitted.69

On the 13th of May in Vienna, it was determined that the existing committees of the National Guard and of the students should be superseded by one central committee representing both bodies. The elections held and its sittings begun, the commander of the National Guard declared such proceedings inconsistent with military discipline, and ordered the dissolution of the committee. Riots followed, during which the students and the mob made their way into the Emperor's palace. They demanded not only the re-establishment of the central committee but the abolition of the projected Upper Chamber and the removal of the checks imposed on popular sovereignty by a limited franchise and the system of indirect elections. The Ministry gave way, obtaining the Emperor's signature to a document promising that important military posts in the city should be held by the National Guard jointly with the regular troops, that the latter should never be called out except on the requisition of the National Guard, and that the Constitution should remain without force until submitted for confirmation to a single Constituent Assembly elected by universal suffrage.70 Although Bohemian constitutionalism seemed logical, what German could look with favour upon a Pan-Slavic conference to consider the possibilities of a union of all the Slavonic races? Since the seventeenth century the subjection of the Bohemian Czechs had been a prime condition of internal peace in the Austrian Empire. ‘That this peasant race, with its heretic traditions and under the leadership of a few poets, philologists, and romantics should now aspire, not only to enjoy Home Rule, but to become the citadel of Slavonic influences and propaganda throughout the Empire was regarded by German Austrians, who had not lost their old imperial pride, as a pretension at all costs to be abated.’71

CE 14 June 1848

There is nothing of additional importance from the Austrian quarter. The emperor was staying at Innspruck, surrounded by his family and a crowd of courtiers – and looking on, while his monarchy fell to pieces before his face. Hungary is gone – Bohemia is gone – Lombardy is gone – the home dominions and taxation has been equalised or abolished to a great amount. Revolutionary tempests clear the atmosphere of the world amazingly.

69 Fyffe, p.414.
70 Fyffe, p.422.
71 Idem, p.430.
with Vienna for centre, are gone; and nothing is left him but the German part of the Tyrol, not enough to grow cabbages for his kitchen at Innspruck. He has dwindled to the original status of Rhodolof of Hapsburg, the founder of his house.

Yet Hungarian Home Rule seemed more natural for the Hungarians had always been a ruling, never a subject race. And so, on June 17, 1848, Prince Windischgratz turned his guns upon the city of Prague and ‘in one resolute cannonade, postponing for seventy years the realization of Czech liberties, crushed the Bohemian rebellion.”

CE June 21 1848

Bohemia

The Leipzig Gazette, of the 15th, says that intelligence was received at Leipzig on the 14th inst. of riots at Prague on the previous day. It appears that the Czech party had got up a demonstration on the 12th, and that crowds had assembled in consequence to listen to some inflammatory speeches from the leaders of the party. The result was as intended [...]. The amount of killed and wounded was not known. The capital of Bohemia has been also in a ferment. – The students and people of Prague having respectfully demanded a large supply of artillery and ammunition, and having been refused by the Governor of the city – a prince with an unpronounceable name – they marched on the 12th inst. in vast numbers on his hotel and raised barricades in front of it. They were vigorously opposed by the troops and obliged to retire, though great numbers of the country people were pouring into the town to assist them. It is stated that the Emperor of Austria will proceed to Vienna on the 25th to open the Diet. This is rather problematical. The diet of the capital is unlikely to suit the imperial digestion. The Allgemeine Zeitung gives expression to the general belief in Germany, when it says that the noble Austrian Empire is going to the ground.

The antagonism between the Czechs and the Germans in Bohemia was daily becoming more bitter, the party of compromise, dominant in the early days of March, had disappeared before the German national leaders at Frankfort attempted to include Bohemia within the territory sending representatives to the German national Parliament. The growth of democratic spirit at Vienna was accompanied by a more intense German national feeling, the popular movements at Vienna and at Prague therefore passing into a relation of conflict with one another. On the flight of the Emperor becoming known at Prague, Count Thun, the governor and chief of the moderate Bohemian party, invited Ferdinand to make Prague the seat of his Government, an invitation which would have connected the Crown with Czech national interests was not accepted. A Congress of Slavs from all parts of the Empire, which was opened on the 2nd of June, excited national passions further,
and so threatening grew the attitude of the students and workmen that Count Windischgraetz, commander of the troops at Prague, prepared to act with artillery. Windischgraetz, whose wife was killed by a stray bullet, acted with calmness, and sought to arrive at some peaceful settlement. He withdrew his troops on the understanding that the barricades that had been erected should be removed. This condition was not fulfilled and on the 17th Windischgraetz reopened fire. On the following day Prague surrendered, and Windischgraetz re-entered the city as Dictator, the autonomy of Bohemia was at an end. ‘The army had for the first time acted with effect against a popular rising; the first blow had been struck on behalf of the central power against the revolution which till now had seemed about to dissolve the Austrian State into its fragments.’\footnote{Fyffe, p.425.} Once the revolutionary ball had started rolling, sympathies with Slav peoples increased, the Examiner recognising essential features common to Irish and Czech agitators alike.

CE 28 June 1848

The gathering of the Russian armies on the frontier of Prussian Poland is filling all the North with loud rumours of war. If the Tzar rides over the marches of Brandenburg, the Schlawonian, Croats, Czechs, Poles, &c., will rise in one general insurrection against the supremacy of Germany. These people, who bear to the dominant race the same relation that we Celts do to our Saxon masters, are but waiting for the signal. They have in fact, anticipated it in a desultory way in Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary. The Croats are in rebellion against the provisional government of Hungary, and the Czechs of Bohemia have just thrown Prague into open rebellion. This city endured a terrible bombardment a fortnight ago, from the constituted German authorities, and for the present the Czechish population are beaten into a state of repose.

CE 19 July 1848

The Croats and Illyrians of Hungary – those Irish of the Austrian empire are determined to fight and desperately fight, not alone against the tyranny of Austria, but against the Hungarian adherents of the imperial government.

And in keeping with this spirit of new found kinship, the Examiner offers also an article of scientific support for this positive notion, the theory of racial characteristics influenced by planets, fluids and climate being popular subjects of literature and public debate at the time:

CE 20 September 1848

Destiny of Saxon and Celt

When Scandinavia and Northern Germany overflowed (says Dr.Knox, in the Medical Times), the Saxon race found an outlet in Central Germany and in
Britain; their progress eastward was arrested by the Muscovite and the defeat of Charles XII.; southward and eastward they progressed to a certain extent against the Sclavonic races, but never amalgamating. The German empire was the result of this mock union, sure to be broken in the course of time – time which strengthens races, but breaks down empires. Woe to the empire or nation composed of diverse elements, of different races, and discordant principles! Let Ireland teach the incredulous. The Saxon race or races (for this point has not yet been determined) nominally extended their power into Italy and Sclavonia, sure to be forced back upon their original territory. They attempted to seize on Bohemia, and to convert it into a true Saxon territory, a “right Deutschland,” by the massacre of its Sclavonian inhabitants: the contest was renewed the other day, and is sure to fail. France will interpose her power.

Revolution was again breaking loose in Vienna. Increasing misery among the poor, financial panics, and the reviving efforts of ‘professional agitators’ had renewed the disturbances in forms which alarmed the middle classes as much as those in power. The conflict with Hungary brought affairs to a crisis. After discovering the uselessness of negotiations with the Emperor, members of the Hungarian Parliament requested an audience from the Assembly sitting at Vienna. The most numerous group in the Assembly was formed by the Czech deputies from Bohemia. As Slavs, the Bohemian deputies had sympathised with the Croats and Serbs in their struggle against Magyar ascendancy, and so, ‘blinded by their sympathies of race to the danger involved to all nationalities alike by the restoration of absolutism,’ the Czech majority, in spite of a warning given by a leader of the German Liberals, refused a hearing to the Hungarian representatives. The Magyars, however, sought and found allies in the democracy of Vienna itself. ‘The popular clubs rang with acclamations for the cause of Hungarian freedom and with invectives against the Czech instruments of tyranny.’ Tidings arrived at Vienna that Jellacic had been repulsed in his march on Pesth and forced to retire within the Austrian frontier, and so it became necessary for the Viennese Government to throw its own forces into the struggle, and an order was given by Latour to the regiments to set out for the scene of warfare. This order had been anticipated by the democratic leaders, and some troops had already been won over to the popular side. October 6, Latour's commands were resisted and the regiments subsequently fired on one another. The insurrection was victorious and the Ministers submitted once more to the masters of the streets and the troops were withdrawn. But the fiercer part of the mob was not satisfied with a political victory: after the offices of Government had been stormed, Latour had been captured, dragged into the court in front of the War Office, ‘and there slain with ferocious
and yet deliberate barbarity.\textsuperscript{74} The Emperor had in his usual fashion promised that the popular demands should be satisfied but as soon as he was unobserved fled from Vienna, followed by the Czech deputies and many German Conservatives. Most of the Ministers gathered round the Emperor at Olmuetz in Moravia. The Assembly continued to hold its sittings in Vienna, and the Finance Minister remained at his post. But for all practical purposes, the western half of the Austrian Empire had ceased to have a Government, and the real state of affairs was exposed in a manifesto by Count Windischgraetz at Prague on the 11th of October, in which he announced his intention of marching on Vienna in order to protect the sovereign and maintain the unity of the Empire. The Hungarian Parliament, exasperated by the decree ordering its own dissolution and the war levied against the country by the Court in alliance with Jellacic, the revolt of Vienna seemed to bring deliverance from all danger. The Viennese had saved Hungary, and the Diet was willing, if summoned by the Assembly at Vienna, to send its troops to the defence of the capital. But the urgency of the need was not understood on either side till too late: the Viennese Assembly hesitated to compromise its legal character by calling in a Hungarian army, and the Magyar generals were anxious not to pass beyond the strict defence of their own kingdom, twice withdrawing from Austrian soil after following Jellacic in pursuit beyond the frontier. It was not until Windischgraetz had encamped within sight of Vienna that Kossuth's will prevailed and the Hungarian army marched against the besiegers. Windischgraetz had begun his attack on the suburbs. Among those who fought were two members of the German Parliament of Frankfurt, Robert Blum and Froebel, who had been sent to mediate between the Emperor and his subjects, but had remained at Vienna as combatants. Windischgraetz made his entry on the 31st of October, and treated Vienna as a conquered city. ‘No Oriental tyrant ever addressed his fallen foes with greater insolence and contempt for human right than Windischgraetz in the proclamations which, on assuming government, he addressed to the Viennese.’ Those who were put to death were carefully selected; the most prominent being Robert Blum, in whom, as a leader of the German Liberals and a Deputy of the German Parliament inviolable by law, ‘the Austrian Government struck ostentatiously at the Parliament itself and at German democracy at large.’\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{74} Fyffe p.433.  
\textsuperscript{75} Fyffe p. 434.
CE 13 November 1848

Vienna is now certainly in the possession of a set of barbarians realizing more accurately than any other people ever did, the description of a “swinish multitude”. Already the people have had a taste of conquest, in the act of the imperial general, whereby the Diet – the free image of the nation – that diet lately conceded by the timidity of power – was declared an unlawful assembly indeed, and to be dispersed accordingly. Could an instance of greater treachery and baseness be found than this revocation, in the moment of victory, of popular rights? But the spirit of German liberty, we may feel assured, will not be so easily suppressed. It would be at variance with the character of the most stubborn race in Europe, and with all human experience, if that nation were to suffer themselves to be trodden under the hoof of the most stupid and besotted tyranny in the world. The struggle, commenced in Vienna, will inevitably be renewed through the provinces, with altered fortune. Already there are indications that the whole Austrian empire was in commotion. But the ground of contest is even more extensive – it is as wide as the denominations of German and Slave, as liberty and barbarism.

In the subjugation of Vienna, Fyffe holds that the army had proved itself the real political power in Austria. The Bohemian deputies were still in earnest in the cause of provincial autonomy. The Parliament of Vienna had been recognised by the Court as in lawful session until the 22nd of October, when an order was issued proroguing the Parliament, bidding it re-assemble at Kremsier. There were indications in the weeks following the fall of Vienna of a conflict between the reactionary and the liberal influences surrounding the Emperor, and of an impending coup d'état. A new Ministry, however, came into office, with Prince Felix Schwarzenberg at its head. Schwarzenberg, belonging to one of the greatest Austrian families, had been ambassador at Naples when the revolution of 1848 broke out. Exchanging diplomacy for war, he served under Radetzky. His career had been illustrated chiefly by private scandals so flagrant that England among other countries where he held diplomatic posts had insisted on his removal. As Minister of Austria he achieved political greatness. ‘Like the Roman Sulla, he gave to a condemned and perishing cause the passing semblance of restored vigour, and died before the next great wave of change swept his creations away.’

CE 15 November 1848

The Fall of Vienna

Vienna has fallen. There has been no mock resistance; those who rose for freedom, and shed the blood of others in vindication of it, did not spare their own. They sealed their faith, martyr-like, with their lives. Last of all, the Aula, or University house, was taken by the despot’s army, and the students, the young enthusiastic, thinking men, the same class which, in 1813, rescued Germany from

---

76 Fyffe, p. 435.
the tyranny of Napoleon, and were panegyrised by its succeeding tyrants for doing so – these noble-hearted, generous lads died upon the floors of their own halls, the climax of the victory of savagery and brute force over mind and civilisation. At which glorious news there are English journals which set up a shout of triumph! We pass by the Chronicle. It is without influence or consideration, […] The Times rejoices with the victors, and slanders the vanquished […]. At the end of the article when the pander of murderous despotism had forgotten his first resort to brutality, we have these: - “Had the people of Vienna been less servilely docile of old to the tutelary precautions of a Government, which was often startled by shadows, they would not have fallen into the snares of a few itinerant demagogues, or sunk under the yoke of a sanguinary insurrection. The original blame, therefore, deservedly rests upon the policy of Government like that of Prince Metternich, which has left the people emasculated, demoralised, ignorant alike of their duties and rights.” […] The people, in revolting, proved that even Metternich could not completely debase them. They revolted against a tyranny found out in cheating, in order to enslave and murder them […]. They imagine that in defending this tyranny abroad, they are preserving oligarchy at home. They think it good for the cause of the aristocracy to be identified with that of the two Ferdinands of Austria and Sicily, with idiocy and massacre!

Francis Joseph came to the throne ‘as little implicated in the acts of his predecessor as any nominal chief of a State could be.’ The Assembly during its sittings at Vienna had freed the peasantry from the burdens attaching to their land and converted them into independent proprietors. This remained almost the sole gain that Austria derived from the struggle of 1848. After the removal to Kremsier, a Committee of the Assembly drafted a Constitution for Austria. In the course of debate, it is believed, something had been gained by the representatives of the German and the Slavic races ‘in the way of respect for one another's interests and prejudices.’ And some political knowledge had been acquired on how to approach an adjustment between the claims of the central power and of provincial autonomy.77

CE 11 December 1848
Abdication of the Emperor of Austria
The Emperor of Austria has abdicated in favour of his nephew, Francis Joseph, son of Archduke Francis Charles, his brother. The new Emperor is eighteen years of age. – The reason assigned by the Emperor Ferdinand for his resignation of the imperial Crown, is the necessity of having a younger and more vigorous Sovereign placed over the empire in the present crucial state of public affairs. The ex-Emperor has retired to Prague. Vienna continued tranquil.

77 Fyffe, p.436.
2.2. The Revolutionary Years 1866/67

In the 1860s federalism had little to recommend it. The United States were plunged in civil war; the German Confederation was no more than a barrier against liberal aims; and in Austria the October Diploma, practical expression of federalism, had been unashamedly a device for reviving political feudalism.\textsuperscript{78}

In Ireland, in 1858, a secret political society, the Irish Republican Brotherhood, was formed in Dublin, whose aim was the establishment of an Irish Republic by force. The ideas of the IRB appealed to Irish emigrants in the United States, who provided finance and volunteers to the “Fenians” who pledged to come back to Ireland to fight for independence. So, while the borders within the European Continent were being rearranged to suit nationalist sentiments, Fenians planned to revise the status of Irish sovereignty from their US perspective:

CE 8 October 1866

Foreign intelligence

The ratification of the treaty of peace between Austria and Italy will shortly be exchanged. The arrangements for handing over Venetia to the Italians were to have been completed on Saturday. […] The constitutional party in Hungary demand the concession of a separate ministry, who will adopt their proposals. […] A Fenian meeting, at which fifty-six circles were represented by 381 delegates, was held in New York on the 24\textsuperscript{th} ult. Resolutions were passed supporting Stephens, and a Committee of ways and Means was appointed to obtain funds and war materials. The New York Herald states that the Polish and Hungarian refugees in the United States have determined to give their support to Stephens and the cause of Irish nationality.

At this particular time, Ireland is considered to be a relatively prosperous country, free of any serious social unrest.

CE 30 October 1866

The Saturday Review says, the result of the late election in Tipperary augurs unfavourably for the Government. Lord Derby has exposed his vulnerable point to his opponents by the imprudent declaration of his desire to rule Ireland, as far as possible, through the gentry. Mr. Bright’s\textsuperscript{79} visit to Ireland probably heralds a stormy period. The Review asserts that Ireland enjoys considerable prosperity.\textsuperscript{80}

---

\textsuperscript{78} Taylor, p.122.

\textsuperscript{79} John Bright (1811-89), Quaker, and non-conformist, was a radical and liberal, associated with Richard Cobden in the formation of the anti-Corn Law League. One of the greatest orators of his generation, he was also a strong critic of British foreign policy, especially regarding the Crimean War. Cf. encyclopedia Britannica,11\textsuperscript{th} ed.; as well as online encyclopedia wikipedia.

\textsuperscript{80} CE 18 September 1866. Cholera in Dublin. Since six o’clock yesterday evening up to eleven o’clock this morning, 14 cases of cholera have been reported. Of these 7 have already proved fatal. However, not unusual for the time, cf. also CE 18 September 1866. General News. Cholera has broken out afresh at Birkenhead and Seacombe yesterday. Two fatal and sudden cases were reported.
and adds that the discontent which prevails there is essentially political or social, and can only be removed by revolutionary measures.

The political discontent referred to is, of course, the beginning of the Home Rule movement, which will soon envelope all classes and ignite insubordination in all parts of the island within the next twenty years.

Home Rule reflected changes in the nature of Irish Catholic society and drew upon them. It provided a political vehicle for the propertied Catholic farmers and rural businessmen, whose position had improved relatively in the aftermath of the Great Irish Famine of 1845-51, when smallholders and labourers had been racked by starvation and disease, or driven by despair into the emigrant boats. Home Rule also represented an opportunity for Catholic professionals, whether long-established classes such as doctors and lawyers, or relatively new interest groups such as journalists. Above all Home Rule held out the promise of a new order, when increasingly influential groups such as these would no longer be held back by the constraints of British rule and Protestant predominance.

1867, however, saw radical movements gaining the upper hand in Ireland. Sporadic bombings in England in 1867 and 1868 by the IRB, and a rescue attempt on a prison van in Manchester in 1868, in which a warden was accidentally killed, saw three Fenians hung and become the “Manchester Martyrs.”

---

81 Alvin Jackson, Home Rule, p.3.
82 CE 17 December 1867. The Clerkenwell Explosion. The Times, referring to the Fenian outrage, says – Four persons are already dead. Several seem still in a very dangerous condition, and thirty or forty others, including the youngest children as well as old men and women, suffer from all forms of mutilation. […] The great body of the prisoners were thrown into an indescribable state of alarm by the explosion, and believed the place to be on fire. […] Burke and Casey may protest their abhorrence of the means employed in their behalf, but if they are found to have taken part in organising the Fenian conspiracy, they cannot escape the guilt of having deliberately let loose on this country a set of wholesale murderers. This outrage will then have, at least, the advantage of symplifying the course of the Government. They cannot now hesitate in exercising the utmost rigor of the law, they have not merely to punish the perpetrators of the worst crimes of murder in English history, but to crush a conspiracy of which such outrages, we cannot hesitate to say, are the natural fruit. The Telegraph remarks that Ireland is not Fenian at heart, and it would be a great blunder to confuse together in one silly anathema the whole Irish race.
83 CE 25 November 1867. The Fenian Executions. The arrival of the telegrams at this city on Saturday morning announcing the execution of the convicted prisoners, Allen, O’Brien, and Larkin, caused an excitement unequalled even by the startling news which agitated the community on the 6th of March last. Although for a short time before public opinion regarded the event as almost certain the news that it had really occurred was received at first with almost general incredulity, and it was only when successive telegrams had confirmed the first announcement of the tragedy, that many people could bring themselves to believe the deed had been done. The popular suspense in the country districts was not less deep and universal than in the city. The people had been anxiously watching at the railway stations for every rumour from Cork, and the passengers by the early trains were besieged with eager inquires. Everywhere the one topic engrossed all conversation, and till the last hope was dispelled a merciful commutation of sentence was confidently discussed. […] Armer patrols of police paraded the city on Saturday night and last night, but the streets were on each occasion more than usually quiet and deserted. […] Yesterday, in most of the Catholic churches of the city, after the usual prayers for the departed, a special appeal to the faithful was made in behalf of the three deceased, and received, it is almost needless to add, a fervent response from the congregations, who were deeply affected. On the entrance gates of several of the churches of the city
the Fenians had little success in Ireland, but covertly they maintained an efficient
directorate, and were active in propaganda, particularly in North America. 84

CE 6 January 1866
The “Fenian Button”.
It seems that, in emulation of the famous “Repeal Button,” the Fenians in
New York have adopted a distinguishing ornament, of which we received a
specimen on Wednesday, sent by a friend in New York. It is very neatly made, of
the size of a shilling, and consists of a gilt Irish harp in high relief fastened on a
ground of green silk, and surrounded with a gilt band of engraved metal, also gilt.
At the back it is finished like a locket, and has a pin and fastener attached, so that it
can be worn as a brooch or a scarf pin. As it was only “just out” the day the mail
left New York it is probably the first that has reached this country. - Northern
Whig.

R.V. Comerford has written a definitive study of the Fenians and their role
in Irish society in the nineteenth century. 85 Its origins in ribbonism manifested
itself first in the northern provinces of Ireland as a rather elusive phenomenon in
the 1820s and 1830s, an oath bound, ramified and hierarchical organisation of
lower-class Catholics, with political objectives and colourful rituals. 86 The
ribbonism of the post-famine years is best described as a mode of collective action
rather than a coherent association, which became “a source of much bewilderment
to contemporary policemen and later historians.” 87

CE 19 June 1863
Secret Societies in the North.
The clergy of the united diocese of Down and Connor, by the order of the
Most Rev. Dr. Denvir, have been lately engaged in cautioning their hearers against
the countenancing of parties who, it would appear, are administering a secret oath
to such thoughtless young men as can be induced to join in their mode redressing
the wrongs which afflict Ireland. The form of the oath, we are informed, is in the
hands of his lordship, and the gentlemen whose mission it is to recruit for the Irish
Republic “that is to be” have commenced operations in Belfast and some other
populous districts of the North. - Castlebar Telegraph.

appeared a placard printed on superfine paper and with a deep mourning border having the words –
“Of your charity pray for the repose of the murdered patriots, Allen, O’Brien, and Larkin. God save
Ireland!” […] Yesterday the excitement aroused by the event had of course cooled down
considerably. Nevertheless, even gentlemen of adverse faith and hostile politics were heard to
characterise the execution as a cruel and barbarous proceeding, adjectives which it may be supposed
would receive a much stronger form of expression from the large class whose sympathies are
wholly with the sufferers.

expressing sympathy with Ireland in the pending struggle for constitutional liberty has been referred
to the committee on foreign affairs.

85 R.V. Comerford, The Fenians in Context. Irish Politics and Society 1848-82 (Wolfhound Press,
1998).

86 Idem, p.19.

87 Idem, p.20.
The movement attracted only a small band of followers in the early 1850s, mostly “repealers” upon the death of Daniel O’Connell in 1847, and those who also sympathised with the Tenant Rights League. The bulk of the movement was centred in America where most of the impoverished and those indicted in the ’48 rebellion had been forced to emigrate.

The 1850s was the decade of the American filibuster; it saw Narciso Lopez organising private expeditions to liberate Cuba, William Walker leading private armies against Nicaragua, and John Brown and his men attacking Harper’s ferry. Elsewhere, Garibaldi was perfecting the same mode of warfare. Rapidly improving communications made it possible to envisage the staging of a filibuster across the Atlantic to aid an Irish rebellion. Steamships were improving the speed and reliability of transatlantic journeys. The inception in 1858 of a regular steam packet service between Galway and New York made an immense impression on some minds. (Later in the year companies of Irish-American militia had to be dissuaded from purchasing tickets for group travel to Galway in their colourful uniforms.) And in the spring of 1858 it was well known that the transatlantic cable – with its terminus at Valentia Island – was nearing completion. Henceforth, the news of happenings in Ireland could be conveyed to America in hours instead of weeks. (In the event the cable was completed in August 1858 but it suffered damage shortly afterwards and regular transmission was not achieved until 1866.)

In October 1863, the New York Mercury published a sensational exposé of the Brotherhood, taken up by papers in England and Ireland, which created the impression of a powerful Irish-American enterprise set upon Irish independence. By early 1864 authorities and newspapers in Ireland were on the look-out for ‘the Fenians’ in their midst.

CE 3 October 1865
The Fenian Arrest at Castlemartyr.

Yesterday we stated that a man named Patrick M'Namara had been arrested at Castlemartyr, for Fenianism. The following are the particulars of his arrest: —

“He was arrested in the house of a man named Daniel Ahern, at Castlemartyr, by the police of that town on last Friday week. On the same night a young man named Rohan, the son of a respectable farmer living at Dungourney, within four miles of Castlemartyr, was arrested. They were both taken to Youghal, brought before Mr. Ryan, R.M. It then appeared that Rohan and M'Namara had been drinking together in a public house, and that some persons had given information to the police that he had heard M'Namara attempt to make Rohan a Fenian. Rohan at first refused to give information, but was compelled to do so by Mr. Ryan, and he then stated that M'Namara did attempt to swear him in. M'Namara was then committed, and lodged in the county jail on yesterday. M'Namara's father gave no information whatever to the police, and the statement that appeared to that effect in our paper of yesterday is incorrect.

---

88 Comerford, p.48.
89 Idem, p.110.
Comerford argues that armies, ‘secret or otherwise,’ exist in a socio-economic context, an important factor for an understanding of the Fenians. The most striking find, he declares, being the high proportion of artisans and tradesmen, and the rather low proportion of propertied people, including farmers.

CE 17 October 1865
More Arrests for Fenianism.
Yesterday evening a man named William Kenny was brought to town from Naas jail in custody of the constabulary, and handed over to the detective police, who charged him at College Street Police station with having been connected with the “Fenian movement,” and with having been guilty of high treason. This prisoner had been employed as a grinder in a factory at Manchester, from which he affected his escape, as he was aware that the police were on his track. He was traced to Naas, where he was arrested on the 24th ult., and committed to Naas Jail, where he remained up to yesterday.

Added to this group may be the shop assistants and national teachers, who all in all represent ‘a fraternity of young, unpropertied, educated, urban-dwellers,’ who constituted a section of society ‘in need of social and recreational outlets.’ 90

The drill became their only serious military activity, under the cover of a Sunday excursion or at night, but mostly they were engaged in a wide variety of sports and pastimes. Drill facilitated the change in physical demeanour that was frequently part of the social dimension of Fenianism, as was its conspirational aspect, but the pretence of full secrecy was ‘hilariously inappropriate’ given that membership resulted in a change to a distinctive physical appearance: the ‘well-turned-out Fenian was a bearded young man with a confident step and an independent air who refused to avert his eyes from the gaze of policeman or priest.’ 91

CE 17 October 1865
Fenianism
The city [i.e. Dublin] is at present the resort of a number of Americans. No inconsiderable portion of these gentlemen have a bearing which unequivocally points them out as having received military training. Whatever their purpose in visiting the metropolis, there is no doubt that their movements are keenly watched by some of the most active and intelligent members of the Detective force. It is stated that within the past week two sums of one thousand pounds each, in gold, arrived in Dublin by hand. This money is supposed to have been forwarded from the headquarters of the Fenian Brotherhood in America, to be applied towards defraying the costs of the defence of the prisoners in this country. That these costs will be very large is manifest from the magnitude of the cases, the number of the prisoners to be tried, and the extent of the information; and that every precaution

---

90 Comerford, p.111.
91 Idem, p.112.
has been taken to obtain the ablest counsel is apparent from the fact that Messrs. Butt, Sidney, Dowse, and Waters, have been already retained, and that in addition to Mr. Edward A. Ennis, the services of Mr. John Lawless have been secured as solicitor. - Dublin Evening Mail.

Fenianism was at its numerical height in the years 1863 to ’66, the years of intense emigration from the country and also a time when the US civil war was creating a demand for manpower. The Fenian leadership, however, on both sides of the Atlantic, attempted to discourage this exodus, fearing the decimation of the ranks of Irish Fenianism. 92 Another aspect of its popularity was the prospect of material reward. ‘There was a virtually universal assumption at the time that a successful political revolution would result in the redivision of Irish land.’ This was not an exclusively Fenian idea. Karl Marx had written Das Kapital in the late ‘50s based in an international economic crisis. And talk of Irish-American ships ‘on the sea’ conjured up images of returning exiles ‘claiming back the holdings abandoned by their families,’ 93 ‘soldiers of liberty’ were to be appropriately rewarded. 94 In hindsight, it would be easy to minimise the importance of these fears as the return of exiles en masse never occurred. Only about ten per cent of immigrants returned in the later nineteenth century, but, no doubt, the percentage of those who indulged in this dream was significantly higher, especially those moved by high-spirited

92 Idem, p.114. Cf. also CE 23 December 1867. The Irish in America. The Irish Times begins its notice of Mr.Maguire’s new work in the following terms: - “Any work written by John Francis Maguire commands public attention. There is a peculiar attractiveness in his style, a facility of expression, an appropriateness in illustration, and a power of embodying an anecdote or incident the results of meditation, which win over the sympathies even of a hostile reader of his works. This work, at the present crisis, has a peculiar attraction of its own. It treats of that vast body of Irishmen and Irishwomen who are emigrants, now dwelling in America. It contains the history, social and political, of that Irish nation, which exists not in Ireland, but on the other side of the Atlantic, and which forces itself upon the attention of Ministers and Legislature, whether they will or no.” The following appears in the Universal News: - As was anticipated, this work has attracted attention, and it would be strange indeed if it did not. There is scarcely a feature in relation to our exiled race – their hopes, aspirations, position, or influence, but is touched upon in the volume. If the English newspaper press, who are prone to ridicule the Irish element in the United States, will study this book, a change will come over the spirit of their dremas, and they will learn from the pen of a writer who is not given to exaggerate Fenian influence, what Fenianism really is in America, how it is recruited, how it is supported, what is its policy, and how far it is likely to be successful. The progress and influence of the Catholic Church, the state of education, the remittances of the Irish emigrants to their kindred at home, the courage and bravery of Irishmen in the late war, and the thousand and one special traits and characteristics that go to make up the Irish character everywhere, is portrayed in a truthful, genial, and unbiased manner.

93 CE 27 December 1865. The Fenian Conspiracy in Ireland. The Morning Herald anticipates an outbreak in Ireland during the present winter. It grounds its belief on two reasons - one, that Ireland is now full of returned emigrants from America, who are reckless, but first-rate soldiers; the other, that it is generally supposed that there are at present at sea, on their way from America, steamers laden with arms and ammunition, and considerable numbers of fighting men.

94 Idem, p.115.
proclamations on their behalf. A rising was attempted on March 5, 1867, which began and ended in fiasco.

CE 14 March 1867
Editorial
The Times thinks that there is not the slightest necessity for the proclamation of martial-law in Ireland, and approves of the course the Government has taken in issuing Special Commissions for the trial of the captured insurgents. The convictions obtained and the punishments inflicted will, the Times believes, have a far better moral effect than if ‘several scores of half-starved vagabonds were tried and sentenced by military officers’. Yesterday there was again a complete absence of disquieting intelligence from any part of the country. It is now believed that the bands of insurgents have been thoroughly broken up and dispersed, and that the insurrection has collapsed.

Various attempts were made by the Government, as well as on a national level, to stifle the spread of Fenianism, seeing as it was interfering with the relative prosperity of the country, the wealth not only to be gathered in investment in manufacture, but in part stemming from the budding tourist trade.

CE 10 September 1867
The Prosecution of Orangemen and Ribandmen in Ireland
The Standard commends the Government for its determination to institute proceedings against Orangemen and Ribandmen alike for their recent breaches of the Act, passed sixteen years ago, to restrain party processions in Ireland. As far as their own immediate interests are concerned, they have everything to lose and nothing to gain by their firmness. Ribandmen will not be made more loyal or more Conservative in feeling, however, much they may be awed into being more cautious I conduct, by the impending prosecution against them; and it is not unreasonable to suppose that the Protestants will be, for a time at least, a little out of temper with the Cabinet which thus attempts to curb their more extravagant pretensions, particularly when they have considered – indeed in many respects shown – themselves its faithful supporters. But it is only by such praiseworthy firmness and disregard of party consequences as is displayed in the impending prosecutions that Ireland will become what the Marquis of Abercorn, not more than ten days ago, plainly showed us it ought to be. If the Lord Lieutenant be correct, there is now a large amount of wealth in the country than was ever known to exist in it before in the same form. But it must have tranquillity of all kinds, and especially religious tranquillity, if it is really to prosper.

95 CE 6 January 1866. A Fenian Proclamation. A special meeting of magistrates was held at Caher [investigating] the charge preferred against a young man named Denis Boland, namely - that of being the writer of the following placard, which was found posted on the walls of the court house and at Mr. Chaytor's residence. The prisoner was fully committed to the Clonmel jail for trial. He has since been allowed to stand out on bail: -

FENIANS. The day is not far when the persecuted sons of Erin shall be risen from slavery to freedom, and the Green Flag of Erin shall float on the breeze, surrounded by true Irishmen. May the winds of Freedom soon speed O'Mahoney o'er. To hell with the Saxon tyrants.- I am yours truly, Head Centre. God save the Green.
In a letter to the Daily News, Goldwin Smith, historian and journalist, provides a detailed summary of Fenianism for fellow Englishmen, who perhaps lack the necessary insight into the conditions which created the movement.

CE 27 November 1867
The Irish Question
To the Editor of the Daily News
Sir, - There were obvious objections to discussing the Irish question before the law had taken its course. But now it is to be hoped that it will without delay be brought in its full breadth and significance before the mind of the English people. There can be no doubt, I apprehend, that the Irish difficulty has entered on a new phase, and that Irish disaffection has, to repeat an expression which I heard used in Ireland, come fairly into line with the other discontented nationalities of Europe. Active Fenianism probably pervades only the lowest class; passive sympathy, which the success of the movement would at once convert into active cooperation, extends, it is to be feared, a good deal higher.

England has now before her, unless she can hit on a remedy and overcome any obstacles of class interest or of national pride which would prevent its application, the part of Russia in Poland or of Austria in Italy – a part cruel,
hateful, demoralizing, contrary to all our high principles and professions, and fraught with danger to our own freedom. Our position will be worse than that of Russia in this respect, that while Poland is only a province, our Fenianism is an element pervading every city of the United Kingdom in which Irish abound, and allying itself with kindred misery, discontent, and disorder. Wretchedness, the result of misgovernment, has caused the Irish people to multiply with the recklessness of despair, and now here are their avenging hosts in the midst of us, here is the poison of their disaffection running through every member of our social frame. Not only so, but the same wretchedness has sent millions of emigrants to form an Irish nation in the United States, where the Irish are a great political power, swaying by their vote the councils of the American republic [...].

That Ireland is not at this moment, materially speaking, in a particular suffering state; that on the contrary, the farmers are rather prosperous, and wages, even when allowance is made for the rise in the price of provisions, considerably higher than they were, only adds to the significance of this wide-spread disaffection. The Fenian movement is not religious, nor radically economical (though no doubt it has in it a socialistic element), but national; and the remedy for it must be one which cures national discontent. This is the great truth which the English people have to lay to heart.

The influence of religion in Irish troubles has always been, and in spite of all the evidence produced to the contrary still is, greatly overrated. The Catholic priesthood of Ireland, though a peasant clergy, the partners and the comforters, through dark centuries of the sufferings of an oppressed peasantry, have never been a revolutionary class. I might go further and say that, as a rule, they have not even been a political class; the active part which they took in the struggle for Roman Catholic emancipation, an object directly concerning their religious interests and feelings, under O'Connell, was an exception, not a rule. [...] The Orangemen insisted on treating them as the authors of the rebellion of 1798; but they had, in fact, nothing to do with that movement, which was closely connected with their deadly enemy, the French revolution; the real authors of the movement were Protestants, or rather, revolutionary free-thinkers of Belfast. Nor have the Catholic priesthood anything now to do with Fenianism. In Ireland and America like, they have stood entirely aloof from it, and it has stood aloof from them. [...] They have no control over the movement whatever. [...] 99

whom he can fasten a political or quasi political quarrel in any way that he may please. [...] if he can only manage to escape apprehension at the instant, he will find an “underground railway” everywhere passing him safely from one hiding place to another; he will be enrolled on the list of Ireland’s worthies, and when he dies at last a grateful country will pray for the mitigation of his purgatorial pains. Such is the Poland of this despotic and intolerant Empire. We know not whether the Poles will see the likeness, or even feel flattered by it. So far as regards the moral aspects of the case, they may even prefer their own country, where, if there is an ever-smouldering rebellion there is something like reason for it, which there certainly is not in Ireland.

99 CE 31 December 1867. Requiem Mass at Cong for the Manchester Fenians. The Connaught Patriot gives an account of a Requiem Mass celebrated in Cong in memory of the Manchester Fenians: - “The chapel was densely crowded, and hundreds – we mights say thousands – who could not gain admittance were obliged to kneel outside the doors, and in the grounds of theold and picturesque abbey in which Roderick O’Connor, the last Irish monarch, is interred. At the conclusion of the High Mass, the Rev. Patrick Lavelle ascended the steps of the altar, and addressed the congregation in Irish. “[...] No, brethren, they were not murderers; their souls recoiled from murder, and this the whole transaction on which their fate was founded sufficiently and demonstratively proved. But they were martyrs to a sacred cause – not merely, indeed, that particular cause to which they were supposed to be committed, but the great and undying cause, cherished by every Irish bosom from the rising to the setting sun – of their country’s resurrection. [...] Still, in my soul, I believe the great bulk of the Irish people at home, and the Irish people
The land question, no doubt, lies nearer to the heart of the matter, and it is the great key to Irish history in the past […]. What these people mean by tenant-right is not a rectification of the legal relations between landlord and tenant, or a security to the tenant for the return of his outlay in improvements, but a socialistic alteration of the ownership of land in favour of the tenant – a measure, in plain words of agrarian confiscation.

The real root of the disaffection which exhibits itself at present in the guise of Fenianism, and which has been suddenly kindled into flame by the arming of the Irish in the American civil war, but which existed before in a nameless and smouldering state, is, I believe, the want of national institutions, of a national capital, of any objects of national reverence and attachment, and consequently of anything deserving to be called national life. […] The greatness of England is nothing to them. Her history is nothing, or worse. The success of Irishmen in London consoles the Irish in Ireland no more than the success of Italian adventurers in foreign countries (which was very remarkable) consoled the Italian people. […] “In Ireland we can make no appeal to patriotism, we can have no patriotic sentiments in our schoolbooks, no patriotic emblems in our schools; because in Ireland everything patriotic is “rebellious” – these were the words uttered in my hearing, not by a complaining demagogue, but by a desponding statesman. They seemed to me pregnant with fatal truth.

[…] We have given the Irish a system of education better probably then our own. It is the pledge of our really kind intentions. But improved education excites in them political aspirations for which their minds were too dull and their vision too limited before.100

[…] I wish it were not extravagant to hope that for the consideration of the great Irish questions a short parliament might for once be held in Ireland. In no other way, I fear, will the bulk of our legislators thoroughly get rid of the notions fixed in the minds of so many of them by their favourite journals and their favourite authors about “the incorrigible vices of the Irish” […]. Let them be placed while they deliberate in the midst of that people so graceful, intelligent, and attractive in spite of its misery and squalor, so capable of great virtues, as well as abroad, to a man, have but one heart and one voice in the great, essential, vital, never to be abandoned, never to be forgotten question of national autonomy; that while they will, of course, accept, no matter how reluctantly accorded, any partial and inadequate concession [they] never can rest content until either they finally disappear from the face of the earth, or that grand right be finally recovered and permanently secured and established. We hear a great deal about plebiscites in Italy and other countries. Why not grant the Irish people the benefit of such an experiment? […] Ah dear ‘Repeal’ O’Connell, you and Ireland with you did peacefully, indeed, legally and constitutionally, demand Repeal; and you got Richmond Penitentiary, and Ireland fresh fetters – extermination. […] Ireland is placed in a fearful, inextricable, alternative dilemma, of falling into the hands of English law, no matter what course she may take. If she secretly conspires, she is said to be threatened, to be cursed, and then sent to Pentonville on the exploded assumption that all conspiracy was a sin. If she observes the law, like O’Connell [and] publicly demands a constitutional right by constitutional means, she is ‘proclaimed’ seditious, and guilty of ‘inciting to hatred and dislike of her Majesty’s Government.’

100 CE 17 December 1867 Education Statistics of Ireland. The short Parliamentary paper just published, entitled “Mortality and Marriages in Ireland” derives considerable interest from its being, we believe, the only return issued since the Census volumes, supplying any answers to the question what proportion of the population of Ireland have had elementary education […]. The number is still very low, but the return now issued indicates a gradual improvement in almost all part of Ireland. In the province of leinster, whose population hold the first place, 58.4 per cent of the men marrying in 1865 were able to sign their names on the marriage register, and in 1866 the ratio increased to 69.5 per cent; and of the women marrying the ratios were 59.2 per cent in 1865 and 60.7 per cent in 1866.
unhappily of great crimes, with the speaking monuments of Irish history, the torturing places of former tyranny, and the palaces of former jobbery around them, and perhaps their hearts, and with their hearts their eyes might be opened, and by an effort of the wisdom of which right sympathy is so large a part, they might avert from us the dark omen of the blood which is shed this day. I am, &c., Nov. 23. Goldwin Smith.\textsuperscript{101}

The best encapsulation of what was most important in this period, according to Comerford, is the meeting in November 1866 of Paul Cullen, Cardinal and confidant of Pope Pius IX, with John Bright, the non-conformist hero of the age. For this represented the future alignment of Irish Catholics with the wider contemporary reform movement under Gladstone.

Meanwhile, the Austrian Empire had experienced many lasting changes since the suppression of the Bohemian and Hungarian revolts in 1848 and 1849. First there was a decade of stern autocratic centralization with Germans everywhere, manning administration, officersing the army, controlling the police, and putting education under the tutelage of the Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{102}

\textsuperscript{101} CE 18 December 1867. The Irish Question. Mr. Goldwin Smith, in a letter to the Daily News, supplements a former letter on the Irish question. He deprecates one of the popular plans of land reform as only the surest road to rebellion. It is difficult to satisfy the national aspirations without an actual dissolution of the union, but he suggests the frequent residence of the court at Dublin, as one mode of assuring the mass of the Irish people that the Sovereign of the United Kingdom is really their Sovereign. About once in three years the Imperial parliament should hold a session in Dublin. Ireland should have a liberal measure of local self-government, each province to have a council, to be elective and empowered, subject to the supremacy of the Imperial parliament, to legislate on all matters not essential to the political and legal unity of the empire.

\textsuperscript{102} Fyffe, p. 466: The epoch of military and diplomatic triumph was now ending, the gloomier side of the reaction stood out unrelieved by any new succession of victories. Financial disorder grew worse and worse. Clericalism claimed its bond from the monarchy which it had helped to restore. In the struggle of the nationalities of Austria against the central authority the Bishops had on the whole thrown their influence on to the side of the Crown. The restored despotism owed too much to their help and depended too much on their continued goodwill to be able to refuse their demands. [...] Ecclesiastical laws and jurisdictions were allowed to encroach on the laws and jurisdiction of the State; education was made over to the priesthood; within the Church itself the bishops were allowed to rule uncontrolled. The very Minister who had taken office under Schwarzenberg as the representative of the modern spirit, to which the Government still professed to render homage, became the instrument of an act of submission to the Papacy which marked the lowest point to which Austrian policy fell. Alexander Bach, a prominent Liberal in Vienna at the beginning of 1848, had accepted office at the price of his independence, and surrendered himself to the aristocratic and clerical influences that dominated the Court [...] and the Concordat negotiated by Bach with the Papacy in 1855 marked the definite submission of Austria to the ecclesiastical pretensions which in these years of political languor and discouragement gained increasing recognition throughout Central Europe. Ultramontanism had sought allies in many political camps since the revolution of 1848. It had dallied in some countries with Republicanism; but its truer instincts divined in the victory of absolutist systems its own surest gain. Accommodations between the Papacy and several of the German Governments were made in the years succeeding 1849; and from the centralised despotism of the Emperor Francis Joseph the Church won concessions which since the time of Maria Theresa it had in vain sought from any ruler of the Austrian State.
CE 25 October 1866
Austria
The Evening Post, evening edition of the official Vienna Gazette, says: - Intelligence has recently been published that the Austrian Government had declined a proposal, alleged to have been addressed to it by the Madrid Cabinet, that Spain and Austria should take common action for the defence of the temporal power of the Pope. With reference to this statement we must observe that if it is correct, Spain, like all other Catholic powers, is strongly interested in the welfare of the Holy See, and has made that question the subject of certain representations. The latter have never assumed the character of former proposals. The Austrian Cabinet could, therefore, have no occasion to give a reply of any kind to the Spanish Government.

Neither the Slavonic nor Magyar races would permanently accept the hegemony of the German race, and there followed a period of constitutional experimentation, 1860-67, a half-hearted Federalism which was a failure, a system of Parliamentary centralization that was no greater success. ‘The Magyars would no more come into a Parliament at Vienna to be voted down by Germans than Ulstermen would sit in a nationalist Parliament in Dublin.’

CE 18 September 1866
Austria
A meeting of the deputies of the German Diets of Austria was held the day before yesterday at Aussee-Steiermarke to consider the means to be adopted for determining the position of the German population of Austria and for preserving their connection with Germany. The meeting recognized that the formation of a united German Party was indispensable, and that the principle of dualism with the restriction that certain matters be recognized as common affairs and dealt with by common parliamentary treatment, was the only arrangement by which real liberty could be obtained. It was further agreed that the state of things imperatively called for a clear definition of the competency of the representative assemblies, with a reservation in favour of the maintenance of the peculiar institutions of the different countries as well as for a revision of the constitution by a legal and general representation of the countries at this side of the Leitha.

The system of centralized government devised and administered by Alexander Bach was regarded as an intolerable incubus by races to whom German tradition, mode of life, and spirit of ascendancy were fiercely distasteful. ‘When Austria went into the Italian War, the whole fabric of the Empire quaked as if it were built upon shifting sands.’ The Magyars and Czechs openly rejoiced at

---

103 Fisher, p.1035.
104 An unusual occurrence at the time, CE September 1866: Riot at Prague - On Tuesday night, at Prague, troops were employed to quell a riot which had broken out among the Jews.
Austria’s defeats at Magenta and Solferino.\footnote{105} The Peace of Prague, 23 August, ends the Austro-Prussian War.

**CE 20 September 1866**

Austria, released from her German and Italian tendencies, employing no longer her force in barren rivalries, but concentrating them on Eastern Europe, still represents a Power with thirty-five millions of souls, which no hostility nor interest separates from France […]. A Europe more strongly constituted, rendered more homogeneous by more precise territorial divisions, is a guarantee for the peace of the Continent. [An] irresistible power – can it be regretted? – impels peoples to unite themselves in great masses by causing the disappearance of minor States […] the nations of Central Europe should not remain parcelled out into so many different states, without strength and without public spirit. Political science should rise above the narrow and paltry prejudices of a past age […]. Napoleon I foresaw the changes which are now taking place upon the European Continent. He planted the germs of many nationalities in the peninsula by creating the kingdom of Italy; in Germany by causing the disappearance of 253 independent States.

A few weeks later, the treaty of Vienna ends the war between Italy and Austria. Austria cedes Lombardy and Venetia to Italy but retains Istria and Dalmatia and Ragusa.

**CE 9 October 1866**

The Emperor has decided to renounce the title of King of Lombardy and Venetia, and has decreed accordingly that in future it shall be omitted among his Majesty’s titles, whether the latter be given fully or otherwise.

The Times remarks that as the Hapsburg has ceased to be a German and Italian sovereign, the time has come to consider what place he will have in Europe simply as an Austrian monarch, and to get at the meaning of the word Austrian.

In August 1866, immediately after defeat, the Magyars offered themselves as partners, their demands clearly stated. Belcredi now planned that the other provinces of the empire should be prodded to make similar demands, thus negating Hungary’s unique position. The provincial Diets were recalled, but electoral geometry would produce only German majorities, so Belcredi would have to manufacture Slav majorities, without them actually representing popular movements.\footnote{106} He turned to the Slavs as conservative, clerical, and respectful to the
nobility. However, they, too, had now become liberal and demanded the Rights of Man.\textsuperscript{107} The underworld of Slavs, the Czechs of Bohemia, the Slovaks, Croats, and Serbs of Hungary, could not be expected to welcome the arrangement with Hungary. While up to now the Slavonic population of the Dual Monarchy was divided by geography, dialect and custom, and in some cases by religion, conscious of no common ethnic personality, the state of things was changing. A Pan-Slavonic movement had begun. The movement started with Kollar, the Slovak poet, in 1824, and spread to Bohemia, where it was taken up by the Czech philologists, out of a feeling for the common inheritance of Slavonic culture. The ideas liberated by poets and scholars soon passed into the domain of politics, playing a part in the Bohemian revolution of 1848. Twenty years later, while Alexander II was Tzar of Russia, Pan-Slavic ideas became a directing influence in Muscovite policy.\textsuperscript{108} This new racial philosophy became a force of magnitude, ‘challenging the whole authority of the Porte in the Balkans, and spreading a new restlessness among the many million Slavs who were living, in varying degrees of subjection, within the frontiers of the Dual Monarchy.’\textsuperscript{109} The Examiner reported regularly on the ambitious imperial tour of Bohemia and Moravia, which did not, however, measure up to expectations.

CE 13 October 1866

The Free Presse of this evening says the Emperor will set out upon a tour through Bohemia on Wednesday next. Prior to his departure the Hungarian Diet will be convoked, and an Imperial patent will be issued announcing that as soon as the negotiations with the Diet have been brought to a satisfactory conclusion. A Hungarian Ministry will be formed.

---

\textsuperscript{107} Taylor, pp.142/3.

\textsuperscript{108} CE 27 May 1867. Russia. At a banquet given yesterday evening to the Sclavonian members of the Ethnographical Congress of Moscow, the Minister of Public Instruction, Count D’Tolstoy, said:” – You are not deputies elected by your fellow-citizens in accordance with usage, nor have you any formal powers. You also are not official persons here, but as northern and eastern Sclavonians, I must welcome you as brethren from the west and the south. In our meetings and in our expressions of sympathy there is nothing of a combined character. No political calculation is lessened by the statement of our community of meeting. On the contrary, any such is rather thereby increased. The tie between us is not based upon vacillating external relations, but upon the internal bond within ourselves, created by our history of 1,000 years. Our language, our common Sclavonian ideas, and the Sclavonian heart’s blood that runs in our veins listen to the beat of a Sclavonian heart. Does the heart of a foreigner beat like it? What sceptre will venture to doubt the permanence of the bond between us, or the great future Providence has marked out for the mighty Sclavonian race.

\textsuperscript{109} Fisher, p.1038.
CE 19 - 30 October 1866

Brunn, 18th Oct. - The Emperor Francis Joseph, attended by Count Belcredi, Minister of State, arrived here today, and met with an enthusiastic welcome from large crowds of the inhabitants. Burgomaster Giskra delivered a speech, to which his Majesty replied at great length. The Emperor of Austria has ordered public works on an extensive scale, to be undertaken in Moravia, to relieve the distress brought upon the people of that province by the ravages of war.

Brunn, 19th Oct. – The Emperor has ordered the completion of the Moravian Railway system to be carried out with the greatest possible expedition, and the execution of public works in Moravia to the amount of one million florins during the current year. His Majesty has remitted 10,000 florins to be distributed among the poor of Brunn.

Prague, 24th Oct. – The Emperor arrived here this evening, and met with an enthusiastic reception from the inhabitants. The burgomaster of the town welcomed his Majesty with a speech in Bohemian, to which the Emperor replied in the same language.

Prague, 30th Oct.
On Saturday evening an attempt was made to assassinate the Emperor of Austria, which was defeated by the courage and presence of mind of an English gentleman. The Times says the cold reception accorded by the citizens of Prague to the Emperor of Austria on his entrance into that city was sadly significant of the altered state of public feeling in his regard, which has arisen in Bohemia. The special correspondent of the Times, who witnessed the entry of the Emperor of Austria into Prague as King of Bohemia, says that it was painful in its significance and sad in its present and future portent. Appealing to his subjects for sympathy in adversity he was met by contemptuous coldness and the silence of the grave.

CE 31 October 1866

The Austrian Empire

The Times says the policy of Austria hitherto has been to set the hostile races one against the other, or in mustering up a sufficient military force to crush them all. Our age hardly admits of either policy, and it may, therefore, be questioned how long it will admit of such a state as the Austrian Empire. The Times adds, the battle of Sadowa has revealed the existence of another such man in Europe. All the symptoms exhibited by the new patient seem to point either to the necessity of violent remedies or to inevitable dissolution.

No matter how unpopular the Austrian Empire had become, its military was still resolutely strengthened by Irishmen, and it is interesting to note the detailed and charming account of the services rendered by the Irish elite in exile.

CE 21 November 1866

Irish Officers in the Austrian Service

My “correspondent in Vienna” (I gladly adopt the inverted commas ascribed to him by the Pall Mall Gazette), sends me the following: - The Gazette containing the list of officers decorated for valour in the late war has been published; and much attention is attracted to the exceptional good fortune of the Irish now serving in the Austrian army. They are not nearly so numerous now as they were in the days of Brown and Lucy, or even in the days of O’Donnell and Nugent. But they certainly sustain the high character their countrymen have always
borne in the Imperial Royal army. There appears to have been only five Irish officers serving in Bohemia, all in the cavalry; and they have all, with one exception, been named Knights of the Order of Military Merit – the Austrian equivalent of the Victoria Cross – with the addition that it is not merely a medal but an order of knighthood. The exception is in the case of Count Oliver Wallis, of Carrigmaine, Colonel of the 17th Hussars. Count Wallis had got the Order of Military Merit many years ago for services in the Hungarian campaign, and the Order of the Iron Crown for services in Italy, so it remained with him now to win the Order of Leopold, with the war insignia. Count Wallis is the head of the once great Irish family of Walsh, of “Carrickmines”, as it is now called, near Dublin. The remains of their castles may be seen here and there peering through the trees in that beautiful valley which divides Dublin from the Wicklow Mountains. The Austrian branch of the family has given the Kaiser several ministers, and quite a crowd of generals during the last two hundred years. [...] Another of what the Irish call “the old stock”, Captain Count Patrick O’Hegarty, of the 8th Lancer has got the Cross of Military Merit. The family went into exile with James the Second and was much distinguished in the French Service. The grandfather of the present Count, who was Equerry to Charles the 10th, married a princess Lobkowitz, of the old Bohemian family of that name, and they have since settled in Upper Austria. The same distinction was also won by Captain Alexander O’Hanlon MacDonnell, a brother to Count MacDonnell, Chamberlain to the duchess of Modena...an Irish branch of the great house of the Isles. Captain MacDonnell’s regiment, the 2nd Uhlans, of which the late Austrian Premier, Count Mensdorff, is colonel-in-chief, was the first that crossed swords with the Prussian cavalry emerging from the passes; and it fought in every engagement in which Gablenz’s corps was engaged. At Trautenau Captain MacDonnell much distinguished himself, and at Koninghof, where, according to an account I have seen of the battle “he made with his squadron, without superior orders and of his own mere motion, a most brilliant charge through a veritable rain of projectiles, to save the retreat of the infantry into that town; he had a horse wounded under him, and lost twenty men and above thirty horses within a few minutes. This charge excited the admiration and gratitude of the infantry and all who saw or heard of it, though some thought it overkeen and daring.” With him rode through it, and they have since received the same decoration, Prince Victor Rohan, of the great French family, and his Royal Highness the Count de Girgenti, brother of the King of Naples, who are officers of the same regiment. Captain McDonnell had three horses killed under him, but escaped without a scratch. Not so Captain Patrick Murray, of the 4th Cuirassiers, who was thrice wounded early in the campaign, yet contrived to get on his horse again ere its last fatal day, and did valiant service during the retreat. Captain, now Major Gabriel Fitzgerald, of the 28th Regiment of Cuirassiers, a soldier of many previous brilliant services, got his promotion on the field. He will be remembered by the Irish who were at Ancona in 1860. Both he and Captain Murray have also got the Cross of military Merit. All these officers are, you will observe, cavalry officers; and in such a cavalry as the Austrian, I need not tell you, a man must have every quality that makes a good officer to be specially distinguished. 110

110 CE 21 May 1878: Irishmen in the Ottoman Service. I am informed that two of the Turkish regiments of Baker Pasha's command are led by Irishmen. One of these officers named Mathews, is a member of an old Tipperary family, for many years a Turkish Mussulman. In contrast, CE, 1 July 1878: The rule, no Irish need apply, has not been laid down with regard to the British navy, but a rule for the discouragement of Irish and Catholic boys from entering it does appear to have been adopted. We have already remarked upon the fact that a barrier was set against
In 1867 the question now was not so much whether there should be an independent Parliament and Ministry at Pesth, as whether there should not be a similarly independent Parliament and Ministry in each of the territories of the Crown, the Austrian Sovereign becoming the head of a Federation instead of the chief of a single or a dual State. Count Belcredi was disposed towards such a Federal system, but he was confronted within the Cabinet by a rival who represented a different policy. After making peace with Prussia, the Emperor called to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Count Beust, who had been at the head of the Saxon Government, and the representative of the German Federation at the London Conference of 1864. Beust advocated the retention of the existing Reichsrath and of a single Ministry for all the Cis-Leithan parts of the Monarchy. His plan pointed to the maintenance of German ascendancy in the western provinces, which offended the Czechs and the Slavic populations, but was accepted by the Emperor. Belcredi withdrew from office, and Beust became President of the Cabinet.111

CE 20 July 1867
The Austrian Reichrath
Vienna, July 18th (Evening) – In to-day’s sitting of the Lower House of the Reichsrath, a debate took place upon a motion for an address to the Emperor, praying for the formation of a complete ministry for the western half of the empire. Baron von Beust declared that the desire for such a ministry was perfectly just, but that, at the present moment, a change with the existing provisional government might obstruct the settlement with Hungary. When the delegates from both portions of the empire had terminated their negotiations, the proposed ministry would then be formed from the majority of the house. A long and animated debate ensued, and the motion, which was opposed by the Tyrolese, Galician, and Sclavonian members, was finally withdrawn. (Reuter’s Telegram)

The misfortunes of Austria in the Prussian War was, in turn, an opportunity at Pesth, and it is to the credit of Deák that after the Austrian defeat at Sadowa, he made with Beust, the Dual Monarchy of 1867.

---

111 Taylor, p.143.
CE 2 September 1867

Austria

Vienna, 31st August. – It is stated that Herr Von Deak, Austrian Minister of Finance, and the Hungarian Ministers have come to an understanding on the proposal relating to the amount of public debt to be allowed to Hungary. [...] At a council of Ministers, held under the presidency of the Emperor, definitive resolutions have been arrived at respecting the question of the public debt and the budget for 1868.

This constitution accorded a parity of power to the two strongest races of the Empire, the Germans and the Magyars.

CE 6 September 1867

Austria and Hungary

A discussion has just arisen between the Camarade, the organ of the war department at Vienna, and the Honved, a publication of the Hungarians of 1848 and 1849, showing to what a point the spirit of separation is awakened in Hungary. The last-named journal demands the re-establishment of a national Hungarian army distinct from that of Austria, and says: -

The Austrian officers are the bravest in Europe, the Austrian artillery is the best, the Austrian strategy is as able and as developed as that in France. Where then is the cause of Austrian defeat? In the soldier. We have the machine, but the mainspring – the soul – is wanting. The Camarade desires that we should confide our fate, our national existence and our constitution to the Austrian army. We are not of that opinion; we are convinced that an Austrian national army and a Hungarian one marching hand in hand, would better defend the monarchy than the generals of Solferino and Sadowa. And as to what concerns our constitution, who will guarantee to us that some fine evening the superiors of the Camarade will not send us a battalion of chasseurs charged to post in the streets during the night immense placards bearing these words: “The constitution is suspended!”? The first guarantee of a constitutional country is an army having taken an oath to its constitution. We cannot ask the Austrian army to take an oath to that of Hungary; and that is why we desire a national army for ourselves and another for the other half of the empire.

Thus in Cisleithania, with the seventeen provinces of Austria, the Germans were predominant, in Transleithania, meaning Hungary, Croatia, Slavonia, Transylvania, and some frontier districts, the Magyars dominated. ‘You look after your barbarians,’ said Andrassy, the Hungarian, to Beust, the German, ‘and we will look after ours.’112 On the whole, Taylor holds that the Austrian citizen after 1867 had more civic security than the German and was in the hands of more honest and more capable officials than in France or Italy; in fact, he had an enviable existence, except that the state lacked national inspiration, and the dynasty could find no ‘mission’ to replace this. The German liberals offered a certain liberalism even in national affairs, and postulated a rather vague language equality

112 Fisher, p.1036.
in schools and public offices. The constitutional article left ambiguities to be disputed in the future; for it spoke both of the ‘provincial language’ and of the ‘language usual in the province’. The Czechs argued that Czech and German were the two ‘provincial languages’ of Bohemia and that therefore Czech could be used in schools and official matters throughout Bohemia; the Germans answered that Czech was not the ‘language usual in the province’ in the exclusively German areas. In the Bohemian Diet the German majority, who were also the liberal leaders in the Reichsrat, passed a decree forbidding the teaching of a second compulsory ‘provincial language’; they knew that all Czechs would learn German and wished to protect themselves from having to learn Czech.\footnote{Taylor, p.152.}

Though Bohemia had the form of local self-government in a semi-feudal diet, this possessed little real powers, and it was dominated by the province's German minority (the so-called Sudetens), who after 1867 considered it wiser to cooperate with fellow German nationalists in the Reichsrat at Vienna in order to maintain German ascendancy throughout the Austrian dominions.

\begin{flushleft}
CE 18 September 1867
Baron von Beust
Riechenberg [sic], Sept. 17\textsuperscript{th}. – Baron von Beust has arrived here and was received by the authorities of the town. In the speech he delivered he laid stress on the necessity of a reconciliation taking place between the national parties in Bohemia.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
Opposition of the Czech majority in Bohemia (and Moravia) was thus intensified, and to mark their resentment against the withholding of the national autonomy accorded to Hungary, their deputies absented themselves from the Liberal Reichsrat from 1867 to 1879.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
CE 20 September 1867
Vienna, 19\textsuperscript{th} Sept. – To-day’s papers contain the full text of Baron von Beust’s speech at Reichenburg, of which the following is a more extended summary than any previously telegraphed. His Excellency reviewed, retrospectively, the vents of 1866, and repudiated the suspicion that he had brought about the war. Then, referring to the internal affairs of the Empire he asserted the necessity of maintaining the German element in Austria, and expressed a hope that the nationalities composing the Austrian Empire would become reconciled with one another. He blamed the encouragement given by Russia to the Czech national party,\footnote{CE 27 August 1867. The Weekly Press. The Chronicle, under the heading of the “Moscow Conspiracy,” remarks that for a thoughtful observer the Slavonic demonstration at Moscow of far greater interest than the Paris Exhibition, which really presents nothing new, but merely a splendid collection of things well known, whereas the Moscow meeting is a sign to the whole Western Europe that a cloud is gathering in the far East, which will in a short time, perhaps, darken the entire horizon. Panslavism means, in the first place, a union of all the members of the Slavonic race, and,} and in conclusion, exhorted his hearers to lay aside their pessimism and to hope for a happy future for Austria.
\end{flushleft}
Czech patriots had found a new strategy to reassert themselves. Nationalists had successfully reached out and spread political awareness among the most rural regions of the country. What had originally been intended as a day of silent commemoration at the foot of the White Mountain outside of Prague, on 8 November 1867, quickly gathered momentum when thousands of nationalist-minded Czechs took part. The initiative was duly taken, and several demonstrations followed suit. A mass movement of protesters was seriously upsetting the Austrian authorities.115 This wave of protest, essentially a peaceful struggle for power, was not only idealistic in nature, it was also decidedly materialistic in content. The government in Vienna had increased taxation in Bohemia in March 1868, and by April, leading figures in the Young Czech Party prepared to instrumentalize the monster meetings to push a resolution of their own, combating their lack of influence on political measures in their own country. They demanded the dissolution of the Bohemian diet, the election of a new diet through general suffrage, and a constitution similar to Hungary’s. Meetings took place on a weekly basis throughout Bohemia, always held at locations soaked in historical meaning. The authorities reacted and forbade future meetings that had no written consent.

Inexperienced and ambitious, this new generation of Czech leaders now made decisions as fateful and as mistaken as the decisions of the Germans. Czech nationalism could have been a programme of democratic rights and instead, the sons of Czech peasants presented themselves as claimants to the inheritance of the dead Kingdom of Bohemia. The Hungarian example led Czech intellectuals to ally themselves with the feudal aristocracy, who demanded an autonomous Bohemia:

the nobility patronized Czech culture, the intellectuals espoused the rights of the Bohemian Crown. The nobility cared not for Czech emancipation, which could mean the emancipation of their own peasants. Clam-Martinic, head of the Bohemian noble party of interests, wanted an artificial feudal state they could run without interference from bureaucracy or liberalism or modern industry, and on their prompting the Czech leaders finally agreed to attend the Reichsrat. This gained them nothing except abuse from the Germans, and when they withdrew this too achieved nothing, only to make the course of business run smoother. The Czech boycott of the Reichsrat was approved, and Francis Joseph announced his intention of being crowned King of Bohemia as well as King of Hungary, whereupon the Reichsrat was closed. On June 8, 1867, Francis Joseph was crowned King of Hungary amid the acclamations of Pesth. The gift of money made to each Hungarian monarch on his coronation Francis Joseph distributed among the families of those who had fallen in fighting against him in 1849. A universal amnesty was proclaimed, no condition being imposed on the return of the exiles but that they should acknowledge the existing Constitution. Kossuth alone refused to return to his country so long as a Hapsburg should be its King.

---

CE 11 June 1867
The Hungarian Coronation
The Times regards the coronation at Bude as any event of European importance. It implies a reconciliation, not only of the Magyars with the Emperor, but of all Hungary with all Austria, of all Austria with all Germany, if the reconciliation is sincere. If the two leading nations of the Austrian monarchy reassert their ascendancy over the less civilized races, and Austria, by the side of Prussia, resumes her position as a first-rate power, Europe may look forward with calmness and confidence to the solution of the Eastern question.

Andrassy realized that a settlement in Bohemia would destroy Hungarian predominance, and spoke with contempt of the Bohemian programme. He diverted the Emperor to foreign politics; and there was no more talk of a coronation in Prague or a revision of the settlement of 1867. In a bid to counteract the growing tension between the nations, the Emperor granted an amnesty to political refugees of the empire, a gesture that in its generosity must have created a bit of a stir in the Irish reader well acquainted with some of the conditions of emigration at home.

---

117 Fyffe, p.529.
CE 28 June 1867

The Amnesty in Austria

The Austrian journals are unanimous in their appreciation of the Act of amnesty promulgated by the Emperor Francis Joseph. The Press of Vienna, for instance, says: “This act signifies that Austria desires no longer to send forth political refugees. Martyrdom for politics has come to an end in this Empire. The persons amnestied will return to their country, and will become convinced that its soil is no longer favourable to political agitation. The period of youthful illusions has passed away, and that of assiduous and indefatigable work has opened. The leaders of the emigration will be unable to preserve any influence, except upon condition that they take active part in the labours of the day, and devote their energies to the development of the prosperity of the country.”

At the same time, the circumstances surrounding the execution of Maximilian of Mexico, although overtly a crisis affecting solely the Austrian Empire, or more specifically the House of Habsburg, received not only prominence in print but possessed seemingly meaningful connotations regarding the fate of condemned Fenians in British gaols.

CE 28 June 1867

Victor Hugo’s Address to Juarez

The Guernsey Star publishes an impassioned appeal which Victor Hugo has addressed to the President of the Mexican Republic on behalf of the Emperor Maximilian. M.Hugo says: “[…] “Let the world behold this prodigious thing: the Republic holds in its power its assassin – an Emperor. When about to crush him, it perceives that he is a man, it lets him go, and says to him, ‘You are of the people like the others – depart.’ This, Juarez, will be your second victory. The first, that over usurpation, was glorious; the second, to spare the usurper, will be sublime. Yes, show to those kings whose prisons are crowded, whose scaffolds are encrusted with blood – to those kings of gibbets, of exiles, […] – to those who have a Poland, to those who have an Ireland, to those who have Havannah, to those who have Crete – […] to those emperors who so lightly cause men to be beheaded – show them how an Emperor’s head is spared. […]”

The tragic demise of the executed Habsburg is, of course, first greeted with commiseration and sympathy, and reflects also the general esteem in which the Austrian ruling family is held at this point in time in Ireland.119

---

118 CE 2 July 1867. Execution of the Emperor Maximilian. New York, July 1st. – The captain of an Austrian frigate has telegraphed from New Orleans to the Austrian Minister at Washington that the Emperor Maximilian has been executed, and that Juarez refuses to deliver up the body.

119 Relations with Great Britain were also favourable at the time: CE 27 July 1867. Vienna, July 26th. – The formal investiture of the Emperor with the Order of the Garter, took place yesterday evening. Upon the presentation of the insignia the Marquis of Bath delivered a speech, assuring his Majesty that Queen Victoria gladly availed herself of the present opportunity to confirm the alliance long existing between England and Austria. The Emperor in his reply laid greatful stress upon the value of the friendly assurance just received, and added, that no wish was nearer his heart than to see personal relations drawn closer that connected him with the Queen.
CE 4 July 4 1867
Editorial
The untoward fate which has befallen the Emperor naturally excites commiseration in Europe. His bravery, his amiable qualities, and his misfortunes are calculated to make deep impression on his behalf. We are apt to sympathise with brave and good men in adversity, even where they are palpably in the wrong, and the faults of Maximilian were, at the utmost, errors of judgement and weakness. He had no claim upon the Mexican people. He had no right to interfere in their quarrels, but he allowed himself to be tempted by the offer of a crown, the wild dream of founding a Latin Empire in the West, and became the tool of the ablest, but most unscrupulous, politician in the world. This was his first error. Imperial institutions were not in favour in Mexico. The meridian was unsuited to them. The people if they had a predilection for anything but anarchy, leaned rather to republicanism. Yet. After an experience of the country and the people, sufficient to have opened his eyes to the truth, Maximilian continued to dream on. Even when deserted by his faithless patron, he held with Austrian tenacity to his ambitious vision. He never had a chance against Juarez after the French ceased to hold the country under military rule. All the advantages were with his antagonist who was possessed of superior ability, the sympathy of the people, and the powerful support of the United States. His prolonged resistance, hopeless, though heroic, served only to irritate his adversaries and precipitate his fate. Destiny was against him, and even his good qualities – his courage, his generosity, his stubborn endurance, contributed to work his ruin. He has fallen with honour, and his history, though clouded with misfortune, will not be the least illustrious record of the House of Habsburg.120

However, it is the hypocrisy of moralists within the House of Lords regarding the ‘barbarous’ death sentence imposed in Mexico – as opposed to the lawful measures with equal effect imposed on Fenians – which galls the editor of the Examiner, and, no doubt, its readers.

CE 10 July 1867
Editorial
The short discussion that took place in the House of Lords last night relative to the execution of the Emperor Maximilian, illustrates a very marked peculiarity in the English character. However honest and sterling Englishmen may be in their

CE 8 November 1867. Austria and England – The Visit of Baron De Beust to London. We read in the Vienna Presse: - Baron de Beust went to London to enter into personal relations with the leading statesmen of England, or rather to renew those relations with them, for since the conference on Danish affairs he has been held in esteem in London. When it is considered that people here await with the greatest impatience the arrival of this politician, since it now rests with him to make the new machine of the state work, it is evident that important reasons must have determined him to spend even so short a period as two days in the English capital. Among those reasons the chief one is the desire to realise the long-promised understanding with the western powers, and to act in this way on Prussia through the medium of England.

120 CE 10 July 1867. The Death of Maximilian. The Austrian barque Adria, Captain Scopulich, arrived in the harbour on Monday, with wheat, for orders. The captain, having heard of the death of the Emperor Maximilian, hoisted his flag half-mast high, and on yesterday morning fired twenty-one minute guns in memory of the late Emperor. Other Austrian ships in the harbour have also had their flags half-mast high.
private affairs, in public they are the living representatives of the Pharisee. Public men in England are perpetually elevating their hands and eyes with pious horror at the misdeeds of their neighbours, while they regard with perfect imperturbability acts of their own not a whit less questionable. Measured by our nations of right and wrong, the execution of Maximilian was all that Lord Derby describes. The act was barbarous; probably it was gratuitous and unwise also. [...] What right has Lord Derby, of all the statesmen in Europe, to assume the tone of the moralist, and lecture the Mexicans upon outrages which have stained their victory? It is not many weeks since his lordship and his colleagues determined, after mature deliberation, not upon one but a series of executions which would have afforded a parallel and a precedent for the murder of Maximilian. If we do not allow ourselves to be deceived by the glitter of a crown, the differences between the Fenian leaders and the Austrian Prince are not so great that the principle which could be applied to the one would be inapplicable to the other. [...] Ask one of the Fenian leaders to define their position on Ireland, and he will reply that they are Irishmen – not strangers – who see their country rapidly declining in the social scale; who connect that decline [...] with the system of Government to which it is subjected; that they have come at the solicitation – at least with the tacit assent – of the vast majority of the Irish people, which is true, to endeavour to subvert the existing government, and substitute one that will have no hostile interests to distract its attention from Ireland, whose sympathies and traditions will be in unison with those of its subjects, and not with the sympathies and traditions of some other and greater land. [...] The English Government having defeated the efforts of these men, and taken the chief amongst them captive, proposed to inflict on them the penalty of death. What right, we ask, has that government to censure another Government which, having captured its enemy – and that enemy one who opposed Mexican arms not by Mexican but by French and Austrian bayonets – proposes to apply to him the principle England has herself adopted and to put him to death.

Fortunately, for Austria’s convivial contemporary image, there were no further unseemly incidents at this time. Quite the contrary, in fact, when newspapers were able to report on fascinating events more readily subscribed to the empire of festive pageants, royal celebrities, and a dashing military.

CE 23 August 1867
Napoleon at Salzburg

Salzburg, Aug. 18. – This morning, to-day being the Emperor Franz Josef’s birthday, high mass was performed in the Cathedral; the ministers, Court officials, and staff officers appearing in full uniform, and the court mourning being suspended for four and twenty hours. Strolling through the town after this special service was over, I noticed with some surprise that neither public buildings nor private houses were decorated with flags, evergreens, or festive devices of any kind whatever. At the Bahnhof, however, the tricolour was liberally displayed [...] At half-past four precisely the Emperor and Empress made their appearance, to the strains of Papa Hadyn [sic]. The Empress, who looked, if possible, lovelier than ever, was dressed in blue and white (Bavarian colours), and wore a plain black straw hat with a plume of black feathers. The Emperor was in a uniform of Field Marshal, relived by the ribbon and crachal of the Legion d’Honneur and the collar of the Golden Fleece. [...] Franz Josef and his beautiful consort advanced to the
side of the saloon, from which Napoleon and Eugenie, followed by Prince Metternich and the Princess d’Esling, promptly descended. [...] The Empresses stood for some minutes together, conversing in a very animated manner, and the contrast between them was remarkable. Elisabeth of Austria is more than a head taller than Eugenie of France; the former is as lithe and slender as a young poplar; the latter has grown stout of late, which makes her look shorter than she really is. [...] A thick black veil hid the Empress Eugenie’s face from view; the spirited, refined countenance of Elizabeth no envious covering concealed.

CE 23 August 1867
The Austrian Army

The country about Bruck-on-the-Leitha has long been a favourite ground for encamping and exercising troops. The troops encamped consist of eight regiments of infantry, four battalions of Jagers, eight regiments of cavalry, 16 batteries of artillery, three companies of engineers, a detachment of pioneers, and a company of the ambulance corps. [...] The town of Bruck is now crowded with generals and officers of the general staff, ordered there for a course of instruction, and who relieve each other regularly after a stay of a week or a fortnight. [...] The Emperor has frequently visited the camp, and Field-Marshal the Archduke Albert, Commander-in-Chief of the Army, has taken up his residence at Bruck, and has been present at all manoeuvres since their commencement.

Equally promising is a report on Austria’s positive attitude towards Poland, an old ally and hopefully a faithful one in the power struggle with Russia over Slavdom:

CE 20 September 1867
Austria and Poland

The 12th of September was celebrated at Tolkiew, Galicia, by the inauguration of a monument to Sobieski, it being the anniversary of the battle of Vienna, in which the polish hero saved Austria from Turkish conquest. This has been warmly remarked upon by the Debate, the semi-official journal of the cabinet of Vienna. The following is the conclusion of this article: -

If we wish to close that breach which has been opened in our sides; if we wish to give to liberty – and especially to liberty in Austria – new and valiant defenders, Austria must show herself grateful; she must hasten, for she has no right to temporise – to discharge an old debt; she must address herself to the deliverance of the Polish nation, groaning under the yoke which oppresses it; she must appear as its saviour, Poland formerly brought safety to her. Resuscitated Poland will be the strongest and most faithful ally of Austria against the invading flood of Panslavism, which in its vast and monotonous uniformity, threatens to extinguish every spark of liberty. 121 That is the finest homage which grateful Austria can pay to the memory of Sobieski, the hero King.

At this time the Emperor, it appears, can do no wrong and he moves matters most wonderfully not only on a political but also on a theological level, his

---

121 CE 20 September 1867. The Narodni Listy of Prague states that all the young Russian students attending the lectures at the Polytechnic School there have received orders to leave the city within twenty-four hours, if they cannot produce the certificate authorising their attendance.
popularity soaring with every proclamation. Although probably going against his conservative Catholic upbringing, the Emperor does not plan to thwart the ideals of a more modern age:

CE 19 October 1867
Austria
Vienna, Oct. 17th. – In the morning’s sitting of the Lower House of the Austrian Diet, the President rose and addressed the house relative to the autograph letter, which had been addressed by the Emperor to Cardinal Rausch. He said the declaration was made by the Emperor that no course opposed to constitutionalism could lead to any result, and that henceforth there must prevail in Austria an entire freedom of conscience, and perfect peace in all free and religious matters. It has caused a general show of rejoicing to ring through the entire empire. The President then called upon the house to cry “Hurrah for the Emperor!” which was done three times with the utmost enthusiasm.

CE 30 October 1867
Austria – The Concordat
The Austrian Chamber, in its sitting on the 23rd, not only adopted the law providing for civil marriages, but shortened the period proposed by the committee of interval before it was to come into operation from three months to forty-five days. The Poles voted for the bill with the Left and the Centre, and consequently the majority was very large. This is the first breach in the Concordat. Mixed unions between Christians of various sects are allowed unreservedly. If a priest refuses to bless a mixed marriage he is put aside and the civil marriage proceeded with. In short the whole jurisdiction of marriage affairs is taken from the religious tribunals and transferred to the civil. The bishops meanwhile continue to fulminate against the Reichsrath and the government. – London Express.

Thus, when the Emperor returns to his capital in November, after a sojourn in Paris, his highness is received most warmly by his people.

CE 9 November 1867
Return of the Emperor Francis Joseph to Vienna
Vienna, Nov. 8th. – The Emperor arrived here at 4.30 this afternoon on his return from Paris. His Majesty was received at the railway station by the chief military authorities of the capital. Deputations from both houses of the Reichsrath and by the burgomaster and common councillors. The burgomaster addressed his Majesty in a lengthy speech, laying special stress on the statement that the words

---

122 CE 17 December 1867. By Telegraph. Austria. Vienna, Dec. 16th – The Official Gazette of today publishes a report of the Minister of Public Instruction to the Emperor on the success which attended the educational exhibition held at Paris, at which two first prizes were adjudged to Austria. The report says – Austria thereby received testimony from abroad that her school system, despite the great divergency in the culture and language of the different races of the empire, is far better than has generally been supposed. The attention of the ministry will henceforth be directed towards effecting in this department, which has never been left at a standstill, further and more decisive progress, with a view to the more complete and perfect education and culture of the people. The Official Gazette states that the Emperor, on receiving this report, expressed satisfaction at its contents.
spoken by the Emperor in Paris had been most joyfully re-echoed throughout the entire Austrian Empire, for it was only by peace at home and abroad, and under the protection of liberal and popular laws, that the happiness of Austria could be secured. [...] The Emperor’s speech was received with enthusiastic applause. His Majesty drove in an open carriage through gaily decorated and crowded streets, and amidst continuous cheers.

The year closes with reports regarding bills on economic matters, and though it would have been gratifying to read of the success of an Irish exile in an Imperial Government, albeit on the continent, the Cork Examiner never called attention to the fact that Count Taaffe was of old Irish stock.

CE 18 December 1867
Austria
Vienna, December 16th. – In to-day’s sitting of the committee upon the budget, Baron Von Beust stated that it was the intention of the government to call together the delegates of the Hungarian Diet and the Austrian Reichsrath for a short session as early as possible. The chairman of the committee said that it was desirable the legislative assemblies of the empire should be made acquainted with the views of the committee on the pending questions, and he therefore wished to announce that the committee was strongly of opinion that the session of the Reichsrath would be prolonged. The chairman and the reporters of the committee enlarged on the general political reasons for this step, as well as upon the necessity that the budget should be settled, and that the bills relating to religious matters and those bearing on politics and economical questions should be discussed. Dr. Bergerspoke against the present convocation of the provincial Diets. The Galician members of the committee replied by pointing out that such convocations of the Diets was essential, in order to notify them the sanction given by the Emperor to the new constitution, and also that they might vote the budget. The committee upon the budget adopted the bill, requesting authorization to continue the provisional levy of rates and taxes, but only for the next three months.

Vienna, Dec. 17th. – The Debatte understands that Count Taaffe, and not Prince Carl Auerspeg, will probably be charged with the formation of the new Cabinets. The official Vienna Gazette is authorised to deny as altogether untrue the report now current as to an impending loan for military purposes, and that an increase of the tax upon coupons is intended.

2.3. The Spread of Liberalism

In the Austrian Empire, in 1868, after the creation of a bourgeois ministry, imperial policy was to bring the Czechs back into politics, in order to play them off against the Germans. Rieger, the most prominent Czech leader, followed wild courses, talking of Pan-Slavism in Russia. But Russian tsardom was at this time neither willing nor able to disrupt the Habsburg Monarchy, and, furthermore, Pan-Slavism estranged the Bohemian aristocracy. Eventually, the eighty absentees from
the Reichsrat declared their aims, asking for equal national rights for the Czechs in Bohemia, and for a reform of the electoral system.¹²³ The Declaration had been partly prompted by Taaffe, the deputy Prime Minister.

CE 1 January 1868
The Austrian Ministry

Vienna, 31st. – The official Gazette of this evening publishes a series of autograph letters addressed by the Emperor to the new ministers. Prince Auersperg is appointed president of the council. Count Taaffe deputy president. Herr Von Plener minister of commerce. Herr Von Hasner minister of education and public worship. Count Pottociki minister of agriculture. Dr. Giskrat minister of the interior. Dr. Herbst minister of Justice. Herr Von Breitt minister of finance, and Dr. Orger minister without a portfolio. Count Taaffe receives the grand cross of the Leopold order. The Emperor expresses his warm thanks to Prince Auersperg for the service he had rendered as President of the Upper House of the Reichsrath, and confers the order of the Iron Crown of the second class upon Dr. Giskra in acknowledgment of the ability displayed by him as president of the lower house. Herr Von Becke received the Iron Crown order of the first class, and in a letter to Herr von Hife, minister of justice in the late cabinet, the Emperor bestows him the Order of the Iron Crown of the first class, and reserves the opportunity of again employing him in the public service. The Gazette also publishes a law, counter signed by the new ministry, and dated 31st ult., respecting the continued provisional law of rates and taxes, together with the estimates for the State expenditure to the end of March, 1868.

Taaffe¹²⁴ was an ‘Emperor’s man’, an aristocrat of Irish origin, German in that his estates were in Tyrol, and with Irish ingenuity, he could adapt himself to German liberals and Czech intellectuals, and got on with them as well as with the Emperor himself. And he relied on time, rather than on energy, to provide solutions for the work on a system of national equality. Having no estates in Bohemia, he escaped the conservatism of Bohemian ‘historic’ rights and had no sympathy with federalism.¹²⁵ His aim was for Czechs to acknowledge the unity of Austria by attending the Reichsrat, in return for fair treatment in Bohemia. However, this was not a simple conflict between Czech and German, it was a clash between the historic Kingdom of Bohemia and the equally historic ‘Holy Roman Empire of the

¹²³ Taylor, pp.153ff.
¹²⁵ Taylor, p.154.
German Nation’ which had included Bohemia. The elder Plener, Finance Minister under Schmerling, expressed the German position: ‘The wishes of the Czechs in Bohemia are a sentence of death to the Germans.’ These wished, as they are a minority in Bohemia, to form a whole with the Germans of the other provinces through the central parliament, willing to sacrifice the Ruthenes to the Poles, the Slavs and Rumanians to the Magyars, because Ruthenes and Slovaks could be Polonized and Margyarized – ‘but Germans can’t be Czechized.’ The supposed danger to the Germans in Bohemia produced a later trend in Austrian politics, riots in the streets of Vienna. Meanwhile, a post-revolutionary phase was making itself felt in Ireland also. A pragmatic approach was taken to the obvious differences in the quality of life as seen in Ulster and the rest of Ireland, and it was thanks to liberal newspapers such as the Cork Examiner that positive and constructive ideas were initiated to bring the economy of the south up to standard.

CE 30 July 1867
The State of Ireland
The following are the speeches of Mr. Maguire and Mr. Monsell in Friday night’s debate on the condition of Ireland:

Mr. Maguire – Sir, am quite ready to admit the kindly and candid disposition of the hon. baronet who has just spoken, and I earnestly wish that he and his hon. friend from Ulster, whose constituents enjoy so many advantages, would, without prejudice, take a practical view of the state of things in the three other provinces of Ireland; for those who know anything of Ireland understood the reasons why Ulster had prospered so greatly when compared with the southern provinces. Thus, for instance, the land question was settled in Ulster. There the occupiers enjoyed the protection of the custom of tenant-right, while there was no such protection – no such right in Connaught, Leinster, or Munster (hear, hear). In Ulster the church question was settled, on a better basis certainly, than in the other provinces. The Established Church enjoyed its revenues, and the Presbyterians had their Regium Donum. Then, as to the education question, the Protestants and the Presbyterians of the north monopolised the collegiate institutions of the province. Added to which advantages, the people of Ulster possessed important branches of manufacture, which were, to a certain extent, owing to the fact that the Presbyterians and Protestants of Ulster had been the objects of special favour and protection, of the solicitude of the English crown and government, while the people of the west and south had been marked out – not in recent times, it is true – for plunder, oppression and persecution (hear, hear), of constant and continued misgovernment (hear, hear).

One of the areas sought out for development, particularly for rural Ireland, was tourism.

126 Taylor, p.159/60.
Excursus: Tourism in Victorian Ireland

The tourist industry meant that one could develop the country on a regional level, especially the most western and southern regions most affected by the Famine and emigration and lacking the possibility of industrial development. Linking these regions with important towns and harbours through a network of roads and rails and telegraph poles proved the next logical step and saw the country unified by modern means of transport and communication. Queen Victoria paid four visits to Ireland, her first visit on August 3rd, 1849, when the royal yacht docked at Cobh in Cork Harbour, and, in her honour, Cobh was renamed Queenstown. ‘As could be expected, the visit was a lavish affair with troops lining the entire route during her tour of Cork city.’ While in Cork, Queen Victoria also viewed the newly opened Queen’s College before continuing the royal Irish tour with a visit to Dublin. Queen Victoria’s second visit was in 1853 when she visited the Irish International Exhibition at Dublin’s Leinster House. In August 1861, Victoria toured the south of Ireland, spending several days in Killarney as a guest of the local Kenmare and Herbert families, followed by another brief stay in Dublin, where the royal party stayed at the Vice-regal Lodge.

Queen Victoria’s son, Edward Prince of Wales, was a frequent visitor to Ireland. Aged just sixteen and a half, the young royal made his first visit to Ireland in 1858 when he gave his name to the Prince of Wales route - a coastal tour from West Cork to Killarney which if the prince didn’t discover himself was certainly discovered for him by the tourism interests of the area. Edward’s military connections and his love of horses saw him return to attend certain events such as the 1868 Irish Grand National held before a capacity crowd at Punchestown racecourse.

The Prince of Wales Route to Glengarriff and Killarney.

CE 4 June 1879

128 Horgan, p.14/15: In April 1900, Queen Victoria made her fourth and final visit to Ireland. The visit, lasting three weeks, got underway when the royal yacht Victoria and Albert sailed into Kingstown Harbour and berthed at Victoria Wharf. While flagged as a courtesy visit the royal visit also had the objective of trying to defuse Irish opposition to the Boer war. The elderly Victoria stayed within the Dublin region making Daily carriage rides throughout various parts of Dublin while evenings were spent dining with selected guests at the Vice-regal lodge. Despite an undercurrent of Irish nationalism, the reaction of the Irish public to these visits was generally favourable with thousands turning out to welcome her.
129 Idem, p.15: Following the death of his mother, the newly crowned King Edward again visited Ireland in 1903 visiting Dublin, Belfast, Connemara and Cork. The royal party travelled on the lavish state railway coach from Cork to Queenstown before departing. The journey of 12 miles was the only trip by royalty on the state railway coach.
The through route to Killarney opened on Monday, and, as we are glad to see intelligent enterprise successful, we have much pleasure in saying that the number of passengers availing themselves of the advantages offered was large beyond expectation. Indeed it would be surprising if this route did not turn out remarkably attractive, on account of its cheapness and convenience, as well as of the facility it affords of enjoying some of the most delightful scenery in Ireland. It is not only exceedingly cheap, but, working in connection with the Great Southern and western Railway, it affords all the advantages of circular ours. For example, the traveller may leave by the Bandon railway, proceed to Killarney and return by the Great Southern and Western to Cork, or he may go on to Dublin, while from Dublin he may visit Killarney, branching off at mallow and coming to Cork by the Bandon line, and so on. To all these conveniences are added, that of being able to make halt at a number of the most interesting spots. To those who have not yet seen the delightful country which lies between Bantry and Killarney, we have only to say that there lies before them in this trip a treat of the most extraordinary kind. From Bantry to Glengarriff is a drive of surpassing beauty, revealing as it does so many of the most striking features of that noble bay. Glengarriff itself is too famous and too admittedly lovely to need dwelling on. From Glengarriff to Kenmare, and from Kenmare to Killarney, the traveller is brought, by mountain roads filled with pictures of sublimity and grace. It is superfluous to say that Killarney offers him an unending variety of loveliness. We are quite satisfied that auspicious as has been the opening of this route it is only in its infancy, and that some day it will be found, as it deserves to be, rivalling in the rush upon its resources the Highland roads or Alpine passes.

The ‘fledgling’ Irish tourism industry made great use of these visits for its own intents and purposes, as royal visits presented ‘valuable marketing opportunities and helped raise the consciousness of Ireland amongst would-be travellers of the time.’

In particular they made it fashionable for Victorians to go on holiday in a country where news of famine and land wars seemed to dominate to the exclusion of all else. The manager in which hotels were quick to exploit any royal connections for their own commercial benefit indicated this. Advertisements regularly made play on any patronage by the English royalty or failing that, made

---

130 Idem, p.15.
131 CE 16 August 1867. The Tourist in Ireland. (From the Dublin Evening Mail). The Cork Examiner is surprised that “in the most glorious season for touring in Ireland we ever remember we should have few or no tourists.” Our contemporary might write the same of the north and west as of the south. […] Has the artificial triumphed in competition with the natural? Does Paris, with its glasshouse and garden, and kiosks and curiosities, and foreign visages and costume, and glare, and heat, and dust, and fatigue, recommend itself more than the green sod and foliage of soft and numerous hues, a varied and soothing landscape, the boldest cliffs, and long, health-bringing rollers from the ocean? […] Does not every one declare that all exhibitions are unendurably hot, irritating, tiresome, and unsatisfactory? […] But the Cork Examiner assigns as the more serious cause of the absence of pleasure prties from Ireland, the “bogie of Fenianism.” We are reminded by the remark that sympathetic phraseology, mischivously misplaced, has done more to produce in England the absurd idea that Ireland is unsafe for the tourist than the ridiculous antics of the actual “boys in green?” The difficulty contended with is not to show the Fenians to be powerless, but that the general population are peaceably disposed, and that all things proceed regularly and quietly, in the remotest districts, as of old.
mention of visits by any of the royal houses of Europe. In Killarney, the royal Victoria Hotel proudly displayed the register containing the signature of the Prince of Wales, its most famous guest, and regularly used its “royal” connections as a weapon against the rival Great Southern and Western Railway Hotel.132

The Victorian era also marked the integration of local worlds into larger entities, and, in the case of Ireland, loyalty to queen and empire was frequently matched by a loyalty to Rome and the spiritual empire the Roman Catholic Church was building at the time.133 But also the revolution in communications, reflected in the growth of newspapers, evident in Ireland as elsewhere with the establishment of local and national newspapers, brought home the reportage of local events as well as the in-depth coverage of battles in Africa. The newspaper was also a vehicle for advertising, hotels and tourist resorts among others. Travel and tourism, of course, at this time remained “the preserve of an elite in society who had both the time and the means to indulge themselves.”134

Literacy and artistic tastes played a key role in dictating the travel fashions of Victorians. Ireland was visited by many of the leading British literary figures of the time- Sir Walter Scott, William Makepeace Thackeray, Lord Alfred Tennyson and numerous lesser-known writers. In writing about their travels in Ireland, they brought Ireland into the drawing rooms of the new travelling public.135

After the Famine, numerous travel accounts of Ireland were published, with Paschal Grousset’s ‘Ireland’s Disease: The English in Ireland’ (1887) remaining a

132 Horgan, p.15.
133 CE 1 January 1868. The Prince of Wales and the Garibaldians. An Italian journal asserts that the Prince of Wales lately sent a large sum to the Garibaldi Committee in retaliation for the support which Cardinal Antonelli has given the Fenians. The osservatore Romano publishes the following contradiction of this statement on the part of the Cardinal: - “Whether the Prince of Wales has, or has not, subscribed in aid of the Garibaldians is of little consequence, as this incident would not change into victories the disgraceful defeat they have sustained from a handful of soldiers whom they had previously insulted. But it is simply ridiculous to attribute to his eminence Cardinal Antonelli the thought of succouring the Fenians. The Italian journals should at least invent lies with more savour of probability.” This contradiction might have carried some weight, only that its appearance was simultaneous with the solemnization of a funeral Mass at the church of St.Andrea delle Frati for the repose of the three Fenians executed at Manchester. – Pall Mall Gazette.
134 Horgan, p.17. Cf. CE 16 November 1889.Supplement to the Cork Examiner. Extraordinary Female Traveller. Madame Ida Pfeiffer, the extraordinary female traveller, awakened curiosity in every important country in the world. […] She lived in Vienna, Austria, and was forty-five years of age when she began her travels by a journey to the Holy Land. She was regarded as a crazy enthusiast, for she was obliged to go alone, and with small means.[…] She studied languages and botany. By the sale of her well-written books, and geological and botanical specimens, she obtained money for new journeys. Wherever she went she was ready to rough it in any manner, and readily adapted herself to the customs of any country. […] She died in Vienna, October 27th 1858, of a fever contracted in Madagascar. She had not expected to die in her own land, for she once wrote: “And should death overtake me sooner or later during my wanderings, I shall meet his approach in all resignation, and be deeply grateful to the Almighty for the hours of holy beauty in which I have lived and gazed upon His wonders.”
135 Idem, p.31.
‘penetrating travelogue and analysis of Ireland at the height of the land war’ by an exiled French journalist and ex-Communard. Similarly, Marie-Anne de Bovet’s ‘Three Months Tour Of Ireland’ (1891) provides an interesting perspective on late Victorian Ireland, writing about the social conventions of the time. Jiri Guth, featured among even more illustrious writers, figures in a publication brought out to commemorate Cork City as European Capital of Culture 2005. Guth, later known as Jiri Guth-Jarkosky, a Czech prose writer and journalist, wrote a number of articles on his travels around Europe, writing here, in 1895, on Cromwell-Cork compared to Dublin and Belfast, and its lack of sights.

On an evening in autumn I arrived from Youghal, in Cork, the third city in Ireland. It is located directly at the opposite end of the island from Belfast. [...] There were times when the English chronicler Camden claimed about this city and the surrounding region that it swarmed with all kinds of brigands, so as the citizens were forced to keep a guard constantly positioned at their door, which door they shut not only during the night but also at mealtimes and while at prayer. In those times the people would not allow a stranger to come into the city while carrying a weapon and would venture out for a walk solely in the company of a guard. Apparently they distrusted their neighbours, which is why they entered into marriage only amongst themselves. The latter circumstance would in fact worry us very little even now, after 300 years, as – it cannot be helped, and to tell the truth - the local girls are not worth a penny. This notwithstanding, we did not need for our security either sabres or mortars, not to mention cannons, significantly unlike Oliver Cromwell who on capturing the city ordered all bells to be recast as guns. And when the burgomaster, possibly together with representatives of the clergy, timidly objected, Cromwell replied entirely in earnest: And why not? Wasn’t gunpowder invented by monks to? The chronicle does not mention the gentleman’s response. Cromwell must have cast a great number of guns there, considering that already since the seventh century the place has been renowned for the piety of its inhabitants: up to 700 priests and monks used to live there then. These days, the number is considerably lower as the area has grown substantially impoverished. The spilled blood, which streams through the successive history of Cork in a manner similar to the rest of the entire Erin, has been paid for – among others – by King George II whose statue disappeared several years ago from the Grand Parade: after a long search, it was found in the mud of the river Lee.

We shall not dwell long in Cork: it has nothing to offer, excepting perhaps a nice contrast which this old town makes with Anglo-Saxon Belfast. The city is a peculiar melange of new, wide streets with streets old and crooked, nonetheless all largely dirty. In Belfast, a general stir and the modern quest for money, here a life lazy, apparently careless, Irish. In Dublin, both of these aspects seem to be

136 Cf. Marie-Anne de Bovet, on the horrors of Cork architecture and the profession of begging, in Joachim Fischer and Grace Neville, (eds.) As Others Saw Us, Cork Through European Eyes (Cork, 2005), pp.184-189.
137 Joachim Fischer, As Others Saw Us, xv: ‘He was a collaborator of Pierre de coubertin and founding member of the International Olympic Committee. After the foundation of Czechoslovakia in 1918, he became Master of Ceremonies to its first President, Tomas Garrigue Masaryk.’
138 Fischer, As Others Saw Us, pp. 190-197.
combined somehow. Faces here are smiling and lively, intelligent, and you are unwittingly reminded of what you have heard and read about the origin of this people and about the immigration from the southern shores. The immigrants are recalled mainly by the black eyes and black hair, notably different from the red beards and greyish eyes of the Anglo-Saxons. Moreover, the Irishman is contemplative and has little energy, same as his ancestors in the distant south, and appears to be similarly inimical to work. Cork has a flavour of a southern town (and together with it a great number of Irish towns in this region and also in the west, for instance Limerick or Galway) in regard to an additional fact that the inhabitants seem to live more in the street than at home. Despite Cork having some 80,000 inhabitants, the city looks as if lifeless and without any commerce. However, its location is simply ideal for international trade: a remarkably beautiful port of Queenstown which would accommodate the entire British fleet and which all-English transatlantic ships stop at, and yet not a soul in sight; and if any commerce still happens it diminishes from year to year. We can document this assertion by figures at hand.

Some attribute the Irish idleness to temperament, the fecklessness of a race incapable to make advantage even of the most favourable conditions, others on the other hand claim that completely different reasons are to blame for the fall of Ireland into decrepitude and that if the Irish could govern themselves, they would show an entirely different kind of endurance and energy. Some arguments can be supplied for the former claim, while the latter is still waiting to be proven after Gladstone and his supporters have managed to break through with their home rule. Apart from that, however, Belfast prospers, in spite of the conditions of its growth being so much like the conditions here. But we are once more becoming entangled in the spider-webs of politics: let us leave these tenets promptly!

Cork-life is chiefly concerned about two ideas: eating and joking, to quote a description of the merry wind of the Corkonians provided by Arthur Murphy in 1748; which is roughly to say that these two notions - food and lightheartedness - which, all in all, represent leading ideas of the entire humanity - managed to powerfully spurt out above the usual level in Cork. The idea of sweet idleness is still highly valued; nonetheless, it appears that the situation is much worse with regard to food. People have no money to obtain it, and this is proven by the Irish poverty every so often pulling at the tail of our coat. Beggary is a well-developed occupation in this town as well, and it may be that if we stayed here longer we would get to know about a few of those poor widows akin to the one in Dublin who, when arrested for begging was discovered to harbour in the secrecy of her shift 120 pounds sterling in gold and silver, together with approximately 7,000 guldens’ worth of other kinds of money in paper and copper, and next to that a couple of boiled potatoes, a handful of peas and similar trifles of a beggar. What is interesting is that Protestants put the blame for the extraordinary development concerning beggary in Ireland on the Catholics. This is to be understood as a claim that Catholics do not pursue charity in a systematic manner and merely give without considering whether the need is real, while in protestant England - where begging has been outlawed - charity, to a large extent run by private hands, is properly regulated. Hence it happens that an Irish beggar, knowledgeable about this trade, has a decent income equivalent to the middle classes, and on top of that no work and no concerns. It is as if the Irish had begging in their blood: they extend
their hand as time lies heavy on it, especially when they see a stranger; at least one out of ten will be bound to take pity on their rags and their dirt.\textsuperscript{139} […]

In Cork neither can we keep from acquiring the impression of general ruin, which permeates Ireland in all places of human presence. With great interest we examine modern buildings of which particularly the Cathedral of St Finbar stands out; it was built in the style of Tudor Gothic and completed in 1870. Then various public houses, etc.

Besides these individual accounts of tours in Ireland, the development of guide books in the conventional sense of the word have begun. The development of the railways, with a vested interest in the promotion of tourism, required more detailed and reliable sources of information for the tourist, such as ‘Murray’s Handbook to Ireland’ and ‘lack’s Guide to Ireland,’ the two best-known guidebooks of the time. Both updated on a regular basis, they carried detailed accounts of what to see and do, and featured extensive tourist-related advertisements.\textsuperscript{140} Equipped with, no doubt, one these good books, Richard Bermann visits Cork and south-west Ireland in 1914.\textsuperscript{141}

It was a dull foggy morning. We are standing on the boat deck, at a spot, which is pleasantly warmed by the stream engine. In front of us, on the unpleasant third-class deck (it must be permitted again) stand twenty Irish boy scouts in uniform, which provocatively Irish-green neck scarves and yellow embroidered harps on their jacket sleeves, not to mention the green shamrock leaves. Embellished with these national symbols, and above all feeling very important because of them, the tall boys stand there Irish nostrils wide to draw in the scent of their country. Over there it begins. A green strip of coastline; it kindly opens up and lets the steamer in. We are entering a labyrinth of canals and bays, of islands and foothills. It is like a Norwegian fjord, just not as a resolute, softer, cosier.

The sea pays the land a friendly visit and runs deeply into it. Small towns with big cathedrals stand out on the banks and every place has its pleasant suburbs.

\textsuperscript{139} Cf. also E.Lynn Linton, About Ireland (London, 1890): pp.9ff. ‘Those who plead for the landlords who have been so cruelly robbed and ruined are weak-voiced and reticent compared to the loudly crying advocates for the peasantry. English tourists run over for a fortnight to Ireland, talk to the jarvies, listen to the peasants themselves, forbear to go near any educated or responsible person with knowledge of the facts and a character to lose, and accept as gospel everything they hear. There is no check and no verification. Pat and Tim and Mike give their accounts of this and that, bedad! and tell their piteous tales of want and oppression. The English tourist swallows it all whole as it comes to him, and writes his account to the sympathetic Press, which publishes as gospel stories which have not one word of truth in them. In fact, the term “English tourist” has come to mean the same as gobemouche in France; and clever Pat knows well enough that there is not a fly in the whole region of fable which is too large for the brutal Saxon to swallow. […] Only the other day a young Irishman who has to do with the land question was mistaken for a brutal but credulous Saxon by the jarvey who had him in tow. Consequently, Pat plied his fancied victim with the wildest stories of this man's wrongs and that lone widow's sufferings. When he found out his mistake he laughed and said: “Begorra, I thought your honour was an English tourist!”

\textsuperscript{140} Idem, p.32.

\textsuperscript{141} Fischer, As Others Saw Us, xv: ‘Richard Berman (1883-1939) was born in Vienna and published in Expressionist periodicals, also under the pen name of Arnold Höllriegl. He had to emigrate to the USA in the 1930s and died in Saratoga Springs.’ Text featured, pp.212-221.
with big houses and neat gardens. Then the bay becomes narrower, turns into a canal, finally into an estuary. Between green hills (one understands immediately why Ireland is called the emerald isle) lies a city. Charming. The steamer stops. The city is still there. Perhaps for too long. Fine, we’ll get out. One notices that there is a main street; the hotel that adorns it is just somewhat mediocre. Nevertheless one gets cleaned up and goes out. So this is the city of Cork in the south of Ireland! There is a main street and then another main street. The latter is called the Grand Parade; my tourist guidebook says it is a very beautiful street and its main ornament is the statue of King George II; but the statue is not there any more, since the loyal Irish subjects chucked it in the river one day. It was not very nice of them, for even if they were of a rebellious disposition, they should have left the poor tourist this little bit of attraction. However, what does one possess a guidebook for, but to provide one with the necessary sights? So what does my green-covered guidebook with the many illustrations say?

It maintains that St Finbar founded an abbey in the seventh century. Hm, exciting! Furthermore, Desmond McCarthy, King of Munster, submitted to the English King Henry II in 1172. Of course, as soon as one sets foot in Ireland, the old kings are at their tricks again: we have come across a key concept here. Nonetheless I cannot view King Desmond McCarthy; he is well and truly dead in all his glory. The guidebook suggests that I could look at the Bank of Ireland building. Or the house of the ‘Country Club’. It is a difficult choice; finally I decide to go to the Catholic Cathedral and am rewarded with a pleasant surprise. The church was only built in 1879 and is nevertheless an important work of art. In Ireland there are - apart from picturesque ruins - not very many Old Catholic churches; most cathedrals were rebuilt after the Catholic emancipation, and it appears not always with great success. This church here, a brand new although Romanesque one and – oh wonder! - in spite of it all a beautiful church, wants to say something and say it loudly: ‘I am the old church of the Irish apostles - I am the new church, which has not died, and rules over Cork and over the whole island!’ The sacristan says the church is one of the most beautiful specimens of the Old French Gothic style. He is wrong but I still give him his three pence. He brings me a book and says I must write my name in it. A gentleman like me would not come to his church every day. (A dark supplication bothers me: should the man have noticed from my pronunciation of England that I am a foreigner? I had banked so much on Ireland! The people here speak poor English - I also speak poor English, so they could have had the grace to take me for a real Irishman.)

After the visit to the church another embarrassing break occurs in the sequence of sights and pleasures in Cork. This excited and exciting provincial city continues to lie on the banks of the river Lee and does not stir. What can a man do but go for lunch? The pubs are terribly tempting. After a walk through the main street, or rather both main streets, we sit down at a passably laid table: the Irish national dishes may begin. But no, the menu is exactly like the one at Lyons in London, where I got an upset stomach. I can have roast beef, a steak either under or over cooked, a large choice of potatoes, a cup of tea. It doesn’t cost any more than a luxury breakfast in a decent first-rate German wine restaurant. Anyway if you pour spicy Worcester sauce on an English lunch, then spread mustard on it, then sprinkle it with pepper, on top it with fruit jelly, you will finally get a bit of taste into this innocuous, plain stuff.

Every now and again I look at my watch, but it is still not tomorrow morning. I stroll through the streets and discover two categories: dirty and boring. The shops are being shut in front of my nose because it is one of those countless
Irish holidays. Suddenly, I see a poster: somewhere out there a horse show is being held. Ha, I almost storm on to the deck of an electric tram. Once again we travel through very charming suburbs where the gardens enclose Italian vegetation but under a dull sky. A fenced in area. Beggars. Crowds. Tickets, please. I go through the revolving door and realise suddenly that I am wrong. I come straight from London to Cork and demand - because there is no suitable train out of it - that Cork, the south of Ireland should be as lively and interesting as this bustling, roaring London. Whereas, I am in a country where proper pigs are fattened and pedigree horses bred. Such a country needs market towns and they have to look just like Cork. In the big open square, countless agricultural machines swirl around, steam engines pound. Rakes, flails, scythes move rhythmically. It is a colourful picture. Well-fed farmers with sports caps stand matter of factly in front of the machines, form small groups and watch.

The horses are standing in the big wooden sheds; they will be presented in the ring shortly. From another shed we hear loud crowing - Irish prize poultry are certainly not small. My companion is unhappy. He had expected something sensational, at least some of the hustle and bustle of the funfair. No, it just isn’t there. One single stand sells artificial flowers, and a few country ladies are buying these flowers. Their great-grandsons will still have them in their inherited vases. Apart from that, seed stores, fertilisers. A bar, in which men legs apart drink whiskey without passion but with dedication. A small tea tent for the ladies. That’s it. And yet all Cork is out here. […]

The English are so afraid that in the event of a European war the food supply to their industrial cities could be cut off. […] Healthy agriculture in Ireland protects London and Birmingham from the danger of war better than a hundred dreadnoughts, which cannot feed the hungry bellies of British citizens. […] Looking at it from this point of view, all good Irish men and women and even more all good English people should be in favour of filling in the famous lakes of Killarney and of planting potatoes in the reclaimed land. This laudable plan should be executed, but please, not this week. For I am about to go to Killarney and want to have evergreen, wildly fragrant woods and dark waters. I will dream of them. After seeing the horse show I am thoroughly in favour of having agricultural centres such as Cork – but I think that after a day in Cork one has to have a decent animated sleep and dream about something else. No fervent Irish patriot can expect me to dream of potatoes.

While early visitors to Ireland were drawn mainly from the industrial cities of England,¹⁴² such as London, Manchester and Birmingham, in time, smaller

¹⁴² CE 26 August 1867. The Tourist Season in Ireland (from the Star). Now that all the world is on a tour, or about to start on one, we should like to say a word to those who have not taken wing, in reference to a country which deserves more of our holiday patronage than it receives. Ireland is not altogether made up of bogs, Fenians and landlords. Persons who judge of it from the accounts in the papers are likely to think that the pastimes of the peasantry are dangerous to an unaccustomed traveller, and that the perils to be undergone from the stupidity of detectives, or the loyalty of Orangemen, would prevent a journey through the island attended with a reasonable amount of enjoyment. Let us disabuse the. Nature despises politics, and a landscape or a seascape never suffers from a polemical cloud. The romantic scenery of Killarney remains after the “rising,” and all the drums and fifers that ever played the Boyne water will not remove the wild charm from the giant’s Causeway. Besides, those spurts of treason do not indicate the normal condition of things. If anything, at this moment, except perhaps in the north, Ireland is too quiet. […] Cork is not an interesting place in itself, and the tower which now overshadows the grave of Father Prout is as ugly and contemptible a concern as was ever idealised out of the commonplace by a poet. Let the
numbers of tourists from France and Germany\textsuperscript{143} supplemented them. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, there was a noticeable increase in American visitors\textsuperscript{144} reflecting, foremost, the emergence of a new world power, and secondly, many of these Americans were taking advantage of the transatlantic stop-off at Queenstown, to include Ireland on their European tour.\textsuperscript{145}

\textbf{Excursus: Travelling in Austria}

A brief look at travelogues of the period, essentially turn-of-the-century publications designed for the English-speaking, primarily the American market, allows one a glimpse at the re-emergence of the image of Austrian bonhomie, richly imbued with gaiety and culture, which did much to colour enhance the image of Austrians on a political as well as on a quite pedestrian level.\textsuperscript{146} These images proved to have lasting quality and may not only be detected in ordinary newsworthy articles on the empire, but also rather generously in actual reports on the Great War. One example chosen is Bayard Taylor’s “First Impressions of the Capital”\textsuperscript{147}

I have at last seen the thousand wonders of this great capital, this German Paris, this connecting-link between the civilization of Europe and the barbaric magnificence of the East. [It] reminds me of the never-ending crowds of London or the life and tumult of our scarcely less active New York. The morning of our traveller proceed from Cork to Youghal – a quaint old spot, where tradition has it that Spenser read part of the “Faerie Queen” to Raleigh (they show you the tree under which the reader and his listener sat), and where Sir Walter is said to have planted the first potato – the root, according to Sydney Smith, of a great of population and consequent misery in Ireland. […] Why does not Mr.Cook turn his speculative glance across to Dublin, or to Conemara, and organise a voyage round the coast or up the country, or through the middle, and show the British citizen a place which can never be united to this kingdom until there is a closer interchange of sympathy and acquaintance?

\textsuperscript{143} CE 2 September 1867. Popular Feeling in the South of Ireland. A correspondent of Saunder’s News-Letter, writing from Tipperary, gives the results of his observation of popular feeling, in the shape of answers to two questions – 1st, are the people loyal at heart; 2\textsuperscript{nd}, whether the Fenian conspiracy is at an end. He states that the people, by hereditary instinct, are attached to the Crown, and believe that if the sovereign were oftener seen in Ireland this latent loyalty would be evoked. […] The examples of treachery disclosed by the recent trials – the known danger of being connected with the conspiracy – the hopelessness struggling for a week against the giant resources of England – these and other facts are known and appreciated by the inmates of the humblest cottage – and it would excite surprise to one unacquainted with the peasantry, the extent of their knowledge not merely of local but of Continental politics.

\textsuperscript{144} Horan, p.36.

\textsuperscript{145} Horan, p.32: ‘Writers like Plummer F. Jones’ A Ramble in Ireland (1909) marked a contrast to the more formal Victorian English writers.’


\textsuperscript{147} W. Halsey (ed.), Seeing Europe with Famous Authors (10 Volumes), Volume V: Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Switzerland, Part One, Francis (London, 1914).
arrival we sallied out from our lodgings in the Leopoldstadt to explore the world before us. Entering the broad Praterstrasse, we passed down to the little arm of the Danube which separates this part of the new city from the old. A row of magnificent coffee-houses occupy the bank, and numbers of persons were taking their breakfasts in the shady porticos. The Ferdinand's Bridge, which crosses the stream, was filled with people; in the motley crowd we saw the dark-eyed Greek, and Turks in their turbans and flowing robes. Little brown Hungarian boys were going around selling bunches of lilies, and Italians with baskets of oranges stood by the sidewalk.

[...] The Altstadt, or “old city,” which contains about sixty thousand inhabitants, is completely separated from the suburbs, whose population, taking the whole extent within the outer barrier, numbers nearly half a million. It is situated on a small arm of the Danube and encompassed by a series of public promenades, gardens and walks, varying from a quarter to half a mile in length, called the “Glacis.” This formerly belonged to the fortifications of the city, but as the suburbs grew up so rapidly on all sides, it was changed appropriately to a public walk. The city is still surrounded with a massive wall and a deep wide moat, but, since it was taken by Napoleon in 1809, the moat has been changed into a garden with a beautiful carriage-road along the bottom around the whole city.

It is a beautiful sight to stand on the summit of the wall and look over the broad Glacis, with its shady roads branching in every direction and filled with inexhaustible streams of people. The Vorstaedte, or new cities, stretch in a circle, around beyond this; all the finest buildings front on the Glacis, among which the splendid Vienna Theater and the church of San Carlo Borromeo are conspicuous. The mountains of the Vienna forest bound the view, with here and there a stately castle on their woody summits.

There is no lack of places for pleasure or amusement. Besides the numberless walks of the Glacis there are the imperial gardens, with their cool shades and flowers and fountains; the Augarten, laid out and opened to the public by the Emperor Joseph; and the Prater, the largest and most beautiful of all. It lies on an island formed by the arms of the Danube, and is between two and three miles square. From the circle at the end of the Praterstrasse broad carriage-ways extend through its forests of oak and silver ash and over its verdant lawns to the principal stream, which bounds it on the north. These roads are lined with stately horse-chestnuts, whose branches unite and form a dense canopy, completely shutting out the sun.

Every afternoon the beauty and nobility of Vienna whirl through the cool groves in their gay equipages, while the sidewalks are thronged with pedestrians, and the numberless tables and seats with which every house of refreshment is surrounded are filled with merry guests. Here on Sundays and holidays the people repair in thousands. The woods are full of tame deer, which run perfectly free over the whole Prater. I saw several in one of the lawns lying down in the grass, with a number of children playing around or sitting beside them. It is delightful to walk there in the cool of the evening, when the paths are crowded and everybody is enjoying the release from the dusty city. It is this free social life which renders Vienna so attractive to foreigners and draws yearly thousands of visitors from all parts of Europe....

We spent two or three hours delightfully one evening in listening to Strauss's band. We went about sunset to the Odeon, a new building in the Leopoldstadt. It has a refreshment-hall nearly five hundred feet long, with a handsome fresco ceiling and glass doors opening into a garden-walk of the same
length. Both the hall and garden were filled with tables, where the people seated themselves as they came and conversed sociably over their coffee and wine. The orchestra was placed in a little ornamental temple in the garden, in front of which I stationed myself, for I was anxious to see the world's waltz-king whose magic tones can set the heels of half Christendom in motion.

[...] Strauss seemed to feel the music in every limb. He would wave his fiddle-bow a while, then commence playing with desperate energy, moving his whole body to the measure, till the sweat rolled from his brow. A book was lying on the stand before him, but he made no use of it. He often glanced around with a kind of half-triumphant smile at the restless crowd, whose feet could scarcely be restrained from bounding to the magic measure. It was the horn of Oberon realized. The composition of the music displayed great talent, but its charm consisted more in the exquisite combination of the different instruments, and the perfect, the wonderful, exactness with which each performed its part—a piece of art of the most elaborate and refined character.

The company, which consisted of several hundred, appeared to be full of enjoyment. They sat under the trees in the calm, cool twilight with the stars twinkling above, and talked and laughed sociably together between the pauses of the music, or strolled up and down the lighted alleys. We walked up and down with them, and thought how much we should enjoy such a scene at home, where the faces around us would be those of friends and the language our mother-tongue.

[...] We visited the imperial library a day or two ago. The hall is two hundred and forty-five feet long, with a magnificent dome in the center, under which stands the statue of Charles V., of Carrara marble, surrounded by twelve other monarchs of the house of Hapsburg. The walls are of variegated marble richly ornamented with gold, and the ceiling and dome are covered with brilliant fresco-paintings. The library numbers three hundred thousand volumes and sixteen thousand manuscripts, which are kept in walnut cases gilded and adorned with medallions. The rich and harmonious effect of the whole can not easily be imagined. It is exceedingly appropriate that a hall of such splendor should be used to hold a library. The pomp of a palace may seem hollow and vain, for it is but the dwelling of a man; but no building can be too magnificent for the hundreds of great and immortal spirits to dwell in who have visited earth during thirty centuries.

One of the most interesting objects in Vienna is the imperial armory. We were admitted through tickets previously procured from the armory direction; as there was already one large company within, we were told to wait in the court till our turn came. Around the wall, on the inside, is suspended the enormous chain which the Turks stretched across the Danube at Buda in the year 1529 to obstruct the navigation. It has eight thousand links and is nearly a mile in length. The court is filled with cannon of all shapes and sizes, many of which were conquered from other nations. I saw a great many which were cast during the French Revolution, with the words “Liberte! Egalite!” upon them, and a number of others bearing the simple letter “N.”

A similar circumspect description is offered by Thomas Frognall Dirbin in his essay for the same collection, entitled, “Schoenbrunn and the Prater,” which shall serve here to further illustrate the concept of an emerging stereotype, and contrasts, again, rather nicely with the previous descriptions of travellers in Cork:
About three English miles from the Great Belvedere - or rather about the same number of miles from Vienna, to the right, as you approach the capital - is the famous palace of Schoenbrunn. This is a sort of summer-residence of the Emperor; and it is here that his daughter, the ex-Empress of France, and the young Bonaparte usually reside. The latter never goes into Italy, when his mother, as Duchess of Parma, pays her annual visit to her principality. At this moment her son is at Baden, with the court. It was in the Schoenbrunn palace that his father, on the conquest of Vienna, used to take up his abode, rarely venturing into the city. He was surely safe enough here; as every chamber and every court yard was filled by the elite of his guard - whether as officers or soldiers.

It is a most magnificent pile of building; a truly imperial residence - but neither the furniture nor the objects of art, whether connected with sculpture or painting, are deserving of anything in the shape of a catalogue raisonne. I saw the chamber where young Bonaparte frequently passes the day; and brandishes his flag staff, and beats upon his drum. He is a soldier (as they tell me) every inch of him; and rides out, through the streets of Vienna, in a carriage of state drawn by four or six horses, receiving the homage of the passing multitude.

To return to the Schoenbrunn Palace. I have already told you that it is vast, and capable of accommodating the largest retinue of courtiers. It is of the gardens belonging to it, that I would now only wish to say a word. These gardens are really worthy of the residence to which they are attached. For what is called ornamental, formal, gardening - enriched by shrubs of rarity, and trees of magnificence - enlivened by fountains - adorned by sculpture - and diversified by vistas, lawns, and walks - interspersed with grottoes and artificial ruins - you can conceive nothing upon a grander scale than these: while a menagerie in one place (where I saw a large but miserably wasted elephant) - a flower-garden in another - a labyrinth in a third, and a solitude in a fourth place - each, in its turn, equally beguiles the hour and the walk. They are the most spacious gardens I ever witnessed.

It was the other Sunday evening when I visited the Prater, and when - as the weather happened to be very fine—it was considered to be full, but the absence of the court, of the noblesse, necessarily gave a less joyous and splendid aspect to the carriages and their attendant liveries. In your way to this famous place of Sabbath evening promenade, you pass a celebrated coffee-house, in the suburbs, called the Leopoldstadt, which goes by the name of the Greek coffee-house on account of its being almost entirely frequented by Greeks - so numerous at Vienna. Do not pass it, if you should ever come hither, without entering it - at least once. You would fancy yourself to be in Greece, so thoroughly characteristic are the countenances, dresses, and language of everyone within.

But yonder commences the procession of horse and foot; of cabriolets, family coaches, German wagons, cars, phaetons and landaulets, all moving in a measured manner, within their prescribed ranks, toward the Prater. We must accompany them without loss of time. You now reach the Prater. It is an extensive flat, surrounded by branches of the Danube, and planted on each side with double rows of horse-chestnut trees. The drive, in one straight line, is probably a league in length. It is divided by two roads, in one of which the company move onward, and in the other they return. Consequently, if you happen to find a hillock only a few feet high, you may, from thence, obtain a pretty good view of the interminable procession of the carriages before mentioned: one current of them, as it were, moving forward, and another rolling backward.
But, hark! the notes of a harp are heard to the left, in a meadow, where the foot passengers often digress from the more formal tree-lined promenade. A press of ladies and gentlemen is quickly seen. You mingle involuntarily with them; and, looking forward, you observe a small stage erected, upon which a harper sits and two singers stand. The company now lie down upon the grass, or break into standing groups, or sit upon chairs hired for the occasion - to listen to the notes so boldly and so feelingly executed. The clapping of hands, and exclamations of bravo succeed, and the sounds of applause, however warmly bestowed, quickly die away in the open air. The performers bow, receive a few kreutzers, retire, and are well satisfied.

The sound of the trumpet is now heard behind you. Tilting feats are about to be performed; the coursers snort and are put in motion; their hides are bathed in sweat beneath their ponderous housings; and the blood, which flows freely from the pricks of their riders' spurs, shows you with what earnestness the whole affair is conducted. There, the ring is thrice carried off at the point of the lance. Feats of horsemanship follow in a covered building, to the right; and the juggler, conjurer, or magician, displays his dexterous feats, or exercises his potent spells, in a little amphitheater of trees, at a distance beyond.

Here and there rise more stately edifices, as theaters, from the doors of which a throng of heated spectators is pouring out. In other directions, booths, stalls and tables are fixt; where the hungry eat, the thirsty drink, and the merry-hearted indulge in potent libations. The waiters are in a constant state of locomotion. Rhenish wine sparkles here; confectionery glitters there; and fruit looks bright and tempting in a third place. No guest turns round to eye the company; because he is intent upon the luxuries which invite his immediate attention, or he is in close conversation with an intimate friend, or a beloved female. They talk and laugh - and the present seems to be the happiest moment of their lives.

All is gaiety and good humor. You return again to the foot-promenade, and look sharply about you, as you move onward, to catch the spark of beauty, or admire the costume of taste, or confess the power of expression. It is an Albanian female who walks yonder, wondering, and asking questions, at every thing she sees. The proud Jewess, supported by her husband and father, moves in another direction. She is covered with brocade and flaunting ribbons; but she is abstracted from everything around her, because her eyes are cast downward upon her stomacher, or sideways to obtain a glimpse of what may be called her spangled epaulettes. Her eye is large and dark; her nose is aquiline; her complexion is of an olive brown; her stature is majestic, her dress is gorgeous, her gait is measured - and her demeanor is grave and composed. “She must be very rich,” you say - as she passes on. “She is prodigiously rich,” replies the friend, to whom you put the question - for seven virgins, with nosegays of choicest flowers, held up her bridal train; and the like number of youths, with silver-hilted swords, and robes of ermine and satin, graced the same bridal ceremony. Her father thinks he can never do enough for her; and her husband, that he can never love her sufficiently.

Whether she be happy or not, in consequence, we have no time to stop to inquire, for see yonder! Three “turbaned Turks” make their advances. How gaily, how magnificently they are attired! What finely proportioned limbs - what beautifully formed features! They have been carousing, peradventure, with some young Greeks - who have just saluted them, en passant - at the famous coffee-house before mentioned. Everything around you is novel and striking; while the verdure of the trees and lawns is yet fresh, and the sun does not seem yet disposed to sink below the horizon. The carriages still move on, and return, in measured
procession. Those who are within, look earnestly from the windows, to catch a glance of their passing friends. The fair hand is waved here; the curiously-painted fan is shaken there; and the repeated nod is seen in almost every other passing landauet. Not a heart seems sad; not a brow appears to be clouded with care.

Given the beauty of the culture and its environs, it is indeed difficult to return one’s focus to the powerful force of nationalist fervour at work, intent on disrupting the lair of the Lotus Eaters, and culminating in World War I. This paper now turns to examine the last three decades of the nineteenth century to examine how the power of nationalism and newspapers combined to bring about constitutional reform, literacy and anarchy.

2.4. Home Rule Movements

The 1870s, a decade beginning so promisingly with ventures into constitutional reform148 and technological progress triumphant at regional level,149 did not translate in Ireland into peaceful years of political progress towards self-government. Instead, the catchwords ‘Land Bill’ and ‘Emigration’ marked a period of increasing rural rebellion and exodus, connected with the quintessential question of land and its ownership. Even members of the Catholic clergy, often forced to an ambivalent stand on the protestations of the Irish poor, where not safe from expulsion from their homes.

148 CE 16 May 1870. The Ballot. The Saturday Review expresses its opinion that the ballot will almost destroy intimidation and it will render bribery on the whole more troublesome and inconvenient although it may perhaps facilitate some special forms of corruption. It is doubtful whether the ballot will diminish the corruption of Irish boroughs, but it may baffle the priests and the mobs, as it will certainly disarm the landlords.
149 CE 21 October 1871. Expeditious Telegraphing at Cork. An operation was performed at the local telegraph office yesterday, which probably surpasses any feat in telegraphy yet attempted at this side of the Atlantic. Correspondents of all the London morning papers, and the provincial journals in the three kingdoms, were awaiting the arrival of the Java at Queenstown, and in getting possession of the files of American papers – which were readily furnished to all by the courteous agent of the company. Mr.Charles Grierson – they poured such a flood of messages into the Cork office for transmission, as in all probability no single office in Great Britain had ever been called on at once to transact before. The aggregate number of words despatched exceeded 30,000, some of the principal messages exceeding 6,000 words. The work was performed with astonishing expedition. A message of 6,000 words for the London Daily News handed in at 5.30 (English time) was despatched in three hours and ten minutes. Messages of nearly equal length were transmitted to Manchester, Liverpool, Glasgow, Dublin, and Belfast with equal celerity, and the entire of the immense mass of correspondence had been worked through long before midnight – a feat which none of the correspondents concerned could have anticipated. The remarkable expedition with which the messages were despatched was due in a great measure to the careful arrangements and intelligent supervision of Mr.James Hawkins, the local superintendent, who was admirably seconded by his skilful and energetic staff.
CE 20 April 1870
The Land Bill – Emigration

The Dublin Post says: Almost daily we are in receipt of communications from clergymen and others complaining of the delay which has been caused by the repetition of purposeless speeches in committee on the Land Bill. That clergymen who have written state that they do so in view of the large emigration which is now in progress, and threats of eviction which have been particularly rife during the past two or three months. A correspondent from the county of Sligo states that the notice to quit served on Father John MacDermot has left many of the people to suppose that there can be no security for them, and they are making preparations to leave the country. We have reason to believe that in consequence to the little hope people have of a good Land Bill passing this session, thousands of emigrants are heading for America; and not from the South and West alone, but from the Northern province. A correspondent, writing from Dundalk on Saturday, states that “the emigration this year promises to be on a much more extended scale than the last. A few days ago I saw three large floats or wagons heavily laden with trunks and boxes, coming along a road outside town; behind these walked some three hundred men, mostly young, active fellows, and upwards of fifty young women. They marched in good order, and were all from the County of Monaghan, and were to take the steamer from Dundalk for Liverpool enroute for New York.” A letter which we have received from Derry this morning also refers to the increased emigration; whilst from Cork the reports of the local journals are to the same effect. Those who are of the opinion that this country is over populated, may regard the exodus with satisfaction, but those who are of a contrary opinion, and would wish to see the tenant class fairly treated, should call upon their representatives to do all in their power to hasten the progress of the Land Bill, with the addition of the retrospective clause, from the date of the introduction of the Bill, at least.

The spirit of Fenianism had not died, and even though the movement was keeping a low profile in the British Isles, as opposed to their counterparts in North America,150 the sympathy of the people were with them in their British gaols. They had, after all, sacrificed their freedom for the freedom of their country, or at the very least, for the fair option to own it.

CE 4 September 1871
The Amnesty Demonstration in Dublin.
Desperate Conflict between the Police and the People.
[Special telegram]

Dublin, Sunday Night. – An immense Amnesty meeting was held in the Phoenix Park. About fifteen or twenty thousand were present. The addresses were delivered from vans, drawn by four horses. There were no bands, banners, or flags. Mr.Butt, Mr.Nolan, Mr.Smith, Member for Westmeath, Mr.T.D. O’Sullivan.

150 CE 13 October 1871. City Edition. By Telegraph. Fenian Raid on Manitoba. The Fenians repulsed by United States Troops. General O’Neill a Prisoner. Toronto, Thursday. – The Government has received information that a large body of Fenians under General O’Neill have crossed the border at Pembina, and seized the Canadian custom house and Hudson Bay fort. They were attacked and dispersed by the American troops, and General O’Neill was made prisoner. A large body is reported to have crossed at St.Joe. The people of Manitoba are armed again. A large portion of the flourishing town of Windsor, was consumed by fire this morning.
Mr. Ryan, merchant, and others, addressed the meeting at great length. The object
of the meeting was to obtain complete amnesty to the military prisoners.
Mr. P. J. Smith presided. The following resolution and memorial were agreed to:

That we, the people of Dublin, in public meeting assembled, feel it is our
duty to represent to her Majesty the Queen, the universal wish of the Irish people
that the amnesty already granted to many political prisoners, should be extended to
all who are still undergoing punishment for political offences.\footnote{CE 10 October 1871. Reply to the Castlebar Memorial. Mr. Gladstone, in reply to a memorial
from the Castlebar Board of guardians, in favour of the release of the remaining Fenian prisoners,
regrets that her Majesty's government cannot concur in the views expressed, and considers that the
cries committed by the prisoners alluded to do not fall within the category of political crimes, and
are not any way entitled to similar indulgence.} The proceedings terminated with a cordial vote of thanks to the Chairman, who
besought those assembled to disperse in an orderly manner. A collision, however,
ocurred as the vast crowds were returning from the Park, and something like a riot
took place.\footnote{CE 9 September 1871. Education in Ireland. The Commissioners of Education in
Ireland, in their report, state in reference to the regulation of the estates confided to them, and
which, subject to their control, are managed by land agents, that they are generally in a satisfactory
condition, that the rents are fairly paid, that they have during the past year made for each estate such
grants for expenditure and for assistance to tenants as were recommended by the respective agents
and appeared to be judicious, and that, with a few exceptions, the tenantry are quite peaceable and
well conducted. As regards the primary schools established by us for the benefit of the children of
our tenants (the Commissioners add), the returns from those on the Dungannon, Navan, and
Ballyroan estates show a great increase in the number of pupils, whilst those on the Armagh and
Raphoe estates continue to be also well attended, and all are reported to us to be very valuable in
their respective localities. Of the schools established by private foundation, that of Midleton, in the}

Although Irish members of Parliament worked incessantly at improving the
general lot of their constituents, the Act of Union remained a fact, and British
policy- and opinion-makers would not be easily swayed by a few flung stones:

CE 13 September 1871
John Martin and the Dublin Riots
Mr. John Martin, M.P.\footnote{Jackson, p.18: 'John Martin, a Young Ireland activist, was a founder of the Home Rule
movement, and sat as MP for Meath between 1871 and 1875.'} has written a letter to the Times with reference to
the Dublin riots, in which he sharply criticises the English questions generally,
declaring that the grievance of the Irish people is not the measure by which they are
kept in subjection, but the subjection itself, which they are bent upon having
removed.\footnote{One of these grievances being, of course, agrarian unrest due to the tenants' lack of security of
tenure. Cf. CE 19 October 1871. Agrarian Outrages in Ireland. Several agrarian outrages have been
committed within the last few days at Glasson, near Athlone. A man has been so dreadfully beaten
that his life is despaired of and in the same locality the farm implements of a large farmer have been
broke. The protection of the police has been claimed and patrols nightly parade the roads.} The Times, replying to the letter, contends that the policy which has
arisen out of the Union is emphatically Imperial as opposed to National, that there
exists no such thing as Irish subjection, and that on the whole Ireland is in a better
position,\footnote{Cf., for instance, CE 9 September 1871. Education in Ireland. The Commissioners of Education in
Ireland, in their report, state in reference to the regulation of the estates confided to them, and
which, subject to their control, are managed by land agents, that they are generally in a satisfactory
condition, that the rents are fairly paid, that they have during the past year made for each estate such
grants for expenditure and for assistance to tenants as were recommended by the respective agents
and appeared to be judicious, and that, with a few exceptions, the tenantry are quite peaceable and
well conducted. As regards the primary schools established by us for the benefit of the children of
our tenants (the Commissioners add), the returns from those on the Dungannon, Navan, and
Ballyroan estates show a great increase in the number of pupils, whilst those on the Armagh and
Raphoe estates continue to be also well attended, and all are reported to us to be very valuable in
their respective localities. Of the schools established by private foundation, that of Midleton, in the} so far as her position in the State goes, than England, Scotland, or
Wales.
The role of the Cork Examiner is still in keeping with its original concept of regional and national political and industrial development, its Catholic undertones present not only in its reporting of ecclesiastical matters and concerns, but also in its call for non-combative progression, the slower road to self-sufficiency and consequently self-government.

CE 16 September 1871
Home Rule
(From the Nation)

The Cork Examiner is doing valuable service to the cause of the Irish nation by the publication of a series of articles dealing fully with the Home Rule question. These timely contributions to the national case on the supreme questions of the time, and indeed, of all time, for the people of this country, and distinguished by the writer’s exhaustive knowledge of his subject, by his political tact, by his judicious reasoning, and by the finely tempered eloquence of his words. We do not hesitate to ascribe these very striking articles to the pen of Mr. Maguire, and we hail them, not only for their great intrinsic value, but for the pleasing anticipations which they enable us to make in reference to the part which Mr. Maguire will take in opening our national case next session.

An example of one such article is the following:

CE 18 October 1871

If we could only know clearly that, in going for Home Rule, we were not furthering the objects of Fenianism, - which is something, in our mind, very different from Constitutional Government in Ireland, - we would be amongst the foremost in looking for that which we believe to be a good and useful thing for our country. We know this to be what hundreds of thoroughly patriotic Irishmen, without distinction of creed, and of various classes, are constantly saying in reference to the great question of the time. These words accurately embody their

155 CE 23 May 1879. Ascension Thursday. Yesterday, this great Christian festival was kept by our large Catholic community as a solemn holiday, in accordance with the ordinances of the Church. The day was exceedingly fine, the warm sunshine being tempered by a refreshing breeze, and the streets were crowded during the day with large numbers of people, who seemed to thoroughly enjoy the fine weather. In the early portion of the day Masses were said in the different churches throughout the city, attended by large, devout congregations, whose demeanour was most edifying. At the North Cathedral, immediately after nine o’clock Mass, his Lordship, the Bishop of Cork, confirmed no less than 237 children, 133 being girls, and 104 boys. The answering of the candidates for the strengthening Sacrament, in the articles of Catholic teaching, was highly satisfactory, reflecting great credit on their instructors. In the evening, the churches were crowded with pious worshippers, who attended to pay homage to the Holy sacrament, which was exposed for Benediction. The office of Vespers was also sung, after which, in the majority of the churches, sermons were preached on the great event commemorated. The great festival was kept by the crowds, who were to be seen in the streets and suburbs in an exceedingly orderly and sober manner, highly creditable to those who seldom indulge in a day’s rest from the labour in which their lives are spent.
apprehensions and their policy. As devotedly attached to their country, and as anxious to see it increase in honour and prosperity, as any Irishman can be, they shrink with instinctive aversion from what is secret and illegal, and cannot or dare not show itself in the light of day. They desire to see the legislation and government of their native land placed on a basis more in accordance with its requirements, and they feel satisfied that every possible advantage which the most ardent lover of his country need rationally look for, could be obtained under the Federal system; but they will not go one jot farther, nor will they give any aid or countenance to those who contemplate a change of an extreme or violent character. We repeat our personal knowledge of this being the feeling and determination of numbers of Irishmen, whose support would secure the success of the cause of Home Rule – whose aid would be invaluable in any undertaking or enterprise whatever. […] There are some among us, possibly there are many, who, though individually averse to all violent means in politics, still entertain a kind of tenderness towards Fenians and Fenianism, on this ground, - That the Fenian conspiracy, for we cannot call it insurrection, did give an impulse to remedial legislation for this country. […] Admit then, that Fenianism had a certain share in the Church and Land Acts of 1869 and 1870. But then comes the question – could Fenianism in any way promote or bring about the settlement of Home Rule? On the contrary, would it render that settlement wholly impossible? So surely as we believe in our own existence, so do we believe that the least admixture of the policy and objects of Fenianism with the Home Rule movement would be its destruction. No two things are more opposed in their meaning, purpose, and object, than Separatism and Federalism – than that which severs and that which unites. These constitute the two extremes of the National question, and no human power can reconcile them. […] Even assuming that Ireland was united in the resolve to separate, Ireland could not cope with the armed power and enormous resources of England […] Why there are tens of thousands of Irishmen – hundreds of thousands of Irishmen – who would be almost as opposed to any attempt at Separation as Englishmen could be; not only because any such attempt would be in the last degree calamitous, but that Separation would not give to Ireland the advantages which she would derive from union under a wise and liberal arrangement. […] The creed of the true Irishman should henceforward be – Federation, not Separation.156

Separation was and continued to be an issue in Irish political discourse, and even if it could not be enforced immediately, the idea of its success was kept alive in the States, foremost. However, another agricultural crisis, which began in 1878 and led to the ‘land war’ of 1879-82, again transformed the country.

---

156 CE 11 October 1871. The Marquis of Lansdowne, following in the footsteps of his political Chief, took advantage of an interesting and favourable occasion to give expression to the present policy of the Gladstone Cabinet on the question of Home Rule. The Premier confided his sentiment to the good folk of Aberdeen; the Marquis developed his views before his friends, his tenants, and his dependents, at an agricultural dinner in Kenmare. The townsmen of Aberdeen, yet unawakened to the advantage of a more direct and personal management of their affairs, appeared to approve of Mr. Gladstone's views, whereas, no sooner did Lord Lansdowne mention the magic words, 'Home Rule,' than there rose from townsman and tenant such an outburst of enthusiasm as must have impressed his Lordship with a belief that, if the whole thing were a delusion, it was one that lived deep in the hearts of the Irish people.
The Agricultural depression of 1878 was, of course, a British and European phenomenon, but it fell upon an Ireland where the chief emotion and preoccupation in the countryside can be summed up in one word: insecurity. Landlords did not live at permanent (or even temporary) war with their tenants; tenants had no doubt that landlordism would continue to exist. Nevertheless, tenants perceived that their interests and those of the landlord were often at variance, with tenants pressing for some further protection for their rights, and landlords, naturally enough, looking to defend their privileges (for landlordism in Ireland still afforded privileges). [...] Tenant farmers were caught up not so much in a crisis of rising expectations as one of rising frustrations. They believed now that the famine was not an act of God but a conspiracy of landlords. They did not see why they should stand by in 1879 as they had done in 1847 and endure the worst effects of an agricultural catastrophe. Hence the popular explosion that occurred in the west of Ireland in 1879.157

Tenant right associations were already well established and spread throughout the country, but what was needed was ‘leadership, propaganda and organisation on a nationwide scale.’ It was agricultural depression158 which lead to an alliance with the Home Rule Party, giving the parliamentary party its mass base and defining its role until the end of the First World War.159

CE 5 November 1879
The Times on Irish Affairs
(Special telegram from our correspondent).
London, Tuesday Night.
The Times of to-day, writing in reference to the protest uttered against the supposed intention to force the Irish people to emigrate, sneers at the assertions of Irish members, that famine menaces the land, saying that the victims furnish us with no details of their affliction, and that Englishmen are sceptical as to the danger, and also says, that the destitution likely to prevail during the winter is a matter for the exercise of private charity, and ridicules the demand for public works, as unprofitable, expensive, and opposed to the principles of sound economy. As to emigration, it repeats its declaration that Ireland is over peopled, and that Irishmen had better migrate, and find room and bread, than starve at home, and that it is encouraging the national indolence to coin plans, and that if forced abroad the Irish peasant must toil for his bread, and give a fair day’s work for a fair day’s wages.

157 Boyce, Nineteenth Century Ireland, pp.163.
158 CE 5 November 1879. The Distress in Ireland. (Special Telegram from our Correspondent) London, Tuesday Night. The Cabinet Council to-day discussed the several schemes and memorials submitted relative to the distress in Ireland, as also to the official reports on the same. The Irish Secretary and the Chancellor of the Exchequer both furnished reports asserting that there was nothing as yet in the condition of any section of the population demanding extraordinary measures. Mr. John George MacCarthy’s reclamation scheme was under consideration, but no conclusion was arrived at respecting the form the public works will take, if started. There is every disposition to defer State aid, or to withhold it altogether, the majority of the Ministers being led by the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the reports from Mr. Lowther to believe that all the representations of popular destitution is grossly exaggerated.
159 Boyce, p.164.
CE 5 November 1879
Editorial

It is, we fear, a not improbable consequence of the distress which threatens us in the coming season, that emigration may be largely increased. We regard this as a misfortune for the country. So far from believing with the Times that Ireland is over peopled, we are quite satisfied that the contrary is the fact, and that with a larger population to feed, it might yet be richer and happier than it is at present, or than it ever has been. [...] It is one of the beautiful traits of the Irish race, that beyond the sea it does not forget the kindred left a home, and the emigrant to the States is not content until he can draw after him, to share his luck whatever it may be, father and mother, brothers, sisters, and even cousins, and thus the drain upon this country is to a large extent regulated by the earning power of labour in America, and the capacity of the Irish there to “send for” their kinfolk. On these grounds, therefore, it may be assumed that emigration will assume considerable proportions. That is not a pleasant prospect. For not only does it mean a large deduction from the producing power – the bone and sinew – the youth and vitality of this country – but it does not always mean good fortune for the emigrants themselves. [...] Unlike the immigrants from Germany or Norway, the Irish, who are for the most part people bred up in the country, and fitter for agricultural pursuits than any other, remain in New York or some of the other great seaboard towns. They are tempted by the existence of a colony of their countrymen, by high wages, and, in good times, the readiness with which employment is obtained. But once they settle down in the city there is, in the majority of cases, no chance for them but that of remaining day labourers all their lives [...]. The late John Francis Maguire, in his work on that subject, employed all the vehement eloquence of which he was master in urging the people he loved so much to avoid it. The Catholic Clergy of the States, the most honourable Irish politicians – in fact, every one anxious for their welfare, has sought to impress on Irish emigrants that the true home for them was not in the city, but on those plains where the labour of the farmer might build up a home for him secure and independent, and free from the temptations of urban life.

2.4.1. The Irish Home Rulers

Young Irelanders and later Fenian militants had ‘indirectly facilitated the creation of the constitutional Home Rule movement after 1870 by supplying martyrs to the Irish national cause.’ There were ‘dynastic bonds’ tying the Young Irelanders to the Home Rule Party, the most important of these being John Blake Dillon, one of the circle of Nation intellectuals, and his son, John Dillon, the Irish Parliamentary Party leader of the 1890s and after. Some Young Irelanders, who had survived the battles of the 1840s, were to participate in the Home Rule campaigns of the 1870s and 1880s. Another influential supporter of the Home Rule

---

160 Jackson, p.18: ‘Three Fenians - the ‘Manchester Martyrs’ - were hanged in November 1867 having been convicted of the murder of a policeman. In addition many Fenians were imprisoned at this time, and the campaigns in 1869-70 to secure their release trained leaders and mobilised public opinion in ways that the Home Rulers of the 1870s were able to exploit.'
movement was Charles Gavan Duffy, editor of the Nation. As historian, biographer as well as politician, he sought ‘to inculcate the Young Ireland ideal into the Home Rule generation.’ 161 Patriotic Toryism also contributed to the emergence of Home Rule. Represented by a group of Trinity College graduates associated with the Dublin University Magazine, it continued to be the biggest Irish parliamentary grouping as late as 1859, and, considering its organisational and intellectual vitality, had a lot to offer to Home Rule. 162 Isaac Butt, who had launched Dublin University Magazine in 1833, had risen to fame for defending Young Ireland and Fenian prisoners, and in 1870 he emerged with other Tories as a founder of the Home Government Association, an immediate precursor to the Home Rule movement.

The apparently paradoxical role of patriotic Toryism in the emergence of Home Rule becomes easier to comprehend when it is recalled both that Tories were essentially the advocates of the Protestant interest, and that the Irish parliament that had flourished before the Union (1800) had been an exclusively Protestant institution. Many Dublin Protestants had been enthusiastic Irish patriots in so far as the representative institutions of the Irish nation had been dominated by their own co-religionists; and it had been Protestant patriots who, throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, had been first in defending the rights of the Irish (Protestant) parliament against English legislative incursion. These Dublin Protestants had, of course, been opponents of the Union, on the grounds both of patriotic principle and of immediate economic interest, since the end of the Irish parliament brought a severe blow to the many trades that had enjoyed the patronage of rich Irish peers and MPs. 163

Another broad section of the Home Rule movement was represented, on the one hand, by a relatively wealthy post-famine rural population – once land reform had been linked to devolution – and on the other, a growing educated urban elite experiencing a crisis of bourgeois expectations.

The newly strengthened Catholic middle class had aspirations, but its upward mobility was checked by the domination of the higher ranks of the professions and public service by the residual Irish Protestant elite or (still worse) by Englishmen. Home Rule promised these thwarted Catholics a further social and economic liberation - a removal of the glass ceiling that, under the old system, appeared to curtail their advancement. 164

161 Jackson, p.19.
162 Idem.
163 Idem, p.20.
164 Jackson, p.21. ‘The disestablishment of the Church of Ireland, under legislation passed in 1869, represented the humiliation of the central institution of the Protestant ascendancy class. Electoral reform through the Irish Franchise Act (1850), the Irish Reform Act (1868) and the Ballot Act (1872) appeared to gnaw further at he gentry’s already shaky political authority.’ (p.22)
Also cultural and technological developments greatly helped in the promotion of the Home Rule movement, such as accessible education with the creation of the national schools in 1831, and the endowment of intermediate in 1878, producing ever-higher levels of literacy and thus political awareness. Combined with the abolition of the stamp duty and taxes on paper, the newspaper industry flourished, which in turn often acted as ‘an evangelist for Home Rule,’ in particular, the Irish provincial press. Moreover, numerous leaders of the Home Rule movement were either directly involved in the newspaper trade, such as Tim Healy and William O’ Brien, or clever at using the press to further their own careers, such as Charles Stewart Parnell.

The spread of the electric telegraph and the growth of the railway network assisted the newspaper industry in terms of garnering stories and distributing copies, but each also possessed a wider political significance. O’ Connell had not needed railways in arranging his campaigns and mass meetings in the 1820s, although his repeal effort in the early and mid 1840s had benefited from the nascent rail system. The efficient Bianconi coach business served the politicians of the early nineteenth century, as so many others, and Charles Bianconi was in fact a great friend of O’ Connell. However, the Home Rule movement coincided with the golden age of the Irish rail network, which cut down the time and expense of travel and opened up hitherto relatively inaccessible parts of the country. Parnell himself acknowledged his debt to trains by arguing that if the Young Irelanders had possessed similar resources in the 1840s, they might have built up an effective national organisation thirty years in advance of his own.

In May 1870 Isaac Butt founded the Home Government Association, to be succeeded in November 1873 by the Home Rule League. As Home Rule leader, ‘Butt preserved an interest in the Protestant landed elite, a respect for the

165 Jackson, p.22.
166 CE 23 May 1879. The Clare Election – Great Demonstration Yesterday. Ennis, Thursday. There was a grand demonstration held to-day to celebrate the election of the O’Gorman Mahon. In the carriage were a. McMahon, S.J. Meany, and T. Lynch with our member, while on the box figured Michael Considine in a newly-braided green coat and a heap of indescribable medals. The absence of our local reporter of the Limerick papers was remarkable to the say the least, for lately we have had some queer doings between him and the former benefactor of “which nobody can deny.” Indeed I am forced to refer to the thing, but I cannot see a better use of public journals than the self-corrective one clearing away each other’s mistakes. After having been cheered and almost chaired through our dirty streets, the O’Gorman Mahon made in O’Connell’s Square such a speech as your readers would expect. He spoke with as fine and as fresh a voice as he might have spoken at twenty-eight and, I must add, with as national a ring. S.J. Meany and Michael Considine followed. The immense crowd was most enthusiastic. Now that the election is oer we were beginning to learn the cause of the voting. The influence of agents and sub-agents and the silent opposition of the priests accounts for the large polling of the Conservative. Know for a fact that nearly half the priests of the diocese took a pretty active part in the support of the elected member.
167 Jackson, p.23.
168 CE 9 January 1879. To the Editor of the Cork Examiner. Sir, - […] You charge Mr. Butt with a leaning to Toryism. Are you aware that the Cork Examiner is credited with a leaning to Whiggery,
institutions of the British state and a hostility towards Liberalism that were all consonant with his early Tory career.¹⁶⁹

The horrors of the Great Irish Famine of 1845-51, combined with the tardiness of British relief policy, have traditionally been defined as a turning point in Butt’s political evolution. And, indeed, in 1848, at the height of the famine, when the Young Irelanders rose unsuccessfully against British rule, Butt took on the legal defence of some of the rebel leadership. Viewed from a narrowly Orange Tory perspective this was perhaps a rather strange proceeding, yet Butt the Protestant patriot and social conservative was fighting for a sober Protestant patriot and social conservative like William Smith O’Brien, an ex-Tory and the generalissimo of the abortive revolt. Twenty years later, Butt defended the leaders of the Fenian (or Irish Republican Brotherhood) revolt of 1867, in some ways a more shocking brief than that supplied by the Young Irelanders. Yet here again were insurgents who proclaimed a secular and inclusivist nationalism, and who, despite the presence of some social radicals, were often nostalgic conservatives with a practical concern for property. Seen in these lights, the distance between Butt the Orangeman and Butt the Home Rule leader was perhaps not so very great.¹⁷⁰

The launching of the Home Government Association was inspired by the reconstruction of the federal government in the United States in the late 1860s, and the construction of a new federal constitution in Canada in 1867. Butt called both for an Irish parliament with domestic autonomy, and for a federated United Kingdom that would respect local needs while preserving the ‘one great Imperial

which we know is rather influential in Cork? No doubt your authority is very great, and justly so, because on most Irish questions you are in accord with National feeling, but, with all respect, I must say that the Whig tone which has always flavoured your journal, has been most objectionable, and goes far to invalidate most of your strictures on Mr. Butt. Mr. Butt is no Tory, nor supporter direct or indirect of the Tories as a party. […] As for Mr. Butt’s support of the Government on the Eastern question, you, a Catholic journalist, ought to bear this in mind, that Lord Beaconsfield, in his opposition to Russia, had the support not merely of the English “jingoes”, but of every Conservative and Catholic influence on the Continent of Europe. There was not a second opinion amongst the Catholics of every country of Europe, and in that they had the open sympathy of the Holy See itself, as to the necessity in the interest of religious freedom, and the existence of the great old Catholic churches of the East, to stay the progress of Russian oppression. And now what is the result both in the east and West of Turkey, those Catholic communities, that like our own here in Ireland preserved their perennial life in the darkness and sorrow of persecution, now come out in the light of freedom, and in Armenia and Bosnia assume the order and show the vitality of Catholic organization […]. Surely, Sir, a Catholic journalist when discussing the action of a representative of a Catholic nation, in relation to these events, might see in his support of the party, that thus intentionally or not interposed between the blackest religious tyranny that ever existed since the Roman Empire persecuted the early Christians and helpless religious communities that kept their faith with unexampled fidelity, the possibility of some higher and better explanation of his conduct than mere Toryism. […] I am, Sir, your obedient servant, Edward T. O’Dwyer.

¹⁶⁹ Jackson, p.28.
Ireland would thus have been able to enjoy self-government and a distinctive ‘national life’ while participating in the wider empire.

The bitterness and intensity of the passion which the struggle over Irish Home Rule infused into British politics at this time can be understood only if we remember the manner in which the Irish campaign was waged and the alarming perspectives which it was thought to disclose. The Irish Home Rule League which had been started in 1870 by Isaac Butt with a view to obtaining by legitimate parliamentary pressure the concession of Home Rule for Ireland was only part of a larger movement. Fourteen years earlier a secret society known as the Irish Republican Brotherhood had been founded to sever Ireland once and for all from Britain by force of arms. The constitutional action of Irishmen at Westminster was flanked by revolutionary movements outside, by the I.R.B. in Europe, by Clan na Gael in America, sworn and secret fraternities for whom the true method of suasion was not talk but dynamite; and in the lurid light thrown upon this darker side of the Irish movement by Fenian outrages many an Englishman who would have voted for a Parliament in Dublin if Ireland had presented herself in a gentler guise recoiled from concessions. Moreover in Ireland itself an agrarian agitation patronized by the political leaders was prolific in the meaner sort of crime. It was in vain that the Government essayed to suppress Michael Davitt’s Land League. A Ladies’ Land League continued the work.

Save for a handful of Protestants the Irish parliamentary representatives were solid for Home Rule, and by a policy of systematic obstruction set themselves to make Parliament inoperative until such time as their policy was accepted. Fatigued and exasperated by all-night sittings, assailed in their complacency by jibes and insults, outraged by Fenian crimes, alarmed by the spectre of republicanism and perplexed by the fact that the good intentions towards Ireland which they were conscious of entertaining were met by an ingrained temper of hostility and distrust, the average English parliamentarians offered an energetic resistance to Home Rule.

However, due to a lack of cohesion at the House of Commons, the fifty-nine Home Rule MPs did not constitute a ‘party’ in a formal sense, even allowing for the relaxed parliamentary discipline of the time. The general election of 1874 did not allow enough time to nominate appropriate parliamentary candidates, many of those returned being former Liberals lacking in loyalty to Butt’s federalist notions. When a post-election conference was held in Dublin in March 1874, only forty-six of the fifty-nine MPs attended, and they affected to believe that a meaningful struggle for the federalist cause could be sustained by ‘taking counsel

---

171 Jackson, p.28: ‘Butt fleshed out his own ideas in the pamphlet Home Government for Ireland (1870) where he proposed Canada as a model for the constitutional relationship between Britain and Ireland, and thereby anticipated the treaty negotiators of 1921 who were much taken with the same analogy.’

172 Fisher, pp. 1046/47.

173 Jackson, p.31: ‘One unusually candid patriot explained to a Liberal minister that his new-found separatist enthusiasm was his ‘only chance (of election). I do not think anyone can make much of my Home Rule’.
together, making all reasonable concessions to the opinions of each other, by
avoiding as far as possible isolated action’. But even these modest hopes were
dashed when Home Rulers, rarely acting as a unified bloc, distinguished
themselves by divisions and absenteeism.

The impatient youngsters of the Home Rule party included J. G. Biggar
(MP for Cavan from 1874), Edmund Dwyer Gray (MP for Tipperary from 1877),
Charles Stewart Parnell (returned for Meath in 1875) and John O’ Connor Power
(MP for Mayo from 1874). It is important, however not to exaggerate the
differences initially dividing these men and their followers from Butt. The young
Turks had close connections with the Fenian movement (Biggar, O’ Donnell and
O’ Connor Power were all initiates); they had equally good links with the
trenchantly patriotic Irish communities in Britain and the United States. In
parliament they sought to break British opposition, not through the charm offensive
favoured by their party leader, but rather through a more direct and brutal tactic:
obstructing government business.

Irish nationalism entered a new phase when in 1879 the magnetic Charles
Stewart Parnell began to draw the Catholic Irish electorate into his "Nationalist
Party", collecting funds from Irish settlers and sympathizers in the United States.
Eventually four-fifth of all Irish members of the British parliament constituted a
solid Nationalist block supporting the demand for a separate Irish parliament. Also
in 1879, Michael Davitt, a former Fenian, launched the Land League, which
enlisted Irish peasants in the cause of national agrarian reform. Neither Land
League nor Nationalist parliamentarians employed conventional political methods.
While the one incited acts of violence against landlords, the other caused uproar at
Westminster by heckling speakers and hurling inkstands. Ireland was put under
martial law and Parnell and Davitt, and several of their followers imprisoned.
Finally, in 1887 William Gladstone, Liberal Prime Minister, finally accepted
Parnell's terms and agreed to support "home rule" for Ireland.

All the rebel traditions of Erin were embodied in the person of Charles
Stewart Parnell. He was in touch with the secret societies of Ireland, England, and
America, President of the Land League, Chairman of the Irish party in the House of
Commons, the uncrowned sovereign of the Irish race. Every agency obnoxious to
England recognized the mastery of this strange and mysterious being of ice and

174 Idem.
175 CE 25 February 1879.Editorial.Our London correspondent telegraphs that the Secretary of the
Home Rule Parliamentary Party has received a letter from Mr. Butt in which that gentleman
practically resigns the leadership of the Home Rule party, for it puts Mr. Butt’s conditional retention
of his place on grounds most unlikely to disarm the hostility of the extreme section of the party. It is
believed that Mr. Shaw [member for Cork] will take Mr. Butt’s place.
176 Jackson, p.34.
flame. In the House of Commons the proud, handsome, unsociable Irish landlord with his swarthy beard and dark flashing eyes, sitting still and saturnine among his obedient following, was regarded with a kind of awe. Descended though he was from an old and respected Anglo-Irish county family, he was known to be the foe of Britain. People thought him inhuman and none too scrupulous. Indeed before ever Gladstone launched his first Home Rule Bill he had been compelled to put Parnell under lock and key.

From time to time phrases dropped from the formidable Irishman which disconcerted his Liberal supporters. “No one can set bounds to the march of a nation,” he once said, and again, addressing an American audience (February 20, 1880): “None of us, whether we are in America or Ireland or wherever we are, will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England.” Faced with these declarations, Liberals could only hope that conciliation would kill conspiracy, that reform would avert revolution, and that the poison of violence would be strained away from the Irish system by the remedial action of a subordinate Parliament.177

In early 1878 Parnell had met an emissary of Clan na Gael and by October of that year he had been offered conditional support of American militants. These conditions, devised by the leading American hardliner, John Devoy, amounted to a redefinition of the relationship between the parliamentary movement and the militants, with a new emphasis on the land question in Ireland.178 This bargain also involved abandonment of Butt’s federalist programme to be substituted by a more aggressive parliamentary policy. Parnell became increasingly celebrated for his policy of obstructionism:179

CE 28 February 1879
Mr. Parnell’s Obstruction
(Special telegram from our correspondent)

Mr. Parnell’s announcement that he means to oppose the War Secretary’s proposals, that questions of army discipline shall have precedence of other business, drew a large attendance in the floor and gallery of the Commons this afternoon. It is reported Mr. Parnell’s attitude, in which he is supported by other members of the extreme wing of the Irish party, is viewed with strong disfavour by the moderate Home Rulers, who declare that the idle policy of exasperation is certain to do more harm than good.

177 Fisher, p.1047.
178 Jackson, p.36.
179 CE 28 February 1879. Mr. Parnell’s Obstruction. (Special telegram from our correspondent) London, Thursday Night. Mr. Parnell’s announcement that he means to oppose the War Secretary’s proposals, that questions of army discipline shall have precedence of other business, drew a large attendance in the floor and gallery of the Commons this afternoon. It is reported Mr. Parnell’s attitude, in which he is supported by other members of the extreme wing of the Irish party, is viewed with strong disfavour by the moderate Home Rulers, who declare that the idle policy of exasperation is certain to do more harm than good.
CE 10 September 1879
The Government and Obstruction
(Special telegram from our correspondent)
London, Tuesday Night.

The reference of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his address at Exeter to Parliamentary obstruction, is interpreted as an admission that the government is powerless of itself to deal with the Irish members, and can suppress their hostility only by the co-operation of the House.

In spring 1879 Devoy offered a reformulated deal which has become known as the New Departure. ‘On 1 June 1879 Parnell and the American Fenians fudged an understanding of sorts\(^{180}\) which bound them to mutual support and a shared political agenda.’\(^{181}\)

In fact, two distinct Fenian-dominated initiatives served to create the land campaign, or ‘Land War’, of 1879-81 and to bind the parliamentarians to an aggressive agrarian policy. At a national level the American Fenian (or Clan na Gael) leader, John Devoy, sought to reach a deal with Parnell, as the most prominent ‘advanced’ parliamentarian. Several approaches were made which eventually produced the ‘New Departure’ of June 1879, the informal agreement endorsing full legislative autonomy for Ireland, compulsory land purchase (official compulsion on landlords to sell out to their tenants), and a thoroughly independent Home Rule party at Westminster. In addition, the ‘New Departure’ asserted the integrity of the Fenian movement and of its armed strategies. Complementing this national initiative was Fenian involvement in the launch of a land campaign in the west of Ireland. This began in County Mayo in 1878-79, and would eventually achieve a national significance. Fenians were active in organising a series of meetings (beginning at Irishtown, Mayo, on 20 April 1879 and Westport on 8 June) which culminated in the creation of the National Land League of Mayo on 16 August. From this provincial initiative came the Irish National Land League,

---

\(^{180}\) Not all Fenians accepted the deal, James Stephens expressed his scepticism at the new found camaraderie between men of physical force and obvious constitutionalists:

CE 27 February 1879. James Stephens. In recent interview in New York Mr. Stephens said he never felt better. […] Mr. Stephens said he had lived principally in Paris since he went from New York four years ago, but was in constant communication with leaders in Ireland of the party who believe in physical force. [They] had not the numbers which they had in the hey-day of the Fenian Brotherhood, but they had united ranks, discipline, and harmony of thought and action which was almost unknown before. The disorganisation of the Home Rule party, which Mr. Stephens considers dead, had increased the revolutionary ranks wonderfully. The reporter asked whether the “New Departure,” as it is called, would not take the place of the Home Rule movement, and keep the Irish people’s minds in the grove of constitutional agitation and action. “Not at all,” he replied. “This New Departure has failed. It never could succeed. The Home Rule movement sprung up after the defeat of the Fenian physical force movement at that time, and the Nationalists joined it because, temporarily dispirited by this failure, they hoped such a movement might accomplish something. In this they have been woefully [sic] disappointed, and the fall of the Home Rule party rang the death-knell of constitutional agitation among Irish nationalists. […] He intends, he said, to travel over every State and territory of the Union, and try with all his power to consolidate the ranks of the Irish National revolutionary societies, avoiding all collisions and controversies and causes of disunion. He came to try and make peace, and consolidate the divided ranks of his countrymen. He wanted to see them united and working in harmony for the object which they all wanted to see accomplished — the independence of Ireland. - Boston Pilot.

\(^{181}\) Jackson, p. 37.
founded in Dublin on 21 October by Michael Davitt, Patrick Egan and Thomas Brennan, all social radicals and IRB members. Hovering uncertainly at the edge of much of this enterprise was Parnell, who had no significant record of agrarian activism, but who saw strategic opportunities both for himself and or the cause of Home Rule.182

Parnell was elected President of the Irish National Land League because of his parliamentary obstructionism183 and because he had the confidence of the Fenian movement, but he was not, or ever would be, an agrarian radical. His apparent sympathy with advanced nationalist demands won him not only Fenian respect but also Irish-American dollars, resulting at the general election of April 1880 in twenty-seven seats, and facilitating his nomination in May as the chairman of the Irish parliamentary party.184

182 Jackson, p.40.

183 CE 23 May 1879. The Irish Members and the Votes of Supply. (Special telegram from our Correspondent) London Thursday Night. The Government, apprehending war to the death from the Irish members on the Votes on Supply, in revenge for their repulse of the O’Connor Don University Bill, are considering the effect of the resolution, passed early in the session, regulating the conduct of business. This resolution does not raise a barrier against the plan of campaign, being arranged by Messrs. O’Donnell, Parnell, and others, who are to fight out, according to strict parliamentary rule, every item of the Estimates. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, therefore, foresees a troubled time, but the ministry, powerless to curb the constitutional right of the enemy, whose anger they have keenly provoked. The project of a much interrupted session, and its consequences, were discussed at to-day’s Cabinet Council.

184 CE 6 May 1879. Death of Mr. Butt. (Special telegraph) Dublin, Monday Night. Mr. Isaac Butt, Q.C., M.P., died at a quarter past four to-day, at Roebuck Cottage, Dundrum, a few miles from Dublin. Mr. Butt was in his 65th year. […] His splendid speech for Casey in the Mitchelstown libel case, when he, for the last time, met his old legal opponent, Serjeant Armstrong, and practically defeated him, will not soon be forgotten by the Irish tenants. Mr. Butt’s last public speech was made at the home Rule Conference in Dublin on February 4th, when Mr. Dillon charged him with being in private negotiation with the English ministers as to how their business was to be conducted during the approaching Session. Mr. Butt made a most spirited reply, and his concluding words, frequently applauded by his hearers, were – “I have not the strength and energy and power that I had ten years ago when the National cause was lower than even dissensions have made it now. When the national spirit was extinct I worked hard. I revived the national cause. I created the very spirit that has now become, perhaps a little too exuberant. My strength is still at the disposal of the country, if I can give it with honour and respect to myself, but I will tell you what I will not do – if I am allowed to manage I will not be a nominal leader. The moment I find that I am thwarted in such a way that I cannot carry out my plan of conciliating English opinion, that moment I leave to those who thwart me the responsibilities, the power, and the reproach, and I shall return into private life and watch, if I live long enough to see it, for an opportunity to serve Ireland.” […] He altogether sat in Parliament for 21 years, from 1852 to 1865 for Youghal, and from 1871 for Limerick. He made no fortune by his great abilities, but a National tribute, which reached £4,000, was collected many years ago, and spent by him in the Home Rule cause.

CE 7 May 1879. Editorial. In Isaac Butt Ireland has unquestionably lost a loving son and an earnest advocate of her interests. However men may differ in their estimate of his aims and policy, there is no question of his sincerity, nor yet of the great capacity which he brought to the aid of his convictions. His disappearance leaves a large blank in our political world. […] The place he occupied was not filled, and it is not very easy to see or to say how it can be filled. He was leader of the Irish parliamentary party - indeed of the Irish people - not merely by election, but by virtue of certain gifts and qualities which seemed to mark him specially out for that eminence. In him we saw something of the grandeur of figure which seemed to belong to the earlier generation of Irish struggle. […] The circumstances of this country have tended to bring great lawyers into the front rank of popular politics, and he was a conspicuous instance. The splendid forensic displays which
CE 17 July 1879
Editorial

It was not unfrequent a short time since to find Home Rule treated as a
decaying cause, more specially by those in whom the wish was father to the
thought. Recent occurrences, however, tend to show that so far from having lost in
vitality it has gained. All the evidence of a firm hold on the national mind, and of
steady growth in the acquisition of intellectual forces to its ranks, are patent to the
most cursory observation. The leader whom Ireland loved has passed away, but the
cause has survived him in unimpaired vigour. The elections of Limerick, Cork, and
Longford have given proof that Home Rule is a prime factor in Irish politics.
Another election is impending, and promises to offer a further striking example of
the potency and growth of the national idea. Mr. William O’Brien, Q.C., in seeking
the suffrages of the electors of Ennis, declares that he is prepared to adopt and
advocate the cause of Home Rule. This is a fact of more than ordinary importance.
Mr. O’Brien is so well known as a man of sterling sincerity and independence that
no one will believe he has taken up the cry as a convenience, or to serve any
personal ends. Had he chosen to trade on it he might have adopted it long ago, and
easily enough obtained a seat in Parliament. But the most enduring convictions are
often of slow growth and they are especially likely to be so in men of a
scrupulously conscientious nature. This we know Mr. O’Brien to be, and we attach
all the more value to the decision which has induced him to announce deliberately
his adhesion to the cause. His eminent position and acknowledged ability add to the
weight of his pronouncement in favour of a movement which has hitherto been
sought to be discommoded by men of the official class. We write less in
reference to the Ennis election than to note the advance of the Home Rule cause, of
which Mr. O’Brien’s accession is a symptom: Ennis, it may be hoped, will know
how to make a worthy choice. On that point we do not for the present propose to
offer any attempt at guidance. The duty of the electors is to use their power so as to
forward the national movement, and all the great interests, such as those of
Catholic education and the independence of the tiller of the soil, which are so
wound up in it. The way to do that is to select a representative of the genuineness
of whose sympathy with their feelings they are satisfied, and, if possible, at the
same time, one who by his ability will strengthen the National phalanx in
Parliament.

he made in defence of men who had been involved in insurrectionary movements won for him a
great deal of the affection which he obtained from the people.

CE 2 August 1879. The Irish University Bill. (Special telegram from our Correspondent). London,
Friday Night. This afternoon the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in
Ireland, accompanied by the Rev. Dr. Rogers, Belfast, and the Rev. Professor Doherty,
Londonderry, had an interview in Downing-street with the Prime Minister, respecting the Irish
University Bill, the sectarian character of which they urged, and endeavoured to extract a promise
that the Government would abandon the measure. Lord Beaconsfield made an elaborate, but gave
no promise, one way or the other. Just at the end of the morning sitting this afternoon on the usual
reading of orders on the book, it was mentioned that the Irish University Bill would be taken first in
order at two o’clock next Tuesday, whereupon Mr. Courtenay attempted to throw obstacles in the
way of the measure, but was promptly sat upon. The position of the bill just now is very strange,
supported by the Government, opposed by the Obstructives, supported by the Home Rulers,
opposed by the Liberals, supported by the Irish Whig Catholics and some Irish Conservatives, but
opposed by the majority of the Conservative party. Outside Parliament it is favoured by English
Catholics including some English bishops. The debate on Tuesday next is awaited with great
interest. It is anticipated the measure will be settled for that day by talking it out, and that the
government will not strain against the growing hostility to it.
Unfortunately, the National phalanx would, from time to time, deliver controversial material: especially regarding Catholic education and the Irish University Bill.

CE 22 April 1879

The declaration of the Catholic laity of Ireland on the subject of University Education is a document which sums up in brief but forcible language the Catholic case, and is in point of justice or expediency perfectly unanswerable. It is not just to deprive Catholics of that equality in a matter so important as education to which they are entitled if the constitution and the laws are not a gigantic swindle. To answer that the existing colleges are open to them is a reply of exactly the same class as if it were said in the time of the penal laws that there were churches open for the Catholics from end to end of the country. Injustice can hardly be expedient in any high sense of the word, but it must be emphatically inexpedient in the in the last degree when it impresses the mind of the great bulk of the nation, with an abiding sense of wrong, and renders religious peace in the country an impossibility. If the Education question were fairly settled in compliance with Catholic demands and consequently the sense of oppression removed from the Catholic mind, we believe there would be found few countries in the world more free from sectarian bitterness. But it is impossible that sectarianism can be kept out of a front place in political controversies so long as a religious ascendancy is sought to be maintained of the most offensive and annoying character.

Contemporary Catholicism and the Ultramontane feeling in the Vatican proved too provocative to Gladstone and his Liberal party, whose roots were in Non-conformism. ‘And Victorians were obsessed with the role of education in forming and moulding men’s minds on all sorts of controversial subjects, especially the relationship between science and religion.’

Gladstone’s approach was therefore cautious. [He] proposed the replacement of the Queen’s College system by a new and enlarged University of Dublin, with the foundations in Cork, Galway and Belfast and the Catholic University in Dublin as affiliated institutions. This would provide a kind of ‘neutral’ university, and would be preferable to the totally unacceptable idea of a

---

186 CE 28 October 1871. The Education Question. The Tablet says the Legislature should give the majority of Irishmen the education they desire, unless it wishes to encourage Home Rule Government. The secularist Liberals are however likely to refuse the concession to Catholic claims. And CE 22 April 1879. The University Education Question. (Central News Telegraph). Dublin, Monday Night. We have reason to believe that endeavours to effect a satisfactory understanding between her Majesty’s Government and the Roman Catholic authorities in Ireland, with regard to University education have resumed and that the measure which The O’Connor Don is to introduce in the House of Commons will represent substantially a compromise or agreement, which persons in the confidence of the Irish Government on the one hand, and leading Roman Catholics on the other hand have, within a few days past, approved. The scheme is based very much on the lines and principles of the Intermediate Education Act of the last Session. A newly constituted State University, called the National University of Ireland, which will, we believe, be the existing Queen’s University under another name, and in which the present institution will merge, is proposed.

187 Boyce, Nineteenth-Century Ireland, p.156ff.
concurrent endowment for the Catholic University of Dublin (the Queen’s Colleges were largely ignored by Catholics).^{188}

CE 4 November 1879
The Catholic University of Ireland

The education question in Ireland is rapidly passing through phases of a very grave character, some of them hopeful, but others questionable, transitory, and provisional in aspect. We have for the last few weeks, reviewed the general results of the first examination under the Intermediate Education Act. The highly interesting and important proceedings last week, at the inauguration of the Very Rev. Dr. Neville, as Rector of the Catholic University in Ireland, open a new era, and seem the advent of a fresh departure in the direction of higher Education in connection with the Act of the last Session.

After the failure of repeated attempts to found a Catholic University in Dublin during the time of the Penal Laws, the passing of the Queen’s Colleges Act of 1845 by the Conservative Government of Sir Robert Peel, and the intense dissatisfaction which ensued, led the late illustrious Pope to direct the Irish Bishops to establish a University on the model of that of Louvain. The National Synod of Thurles, in 1850, addressed itself to the fulfilment of this duty, under circumstances and at a crisis of the gravest difficulty, sufficient to discourage even the bravest from projecting so gigantic an undertaking. Within the previous five years there had been a loss, by famine fever and emigration, of a million and a half, or nearly one-fifth of the population, a loss exceeding anything known in the modern history of any other nation. The country was one Lazar Hospital, from which the people fled across the Atlantic only to perish on the way. O’Connell, the glory and political guide of Ireland, had sunk of a broken heart on a foreign strand; and an insensate attempt at revolution following on his death further paralysed the popular strength of the country. The Liberal Government of Lord John Russell, seconding the policy of his predecessor, Sir Robert Peel, determined to impose, once and for all, the scheme of mixed or secular education in Ireland – the scheme of Earl Grey’s Cabinet of 1831 – the completion of which was attempted by incorporating the three Queen’s Colleges of 1845, that came into operation at the close of 1849, into the Queen’s University, the charter of which was issued in August, 1850, while the Fathers of the Council of Thurles were in session. In this measure several of the Archbishops and bishop were invited to co-operate, her Majesty having appointed them official visitors of the Colleges and the University. Large grants for sites, buildings and fittings, were provided by Parliament for the Colleges, and an ample annual endowment for their support.

To project a Catholic University at such a crisis, in a time of general suffering unparalleled in modern history, and in opposition to State institutions largely endowed and recommended by the name and popularity of a beloved Sovereign, seemed the very climax of human folly. The proceedings of last week in Stephen’s Green led us to review both experiments, that of the State and that of the Catholic people. The three Queen’s Colleges were opened November, 1849; the Queen’s University was chartered in 1850; and the Catholic University opened November, 1854. The inauguration of the third Rector of that national institution took place last week under such auspicious circumstances as compel us to take brief retrospect of the Catholic University during its gallant struggle of a century.

^{188} Boyce, Nineteenth-Century Ireland, p.156. CF. also Lyons, p.94: ‘These were the ‘godless colleges’ denounced by O’Connell (in a phrase borrowed from the High Tory, Sir Robert Inglis).’
Early in 1854, at a Synod meeting of the Bishops, Dr. (now cardinal) Newman was nominated Rector of the Catholic University, and his appointment was confirmed by his Holiness. On Whitsunday, the 4th June, in that year Dr. Newman was inaugurated as the first Rector of the Catholic University in the Pro-Cathedral, Marlborough-street, in the presence of Archbishop Cullen, the first Chancellor of the Catholic University. The solemn words of the illustrious Cardinal Archbishop of Dublin, addressed to the first Rector on that occasion, are deserving of deep consideration:

“And you, Very Rev. Father, in whom the execution of so great a work is committed by the Church of Ireland, allow me to exhort you to meet the difficulties and trials which you will have to encounter with courage and determination. You will have with you the blessing of the successor of St. Peter, the sanction and cooperation of the Church of Ireland, and the fervent prayers of the faithful. All difficulties will gradually vanish and a fair and open field will be presented to you for your labours. Teach the young committed to your care to cultivate every branch of earning, to scan the depths of every science and explore the mysteries of every art; encourage the development of talent and the flight of genius; but check the growth of error, and be a firm bulwark against everything that would be prejudicial to the interests of religion and the doctrines of the Holy Catholic Church. In all circumstances and at all times, let it be your care to infuse a strong Catholic spirit, a true spirit of religion, into the tender minds of youth; to make them understand the value of that element, of that *aroma scientiarum*, without which the sciences only corrupt the heart, and spread baneful influences around. In this way your labours will tend to restore the ancient glories of this Island of Saints; you will enrich the State with obedient, faithful, and useful subjects, and give to the Church devoted and enlightened children. Your praise will be in all the Churches, and an imperishable crown prepared for you in heaven.” These solemn and prophetic words are profoundly significant when interpreted by the events of the last twenty-five years.

---

189 On its anniversary: CE 4 June 1879. Editorial. An active agitation has been commenced against the Irish University Bill. The Liberation Society and the Nonconformist Committee have raised the cry that the proposed endowment is a mere subsidy to the Catholic Church. The supporters of the Queen’s Colleges, who do not like to see their pet institution deprived of the monopoly of State assistance, are joining in the opposition, and in the columns of the Irish Conservative journals the bill has been made the subject of continual and envenomed misrepresentation. With an utter disregard of truth the public have been told that the measure has been framed in secret by the Catholic Bishops, that it is their bill, and the Catholic laity have had no part in its preparation, have given no sanction to its provisions, and are in no way concerned as to its fate. It is to be feared that the government are by no means well disposed towards the Bill, and that unless the combined attacks of its enemies be met by an emphatic expression of Catholic opinion its fate is sealed. We would, therefore, advise the Catholic laity to sign the “Declaration” which we print in another column, in which the opinion of the great mass of the Irish Catholics on this subject is, we assert, correctly expressed.

190 CE 2 August 1879. Mr. Parnell and the Home Rulers. [...] The London correspondent of the Freeman writes – A letter was received in London on Tuesday by a well-known Home Ruler from, it is said, a Catholic clergyman, and another was received yesterday by a prominent Irish member, giving some details of the alleged speech in question. Mr. Parnell, it is said, reviewed the character of some of his colleagues in a manner more frank than conciliatory. He described Mr. Shaw as an old woman unfit to lead any party, Mr. O’Shaughnassy as having handed himself over body and soul to the Whigs, and as not giving the advanced section the least assistance; Mr. Gray, he said, should be kicked out of Tipperary at the next election, and would be; Colonel Colthurst was a wooden-headed martinet; and Mr. Gabbett a very good dancer, but politically an ass. I am sorry I cannot give any more of Mr. Parnell’s word photographs. These are all I have heard. It is further said that at the late meeting of the Home Rule members, Mr. Parnell, when his motion about the Queen’s College estimate was negatived on a division, then and there informed those Catholic
In the second half of the nineteenth century university education moved along different paths: the traditional path represented by Trinity, attended by the ‘the flower of Anglo-Irish youth’ and many Catholics of middle and upper class backgrounds – until it was formerly denounced by the hierarchy in 1875 as ‘dangerous to faith and morals’; a second path was created by Cardinal Newman, as rector of the Catholic University founded in Dublin in 1854, which began promisingly with his publication The Idea of a University, but which struggled to survive, ‘let alone make an impact on the educational world around it.’ Having passed into the hands of the Jesuits in 1883, it became the centre of learning for some of Ireland’s ‘ablest young men,’ amongst them James Joyce, Francis Sheehy-Skeffington, T.M.Kettle, and F.Cruise O’Brien.191

Equally controversial at the time were Parnell’s forages into the sphere of the Land League. Parnell’s Irish-American ‘treasure-chest’192 allowed him to direct the mounting agrarian distress constructively into the channel of the new Land League, touring the country to rouse support for the League, and to define its purpose and strategies:193

members who voted against him that they were a cowardly set of Papist rats, undeserving of getting anything. As I said, I do not vouch for all this, but as it is now the subject of conversation, there is no reason why it should be kept from those most interested – the Irish public.  
191 Lyons, p.95. Cf. also CE 26 June 1882. Irish University Education. The Catholics of Ireland have just now before them a task of considerable difficulty and complexity, in which the honour and well-being of their country is involved, and by which the best interests of religion may be benefited or injured. This task is to secure for their children such a complete and thoroughly organised system of university education as will enable the Irish Catholic youth in every department of intellectual life, literary and scientific, to stand on a footing of perfect equality with their Protestant fellow-countrymen wherever educated, whether in the Queen’s Colleges or at Trinity College. The difficulty and complexity of this task are not lessened by being in many respects masked, and even partially concealed from view; nor, again, because the work to be done belongs to the class of undertakings which are the common duty of many men of various conditions and different kinds of responsibility. […] The Catholics of Ireland have accepted the Royal University; but only for the present, and as far as it goes. It would be an error and a delusion to assume from this that they accept, or acquiesce in, or even purpose to tolerate for the future, the existing Irish arrangements as to University Education. […] They did not, it might almost be said, so much oppose the Queen’s colleges as ignore them, or rather declare them to be impossible institutions, which utterly failed to satisfy the wants or legitimate demands of the Catholic people, and the existence of which became an acute grievance, inasmuch as it created a fresh disadvantage and inequality for Catholics. […] They rae not so conceited nor so ill-informed as to imagine that they can overlook or despise the splendid equipment of the colleges, or to close their eyes to the tremendous advantages secured to their students. How can Irish Catholics, therefore, be satisfied with the public education arrangements which surround them, which fetter the limbs of their youth at every stage of the race? They are bound to do all in their power to reverse them, both because of the disadvantages they impose on themselves, and even more so because of the privileges and advantages they secure for their antagonists.

192 CE 28 October 1879. On Sunday, meetings of Irishmen in support of the anti-rent agitation in Ireland were held at Lowell and New Orleans. A Catholic priest presided at the latter, and speeches were delivered at it by two other priests. Resolutions were passed approving the course adopted by Mr. Parnell, who may expect an enthusiastic reception at the other side of the Atlantic. 
193 Jackson, p.41.
CE 19 August 1879

Land Convention in Castlebar

Castlebar, Saturday. – A meeting in connection with the land agitation in Mayo, the first convention of tenant farmers held in Ireland since the repeal of the Convention Act, took place at Castlebar to-day in Daly’s Hotel, and was attended by representative delegates from all parts of the country. […] Mr. Michael Davitt then read a document embodying the rules and objects of the proposed association: This body shall be known as the National Land League of Mayo, and shall consist of farmers and others, who will agree to labour for the objects her set forth, and subscribe to the conditions of membership, principles, and rules specified below.

Objects. – The objects for which this body is organised are –

1st. To watch over the interests of the people it represents, and protest the same as far as may be in its power to do so from an unjust and capricious exercise of power or privilege on the part of the landlords or any other class in the community (hear, hear).

2nd – To resort to every means compatible with justice, morality, and right reason which shall not clash defiantly with the constitution upheld by the powers of the British Empire in this country for the abolition of the present land laws of Ireland and the substitution in their place of such a system as shall be in accord with the social rights and interests of our people, the traditions and moral sentiments of our race, and which the contentment and prosperity of our country imperiously demand.

3rd – pending a final and satisfactory settlement of the land question the duty of this body will be to expose the injustice, wrong, or injury which may be inflicted upon any farmer in Mayo either by rack-renting, eviction, or other arbitrary exercise of power, which the existing laws enable the landlords to exercise over their tenantry, by giving all such arbitrary acts the widest publicity and meeting their perpetration with all the opposition which the laws for the preservation of the peace will permit it. In furtherance of which the following plan will be adopted: - (a) Returns to be obtained, printed, and circulated of the number of landlords in this county, the amount of acreage in possession of same, and the means by which such lands were obtained, the farms held by each, with the conditions under which they are held by their tenants, and the excess of rent paid by same of the Government valuation (hear). (b) To publish by placard or otherwise notice of contemplated evictions for non-payment of exorbitant rent, or other unjust cause, and the convening of a public meeting if deemed necessary or expedient as near the scene of such evictions as circumstances will allow, and on he day fixed upon for the same (hear, hear). (c) The publication of a list of evictions carried out, together with cases of rack-renting, giving full particulars of same, name of landlord, agents, &c., concerned, and the number of people evicted by such acts. (d) The publication of the number of all persons who shall rent or occupy land or farms from which others have been dispossessed for non-payment of exorbitant rent, or who shall offer a higher rent for land or farms than that paid by the previous occupier. (e) The publication of reductions of rent and acts of justice or kindness performed by landlords in the county.

4th. This body to undertake the defence of such of its members or others of local clubs affiliated with it who may be required to resist by law actions of landlords or their agents who may purpose doing them the injury, wrong, or injustice in connection with their land or farms.

5th. To render assistance when possible to such farmer members as may be evicted or otherwise wronged by landlords or their agents.
6th. To undertake the organising of local clubs or defence associations in the baronies, towns, and parishes of this county, the holding of public meetings and demonstrations on the land question, and the printing of pamphlets on that and other subjects for the information of the farming classes.

7th. Finally, to act as a vigilance committee in Mayo, noting the conduct of the grand jury, Poor-law guardians, town commissioners, and members of Parliament, and pronounce on the manner in which their respective functions are performed whenever the interests, social or political, of the people represented by this club renders it expedient to do so.

The following “declaration of principles” was appended to the resolutions:

The land of Ireland belongs to the people of Ireland, to be held and cultivated for the sustenance of these whom God decreed to be the inhabitants thereof. Any restriction, therefore, upon such a distribution by a feudal land system embodying the laws of primogeniture and entail, the amassing of large estates, the claiming of proprietorship under penal obligations from occupiers, and preventing the same from developing the full resources of the land, must necessarily be opposed to the Divine purpose for which it was created, and to the social rights, security and happiness of the people. The landlord system, which an alien Government has imposed upon our country in the place of that which recognised no intermediate ownership between the cultivator of the soil and the State, has reduced Ireland to a degree of poverty and social misery incompatible with the natural productiveness of this land and the progressive prosperity of other civilized nations. The area of Ireland and the natural wealth of its soil, is capable of supporting from twelve to twenty millions of inhabitants if restrictive land laws did not operate against the full development of the country’s resources and the unfettered cultivation of the land. Yet the population of eight millions previous to the 1847, was reduced by death, starvation, and exile consequent upon an artificial famine and continued impoverishment to little over five millions at the present day.  

The Cork Examiner promoted the policy of conciliation over controversy, and through articles and editorials hoped to diffuse the inflammatory situation, drawing attention to outstanding wrongs of the landed aristocracy, but helpfully pointing out the widespread feature of responsible landlordism as well.
CE 30 September 30 1879

Editorial

We are authorized and very much pleased to be able to state that the Earl of Cork has given an abatement ranging from 15 to 25 per cent to the tenantry on his large estates in the counties of Cork, Kerry, and Limerick, on two gales of rent, viz.: that about to be collected next month, and the gale that will be collected next spring. This announcement is the more important as there have been whispers of a determination on the part of the great proprietors to band themselves together with the view to resisting anything in the shape of general or systematic reduction. We by no means accept these statements as true, and even if they have been mad with some show of authority, we are not without hope that the views which have led to such a resolution are capable of modification. It may well be hoped that the example of a nobleman like the Earl of Cork will not be without an important influence in determining the course of others, and we hope to see it extensively followed. The organs of the landlord party – those which affect to speak in the name of the owners of property – are constantly dwelling on the advice that tenants get on the platform of public meetings. Well, we are not going to endorse every sentiment uttered, or even every counsel offered at those gatherings. But it may be well to remember that there are two sides to the question, and that injudicious counsel is not confined to one. The platform doubtless sometimes hears very extreme expressions from men whose deficient judgement or passionate sympathy with the masses leads them beyond the bounds of prudence, but in the quiet of the lordly mansion it is not clear to us but there is advice given which errs in the opposite direction. Most of the great proprietors of the South – we speak of those we know best – are, we believe, disposed to act with kindness and forbearance towards their tenantry. We believe they would willingly do what they thought to be right. […] A ready acceptance of the obligation which the condition of things at the present moment has placed on the owners of property, such as seems to have been general at the other side of the Channel, would do much to counteract the evil effects of the inflammatory eloquence which has been indulged in by the landlord organs, and which has done so much to aggravate existing differences. Those who stand between the great proprietors and the adoption of such a course, as that which Lord Cork has, with equal judgment and generosity, may, be their intentions what they will, hold themselves answerable for a good deal of embittered feeling in connection with the Land Question.

CE 14 October 1879

There are at present many vague rumours flying about of measures to be resorted to by the Government to dispose of the Land agitation in a manner gratifying to the landlords. Of course they are not very precisely indicated. A leading Government organ suggests no less violent a remedy than to dissolve parliament and go to the country with hostility to the Irish Obstructionists and Land agitators for a cry. […] They would like these agrarian meetings to be suppressed by proclamation, with the reservation, of course, that those who did hold them after warning given should be shot down. […] We believe that the course indicated by Mr. Parnell at Navan, the suggestion to tenants to keep in their minds the idea of an ultimate resistance, is, if there were any likelihood of its being carried out into actual practice, calculated to injure principally the tenants themselves. 196 […] It

196 CE 17 October 1879. Editorial. Speaking at Newry yesterday, Mr. Parnell said the only real way to prosperity to Ireland was to obtain a restoration of a native Parliament, and this consummation would not be far distant. The land question would be settled in one way, by a determined opposition
may be hoped that the present agricultural crisis does not represent a normal state of things. [...] But should the suggestions that are made to the government be adopted, what will be the necessary consequences? Suppose the Government dissolve and go shouting to the constituencies “down with the Irish” they might successfully arouse too ready dislike of England and Scotland towards this country into a pestilent activity. If they do so, we on our side are not likely to be backward in responding to the call. What will the consequence be? Why the inflaming of old national hatreds that it has been the aim of all wise English statesmen to abate. In such a case would the position of Irish landlords be pleasant than it has been of late? They might get themselves constituted once more a tyrannical ascendancy and a sort of foreign garrison in the heart of Ireland. Would that make their position more safe or agreeable? [...] The Coercion Act they demand would be simpler for the Government, but we are not sure that it would be better for those who ask for it. The spirit of the time, which is gradually insisting more and more strongly on the independence of the tiller of the soil, is not to be suppressed by the action of brute force. [...] Owners of property in Ireland may well believe that their worst enemies are not to be found on platforms alongside Mr. Parnell, but amongst the leader writers of the Orange papers and the amateur correspondents of the Times.

CE 20 December 1879
Supplement
The Irish Question
The following is a translation of the text of the letter which appeared in the Republique Francaise, and of which Mr. F.H. O'Donnell, M.P. for Dungarvan, subsequently avowed the authorship: -

“It is with indignation against odious manoeuvres, as well as the most lively confidence in the sympathy of the French people, that the Irish Nationalists have learned the deplorable reality of their situation in the public opinion of Europe. The English Government plays the “role” of Liberator and Reformer amongst the continental nations. It seeks for improvements in Asia Minor; it represents itself as the protector of the liberty of the people and of industry in the East. Ah! if an assembly could be collected for the purpose of considering the domestic policy of England! If Plenipotentiaries of great Powers could have an opportunity of studying the English way of improving the condition of the farmers and tenants of Ireland.

Europe knows that the state of affairs in Ireland is of the gravest and most disastrous character, profound misery, restlessness of mind, public protestations and meetings, marches and countermarches of the military and police, arrests and imprisonment of the popular leaders, and in a word, all the symptoms of distress, discontent, and its suppression by mere force.

In this 19th century it has long been admitted as an axiom that when a Government is in a constant struggle with the governed, there must be some vice in the Constitution. [...] It may be seen that I don’t seek to disguise the accusations made against the Irish people. On the contrary, I expose them in all their rawness, in order to prove that they are calumnies, invented on purpose to mislead the conscience of Europe. It is the interest of the English Government to hide its despotism in Ireland, for otherwise, who would believe in its pretended

on the part of the tenantry to pay unjust rents, and by determined obstruction in Parliament to the passing of bad laws. It was impossible for the farmers of this country to compete with a country like America, where the land was free to the people. They should stick to their agitation and encourage the tenants to take a determined attitude towards the landlords who asked too high rents.
disinterestedness, in its intervention in favour of the Rayahs of Turkey, and the Fellahs of Egypt. But let not Europe allow herself to be imposed upon in this way; England has at home millions of unfortunate Rayahs and oppressed Fellahs. […] The London publications inform you that Mr. Parnell and his colleagues demand “the abolition of rents;” that their agitation is directed against the payment of rents on farms – that is a lie – an infamous lie. The London publications omit one word which makes all the difference: the Irish patriots have not got up the agitation against the rents, but against exorbitant rents. […] It is pretended that our object is to change the Irish peasantry into peasant proprietors without compensation to the actual lords of the soil. That again is a lie. Mr. Parnell proposes, like Sein and Hardenburg in Prussia, that the State be the mediator between the proprietors and the cultivators, and that it facilitate between them a system of agreement by which the latter can become proprietors in their turn by paying over and above the fixed rents a certain stipulated sum annually for 35 years commencing from that. […] Another lie states that Mr. Parnell and his colleagues urge the people to insurrection. This is as monstrous as it is absurd. We are Irishmen and we love our country. We are members of Parliament, and we know the strength of the Government and the weakness of Ireland. We cannot desire our country to become the prey of soldiers just returned from the war of extermination of the south of Africa. […] We know the advantages of an agitation that is constitutional and legal. For the first time since the pretended Union with England, Ireland possesses a majority of national representatives. We are sixty in the Parliament of Westminster. Our electors, being organised, take an important part in the party contests in forty large towns and cities of England and Scotland. We are seven millions of Irishmen in Ireland and Great Britain. We have friends and compatriots in all the large colonies, who are in the enjoyment of self-government […]. The two hundred millions of the natives of India who are entirely handed over to the arbitrary rule of the English Governors have their eyes fixed upon us, and consider us as the champions put forward in the cause of right and liberty.197

197 CE 28 January 1880. The Distress – Mr. O’Donnell’s Appeal for Continental Aid.(Special telegram from our correspondent) London, Tuesday Night. The Times’ correspondent says that the Italian Press publish Mr. O’Donnell’s appeal for Continental aid and sympathy, commenting favourably thereupon, and denouncing British rule in Ireland. And CE 6 February 1880. The Pope and Ireland Rome, Feb. 1st I send you a copy of the letter received this day (Feb. 1st) by Mgr. Kirby, Rector of the Irish College, Rome, from Cardinal Nina, inclosing the sum of ten thousand francs for Ireland. I believe the Congregation of Propaganda Fide and other bodies will imitate the example of the Holy Father, and send donations to relieve the Irish sufferers.

CE 13 February 1880. Mr. O’Donnell’s Amendment. (Special telegram from our correspondent). London, Thursday Night. Mr. O’Donnell resumed at five o’clock, his speech on the amendment to the Royal Address. He made a vigorous and unsparing attack on the Government and English rule of Ireland generally. He was particularly severe on Lord Beaconsfield, whom he called a successful adventurer, an Imperial Bohemian, who bamboozled the stupid intellects of English Conservatism, as his Jewish brethren palmed off the spurious silks of Egypt on the dames of Venice. Lord Beaconsfield, he declared, was a great electioneering agent, but no statesman. The member for Dungarvan commented bitterly on the conspiracy between the Ministry and the Ministerial organs, whereby the first absented themselves while the Irish representatives were urging the cause of Ireland, and the second suppressed the case submitted in its behalf. Mr. O’Donnell was occasionally too vehement in manner, but made on the whole a very able speech. Mr. Biggar followed, and Mr. Finnegan and others supported the amendment.
2.4.2. Agitation in Austria

In the 1870s the Continent was embroiled in regional agitation itself, Austria, in particular, being pulled at the seams of its imperial mantle.

CE 16 May 1870
Austria
Vienna, 18th Evening.
The Emperor has addressed an autograph letter to Lieutenant Field Marshal Coller, removing him from his post as governor of Bohemia, but expressing himself at the same time in acknowledgment of the great services he has rendered to the State. His Majesty has appointed to succeed him Prince Dietrichstein Mensdorff.

France also had to brave a challenge placed by the people:

CE 16 May 1870
The Emperor and the Prebiscatum
The Spectator says it must be weary work for the Emperor to learn, as he is learning, that after all his work and his success there is hatred for him wherever there is intelligence. [...] A Hapsburg might not mind, for he is in his place by divine right, but a Bonaparte must for he claims to rule by the will of the people. The plebescitum shows that the future is against the Bonapartes.

And Russia remained an element of uncertainty in the East,

CE 16 September 1871
Editorial.
The Cloche says the Vienna Cabinet intends appealing to the Russian Government to put an end to the Muscovite Panslavism in Bohemia. The same paper says that the relations of the two Governments are not of the best.

The most important events at the beginning of the decade were marked by the Franco-Prussian War and the proclamation of the Second German Reich, thus promoting King Wilhelm I of Prussia to German Kaiser. In the Kulturkampf, lasting well into the 1880s, the new German state embarked on a ‘trial of strength’ with the Catholic Church as a reaction to the Vatican decreeing the pope’s

---

198 CE 17 May 1870. Assassination of an Austrian Prince. The circumstances of the murder of Prince Louis of Arenberg, military attache at the Austrian Legation in Russia are narrated on Saturday in a letter from St.Petersburg. The prince, who was found assassinated in his bed, had two servants, a valet-de-chambre and a groom, who have been in his service for eight years. [...] At the moment when Prince Louis of Arenberg was murdered, he was preparing to make an excursion to the Caucasus, in the company of Colonel Blanc, the military attache to the British Legation at St.Petersburg.

199 Taylor, p.157: ‘Only the Bohemien Diet expressed sympathy with France and protested against the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine; a gesture of moral support more challenging to the Germans than useful to France. It was repaid, with equal futility, by French expressions of sympathy in 1938.’
infallibility. 200 The German state was to be a model of secular nationalism, although Catholics were persecuted, and the economy was to become independent, although the agricultural crisis caused many Germans to emigrate. 201

CE 8 September 1871
Austria and Germany

The Eastern Budget publishes the following letter from its Vienna correspondent, dated the 3rd instant: - “The second meeting of the Austrian and German Emperors is to take place at Salzburg on the 6th. The two Imperial Chancellors will be present, and also the Prime Ministers of Hungary and Cis-Lithuania, Count Andrassy and Sohenwarth, who were invited by their Emperor in order to be presented to the Emperor of Germany. On this occasion the understanding arrived at in the Conference at Gastein is to be finally confirmed. […] The task of the two Ministers was merely to examine whether and in what manner the personal re-approachment between the representatives of the two dynasties which rule in Central Europe could be brought into harmony with the interests of their respective states, and taken advantage of for the promotion of European peace. It is creditable to these two statesmen that they perceived with equal sagacity and zeal the great advantage which the Austro-Hungarian and German empires would derive from a concerted policy. The idea which inspired the present agreement was the same as that which originated in the great political manifestation of last December – namely, of determining the relations between the two empires exclusively by their national interests, now that their old dynastic policy has been given up. […] Judging by recent events, any precaution taken against Socialism must be welcome. 202

200 Cassell’s Chronology, p.422: 18 July The First Vatican Council votes in favour of the idea that the pope’s ‘infallibility’ when he speaks ex cathedra on issues of faith and morals. The vote reflects the Catholic Church’s feelings of vulnerability in the face of radical nationalism and liberalism. Cf. 20 Sept. Italian troops enter Rome [to] fight the battle of Sedan. The unification of Italy, initially helped by Napoleon III’s diplomatic ambitions, is now completed amid his personal and political ruination.

201 Idem, pp.422ff. CE 25 October 1871. Editorial. The United States’ Census of 1870 has demonstrated the important fact that nearly one-tenth of the inhabitants were born either in Ireland or Germany; Ireland having contributed 1,855,779, and Germany 1,690,533. The largest number of Irish reside in New York, where there are 528,806, but the Germans are more evenly distributed through the country. In New York they number 316,902. There are larger numbers of Germans than Irish in the West, and more Irish than Germans in the Atlantic States.

202 CE 13 September 1871. The International Society and the Emperors. The International Society, according to the Vienna papers, has occupied more attention at the meeting of Count Beust and Bismarck than any other question. They are the best reason for believing that a great effort is about to be made by the European governments to crush this society. The Belgian employers are forming a League to prevent all partial strikes, by a general locking out. A meeting of the leading manufacturers was held on Saturday in Paris, with the same object, strikes being apprehended in France, in towns where industrial activity is reviving. The Journal des Debats strongly approves of this course saying that it would be far more effectual than a law against the International. And CE 12 October 1871. Prosecution of Members of the International at Prague. Pesth, Tuesday. – The investigation of the case of the workmen who were arrested on the charge of being concerned in the International has been concluded. The evidence proved that the accused were all in direct communication with the Paris Commune, and received instructions from the International Society. The deputies belonging to the party of the Extreme Left are compromised. The Cork Examiner did not entirely condemn Socialism but tried to reach a conciliatory tone: CE 9 November 1871. Editorial. The city has been visited once again with strikes of workmen, which, though partial, have caused some suspension of business, and may probably proceed to a yet more serious extent. We propose to offer a few considerations on a subject, the principles of which,
The decades which succeeded the Franco-Prussian War were marked by a great expansion of German industry and commerce, and the population which had previously been predominately rural swelled the numbers in the towns, and soon the balance between urban and rural Germany was reversed. Leadership in two important branches of industry, the chemical and the electrical, ‘fell as a natural prize to the superior education of the German people’ \(^{203}\) Impetus was also given to marine enterprise and the old Hanseatic spirit was revived.

It is difficult to overestimate the achievements of the German people during the twenty years of Bismarckian peace, which followed the convulsion of the Franco-Prussian War. Great as had been the pace of economic progress, it had not outstripped the organizing power of the German mind. The foundations of public education had been wisely and truly laid. The schools were good, the Universities were numerous, and inspired with a zeal for the advancement of knowledge. Nowhere were the advantages to be derived from the marriage of science and industry more quickly, more generally, or more intelligently perceived. In the field of business the organizing instinct of the German people had led to the foundation of Kartells or combines for the maintenance of prices and the limitation of output. Scientific and learned treatises issued every year in prodigal abundance from the printing presses. No people in Europe read more widely or seriously. Music was everywhere – cheaper than in France, more universal than in England, and the best (save for Vienna) to be found in any quarter of the globe. \(^{204}\)

As Austria had remained neutral in the Franco-Prussian war and now accepted German hegemony, the Austrian Emperor no longer felt committed to his German liberals, and in the autumn of 1870 he had turned to Taffe once more to negotiate conciliation with the Czechs. Unfortunately, when talks with both Germans and Czechs collapsed, there remained only two alternatives: ‘the dogmatic Austrian centralists, still led by Schmerling, or the federalizing aristocrats whose last representative had been Belcredi.’ \(^{205}\)

\(^{203}\) Fisher, p.1050.
\(^{204}\) Fisher, p.1057.
\(^{205}\) Taylor, p.157.
The Magyars insisted that they would never tolerate Schmerling as Prime Minister of Austria; and this Hungarian interference in the affairs of Austria made Francis Joseph the more resolved to appoint a ministry which would recognize Bohemian rights and so deprive Hungary of her unique position. In February 1871, a ‘ministry above the parties’ came into office, federal in programme, yet – despite liberal outcry – mainly German in membership.206

Hohenwart, a German aristocrat, became Prime Minister, and Schäffle, a radical Protestant intellectual from Baden, Minister of Commerce. Schäffle was devoted to the German spiritual tradition, not Prussian force, and believed this tradition could be renewed in the Austrian Empire.

Schäffle was almost the first to grasp the class division of the nationalities; and he advocated universal suffrage as weapon at once against liberalism and against the German monopoly. With the limitless confidence of the idealist, he believed that the Germans would quietly accept the loss of their privileged position207 and that universal suffrage would make Austria universally contented and so capable of challenging Magyar hegemony also. Universal suffrage was too daring a doctrine for Francis Joseph, and Schäffle had to be content with a meagre extension of the franchise – enough, however, to give the Czechs control of the Bohemian Diet.208

CE 12 September 1871
Editorial

Telegrams from Vienna state that the home rule party have completely triumphed at the elections, and that the new imperial Parliament will show a clear majority for granting increased autonomy to the various provinces of the empire. The imperial principle, after ruling Europe for some centuries, is giving way before the progress of political knowledge among the masses.209

The Cork Examiner’s almost daily reports on the situation in the Empire, reflected Ireland’s growing interest in the politics of home rule and the natural curiosity to observe similar events abroad, for example:

206 Idem.
207 CE 18 September 1871. The Bohemian Diet. Prague, Saturday. – The German members were absent from the Diet to-day. A declaration on their part was read justifying their non-participation in the debate by the illegality of the Diet in consequence of the prerogatives asserted by the Crown. They protest against any illegal votes that may be passed, and request that the Governor will bring their declaration under the notice of the Government.
208 Taylor, p.158. And CE 20 September 1871. The New Austrian Diet. The New Austrian Diets have everywhere opened with rejoicings and acclamations at the triumph of Federalist policy. The Emperor has completely accepted the new state of affairs.
209 CE 12 September 1871. Austrian Federalism. The party in favour of granting separate constitutions to the Austrian Nationalists has completely triumphed at the elections. The adoption of the new policy is certain.
CE 13 September 1871. Austria. Vienna, Tuesday Evening. – Count Chokete, the Austrian Minister at St.Petersburg, has been appointed Governor of Bohemia, pro tem. Various other appointments of provincial functionaries have been made.
CE 16 September 1871
Austrian Federalism
Prague, Sept. 14. – The Bohemian Diet was opened to-day. The Royal rescript was [sic] read, which, after referring to the patent of 30th July, 1870, expresses a wish for a settlement of the relations of the Kingdom of Bohemia with the remainder of the monarchy. It recognises the right of the Kingdom of Bohemia, and announces that his majesty is ready to reiterate this recognition by a coronation oath. The rescript calls upon the Diet to deliberate upon the constitutional status for the Kingdom of Bohemia without violating the rights of the other kingdoms and provinces of the monarchy, and concludes by mentioning a bill to be submitted by the Government providing new regulations for elections to the Diet, and also a Nationality Bill.

CE 20 September 1871
The Home Rule Question in Austria
Vienna, Monday. – The Official Evening Post remarks that in the proposed Bohemian draftlaw a basis has for the first time been obtained, upon which it is possible to discuss the question of understanding with the constitutional opposition. The form of agreement can naturally only be in a constitutional sense a Reichsrath, containing representatives from all parts of the Empire, which will have to investigate these demands, and to decide upon acceptance or rejection.

CE 11 October 1871
Editorial
The Bohemian Diet adopted yesterday by a unanimous vote the bill carrying into effect the scheme of home rule framed by a committee of the legislature.

CE 11 October 1871
The Home Rule Question in Austria.
Prague, Tuesday. – In to-day’s sitting of the Bohemian Diet, the Nationality Bill and the new electoral regulation were read a second time, in conformity with the proposals of the committee. The draft of the address, together with the appendices relating to the fundamental laws, was then unanimously read a third time, each vote being recorded. With reference to Herr Riegers motion it is announced that two thirds of the members of the Diet have declared in favour of the committee’s proposals.

CE 13 October 1871
Combination Against Count Beust.
Vienna, Thursday. – According to the Neue Freie Presse of to-day, Ministers Schoffel [sic] and Habietinck have expressed their determination to resign in case Count Beust is not removed from office. This determination

---

210 Taylor, p.160/1: ‘Hohenwart’s policy could have been carried through only at the price of new conflict with the two nations whose opposition had weakened the empire for twenty years. The Czechs lacked as yet the numbers, the unity, and the wealth to be formidable. [Yet] the Germans, too, did not owe their return to office to their own strength. They had been imposed on Austria by th eMagyars. These were the victors of 1871: they perpetuated national conflicts in Austria and so ensured their own predominance at the very moment when changed foreign circumstances made it less necessary. Beaust had failed and was now dismissed; he was succeeded as Foreign Minister by Andrassy, who thus attained th eposition which he had coveted ever since his return from exile.’
appears to have been arrived at in consequence of the demonstration of the students in Aula, of the university, at the inauguration of the Rector Magnificus.

CE 17 October 1871
Editorial

The Home Rule agitation threatens to be a source of some trouble in Austria. Count Beust, the Imperial Chancellor, is directly opposed to the concession of the demands of the Czechs, as put forward by the Bohemian Diet, and threatens to resign if they are granted. The German population support the Chancellor, who has also on his side the sympathies of Prince Bismarck, and late telegrams from Vienna state that the demands will not be granted. The Czechs, and the various other nationalities are resolved to press their claim, and the circumstances may be serious if some solution be not speedily found.

CE 17 October 1871
Expected Civil war in Austria
Vienna advices state that there is no chance of the Government conceding the exorbitant demands of Czechs. Civil war is not an improbable result of the crisis.

CE 18 October 1871
The Home Rule Question in Austria
Vienna, Monday. – The Emperor intends postponing his decision as to the reply to be given to the demands of the Bohemian diet. He has heard the opinion of all Ministers on the subject.

CE 28 October 1871
The Austrian Ministerial Crisis

The Emperor of Austria has at length adopted a course which must prove decisive of the ministerial crisis. The Hungarian Minister, with Count Beust, have drawn up an ultimatum, placing the bargain with Hungary and the legality of the December Constitution above discussion. This ultimatum, which virtually rejects the demands of the Bohemians for independence, will be sent to the Bohemian Diet.

CE 30 October 1871
Editorial

Late telegrams from Vienna confirm the intelligence that the Home Rule party in the Austrian Ministry have been defeated, and that the forthcoming Imperial rescript will contain a decisive rejection of the demands of the Bohemian Diet. Great difficulty is, however, experienced by Count Hohenwarth in forming a new Cabinet, and the Times correspondent believes that the home Rule party will not accept their defeat as final. The same correspondent doubts that they will succeed in carrying their scheme through the Reichsrath even should the German members decline to take their seats, and says that in the Upper House the advocates of Home Rule not only do not command the necessary majority of two-thirds, but are in an absolute minority. It is further believed that the Hungarian Parliament, upon full consideration of their situation, will not be disposed to countenance the demand, as it would materially alter their position in relation to the rest of the empire, and the Poles are becoming uncertain, while the feeling against the movement amongst the Germans, both in Austria and in the neighbouring empire, has become very intense. The reconstruction of the empire proposed by the Home
Rulers would create five groups of states for purposes of domestic legislation – a German group consisting of the purely German provinces; a Bohemian, consisting of Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia; a Hungarian, consisting of Hungary and Transylvania; a Croatian, consisting of Croatia, Dalmatia, Slavonia, the military Frontier, and part of Carinthia and Carniola.

CE 30 October 1871
Austria

Peste, Saturday. – In to-day’s sitting of the Lower House of the Hungarian Diet Herr Helfy, a member of the extreme Left, asked the President of the Ministry, Count Andrassy, if it were true he was using his influence to prevent the demands of the Bohemian Diet being granted, and what motives he could assign for this course, which was incompatible both with the interests and laws of Hungary.

CE 2 November 1871
Home Rule in Austria

Vienna, Wednesday. – The Neue Freie Presse announces that Baron Kellerberg has been instructed with the formation of a new cabinet on the basis of maintaining the present constitution.

CE 7 November 1871
Home Rule in Austria

Prague, Saturday. – The Imperial rescript, in reply to the memorial of the Bohemian Diet, was read to the Diet in to-day’s sitting. The document emphatically declared that the homogeneity of Hungary with the Empire is on full force by virtue of the law, and that the administrative relations of the Cisleithian dependencies have been regulated by the fundamental laws of the realm. Changes could, therefore, only be brought about by constitutional means. The Rescript exhorts the Diet to send representatives to the Imperial Parliament. It expresses a confident hope that the members would be sent to the Reichsrath. Abstention in this respect involving grave responsibilities.

Vienna, Saturday. – Baron Von Kellersperg is said to have proposed a list of ministers to the Emperor. The programme of Baron Kellersperg includes the dissolution of the Diets in Bohemia, Moravia, Carniola, Upper Austria, Galicia, and the Bukowina.

CE 8 November 1871
Editorial

Count Beust, who was one of the most strenuous opponents of the home rule movement in Austria, has resigned his office as Imperial Chancellor and is about to be replaced by Count Andrassy, the President of the Hungarian Ministry. The change seems to foreshadow a compromise on the question.

CE 9 November 1871
Editorial

The Vienna correspondent of the Standard states that the resignation of Count Beust has produced quite a panic in Vienna, and caused a fall in the Stock Exchange. It is reported that the dismissed Minister will be sent as Ambassador to England, in order to soften the bitterness of his defeat, but according to other reports his fall is not definitive, and powerful influences are being brought to bear to effect a compromise, and secure his restoration to office. The Times regards the
dismissal of the German minister as an event of the gravest character, inasmuch as it will occasion widespread alarm amongst the German population, and will encourage the Czechs to persevere in their demands. The surmises of the times are to some extent borne out by the action of the Bohemian Diet yesterday in reference to the Imperial Rescript rejecting its demands and directing it to proceed to the election of members to the Reichsrath. The Diet declined to make the election, and was thereupon closed.

CE 9 November 1871
Resignation of Count Beust.

[…] The Times cannot be indifferent to this important event; Count Beust retires, but Count Andrassy, who agrees with him in the substance of his policy, assumes office as minister of Foreign Affairs. The Czechs believe Beust to be the representative of German ascendancy, [illegible] the Germans rely on him to check the policy which would place their race under the control of alien majorities. His resignation will produce alarm and irritation on one side, and hopes destined perhaps to disappointment on the other. The feelings cannot but have their effect on the empire, and the expectation of what’s to come bids the times look upon the event as one of the most important of the present year.

CE 9 November 1871
City Edition.
By Telegraph.
The Home Rule Agitations in Austria. Refusal of the Bohemian Diet to Send Deputies to the Imperial Parliament.
Prague, Wednesday. – The Bohemian Diet unanimously declined in today’s sitting to proceed with the election of members to the Reichsrath. The Diet was therefore closed.

CE 11 November 1871
Austria
Vienna, Thursday. – According to the New Free Press the formal appointment of Count Andrassy as well as the official acceptance of Count Beust’s resignation and his appointment to the Embassy at the Court of St. James under peculiarly favourable personal conditions may be expected to-day.

CE 15 November 1871
Austria
The Times draws a gloomy picture of the present position of Austria, which it describes as the sick man of Europe. If, it says, by the fall of Count Beust, the failure of his successor, or the weakness of the Court, the Austrian Germans become alarmed, an impulse may be given to the disintegration of the Empire which no caution or forbearance on the part of its neighbours may be able to control.

CE 16 November 1871
Continental Affairs
In Hungary the paper which is Count Andrassy’s organ, says his policy must be a close alliance with Prussia and distrust of Russia. A letter from Kossuth is published in Germany in which he expresses warm sympathy for the Czechs. The independence of Bohemia, he says, can never affect the interest of Hungary.
CE 17 November 1871
Editorial
The Bohemian Chamber having refused to send delegates to the Imperial Parliament on account of the rejection of their demand for home rule, the new Austrian Government have issued orders that the election shall be made by the direct vote of the people, thus ignoring the local legislature.

CE 22 November 1871
Austria
Vienna, Monday. – The morning journals unanimously state, as a positive fact, that negotiations are being carried on with Prince Adolphe Auersperg in reference to the formation of the Cisleithian Cabinet. Prince Auersperg has not yet submitted his programme to the Emperor, as he has still to consult his political friends.

Excursus: The Empress Elisabeth and Ireland
CE 10 January 1879
The Empress of Austria’s Visit to Ireland
A Pesth correspondent says “There is a whisper that on the occasion of her late sojourn in England the court of St. James did not exactly display that etiquette towards the Austrian empress which her position ought to have insured. There were a coldness and stiffness exhibited both by the Palace and the aristocracy that is said to have somewhat marred what might otherwise have been a more agreeable visit. Some ago the Empress determined to visit Ireland, where fox hunting is reported to be the finest in the world. […] Besides, the Austrian Court, and the Austrian throne has, in times gone by, been surrounded by a galaxy of Irish gallantry and valour that has acquired an historic character. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that the Empress should have made up her mind to spend a hunting season in a land which is associated with so many favourable souvenirs. A suitable residence in Kildare or Meath was some time ago secured, and a steamer chartered for the transport of her Majesty’s suite and stud. […] All of a sudden a hitch has occurred, and every Court gossip has a different history to relate of the cases that it is thought must lead to the abandonment of the proposed visit. […] Queen Victoria commissioned Prince Teck, who was formerly an Austrian officer, to proceed on a mission to the Austrian Court. Prince Teck travelled incognito, and his arrival was ascribed to personal matters. It now transpires that the Prince was entrusted with the very delicate task of impressing upon the Emperor and Empress the inadvisability of the latter’s visit to Ireland. It was represented that Ireland was a Catholic country, and that its people would be likely to make demonstrations in favour of a Catholic Empress on their soil which might contrast strangely when compared with a welcome given to a Protestant Sovereign. Her majesty confessed that she had every faith in the loyalty and devotion of her Irish Roman Catholic subjects, but as such demonstrations might be made the means of serving other ends than mere courtesy her Majesty thought it more fitting that the visit of the Empress should be indefinitely postponed. The Emperor Francis Joseph expressed his concurrence with the views and wishes of her Majesty Queen Victoria, but assured Prince Teck that the proposed visit had no other object but that of affording the Empress the gratification of the chase. He further intimated that he had no doubt that the Empress Elizabeth would postpone the visit in view of these
representations. I am informed, however, that her Majesty stated that whilst
appreciating the grounds of Queen Victoria’s fears she nevertheless purposes to
make her hunting tour in Ireland, in the assure conviction that the private and
special nature of her visit will not be accompanied by any such demonstrations as
those hinted at or feared by the English Court. It is even said that the Emperor
Francis Joseph has intimated that he has been opposed to this Irish visit from the
very outset, but that her Majesty is not to be moved from her purpose. The
resolution of the empress is reported to have caused great pain to the emperor, who,
nevertheless, is inclined to insist on the empress complying with the wishes of the
Court of St. James. Knowing that her Majesty has always carried her point in the
past, I feel convinced that she will score a victory on this occasion.211

The trip had only been suspended for a little while, and late February it was
made known that the Empress Elisabeth was actually on her way to Ireland.

CE 20 February 1879
The Empress of Austria’s visit to Ireland.
Vienna, Wednesday Evening.
The Empress Elisabeth left here to-day on her visit to Ireland, and will
reach Calais tomorrow evening. Among her Majesty’s suite are Count Von Laresch
Moenich, baron Ivan Von Nopessa, Prince Rudolph Lichtenstein, Countess
Festetics Von Tolna, and Herr Lange, court physician.

Given the strong reservations on the part of Queen Victoria regarding the
royal Catholic visit, Empress Elisabeth’s sojourn in Ireland was given perhaps
more publicity than would have been due under other circumstances. As such, an
almost daily recital of her actions and whereabouts were dutifully reported, much
in keeping with any celebrity occasion of the present:

CE 22 February 1879
The Empress of Austria in Ireland.
(Central News Telegram)
Dublin, Friday Night.

211 CE 15 January 1879.Queen Victoria and the Empress of Austria. (Special telegram from our
Correspondent) London, Tuesday Night.Queen Victoria has despatched a second autograph letter to
the Emperor of Austria remonstrating against the intention of the Empress to occupy a temporary
residence in Ireland during the hunting season. Her Britannic Majesty repeats her previous
objections to such an arrangement on the part of the Austrian Empress, and urges that though no
protest can be entered on political, public, or international grounds, these personal considerations
which govern the amicable relations of sovereigns are powerful enough in this case to suggest the
propriety of withdrawing a step, which, if carried out, would bear the aspect of offence and
intrusion. It is understood here that the Empress of Austria persists in her design, and that the
Cabinet and court are strongly in sympathy with it.
CE 18 January 1879.The Queen and the Empress of Austria.(Special telegram from our
Correspondent).London, Friday Night.The result of the second autograph letter addressed by Queen
Victoria to Schonbrunn remonstrating against the visit of the Austrian Empress to Ireland is that her
Majesty has abandoned her intention for the present. The residence engaged will be, however,
retained.
Much interest is felt in the visit to Ireland of the Empress of Austria, who will arrive at the North Wall at 9.30 to-morrow. Notwithstanding the efforts which have been made to induce her Majesty to pay a brief visit to Dublin, she has expressed a resolve to preserve a strict incognito as the Countess of Hohenembs. The Empress will travel direct from the North Wall to Kildock Station in a special train put on by the Midland company, and proceed from that to Summerhill House, where she will remain for nearly a month. Precautions have been taken to render her Majesty's reception to-morrow as private as possible in accordance with her wishes.212

Elisabeth, known for her horsemanship, could not have resisted a trip to Ireland, itself the country of origin of the National Hunt,213 and its longstanding tradition of hunting with hounds. There used to be a saying in Ireland that the sign of a "good" family was "a priest in the family, a pump in the yard, and the hunt once a year". Hunting with hounds is a tradition in Ireland that goes back to ancient times and features strongly in Celtic literature and legend.214 In those earlier years, packs of hounds belonged to local families and disputes often arose between neighbouring landowners over hunt boundaries or their respective hunting country, as it is known. Family names such as the Nicholsons of Meath, the O'Driscolls of West Cork, the McCalmonots of Kilkenny, the Filgates of Louth and the famous Ryans of Scarteen, still survive to this day and still have strong connections with foxhunting in Ireland.215 The following account offers an impressive picture of the Empress in the saddle.

212 CE 24 February 1879. Editorial. [...] The Empress of Austria arrived in Dublin on Saturday morning, and although her coming was not public, she was accorded a most cordial reception by the people. She proceeded at once to Somerville House.
213 Nowadays, National Hunt racing is the official name of horseracing in the United Kingdom and Ireland where the horses jump over obstacles. The National Hunt season is usually held during the winter when it is not competing with the more glamorous sport of flat racing, and the softer ground at this time is also more appropriate for jumping. This type of jump racing is only taken seriously in Britain, Ireland and France, in Ireland being far more popular than flat racing, while in England it is more balanced. As the horses come from a variety of sources, former flat horses, others bred for jumping, they do not have to be thoroughbreds, but the ones who are not tend to be French. National hunt racing actually originated in Ireland in the southern counties, with early races of two-horse contests, known as "pounding races," popular in the early 18th century. These long trips across country required horses to jump whatever obstacles the landscape offered. The first record of such a race took place between the towns of Buttevant and Doneraile in County Cork in 1752. The distance of the race was 4.5 miles (7.2km), start and finish marked by the church steeple in each town, hence the term "steeplechase". The first use of the term steeplechase on an official racecard was in Ireland in the early 19th century. Cf. online [http://www.en.wikipedia.org/] 10.05.2007.
214 The Hunting Association of Ireland, founded in 1859, is the national body which coordinates and promotes hunting with hounds.
215 Almost every county has its own County Hounds. The Muskerry Hunt is the oldest pack in the country having been established in 1743, while the Duhallow is the oldest pack with continuous record having been established in 1745. The Kildare Hounds have records to show that a Hunt Club existed in Kildare as far back as 1766. Other hunts with a rich and long tradition include the Ballymacad Hunt centered around Oldcastle in Co. Meath who celebrated their bicentennial in 1997 and the Kilkenny Hunt, the oldest county pack in the country, also established in 1797. The Ward
CE 25 February 1879
The Empress of Austria in an Irish Hunting Field
(Special telegram from our Correspondent).
Dublin, Monday Night.

To-day the Empress of Austria had her inaugural essay over an Irish hunting country, and was afforded one of the most brilliant runs the famed Ward Union members have ever enjoyed. The day was fine but piercingly cold, and there was a high wind blowing. The meet was in the lawn of Mr. James Thurider, Parsonstown Manor, Batterstown, and upwards of 150 followers of the chase awaited the word to go. Amongst the company was Earl Spencer, the ex-Irish Viceroy, who had come specially over from his seat in England to enjoy a few days with this now noted pack of staghounds. [...] The Empress rose magnificently throughout, having a most graceful seat and faultless hands. To-day her Majesty will hunt with the Royal Meaths.

A traditional song, “The Stag Hunt,” tells of an incident that happened in Castlemahon during the Land War, the exact time when the Austrian Empress was enjoying the hunting season in Ireland. Members of the Castlemahon Branch of the Land League, it is said, met at Lewis's Cross to strike a blow against the rack-renters and shoneens assembled for a stag hunt. A poem was written about the happening, the author being John MacEniry, of Curragh, a youth of 17, who was attending Michael O'Callaghan's famous school at Castlemahon.216

THE STAG HUNT

They came with pomp and pride and glee
To hunt the deer away,
They said they'd ride from sea to sea,
And who would dare gainsay?
To Lewis's Cross they all drew nigh,
And curbed their prancing steeds,
What rebel now dare quell their joy
Or stop their gallant deeds?
The noble-hearted true O'Brien
Lies in his prison cell,
And the General – Father Matthew Ryan –
Pines in a jail as well;
But little care that shoneen crew,
And all their flunkey train,
If every patriot, tried and true,
Were safely lodged in jail.
But hark! What mean that gathering crowd
So darkly circling round?
The upstart sycophants so proud

Union Stag Hunt is the only hunt in the Republic hunting the deer and still have an enormous following in their hunting country of North Co. Dublin and Co. Meath. Cf. online [http://www.hai.ie/] 10.05.07.
Like not that hostile sound.
But wherefore dread a peasant throng
Who were so meek before,
Our gallant steeds are swift and strong,
And we will hunt once more.
Away across the country
The noble stag is gone,
Across the Deel's broad foaming flood,
And still goes bounding on.
But are the huntsmen on his track?
Ah, no! they are not here,
Our gallant boys have turned them back,
They've fled in craven fear.
The huntsmen all in fled
From Castlemahon men;
Their dogs and deer are lying;
They will not dare again
To come into our native plains,
From which they fled in fear;
While Irishmen wear prison chains,
They'll never hunt a deer.

The report below is reminiscent of the words of the poem, though in the case of Her Majesty, it was her unique bravery which was sought out for commendation:

CE 27 February 1879
The Empress of Austria
Dublin, Wednesday.

To-day the Empress enjoyed the informalities and privacy of a bye-day meet, which took place at Rathmolyn, being an extremely select one. The empress rode the horse lately hunted by the late huntsman of Wards, Charley Brindley. Earl Spencer was of the company, as was also Captain Middleton. An outlying stag [was] set on foot, and gave a capital run over a rather boggy track for

217 Antony Taylor, 'Pig-Sticking Princes': Royal Hunting, Moral Outrage, and the Republican Opposition to Animal Abuse in Nineteenth-and Early Twentieth-Century Britain,' in History 89 (293), 2004, pp.30–48. Abstract: This article locates monarchy in the debates arising out of the anti-animal abuse campaigns of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Through a close examination of urban republican criticisms of monarchy, it seeks to question the role of royalty as the custodian of shared national values concerning animal welfare. It demonstrates that hostility to monarchy based on its role in encouraging and patronizing hunting belongs to a long tradition. Much hostility to royalty crystallized around the royal patronage of fox-hunting and of pheasant-shooting. The nineteenth-century precedents for recent concerns about the visible presence of royal figures on the hunting-field articulated many of the component elements of a republican position. For many urban radicals the connection of reigning monarchs with the hunt demonstrated the dysfunctional nature of royal existence, the limitations of royalty's attainments, and the perceived need by monarchs to satisfy the baser, more carnal urges arising from a life devoted to indolence and pleasure. This article shows that hunting, as a marker of a robust masculinity and of the opulence of royalty, brought the reform community into collision with supporters of the monarchy, and provided an example of royal ritual that failed to work in the interests of the throne. The article concludes by revealing the connections between the land debate, criticisms of the royal house, and animal welfare politics in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.
forty minutes, the Empress all through being amongst the leaders. One canal shirked by a few plucky gentlemen was crossed by her Majesty in Royal style.

The pressure brought to bear on the royal visit before its commencement was clearly designed to avoid the following circumstance, where a member of a royal Catholic family pays their respects to Maynooth, the training college for the Irish priesthood.

CE 8 March 1879
The Empress of Austria at Maynooth
Dublin, Sunday.

This morning the Empress of Austria, accompanied by a brilliant staff, heard Mass in the Junior Chapel of Maynooth College. The Rev. Dr. Murray officiated. The utmost privacy was observed, the Empress forbidding any ostentation. Subsequently, the Bishop of Gadara, and Archbishop-elect, gave benediction. Her Majesty then visited the refectory, the kitchen, and the library of the College, and when shown the ravages of the recent disastrous fire, she expressed a hope that the building would soon be restored. She secured for the students a holiday, and was frequently cheered as she passed along the cloisters.

Unfortunately, the Empress’ visit was cut short by an unexpected natural disaster in her own Empire, and she was required to return immediately. Her husband also had been forced to give up plans at Pesth in relation to the forthcoming silver wedding anniversary of the royal couple.

CE 18 March 1879
The Empress of Austria
Vienna, Monday.

The Official Vienna Abenpost [sic] announces that the Empress has resolved, in consequence of the catastrophe at Szegedin, to return immediately to Austria, and will Ireland as soon as the necessary travelling arrangements are completed. Her Majesty is expected to reach Vienna on the 26th inst.

218 CE 11 March 1879.A Hungarian Village Destroyed by a Flood.Pesth, Monday.This morning the village of Dorozsma, near Szegeden, was totally destroyed by floods from the Theiss. Four hundred houses were destroyed.

219 CE 15 March 1879.The Catastrophe at Szegedin.Pesth, Friday.In an autograph letter addressed by the Emperor of Austria to the President of the Hungarian Council and Ministers, his Majesty says that in view of the terrible catastrophe at Szegedin he has abandoned his intention of proceeding to Pesth to receive the congratulations on the occasion of the approaching celebration of his silver wedding anniversary. His Majesty at the same time expresses his desire that the sum which would have been expended on he proposed festivities should be distributed among the sufferers from the inundation. In addition to the contribution which he has already made the Emperor grants from his privae purse, in his own and the empress’ name, a further sum of 40,000 florins in aid of the distressed inhabitants of Szegedin.
The next festive occasion regarding the popular Empress was the aforementioned silver wedding anniversary, which again received full coverage in the Irish press.

CE 22 April 1879
Editorial
The festivities in connexion with the celebration of the Silver Wedding of the Emperor and Empress of Austria, commenced yesterday at Vienna. Addresses were presented to the Emperor from the Hungarian Ministers, the Episcopate, and the Croatian Diet, and his Majesty warmly acknowledged the assurances of affectionate loyalty expressed towards the Empress and himself. Great preparations have been made throughout the country to render the celebration a splendid and successful one.

Vienna, adhering closely not only to the official protocol of the Spanish court but also to its own customs and rich traditions, sees the Emperor involved in an intricate balance of protocol and current politics.

CE 24 April 1879
The Silver Wedding of the Emperor and Empress of Austria.
Vienna, Wednesday Evg.
At noon to-day the ceremony of delivering up the keys of the Votine [sic] Church to Cardinal Kutschker, was performed with great solemnity by the protector, the Archduke Charles Louis. The Emperor and Empress received to-day deputations from the German Order of the Knights of Malta, the Bohemian, Galician, Lower Austrian, Moravian, Styrian, Silesian and Tyrolese nobility, the chambers of commerce, and the inhabitants of Sarajewo. On receiving the letter, the Emperor said – “I hope to be able to secure to Bosnia a lasting peace, and thus lay a firm foundation for the happy future and prosperous development of that province. In carrying out this task, I rely upon the zealous support of the population.”

CE 28 April 1879
The Silver Wedding of the Emperor and Empress of Austria.
Vienna, Sunday.
The public festival in celebration of the Silver Wedding of the Emperor and Empress of Austria were brought to a close to-day by the grand civic procession, which was favoured by fine weather. All the seats and stands en route of the procession were densely crowded with spectators. The colonnade to the left and

---

220 CE 28 April 1879: Vienna, Wednesday Evening. The city this evening is most brilliantly decorated for the fetes in honor of the silver wedding of the Emperor and Empress, the streets through which the procession is to pass having an especially gay and animated appearance, and the crowds of sight-seers are very large. Numerous patriotic manifestations are being made in the provinces, and the event is being commemorated by acts of public benevolence, and holidays in the schools. An Imperial act of grace is promulgated wholly or partially remitting sentences passed upon 377 individuals, including 48 who have been condemned for insults to the Sovereign or members of the Imperial Family. A number of decorations have been conferred by the Emperor on the occasion of the completion of the votive Church. The chief constructor, Councillor Ferstel, received the order of the Iron Crown of the second class.
right of the emperor’s tent was occupied by the principal State dignitaries, members of the Diplomatic Body, and Generals of the Army. In the Emperor’s tent were his Majesty and the Empress, surrounded by the embers of the Imperial Family. The Emperor and Empress arrived at 11 o’clock precisely, and were received by the Burgomaster, who delivered an address, to which his Majesty replied in gracious terms. After the singing of the festival hymn by a chorus of male voices, the various emblematical groups forming the procession passed before the imperial tent in accordance with the programme amid loud enthusiastic cheers from the immense assemblage, numbering some hundreds of thousands, a large number of whom had been in their places since an early hour this morning. The groups were of a very picturesque character, all the persons taking part in them being attired in rich and splendid costumes. The festival terminated at half past one o’clock in perfect order, and without any accident.

Hardly a year later there was another cause for jubilation in Austria as Crown Prince Rudolph was getting married. However, the Empress Elisabeth managed to plan her visits to Ireland around this joyful occasion, entertaining the possibility of actually owning property in the country she obviously already felt quite at home in.

CE 6 March 1880
The Empress of Austria
Dublin, Friday Night. The Empress of Austria will leave Ireland on Sunday next. She will visit the Queen before proceeding to Vienna.

Her brief stay on London to visit the Queen also proved quite eventful:

CE 11 March 1880
The Empress of Austria
(Special telegram from our correspondent)
London, Wednesday Night
The Empress of Austria left Claridge’s Hotel this afternoon for Vienna. Her Majesty rode in a twopenny bus to the railway station, and expressed her surprise to the ladies of her suite, who accompanied her, at the want of taste and comfort shown in a public conveyance in so great a capital. The Empress goes right into Brussels, where she will stop two days to overhaul her future daughter-in-law, Princess Stephanie, who has just received a present of a golden lily from the Pope.

In Brussels her son’s betrothal was duly celebrated in pomp and style:

---

221 CE 10 March 1880. The Betrothal of the Austrian Crown Prince. Vienna, Tuesday. In to-day’s sitting of the Vienna Common Council, a motion was enthusiastically adopted to send a deputation to the Emperor and Empress congratulating them upon the betrothal of the Crown Prince Rudolph. It was also decided to send a congratulatory letter to the Crown Prince.

222 CE 11 December 1880. The Empress of Austria. (Special telegram from our correspondent) London, Friday Night. The Empress of Austria will take up her residence in Ireland immediately after the marriage of her son, the Prince Imperial, with the Princess of Belgian. The Empress has expressed her intention to purchase an estate in Ireland for a residence, as she proposes to greatly prolong her future visits.
CE 19 March 1880
Brussels, Thursday
The [illegible] performance of the “Freischutz” in honour of the betrothal of
the Crown Prince Rudolph to the Princess Stephanie Clotilde took place tonight at
the Theatre Monnai. The King and Queen, accompanied by their daughter and
Prince Rudolph, occupied a box immediately facing the stage. The whole official
world, including the diplomatic body, the Ministers, members of the Senate, The
Chancellor of Representatives, and all the chief authorities, were present. The
Royal Family were received with great enthusiasm.223

Returning to the less festive aspects of political life, 1879 marked also a
turning point in the Austrian monarchy. Just as Parnell had emerged in Ireland to
give a new impulse to Irish politics, so did a compatriot in Austria. At the general
election of June 1879, Imperial influence was again used against the Germans and
the liberals lost their majority,224 Taaffe becoming Prime Minister. German
hegemony in Austria ended when Taaffe aimed to conciliate the nationalities, under the famous devise ‘None of the various nationalities is to obtain decisive predominance.’

CE 30 June 1879
The Bohemian Election
Prague, Saturday.

The elections in the rural districts of Bohemia were held to-day. Prince Karl of Schwarzenberg, and all the candidates nominated by the Czech Club were returned, while in thirteen districts, hitherto represented by constitutionalists, there have been elected nine candidates, nominated by the Central Committee of the Constitutional party, three independent German liberals, and Prince Adolph of Schwarzenberg, a Conservative. The Narodin to-day states that the large landowners “belong” to the Constitutional party have decided to leave the Conservatives twenty-eight seats in the Bohemian Diet.

In return, the nationalities had to accept the unity of Austria and send representatives to attend the Reichsrat. Taaffe had thus created a government bloc, the so-called ‘iron ring,’ simply by appealing to loyalty. This appeal won the support also of the great landowners and the Poles, and the German Catholic peasantry. Taaffe then successfully persuaded the Czechs, and the Slovenes who followed the Czech lead, to return to the Reichsrat to swell the ‘iron ring,’ as Rieger found it difficult to hold his people to the policy of boycott after the failure of 1871. ‘A Czech nation was coming into existence.’

CE 9 July 1879
The Austrian Elections
Vienna, Tuesday.

The Fremdenblatt to-day, in a leading article upon the result of the recent elections, denies the assertion made by several papers that Austria stands on the brink of a reaction, and states that the electoral returns show that no constitutional party in the State is strong enough to drag the Government into the vortex of a constitutional conflict. The journal adds that the chief task of the now Lower House will be to re-establish a political equilibrium, and to meet with decided opposition any endeavours in any other direction.

---

226 Taylor, p.169.
227 Taylor, p.88: ‘The Czechs […] sought the alliance of the ‘feudal’ nobility of Bohemia against their German colleagues of Kromeriz; and in 1879 Rieger, Palacky’s son-in-law and principle Czech spokesman at Kromeriz, entered into partnership with the Imperial government to end the hegemony of the German liberals.'
Despite bearing an obviously Irish family name of repute, the Premier of Austria receives merely media acknowledgment for his political position, but no testimonial to his roots. In contrast stand the extraordinary lengths of reports on the retirement of the former Premier, Andrassy:

CE 13 August 1879
Count Andrassy’s Retirement.
Vienna, Tuesday.
The ministerial journal Fremdenblatt of to-day states that among Count Andrassy’s friends here, the statement made by the Pesther Lloyd yesterday relative to the count’s projected retirement, is neither confirmed nor contradicted. The Hungarian and Austrian opposition papers receive the announcement with satisfaction, but the ministerial journals express the deepest regret. All, however, cast some doubt upon the correctness of the news. The Tagblatt of to-day states that the Emperor Francis Joseph accepted Count Andrassy’s resignation before the latter left Ischl. It is stated that Baron von Hoffmann would replace the count at the head of the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Office. Count Andrassy was at Pesth on Sunday and arrived at Perches yesterday.

Andrassy’s successor is duly nominated.

CE 15 August 1879
The New Austrian Ministry.
Vienna, Thursday.
An Imperial decree, dated 12th inst., is published to-day, constituting the new Austrian Ministry as follows: - Count Taaffe, Minister of the Council and Minister of the Interior; Dr. Von Stremayr, Minister of Justice and Public Worship; Baron Von Horst, Minister of National Defence; Count Falkenbayn, Minister of Agriculture; Herr Korb Windenbeism, Minister of Commerce; Herr Chertek is appointed head of the Finance Department, and Herr Ziemialkowsky, and Prasak, Minister without portfolio.

Most articles on the Austrian Reichrath are centred on Andrassy, his retirement from Government and his views on the new Government:

CE 16 August 1879
The Retirement of Count Andrassy
Vienna, Friday.
The Presse points out that want of rest is the sole cause of the retirement of Count Andrassy, who only delayed taking this step until the main promises of the

---

228 CE 14 August 1879. Austria. Vienna, Tuesday Evening. Two autograph letters of the Emperor will be officially published to-morrow, one addressed to Dr. Stranager, accepting, on the 11th ultimo, the resignation of the Ministry; and the other entrusting Count Taafe [sic] with the formation of the Cabinet.

229 CE 15 August 1879.Count Andrassy’s Resignation.Brussels, Thursday Evening. The Independence Belge of this evening publishes a telegram from Vienna stating that the Emperor of Austria has accepted Count Andrassy’s resignation with the reservation that he should remain in office pending the nomination of his successor.
Treaty of Berlin had been fulfilled by the evacuation of the Balkan Peninsula by the Russian troops. The journal adds, neither the question of the entry of the Austrian troops into Novi Bazar, not the new state of affairs created in the Cisleithan Monarchy by the recent elections to the Austrian Reichsrath, had any influence with Count Andrassy’s resignation. The Premier was, moreover, perfectly well aware of the proposals of Count Taaffe, rejecting the constitution of the new Austrian Cabinet, and expressed approval of the Count’s ministerial programme, and of the composition of the Ministry.

CE 18 August 1879
The Austrian Ministry
The Nein Pesther Journal, the organ of the middle classes, already expresses itself in less violent terms against Count Andrassy, and said that we must bear in mind that his enemies are also the enemies of Hungary.

The Pesther Lloyd says the Taaffe ministry carries in itself the symptoms of decay, and represents reaction not coalition.

Reaction being also manifest in the Eastern Question preoccupying European Powers of the time. The Austrian occupation of Turkish Bosnia is basically construed as Prussian interference, and Bismarck figures prominently in all articles on this aspect of European policy making.

CE 27 August 1879
Count Andrassy Interviewd.
Vienna, Thursday.
The Tagblatt of to-day publishes a report of an interview, of nearly one hour’s duration, between a member of its editorial staff and Count Andrassy. In the course of conversation the count declared that his resignation was contrary to the...
wish the Emperor, who considered such a course unnecessary, and only assented to it because he was unwilling to take responsibility for any deteriorations in Count Andrassy’s health that might result from his remaining longer in office. Passing next to the Eastern Question, Count Andrassy expressed the opinion that if Austria had not occupied Bosnia she would have abdicated her rights in the East, and laid stress on the fact that he had been able to maintain peaceful relations between Austria and Russia, and had also deprived the latter of all cause of complaint against the policy of Austria in the Eastern question. The task of introducing conciliation in the Mahommedan element had now, said the Count, fallen to Turkey – the only Power to fulfil that mission among two hundred million Mahommedan subjects of Turkey in Asia and Africa. Referring to the Novi Bazar question, Count Andrassy hoped that the occupation of the Sandjak would be carried out without bloodshed, and pointed out that it had been affected without the convention between Austria and Turkey. A belief would have arisen in the latter country that that goal of Austria was Salonica. The Count added that the occupation of Novi Bazar was being solely undertaken with a view to guaranteeing Austria’s commercial relations with Salonica, to strengthen the Austrian position in Bosnia, and to ensure the fulfilment of the Treaty of Berlin. As regards his successor, Count Karolyi had declined the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, but declared that he would use all his influence in order that the Emperor’s choice might fall upon the statesman most competent to serve his Majesty. Touching, in conclusion, upon home affairs, Count Andrassy observed that the existing dualism might be regarded as the result of historical development, and expressed his conviction that a party would be formed in Austria having the courage to declare itself the governmental party. Baron Haytelle, the Austrian Ambassador at the Italian Court, arrived here yesterday, and had a long conference with Count Andrassy. The latter left Vienna this morning on a visit to Prince Bismarck, at Gasteine.\textsuperscript{233}

The Editorial examines the situation presenting itself in Eastern Europe, making reference to the Germans living outside the frontiers of the Second Reich, and their possible potential as leverage in favour of German interests in the East.

CE 1 September 1879
Editorial

As soon as Prussia had extended her sway over the rest of Germany, Prince Bismarck’s first act was to form the celebrated triple alliance, by means of which all future rivalries and all dangers of collision between Austria, Russia, and Germany were to have been removed. Until the date of the Berlin Congress the union of the three Empires remained unbroken, and ostentatious professions of sympathy and regard were constantly exchanged between the Czar and his venerable uncle. But since then a remarkable change has set in. With the close of the Turkish war a divergence began to be apparent in the views and interests of the three Powers. Austria put forward claims which could not be reconciled with the traditional policy of Russia. Although the ostensible object of the occupation of

\textsuperscript{233} CE 29 August 1879. The Emperor of Austria. Prague, Thursday. The Emperor Francis Joseph arrived here last night, and will be present at the manoeuvres of the troops of the division stationed in the district.

Count Andrassy. Gastein, Thursday. Count Andrassy remained yesterday with Prince Bismarck from 11 o’clock in the morning until past 4 in the afternoon. After dinner the two statesmen drove out together.
Bosnia was only to maintain order in territories adjoining the Austrian frontier which the Porte had been unable to control, it was very well understood that the act was in reality intended to prevent the Russians from extending their influence in that direction. In the arrangements made at the Congress the influence of Germany was exerted rather to thwart than to advance the designs of Russia, and ever since Prince Bismarck has shown an anxiety to strengthen the position of Austria and use her as a counterpoise to Russian influence in the East. To his advice the occupation of Bosnia is mainly attributed, and he is reputed to be counselling a yet more vigorous interference on the part of Austria in the affairs of South Eastern Europe. And although Count Andrassy, for reasons which have not yet been satisfactorily explained, is retiring from the direction of the Austrian Government, the intimate conferences which he has had with the German Chancellor during the past few days are believed to have for their object the continuance of the understanding that has been established between the two Empires. […] The grievances of the Russian Press are sought for in quite a different quarter of the world. The chief complaint against the Germans is that they are fomenting an agitation in the Baltic provinces. The inhabitants of these provinces are German in race and culture, and the St. Petersburg journalists allege the a [sic] design is entertained at Berlin of reclaiming them for the new German Empire. Dark hints are thrown out that the plans of an invasion of Russia are being matured in the German capital, and that political agents in the German provinces are already inciting the population to renounce their allegiance to the Czar. […]

As regards the Czechs, who had been boycotting the Austrian Reichsrath since 1867, by 1879 they recognised the failure of their policy of passive resistance and returned to the Bohemian diet and the Reichsrat, joining a government coalition under Taaffe, along with the German clericals, aristocrats and Poles. In return, Czech was designated an “outer” language, that is it was recognised for public use in courts of law and government offices, and in 1882 even Prague University was divided into Czech and German institutions.

CE 20 September 1879
Austria
Vienna, Friday.
A Conference of the leaders of the fractions of the Right in the Austrian Reichsrath was held yesterday, at Hokenwort, and which also comprised the representatives of Czech and Polish fractions. The following resolutions were adopted: - “1st - That the collective fractions of the Right, as a great and organised party, should actively participate in parliamentary life. 2nd – That this organisation should find expression in the union of the individual clubs of the Right in a standing committee.”

234 Taylor, p.170, footnote: That is, in the contacts of executive and judicial officials with the public. The ‘inner service,’ that is the correspondence of officials with each other, remained exclusively German.
CE 8 October 1879
Opening of the Austrian Reichsrath
Vienna, Tuesday.

The Lower House of the Austrian Reichsrath was opened to-day, all the ministers being present. Count Taaffe, the President of the Ministry, introduced Herr Negrelli to the House as President by reason of seniority. Herr Negrelli, having taken the oath, addressed a few words of cordial welcome to the members, after which the secretaries were summoned to the tables, and the President received the oath of the deputies, all taking it without reserve.

Vienna, Tuesday.

The Czech deputies of Bohemia and Moravia, together with the large landed proprietors of these provinces, have held a meeting, at which it was resolved to establish a Czech Parliamentary Club, and also to take steps to be represented in the committee of the autonomist party by five permanent members. The party of the Right have also decided to be represented in the same committee by five delegates.

In 1882 the Czechs received a further reward: the franchise was lowered to bring in the ‘five-florin men,’ clerical German peasants and Czech peasants and shopkeepers. Thereafter the Czechs continued to support Taaffe in the hope of securing the entry of Czech into the ‘inner service.’

---

235 CE 9 October 1879. Opening of the Austrian Reichsrath – Speech of the Emperor. Vienna, Wednesday. The ceremony of opening the Austrian Reichsrath took place in the morning in the Hofburg. The Emperor, in his speech from the throne, after greeting the deputies on the occasion of the new period of constitutional activity, said that the entry of the representatives of Bohemia into the Reichsrath, which had been accomplished without prejudice to what they consider their rights, and in spite of difference of opinion was an important step towards that general reconciliation and good understanding which had ever been the object of his desires. His Majesty entertained the confident hope that by the exercise of a spirit of moderation by all parties, and by mutual respect for each other’s rights, it will be possible to attain that object which should ever be kept in view in the interest of the prestige of the monarchy, and to secure the universal and cheerful recognition of the constitution. In announcing the introduction of bills affecting the military system of the monarchy, his Majesty said that the deliberations of the House on these matters must be guided by the patriotic consideration that the monarchy must ever be in a position to assert its influence with all the weight of its prestige, whenever events should demand the protection of its interests. […] The Emperor then alluded to the many tokens of loyal love and affection which he received at the hands of the people on the occasion of his Silver Wedding, and expressed the conviction that the representatives of the people would act in similar spirit of harmonious cooperation. The speech concluded with the following words: - “Austria true to her historical mission, will be a rock of defence to the rights of other countries, and her people, joined, as they are, by an indissoluble bond of union, will ever remain the home of the right and true liberty.”

236 CE 15 October 1879. The Austrian Reichsrath. Vienna, Tuesday. In to-day’s sitting of the Lower House of the Austrian Reichsrath Count Cornini was elected President by 338 votes out of a total of 341. The count upon assuming the Presidential chair thanked the house for having elected him, and afterwards addressed the Czechian members who recently re-entered the Reichsrath. He cordially greeted them, and promised to exercise a friendly regard for their demand. He hoped that they would uphold the constitution and the fundamental laws of the State, and expressed a desire that no re-kindling of internal quarrels would again impede solutions of the urgent economical questions now pending. The President concluded by proposing three cheers for the Emperor, which proposal was heartily responded to. The house subsequently re-elected Dr. Smolka, a Pole, the First Vice-President by 180 votes out of 339, and Baron Goedel-Lannon, the Second Vice-President. The proposal to draw up an address in reply to the speech from the throne was then adopted, as was also a motion to appoint a committee of twenty-four members to draft the address.

237 Taylor, p.170.
forced to choose between Russia and Austria, it would always be Austria he would prefer, partly from the call of blood, partly because Austria would advance historic claims upon Silesia, Alsace, and the constitution of the Reich itself, putting in dispute the triumphs of the Hohenzollern. And so, when the Balkan troubles of 1878 began, Bismarck made a secret treaty with Austria behind the back of his Russian ally. In the impending struggle against Pan-Slavism Bismarck ranged his country on the Austrian side, the dual Alliance of 1879 became, by the junction of Italy in 1882, the Triple Alliance which lasted to the outbreak of the Great War. ‘From that moment it was fated that, should Austria and Russia come to blows in a Balkan trouble, the German army would stand side by side with its Austrian ally.’

CE 25 October 1879

Editorial

Lord Salisbury now went so far as to say that he had discovered a new gospel – “Glad tidings of great joy” – in the alliance between Austria and Germany. It was somewhat strange that Lord Salisbury was not certain of this happy alliance, for it turned out that he had only read it in the newspapers. What was the alliance? If the Government had discovered than an agreement existed between Austria and Germany to prevent Russia from advancing her lines in the direction of Constantinople, it was indeed good news but it was what the Liberal party had always advocated. They objected to this country being called upon to act alone, and had long ago pointed out that the interests of Germany and Austria, in the existence of Turkey, was quite as great as those of this country.

238 Fisher, p.1054.
239 CE 25 September 1879. Negotiations of grave importance have been proceeding at Vienna during the present few days. The interview between the German and Austrian Chancellors have led to new political arrangements which open a fresh chapter in European history. The union therefore exiting between Russia, Austria, and Germany has been virtually dissolved, and in its place has arisen an alliance between Austria and Germany, with which we are told England will sooner or later be associated. The objects of this new combination are not distinctly avowed, but they are more than suspected. For some time past a great change has been taking place in the relations of Russia and the two German Powers. The latter, under the guidance of Prince Bismarck, have adopted a course of action in reference to Eastern affairs which has brought them into collision with their former ally. At the Berlin Conferences, Austria allowed herself to be put forward by England and Germany as the rival of Russia in the East, and by the occupation of Novi Bazar she has planted herself on the road to Constantinople. The change in the attitude of the German Powers upon the Eastern question has been bitterly resented by the Russian Chancellor, and both parties have been actively engaged ever since in forming new combinations, which may be the prelude to serious events. If we are to believe the political gossips, Russia alienating herself, the German Powers has sought the friendship and support of France, and Prince Bismarck’s counter move is the close alliance with Austria that is said to have been consummated by his visit to Vienna. No treaty has as yet been assigned between the two Powers, but a complete exchange of views has taken place, and the heads of an arrangement for mutual support have been agreed on with a view to contingencies. Assurances are said to have been confidentially given to the Russian Chancellor that nothing hostile to Russia is intended by the Vienna conference; but when two first rate military Powers deem it necessary to enter into closer alliance, and to exchange promises of support in the face of Europe, the situation becomes critical.
Austrian internal affairs were at this moment concerned with reconciliation and the military bill:

CE 25 October 1879
Austria
Vienna, Friday

The Committee of the Lower House of the Reichsrath, on the address and reply to the speech from the throne, have terminated their deliberations. The draft addresses, both of the majority and minority, view with satisfaction the entry of the Czech Deputies into the Reichsrath, and express the desire for a general reconciliation.\(^{240}\) They further point out the importance of settling the military question with the greatest possible regard for the tax-payers,\(^{241}\) and of a reform in the system of taxation, and lay stress upon the necessity for favourable commercial relations, particularly with the German Empire, and while, however, the draft of the majority attach great weight to administrative decentralization, and to the scrupulous observance of the fundamental laws of the State, respecting the equal rights of all the Austrian peoples, as well as to the unimpeded development and efficiency of the Provincial Diets. The address of the Minority points out that a general understanding does not require any further constitutional measures and should not entail any additional restrictions upon the simplification of the Administrative system, and the common conduct of State affairs.

Although Taaffe’s government had improved the linguistic and cultural equality between the Czechs and Germans in Bohemia in the short-term, his

\(^{240}\) CE 1 November 1879. Vienna, Thursday. The debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne was continued this evening. In a late sitting in the Lower House of the Reichsrath Count Taaffe, the President of the Council of Ministers made a speech in which he said the Ministry had undertaken a difficult task in attempting to bring about an understanding and a reconciliation between political parties. The role of mediator was always a thankless one, and in this case it was a duty of patriotism. The Ministry was not a party Ministry. It would [illegible] be able to take up a position above the [illegible] of political parties. If a reconciliation is to be attained, theoretical party conflict must be avoided, for the existence of the Constitution and its legal efficacy could not and must not any longer remain in jeopardy. Later setting aside a few harsh words which had fallen in the course of the debate, the address of the majority coincided in spirit and in wording with the speech from the Throne. Exactly in the political direction towards which reaction of the Government was devoted and which aimed at the conciliating conflicting questions and at averting all Constitutional contentions the Government could only determine to recommend the adoption of the recommendation of the Majority as a basis for the special discussion. This announcement was received with loud cheers and a resolution to close the general debate was adopted by 167 votes against 130. By a similar vote the House resolved to adjourn until to-morrow.

\(^{241}\) CE 18 November 1879. Austria – The New Army Bill. Vienna, Monday. A conference of all the party leaders in the Austrian Reichsrath has been held at the residence of Count Taaffe, the President of the Council, to discuss the new Army Bill, submitted by the Government to the Parliament. Count Taaffe first addressed the meeting, and commenced his speech by pointing out that the military question was not a party, but an Imperial question, affecting the existence of the Empire. It was necessary that the government should always have at its disposal an army ready for action, if, on the one hand, order was to be established, in the affairs of the East; and, secondly, if peace was to be maintained. If the Austrian army were allowed to remain at its present strength, and the Army Bill were only to be operative, in a short period Austria would scarcely be able in future to gain a single ally, and she would, moreover, lose some powerful friends who would cease to regard the monarchy as an ally worthy of themselves. Eventually, before the meeting separated, the party-leaders declared that they had no wish to treat the military question as a party one, nor as a question of confidence; or want of confidence in any particular cabinet, but that they desired to consider it from an objective point of view.
reforms caused prolonged outrage among the Germans, who saw their position of political supremacy challenged. Henceforward, nationalist rivalry between the Czechs and the Germans would become intense.

2.4.3. Advanced Nationalism in the 1880s

The success of Parnellism as a national phenomenon was dependent in the first instance on developments that pre-dated Parnell’s rise to prominence; particularly a remarkable rise in literacy levels and advances in mass communication. By the mid 1870s an extensive railway system had been established throughout Ireland along with electric telegraph. […] The telegraph, which enabled the publication of speeches within a day of their being delivered, greatly stimulated the growth of both public oratory and the provincial press […]. While these developments worked to promote the political integration of the community in Britain generally, in Ireland during the Land War they had a similar, though more special, role of assisting the mobilization and integration of the agrarian agitation, and especially in facilitating ‘Parnellism’ as the medium through which the political world was made comprehensible to the largely peasant population that had thrust itself onto the political stage in 1879, motivated in varying degrees by fear of famine and the protection of living standards. 242

Although Parnellism was to a great extent a product of the Land war, it had come into its own in an age of popular national symbols, such as the ‘national anthem’ ‘God save Ireland’ and the green flag to be raised on occasions as the national festivals of St. Patrick’s day and, especially, ‘memorial day’, held on 23 November in honour of the Manchester martyrs. An iconography of nationalist heroes from Brian Boru to Thomas Davis and Daniel O’Connell figured in a thriving cheap literature and was soon to include Parnell.

He was also of course personally well equipped for the role of national deliverer, being endowed with imposing stature and physical attractiveness. […] More exactly, the public Parnell, the national icon, was a construction of the private man, a dramatic construction intended to inspire awe and devotion through the possession of characteristics deemed to be out of the ordinary run of humanity. […] It would be difficult to overestimate the degree of connivance in Parnell’s public self and the importance he attached to endowing it with exceptional characteristics – excusing failure to attend public meetings without apology as part of the ‘ethics of Kingship’ and acknowledging his brother in public only with a wink so that the integrity of the national icon would not be compromised by any perceptible display of ordinary human affection.243

242 James Loughlin, „Constructing the political spectacle. Parnell, the press and national leadership, 1879-1886,“ in G. George Boyce and Alan O’Day (eds.) Parnell in Perspective (Routledge, ), pp. 221-241.
At this time also, in both Britain and Ireland, the relationship between the press and politics was symbiotic and mutually beneficent. Just as the growth of the provincial press in Britain had stimulated political activity in a more settled environment, the same phenomena occurred in an Ireland in the throes of a national crisis, and thus to a greater degree, as explained by M.J.F. McCarthy, a Freeman’s Journal reporter during the Land War, who wrote:

Print had become for the first time an actuality for the Catholic peasants and part of their everyday life, speaking to them in a thrilling, palpitating language, intelligible – and there lay the marvel – yet different from anything previously known, for it enabled them to hear their friends at a distance talking to them in accents of power about the wondrous doings of the Land League.244

Not only nationalist papers propagated Parnell’s interests, as the Liberal Unionist Irish Times was forced to admit, because in effect all papers reporting his activities were promoting Parnellism. The centrality of the press to nationalist politics in the 1880s can best be seen by comparing this period with O’Connell’s when, as the Irish Times noted,

it would have been a very strange extravagant proceeding to send a corps of accomplished reporters after not only the principal but the subordinates into every small country town. This has now been done, and the government’s own telegraph service [is] profusely employed for months in the work of explaining to the whole nation the arguments and adjurations of the League platform in whatsoever field set up in all broad Connaught or Munster.245

As noted by James Loughlin in his article, the demonstrations at which Parnell made his most important extra-parliamentary speeches were ‘impressive, newsworthy events.’

---

244 Loughlin, p.225: ‘What in fact McCarthy is describing is the central role played by the press I establishing the ideological context of the agrarian struggle and in creating a sense of participation for the Irish peasantry in great national events.[…] The press, however, not only gave a sense of participation in national activities but also created a link between the humblest member of the league and the supreme leader, Parnell. McCarthy observed that for the impressionable younger generation educated in the national schools ‘the newspapers were their evangel, Mr.Parnell their saviour, and his lieutenants their apostles’. Parnell’s activities, he estimated, caused the newspapers ‘to be read by ten people for the one who had read them before’. For his part Parnell was always keen to facilitate the press. Under this stimulus it is hardly surprising that the number of nationalist papers rose remarkably. Between 1880 and 1886, in fact, they increased by 25 per cent, from 41 to 55.

245 Loughlin, p.226: ‘The Irish Times also acutely pinpointed an important aspect of Parnell’s political act as a mass obsession when it described it as a ‘drama’ in several acts, the suspense of which was maintained by his refusal to articulate a specific set of agrarian demands, and with a new act about to open now in November 1880 with the news that he was going to be prosecuted. The scenario presented by the Irish Times was one in which Parnell, possessed of enormous ‘force’, was pitted against ‘society’ which would refuse to be defeated.'
Extensive railway communications made possible the assembling of massive gatherings throughout the country on a weekly basis. Within a short period of the beginning of the land agitation they had assumed a highly formulized ritual, having, in this respect, much in common with similar gatherings in Europe. In keeping with an agitation articulated in terms of a struggle for freedom from English oppression these demonstrations were, in the main, great pseudo-militaristic gatherings, with the population arrayed in green banners and rosettes, often carrying imitation pikes and swords, and an abundance of green ‘national’ flags. The crowds would usually be divided into ‘foot’ and ‘cavalry’ – the latter representing better-off farmers – while the streets would be bedecked in bunting and with triumphal arches displaying a range of nationalist slogans.  

One of the enduring themes throughout the Land war was that Ireland was not asking for anything that other European nations had not achieved. ‘The eyes of the world are fixed upon us. Do not let it be said that this, the best and greatest struggle that Ireland has ever made, will fall short.’ To this end Parnell hoped to enlist the support of influential Europeans, such as Victor Hugo. However, Hugo failed to endorse the nationalist struggle, which was probably just as well for ‘Parnell would have strenuously to reject the claim of clerical opponents in Ireland that he was enlisting Red revolutionists in the agrarian campaign.’ Despite these occasional misjudgements, Parnell’s presentation of the agrarian struggle was highly successful.

---

246 Idem.
247 Loughlin, p.227.
248 CE 15 April 1880. The Late Irish Political Events.(Special telegram from our correspondent). London, Wednesday Night. It is stated that the Pope is about to issue a Pontificate letter to the Irish bishops, having special reference to the General Election, and the invasion of the pastoral rights of the priesthood by politicians described as “apostles of Communism, revolution, and infidelity.” The successful aggression of Mr. Parnell on the constituencies defended by the hierarchy produces a great impression here, where the Obstructive victories over the clergy by a leader who has more than once betrayed hostility and contempt towards the Catholic religion, is taken as a sign that the masses are breaking away from the old traditions of obedience to the guidance of the priesthood. Exaggerated importance is given to the allegation that some of Mr. Parnell’s nominees proclaimed, or are said to have proclaimed themselves Garibaldians and followers of Mazzini, and attempted to cast ridicule on the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. It is stated that a special communication on this latter point has been forwarded to Rome.

CE 15 April 1880. The London Journals and Mr. Parnell. (Special telegram from our correspondent).London, Wednesday Night. Some of the London journals admire the success with which Mr. Parnell, a Protestant, and alien in manners, culture, and creed, challenges the authority of the Roman Catholic priesthood.

249 Loughlin, pp.232-35: ‘It also appears that the Irish political context following the end of the Land War had significantly changed, with national concerns giving way to local interests. At any rate, worried whether there would be mass support for a home rule campaign divorced from the agrarian issue and whether the undoubted development of mass nationalist consciousness that had occurred during the Land War would be accompanied by an equal degree of commitment. These fears were well founded. The years 1882-5 proved to be years of slow growth in building the National League, despite the fact that more meetings were held in the period than during the Land War, with the situation only improving significantly following the franchise reforms of 1884-5 and in the run-up to the general election of 1885. […] Nationalist fortunes began to improve significantly in 1885. The franchise reforms of 1884-5 trebled the numbers entitled to vote in Ireland
The attendance at the land meeting in Killarney yesterday numbered upwards of five thousand. And would have been still larger but for the action of the Kerry landlords, many of whom sent their bailiffs amongst the tenantry to deter them from taking part in the demonstration. The O'Donoghue, who was warmly received, was the principal speaker. Having commented in strong terms on the conduct of some Kerry landlords and agents, including Mr. Hussey, who, he said, regarded the tenants as mere rent-making machines, he insisted that the power of dictating the terms on which the people should hold the land should be taken away from the “fistful of landlords who now exercise it.” With respect to his own tenants The O'Donoghue said that as soon as his son came of age, which will be in eight days more, leases for ever will be offered to them on the lines of Mr. Butt’s Land Bill, the rents to be fixed by arbitration, and subject to revision every thirty-one or twenty-one years, and furthermore that every tenant who pays his rent will be forgiven a gale. Amongst the letters read was one from the Bishop of Kerry approving of the meeting on the understanding that there was no intention of making personal attacks, and that the object was to break down the system which permits the landlord to charge what rent he likes and to evict if he does not get it.

and gave political power to many thousands who previously had none. The run-up to the general election of 1885 saw the effective re-creation of a political context of national dimensions entailing mass participation as local branches of the National League sprang up all over Ireland geared to ensuring nationalist representation of the new Irish county seats. Meanwhile the primacy of national issues over local interests was confirmed in the winter of 1885-6 with the Parnellite triumph at the general election, and when it became clear that Gladstone intended to enact a home rule Bill for Ireland.

250 CE 11 March 1880. The Anticipated Changes in Irish Representation. (Special telegram from our correspondent). London, Wednesday Night. Among the present Irish representatives who are regarded as doomed to exclusion from the next Parliament are – Sir George Bowyer […], Mr. Denis O’Connor, or his brother, The O’Connor Don. The O'Donoghue is supposed to have secured his seat by his timely conversion to Parnellism.

251 S.M. Hussey, The Reminiscences of an Irish Land Agent (London, 1904), Preface: Probably the first criticism on this book will be that it is colloquial. The reason for this lies in the fact that though Mr. Hussey has for two generations been one of the most noted raconteurs in Ireland, he has never been addicted to writing, and for that reason has always declined to arrange his memoirs, though several times approached by publishers and strongly urged to do so by his friends, notably Mr. Froude and Mr. John Bright. [In] this volume he endeavours to supply some view of his own country as it has impressed itself on ‘the most abused man in Ireland,’ as Lord James of Hereford characterised Mr. Hussey. How little practical effect several attacks on his life and scores of threatening letters have had on him is shown by the fact that he survives at the age of eighty to express the wish that his recollections may open the eyes of many as well as prove diverting. Possessing a retentive memory, he has been further able to assist me with seven large volumes of newspaper cuttings which he had collected since 1853, while the publishers kindly permit the use of two articles he contributed to Murray's Magazine in May and July 1887.

252 CE 6 January 1880. Landlord Liberality – “Live and let live.” To the Editor of the Cork Examiner. Dear Sir, - My landlord is one of those men who, though he “does good by stealth he’d blush to make it known.” I give you his name but not for publication. He has, unsolicited and unexpectedly on my part, made me, with his other tenants, an abatement of ten per cent on my gross yearly rent.
Land meetings were also held at Kileonry, in Mayo, and Kilconnelly, in Galway, yesterday. [Parnell] was not, nor was he to become, a thorough-going agrarian radical, but he had influence over the radicals as a successful fundraiser, gathering some 72,000 pounds in North America in January-March 1880, and as an apparent sympathiser with very advanced nationalist demands. His reported comment in Cincinnati on 20 February 1880 that ‘none of us will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps England bound to Ireland’ won him Irish-American dollars and Fenian plaudits. 253 His importance as a parliamentarian was also growing in keeping with his North American success. At the general election of April 1880 twenty-seven of his supporters were returned, facilitating his nomination in May as the chairman of the Irish parliamentary party [...] and in the autumn of 1880 he toured the country to rouse support for the League, and to define its purpose and strategies. 254

CE 4 October 1880

Mr. Parnell’s visit to Cork. Great Demonstration. Splendid Display by the Traders. Mr. Parnell paid his long-promised visit to Cork yesterday, and his advent was signalised by a demonstration which for enthusiasm and as an expression of the popular will has not been exceeded by anything of the kind that has occurred in

And not alone has he thus generously refunded, but in settlement of account scarcely one sixth part of the amount has been paid to me in cash. My landlord being a resident, and his dealings almost exclusively confined to the town and neighbourhood, confers a solid benefit by practically carrying out the maxim of (I think) Kord St. Leonard, “Property has its duties as well as its rights.” Spend your money where you get it. You thereby foster a spirit of local enterprise. A demand for labour follows. With increased labour comes increased pay; with increased pay comes better food; with a more generous diet (and it sadly wants to be more generous) the Irish labourer can work as he does work in every country other than his own; manufactures will commence, progress and eventually succeed. With a good trade and flourishing commerce the disaffected agitators at present scattering discord and disunion will be neither regarded nor listened to. [L]andlords and tenants take advantage of the facilities offered for improving the waste lands of this country, join heart and hand, and don’t toss the obligations, like a tennis ball, one to the other. We are dependent each upon each, “Live and let live,” should be the maxim. Distress exists, be it little or much, it does exist, and will increase until preventative means be used. Instead of airing your eloquence in high flown language at mass meetings, put your shoulder to the wheel and work harmoniously together like humane and business men. Give employment, keep the workhouse empty, and raise the status of the labourer. You will grow more crops, feed more cattle, your home shall be full and plenteous, and the land flowering with milk and honey, the better paid working man [illegible] your butter and your meat – the surplus you can sell elsewhere. You have unexampled facilities for transport, the Cork and Macroom Railway Company, adopting in its entirety the theory of “Live and let live,” has in that spirit of philanthropy so eminently its own given full means to the working carrier of making an ample livelihood in the cartage of goods to and from Macroom, a means which is being availed of already to a large extent. Let us hope that before long we may see a well-appointed four-horse coach on the road and amongst the passengers your obedient servant, A small farmer and working man, Macroom, 1st January, 1880.

253 CE 7 January 1880. Editorial. It is asserted that little sympathy with Mr. Parnell’s agitation is felt in America outside the Irish portion of the population. Apparently it is not quite true, but even supposing there were more truth in the statement, there is one feature of it which cannot be very gratifying to his English critics. The charity to which we were bid to look in England is not forthcoming; in America it is. England might have been spared the humiliation of seeing British subjects compelled to cross the Atlantic to look for alms if only the Government had been awake to the manifest duties of the situation and had taken prompt and efficacious measures to meet the crisis. But the Government would not do so. The Prime Minister deliberately rejected the plea for public employment, and loftily bade the distressed Irish to go seek British alms. They have gone instead to seek alms in America, whence if the alms come they will be coming from brethren in blood and in affection.

254 Jackson, p.41.
this part of the country for years. The “oldest inhabitant,” who usually has something better to cite from the days of O’Connell, readily acknowledged that yesterday’s demonstration for its proportions and the magnificence of the display, entirely excelled the most enthusiastic efforts of former days. The municipality, the trades and the people all combined to give éclat to yesterday’s proceedings. The trades, who are always so important a section in such demonstrations, seemed to have gone to great trouble and expense to give effect to the magnificent pageant, which certainly was very much beautified and enhanced by the splendour of their banners and devices.

One of Parnell’s most significant statements came at Ennis, 19 September 1880, when he outlined the strategy of ‘moral Coventry’ or ‘boycotting’, named after its most celebrated victim, Captain Charles Boycott:

CE 20 October 1880
The State of Ireland

Mr. Charles Boycott writes to the Times from Loughwark House, Ballinrobe, Mayo: - The following details may be interesting to your readers as exemplifying the power of the Land League: - On the 22nd of September a process-server, escorted by a police force of 17 men, retreated on my house for protection, followed by a howling mob of people, who yelled and hooted at the members of my family. On the ensuing day, September 23, the people collected in crowds upon my farm, and some hundred or so came up to my house and ordered off, under threats of ulterior consequences, all my farm labourers, workmen, and stablemen, commanding them never to work for me again. My herd has been also frightened by them into giving up his employment, though he has refused to give up the house he held from me as part of his employment. Another herd on an off farm has also been compelled to resign his situation. My blacksmith has received a letter threatening him with murder if he does any more work for me, and my laundress has also been ordered to give up my washing. A little boy, 12 years of age, who carried my post-bag to the neighbouring town of Ballinrobe, was struck and threatened on September 27, and ordered to desist from his work; since which time I have sent my little nephew for any letters, and even he, on the 2nd October, was stopped on the road and threatened if he continued to act as my messenger. The shopkeepers have been warned to stop all supplies to my house, and I have just received a message from the postmistress to say that the telegraph messenger was stopped and threatened on the road when bringing out a message to me, and that she does not think it safe to send any telegrams which may come to me in future for fear they should be abstracted and the message injured. My farm is public property; the people wander over it with impunity. My crops are trampled upon, carried away in quantities, and destroyed wholesale. The locks on my gates are smashed, the gates thrown open, the walls thrown down, and the stick driven out on the roads. I can get no workmen to do anything, and my ruin is openly avowed as the object of the Land League, unless I throw up everything and leave the country. I say nothing about the danger to my own life, which is apparent to anybody that knows the country.255

255 CE 11 November 1880. Editorial. The Orangemen have begun their march into Mayo. Thirty “picked men” left Monaghan last evening for clones, where they are to be joined by a detachment of about the same number. The combined force will then proceed to Ballyhaunis, and on to
When agrarian crime rose rapidly in the winter of 1880-1 it was linked by the British authorities to the spread of the Land League. Parnell wanted legislative independence for Ireland and the land question mattered ‘as a longstanding and unavoidable political issue that all patriots, whether or not they were social radicals, were now compelled to address.’ On 18 October, Parnell issued the ‘No-Rent Manifesto’, calling for a national rent strike, two days later the government, having interned the leaders, moved to outlaw the League itself.

How did Europe view these developments in Ireland? Both German and Austrian papers took an interest in the policy of Parnellism, the German papers
taking a sceptical and at times hostile attitude to both form and content and its
devisor, the Austrian viewpoint merely interested:

CE 12 February 1880

**German Opinion of the Irish Party**

Berlin, Wednesday Evening

The *North German Gazette* of this evening publishes an article in which it
draws attention to the attitude taken up by the Irish Catholic party in the British
Parliament. It says the matter has ceased to be comic, and has entered upon a phase
which becomes serious. Against the proceedings of this party a remedy must be
sought, and the measures the ministry intend adopting are looked forward to with
much anxiety. The above article is regarded here as making indirect reference to
the peculiar attitude which the Centre party in the German Parliament are expected
under certain circumstances to assume.

CE 6 October 1880

**The German Press on Mr. Parnell’s Scheme**

(Special telegram from our correspondent)

London, Tuesday Night

The German papers, particularly the *Dagesblatt* [sic], criticise sharply Mr.
Parnell’s reference to Land Reform in Prussia, declaring his comparison wholly
untenable, since the conditions altered in Prussia and existing in Ireland are
altogether different, and Stein’s experiment, moreover, was carried out in a manner
and with results which Mr. Parnell misapprehends. These organs declare if Mr.
Parnell knows as little of the Irish as of the Prussian land question he can only
prove a false guide.

CE 13 December 1880

The Foreign Press and Mr. Parnell

**The Vienna correspondent of the Chronicle** says the *Free Press* publishes
the text of a communication made by Mr. Parnell to its London correspondent who
desired his opinion on the Irish question from the Land League point of view,
including of course his own as expressed in the Waterford speech. Mr. Parnell
replied that the Land League had by no means given up the chief object of their
efforts, viz., Land Reform. The League, he intimated, was determined to adhere to
the platform where its operations were based, viz., providing land for the. The
Waterford speech was but a pronunciamento for the Home Rulers in connection
with their Parliamentary duties, and his discourse was not of a revolutionary
character, but meant only a change so far as its organization went of the movement
which was spreading all over Ireland on a great scale. The Government were trying
to deprive the League of its hold on the people, and desired to drive the latter to
desperate resorts, but in spite of those efforts the League maintained its hold on
them and adhered steadfastly to its original programmes.

The Kilmainham Treaty of April 1882 restored Parnell to the public
arena.257 This meant the withdrawal of the ‘No-Rent Manifesto’ and undertaking to

---

257 CE 9 June 1882. Arrival of Mr. Davitt in Cork. Mr. Michael Davitt arrived in this city at eight
o’clock last evening, from Dublin, on the way to America. [...] Mr. John O’Connor, who was very
move against agrarian crime, for which in return the government was to address the two key constituencies excluded from the benefits of the 1881 Land Act relating to rent arrears and leaseholders. After Parnell and his imprisoned lieutenants were to be released from gaol, there followed, on 6 May, ‘one of the most shocking crimes of the late Victorian era, the Phoenix Park murders:’ The Chief Secretary for Ireland, Lord Frederick Cavendish, and the Under Secretary, T. H. Burke, were killed by revolutionary nationalists of the marginal ‘Invincibles’ sect, dedicated to physical force.²⁵⁸ Parnell was able to utilize the backlash²⁵⁹ in its aftermath in reconstructing the national movement along more conservative lines.²⁶⁰

warmly received, introduced Mr. Davitt as the man who had instituted a rebellion, in which they must all join – a rebellion against landlordism and against injustice (applause). [...] After the cheering and the general demonstration had to some extent calmed down, Mr. Davitt said – Citizens of Cork, [now], I am sorry that I cannot this evening speak upon topics that I would wish to discuss on the eve of my departure for America (“Success to you”), because in deference to the expressed wish of my friend, your representative and Ireland’s champion, Charles Stuart Parnell (applause, and cries of “Ireland’s king”) – in deference to a wish from him I have endeavoured to travel through Ireland without making any speech whatever to large or small meetings. [...] He has all the responsibility of this great movement on his shoulders, and I am only a free lance by his side (loud cries of “you are everything”), and I am therefore anxious to defer to his wishes in every respect in this movement in Ireland. [...] I am going to America for a double purpose – First, I am going there to appeal to our generous exiled brethren to support Miss Parnell and the Ladies Land League in the charitable work they are carrying on here in Ireland (cheers). [...] The next reason why I go to America is this – Rumours have gone abroad, rumours spread by the landlord organs of Ireland and England, that there is a split (cries of “There is none”) a split in the Land League movement, that Mr. Parnell’s followers are drawing away from his leadership (no, no). I wish to tell all our people in America that that is a foul calumny and a lie. [...] This has been the cause of failure in the past, disension and disunion in the national cause; we have profited by past experience and, please God, we will show that we have profited to advantage (cheers).

²⁵⁸ CE 8 February 1882. The Murder of Bailiffs Near Lough Mask. (Special telegram). Cong, Tuesday. The seventeen men in custody charged with complicity in the murder at Cloughbrack, near Clonbury, county Galway, on the 3rd of January last, of the bailiffs John Huddy and Joseph Huddy, whose bodies were found in Lough Mask ten days ago, were brought up to-day on remand [...]. By consent of the Sessional Crown Solicitor, six of the prisoners [...] were discharged. [...] The six men who were liberated were received by the crowd outside with loud cheers.

²⁵⁹ James Carty, Bibliography of Irish History 1912-1921 (Dublin, 1936), Introduction, p.x: Systematic Irish political “propaganda” in the modern sense may, perhaps, be said to date from the end of 1885, when the Irish parliamentary Party, led by Parnell, won 85 of the 105 Irish seats – an electoral demonstration,” wrote John Morley, “never surpassed in any country” – and Gladstone was converted to the policy of Home Rule. English political students, tourists and special correspondents visiting and writing about Ireland were more numerous than ever before, and the “Irish problem” was regularly examined and often solved in the monthly and quarterly reviews. Irish nationalist organisations now increased their efforts to convince public opinion in England, by the distribution of literature, that the demands for agrarian reform and self-government were reasonable and just. The Irish Press Agency, established in London in 1885 by the Irish Parliamentary Party, issued large numbers of leaflets and pamphlets for the next thirty years, showing special activity when prospects of Home Rule were most favourable (in 1886, 1892-1893, and 1908-1914). A counter-propaganda on a still more voluminous scale was conducted by the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union, which afterwards changed its name to the Irish Unionist Alliance, and continued to diffuse Unionist books, pamphlets and journals, until 1921. [...] The associated Unionist organisations, commanding large financial resources and having the support of great newspapers, showed remarkable propaganda activity in 1910-1914.

²⁶⁰ Jackson, p.45.
CE 16 May 1882

The dreadful assassinations in Dublin have made an impression on the minds of the people of this country which is not likely to pass quickly away. It might appear that as the event grew comparatively old its horror would have gradually worn off, but this does not appear to be the case. The desire for the capture and detection of the murderers is as keen as ever it was. Every incident seeming to tend to their arrest is regarded with the most intense and almost passionate interest. […] The importance of this disposition on the part of the public at this movement cannot be over-rated. It is, we believe, the best guarantee against the machinations of that criminal organisation at the other side of the Atlantic which, if it has not actually devised this crime, apparently glories in it. […] The hue and cry not of a police force but of a whole nation is a formidable thing to encounter. […] The system which is based on astonishing and horrifying the world is not likely to be nice in its choice. It can only be check-mated by the stern and practical condemnation of the whole Irish people.261

By August, the Cork Examiner was able to report on a topic closer to its original sentiments, the industrial development of Ireland, with a review of the national exhibition:

CE 21 August 1882

The national Exhibition262

(From our special reporters). Dublin, Sunday Night.

The first week, I may say, of the Exhibition has now closed, and the promoters and well-wishers have no reason to be dissatisfied with the result. The attendance, except on the opening day, was not overlarge, but on yesterday (which was the first shilling day) crowds flocked to the building, and I feel certain that as long as the low rate of admission prevails the number of visitors will be unusually large.

261 Cf. also CE 17 May 1882. Cardinal M'Cabe on the Assassinations. Cardinal M'Cabe arrived at Kingstown this evening. His Eminence, replying to an address from the Town Commission of Kingstown said: On the eve of my departure for Rome it was my painful duty to denounce the perpetration of a foul murder committed in the darkness of night in an obscure street of Dublin, and again on mid-journey homewards the report of a double act of brutal assassination which has shocked the civilised world horrified me. But this time the crime is perpetrated, not in a backstreet, not in the dark of midnight, but in the glorious light of a summer setting sun, under the shadow of the Viceregal palace, and in view of the Queen's representative. This hideous deed of blood, most wicked in its inception, brutal in its execution, and revolting in all its details, has bowed down the head of every truehearted Irishman with shame, and filled his heart with feeling almost approaching to despair for the future of his country. We have, however, the consolation of believing that this crime was not concocted in Ireland, and of knowing that its commission has called from every class of our fellow-countrymen an outburst of heartfelt reprobation.

262 CE 27 January 1882. The project of an Exhibition of Irish industry ought to commend itself to the interest of every Irishman. There are adverse circumstances to be encountered, but we hope they may be successfully overcome. There are considerations which weigh against the determination to effect the undertaking this year. It may well be said that an attempt of the kind needs a peaceful atmosphere to flourish in, and we can scarcely say that there is any certainty of that being found a so early a period as that which must necessarily be fixed. But at the present moment the national movement in favour of Irish manufacture has retained much of its enthusiasm, and there is a good deal to be said in favour of the idea that advantage should be taken of the warmth of feeling that exists.
The adamant Nationalism, or indeed Liberalism, of newspapers in the early 1880s forced the Governments of both Great Britain and the Austrian Empire to resort to censorship and incarceration of recidivist editors.

CE 10 December 1881
The Staff of United Ireland
(Special telegram)
London, Friday Night
Two members of the staff of United Ireland – Mr. O’Keeffe, the general manager, and Mr. Donelly, the foreman printer – arrived in London this morning, having eluded the service of the warrants which had been issued for their arrest. Arrangements have already been made for the production of the paper here should it become necessary.

CE 27 January 1882
Seizure of United Ireland in Belfast
Dublin, Thursday Night
The police seized to-day in Belfast four hundred copies of United Ireland. The papers were made up in parcels for transmission from Belfast to newsvendors in Armagh, Belleek, Kilmalock, Navan and other places. […] Special policemen were detailed to-day in Dublin to seize copies of United Ireland from the street vendors.

Seizure of the Irish World
(Special telegram)
Dublin, Thursday Night
250 copies of the Irish World were seized at North Wall to-day. The articles in the copies seized were of more than usual inflammatory nature.

CE 21 January 1882
Confiscation of Journals in Vienna
Vienna, Friday
To-night’s evening papers were confiscated because they contained a speech by the President of the United Liberal Club.

CE 26 January 1882
The Vienna Press
The Chronicle’s Vienna correspondent says – The director of police has sent for the newspaper editors and reminded them of the criminal law overriding the publication of any news of military operations in war time. This is considered to indicate that war operations are on a much larger scale than the Government are willing to admit.

With regard to the continuing dilemma of Catholic education, specially at University level, ‘the most significant development in the history of Parnell’s long relationship with the Catholic Church’ occurred in 1884, when Parnell, prompted by the Irish bishops, was to take up the case of the Vatican’s property under threat from the secular authorities. The intervention of Cardinal Manning persuaded
Parnell to drop the matter, and his ‘piety,’ or rather the growing discipline and influence of the Parnellites, was rewarded when ‘the Catholic agreed to accept the Irish party as their sole parliamentary agents on the educational issue.’ This agreement marks also a critical stage in ‘the emergence of Catholicism as the established church of the national movement and of the nascent Irish state.’ When the Tory government fell in early 1886 and the third Gladstone administration was restored to power, there followed ‘the generous response to the Irish demands that the new Prime Minister had promised.’

On 7 April 1886, the day before the introduction of the Home Rule Bill, Parnell was able to assemble his party and inform them of the measure’s contents. The Home Rule Bill of 1886 made provision for a unicameral Irish legislature (the word ‘parliament’ was avoided), modelled on the general synod of the disestablished Church of Ireland. Controversially, there was to be no Irish representation at Westminster. Instead, there was to be two ‘orders’ in a new legislature: these might meet and debate together, but if it was so wished, they could meet and vote separately. It was proposed that the first order should have 103 members, comprising the 28 existing representative peers and 75 additional members, elected for ten years on a highly restrictive franchise. The members themselves were to be comparatively wealthy men, possessing either four thousand pounds in capital or property worth two hundred pounds a year. The first order, in brief, represented the Irish ‘classes’, and given the constrained franchise and the presence of the peers, it would have been disproportionately Protestant in composition. The second order was to have 204 or 206 members, depending on whether the graduates of the Royal University, like those of Trinity College Dublin, were to be enfranchised. Here there were no fancy franchises or restrictions on membership, for the normal (and, after the reforms of 1884-45, relatively expansive) parliamentary franchise applied. The popularly consisted second order was to have pre-eminence in the proposed Home Rule dispensation. The first order had no right of veto, but merely a delaying power of three years, much like the British House of Lords after 1911.

This move raised the hackles of Unionists in Britain and Ireland, and set the scene for the parliamentary processes which would eventually lead to the partition of the 32 county island into 26 southern and 6 northern counties. Initially, these

---

263 Jackson, p.47.
264 Jackson, p.56.
265 Jackson, p.57. Cf. also pp.58/59 on details of Home Rule Bill: ‘The Home Rule Bill of 1886 accepted implicitly that the parliament of the United Kingdom remained the supreme legislative authority for Ireland. The new Home Rule legislature was given wide-ranging powers over domestic issues, although Westminster retained in its grasp a list of crucial ‘reserved’ matters. […] Some legislative ‘no-go’ areas were also mapped out. These mostly involved the ever-controversial question of religion, and were designed to quieten Protestant fears of Rome Rule without giving offence to Catholics. The proposed Irish legislature could not endow any church, restrict religious practise or impose religious tests for public office. The legislature could not require children to receive religious instruction at school: it could not skew the processes of law to favour any denomination.’
predominantly British Unionists felt that Gladstone had ignored a major issue, and began to canvassing the idea of special status for Ulster. And while British Unionists were also concerned about the possible effects on the empire, Irish Unionists were alarmed by the possible relegation of Ireland from its metropolitan status to the ranks of the colonies.

The North Down MP, Thomas Waring, affirmed on 8 April that ‘Irish loyalists were now part of one of the greatest Empires of the world…and were utterly determined that they should not be changed into colonials’. There was also a quirky and recurrent, though admittedly rare, Irish Unionist view that complete independence for Ireland would be a more rational and more desirable option than Home Rule. More perhaps than their British brethren, Irish Unionists complained that the problem with Home Rule was largely the Home Rulers. In May 1886 Colonel Edward Saunderson, MP for North Armagh and leader of the Irish Unionist parliamentary party, identified ‘85 reasons why this House should not consent to this (Home Rule) Bill. They are not abstract, but concrete reasons - and they are to be found sitting below the gangway, opposite.266

The second reading of the Home Rule Bill caused the dissolution of parliament and the country went to he polls to reinstate the Conservatives.

But of course the Home Rule debacle concerned more than the reputations and credibility of Gladstone and Parnell. Traditional interpretations have emphasised the extent to which the Home Rule ‘crisis’ had a lasting impact upon British and Irish party divisions. After the spring of 1886 the Liberals were divided between Gladstonian loyalists and those ‘Liberal Unionists’ who, led by Lord Hartington and Joseph Chamberlain, acted increasingly in collision with the Tories. By the end of 1886 one of the most Whiggish of these Liberal Unionists, G. J. Goschen, had attempted the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer in a Conservative government; after 1895 he was joined by other party colleagues. In 1911 the Conservatives and Liberal Unionists formally amalgamated their respective party machines.267

The late 1880s marks a barren period for the Home Rule idea and movement, given the Conservative Party’s ascendancy over government from 1886 to 1892, as no major constitutional initiative was forthcoming, except a failed effort in 1892 to launch a local government reform for Ireland, and the introduction of

---

266 Jackson, p.62. Not that Unionists proved less insufferable, e.g.: ‘Also peculiar to Irish Unionism was the threat, implied or direct, of physical force. Not all Irish Unionists were prepared to endorse such language, and indeed some endeavoured to distance themselves from their more bellicose colleagues. Still, in 1886 a number of Irish, particularly Ulster, Unionist leaders alluded to the likelihood of armed resistance in the event of the passage of the Home Rule Bill. Of these William Johnston, MP for South Belfast and something of an ingénue (despite his fifty-seven years), was perhaps the most direct. On 26 April and 6 May 1886 Johnston announced plans for military preparation at two Unionist meetings in Ulster, while in the House of Commons he warned that resistance would be offered ‘at the point of the bayonet’.

267 Jackson, p.65.
some minor land legislation. Some of these difficulties became evident in the divisions within the Home Rule leadership over the renewal of land agitation in 1886, when Parnell had sought to enact a Tenant’s Relief Bill to make evictions more difficult to execute. However, his measure was thrown out by the Conservatives and the initiative on land fell into the hands of his more aggressive lieutenants, resurrecting the idea of rent strikes and war chests from money that would have been paid to landlords.

The resuscitation of Healy’s proposal was carried out by T.C. Harrington in August 1886, and others, such as John Dillon and William O’Brien, fell swiftly into line. A practical scheme was outlined in the Parnellite newspaper United Ireland in October: this urged tenants to combine in order to force acceptable levels of rent on their landlords. If landlords refused to negotiate, the rents would be paid into an estate fund which would be used in turn to pay the maintenance and legal costs of those tenants caught up in the struggle for justice. The resulting agitation, the Plan of Campaign, was carefully orchestrated by the National League, with indebted and therefore vulnerable landlords finding themselves the focus of the assault. It has been argued that the plan was a grander offensive than has generally been assumed, operating in 203 estates throughout the country - including, in a scattered way, Ulster. But, even so, and despite massive publicity for particular controversial evictions or confrontations, only one percent of the total number of estates was affected by the agitation.268

Jackson describes how the prosecution of the government and landlord case in combination with the costs of the tenant enterprise, caused a great deal of trouble to the organisers. In 1887 the new Chief Secretary for Ireland was Arthur Balfour who, though considered a dilettante, possessed ‘intellectual self-confidence, languid determination and bloody-minded gentility,’ which he used to undo the constitutional achievement of the Home Rule movement in its quest for ‘respectability’. The strategy he employed to achieve this end was the equation of nationalism with criminality, hastening, for example, to enact the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Bill to enlarge the powers of the government269 at the

---

268 Jackson, p.68.
269 CE 14 December 1889.Editorial.The national Tenants Defence League is Daily making magnificent progress through the length and breadth of the country. Within the past week Galway and Sligo, Meath and Westmeath, Armagh and Dublin, have endorsed the declaration of Thurles. There has been every succeeding day a marked increase in the enthusiasm of the public in favour of the new movement, and its mode of working and objects have, as time passes, become more distinctly understood. In a very few days every county of Ireland will have been enrolled in the one great organisation, and the people banded together on a very practical, very broad, and very comprehensive platform. The latest authoritative pronouncements on the merits and the expediency of the League are calculated to bring home to the mind of every Irishman, if not fresh and new views of the question, at least a more decided conviction than ever of the necessity of supporting the Tenants’ League as a means to social and national improvement. Of the splendid address of the
expense of ‘normal’ judicial process. The creation in 1888 of a Special Commission to investigate alleged links between the national movement and crime is generally regarded as part of his strategy of incrimination. The following reports from the Examiner highlight the process admirably:

CE 31 January 1889
The Arrest of Mr. Wm. O’Brien, M.P.
His Departure for Dublin. Great Popular Ovation En Route.
Mr. O’Brien left Manchester at 9.40 this morning for Dublin […] and was conveyed across the Channel to Kingstown. […] The police made no attempt to prevent the people speaking to the prisoner as he left the steamer, but having entered the railway carriage he was isolated from the crowd by a strong cordon of Dublin police.

CE 1 February 1889
The Political Prisoners
Condition of Wm. O’Brien, M.P.
[…] A Dublin correspondent says: - The following telegram from a magistrate at Clonmel has been received in Dublin this afternoon:

Dear Sir, - I am just after visiting Mr. Wm. O’Brien, who arrived at the prison270 here between two and three o’clock, and found him in an exhausted state and excited condition. He had been forcibly deprived of his clothes, and his hair and beard cut close. He told me he had resisted with all his strength, and would do

Archbishop of Dublin it is unnecessary to speak. […] The Primate of all Ireland, in a letter to the presiding Chairman of the Armagh Convention, declares – “I see no hope of safety for the tenants but in such combination as the Tenants’ Defence Association, kept rigidly within the bounds of law and justice, while fairly securing fair treatment by mutual assistance and support. [This] makes more emphatic his approval of the Organisation instituted to combat and overthrow the designs of a conspiracy against the tenant class, which employs all the old devices of landlordism, with new powers afforded by Mr. Balfour’s Government, for the express purpose of crushing at one blow the tenants’ agitation against rack-rents and the National agitation by which it is backed up.

270 CE 21 December 1889.Release of Mr. Wm. O’Brien, M.P. (Special telegram). Presentation of Addresses.Galway, Friday.Precisely at nine o’clock this morning Mr. O’Brien was released from Galway gaol after an incarceration of four months, inflicted upon him for a speech addressed to Mr. Smith-Barry’s Clonakilty tenants. A crowd assembled at the gaol cheered loudly. The hon. Gentleman was conveyed in the carriage of the Bishop of Galway to the latter’s residence, where he breakfasted and received an address from the Aloysian Society, to which he delivered a spirited reply. Next he drove to the Temperance Hall, where an enormous crowd had gathered, and where it had been arranged the presentation of the addresses would take place. […] Mr. O’Brien, on rising to reply, received a great ovation.

CE 27 December 1889. Mr. Wm. O’Brien, M.P., the Guest of Archbishop Croke.(Special telegram).Thurles, Wednesday.Mr. Wm. O’Brien is the guest to-day of his illustrious friend and admirer – Archbishop Croke. […] Archbishop Croke said – It is not necessary for me to make any formal introduction to you of the much loved and patriotic Irishman who I am proud to have at my side here to-day (cheers). He is well known to you as a tried and trusted representative of the Irish race at home and abroad […]. Mr. William O’Brien then said – […] We are living in memorable times; we are living in trying times. The whole world to-day is ringing with the name of Tipperary – ringing with the infamous deeds of Mr. Smith-Barry and his syndicate (groans), and, above all, ringing with the fame of the calm and steady and magnificent courage of the men of Tipperary (great applause).
so as long as he lived. He says he will not wear the prison clothes. Edward Hackett, Visiting Justice.  

Balfour was also the guiding light behind the so-called Ponsonby syndicate, a combination of landlords fending off the plan of campaign’s assault on an encumbered Cork estate. Although Balfour failed to find official funds for the Ponsonby enterprise, he was quite adept at raising money for other questionable ventures: ‘It has recently been calculated that by 1889 secret service expenditure in Ireland had doubled compared with the average annual outlay under earlier administrations.’

CE November 23 1889
Manchester Martyrs Anniversary.
Police Manoeuvres Bandon.
To-day being the anniversary of the judicial murder of Allan, Larkin, and O’Brien the police authorities in West Cork have taken extensive precautions to prevent the customary demonstration there. [...] Yesterday a squad of policemen equipped with paste-pots and old paint brushes were to be seen busily engaged in posting copies of a proclamation, which warns all law-abiding subjects against taking part in any demonstration to the murdered patriots. The Bandon folk are much amused at these exceptional measures, which, it is to be presumed, are taken to prevent the loyal Orange residents from being scandalized by Nationalist demonstrations.

CE 31 December 1889
Police Espionage on Mr. Wm. O’Brien
The conduct of the police while Mr. O’Brien was staying in Bantry was most ridiculous. From the very moment in which he entered the town two policemen were instructed to follow and watch all his movements. During his address on Saturday night to the people from the window of Mr. Gilhooly’s residence, a policeman was industriously noting the few words spoken by him. The policemen in heavy coats were compelled to remain on the road on Saturday night under all the rain opposite Canon Shinkwin’s house where Mr. O’Brien was staying [...] and at 4 o’clock on Sunday afternoon when he left the residence of his rev. host, and proceeded in company with his colleague, Mr. Gilhooly, to Glengarriffe, he was followed on an outside car by members of the force.

The main target of these political persecutions was, of course, Parnell himself, who one sought to incriminate and weaken, especially regarding the

---

271 CE 1 February 1889. Warrants for Messrs. Kilbride and Carrew. M.P.s. Warrants for the arrest of Messrs. Kilbride and Carrew, members of Parliament, have been in the hands of the police for about a week, but their whereabouts have not yet been ascertained by the officials. The hon. members are supposed to be in England.

272 Jackson, p.69.
relationship between Parnellites and the Irish Catholic hierarchy which though established might just as easily be subverted.

CE 1 February 1889
The “Times” Commission. Forty-second Day
London, Thursday.

The Special Commission engaged in the inquiry into the charges and allegations contained in the Times publication “Parnellism and Crime,” sat again to-day.

Unfortunately for Parnell, his private life also came under closer scrutiny at this time, and it was his relationship to a married woman, Katherine O’Shea, and not his relationship to Fenianism, which would lead to his downfall.

CE 30 December 1889
London Correspondence
London, Sunday Night

[…] Mr. Gladstone enters to-day on his eightieth year, and for the moment the rancorous tongues of his enemies have been silenced. At an age when the shadow of the future lies on all other statesmen, he keeps himself in touch with all the pressing problems of life, and lends his unequalled authority and experiences to their practical solution. A life rich in great achievements lies behind him, and though he has often yearned to doff his armour, and has once essayed to retire into the seclusion and peace of private life, the consciousness of a mission seems to have impelled him to keep his foot in the arena. It is not the marvellous union of intellectual and physical qualities alone that gives Mr. Gladstone the supreme position among the men of the time, but the high moral character of the Grand Old Man, most of all, has made him the loftiest type of the statesmanship of the age. […] A reporter of the organ edited by Mr. Marks, the Jewish gentleman, who is also proprietor of the Financial News, and whose brother is at present being prosecuted in connection with the Financial Times, another money journal, on a charge of having attempted to blackmail a city company promoter, has had an interview with the notorious Capt. O’Shea. It will be remembered that the Evening News is the paper in which Houston, of the Loyal Patriotic Union, the friend and patron of Pigott, the forger, spreads his unblushing calumnies with reference to the Irish members. Capt. O’Shea is alleged to have informed this reporter (who was possibly Houston himself) that he had instituted a suit of divorce against his wife and that Mr. Parnell was the co-respondent. The rumour has elicited considerable

---

273 CE 2 February 1889.Supplement to the Cork Examiner. John Dillon. Mr. John Dillon has a marked temperament and tone of mind. His nervous, mental temperament predominates over his vital powers, and his motive muscular organization has the ascendancy of his vital and digestive functions, giving him greater activity and nervous impressibility than a warm impulsive nature. He is liable to extremes of mental action, and very liable to overdo and thus impair vitality and digestive power. Such an organization is liable to exhaust itself before old age is attained. He has a marked, distinct individuality, and a character peculiar to himself. The form of his head indicates great tenacity and an unbending determination to maintain his position or die in the attempt, for he would find it very difficult to submit to another or yield his point. […] L.N. Fowler, Phrenological Magazine for February.
sensation, but it will be remembered that no one was more strenuous than Captain O’Shea himself some time ago in denying the imputation.\textsuperscript{274}

Although the Cork Examiner had needed to be won over to Parnellism when it first became popular, it stood by the national leader in his plight over moral rectitude. Eventually, however, the paper sided with the growing movement of anti-Parnellites who hoped to rescue the Irish party from total ruination.\textsuperscript{275}

\textbf{CE 31 December 1889}

Editorial

[\ldots] As this divorce case at present stands, it looks as ugly a conspiracy against the character of a prominent public man as ever was disclosed. The circumstances under which Captain O’Shea brings his charges against Mr. Parnell are so enveloped with suspicion, so apparently inconsistent with genuineness and honesty, that the public sympathy is sure to wholly and entirely with the distinguished gentleman, against whom he has nursed his wrath so long to spring a new and dangerous mine beneath him when he has his foot on the neck of an old and unscrupulous foe.

\textbf{Excursus: Language and Literary Revival}

By the late 1870s and early 1880s many endeavours had been undertaken\textsuperscript{276} to draw the public’s notice to the need of restoring the ancient Gaelic tongue to a position where it would serve as the first language of communication in the country.

\textsuperscript{274} CE 31 December 1889. The Plot against the Irish Leader. Statement of Mr. Parnell. I obtained an interview from Mr. Parnell to-day with reference to the announcement of proceedings of Captain O’Shea against him in the Divorce Court. Mr. Parnell stated that he had not heard up to then that any such proceedings had been taken, but said that Captain O’Shea had been threatening such proceedings for years past, in fact since 1886, when Captain O’Shea had separated himself politically from him. […] Freeman.

\textsuperscript{275} Jackson, p. 76: ‘On 29 November, Parnell responded with his great ‘Manifesto to the Irish People’ wherein, amongst a welter of other accusations, he attacked Gladstone’s presumption and repudiated the Liberal alliance. This in turn precipitated a great crisis within the parliamentary party, which in effect was being invited to choose both between Parnell and his political strategies, and between Gladstone’s political diagnosis and that of their own leader. The party reconvened on 1 December in Committee Room 15 of the House of Commons, and - after five days of fractious debate - McCarthy led forty-four of his colleagues away from the room and into schism; twenty-eight Irish MPs remained true to their embattled chief. This marked the beginning of a nine-year civil war within the Home Rule movement.’

\textsuperscript{276} CE 14 June 1879. The Irish Language in Newcastle West. Dr. O’Brien, Dean of Limerick, held an examination in the old Keltic [sic] tongue last week, and distributed premiums among the proficients in language on Sunday last in the church, after last Mass. The examination comprised the whole of the ‘First Book’ – a viva voce translated of original sentences and passages spoken by the Dean, but more particularly in writing from the Dean’s dictation, and in the Irish character, some not very easy verses. The success in all was most decided; but the writing of two of the competitors under fifteen, in the old tongue, was marvellous. Here is something like progress.
On Wednesday, the Rev. E. Barry, C.C., Youghal, and Dr. Charles Ronayne, J.P., conducted the examination in Irish at the village of Gurtroc. The book selected for the examination was An Ceid Cabar Gaedilge, of the “Society for the preservation of the Irish language.” Twenty-one boys presented themselves. They had been prepared by Mr. Farrell, National School teacher of Cloynepriest. They were critically examined in the reading, writing, and spelling of the Irish, and particularly in its phrase and grammar idioms, and so carefully prepared were they and so thoroughly did they know the language, that it was difficult to select the three best boys for prizes. However, after severe testing in the “ellipses” and “aspirations,” the three best came to the front. The first was a poor boy, Patrick Cotter, the son of a labourer, a lad of 14, who displayed great ability and singular intelligence. The second was the eldest son of the teacher, a very clever young lad. The third was P. Cashman, a very young boy of ten years, whose bright face and smart answering pleased and surprised his examiners very much. Father Barry, who parsed them critically in the “aspirations,” was very much pleased with their creditable knowledge of the subject, especially with the sharpness of this young child of ten years. Dr. Roynane, in awarding the prizes, congratulated the boys in their training and intimate knowledge of the difficult idioms of their noble tongue, of which he told them ever to be proud. He told them how now-a-days it was studied by the learned in all countries, and admitted to be the finest of spoken languages; that German, French, and Italian scholars were studying it with...

---

277 CE 8 November 1879. The Preservation of the Irish Language. To the Editor of the Cork Examiner. Sir, - You are, of course, aware that a Society constituted for the preservation of our native language and numbering among its members, persons distinguished for literary and scientific acquirements, has its head-quarters at No. 19, Kildare-street, Dublin. You also, probably, know that classes are formed among the Irish in New York, Boston, and other American towns, as well as in different cities in England, in which the ancient Gaelic speech is cultivated. And you are not ignorant that Gaelic professorships exist in the Universities at Oxford and Leipsic [sic]. But at home, amongst ourselves, a disgraceful apathy on this subject appears to be prevalent. An Irishman, whose sympathies are truly and honourably national, should feel pride in preserving the old tongue of his country; a tongue which I believe is the oldest spoken language in Europe. Something has, indeed, been done in this direction, and a few – I fear very few – of our country schoolmasters have creditably set their hands to the good work. But, as a rule, the existing generation of Munster peasants, nearly all of whom can speak Irish, speak nothing to their children, but the barbarous English patois, in which grammar is set at defiance, so that the rising generation are, to an immense extent, growing up in ignorance of the grand old expressive language of their ancestors. Nay, there is an incredible meanness, a spirit of provincial flunkeyism, in the minds of many of our people, who positively seem vain of that scandalous ignorance. Ask a stripling you may meet on the road some question in Irish, and ten to one he answers you with a self-sufficient air, “I has no Irish;” as if the avowal of his shameful incapacity were something to be proud of! The melancholy fact seems to be that the iron of slavery has entered into the souls of our people, and corrupted or distorted their minds to so great an extent, that, in numerous instances, they appear to regard their ignorance of our ancient language as a sort of social distinction, instead of what it really is, a burning disgrace. I have been led to trouble you with these remarks by a contrast the Welsh nation presents to our degraded Irish flunkeyism in this important particular. […] Twelve weekly journals, eighteen magazines, and a large number of books are published in Welsh. It is manifest, from the above-stated facts, that the Welsh people have an honourable sense of self-respect, which they show by resisting for six hundred years every effort to rob of the hereditary language of their country. I wish our people would imitate their self-respect, and emancipate their minds from the scandalously slavish notion that the knowledge and habitual use of their country’s ancient, noble, copious tongue is a badge of social inferiority. The immortal Grattan has left on record his desire that our people should be bi-lingual – that while acquiring the language of England, they should carefully preserve their own. Our priests could do much to keep the Irish language alive. The recital, in Irish, of the prefatory prayers before Mass, on Sundays and holidays, has, after a period of disuse, been resumed by the
greater zeal than even our own countrymen, some of whom were foolish enough to feel ashamed of it; and he particularly congratulated Mr. Farrell for having so perfectly trained these boys in the literature of their native speech, and he hoped that this would be the beginning of Irish examinations through the country, that would so much stimulate its culture, and that the National school teachers, on whom so much depended, would emulate Mr. Farrell’s splendid example, and that those who ought to promote its culture would do their duty by their country’s beautiful literature, their rich and noble language, the Irish Galtic.

This was followed in the late 1880s and early 1890s by the Irish literary renaissance. The restoration of an Ireland inspired from a Gaelic past was given a great boost by the simultaneous literary activities of a gifted group of Protestant Anglo-Irish poets, playwrights and scholars, such as William Butler Yeats, Lady Gregory, George Russell (who wrote as “AE”), Standish O’Grady and John Millington Synge, who found an irresistible subject for their work in the ancient Irish heroes of legend, or in the speech patterns of a rural people who, though now more English-speaking than Irish-speaking, possessed a richness of vocabulary.

rev. gentlemen whose ministrations I attend. To others I would say, with great respect, go and do likewise. I am, sir, your faithful servant, Eirionnact.

278 CE 3 February 1882. The Irish Language. A branch of the Gaelic Union having been established in Cork for the preservation and extension of the Irish language, the first meeting of members was held on Tuesday, 31st ult. Letters were read from David Comyn, Esq. Hon. Secretary Gaelic Union, head office, Dublin; […]. It was announced that two Irish classes are in course of formation in this city, particulars of which will be duly published. Those who wish to aid this truly patriotic movement should at once apply for information to P.F. Barry, Esq., Grand Parade and Great George’s-street. Meeting adjourned until that day week.

279 Jackson, p. 86: ‘The role of the Parnell split and of the 1893 failure was evidently as profound within Irish nationalist politics as within British Liberalism, though the area remains contentious. The death of Parnell and the weakness of the Irish constitutional forces in 1893 were seen by W. B. Yeats as creating the space for a new nationalism, more cultural orientation and less committed to the old parliamentary nostrum. And, indeed, at least on the surface, there is much to commend this argument. The Parnell split opened up divisions within the Home Rule party which weakened its effectiveness, even after the supposed reunification of the warring elements in 1900. These divisions coincided with a flowering of cultural nationalism and separatist conviction, as evidenced by the foundation of the Gaelic League (in 1893), the Irish Literary Theatre (1899), the Abbey Theatre (1904) and Sinn Féin (1907). In this Yeatsian interpretation, there was a crisp dichotomy between the old and new nationalisms, with the latter inevitably superseding the former. The Irish revolution, in this and other readings, flowed automatically from the deep-seated limitations of the Home Rule movement. The integrity of this thesis will be evaluated in what follows; but it should be said immediately that a new generation of historians had provided a subtler picture of the Home Rule movement in these years, and a rather more upbeat account of its effectiveness. Scholars such as Patrick Maume and Senia Paseta have outlined a Home Rule movement that was simultaneously more radical than has hitherto been appreciated, and more deeply rooted in key sectors of Irish society. Still, the case for division and weakness is hard to ignore. The war between the Parnellites (led by John Redmond) and their opponents (led ostensibly by Justin McCarthy, but with John Dillon, T. M. Healy and William O’ Brien as the key players) did not end with the Uncrowned King’s death in October 1891, or with the comparatively poor showing of Parnell’s supporters at the general elections of 1892 and 1895. Indeed, though the anti-Parnellites secured seventy-one seats in 1892, and their opponents only nine, the extent of the victory was greatly magnified by the first-past-the-post electoral system. The Parnellites garnered around one-third of the nationalist vote, and were thus a much more serious political force than their parliamentary strength suggested. And even with only nine seats, the Parnellites had both outstripped the expectations of their enemies and remained ‘politically viable’.
which owed much to inherited renderings of Irish thought into English expression. Douglas Hyde in 1893 founded the Gaelic League to revive the Irish language which had been discouraged by Daniel O’Connell, parish priests and parents who wanted their children fitted for emigration to America or Britain. Although none of these writers were committed to political separation, the rise in public interest in a Gaelic culture that had been passed on orally in peasant households, its written texts disregarded except by specialist scholars, generated a new pride in the Gaelic past. And compulsory primary education had increased the number of people who could read.

The **Gaelic Athletic Association** added a sporting element to Gaelic nationalism, underlined by the rule that its members must play only the games of Gaelic football and hurling. Anyone caught playing “foreign games” of rugby, soccer or hockey was expelled, and membership was barred to those in the crown forces, including the Royal Irish Constabulary. The Catholic Church had at first been hostile towards the GAA, rejecting any assembly they were not directly involved with, particularly when these assemblies were instilling new ideas and possibly ideologies in the unsuspecting youth of Ireland. This attitude changed when the hierarchy decided that it would be advantageous all round if they too became involved, and henceforth all sporting fixtures were presided over by the parish priest.

While idealist Hyde inaugurated the Gaelic League for the preservation and development of the Irish language, at the beginning of the twentieth century, activist Arthur Griffith\(^\text{280}\) felt that Ireland, like Hungary, should not beg home rule or anything else of a foreign parliament, but rely on herself and her own powers of passive resistance to achieve full statehood. It was the beginning of Sinn Féin.

---

\(^{280}\) Arthur Griffith, born and educated in Dublin, in 1896 emigrated to the Transvaal where he worked as journalist and fought in the Boer War, returning to Ireland in 1899. In that year he joined the Irish Republican Brotherhood, co-founded the Celtic Literary Society and became editor of the influential republican journal United Irishman at the behest of its proprietor Maud Gonne. In 1900 Griffith founded Cumann na nGaedheal. He wrote articles condemning the visit of King Edward VII to Dublin in 1903 and a year later he published a pamphlet on the 1848 Hungarian Revolution entitled The Resurrection of Hungary (1904). Griffith founded the Sinn Féin Party in November, 1905. The following year he began publishing Sinn Féin in which he urged passive resistance to British rule in Ireland. Griffith became President of Sinn Féin in 1910 but resigned from the IRB when the Rising became imminent. He was interned in Reading Gaol prior to the Rising and several more times before his election as Sinn Féin candidate in 1918. Griffith was imprisoned during the War of Independence and on his release he lead the Irish Treaty Delegation to London in December, 1921. Griffith was elected President of the Irish Free State shortly before his death in 1922. Cf. inter alia, F.S.L. Lyons, Ireland Since the Famine.
Setting the scene for **Austria in early 1880**, is another charming portrayal of Easter celebrations in the capital:

CE 6 April 1880
Easter in Vienna

The Easter festival and all its attendant ceremonies, of which there are many and of great variety and splendour, has passed off quietly. I say quietly, because there was not the slightest disturbance – a circumstance which under similar conditions in the money centre of the world, or even in any other large English or American city, would not have been wanting. In all the excitement of sight-seeing, the rush and crowding for a better place in the churches and in the streets, I neither saw an angry movement, a petulant jostle, nor hear a coarse word of jest or temper. Let it here be said, in all honour to this people, mixed as it is with so many nationalities, each possessing more or less antipathy for the other – and alas, in shame to our own – that the behaviour of what is known as the common people is excellent, better than which one could not desire. You enter a crowd, as dense as you can well imagine, and with a polite mien and an occasional *ich bitte Sie* or *erlauben Sie* respectively – “I pray you” and “allow me” – you pass through it without fear of having your ribs broken by the spasmodic movement of some sharp and powerful elbow or your hat smashed over your eyes by some rowdy, who, for the sake of the fun (?), has not forgotten to provide himself with a flask of “old rye,” from which, in order to give a more lively colouring to the surrounding picture and produce an equally lively volubility in his tongue – that factor of abuse and obscenity in such a mouth – he takes a frequent “pull.” This marked serenity may be accounted for in many ways; it may be owing either to the almost total disuse of ardent spirits – the soothing and less exciting properties of the malt being preferred – or to the naturally phlegmatic temperaments of the people themselves, whom it seems almost impossible to arouse to be a greater expression of their inner enjoyment or pleasure than a rather weak hurrah or a half choked ach! Their faces, however, reflect intense ecstasy within, which they prefer to enjoy in their own quite inoffensive way than by annoying their neighbours with boisterous exclamations. Would that this were the general feelings in Old England! Again, the great school of military discipline, which takes effect upon the women and children through the men, added to the awe of the law which is meted out with Spartan-like promptitude, may influence their movements in a great measure. The children, especially, are remarkably polite, respectful, and well-behaved. […] The inevitable Easter egg makes its appearance in all shapes, sizes and varieties of tint and material […]. In passing leisurely through the streets the eye is attracted by the brilliant decorations of the shop windows, especially those of the confectioners […]. In the fancy goods stores, writing utensils, candlesticks, inkstands, sand boxes, seals, and so forth, in each of which the egg has a prominent position, are to be had. These tools – for one could scarcely call them anything else – are all necessary for a person of “correspondence” in this country, for they will cling with great tenacity to the antiquated custom of the drop of sealing wax on the back of their letters, impressed with the coat-o-arms or monogram, and the disagreeable sand-box instead of the modern blotting paper […].
Generally accepted as the era of Taaffe, the Austrian Empire had to contend principally in this decade with nationalist ambitions of the Czechs and the Poles, similar in tenacity to their Irish equivalents, as well as recurring animosities in Hungary, such as the following:

CE 19 January 1880
The Pesth Riots

The Daily News correspondent telegraphing yesterday morning in regard to the disturbances says: - The general belief is that the neck of the movement is broken. The same correspondent telegraphing last evening says - the excitement is beginning to subside although the situation is far from reassuring yet. [...] There was no renewal last night of the demonstrations before the National Casino[illegible] and the streets again present their normal appearance. The internment of the two individuals who were killed at the recent riots took place in perfect order.

CE 27 January 1880
The Recent Riots in Pesth

Pesth, Monday

In the Lower House of the Hungarian Diet today, M. Tisza, the President of the Ministry, opposed the motion brought forward by M. Moezary for a Parliamentary inquiry into the recent riots in connection with the popular demonstrations against the National Casino in this city, and gave an account, based on official reports, of the disturbances which took place. M. Pzitagye proposed that the debate on the motion should be adjourned until the 28th instant, and that the document on which M. Tisza had founded his statement should be printed and distributed among the deputies. The Minister President assented to the adjournment, but refused to agree to the proposal to have the reports printed, adding that he should treat the matter as a Cabinet question. On the motion being put to the vote, the House assented to the adjournment of the debate, but rejected by 146 votes against 115 the proposal respecting the printing of the documents.

281 Taylor, pp.169ff.
282 CE 15 September 1880.Austria and the Poles. The Standard Paris correspondent says the visit of the Emperor of Austria to his Polish subjects has excited considerable expectations and apprehension. The Austrian Poles regard it as a pledge of the development of their national liberties. The Germanic party look upon their Sovereign’s progress through Galicia with deep displeasure while Russia feels some uneasiness on the matter and cannot pardon Austria for the policy pursued.
283 CE 30 January 1889.Austria and Hungary. The Times Vienna correspondent, telegraphing on Monday, says – At a banquet intended as a demonstration against the new Army Bill, a telegram was read from Louis Kossuth, in which he says: “The Hungarians have the right and also the duty to be a nation, to make this nation a State. An indispensible condition of this is that they should have a National army with hungarian colours, a Hungarian commander, and hungarian feeling. That man is no Hungarian who would surrender these rights. The patriotic sport of our National youth is the hope of our future history and the bulwark of our safety. To you applies the warning – be watchful, Hungarians, who stand watching over the fatherland, if though hast not courage.”
284 The National Casino, a great debating society of the higher and middle classes, was often the scene of violent demonstrations. “The National Casino was founded by a handful group of young Catholic aristocrats in 1827 but the majority of the membership comprised a non-aristocrat (gentry) majority as early as in the early 1830s with a small number of burghers, too.” Cf. Voluntary societies as social networks in mid-19th century Hungarian towns by Árpád Tóth, Ph.D. (Univ. of Miskolc, Hungary) to be presented at the session ‘Between cousins and kings: civil society or something else in European Cities east and west’ at the Eighth International Conference on Urban History.
Education at University level was continually a point of contention in Ireland as well as the continent, exemplified by the Czech national movement and its attempts to secure a Czech speaking university education for Czech scholars:

CE 9 February 1880
Prague University
Vienna, February 7th
A resolution having been introduced in the Budget Committee by Herr Jireczek, in favour of placing the Czech and German language on an equal footing at the Prague University. Dr. Stremayr, Minister of Justice, Public Worship and Instruction, delivered a speech on the subject, in which he opposed the idea of converting the University into a purely Czech institution, and declared that the retention of its German character was a State necessity. The Minister added, that he agreed with the resolution on its general terms, for the Government were desirous of doing justice to all nationalities, but he pointed out, as a similar case, that at Lemberg, where there were also two nationalities, the use of two different languages could not be introduced in the university. The resolution was adopted, the minority voting against it including the members of the Constitutional party.

Another point of comparison between Ireland and Austria at this time was not only the agitation prompted by various societies, secret or otherwise, but the topic of governmental secret services to combat them:

CE 14 April 1880
Vienna – The Secret Service Fund
Vienna, Tuesday
The Lower House of the Austrian Reichsrath to-day decided immediately to commence the debate upon the different clauses of the budget. During the discussion which followed upon the paragraph concerning the secret service fund, Dr. Herbst declared, in the name of the Constitutional party, that, distrusting the action of the Government, they would not vote for the fund, as its application was entirely removed beyond the control of the Legislature.

Herr Grocholski, a Polish member, declared that his party would vote for the fund, but in doing so they did not intend to record their positive confidence in the Government. Herr Wowalski said that the Ruthenians opposed the fund on account of the support given by the Government to the Poles during the late elections. Count Von Taaffe, President of the Ministry, made a speech, in the course of which he stated that in the budget debate in 1870, Herr Skene declared that in view of the relations of the political parties in Austria, a secret service fund would have to be granted to every ministry. Count Von Taaffe added that he did not regard the question as one of confidence in the Government. If the fund were granted he would use it in the way contemplated by Herr Skene – namely, for

---

285 CE 8 May 1880. Austrian Finance. Vienna, Thursday. In to-days sitting of the Lower House of the Reichsrath the Government presented the balance sheet of the old “State banks of advances.” It shows that only 12,307 florins had to be written off as irrecoverable, but that on the other hand interest to the amount of 2,900,000 florins remained unpaid. A motion of the Left to make the recent reply of the Minister of Justice relative to the use of Czech and German languages in Bohemia the subject of a debate, was opposed by the Right and rejected.
protection of the Government against attack. On the paragraph being ultimately put to the vote, it was rejected by 154 against 152.286

There was a tentative link between Irish consciousness of Catholic emancipation and the Russian war on Nihilism. Daniel O’Connell’s plan of action to emancipate Catholics was also employed to gain rights for other oppressed minorities, including England’s Jews. It seemed the favour was not being returned by Continental Jews, in whose power as journalists it could have lain to induce European readers to sympathise morally, politically and perchance financially with Irish aspirations. Not only were they antagonistic to Irish ambitions, they were upsetting a great Christian power to boot:

CE 3 May 1880
Editorial

On Saturday an announcement was made which naturally caused some sensation. It was to the effect that a decree had been promulgated in St. Petersburg ordering all foreign Jews to quit that capital in six hours. The statement did seem probable […]. Indeed, so completely is it opposed to the truth that it appears measures contemplated for more strictly carrying out the regulations with regard to the residence of Jews have been again suspended. Under the appointment of General Loris Melikoff to the dictatorship, which was first generally supposed to be intended to emphasize the war against Nihilism, has had quite a different result. Under his rule a military system has prevailed, as if he had seen the futility of attempting to crush out discontent by mere repression. It was therefore unlikely that he would enter upon a crusade which would be calculated at once to deprive Russian society of some of its most influential men of business and at the same time fill with a new exasperation a race which, whatever may be said of it as a whole, has shown that it is capable of producing most terrific examples of malignity. The report has probably originated in a growing feeling that has undoubtedly prevailed in Russia that Nihilism, with all its destructive tendencies, is not only largely recruited from the ranks of the Jews, but that owing to their activity and the superiority of their intelligence to that of the average Russian peasant or workman, they are the leading spirits in the movement […]. Besides that, the chief of the band, Laiba Deutsch, was also a Jew. […] It is also alleged that Hartmann is a Jew or of Jewish origin. This person, it is hardly necessary to say, is accused of having attempted to blow up the train in which the Czar was travelling. We ought almost to be ashamed to mention his name, remembering that a political banquet in this city an Irish Member of Parliament held up for admiration and imitation the example he was supposed to have given. However, these ugly facts cannot be passed over, and we must make the best of them. It is scarcely to be wondered at that the hideous predominance which Jews have assumed in the Nihilist movement should have occasioned very deep and angry sensation in Russia, but we are glad that the feeling has not produced any extreme

286 CE 15 April 1880. The Austrian Ministry. Vienna, Wednesday. The report published to-day by a Vienna paper that the Austrian Ministry had tendered their resignation, in consequence of the rejection by the Lower House of the clause of the budget concerning the secret service fund, is premature. No decision has yet been taken by the Cabinet respecting the course to be adopted.
measure of persecution. It is rarely that persecution succeeds in its object. In the case of a race so versatile and by consequence in some senses so powerful, as the Jews, it is especially likely to fail. The reported measure, if it were really adopted, would be only likely to produce new recruits for the band of assassins. We do not say this with any peculiar feeling of sympathy for the race. A large proportion of them exercise a very evil influence on opinion in Europe. In England they received the help of the Catholic vote at the instance of O’Connell to help them to enter Parliament, and their co-religionists have repaid the favour by furnishing to the Continental press consistent enemies and calumniators of Catholicism. We do not regret the course which has met with such ingratitude. It was right in itself and therefore well done whatever the result.287

The accomplishments of modern media and communication technology let the world appear smaller and make distant regions more accessible than previously experienced.288 The telephone system was slowly progressing,289 as was the illumination and general electrification of home and industry. It therefore seemed quite natural that a Balkan state would congratulate Great Britain’s new Prime Minister, thanking him cordially for the interest taken in their affairs.

287 Cassell’s Chronology, p.434, for the year 1881: 13 March Alexander II, tsar of Russia since 1855, is assassinated in St.Petersburgh. Sophia Perovskaya, head of a group of nihilistic revolutionaries, has organised the bomb attack. Alexander’s son succeeds as Alexander III and makes Jews the scapegoats for his father’s death. A series of pogroms (massacres) follows, which will cause millions of Russian Jews to emigrate.

288 CE 15 December 1881. The Loss of the Idumeo. To the Editor of the Cork Examiner. Queenstown, 14th Dec. 1881. Dear Sir – I am desired by my friend, Mr. P. N. Ivanvich, Mayor of Lossin Piciolo (Austria) to publish a letter in his name in your paper thanking the people in general, and some in particular, for the sympathy evinced on the occasion of the wreck of the Idumeo, when his daughter, the master’s wife, lost her life. I am, dear sir, yours truly, J. Goidanich.

To the Editor of the Cork Examiner, Sir – Deeply touched by the general sympathy evinced by the inhabitants of your environs, as brought to my knowledge through the medium of your columns, and by a feeling friend, on the sad occasion of the loss of my beloved daughter in the shipwreck of the ill-fated Idumeo, off the coast at your part of Ireland. I feel it my duty, on the part also of her afflicted mother and the other members of my family, to transmit through the same medium our heartfelt thanks and deep obligation to all those generous persons who thus contributed to lessen our sorrow, and were the means of consolation in our bereavement – to the writer, especially, whose soul’s outpouring described in verses the dreadful event with loss of our darling Christina – to those who sheltered her remains when rescued from the surf – to the feeling multitude who followed them to their last resting place. It is, indeed, a consolation for us to know that those dear remains are resting in consecrated ground, where we are sure many a pious heat will recite a requiem over them. Let one and all remain assured that we shall treasure for ever the remembrance of such kindness, and that we shall pray God to send down on them hundredfold gladness for the consolation they thus procured to us in that dreadful affliction. Mr. Editor, accept you, also, my best regards and thanks. P.N. Ivancich, Mayor. Laampilcols (Austria) Christmastide, 1881.

289 CE 15 February 1890. Supplement to the Cork Examiner. Austria’s Weather Clerk. The Sergeant Dunn of Austria is an old man named Peter Lechner. He lives, year in and year out, in a round tower on the top of the Sonnblick Mountain in the Austrian Alps – the highest meteorological station in Europe, and perhaps in the world. Throughout the long alpine winter he sees no living soul, save for an hour or two on Christmas Day, when a party cuts its way to him from the valley below laden with presents subscribed for in Vienna. His business in his eyrie between earth and heaven is to take three times a day the reading of various instruments, and to telegraph or telephone them to the clerk of the weather in Vienna. For months his only chance of hearing a human voice is through the telephone. And all this Peter Lechner is willing to do for 200 dols. a year! But then Peter has no expenses, and his life is full of compensations.
Servian Gratitude to Mr. Gladstone
Belgrade, Sunday

A political address has been forwarded to Mr. Gladstone by the municipalities of the Servian towns on the Bosnian frontier, congratulating him on his elevation to power, and alluding to his recent speech in regard to Austria and the Slav nationalities.

However, one was expressly averse to causing any hostility towards a friendly Power and newspapers served quite adequately to convey publicly one’s possibly misconstrued intentions:

Mr. Gladstone and the Austrian Policy

The Press Association has received from the Foreign Office a copy of a despatch from Earl Granville to Sir Henry Elliot at Vienna, enclosing, by Mr. Gladstone’s request, a copy of a letter written in consequence of precious oral and written communications with Count Karolyi:

London, May 4, 1880

Dear Count Karolyi – […] Your Excellency says that his Imperial Majesty expressed in conversation with Sir H. Elliot, his deep regret at my hostile position towards Austria, permit me to say I have no such dispositions towards any country whatever, and that I, at all times, have particularly and heartily wished well to Austria in the performance of the arduous task of consolidating the empire. I feel a cordial respect for the efforts of the Emperor, and I trust that their complete success may honourably and nobly mark his reign. With respect to my animadversions on the foreign policy of Austria, in times when it was active beyond the borders, I will not conceal from your Excellency that grave apprehensions had been excited in my mind lest Austria should play a part in the Balkan peninsula, hostile to the freedom of the emancipated populations, and to the reasonable and warranted hopes of the subjects of the Sultan. These apprehensions were founded, it is true, upon secondary evidence, but it was not the evidence of hostile witnesses, and it was the best at my command. Your Excellency is now good enough to assure me that your Government has no desire whatever to extend or add to the rights it had acquired under the Treaty of Berlin, and that any such extension would be actually prejudicial to Austria and Hungary.

And just to make sure there would be no such infringements on the subjects of the Sultan or otherwise, special envoy, Mr. Goshen has been sent to observe the region in question:

---

290 CE 17 May 1880. The English Proposals on the Eastern Question. The Observer’s Vienna correspondent mentions a rumour which has already gained currency in this country, that England will propose a conference for the settlement of questions in dispute in Eastern Europe.

291 CE 13 May 1880. Editorial. The Vienna papers comment favourably on Mr. Gladstone’s letter to Count Karolyi. The Daily Chronicle’s correspondent says the letter as made an excellent impression in all official circles, and even that portion of the press not favourably inclined to English Liberalism looks upon the inditing [sic] of the letter as a highminded act.
CE 24 May 1880
Mr. Goschen in Vienna
Vienna, Saturday
Mr. Goschen had a long audience of the Emperor Francis Joseph to-day at noon, having previously had a prolonged interview with Baron Kellay, Chief of Department at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. […] The Tagblatt publishes a report of an interview between one of its correspondents and Mr. Goschen. According to this account, Mr. Goschen expressed himself confident of success in his mission, and, said the Porte was animated by good intentions, but lacked the energy to carry them out. […] Mr. Goschen expressed the greatest satisfaction at the distinction with which he had been received in Vienna, and mentioned that Baron Haymerle had spoken in most flattering terms of Mr. Gladstone.

The Emperor was also popular in the Irish press, his consort once again residing in Ireland to enjoy the hunt. The Emperor was also widely known to be a keen huntsman, his popularity among his own peoples seen as steadfast and true:

CE 22 July 1880
The Rifle Competition in Austria
Vienna, Wednesday
The Emperor Francis Joseph paid a visit to-day to the shooting ground to witness the competition for prizes. His Majesty on his arrival was warmly cheered by an immense crowd. He spoke to several of the riflemen, and fired three shots, two of which struck the target, whereupon the cheering was enthusiastically renewed.

CE 13 September 1880
The Emperor Francis Joseph
Lemburg, September 11
The Emperor Francis Joseph arrived here to-day. At the railway station the Marshall of the Province delivered an address of homage, and on his Majesty arriving at the triumphal arch, erected at the outskirts of the town, he was presented by the head of the municipality with a loyal address and the keys of the city. His Majesty, in reply, said he was deeply moved by the expressions of love and attachment which had greeted him on all sides. The entry of the Emperor into the town was accompanied by the pealing of bells, the firing of salutes, and the enthusiastic cheering of the population.292

With regard to the Austrian royal family, the closing of the decade was overshadowed by the tragic death of Crown Prince Rudolf,

292 In 1880 the stage is also being set for the Drei Kaiserbund: CE 15 September 1880. Austria and Germany. The Vienna correspondent of the Standard says the exceedingly warm and splendid reception accorded to the Crown Prince in Berlin has produced great satisfaction in high quarters in Austria. Everyone in Vienna attaches a high significance to the visit of the Austrian Prince. It is universally interpreted as a further proof of the strength of the alliance between Austria and Germany, and that they will be found marching side by side in future under all eventualities. The Vienna correspondent of the Daily News says – Baron Haymerle has returned to Vienna, but he keeps the political secret well. All that is reported as to his interview with Bismarck is but guesswork.
CE 31 January 1889
Sudden Death of the Austrian Crown Prince
Vienna, Wednesday, 2.50 p.m.
Intelligence has just been received here from Meierling, near Baden, a small place in the vicinity of this city, announcing the sudden death of Crown Prince Rudolph, it is supposed from a stroke of apoplexy. […]
Vienna, 5.45 p.m.
The sad news at first produced a paralysing effect, but now the utmost excitement prevails. The telegraph offices are besieged by excited crowds, all business having been brought to a close. The sitting of the Lower House of Reichsrath was closed amidst great excitement, as was also the bourse. All the theatres will remain closed.

There followed a brief résumé on the life of Rudolph, a sympathetic report mirroring similar sentiments as were expressed on the death of his uncle Maximilian of Mexico; to be followed some years later by even more remorse on the demise of his mother, the popular Empress Elisabeth; and even in the throes of a world war, kind words of remembrance for his father the Austrian Emperor, Francis Joseph were to be found.

CE 1 February 1889
Sudden Death of the Austrian Crown Prince
London, Wednesday.
The news received in London this afternoon that the Crown Prince Rudolph of Austria had expired suddenly excited deep and widespread regret in the metropolis. The late heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne had not completed his 31st year, having been born on August 21st, 1858. In 1881 he married Princess Stephanie, second daughter of the King of Belgium, and the only child of that marriage is Princess Elizabeth, now not quite six years of age. Archduke Rudolph was the only son of the present Emperor, Francis Joseph I, the other children of the reigning family being two daughters – the Archduchess Gisela, now in her 33rd year, and the Archduchess Maria Valeria, who is 21. The Archduke Karl Ludwig, brother of the Emperor, now becomes the heir apparent; he is in his 56th year, the Emperor being three years his senior. […] The late Crown prince was well known in London society, and being a friend of the Prince of Wales, visited this country several times, the most recent occasion being at the celebration of the Queen’s Jubilee, when he was one of the escorts of Princes attending her Majesty in the State procession. […] The Evening Standard publishes in its special edition a telegram from its own correspondent in Vienna which says – “The Crown Prince Rudolph met with a fatal accident whilst shooting.”

Thereupon followed reports of rumours as to the actual cause of death, allowing one a precise account on how the terrible story unfolded, not only in Austria but throughout the media conscious world:

CE 1 February 1889
The Death of the Crown Prince of Austria
Extraordinary Rumours.

The Chronicle’s Vienna correspondent, telegraphing on Wednesday night, says – The first news that reached Vienna about noon was that the Crown prince had been accidentally shot dead during a shooting excursion. Later information was to the effect that he had been found dead in bed from apoplexy, and it was not until three o’clock that the official statement in the latter sense was published. This is entirely different from another version which is current, but which the correspondent can only refer to lest it should entail the confiscation of his telegram. According to one version the Crown Prince’s door was found locked, and on its being forced he was found dead from apoplexy, as the official account states; from a bullet through the heart according to an independent account. The rumour most frequently repeated is that death was due to callousy and revenge, and was the act of some person whose name has not transpired. […] Heartrendering scenes are said to have taken place when the sad news was broken to the emperor and Empress. The most painful duty was to convey the tidings to the Crown Princess Stephanie.

St.Petersburg, Thursday.

The death of Crown Prince Rudolph produced a profound sensation here, the deepest regret being expressed on all sides. The principal papers to-day publish long obituary notices. The Novpe Vressyn alludes to the great hopes entertained of the Prince by the Austrian Slavs.

CE 4 February 1889

The Death of the Crown Prince of Austria

Conflicting Press Opinions

The Morning Post Paris correspondent telegraphs on Friday – The news from Vienna confirming the report that the Crown Prince died by violence created the most sinister impression here. The Chronicle Vienna correspondent telegraphs on Friday – Among the many rumours current here this afternoon was one to the effect that the Emperor contemplated abdicating, and almost immediately afterwards it was stated that his Majesty had fallen seriously ill. Neither of these rumours had the smallest foundation from the details that have transpired. Respecting the result of the post mortem examination, it would appear that the physicians found several abnormal growths in the brain of the Crown Prince, such as might lead to mental aberration. Until yesterday evening the Emperor was unaware that the cause of death was other than apoplexy. The Empress, however, was informed by Count Hoyos yesterday afternoon that her son had committed suicide, and her Majesty subsequently communicated the fact to the Emperor. […] The Times Vienna correspondent telegraphing on Friday says – The Archduke Louis, the Emperor’s brother, to-day renounced the right of succession to the Crowns of Austria and Hungary in favour of his eldest son, the Archduke Francis Ferdinand, and his Imperial highness took the oaths of surrender privately before his brother. […] The Archduke Francis is unmarried and has never made any great figure in Austria’s society. He is said to be good-natured, gentle and indolent.

Vienna, Saturday, 10 a.m.

The official Wiener Zeitung to-day publishes a medical statement signed by Professors Hoffmann, Hundrat and Widerhofer that the post mortem examination showed the death of the Crown Prince was instantaneously caused by a shot from a revolver fired by the Prince himself.

CE 7 February 1889

The Late Crown Prince of Austria
The Morning Post Vienna correspondent telegraphs on Tuesday – The most extraordinary and base rumours regarding the end of the prince are in circulation. I may state most positively that there is no truth in the report that a Hungarian lady of great beauty and well known in Vienna society has disappeared.

CE 9 February 1889
The Death of the Crown Prince of Austria

The Chronicle Brussels correspondent telegraphs on Thursday respecting the death of the Crown prince – The crime which deprived the house of Hapsburg of its most promising member was a double one – murder and suicide. The other victim was a baroness, aged 21, and one of the beauties of Vienna society. The acquaintance began some months ago and soon ripened into ardent love, with the result not unusual. This, no doubt, increased the estrangement between the Prince and the Princess, and the Prince scarcely made a secret of his determination to obtain a divorce. The Emperor, however, point blank refused to countenance any such proceeding, upbraiding his son for his mode of life, and threatening to send him as Governor to Bosnia. The last scene, an exceptionally violent one, took place before the suicide. On that day the baroness disappeared, leaving a note for her mother, stating that she was going to drown herself in the Danube. Detectives were employed and discovered that she was staying with the Crown Prince at Mayerling. The mother on the Wednesday of the suicide laid the matter before the Emperor. On returning home the mother found another letter from her daughter, dated Mayerling, stating that she and the Crown Prince had resolved to commit suicide together. The prince had promised her marriage as soon as the Prince obtained the divorce, but this being impossible, they resolved to commit suicide. This they did on Wednesday in the Crown prince's bedroom. When the valet entered he found both bodies lying on the bed. He carried that of the baroness into an adjoining room, so that when Prince Philip of Coburg entered he naturally concluded that it was a case of simple suicide. The body of the unfortunate baroness was buried at Heilefenkrans [sic], near Mayerling, not in Bohemia. […]

As regards political activity in Bohemia, with the succession of Count Taaffe's more sympathetic Conservative ministry,293 the Czech deputies took their seats again at Vienna. They comprised two nationalist groups, the "Old Czechs," led by Palacky's294 son-in-law, von Rieger; and the "Young Czechs," followers of

293 CE 28 June 1880. The Austrian Ministry. Vienna, Saturday. The reconstruction of the Ministry is now completed. The Emperor has written autograph letters to Dr. Stremayr, Minister of Justice, Baron Horst, minister of National Defence, Baron Von Korb Weidenheim, Minister of Commerce, and Baron Kriegrau, Minister of Finance, relieving them of their functions, at their own request. His Majesty has, at the same time, made the following appointment – Dr. Donajewsky, Minister of Finance, Baron Von Keremer, Minister of Commerce, Baron Stroh [?], Minister of Justice and Major-General Count Welserheim, Minister of National Defence

294 Frantisek Palacky (1798–1876), Czech nationalist and historian, is regarded as the father of the modern Czech nation. Palacky played a leading role in the Czech cultural and national revival in the 1820s, 30s, and 40s. During the revolution of 1848, he presided over the first Pan-Slav Congress at Prague. He advocated Czech autonomy within a strong Austrian Empire as the best protection against German and Russian pressure. His paraphrase of Voltaire: "If the Austrian Empire did not exist, it would have to be invented": remains famous. After the suppression of the liberal and nationalist uprisings of 1848 in the Austrian Empire, Palacky became disillusioned and withdrew from political activity until 1861, when he became a deputy to the Austrian parliament. With the introduction (1867) of Austrian centralizing policies, he worked for complete Czech independence.
the more youthful and radical Dr. Karel Kramar. On a cultural level, in 1881 a Czech national theatre was built by popular subscription, and alongside the German university at Prague, a new Czech university was finally established in 1882. In 1883 the Czechs were enabled to secure a majority in the Bohemian diet, and by 1886 local officials were obliged to use the Czech as well as the German language in the transaction of business. Nevertheless, the Czechs desired the restoration of a fully autonomous Bohemia, which they were always denied.

CE 18 December 1889
Editorial
Count Taaffe, Prime Minister of Austria, yesterday declared there was no truth in the rumour that it was intended to have the Emperor crowned King of Bohemia.

The Austrian Emperor
Vienna, Tuesday
Count Taaffe, Prime Minister, to-day replying in the Reichsrath to the interpellation of Herr Von Pleuer, leader of the German Liberals, as to the demand of the Czechs for the Coronation of the Emperor as King of Bohemia, said the Government decided to propose such steps.

He was an advocate of enlightenment and education, rather than revolution, visualizing the Czech nation as a bearer of the democratic ideal. In his History of Bohemia, in German, he visualized Czech history as a constant struggle between Germans and Slavs. This monumental work of scholarship strongly influenced the burgeoning Czech national consciousness. Cf. inter alia, Urban, Die Tschechische Gesellschaft.

295 Meanwhile in Vienna: CE 9 December 1881. Destruction of a Theatre by Fire. Great Loss of life. Vienna, Thursday. The Ring Theatre, where Mdlle. Sarah Bernhardt recently performed, took fire this evening just previous to the commencement of operations. The loss of life was very great. Several bodies have been recovered, while the number of injured is very large. Sixty were saved by ladder, or caught by their clothes. The entire building is gutted.

CE 12 December 1881. Editorial. The Great Fire at Vienna. The Chronicle’s Vienna correspondent says the number of those reported killed in the disaster at the Ring Theatre is constantly increasing. At five yesterday evening it was ascertained that 609 were certainly killed, whilst the number reported to the police as missing is no less than 1,070. […] The Daily News Vienna correspondent says all Vienna is terrified by the extent of the disaster. Yesterday the total amount of the dead was 302, 200 of whom were recognizable. […] Six hundred persons are missing, mostly from the lower and middle classes. I have inquired at the hotels if any English people were missing, and received an answer that all were safe. One American has been recognized among the dead. The Telegraph’s Vienna correspondent says the list of victims, who belong mostly to the lower classes, reveals the distressing fact that a large number of them were quite young people and children. […] In the Lower House of the Reichsrath to-day, a sum of 40,000 florins was voted for the relief of the sufferers by the fire in the King’s theatre. […] The Common Council decided last night that the bodies of the victims of the late fire should be quietly transported to the central cemetery without procession, and there the service will be celebrated to-morrow with great pomp. The municipality has received a telegram from the Lord Mayor expressing the very sincere regret of the citizens of London at the sad calamity. […] At 9 o’clock on Monday morning a requiem Mass will be celebrated in the church of St. Stephen. The funeral will commence at eleven o’clock.

CE 15 December 1881. Vienna, Wednesday. The Emperor has directed a requiem Mass for the victims of the fire at the Ring Theatre to be celebrated to-morrow at Pesth. According to accounts published here of last night’s sitting of the Budget Committee, when the vote for the police was under consideration, complaints were made by some members of bureaucratic slowness, incompetency, and jealousy. […] Count Taaffe declared he was assured at the scene of the conflagration that all were saved.
The result was the electoral defeat of the moderate "Old Czechs" and the adoption by the reinforced "Young Czechs" of the disorderly methods of contemporary Irish Nationalists. The Austrian Reichsrat actually fared worse than the British parliament, for Czech obstructionists were supported by numerous other disgruntled nationalities: Slovenes, Italians, Croats, Ruthenians, and Rumanians. (The Austrian government retaliated in 1893 by placing Prague under martial law and freedom of the press in Czech territories.) Kramar was already advising the Czechs to expect deliverance by Russia, and Professor Masaryk put forward an even more radical nationalism which should include Slovaks and build, by war if necessary, a free and united Czechoslovakia. But the new Czech generation wished first and foremost to substitute Czech bureaucrats for German and did not mind going to Vienna to do so. Taaffe had completed the Czech conversion by making Czech and German the languages of the 'outer service' in Bohemia, and when the Czechs returned to the Reichsrat they received another sweetener when the franchise was lowered to include the 'five-florin men', clerical German peasants, Czech peasants and shopkeepers. Thereafter Czech support for Taaffe had continued in the hope of securing Czech for the 'inner service' as well. Instead of disrupting Austria, the nationalities now competed for jobs in bureaucracy, seeking the favour of central government, Taaffe hoping to achieve a final settlement by keeping all the nationalities in 'a balanced state of mild dissatisfaction.' His system of 'muddling along' gave Austria a decade of stability, as the bureaucracy included men of all nationalities who saw in the Austrian state an outlet for their abilities and ambitions. A new 'Austrian' concept was in fact born – an Austria of state servants, carrying a standard of law and hygiene to the remotest corner, viz. the Bukovina. Moreover, the provinces received more functions of administration. By 1914 Bohemia, still without home rule, had in Prague an administrative machine

296 CE 8 February 1882. The Panslavist Agitation in the Austrian Provinces. Vienna, Tuesday. Today's Fremdenblatt publishes intelligence from Lemberg announcing the following further arrests on a charge of carrying on a Russophile propaganda at Lemberg: - A. Szcerian, editor of two national newspapers at Kilomea; a master of a national school at Czeroviez, Professor Agonvioski; and at Zbnaz, M. Zalask, a lawyer. The Chronicle mentions a rumour that M. Katkoff, the noted Panslavist agitator will be appointed Minister of Instruction. Movement of Russian Troops in Poland. A Cracow telegram reports extensive movements of troops in Podolia, Russian Poland and Bessarabia. A Vienna telegram says the Russian Panslavonic Committee are sending volunteers and money to the Montenegrin insurgents.

297 CE 31 December 1889. Austria. Vienna, Monday. Count Taaffe, Austrian Premier, yesterday issued a formal invitation to the deputed representatives of the German, Bohemian, and Czech parties in the Bohemian Diet to a conference in Vienna. The Emperor has confirmed the distinctions on five members of the Austrian Cabinet.
nearly as large as the imperial machine in Vienna, and larger than the British civil
service in London which conducted the affairs of the entire British Empire.

German had been for centuries the only language of literature and culture;
and it was impossible for the Germans to understand the desire of other nations for
a literature and culture of their own. Many of the Germans were themselves
‘converts’, and these especially resented the refusal of others to follow their
example. One of the German liberals, himself a Czech by birth, expressed this
outlook in 1885: ‘If the Czechs in Bohemia are made into Germans, that is in my
view no deadly sin, for they rise from a lower level to the sunny height of a highly
civilized nation. But to seek to Czechize the Germans in Bohemia is quite another
thing; that would be a disgrace unheard of in the pages of world history.’

German radicals had not experienced the disappointments of the generations
before them, aspiring to re-create the German monopoly in the empire which had
allegedly existed for two hundred years. But should that fail, they were ready to
destroy the empire to preserve the German areas from Slav interference. While the
first ambition was generally shared by the Germans in Vienna, with no experience
of Slav encroachment; the second expressed the views of Germans on the ‘racial
frontiers’, where they had become a minority. However, unbridled nationalism was
the work of a discreditable minority: ‘the schoolteacher who was passed over for a
Czech with a better degree, the signalman who caused an accident and was
reprimanded by his Czech superior, the lawyer who lost his case before a Slovene
judge – these were the standard-bearers of their race.’ While the first generation
of national rivals had fought for appointments at the highest professional and
academic level, their disputes concerned only a few hundred state jobs. The next
generation had enjoyed universal elementary education and fought for the trivial
state jobs found in every village, resulting in the popular national conflicts at the
end of the century. Peasants, now able to read and write, wished to read
newspapers and emancipated, would take their grievances to court.

The new German radicalism was first expressed in the programme drafted
at Linz in 1882 by three young men, all destined to play great, though very
different, parts in the Austrian history of the next thirty years – Georg von
Schönerer, Viktor Adler, and Heinrich Friedjung. All three belonged to the class of
the ‘free intelligence’ and were untainted by the connexion with great industry
which had discredited the older liberals; Adler and Friedjung were Jews, though
both regarded themselves as German nationalists. Adler was a sincere radical,
faithful to the spirit of 1848; and he had national pride without national arrogance

---
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and soon abandoned nationalism for the cause of international Socialism [...]. Schönerer, the only German of the three, aspired to be the Kossuth or Parnell of the German Austrians: empty-headed and vain, he had a gift for evil and destructive phrases and a taste for the howlings of the mob. The anti-Semitism which he invented enabled him to steal the German nationalist movement from more sincere or more generous radicals. Yet anti-Semitism was, for Schönerer, only a first step: the hatred which he directed against the Jews, as being the readiest and most defenseless target, he meant to turn later against the other nationalities of the empire and even against Germans who were not wholehearted in their nationalism.300

CE 10 May 1897
Duel in Vienna
(Reuter’s telegram) Vienna, Saturday
Herr Horica, of the Young Czech Party, having insulted Herr Wolff, a supporter of Herr Schoenerer, in Thursday’s sitting of the Lower House of the Reichsrath, a duel with sabres took place between the two deputies to-day. Both combatants were wounded in the hand.

The Young Czechs rejected the division of Bohemia into Czech and German areas, and the programme of state rights was revived, being no longer a device of aristocratic conservatism but the expression of radical nationalism.

2.4.4. Anarchy in the 1890s

Moderate Czechs and Germans in the Reichsrat were forced to work together by the danger from their own radicals, and thus in 1890 a committee of Czechs and Germans, under Taaffe’s presidency, reached a long awaited agreement. It was proposed that provinces of more than one nationality should be divided administratively according to national distribution, and provincial bodies, such as courts of appeal and administrative centres, should be duplicated. In Bohemia this compromise was rejected by both Czechs and Germans. The Germans insisted on the unity of Bohemia, though this would make them a minority.

CE 6 February 1890
The Germans and the Czechs
Two decrees of the Minister of Justice giving effect to the provisions contained in the recent compromise between the Germans and the Czechs are published to-day. One directs the appointment of a Commission for the partial re-

300 Idem, p.175. One cannot help but be reminded of the phrasemongers of the policy of Ulster separatism.
organisation of certain political and judicial districts in Bohemia, and the other deals with the nominations to Bohemian judgeship.

CE 11 February 1890
The German Bohemian Deputies
Toplitz, Monday

At a meeting of the German Bohemian Deputies yesterday, to consider the result of the recent reconciliation conference, a resolution was unanimously adopted expressing satisfaction with the arrangement arrived at, and declaring the cultivation of the feeling of German nationality to be the duty of all classes of the German population.

The young Czechs also insisted on unity, as a preliminary to the demand that all Bohemia should be Czech.

CE 28 January 1890
Foreign Items
Prague, Saturday

The Young Czechs have refused to attend tomorrow’s meeting of the Bohemian deputies, as they declined to maintain a passive attitude, as requested. A new Czech Chamber of Commerce is to be formed, but the deputies who enter the National Curia will no longer choose to which they will belong.

At the elections of 1891 Rieger was denounced as a traitor, and his followers were ousted by the Young Czechs. Thereupon, Taaffe drew the conclusion that the middle-class nationalists should be swamped by the introduction of universal suffrage. Nineteenth century nationalism was a middle-class movement and, if government had no aristocratic monopoly, the masses were called in to ward off middle-class nationalism and liberalism. Such an imperial appeal to the backward peoples had brought victory to Radetzky in 1848. Also Francis Joseph was persuaded. Alarmed at the growth of Social Democracy and unwilling to resort to the repressive measures which Bismarck had used in Germany, he hoped universal suffrage would make the Austrian workers contented and less inclined to revolt.

CE 31 January 1890
Riot among the Workers in Bohemia
Vienna, Thursday

---

301 CE 11 March 1890. Foreign Items. Prague, Monday. A number of students yesterday made a demonstration at Wolschan Cemetery, but were dispersed by the police.
302 CE 11 October 1893. Coercion in Austria. Vienna, Tuesday. After an excited debate the Reichsrath rejected to-day the motion of the Young Czech Party that the exceptional measures lately taken in Prague should be immediately discussed by the House. Deputy Vaschetz, the Radical member of the Young Czechs, made a violent attack on the Government, whom he censured in severe terms for their absence from the Reichsrath of all members of the Cabinet. – Dalziel.

CE 23 October 1893. Home And Foreign. The Liberal Party in Vienna last night decided upon the rejection of special measures which had been drafted by the [illegible] Government for the maintenace of order in Bohemia. This step cannot fail to harden the [illegible] of the Reichstag [sic]. According to a report appearing in the Lemberg newspapers, the Polish party are determined to force Dr. Steinbach, the Austrian Minister of Finance, to resign, whatever may be his ultimate attitude towards the Franchise Bill.
The newspapers to-day report a most serious riot among the glass workers in Gablenz, Bohemia, the centre of the glass trade. Five hundred men attacked some glass cutting mills at Neudorf and Wiesenthal, and broke up the machinery. The police interfered, and in the conflict two rioters were killed. The glass workers have been on strike some time, and only last week the Tessendorf men marched to Albrechtsdorf and Marienberg and there destroyed a quantity of machinery and goods stocked in the workshops. Since then additional gendarmerie have been on duty in the disturbed neighbourhood. Yesterday’s riot, however, was far more serious than any that has previously occurred.

CE 1 February 1890
Serious Strike Disturbances in Austria
A Vienna telegram says – The glass workers of the Semil district of Bohemia, now on strike, created a serious disturbance yesterday, six hundred of their number having attacked some works a Neudorf and Wiesenthal, and destroyed the machinery. The Gendarmerie were dispatched against the rioters, and serious fighting ensued in which three workmen were killed.303

State employees soon began to agitate for their own demands:

CE 17 April 1890
The Austrian State Employees
Vienna, Tuesday
The Austrian Government has decided to grant a holiday on May 1st to the State employees if they demand it.

Agitation among the Austrian Police
Vienna, Tuesday
An agitation is beginning among the police of Vienna. They are petitioning that their numbers may be increased and their wages raised. They have some time past been doing double duty and get scarcely any sleep, and this without additional pay.304

303 Cf. also CE 27 February 1890. Strike of Bakers in Vienna. Vienna, Wednesday. Three thousand journeymen bakers to-day resolved to go out on strike for an increase of wages and the redress of certain grievances.

CE 6 March 1890. Strikes in Austria. Vienna, Tuesday. The outbreak of a number of strikes throughout Austria and Hungary is expected within the next few weeks. At a meeting of about 500,000 journeymen bakers held in Vienna last night a resolution was passed to strike for an increase of wages. The authorities are preparing to place a few hundred military bakers at the disposal of the masters.

CE 2 April 1890. Strikes on the Continent. A Vienna telegram says – About 15,000 journeymen masons in Vienna struck work on Monday, the masters having finally refused to grant them a minimum of 9s 5d per day for ten hours’ work. At Prague the compositors are agitating for the eight hours’ working day. The glassworkers at Gabbons, in Bohemia, have struck. On Friday 1,500 workmen employed at Marburg by the Southern Railway Company went on strike, […] A squadrons of dragoons had to be sent to occupy the workshops and yards.

304 CE 21 April 1890. The Continental Holiday Agitation. Vienna, Sunday. The Official Wiener Abendpost to-day announces that the directors of the trades which are under the Government administration have been informed that the Government see no occasion to allow work in their workshops to be suspended on May 1st. The workmen will be held responsible for any arbitrary suspension of work.
Two years after the fall of Bismarck, the Habsburg predominance in the Balkans was uncontested, and England and Austria-Hungary stood close together, without England actually entering the rumoured ‘Quadruple Alliance’. However, this position was shaken by the return of Gladstone to office in 1892, as the Liberal ministry rejected the Mediterranean Agreements and regarded Austria-Hungary with suspicion, Gladstone adhering to his judgement made in 1880: ‘There is not a spot upon the whole map, where you can lay a finger and say, there Austria did good.’ The ‘Austrian idea’ in its last version was Roman Catholic in design. The Christian Socialist party, organized by Karl Lueger, was the first attempt of the Church to go with the masses. They appealed to the traditional clericalism of the peasant, in fact, the Christian Socialist party was the Austrian version of the Radical party in France (or even of Lloyd George radicalism in England), except that it worked with the Church instead of against it, diverting the rising political passions into channels not dangerous to the Church, thus generally anti-liberal, anti-Jewish, anti-Marxist, and anti-capitalist.

CE 14 March 1890
The Commission for the Reform of School Laws in Austria
A Vienna telegram says – The special commission appointed to consider a reform of the school laws in Austria has reported in favour of a demand for Catholic schools, all the teachers to belong to the Catholic faith, and the schools to be under the supervision of the Church. The telegram adds that the first serious consequence of the adoption of such a proposal would be a Ministerial crisis.

CE 15 March 1890
The National Schools in Austria
A Vienna telegram says – All the papers throughout the Empire are filled with commentary on the Archbishops declaration concerning the National schools. The opinion prevails that a rupture between the Liberal and Church parties is now inevitable.

CE 2 April 1890
Austria and the Pope
A Vienna telegram says – The Viennese correspondent of the Tribune states that he had an interview with a statesman who informed him that negotiations were...
in progress between the Vienna Cabinet and the Vatican, with a view to restoring some temporal power to the Pope. The arrangement proposed is that the Italian Tyrol should become a Papal State under the protection of the Catholic Powers and that the Pope should take up his residence at Trent. The author of this proposal is Dr. Eugenio Valussi, Bishop of Trent.

In the nineties another universalist movement also established itself in Austria and brought more support to the universalist Empire and dynasty. In 1889 Victor Adler united Marxists in the Austrian Social Democratic party, the same year of the founding of the Second International. Since the Empire brought prosperity to the capitalists of Vienna, it brought prosperity to the workers of Vienna also. Karl Renner, leading Socialist writer on national questions, rejected Hungarian demands for full independence, as ‘the Hungarian market is comparably more important for Austrian capital than the Moroccan market is for Germany.’

CE 31 October 1893
Political Crisis in Vienna.

Vienna, Monday. As a result of the political crisis held yesterday under the presidency of the Emperor, the Ministers have tendered their resignations, which have been accepted by his Majesty. The adjournment of Reichsrath was only sanctioned by the Emperor with the object of allowing time for the formation of a new Cabinet, with which Prince Alfred Von Windisch Gratz’s Conservative, will probably be charged. – Reuter.

At noon the Emperor had an interview with Baron Chlumecky, President of the Lower House and leaders of the three great Parliamentary parties, each of these personages being received in separate audiences. The Emperor will leave for Budapest to-morrow, and will return with the Empress on November 8th. A meeting attended by some fifteen hundred Independent Socialists was held yesterday at Simmering, at which the various speakers described the followers of Dr. Adler as “Government Democrats” and the projected Electoral Reform Bill as worthless. Upon one of the speakers advocating the suppression of the present system of Government the police dispersed the meeting.

The Austrian Social Democrats supported Viennese economic Imperialism in Hungary and in the Balkans in the same way German Socialists supported German Imperialism. Marx had supposed working-class leaders would remain working-class in outlook when in fact a Socialist politician or trade union official was middle class in origin. They could not escape the nationalist obsessions of their class, and as a result the Austrian Socialists divided trade unions and their party into national sections, united only in name.

---
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CE 4 October 1893
The Vienna Anarchists

Vienna, Tuesday. Although the police have in custody most of the Anarchical group, they are still searching for three persons who, since the recent raid on the Anarchist headquarters, have disappeared. These are Johann Nestoupil, editor of a Czech Socialist paper; Joseph Thuma, editor of the German Socialist paper Die Zukunft, and a man who came from London and is believed to have brought to Vienna the verbal orders of the London or American Anarchical leaders. He is believed to be the prime mover of the whole Anarchist group in this country. – Reuter.

CE 9 October 1893
Manhood Suffrage in Austria

Vienna, Saturday. On the occasion of the opening of the Reichsrath on Tuesday next the Socialists had planned a grand demonstration in favour of manhood suffrage to be held in front of the Reichsrath building. The police, however, issued a notice prohibiting any gathering in that quarter, and the Socialists are arranging sixteen large meetings in other parts of Vienna to carry out their original intention. – Dalziel.

At the end of the year, the political climate was critical and a change in government had to be brought about to avoid a further crisis.

CE 1 November 1893
The Austrian Political Crisis.

Vienna, Tuesday. Three workmen’s meetings, and one meeting for working women, were held here yesterday, at all of which an identical resolution was unanimously adopted on the subject of electoral reform. This resolution, after condemning the coalition of the liberals with the pseudo-clerical party for the purpose of opposing the people in their demand for simple rights, declared that the purpose of both parties were mere evasive attempts which aimed at the maintenance of electoral injustice; that the working community did not fear the alliance of the three parties of reaction against the people, which would not stop the movement for direct, equal and universal suffrage carried on by revolutionary Social democracy, and that the working class would, regardless of the consequence and undismayed push forward to the achievements of their rights. Dr.Adler, addressing one of the meetings, hailed the coalition as marking the end of the racial contests in Austria and the beginning of class struggle, man against man. We will only appeal to the last resource, exclaimed Dr.Adler, if we are compelled to do so. – Reuter.

Count Taaffe had audience of the Emperor this morning. The Minister was closeted with his Majesty for fully an hour. While it is admitted on all sides that no decision has been taken by the Emperor in regard to the settlement of the Ministerial crisis, most of this morning’s papers regard the withdrawal of the whole of Count Taaffe’s Cabinet and the formation of a coalition Cabinet, composed of members of Count Hohenwart’s Party, the Polish Party, and the United German Left, as the most probable outcome of the present difficulty. In expressing this opinion the journals are guided by the facts that the leaders of the three great Parliamentary parties at their audience of the Emperor yesterday expressed themselves strongly in favour of such a combination. Although it is stated in
several quarters that no names were mentioned at the interview in connection with the new Ministry, some papers continue in conjecture as to the composition of the new Cabinet, but owing to the present uncertain state of things no value can be attached to them. The leaders of the three parties are still conferring with each other, and their Press organizations are on the whole favourable to the idea of a coalition Ministry, at the same time, however, expressing doubt and anxiety as to the cohesion and durability of such a Cabinet. Count Kalnoky was received in audience by the Emperor yesterday evening. - Reuter.

CE 2 November 1893
The Austrian Political Situation.
Vienna, Wednesday. The Press of the three great parliamentary parties adhere to the hope that the formation of the coalition Ministry may be accomplished. On the other hand persistent rumours are current that prince Alfred Von Windischgretz does not wish to join the projected Ministerial combination.
Budapest, Wednesday. The Emperor Francis Joseph arrived from Vienna at twenty minutes to six this morning. – Reuter.
Vienna, Wednesday. It is said that Prince Windischgretz has on purely personal grounds, declined to form the Ministry. The Emperor last night received Herr Von Chlumetzky, who is now looked upon as the most likely to succeed Count Taaffe. Neither Count Thun, Governor of Bohemia, nor Count Badeni, Governor of Galicia, have the least likelihood of being called upon to form the ministry. – Dalziel.309

Wishing like his predecessors to finally settle the Bohemian language question, Count Badeni, Austrian Premier, created the ordinance of 5 April 1897, decreeing that Czech and German should be the languages of the ‘inner service’ throughout Bohemia.310 The Badeni ordinance exploded German resentment against the dwindling of their monopoly, and in particular the Germans of Bohemia appealed to the Germans throughout Austria, and in Germany as well.

CE 6 April 1897
The Austrian Crisis
(Reuter’s telegram)
Vienna, Monday

---

309 CE 6 November 1893. The Austrian Cabinet. Vienna, Saturday. All papers to-day agree that prince Alfred of Windischgretz has accepted the mission of forming a coalition Cabinet. The organs of the German Left hail the proposed new Ministry with satisfaction. It is understood that Count Taaffe himself recommended the Prince as his successor. – Reuter.

310 CE 3 April 1897. A Parliament with Three Languages. A Parliament at which the discussions are carried on in three different languages is probably unique. The country where this singular fact occurs is well known to English tourists, viz. Switzerland. But few, I believe, have ever had an occasion to be present at the sitting of a Swiss Parliament. The language spoken by the members are French, Italian, and German. Italian, true, is not as often employed as the other two, the members for Tessin (a canton in the South) very often delivering their speeches in French. As almost every educated Swiss speaks French and German, members are therefore able to understand each other’s speeches, although spoken in a different language to their own. It also often happens that when a French-speaking member wishes to make a stronger impression on the German-speaking part of the house, he delivers his speech in German, and also vice versa.
The Emperor having declined to accept the resignation of the Badeni Cabinet, the ministry will retain office. No change will be made in its composition.

CE 7 April 1897
The Austrian Crisis
(Reuter’s telegram)
Vienna, Tuesday

The Official “Wiener Zeitung” to-day published an autograph letter from the Emperor to Count Badeni, in which his majesty says – “I do not accept the resignation of the Cabinet, as I consider it important that the Government chosen by men should be undeterred by momentary party difficulties; let its activity be exclusively guided by the general interest of the State, the while assuring you and the members of the Cabinet on the continuance of my fullest confidence. I expect the ministry will in future, as in the past, carry on the public business with patriotic devotion and firmness, and will unswervingly adhere to those principles which were laid down in the programme submitted on its assuming office and in the speech from the Throne of March 29th.

Thus the ‘people of state’ behaved as though they were representatives of an oppressed minority; and received support from moderate Germans and German Social Democrats. They modelled their tactics on Irish obstruction at Westminster, though the Irish wished to finish the connexion with England, the Germans wished to preserve the Empire. It was as though English members of parliament had resorted to obstruction as a demonstration against the Irish.

The Germans of the Reichsrat had not even the wit and ingenuity which dignified their Irish example: violent hooligans, they were worthy representatives of the ‘people of state’. The nationalist members shouted and stamped for hours on end; banged desks and hurled inkpots at the Speaker, until at last the police were called in and put an end to this parody of representative government.

311 CE 5 November 1897. Disorderly Scenes in the Austrian Parliament. (Reuter’s telegram). Vienna, Thursday. The Lower House of the Reichsrath reassembled to-day after its adjournment at the close of the 27 hours sitting last week. Replying to a question of Herr Dasoyntskis on the subject of the insertion of the minutes of the House of interpolations in foreign languages, Herr von Abrahamovic, Vice-president, declared the standing orders contained no provision regarding this matter. The decision would rest with the future President of the House, whose action he did not wish to anticipate. The Vice-President then replied to several members, who asked to be informed of the reasons which prompted the Chair in refusing last week to allow several deputies to address the House on questions of order. Herr Abrahamovic, in justifying this refusal, referred to the stormy scenes of the last sitting and to the provisions of the standing orders, which he said the Presidential bureau would continue to interpret in a proper manner, and without allowing itself to be intimidated by circumstances or threats, being convinced that in this way it would best serve the interests of the community and of the State, and above all protect the Constitution. The Vice-President’s statement was received with warm applause and capping [sic] of hands by the Right, and with uproar by the Left. On a proposal of Herren Schoenerer and Herbst the House subsequently proceeded to take a series of votes by roll call at 3 p.m. After five votes by roll call had been taken Vice-President Kramary interrupted the public discussion and convened a secret sitting for the purpose of rectifying the minutes of last secret meeting. The House is now deliberating with closed doors.

[At] 7.25 the House again met in public session, the order of the day being the continuation of the debate on the first reading of the bill for provisional extension of compromise. The members of the Left at once created great uproar, demanding that the secret session should be continued. Vice-
Schönerer and his friends appealed from the Reichsrat to the streets. In Vienna, Graz and Salzburg, crowds of rich respectable citizens demonstrated with all the violence of the hungry mobs of 1848. Meetings were held throughout Germany, and messages of sympathy accumulated. Mommsen, famous historian and high-minded liberal, wrote: ‘The brain of the Czechs does not understand reason, but it understands blows. This is a struggle of life and death.’

These reactions could also be followed in detail in the press:

CE 29 October 1897
Austria
Vienna, Thursday
The arrangement arrived at by the lower house of the Reichsrath yesterday, that while the motions should be discussed in the morning sittings, sittings should be devoted to the bill for the provisional extension of the Austro-Hungarian compromise, which forms the subject of an article in the “Fremdenblatt” this morning, the semi-official journal says the German national parties have now entered upon ground where heavy responsibility awaits them. The efforts of the majority are at present directed to the fulfilment of an imperative duty towards the Monarchy. German nationalist obstruction can be fought out on other battlefields, and is not likely to prevent the majority from fulfilling its incontestable duties. - Reuter.

CE 30 October 1897
The Ministerial Crisis in Austria
Vienna, Friday, 2.30 a.m.
The lower house of the Reichsrath has been in a continuous session since seven o’clock yesterday evening. Herr Lecher of the German progressionist party, who commenced to address the house on the Compromise Bill at nine o’clock, is still speaking. – Reuter.

Vienna, Friday, 7.20 a.m.

President Abrahamovics declared that however much the Chair might wish to meet the members’ wishes it could not allow the order of the day to be used for the purpose of preventing the House from making progress of any kind. He, therefore, asked the House to decide at once that the sitting should be devoted exclusively to the discussion of the Provisional Compromise bill. The voting proceeded amid stormy protests and other noisy interruptions from the Left, but Dr. von Abrahamovics’ proposal was adopted by a large majority. The tumult still continued, however, as the Vice-President invited Herr Lueger to address the House on the Compromise Bill at nine o’clock, is still speaking. – Reuter.

CE 9 November 1897.Scenes in the Austria Parliament.Vienna, Monday.In the Lower House of the Reichsrath to-day, Herr von Abrahamovics, the vice-President, referred to the turbulent scenes which marked the last sitting, and strongly animadverted upon the expressions used on that occasion by some of the members.
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At 6.30 this morning, Herr Lecher, German Progressionist member, was still addressing the House, having spoken for nine hours. Shortly before that the Social Democratic deputies called upon the President to suspend the sitting, pointing out that the shorthand reporters were nearly overcome by fatigue. This demand, which was rigorously supported by members of the Left, led to great uproar and the repetition of the stormy scenes of last night.

Vienna, Friday, 10. a.m.

At 9 o’clock Herr Lecher concluded his speech, which had occupied twelve hours in delivery, and on resuming his seat he was warmly complimented by the members of the Left. During the latter part of his speech there was a repetition of turbulent scenes, which continued for some time, as the President declined to accede to the demand of the Left for the suspension of the sitting. Two votes by roll call were subsequently taken upon a motion for adjournment brought forward by the department. This was rejected on both occasions, and at the present moment the House is still sitting. – Reuter.

Like another example from Irish history, in the latter part of the nineteenth century also Slovaks and Little Russians left for America, with the national culture they were not allowed to develop in Europe. They remained devoted to their traditions and conducted the national struggle with American money and methods, adding the new ideal of national self-determination — and paving the way for the American intervention in 1917.

CE 29 April 1897
Russia and Austria
(Reuter’s telegram)
Budapest, Wednesday

The toasts proposed by the Czar and the Emperor Francis Joseph at the banquet given at St Petersburg yesterday, have produced an excellent impression here. Hungarian politicians regard the imperial speeches as a significant indication of the enduring character of the friendly and peaceful understanding existing between Austro-Hungary and Russia.

Those who chose to stay in Europe saw language become a central element in nationalist movements, receiving the support of intellectuals, representatives of literature and culture, who were not even necessarily descendents of the ethnicity revived. Ireland had secured a liberal Protestant elite to spearhead its modest Gaelic revival, but the battle for patois in Austrian provinces possessed far greater

313 CE 20 April 1897. The Balkan Slavonic States. Rumoured Alliance. (Reuter’s telegram). St. Petersburg, Sunday. For some little time a section of the Russian Press has been heralding with a certain amount of confidence and satisfaction the approaching formation under the Russian auspices of a league of the Balkan Slavonic States — viz. Bulgaria, Servia, and Montenegro for the purpose of guaranteeing the security of those States not only against Turkey and Austria-Hungary, in the event of the Macedonian question being raised, but also against the aspirations of the Panhellenism, which might be manifested to the detriment of the Slavonic element in the Balkan Peninsula, in the field of politics, as well as in that religion, and which would become even more intense if the Macedonian question were suddenly brought into the political arena.
dimensions, being a clamorous struggle between living languages. Modern technology had succeeded in transmitting communiqués, but the choice of language of communication itself had become a struggle submerged in a mire of imagined histories and immediate ambition. It is difficult to interpret the emotions invested in these disputes from the vantage point of the 21st century, but the interest of the contemporary Irish press in events unfolding in the Austrian parliament is clearly expressed in regular and lengthy features. Obviously, the conflict touched upon campaigns being transacted at home and offered insight into the bargaining methods of Central Europe, reminiscent of one’s own elaborate techniques.

CE 13 November 1897
The Austrian Parliament. The Language Difficulty.
Vienna, Friday
In the Lower House to-day the Premier declared that the Government would readily co-operate in a settlement of the languages question by constitutional votes, and if a measure introduced with that object encountered opposition rendering its success doubtful, they would use every effort to attain a peaceable solution of conflict between the two Nationalities in Bohemia by means of a compromise. The House might regard this as proof that the Government had no intention of effacing themselves, and would not permit any events to shake them in conviction of the importance of German nationality. Herr von Zallinger, speaking for the Catholic National party in the absence of Baron Diplauli, through illness, declared that the party had never done anything from which it might be concluded that it approved of language ordinances or would refuse its support to an understanding such as Count Badeni had indicated in his speech. He, therefore, moved the following resolution. The House, considering the solution of the languages question, desirable not only by means of ordinances, but rather by legislative action, passes over the motions for impeachment of ministers, and proceeds with orders of the day. Continuing, Herr von Zalinger dwelt upon the Radical tendency of the policy pursued by the obstructionists, and declared that his party did not desire revolution, but rather advocated everything opposed to revolution. He hoped that an orderly state of things, and an understanding between different peoples would soon be brought about, so that the Emperor, who was hailed by all as a prince of peace might be surrounded in his Jubilee Year by his reconciled subjects. Dr. Kronaweter then spoke. – Reuter

CE 25 November 1897
The Austrian Parliament.
Another Uproarious Meeting. Probable Arrest of Deputies.
Vienna, Wednesday
In the Lower House of the Austrian Reichsrath to-day, Dr. Gross, of the German Progressist party, demanded that it should be entered on the minutes that

314 CE 15 November 1897.Editorial.In the Austrian Parliament the Premier declared that the Government would readily co-operate in a settlement of the languages question by constitutional votes, and if a measure introduced with that object encountered opposition rendering its success doubtful, they would use every effort to attain a peaceable solution of conflict between the two Nationalities in Bohemia by means of a compromise.
the President by interrupting the last sitting and by placing the Provisional Compromise Bill first on the list in to-day’s sitting had committed a breach both of the rules of procedure and of the Constitution. Dr. Gross also asked for a vote by roll call on the matter. […] After this a great uproar was caused by the motion by Herr Dyks that only one of a large number of similar petitions against the language ordinances should be read and printed as an annex to the shorthand reports of the proceedings of the House, and that a vote should be taken on the petitions without debate. The members of the Left raised tumultuous protests, stigmatising the motion as oppressive and illegal. The President suspended the sitting and left the House. Indescribable scenes of disorder followed. Herr Wolff, German Nationalist, seized the President’s bell and swung it to and fro. It was wrenched from him almost immediately by Herr Potoczek. In the meantime, challenges, insults and epithets of all kinds were being exchanged between the members of the different parties, and the din became terrible.

A number of young Czechs and Poles suddenly made a dash for the President’s tribune, and surrounding Herr Wolff tried to force him down from it. They in turn were opposed by a large number of members from the Left. Finally some of the young Czechs struck Herr Wolff, and a hand-to-hand scuffle ensued around the tribune, which lasted more than a quarter of an hour. Herr Schoenerer, Leader of the German Nationalists, seized one of the Ministers’ chairs, brandished it over his head, and was apparently just about to hurl it at his opponents, when he was seized by Herr Hogenhofer, who succeeded in getting the chair from him. Tumult and uproar became even worse, and there were cries of “Shame” from the public galleries.

CE 29 November 1897
Vienna, Saturday

The disorderly scenes were continued in the Lower House of the Reichsrath this morning. When Herr von Abrahamovics, the President, made his appearance he was received with cries of “Shame on you,” uttered by the Left, and a deafening noise of shrill whistles and hammering of desks. Many deputies of the Left stationed themselves in front of the Presidential platform, some shouting excitedly and others blowing toy trumpets and whistles. The President took the chair and rang his bell, but the noise continued. The scene lasted a quarter of an hour, when the President rose and declared the sitting suspended. As he was leaving some deputies threw scraps of paper at the Presidential tribune. This induced him to return when he stood unmoved amid shouts of “bravo” and clapping of hands by the Right. Later the President left the platform, while the excitement in the House continued. During the interval Herr Wolff, member of the Schoenerer Party, who in accordance with the new standing orders had been suspended for three sittings, entered the House, but was subsequently ejected by the police, whom he strenuously resisted, striking them with his walking stick. […] Herr Wolff, on his removal from the Reichsrath was taken to the police station, and he will be charged with public violence.

The scenes of tumult were not restricted to the Parliament, and in no time at all supporters of various factions had transported the strife onto the streets:
CE 29 November 1897
Excitement in the Streets.
Vienna, Saturday, 11.30 p.m.

In the course of the afternoon and during the evening large crowds repeatedly assembled in Kingstrasse, between the Parliament Buildings and the University. They were, however, dispersed by the police without serious difficulty, except in front of the Parliament Buildings itself. Here the crowd, numbering two thousand, assembled, consisting chiefly of students and other young men. They replied to the repeated summons of the police to disperse with jeers and groans, and some stones were thrown. The police finally cleared the square with drawn swords. It is not yet known whether any persons were injured. – Reuter.

The riots spread to Bohemia, centering in the capital where the warring parties occupied their strongholds and commanded their followers.

CE 29 November 1897
Disorder in Prague.
Prague, Saturday

In anticipation of the arrival here to-day of several members of the Opposition in the Reichsrath from Vienna a large crowd consisting chiefly of students and workmen assembled at the railway station. The police, fearing disturbances, dispersed the people, who then proceeded to Wenzel Square, where disorderly scenes occurred. Stones were thrown at the police, who finally drew their swords and dispersed the crowd, arresting two persons – Reuter.

Asch (Bohemia), Sunday

Yesterday evening about two thousand persons of the German Nationalist and Social Democratic parties marched through the streets of this town shouting and singing. Some windows of the local Government Building and of several houses inhabited by Czech officials were smashed. - Reuter.

CE 1 December 1897
Czech Rioting at Prague
Prague, Tuesday

In the disturbances here yesterday two revolver shots were fired among the crowd, but no one was hit. The windows of the Provincial Museum were broken. A body of rioters who had assembled in front of the Casino were charged by troops with fixed bayonets, and dispersed, and some persons were slightly wounded. Seven arrests have been made, including an anarchist named Asgerry. The troops returned to barracks at half-past nine yesterday evening. The Czech students also took part in yesterday’s disturbances. They combined with the low class population, and attacked all the German students. They met in the streets […] severely maltreating them. One German student was stabbed with a knife, and seriously wounded. – Reuter.315

---

315 CE 3 December 1897. Austria. The Czechs’ Riots. (Reuter’s telegram). Prague, Wednesday
Since six o’clock this evening the streets have been held by 12 battalions of infantry and a squadron of Hussars. All traffic is suspended. All the shops and business houses are closed. In spite of the strong military display, however, a large Czech mob in the course of the evening made a descent upon the German quarter and plundered houses and shops in several streets. The furniture of a German coffee house was piled up in the street, and set on fire, and on a detachment of troops approaching the rioters greeted them with showers of stones, broken glass and other missiles. One
In the face of such formidable opposition from all sides, the Cabinet was forced to resign. The new challenge would be to find appropriate ministers to take their place and placate the population.

CE 30 November 1897
The Political Crisis in Austria. Forming a new Cabinet.
Vienna, Monday
The demonstration which followed the announcement of the resignation of Count Badeni’s Ministry, were of an unimportant character, and were confined to the Judenplatz, where a number of people assembled in front of the Ministry of the Interior. The evening passed off quietly. The Socialist demonstrations against Count Badeni and the parliamentary majority are reported from Brünn, Klagenfurth, and Gratz, where there were illuminations in celebration of the resignation of the Ministry. Baron von Gautsch has already commenced negotiations for forming a new Cabinet, and he is stated to intend within the next few days, entering into communication with the leaders of the German and Czech parties, with a view to a modification of the language ordinances.

of the officers in charge acted with great promptitude. Drawing his revolver he fired at one of the ringleaders, the bullet piercing his arm.
CE 3 December 1897. Vienna, Thursday. The Prague correspondent of the “Neue Freie Presse” states that in the conflicts between the troops and the Czech population yesterday three persons were killed and thirty-eight seriously wounded. The same journal describing the disturbances in that city yesterday says the Czech populace plundered many German, and especially Jewish, business establishments, with cries of “Down with Germans and Jews.” At eight o’clock in the evening all places of public resort were closed by the military. In the attack upon the German National Schools at Ziscow, the police detachment which followed the mob was received with revolver shots, and thereupon fired into the crowd, severely wounding one of the rioters. At eleven o’clock, in Jungman-lane, Prague, two shops were broken into and sacked, but the plunderers were ultimately driven off by a military patrol. At Weinberg a booth was smeared with petroleum and set on fire. At Liben, near Prague, twenty-one armed rioters were arrested. Another body of the mob pillaged a liquor shop and more than twenty of them were afterwards found helpless from drink. During the disturbances the American Consulate hoisted its flag. The riots are said to have been organised by a secret society, formed with the object of combating the German and Jewish element. – Reuter.
CE 6 December 1897. Prague, Saturday. Shortly before midnight yesterday a rocket filled with gunpowder was exploded outside the premises of a Jewish shopkeeper at Lann. No damage was done. Three persons were arrested in connection with the affair, and one of them confessed his guilt. A search was made to-day at certain houses in the Brent Gasse, from the houses of which shots were fired during the recent disturbances, which resulted in the seizure of the two revolvers, and three persons were taken to the police station on suspicion. Last night sixty-seven persons were brought up on various charges.
CE 8 December 1897. Rioting in Austria. Prague, Tuesday. A despatch received here from Pribram reports an anti-Jewish outbreak at that place. The windows of the Synagogue and houses inhabited by Jews broken by rioters. – Reuter.

CE 1 December 1897. Resignation of the Austrian Ministry. Vienna, Sunday, 6 p.m.. All the members of the Austrian Ministry tendered their resignations to-day. The Emperor has accepted them, and entrusted Baron Gautsch, Minister of Public Instruction, with the formation of a new Cabinet.

CE 1 December 1897. The New Cabinet. Vienna, Tuesday. According to the “Neue Freie Presse” the members of the Right have united to oppose the new Government, and declare that their position is not altered by the change of Cabinet. While willing to vote for the Provisional Compromise Prolongation Bill, the Party declines to entertain any proposal for the repeal of the language ordinances. They also consider that there is no reason for Herr von Abrahamovics to resign his Presidency of the Lower House, seeing that the change of Ministry does not affect the position of President. The groups of the Left have declared their solidarity in opposition to the union formed by the Right. They demand the repeal of the language ordinances, with the withdrawal of the amended
The Cork Examiner in its editorial offers a comparison between the events in Prague and the scenes of wanton destruction in Paris in the days of the French Revolution. They are, however, clearly linked to the violent nature of sittings in the Austrian Senate:

CE 2 December 1897

Editorial

History is being so rapidly made in the Austrian empire that one is reminded of some of the street scenes which preceded the French Revolution. Of course, a similar sequence of events, or a result of the same world-wide importance, could not be anticipated, but the picture presented by Prague at the present moment is not unlike that which was shadowed in the streets of the French capital. In this respect, however, the capital of Bohemia has only followed the example of the capital of the Austrian Empire. The disorder in the streets of Prague is the natural complement to the rowdiness in the Senate, with this difference that, while in the Senate the German element seemed masters, in the scramble this element is faring badly at the hands of the Czechs in Prague. From the state of politics in Vienna no cessation of hostilities between Czechs and Germans can be hoped for, at least it is impossible to imagine harmony amongst all classes under prevailing conditions. Only the most revolutionary measures, pacific or war-like, could bring about this situation. The change in Government has apparently exercised no effect on the turbulence of Right or Left. The new Cabinet has not weakened the determination of the Right to have no repeal of the Language Ordinances, so obnoxious to the Left, who, on the other hand, are solidly massed in opposition to the Right, and demand the repeal of these ordinances, as well as the withdrawal of the Standing Orders. This conditions of affairs in the Reichsrath is not less anarchic than that which has now centred the attention of the world on the Bohemian capital. The Congress of Vienna re-arranged the map of Europe disturbed by the French Revolution and Napoleon, somewhat on the old lines. It has yet to be seen whether from the same city measure can come re-arranging the map of its own empire. Prague is now in the hands of a Czech mob and a military force, but lawlessness appears to have prevailed over authority. To the crowd all that is German is a signal for attack. German houses and shops have been looted, and even German names of streets have been [illegible] to incite acts of violence. The attempt to storm the cartridge factory in Zizko is perhaps, more significant of the mob than any other incident yet reported, and heightens the suggestiveness to which we have alluded. It is apparent then that these disturbances are not merely local, but are provoked by causes which must operate in other parts of the empire and that though Czech or German students may be shot with a view to restoring Prague to its normal state, a policy more radical will be necessary to effect the peace of the Austrian Empire.

Standing Orders which have been opposed as invalid, and the resignation of Herr von Abrahomovicz. – Reuter.

318 CE 2 December 1897. The Austrian Delegation to-day had under consideration the estimates of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Mr. Dumba, the reporter expressed full confidence in Count Goluchowski’s conduct of foreign affairs. Herr Gross, a German Progressist, said that he welcomed the rapprochment between Austria-Hungary and Russia, but advised limitations to such rapprochment on account of the Franco-Russian alliance. Incidentally referring to the present racial crisis in Austria he remarked that the Germans would continue their struggle as long as the system of internal policy hitherto prevailing should continue to be enforced. Commenting on the
It appeared that no compromise would be forthcoming, each faction insisting on their demands being met, which of course stood diametrically opposed to the wants of the competition:

CE 2 December 1897
Troubles in the Austrian Empire
Vienna, Tuesday
The “Neue Freie Presse” today states that Baron Gautsch’s negotiations with the different party leaders, which were continued to-day, have resulted in a basis being found for an eventual agreement concerning the presidential question in the Reichsrath, the abrogation of the new standing orders introduced by Count Falkenhayn, and the settlement of the language question. The solution of these matters now rests with the German Progressist party, which will come to a decision early this morning. As, however, the young Czech party insists upon a dual language qualification for officials in Bohemia the Left entertains little hope of the success of the negotiations, and is preparing a manifesto to be addressed to the German people in the event of their failure.

CE 14 December 1897
The Position in Austria. The Language Ordinances. (Reuter’s telegram)
Vienna, Monday
The Free German Union has now issued a manifesto. It sets forth the necessity of unity and the maintenance of the International position of Austria, but insists on adherence to German Nationality, and expresses the deepest regret at the issue of the languages ordinances, the injury done to party Government by the conduct of the majority in the Lower House, and an amendment of the rules of the procedure introduced by Count Falkenhayn are condemned, and the manifesto goes on to deplore the failure of the efforts of von Gautsch, the new Premier, to establish an understanding. The hope is expressed that an agreement will ultimately be arranged, particularly the view of the necessity of a definitive settlement of the legal position of Austria towards Hungary, and in conclusion, the manifesto declares that united action is imperatively requisite on the part of all Germans on National questions.

One of the main points of contention in the national question centred around the language of instruction in schools:

disturbances at Prague, the young Czech deputy, Dr. Heremld, remarked that the troubles were only to be expected after the houses of the Czechs at Saaz had been stormed. Mr. Dzieduszyki appealed to the Germans to grant a true [sic] of God in order that the bill for the provisional extension of the compromise with Hungary might be constitutionally carried through. After an appeal made by Count Starhemberg for peace between the parties for the sake of the provisional compromise, Herr Dabernig, of the German Popular Party, said that the Germans were not merely fighting for their existence but for Austria’s peace as a great Power, of which the German people formed the indestructible foundation. The Germans were, added Herr Dobernig, ready for peace. Herr Kramarcz, of the Young Czech Party, said that his party did not want Austria to be made Slavonic, but Austria could not be a German state because that would be in antagonism with the principles on which it was founded. Peace which the Young Czechs were always ready was only possible on the basis of equal enjoyment of right. Then after M.Dumba, the reporter, had spoken a few concluding words the Budget of Foreign Affairs, together with a vote of confidence in Count Golouchowski was unanimously passed. - Reuter.
CE 30 December 1897
The Language Question in Austria
Vienna, Wednesday
The Lower Austrian Provincial Diet passed a motion of urgency, proposed by Herr Koliska, yesterday demanding the legal establishment of the German language as the medium of instruction in elementary and middle-class schools in Lower Austria.

CE 31 December 1897
The Prague School
Eger, Tuesday
The Academical Conference held here has passed a resolution declaring that the demand for the transfer of the Prague High Schools to territory where German is the predominant language is abandoned for the present only on the condition of sufficient guarantees being given for the protection of teachers, pupils, and property of these schools. – Reuter.

Perhaps in a bid to recall the hitherto popular image of the peaceable, multiethnic conglomerate, the Cork Examiner presents in a weekend supplement the romantic aspect of the Austrian Monarchy, the story of the engagement of the Emperor to the beautiful young Elisabeth. It must indeed have seemed unfitting to associate the conceit of this couple with the image of street riots and rampage, given the mass appeal of their status and splendour.

CE 14 December 1897
Supplement to the Cork Examiner
Love Won the Day
The Emperor of Austria’s marriage to the Princess Elizabeth of Bavaria was brought about in exceedingly romantic circumstances. His mother intended that he should wed Princess Helena, the eldest daughter of the Bavarian Duke Maximilian, and, indeed, negotiated the match. The young Emperor acquiesced with passive indifference, and set out for Duke Maximilian’s castle to complete the formal betrothal. On his way through the park, before he reached the door of the castle, however, he was strolling about amid the shrubbery, a little girl in a short dress, whose extraordinary beauty fixed his attention and won his heart. Within the hour he ascertained that she was Princess Elizabeth, a younger sister of his intended bride. He cancelled the engagement his mother had made for him, and vowed that he would marry no one but the exquisite creature he had seen in the park. To this Duke Maximilian soon gave his consent, nor did the Princess Helena greatly object, for she disliked the young man. But in his own family, and among the Austrian nobility, the Emperor was vehemently opposed. Princess Elizabeth was not even the eldest daughter, but a younger daughter of a penniless duke, and was not by birth a “Royal Highness.” To all the Emperor was deaf. He was in love with the beautiful girl, and intended to marry her. What was the use of being Emperor if he could not? So, in April, 1854, he was married. His mother and kinsfolk would scarcely recognise his wife, and the Viennese aristocracy held aloof from her. As a result, the fair young Empress mustered up all her pride and returned scorn for
scorn. And at the present day, it is said, she regards all her former enemies with icy condescension despite their strenuous attempts to win her favour.

However, when extremists were able to be placed in positions of power to exacerbate an already impossible situation, the kindly emperor was left with no choice but to close the Reichsrath:

CE 31 December 1897
The Riots in Prague.
Prague, Thursday.
Herr Wolf, Austrian deputy of the extreme German party, who took a prominent part in the recent disorderly scenes in the Reichsrath, has been elected a member of the Bohemian Diet. – Reuter.

CE 31 December 1897
The Reichsrath
Vienna, Thursday
The “Official Wiener Zeitung” to-day publishes an autograph letter from the Emperor to Baron Gaulsch, the premier, ordering the session of Reichsrath to be closed.

Early in 1898 the Austrian government tried another compromise: Czech and German were to be used in the ‘inner service’ in the mixed districts of Bohemia, and knowledge of both languages was to be demanded only of officials who served in those districts. However, this offended both nations, as the Czechs insisted on unity of the ‘historic’ Bohemia and the Germans feared to lose the mixed districts to the Czechs. And so this compromise also had to be abandoned.

At this stage the majority of nationalist middle-class Germans were shocked to find themselves following the lead of Schönerer and general dislike of Schönerer led the moderate German leaders to draw up the Whitsuntide programme of 1899. This expressed the outlook of Germans loyal to the Empire and wishing to preserve and strengthen it. Their only concession was transforming German from ‘the

---

319 CE 18 October 1899. German Progress. Although the cry of “Made in Germany” was doubtless exaggerated, still it was a popular way of drawing attention to a great fact. Ever since the Franco-German war, the balance of military power in Europe has been very different from what it was before. But that alone is only a part of the truth, for that war was also such an awakening of the whole German people, as the world is only now beginning to understand. It is not so much the foundation of the German Empire as a political factor that we have to consider, as the growth of the German peoples themselves. In the “Times,” 28th September, is an article upon the Professional and Social Classification of the German people, which is full of interest for every British trader and man of business. It is based upon the great professional and social census of the people taken on 14th June 1895. It proves the exuberant vitality of the German race, and its rapid increase everywhere. In 1898, the population of the German Empire was over 52 millions, as against 45 millions in 1882, which gives an increase of more than seven millions in 15 years. […] But it is the industrial life of Germany that is of the greatest interest to us nowadays, and this report proves that it is full of an abounding vigour which must, and will, go on growing. […] Not only has Germany the advantage
language of state’ into ‘the language of convenience’. The Czechs, in turn, regarded the ordinance as the status quo from which bargaining must proceed. Now Czechs organised obstruction, and desks banged in the Reichsrat, inkpots flew, and respectable Czech crowds demonstrated in the streets of Prague. The final withdrawal of the Badeni ordinance ended the epoch of middle-class constitutional life in Austria. In 1900 Francis Joseph dispensed with parliamentary ministers, the chief bureaucrat was now called Prime Minister. Everything, from the budget downwards, now became an emergency regulation.

The one tragic incident regarding Austria which touched the Irish reader more deeply on a personal level occurred when the Austrian Empress was assassinated in the autumn of 1898. The Cork Examiner printed an effusion of reports and articles on the late Empress, recalling the popularity and impact of her visits to Ireland as a crowned Catholic Head of State.

CE 12 September 1898
Assassination of the Empress of Austria.
Flight and Capture of the Murderer. His Cynical Demeanour.
Geneva, Saturday. The Empress of Austria was assassinated here this afternoon by an Italian Anarchist. Her Majesty had just left the Hotel Beau Rivage, and was walking to the steamboat landing on the Quay du Mont Blanc. She had reached the Brunswick monument in the square when a man, coming from the opposite direction, suddenly rushed up and dealt the empress a violent blow, to all appearances a blow with the fist. Her Majesty fell but almost immediately rose to her feet, and with the assistance of one of the ladies-in-waiting and some of the passers-by succeeded in reaching the steamboat pier. Her Majesty had hardly reached the deck of the steamer when she fainted. The captain at first hesitated to give the order for departure, but eventually the steamer put off. As the empress did not regain consciousness the steamer was put about before she had left the harbour and returned to the pier. Meanwhile the ladies-in-waiting, who had been endeavouring to bring the empress back to consciousness, had observed a small
stain of blood on her Majesty’s undergarments. When the pier was reached a stretcher was hastily improvised with oars and sailcloth, and on this the empress was carried into the Hotel Beau Rivage. Drs. Golay and Mayor and a priest were immediately summoned, and a telegram was despatched to the Emperor Francis Joseph with the sad intelligence. All efforts to bring the Empress back to life proved unavailing, and her Majesty expired at three o’clock. The medical examination showed that the assassin must have used a small triangular saw file. After striking the fatal blow the murderer made off […] but before reaching the square he was seized […]. The murderer offered no resistance. On the contrary, he appeared to be in high spirits and sang snatches of popular songs. He remarked on the way, “My blow went home. She must be dead.” On arriving at the Police Station the prisoner declared that he was an Anarchist without means, and that his animosity was only directed against the rich. (Later) According to later reports, Luccesi has given some explanation. He states that he came to Geneva to murder a certain personage. His plans failed, and it was quite by accident that he learned of the passage of the Austrian Empress through Geneva. […]

The News in Vienna. Grief and Indignation.

Vienna, Saturday, 8 p.m.

The news of the assassination of the Empress of Austria at Geneva became known in Vienna between five and six o’clock this evening, and spread like wildfire throughout the city, producing an effect akin to stupefaction. Mingled with the feeling of profound grief was one of intense indignation at such an appalling and unprovoked crime. The streets were immediately filled with thousands of people, and in many places became quite impassable to vehicles. All the newspapers issued special editions with the intelligence which seemed to many incredible until a special edition of the semi-official “Wiener Abendpost” appeared with confirmation. The journals all paid a warm tribute to the noble qualities of head and heart of the Empress. They were passed from hand to hand in the street, and groups of people were to be seen on both sides gathered round someone who read the news aloud. The performances in the Court Theatres and in the Jubilee Exhibition were immediately cancelled. Profound grief is everywhere apparent.

Editorial

On Saturday evening by the shores of the Lake of Geneva, a crime of an atrocious character was perpetrated which has already evoked expressions of horror and indignation in every land. As the Empress of Austria was walking from her hotel to a steamboat a wretch rushed at her, and in a moment the august lady fell to the ground stabbed to the heart. Accustomed as the world has been to deeds of utter cruelty and wanton brutality perpetrated by Anarchists there will nevertheless be a great shudder of revolt against the meaningless savagery of this crime. In the case of the assassination of President Carnot and of Senor Canovas there was at all events the poor excuse that the victim represented authority and political influence. Even that paltry justification cannot be pleaded in reference to the attack on this lady, who could not be associated with any political movement, nor be held by any subtle or misdirected reasoning responsible for the hardships of any class or individual in the wide world. The shock caused by intelligence of this awful crime will be felt with special force in these countries where not many years ago the Empress was well known in the hunting field. Much sympathy will be felt all

322 CE 13 September 1898. Our Dublin Letter. (From our Correspondent). Dublin, Monday. There is no part of the Three Kingdoms where the tragedy of the death of the Empress of Austria so strongly forces its personal aspects as it does in the neighbourhood of Dublin. Her reputation as a fearless
over the world by people of every class with the aged Emperor in his supreme misfortune. The Emperor Francis Joseph during his long reign, already numbering fifty years, has been subjected to many afflictions of a domestic as well as of a public kind, but none, of course, could equal to this incomparable disaster.

“Absolutely nothing is spared to me” was the exclamation of the venerable sovereign and then he declared it inconceivable, as well he might regard it, that any man should raise a hand against one who never had done aught but kindness throughout her life. The crime is, as might be supposed, the work of an Anarchist.

The emperor is extolled in almost superhuman virtues and with the support of his family the Habsburgs appear compassionate and natural in their grief.

CE 13 September 1898

The Austrian Press

Vienna, Monday. The journals, which for the most part, again appear with mourning borders and give renewed expression to the general sorrow at the death of the lamented Empress, are all unanimous in their admiration of the sublime superiority to personal considerations, the iron will, the self-control and the marvellous resignation displayed by the Emperor. They record that his Majesty himself gave orders for the body of the empress to be brought to Vienna, made arrangements regarding the transport of the remains, and issued directions concerning the ceremonial to be observed at the funeral. He also personally put off the Hungarian manoeuvres. All the papers testify to the health of the Emperor being unshaken. The meeting of the Archduchess Marie Valerie with the Emperor is touchingly described. The father and daughter remained locked in each other’s arms for several minutes, their sobs going to the hearts of those present. Even yesterday a beginning was made with preparations for the display of public mourning, but to-day the work is proceeding on a great scale, and by the day preceding the funeral, when the remains reach Vienna, all the principal thoroughfares will be draped in sable.

horswoman is still cherished in the memories of hunting folk around the counties of Meath and Kildare, and her kindly presence and genial manners are remembered by the country people round about. There is no doubt that her two visits to Ireland did no end of good by the popularity that she attached to Irish bloodstock throughout Europe. Since she was here scarcely a winter has passed that we had not as tenants of the hunting boxes of Meath and Dublin some members of the Royal House of Central Europe. Of course they were here incognito and under assumed names, according to the custom of Royal personages who are paying unofficial visits, but they will be known all the same. Returning to their native places at the end of the season, they never failed to take with them some Irish horses, in fact, it has been said that they pick up too many of the “good things,” and rather denude those productive localities. Ireland will share in the universal mourning of Europe at her most appalling and tragic end, and will tender to the great Catholic Emperor the condolence of a nation that has kindly recollections of her beautiful attributes. We all knew her as a sportswoman whose courage was not damped by the most difficult country, but we also saw enough of her to be able to fully appreciate the gentler side of her character. I don’t know whether the occasion is one which should call for a repetition of every episode of her visits, but I remember one which forcibly illustrated the descriptive and versatile powers of the sporting reporter of that day. He had been giving the details of a fast and exciting day with the hounds, in which the Empress had taken a prominent part, and having called her the “Empress,” “her Majesty,” “her Imperial Majesty,” and, in fact, having by the use of a number of other synonyms exhausted his vocabulary, he wound up by describing her as “The Imperial Ten Stone Two.” We are told that the reporter’s versatility quite appealed to the sporting sense of the genial Empress, and that she was much amused.
CE 15 September 1898

Editorial

The terrible tragedy which has attracted the sympathy of the world to the much-afflicted Emperor of Austria continues to be a topic of painful interest. Every day it is emphasised that never in the history of crime has any deed caused a greater shock to humanity, and as a result the cause, if such it can be called in which the murder of this old lady was committed, is assailed by universal execration. [...] The final scene in the tragedy is now at hand. The remains of the Empress having lain in State at Geneva amidst scenes of touching love for the dead and sympathy for the living, have been removed to Vienna. The funeral procession to the railway station in Geneva was as might have been anticipated, a very impressive sight. But perhaps the most striking feature of the calamity is the world-wide pity expressed for the old monarch, whose life of arduous struggle, sacrifice and sorrow forms one of the saddest chapters in personal history. His courage and faith in circumstances which would try the strongest nature will be treasured as a precious example, and we are glad that Ireland has been represented in the condolences extended to the Emperor. To his Eminence Cardinal Logue Catholic Ireland, in particular, should be grateful for having sent timely words of sympathy, and the Lord Mayor of Dublin and the Waterford Board of Guardians, by smaller messages, have shown how this country, which has given soldiers and statesmen to Austria, grieves with the Emperor in the loss of one who had a marked affection for Ireland and its people.

While the Monarchy and its well-wishers were mourning their private and political losses, the ill-disposed within the system were plotting prohibitive measures of their own.

**Excursus: Czech Political Parties Before and During the War**

How did the Czechs themselves sum up their nationalist history? Concentrating here on the latter half of the nineteenth century onwards, the most agreed-upon epoch for analysing ‘Nationalism’ in our modern understanding of the term, Vladimir Nosek, Secretary to the Czech-Slovak Legation in London, wrote an account of their struggle for liberty in November 1918, upon the official recognition of the Allies regarding the independence of a Czecho-Slovak state.

In this publication it is noted that Czech policy had always had one ultimate aim in view: the re-establishment of the ancient kingdom of Bohemia and the full independence of the Czecho-Slovak nation. From the beginning of their political activity, Czech politicians resisted the Pan-German scheme of Central Europe. ‘They preached the necessity of the realisation of liberty and equality for all

---

nations, and of a federation of the non-Germans of Central Europe as a barrier against German expansion.'

The chief reason for the failure of their efforts was the fact that they sometimes had illusions that the Habsburgs might favour the plan of such an anti-German federation, although the Habsburgs always mainly relied on the Germans and Magyars and could not and would not satisfy the Czech aspirations. The Czechs were greatly handicapped in their political struggle, because they had only just begun to live as a nation and had to face the powerful German-Magyar predominance, with the dynasty and the whole state machinery behind them. Moreover, the Czechs had no national aristocracy like the Poles or Magyars, and their leaders lacked all political experience and all sense of reality in politics which was so marked in a state built on deceit and hypocrisy. They continually defended themselves with declarations about the justice of their claims, satisfied themselves with empty promises which Austria has never kept, and cherished vain illusions of obtaining justice in Austria, while Austria was via facti steadily depriving them of all their rights. On the other hand, it should be remembered that they were faced with a government that had the whole powerful German Empire behind it, and that they had to struggle for freedom in a state where genuine constitutional government and democracy were unknown. The Czech efforts to obtain some measure of freedom by struggling for democratic reforms were consistently opposed by the dominant Germans.

The political activity of the Czechs did not really begin until 1848. On April 8, the Emperor issued the Bohemian Charter recognising the rights of Bohemia to independence. That year marked the end of Metternich's absolutism and revolution broke out in Western and Central Europe, including Bohemia.


At that time the Czechs already counted on the break-up of Austria. Also Palacky, in his letter to Frankfurt explaining why the Czechs would not attend the

---

324 Idem, p.18.
325 The Battle of the White Mountain and the Battle of the Boyne proved similar in effect, as the seventeenth century had not only depleted the Czechs of their leaders, the Irish also lost theirs – again.
326 Idem, p.19.
327 Höbelt, Landschaft und Politik, pp.8/9.
Pan-German Parliament, stated clearly that he had no illusions about the good-will of Austria to adopt a just policy towards her nationalities:

“In critical times we always saw this state, destined to be the bulwark against Asiatic invasions, helpless and hesitating. In an unfortunate blindness this state has never understood its true interests, always suppressing its moral duty to accord to all races justice and equality of rights.”  

At the Pan-Slav Congress presided over by Palacky, Michail Bakunin, Russian revolutionary, advocated the dismemberment of Austria in the interests of justice and democracy, and proposed a free Slav federation in Central Europe. The Pan-Slav Congress, attended also by the Poles and Yugoslavs, issued a manifesto on June 12, 1848, proclaiming the “liberty, equality and fraternity of nations.” The congress ended prematurely by the outbreak of ‘an abortive revolt in Prague, provoked by the military, which resulted in bloodshed and in the re-establishment of reaction and absolutism.’ The Narodni Listy was founded in Prague in 1860, to support the policy of leading Czech politician Rieger and in 1861 Rieger concluded an agreement with Clam-Martinic, of old Bohemian nobility, by which the latter, recognising the rights of the Bohemian State to independence, undertook to support the Czech policy directed against the centralism of Vienna. The Bohemian nobility, always indifferent in national
matters, with strong conservative and clerical leanings, concluded this pact with the Czech democrats for their own class interests. Soon a new political group came to the front in Bohemia, the Young Czechs, led by Sladkovsky, and more democratic than the Old Czechs. But in the Diet the Czechs remained united.


The Young Czechs opposed the policy of passive resistance that the Old Czechs pursued up to 1879. The Young Czechs saw that it enabled Vienna to rule without the Czechs and against them. The Czechs still reckoned upon the break-up of Austria, although they failed to profit from Austria's difficulties in that period. In November 1866, the Bohemian Diet pointed out that Bohemia had the same right to independence as Hungary, and relying upon the support of the other Slavs in Austria, the Czechs declared they would never enter the Reichsrat. February, 1867, the Austrian Chancellor, Beust, concluded an agreement with Hungary, and on December 21 the “December Constitution” was introduced and dualism became a fait accompli. When the Franco-Prussian War became imminent, the dynasty was forced to yield, and Minister President Count Alfred Potocki negotiated with the Czechs. The Czechs re-entered the Bohemian Diet on the day of the battle of Sedan, August 30, 1870, and issued a declaration of rights with which also the Bohemian nobility publicly identified themselves. On December 8 the Czechs declared their sympathy with France and Russia and protested against the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine and an alliance of Austria with Germany.

In February, 1871, Hohenwart was appointed Minister President with the object of conciliating the Czechs, and Francis Joseph addressed to them an imperial proclamation, called the “September Rescript,” in which he declared:

---

verloren ihre Güter; die Folge war, dass als einziger Landbesitzer der Adel übrig blieb. Der böhmische Adel machte nach einem Dutzend Jahren rechtzeitig seinen Frieden mit Kirche und Reich – und behielt seine Beute. Nirgendwo ringsherum war die Stellung des Adels so mächtig wie in Böhmen.’

332 Höbelt, Landschaft und Politik, pp.11ff.
“Remembering the constitutional ('Staatsrechtliche') position of the Crown of Bohemia and the glory and power which the same has lent to Us and Our ancestors, remembering further the unswerving loyalty with which the population of Bohemia at all times supported Our throne, We gladly recognise the rights of this Kingdom and We are ready to acknowledge this recognition by Our solemn Royal Oath.”³³³

But Francis Joseph was never crowned King of Bohemia. In 1878 Austria occupied Bosnia, and in 1879 Count Taaffe (whose descent from the Austro-Irish nobility is unfortunately not acknowledged by Nosek) induced the Czechs to abandon their policy of “passive resistance” and to enter the parliament in return for administrative and other concessions, including a Czech university. On September 9 the Czechs entered the Reichsrat to maintain their protest against the dual system.

At the same time the so-called “Realist” movement originated in Bohemia, led by Professor Masaryk, Professor Kaizl and Dr. Kramar. It was not a separate party movement, but a philosophic effort for a regenerated democratic national policy. The Realists demanded a practical, forward movement, such as would at last secure independence for the Czechs. In 1890 the Realists published their programme and joined the Young Czechs. This meant the end of the political career of Rieger and the Old Czechs.³³⁴

In Parliament the Young Czechs began a radical anti-German policy. In 1891 they attacked the Triple Alliance. Another radical movement started at this time in Bohemia, mainly by students and advanced workers of the Young Czech Party, calling itself ‘Omladina,’ the Czech word for “youth”. It was to rouse the young generation against Austria, and in 1893 they organised anti-dynastic demonstrations. A state of siege was proclaimed in Prague and seventy-seven members of this secret society were arrested, condemned for high treason, and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment.

In 1893 Professor Masaryk, realising the futility of his efforts against the encroachments of Germanism, resigned his mandate and devoted his energies to scientific and philosophical work. In 1900, however, he founded a party of his own, with a progressive democratic programme.³³⁵

³³³ Nosek, Independent Bohemia, p.25.
³³⁵ Idem, p.27.
In 1896 Badeni attempted to enfranchise the masses, seventy-two additional deputies being elected by universal suffrage. In these elections the Young Czechs again won in Bohemia; in Moravia the People's Party concluded a compromise with the Old Czechs and gained fifteen seats, the Socialists gained three seats and the Clericals one. On entering the parliament, the Czechs again made a declaration of state right. In 1897 Badeni, himself a Pole, issued his famous Language Ordinances, asserting the equality of the Czech and German languages in Bohemia and Moravia. The Germans opposed, supported by the Socialists, and in the Reichsrat they began to obstruct sittings to make proceedings impossible. Badeni resigned and the dynasty gave the Germans a completely free hand in all matters of government.

Due to the rapid cultural, economic and industrial development of Bohemia, the Czech party system began to expand. The Czecho-Slav Social Democratic Party, founded in 1878, became increasingly influential. First it was based on international socialism, in 1897 even opposing the national Czech demands. When their German comrades recognised the state right of Finland and Hungary, but not that of Bohemia, and preached the necessity of assimilating the Slavs, the Czech Socialists began to identify themselves with the national struggle for independence. They organised trade unions, which brought them into conflict with the Austrian Socialists. In 1898 the Czech National Social Party, led by Klofac, was formed in opposition to the Socialists, radically nationalist, and consisting mainly of workmen, evolved from the workers' organisation in the Young Czech

In 1900 the so-called State Right Party was founded by members of the former “Omladina.” It had a radical programme and stood uncompromisingly against Austria, demanding independence for Bohemia, chiefly on the ground of her historic rights.

CE 19 June 1901
Austrian Emperor
Ausseg, Bohemia, Tuesday.
Yesterday evening a Court dinner was given aboard the Habsburg, and the town was brilliantly illuminated in honour of the visit of the Emperor Francis Joseph, who left at ten o’clock on his return to Vienna, accompanied by Dr. Von Koecker, the Premier. On his way to the station the Emperor received a grand

ovation from the people, and before his departure expressed to the burgomaster his pleasure at the patriotic reception accorded to him. – Reuter.

Prague, Tuesday.

Count Von Coudenhove, the Stathalier, has received an autograph letter from the Emperor in the course of which his Majesty says: - "The universal progress which I have recently had an opportunity of observing in every path of intellectual and economic life, and the astonishing development shown by my royal capital, Prague, as well as by the other towns visited by me, have highly gratified me. They strengthen anew my hope that what is the surest pledge of the country’s lasting prosperity, the National place so ardently desired for, which has been paved by successful reapproachment effected between both races in the economic field, will soon be granted to my beloved kingdom of Bohemia. May God grant this.” The letter concluded by directing that these sentiments of the Monarch shall be brought to the general notice of the people, together with the expression of his thanks for the exemplary conduct of the public. – Reuter.

In the elections of 1901 the United Czech Club gained fifty-three seats, the National Socialists four and the Agrarians five, but the real influence of the new parties began in 1907, after the introduction of the universal suffrage which deprived the Young Czechs of their predominance. In 1911 new elections to the Reichsrat took place. The Radicals (four Moravian People's Party, two State Right Party, one Realist) formed a party of independent deputies with Professor Masaryk at their head, demanding full independence for Bohemia, some of them laying greater stress on her historical rights, some on the natural right of Czecho-Slovaks to liberty. All Czech deputies stood in opposition against Vienna, with the exception of Kramar who tried to imitate the Polish positivist policy in the hope of obtaining concessions in return. Kramar abandoned this policy even before the war, when he saw how Austria was tied to Germany.

The Reichsrat was closed when war broke out, and the Diet of Bohemia replaced by an Imperial Commission in 1913. War was declared by Austria against the will of the Slavs, but they did not protest, an organised revolution impossible in view of the presence of German troops and the perfect police spy system in Austria. Dr. Kramar, one of the most prominent Czech leaders, his colleague Dr. Rasin⁴³⁷, and five National Socialist deputies were imprisoned, some of them sentenced to death.

---

⁴³⁷ Dr. Alois Rasin (1867-1923), Czech politician and lawyer in Prague, editor of the Narodni Listy, official organ of the Young Czech Party. He was arrested for political activism and imprisoned 1894 to 1895. A member of the Young Czech Party from 1906 onwards, a member of the Reichsrat from 1911 to 1918. Again imprisoned from 1915 to 1917, and released during the General Amnesty of 1917. Following the arrest of Rasin and Kramar, the Young Czech Party experienced the rise of a strong, new decidedly activist current, which met with opposition under the leadership of Frantisek Sis. A journalist as well as politician, Sis founded the newspaper Narod (The People), which
The effect of these persecutions was that all the Czecho-Slovaks became unanimous in their desire to obtain full independence of Austria-Hungary. Old party differences were forgotten and some of the Czech deputies who had formerly been opportunist in tendency, such as Dr. Kramar and the Agrarian ex-minister Prasek, now at last became convinced that all hopes of an anti-German Austria were futile, that Austria was doomed, as she was a blind tool in the hands of Germany, and that the only way to prevent the ten million Czecho-Slovaks from being again exploited in the interests of German imperialism was to secure their complete independence. On entering the Reichsrat on May 30, 1917, all the Czech deputies, united in a single “Bohemian Union,” made a unanimous declaration that it was their aim to work for the union of all Czechs and Slovaks in an independent, democratic state.

The most significant demonstration of Czech national sentiment took place at Prague January 6, 1918, at a meeting of all the Czech deputies of the Reichsrat and Diets of Bohemia, Moravia and Austrian Silesia, at which a resolution was unanimously carried demanding full independence and representation at the peace conference. And on July 13, 1918, a National Council was formed in Prague on which all parties were represented and which was held to be part of the Provisional Government of Bohemia.

Regarding Ireland in the 1890s, trade and industry were, according to the Examiner, the key sectors demanding more public attention.

CE 2 January 1890
London Correspondence
(from our correspondent)
London, Wednesday Night
The farmers of Ireland ought to notice that large numbers of turkeys, geese, and hares are brought all the way from Austria-Hungary. One Budapest man during Xmas week sent to England over 11,000 turkeys, 5,000 geese, and 7,000 hares. Tradesmen find purchasing from abroad more profitable, and have very little difficulty in disposing of their poultry and game owing to the innocent ignorance of their customers. And on the other, the country would do well to bring in order the already established means of trade and communication, the indigenous railway system.

CE 1 January 1890
Editorial

---

338 Karel Prasek (1868-1932), landlord and member of the Czech Agrarian Party. From 1901 to 1913 member of the Bohemian Diet, and from 1901 to 1918 member of the Reichsrat. Agrarian minister from 1907 to 1908. Cf. Urban, Die Tschechische Gesellschaft.

The recent railway troubles in Cork and the South which have now been arranged so satisfactorily, and we trust for a long time to come, had had one good effect at all events. They have succeeded in thoroughly arousing public opinion on a question of great importance of the welfare of the company, the adequate representation if Cork interests on the board of Directors. The necessity for improving the condition of matters in this respect has long been admitted in a vague sort of way by the Board of Directors, and the impression their action leaves on one is that they were only waiting for sufficient pressure to be applied to grant adequate and reasonable representation to this end of the line. […] But really the directors and the public can be under no misapprehension as to the opinion of Cork merchants and traders of every description in this all-important matter.

Tourism was another area of industry open to endless possibilities of improvement:

CE 19 May 1897
The Prince of Wales Route to Glengarriff and Killarney
This famous tourist route has been taken over by the Development Syndicate of Ireland and will be worked in connection with their proposed new hotel on the South Mall, Cork. This is an important feature in tourist development, as the same company have just completed a contract with the Government for the establishment this year of tourist steamers on the lower Shannon […]

CE 14 September 1898
Tourist Traffic in Macroom
As the tourist season for the year is shortly to close, it will be of advantage, in view of the interest now taken by all classes in its development in this country, to glance back and see what progress it has made in the different districts, what circumstances have brought about the progress and what steps should be taken next year to still further develop the traffic. In this district, the enterprise of the Cork and Macroom Railway in giving frequent and cheap excursions on their line and extensively advertising the beauties of Gogane Barra, Inchigeela lakes, Ballyvourney scenery and mountains, etc. greatly added to the number of tourists who came into our midst. The opening of the tourist route to Glengariffe by way of that railway, and the tourist cars of the syndicate was a huge success, and it is to he hoped that as the scheme is made more widely known, the number of tourists will increase year by year. […] The local hotels, it must be said, did not do very much, or indeed scarcely anything at all, out of the common to induce tourists to visit the town. They did not, as has been done in Bantry, Killarney, Glengariffe, and scores of other places in the South advertise their tariff, the extent of their accommodation, or even their very existence. If they did, they would very materially assist the laudable endeavours of the Irish Tourist Traffic Association and the railway company, and at the same time put money in their own coffers. Englishmen and foreigners cannot through their own inner consciousness, be aware of the beauties and attractions of any given place, and it must, therefore, be brought under their notice in proper style, and when this is done, they generally make up their minds to visit the places in their tour. The local hotels, every one of them, are models of cheapness and comfort, and can easily afford every accommodation to the most fastidious, and are of first-class reputation. It is a pity that their many perfections are not better known, but it is all the fault of the proprietors themselves
in not investing a little in the useful publication of their merits. However, it is to be hoped that things will mend in this direction for next year’s season, and that intending tourists will not have to complain of want of information as to where to go for a pleasant time. To sum up, we have not the town under the Town’s Improvement Act, and the Commissioners are bound to do something of a practical kind to attract the tourist in increased numbers to our midst; and thus add to the revenue of the town.

Disreputable actions in rural areas damaged the image of the Irish countryside and disrupted the ongoing tourism industry.\textsuperscript{340}

\textsuperscript{340} CE 11 June 1895. The evil effects of disunion are well shown by the obvious truth of the contrary proposition that when Irishmen are united there is very little that they do not obtain. The acceleration of the Mails and the placing of the claims of Queenstown in that pre-eminence to which its natural advantages entitle the route were instances of the truth of this proposition, and now we have every reason to believe that another striking example of the great result of the consolidation of our forces will be forthcoming in the success of the movement to develop the tourist traffic of Ireland. The meeting in Dublin some time ago was certainly one of the most representative assemblies that has come together in Ireland for a long time. There was a business-like air about the proceedings. The speech of the Lord Lieutenant and the letter of Lord Powerscourt showed that what is wanted is well understood, and that there is a spirit to make the most of our advantages. We are glad to be able to believe that these efforts are bearing good fruit, and that when this season comes to be reviewed it will be found that hotelkeepers and business men generally will have found it to be one of the best which they experienced for many years. There is really no reason why our tourist traffic should not be one of the largest in the world. There is no more beautiful scenery than is to be found in Ireland. It can be seen without any wearisome journeys, indeed the conventional beauty spots can be “done” in a very short time indeed. This is a matter of some consequence when we are dealing with the typical globe-trotter, whose whole ambition is to place as many renowned places to his credit as possible — to say he was there. He goes forth on the war path, and he will be judged hereafter among his fellow-trippers according to the number of scalps he has at his belt. These flitting sprites require the best hotels. They go in batches to the principal establishments. As a rule they pay well, and it is in order that these will be properly accommodated that we will have to agitate for the building of great hotels with every convenience that wealth or even pampered appetites can expect. After all, the margin of profit must be largest with this expensive class of visitor. […] The great Southern and Western Railway Company have risen to the occasion, and the hotels on the southern route will be worthy of any country in the world. In other parts of Ireland the necessities of the situation have been recognised, and in a comparatively short time not one of the classic Irish tourist resorts will be unprovided with a hotel with which not even the capricious globe-trotter need be dissatisfied. But there is another field for profit which there is some danger will not receive proper treatment at our hands. Thousands of English and Scotch tourists year after year have gone to France or Holland. These may be induced to come to Ireland. They will come for a week, or a fortnight, or three weeks. Their object will be to spend their holiday exploring the country, perhaps in making tours, perhaps cycling, or on the popular side car. The snapshotist will be very much in evidence, and the results of the industry, exhibited in British photographic galleries, will be no mean advertisement for the picturesque places in our island. This class of tourist will be on a different footing from the globe trotter. Economy and cleanliness will be what he will chiefly have in view. He may go to second-class hotels in the town, and he will expect fair accommodation in the out of the way places which he will seek on the assurance that many of the most beautiful places in the country are out of the beaten path. Much money can be made by the cultivation of this class of traffic, and we hope that such efforts will be made by our hotel keepers as will make the tourist spend an enjoyable time, render him anxious to return, and to advise his neighbour to take his holidays in the Emerald Isle. The comfort of our tourists is the thing most to be aimed at in every case while the economy is an absolutely essential consideration in many. On the former point it is worth while quoting a remark which a Canadian ecclesiastic on a visit to Ireland made to an interviewer a few days ago — “I have been in Killarney,” he said. “The accommodation for seeing the lakes I consider inferior. They have nothing but open whale boats. Now, in Scotland, in the Trossachs and Loch Lomond, we found small steamers and steam launchers, which, I fancy, would be a great improvement in Killarney, which is so subject to high
CE 1 January 1890
Alleged Outrage by Moonlighters\textsuperscript{341} in Kilkenny

Intelligence reached Waterford yesterday that on Saturday night between 25 and 30 men, some of them armed, visited the farm of an evicted tenant named Dempsey at Castlegannon, Kilkenny. They assaulted the Land Corporation caretaker and his family with stones. Additional police protection has been provided for the caretaker.

CE 1 January 1890
The Alleged Moonlighting near King Williamstown
Kanturk, Tuesday

On inquiry I find that what really occurred in connection with the above is of a less serious nature than was at first anticipated. It seems a dance was given at a place called Glencollins, at which Patrick Dunlea attended. During the progress of the dance some friends, for a “lark,” raided the house as Moonlighters. They told all inside to clear out, and the command was immediately obeyed. A shot was fired, some of the grains accidentally striking Dunlea in the leg. Dunlea is not unpopular; in fact the whole thing is regarded as a joke.

CE 23 January 1890
Editorial

Mr Gladstone’s great speech at Chester last evening, though delivered under peculiar circumstances, did not deal with unusual topics, nor did it to any great extent disclose any new Liberal policies. […] And as to the Irish Question, the veteran leader was clear, staunch and as determined as ever. […] Mr. Gladstone’s criticisms of the working of the Coercion Act was, as might be expected, at once acute and statesmanlike. He dwelt at some length on the petty oppressions which, small as they may appear, represent the power of tyranny over great public rights, and denounced with accustomed vigour the system that condemns a peasant to gaol for uttering a sentiment backed by the high authority of Lord Hartington. […] The address is not, perhaps, so powerful on Irish topics as others that have been delivered by the Old Man Eloquent, but it embraces a great variety of important political opinions.

There were more comforting issues at hand also, such as the indisputably refining element of the Young Men’s Society, a branch of which thrived in Cork.

\textsuperscript{341} Carolyn Conley, ‘No pedestals: women and violence in late nineteenth-century Ireland,’ in Journal of Social History (Summer, 1995), footnote 14: “Moonlighters” refers to persons committing acts of terror by night, usually in connection with agrarian or political grievances. Shooting into houses, arson and vandalism were the most common acts of moonlighters during this period.
CE 6 January 1890
Editorial

The annual general meeting of the Cork Young Men’s Society is a subject of perennial interest for all who have due regard to the future of this country. The Southern capital has at all times played a conspicuous part in National affairs, and must, of necessity, continue to do so in the future. It is, consequently, of primary importance to the city and country that the young men who may one day be called on to great and patriotic work, on whom, in any event, the duties and responsibilities of citizenship must fall with special weight, should be adequately and properly trained, and fitted for their mission, be it lofty or humble. To this noble task the Young Men’s Society has, for many a year devoted itself, and the benefits it has conferred on the city and on the country are utterly beyond calculation. […] But through good and evil fortune it has been bravely worked, conferring untold blessings on the Catholic young men of the city. […] Its directors have been enabled to render the proceedings of the society by means of lectures and intellectual entertainments exceptionally attractive, and have ventured to conduct a series of excursions to England and France which some years ago would have been deemed adventurous even to rashness, but which afforded the greatest satisfaction to all who participated in them […]. Bishop O’Callaghan told his hearers yesterday that a secret society exists in this City of Cork, that he was aware of its constitution, its oath, and the dread penalty by which its decrees are, in the last instance, to be enforced. […] This journal was not unconnected with the grave assertions made by a respected clergyman of this city on the same subject. Then the eminent Archbishop of Dublin found occasion for declaring that it had come to his knowledge that certain members of the Gaelic Athletic Association – a small section of course of that great and excellent body – had formed a secret society and were endeavouring to entrap the young men of the country. Our own beloved Bishop now makes the still more direct and definite announcement – the secret society is at work here in this city of Cork. […] The foolishness, to say nothing of the wickedness, of those who believe or encourage the belief that any good can be done for the country by oath-bound secret societies must indeed, after all the lessons of the past, be invincible. It is only intelligence of the Moonlighter’s level that could be led to think, or suppose, that the National cause could be aided in any degree whatsoever by an association whose ultimate sanction is assassination.

Lectures given by international speakers were popular, many dwelling on the cult of national characteristics and the glories of the past.342

342 CE 8 February 1890.Cork Young Ireland Society.Lecture on Hugh O’Neill.A meeting of the Cork Young Ireland Society was held last night in the Assembly Rooms, in which the Rev. J. Murphy, C.C., Queenstown, delivered an exceedingly interesting address on the life of Hugh O’Neill. […] Father Murphy, the course of his address, said that Hugh O’Neill rose in the “dark and evil days” at the close of the sixteenth century, when the feud of races had been embittered by the introduction of the religious element into the strife, and when it became a death struggle for homes and altars alike. The agents of English misrule in Ireland at that time made no attempt to evade the responsibility of their savage acts – on the contrary the State papers of the time recorded them openly and proudly by boasting of the deeds they had done. Treaties were broken, defenceless people were massacred, political opponents were butchered, an their properties appropriated in the name of law, and what was still worse in the name of religion, and the doers of such deeds had at all events the brutal honesty to admit them, and, in so far, they had the advantage of the present agents of misrule amongst us – men who by bad air, bad food, plank-beds, and the other nameless horrors of their gaols, sought to rid themselves of political opponents (hisses). Such men did not even deserve the name tyrants – they were contemptible cowards, hypocrites, double-dyed with the
CE 18 January 1890

“The Characteristics of the Celt?”

This was the title of a very interesting lecture delivered last evening in the Assembly Rooms by Dr. John Cotter, Ballinspittle. The attendance was satisfactory notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather and the fact that a meeting of the National League and a concert at the Young Men’s Society were in progress at the same time. The lecture was given under the auspices of the Cork Young Ireland Society [and] prominent members of the Irish party and others had occasionally appeared upon their platform as lecturers [...]. The lecturer, who was received with loud applause, referred to the fact that at the present moment the subject of his lecture was of particular interest, when the sun of liberty [was] waiting only until a few more of the clouds of ignorance and bigotry have rolled away to bathe her rejuvenated form in his glorious beams. [...] His object was to indicate the traits of our Celtic character which, in the infancy of our modern history, built up within the small circumference of our island a nation that at all events in the religious history of the world has exerted an influence not second to Rome herself (applause) – traits that for seven centuries have been unmodified by contact with Anglo-Saxon, Anglo-Norman, or Dane; traits that, despite of persecution and death, have for a like period impelled her sons to preserve unblemished the features of Ireland’s National individuality; and these same traits in our National character are the peculiar elements that now impel us to struggle and sacrifice until that national individuality is again restored (applause). The lecturer went on to describe that it was only from the Irish character the characteristics of the Celtic race could be traced, in proof of which he referred to the conquest of Britain by the Romans, the

infamy of killing their victims, and of lying to cloak their guilt (hear, hear, laughter). [...] At that time Ulster was the stronghold of Irish independence. In that province two great and kindred families, the O’Neills and the O’Donnells, had ruled with regal sway for centuries before the Tudors or the Plantagenets were ever heard of. Up to Elisabeth’s time English power had made practically no impression in Ulster, and, indeed, would never have made any impression on that or on any other part of Ireland if the Irish princes and people had been then, as they ought to be, and as they always ought to be – united (applause).

CE 6 April 1897.Lecture at Bandon by Miss Milligan.On Friday evening Miss Milligan delivered a lecture in the Ballroom of the Devonshire Arms Hotel, under the title of “’98 and After.” [...] They were all familiar with her writings in the spirited little paper of which she was editor – the “Seam Bhean bocht” (applause). They were all aware from the newspapers of the many valuable lectures on epochs of Irish history which she delivered from time to time. [...] The lecture, which has already been published, excited much interest, which was further enhanced by the admirable lantern views of places rendered memorable by events of the ’98 rebellion [...], and pictures of the principal ’98, ’48 and ’67 leaders, including Lord Edward Fitzgerald, [...] Wolf Tone, Robert and Thomas Emmet, Smith O’Brien, Mitchell, Meagher, [...]. Mr. Danial O’Dwyer, in proposing a hearty vote of thanks to Miss Milligan, pointed to the fact that almost all the leaders of the ’98 movement were sprung from the foreign element, whose early training was not much calculated to excite in them sympathy for the down trodden masses of their countrymen; but being men of sterling worth, and plenty of courage to back their convictions, they made an effort to throw off the English yoke and remove the grievances from which their country suffered (applause). Ireland’s Protestant patriots were amongst the very truest and bravest she had (applause). The aim of the ’98 men was to weld all classes in the country into one body, united for the interests of their native land. They failed in their main object, but their work was not altogether in vain (applause). The courage and patriotism they showed had been bright examples to Irish patriots since, and would always inspire the efforts of true Irishmen (applause). Mr. D. O’Brien, in seconding, said the lessons he learned from Irish movements was that disunion was responsible for the failure of them all (hear, hear). Were the Irish people united in a constitutional movement and a physical force movement, they could be irresistible (loud applause). Referring to the revival of the Irish language, of which the lecturer is a very warm advocate, he said he hoped that before long many years more has passed the Irish people would have learned to speak their native tongue and appreciate its beauties (applause).
Saxons, and the Normans, and showed how the British character was formed from a combination of these elements. That combination, he had no doubt, formed a good man – one capable of great achievements, as the history of England had shown – a man remarkable for independence of mind, probity, and steadiness, but a man destitute – to some extent, at all events – of the versatility and practical readiness, religious feelings and deep sympathies, and love for the domestic virtues which otherwise he would have derived from his Celtic ancestors. No race could be found on the Continent at the present day presenting any of the qualities that distinguished their ancestors a thousand years ago; the Chaldeans and Trojans, Celtic by extraction, had passed away; the Greek and Italian of the same stock still exist, but conquest, in its varying fortunes, national intercourse and moral laxity, the depressing influences of National decay, and, above all, the growth of indifference to religion, had transformed what was once the Celtic into the modern Greek and Italian characters (applause).  

Well under way is the Celtic revival, and even though the language itself will not be heard spoken by the great percentage of the people, its literary treasures may be appreciated by scholars at home and abroad.
CE 15 June 1895
The Celtic Revival

[William A. Leahy says]: To check the retreat of the Gaelic tongue is indeed a desperate task; Provencal, Flemish, and Greek afford imperfect analogies, for the first two, at least, were flourishingly spoken dialects which needed only the rise of a Mistral or a Conference to give them literary life; and none of them had such a formidable competitor to oust as the world conquering English. Yet it is interesting to learn that within fifty years 4,000,000 of Irishmen, over half the population, were still using the ancient language. The famine, emigration, the national schools, and the indifference of political leaders completed its ruin. To-day it is understood by less than a fourth of the people, and only one-fourth of these are acquainted with English. In view of the strong prejudice which prevails against bi-lingual nations, it is doubtful if governmental assistance can ever be invoked to stem the tide of decay. Special obstacles are found in the archaic spelling, several times more difficult than that of English, and in the apathy of the peasants. Against such impediments, Dr. Douglas Hyde and his devoted sympathisers are contending valiantly, championing by example as well as precept the retention of a tongue with whose disappearance a whole world of folk-lore and history will die out of popular recollection.

A secondary and more promising aim, recommended by Stopford Brooks in his address before the London Irish Society, is “to get the Gaelic literature into English,” which involves the getting of English-speaking translators into Gaelic. Only one thoroughly familiar with the tongue can pronounce upon its values. That it bewitches scholars who acquire it is certain, and we may well credit their testimony as to the beauty of its poetry and prose. Unlike the Highland Scotch, that “intricate key to an empty chest,” the Irish has an abundant literature whose beginnings antedate the earliest relics of Gothic, and whose period is hardly yet closed. In this literature the whole body of a race which never lacked culture and brilliancy expressed itself down to the year 1700, so that it cannot be barren. Destitute of drama and of reflective work, it possesses a store of epics and annals, ballads and romances, satires and songs, in which rhyme, the invention of the Celt, runs riot in almost cloying elaboration. Under one aspect, with its fairy queens, its bell branches, its cycles of pagan legend, whose heroes – Mananan, Cuchullain, and Finn MacCool – sleep till the day of Erin’s resurgence, it weaves a spell over the fancy like some gigantic “Midsummer Night’s Dream.” Under another, with its reiteration of real sorrows, it moved the heart like a long, low caoine [“keen”].

About the middle of this century there arose a band of young workers in Ireland, exceptionally gifted, and, singular to relate, united. They made literature an instrument towards the revival of national feeling. Their lyre was put to Tyrtaeus’ use, not that of the concert performer. But, in the face of O’Connell’s failure and the impending famine, it was impossible for them to remain politically inert. The revolt they precipitated was crushed, and their leaders exiled. Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, the “Roman soul” of his friend’s epistle, became Premier of Victoria. Thomas D’Arcy M’Gee rose to distinction in Canada, where he drafted the articles of confederation of the present Dominion. Thomas Francis Meagher is remembered in American history as soldier. Of such stuff were those rebels made. Prominent in the thick of the movement or upon its outskirts, were several poets, of whom three

or any Government to refuse the demand for proper facilities for the teaching of the Irish language to Irish children, in Irish-speaking districts. It is to be hoped that the matter will be viewed in this light, and that other towns will bestir themselves, and so strengthen the hands of those who are striving to place the National language of his country in its rightful position.
are held in Ireland to be more worthy, by loyalty and genius, to sing her story. These three were Thomas Davis, James Clarence Mangan, and Sir Samuel Ferguson. The editors of the New Irish Library have already made an effort to get some of the lyrics of this man, and of the swarm of Irish song writers, who, like Wolfe, have become famous for a single utterance, into shape for English readers.

The first feature of the Young Ireland movement which strikes attention is the wide diffusion of the lyrical faculty exhibited. Solid legislators, like Duffy, M’Gee, and O’Hagan, seem surcharged with genuine sentiment and gifted with something of the true singer’s command of rhythmical form. Few odes will bear re-reading to the tenth and twentieth time, like Mangan’s “Dark Rosaleen,” so restless of movement, so mystical in its allegory, so Gaelic in the lingering cadences; or Davis’ “Fontenoy,” a battle piece as starkly literal as a general’s report, but strenuous and intense beyond anything of the kind in Campbell or Tennyson. Sir Samuel Ferguson has wrought rugged ballads of a diction as gnarled and knuckled as live oak, in his “Welshmen of Tirawley” and “Forging of the Anchor,” besides more delicate work, like “The Lapful of Nuts.”

Novelists abound as well as poets, but it was before the Young Ireland wave had reached its crest that the three chief fiction writers of the nation put forth their studies of native life, Banim, whose gifts were wild imagination and the historical sense; Carleton, a powerful delineator of peasant matters, and Gerald Griffin, the master of tenderness and sweet humour, whose novel, “The Collegians,” remind one of Hawthorne in its beauty of style and does not suffer by the comparison. If the new movement only succeeds in replacing Moore by Mangan and Davis, and Lover and Lever by this trio of storytellers, more veracious and authentic, it will have rendered a service to candid inquirers from without as well as to Ireland.345

CE 13 September 1898
Editorial

The Irish Language National Fund is now well before the public. The first list of subscriptions has been published, and every Irishman, be he Nationalist or Unionist who is not included in these contributors, is expected to lend a helping hand to the movement. This appeal has been made by gentlemen whose names are a guarantee of its worthiness. His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, the Most Rev. Dr.O’Donnell, Bishop of Raphoe; the Lord Mayor of Dublin; Mr.Douglas Hyde, President of the Gaelic League; Rev. Eugene Ogrowney, M.R.I.A., Vice-President Gaelic League, and Mr.John MacNeill, B.A., editor of the “Gaelic Journal.” But more important is the fact that while the Ancient Order of Hibernians subscribed

345 CE 11 October 1893. Novel Prosecution at Castlemartyr. Fines for Using the Irish Language. At Castlemartyr Petty Sessions yesterday a case of a novel character came on for hearing. The defendant, who is a respectable farmer, residing at ballymacoda, named James Gleeson, was summoned by Sergeant Jestin for that on the 29th September last he did allow a car, his property, to be used on the public street at Castlemartyr without having his name and residence properly painted thereon. […] Mr.Keane, solr., contended that the Act of Parliament was complied with and pointed out that the only complaint the sergeant had to make was that he could not read the Gaelic words. Mr.Keane – […] I would point out to your worship that there are several parts of this country where the English language is not spoken at all, and where if words were painted or written in Irish they would be more legible and readable than English words, and the car in this case has been at fairs and markets for upwards of 20 years, and the wording on it has never been questioned. […] I know myself that there is a large portion of this country where the English language is not spoken, and the Irish people are entitled to use their own vernacular when there is no law to prevent it. [The Bench] convicted the defendant, but only imposed the nominal penalty of 6d and costs, and intimated that the defendant could put two names and addresses in future on the car – one in English, and the other in Irish.
L10,000 to found a Celtic chair at Washington, the language in its home, where it is spoken by three-quarters of a million of the population, has not received any such stimulus. This is an anomaly discreditable to the sense and patriotism of the Irishmen in Ireland to be permitted to persist any longer. Despite penal laws and a narrow-minded view of education necessary for our youth, despite the hideous boycott that naturally arose from these circumstances, prohibiting the use of the mother tongue in many departments of public and social life in which it might have been advantageously utilised, Gaelic has survived and that is the best assurance of the success of the present movement. While the spirit that was displayed at the meeting held in Millstreet on Sunday is preserved by any section of our people there is every reason for looking hopefully to the future. And we know that the spirit is widely prevalent, and is spreading. Our columns bear testimony almost every week to the growth of the feeling that in the Gaelic language the Irish people possess a sign of their distinctive nationality and of their individuality, of which no laws can deprive them – that in proportion to the spread of that feeling Irish nationality and national dignity and pride will be strengthened and enhanced. To these gatherings of which the Millstreet meeting was so excellent an example, the promoters of the Irish Language National Fund can confidently look for support. The object is to stimulate public opinion in the Irish-speaking districts to which end it is proposed to send forth organisers and in their own interest every branch of the Gaelic League should render all the assistance in their power.

The language question had always been linked to the matter of schools and education in general. The then current policy on education in Ireland may be deduced from the following lecture delivered by an Irish Member of Parliament:

CE 24 January 1890
“The Irish Educational Problem”
Lecture by Mr. Maurice Healy, M.P.

[...] The lecturer, who was received with applause, admitted he was influenced in his remarks by the remarkable debate at the close of the last session of Parliament, and the discussion which followed throughout the kingdom. It was plain that the Irish education question was now a practical political issue, and no longer a shibboleth of parties (hear, hear). The lecturer went on to explain the difficulties of the Irish educational question. [...] He drew an instructive parallel between the education condition of Ireland and of the other countries under the same crown and Parliament. The returns of the last Parliamentary elections showed that whereas in Ireland 1,000 [...] sometimes 2,000 out of 10,000 were illiterate, the numbers in Scotland might often be counted on the fingers of one hand. [...] During Mr. Balfour’s speeches in Scotland the select Jew who formed his following took occasion, like the Pharisee, to thank God that they were not, as the Irish in the matter of education, but while Scotland had good reason to be proud of her educational superiority, he (the lecturer) maintained that Ireland had no reason to be ashamed of her educational inferiority [...] Mr. Healy then traced the rise of the Scottish educational system from the passing of the Act “for the settling of schools” in 1697, and quoted Lord Macaulay’s description of the effects produced by what the historian termed “that memorable ct.” The lecturer then contrasted this state of affairs with what prevailed in Ireland at the same period, when

Crouched beneath the sheltering hedge/Or stretched on mountain fern,/ The teacher and his pupils met/ Feloniously to learn. (cheers).
In Scotland while a school house was planted in every parish, it was treated in Ireland much as if in our days it were a “suppressed” branch of the National League (laughter and cheers).346

Always topical in the Examiner was the question of abstinence; one of its founding principles, and even after the death of John Francis Maguire his legacy to the pledge was kept alive in print.

CE 25 January 1890
Father Mathew and his Converts

The late John Francis Maguire, in his interesting “Biography of Father Mathew”, says that after the good priest had been speaking one day in Golden Lane, Barbican, to crowds of Irish, several hundred knelt to receive the pledge, and among them the Duke of Norfolk, the Lord Arundel and Surrey. Father Mathew asked the earl if he had given the subject sufficient reflection. “Ah, Father Mathew,” replied his noble convert, “do you know that I had the happiness to receive Holy Communion from you this morning at the altar of Chelsea Hospital. I have reflected on the promise I am about to make; and I thank God for the

346 Cf. also CE 10 November 1897. Editorial. Attention is once more called to the important subject of University Education for the Catholic population, who compromise five-sixths of the population of this country. [...] The principles for which the Catholics of this country fought was recognised, but in the application of it the English Ministers were unable to grasp its vital elements, or feared to do so. Now the University question is once more one of the great causes in contemporary politics. [...] Catholics ask for a University that shall in all respects be as available to them as the University of Dublin and Trinity College are to Protestants. [...] But the bigots of Ulster are not disposed to bury the hatchet, and it has to be seen if this disloyal band of fanatics can thwart the intelligence, the sense of justice and the desire for good government possessed by enlightened British statesmen. [...] This case of justice delayed to Ireland must be always reckoned amongst the blunders of the Irish Administration.

CE 22 December 1897. An Irish Catholic University. (By an Irish Catholic Unionist in the “Pall Mall Gazette”). On no other subject do Irish Catholics feel a greater sense of injustice than in the absence of a provision for equality in University education with their Irish Protestant fellow countrymen. The opponents of an Irish Catholic University contend, on the other hand, that they have no grievance, as they are at perfect liberty to attend Trinity College, Dublin, where all religious tests have been abolished since 1873, or the Queen’s Colleges of Belfast, Cork, or Galway, where no religious tests have ever existed. The most obvious reply to this contention is that over three-quarters of the Irish race profess the Catholic religion, and that their opinions and prejudices are entitled to some consideration as long as they can receive attention without any injustice being inflicted on any section of the minority. What then are the reasons which inspire the Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland in their condemnation of Trinity College as an institution for the higher education of the Catholic youth? Its Provost belongs to the Protestant Church, the overwhelming majority of the Professors, the Fellows, and the students profess the same religion, the Faculty of Divinity is that of the lately disestablished Church of Ireland, and the service of that church is celebrated in the college chapel. It is necessary to reverse these facts and to assume that the atmosphere were as Catholic as it now is Protestant [...] and then ask any religious Protestant this question: Would he care to confide the education of his son to a body of men professing these views? [...] The objection to the Queen’s Colleges stands on a totally different foundation. It is true that they might also be condemned on the ground of inequality, for while Catholics see ample provision made for the religious wants of their Protestant fellow-countrymen in Trinity College, no attempt was made to meet their prejudices in this respect when the Queen’s Colleges were established in 1845, or since that time. [...] Whatever the Catholic prejudices against a Protestant atmosphere in education may be, the feeling is much stronger where the spirit of the educational system ignores religion altogether. [...] But, after all, the main question is, what will satisfy the claims of the Catholic Hierarchy. Their one requirement is absolute equality in secular education. With this object, they desire the establishment of a Catholic University under Catholic control.
resolution, trusting to the Divine goodness and grace to persevere. Tears rolled down his cheeks as he uttered those words with every evidence of genuine emotion. [And] it was not until many years after that at the command of his medical advisers, he substituted moderation for total abstinence.347

The Gaelic Athletic Association came under further notice of the Catholic hierarchy, not so much due to its secret organisations but its public show of intemperance:

CE 20 March 1890
The Archbishop of Cashel on the Temperance Movement
Appeal to the Gaelic Athletic Association
The Palace, Thurles, March 18.

My Dear Friends – I ask leave to state a case to you and to solicit a favour. The case is this: - His Grace of Dublin, in conjunction with a large number of the Irish Bishops, has prepare to celebrate the approaching Centenary of Father Mathew by a simultaneous advance all along the line against intemperance, to result in the spread, throughout the country, of temperance societies, or of teetotal societies, or of both associations combined. […] The excessive use of strong drink, everywhere hurtful, and unhappily on the increase, is, and has been, simply ruinous in Ireland. […] It has made countless homes desolate. It has given victims, without number, to the grave, to the gaol, to the prison, to the workhouse, to the ocean. […] It casts a stigma on o name and nation. For centuries it has largely contributed towards making us slaves and keeping us so; and to this very day, it is constantly flung in our face, both at home and abroad, […]. Banish drunkenness from Ireland, and she would be, I believe, not alone the fairest, but the happiest, the most flourishing, and least sinful nation on the face of the earth. Such is my case. Would you, as a body, join in a holy crusade against drink? […] The athletes of old in Greece and Rome had to undergo a dreadfully severe training. They took their food mostly dry, we are told; and I nowhere find mention of wine as having formed a portion of their dietary. […] In modern times it is much the same. Athletes in our days, to excel, must not only be sober, but even rigidly abstentious. It has

347 CE 7 October 1893. Letters to the Editor. Father Mathew’s Birthday. St. Finbarre’s, Cork. October 6th, 1893. Dear Sir, It is with feelings of pain and humiliation that I have during the week looked in vain for any notice of the recurring birthday of a man, who had brought blessings untold to thousands of our countrymen at home and abroad. For years, Father Mathew’s birthday had been honoured by Procession and Celebrations, but his year his name is not even mentioned, and yet there has been no period in our history in which there exists more need of infusing the spirit of Father Mathew into the hearts of our people, for never has there been such widespread tendency to drink among all classes, old and young, as at the present time. Through the kindness of the Corporation of this city, I have obtained the site of the old Friary, where Father Mathew prayed and laboured, and have erected on its ruins a beautiful Hall to shelter those who, during the winter evenings, may be exposed to the danger of drink by the comfort and warmth of the public House, but who, having this hall, would seek its shelter and enjoy its recreations. In the midst of constant demands made on the people of Cork, I have abstained from making any appeal to meet my first liability of L450 to the contractor, trusting in Divine Providence and the many friends of temperance who, I am convinced, will aid me to clear off the debt. This Hall, as seen by advertisement, will be opened on Tuesday evening, October 10th, the Birthday of Father Mathew, with a Concert and Addresses, at 8 o’clock, pm, when I shall be happy to welcome those who are the friends of temperance. – I am, yours truly, A. Maguire, P.P.
sometimes been charged on the GAA that, either before or after play, more drink used to be consumed by the contestants than was useful or necessary for them. […] Join the Temperance Association that will be established next Sunday in your respective parishes. Do so in a body, and in your uniform. You will thus serve the cause, benefit yourselves, secure the stability of your association, and wipe a foul stain off the face of your country.

Regarding the Home Rule movement and the role of Parnell, it has been noted in a previous section that the outgoing 19th century did not offer much in support of the party, both the Conservatives and Liberals distancing themselves from the national leader on account of his politics regarding the former, and his private life regarding the latter. However, there was an element of support left for Parnell in Ireland.

CE 21 January 1890
Mr. Parnell and the Cork Branch of the National League
Mr. J. C. Forde, hon sec of the Cork Branch of the National League, received the following letter yesterday: -

House of Commons Library, January 17th, 1890
Dear Sir, Mr. Parnell has directed me to acknowledge the receipt of the resolution arrived as by the members of the Cork Branch of the Irish National League, and he has also desired me to say that he thanks the members of that body for their kindness and sympathy, which are most gratifying to him, and which he values the more highly coming as they do from so important a section of the constituency which Mr. Parnell has the honour to represent. I am, yours truly,

H. Campbell, Private Secretary

[…] The above is in acknowledgment of the following resolution […]: -

“[…] That we, the Committee of the Cork Branch of the Irish National League, take this opportunity of expressing our unaltered confidence in the Leader of the Irish people – Mr. Charles Stewart Parnell. On behalf of his constituents in this city, we promise him their sympathy and support during his contest with the vile conspirators who are endeavouring to drive him from public life, and thus delay the march of the Irish nation towards prosperity and independence, and we are sure that he will succeed in defeating the plot launched through the medium of the wretched renegade O’Shea, as completely as he has already triumphed over the conspiracy of which Richard Pigott was the instrument and the victim.”

Parnell’s legacy, the establishment of a confident tenants’ organisation and its subsidiary organisations, still fared well, so well in fact that the Government of the day was again forced into employing coercion to try to subdue the Irish, which again failed miserably.

CE 6 February 1890
Editorial
The Tenants’ Defence Fund goes ahead magnificently. The lists of acknowledgments published day after day in the Freeman show no falling off
whatever and the total to-day will be fully up to £40,000 if indeed not in excess of
that amount. [...] It is very probable that the order of the Conventions will be
recognisable in the amounts of the subscription list when the final account taking
has concluded, but it may well be hoped that the enthusiasm which was manifested
at each succeeding convention will find its solid equivalent in the pecuniary
support afforded to the good tower of resistance to evictions now being raised by
the whole Irish nation. [...] The Irish Policy of the Government
The Daily News says – At no time perhaps in the whole history of the Irish
land struggle was there so much bitterness of feeling, so much passion, so much
hatred, as has been seen in these very latest days. The Government has a free hand
with Coercion. They have stopped at nothing; they have made their military and
police force servants and instruments of the landlords; they have flung into prison
right and left the men who dared to give counsel, comfort, and encouragement to
the tenants. Are the tenants cowed, quiet, and submissive? Is there any evidence to
show that the agitation of the tenants anywhere reduced to [...] inertness? Is not the
evidence all the other way? The policy of the Government has not weakened but
strengthened the National demand for Home Rule.

Unfortunately for Parnell, it seemed that Ireland would have to drop the
great leader who had achieved so much for his country but had fallen too deep to
continue at its head. The press, in particular, would be the instrument to make or
break him, he who had built his reputation upon the printed word.

The most ferocious period of conflict occurred between the Committee
Room 15 debates in December 1890 and Parnell’s death in October 1891. There
were two critical focuses of the struggle: the nationalist press and by-elections. The
party organ, United Ireland, was seized by Parnell after fisticuffs at its offices on
10 December. The anti-Parnellites retaliated publishing the Insuppressible
(December 1890-January 1891) and, later, the National Press (from March 1891).
At the end of July 1891 the proprietor of the influential Freeman’s Journal,
Edmund Dwyer Gray, defected to the anti-Parnellites, carrying the support of his
paper with him. The press was of course, the chief medium by which the issues
and, much more important, the rhetoric of the contest were conveyed. The
editorials and speeches of T. M. Healy plumbed new depths of verbal violence at
this time. Complementing this struggle for the press, and providing a focus for
journalistic aggression, were the three by-election contests that coincided with the
last desperate months of Parnell’s life. These were a crucial test of the mood of the
country, and from the beginning it was clear that the anti-Parnellites had the upper
hand. At Kilkenny North (22 December 1890), Sligo North (2 April), and Carlow
(8 July), anti-Parnellite majorities were recorded. The tightest contest was fought
in Sligo, and even here the Parnellite candidate, Valentine Dillon, lost by 768 votes
in a total poll of 5,754. When Parnell died, on 6 October, his vacant seat, Cork
City, fell to an opponent, Martin Flavin. Only on 23 December 1891 was the first

348 CE 11 July 1891.American Opinion of the Carlow Election.New York, Thursday.The result of
the Carlow election is regarded as making the end of Mr.Parnell’s career. The newspapers all take
this view, some saying it will be impossible for the Home Rule leaders to come to America again to
raise the campaign funds, since not even the partisans of Mr.Parnell will contend henceforth that he
is entitled to share them.
of the Parnellites returned to the Commons after a by-election: this was John Redmond who defeated Michael Davitt in the struggle for Waterford City.\footnote{\textit{Jackson}, pp.76ff.}

Responsible also for the fall of Parnell was the Catholic hierarchy who felt they could no longer put their trust in a political representative who held such low morals.

\begin{flushleft}
CE 3 July 1891
Editorial
The resolution adopted by the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, in which an appeal is made to Irish Catholics on religious and moral grounds to repudiate the leadership of Mr. Parnell, is one which no political party, and certainly, not the party immediately affected, can ignore. At the general meeting of the hierarchy at Maynooth, on the 25th June, the Bishops adopted a declaration in all essentials identical with that which they put before the country in November last when the Parnell scandal was in its first and most offensive, because most unexpected, stage of development. The Bishops, of course, see no reason for altering their opinion on the subject of Parnell’s claim to the leadership of the people of this country. The Irish hierarchy was, according to the Parnellite assertion, carried away by panic and by the dictation of an English statesman in November; but now that there has been time for the panic to pass away, now after seven long months have passed, during which there has been amplest opportunity for the careful and conscientious examination of Mr. Parnell’s position and pretension, here are the Bishops of the Irish Church repeating and confirming their former announcement. […] It is a weighty declaration by those whose authority Catholics, at all events, will not lightly dispute or make little of. […] Scarcely a week passes that Mr. Parnell or some leading supporter of his does not attempt to convict a bishop or an archbishop of some particularly mean and untrustworthy offence against honour and truth. But are the Irish people, are the flocks of those pious and venerable and devoted pastors likely to be led far astray by their statements of Mr. Parnell and Mr. Harrington, and others like them? […] There is, we are sure, no Catholic worthy of the name, no matter how they may have been misguided hitherto by the delusive lights of Parnellism, that will not carefully and respectfully heed the warning addressed by the Bishops to their people, and that will not honestly and frankly and obediently recognise his duty as a Catholic and patriotic Irishman.\footnote{CE 4 July 1891.Editorial. The Press Association special correspondent states that the Nationalists did not hold meetings yesterday; but Mr. Parnell continued his tour in the constituency by visiting Fenagh and Ballon. At the former place he was well received, and, replying to an address from the laboureres, said he would propose to add to the Irish Local Government Bill, which would be introduced next session, a provision for works of public improvement. Ballon was unanimously hostile, and the inhabitants refused to listen to Mr. Parnell, who was driven out of the town with shouts of execrations and beating of kettles.}

And Parnell’s reaction duly followed:

CE 30 July 1891
Papers like the Constitution greedily snatch at Parnellite attacks on the Catholic Bishops and clergy of Ireland. Yesterday’s issue of our Conservative and Parnellite contemporary quotes, of course, without the comment which
accompanied it, an extract from a leader in the Belfast Morning News, which was found in the National Press. The editor of the Belfast journal, in a vein of that peculiar piety which belongs to his persuasion, makes use of the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican. The ecclesiastics who denounce adultery in Mr. Parnell are compared to the Pharisee, while the ex-leader is held up as a character like that of the Publican. We do not think we need defend the hierarchy and clergy of Ireland by proving that it is not hypocrisy on their part to condemn the vilest form of immorality. But we might ask the writer in what respect Mr. Parnell is like the modest penitent who “stood afar off.” “God be merciful to me a sinner,” was the cry of the Publican. What is Mr. Parnell’s cry? Where is his repentance? Where is there even acknowledgment that his reeking offence was a sin? Mr. Parnell might recall the parable to our recollection in a different sense from that of the morning News, for he seems to have sinned worse than the Publican, and to be endowed with a more brazen pride than the Pharisee.

Following his untimely death, the press allowed his memory to live on un tarnished:

CE 7 October 1893
The Parnell Anniversary. Demonstration in the City.

Yesterday, being the second anniversary of the death of Mr. Parnell, was observed in a befitting manner by the Parnellites of the city. The ivy leaf was pretty generally worn by the followers and admirers of the late leader throughout the day, while in the evening there was a procession of considerable proportions. The various Parnellite clubs in the city exhibited signs of mourning, the Independent National Club, South Mall, being deeply draped. In one of the windows a likeness of Mr. Parnell was shown. From the parapet of the roof was hung a large mourning board, bearing the last words of the deceased leader, “Give my love to my colleagues and to the Irish people,” while another bore the words, “Done to death Oct 6, ‘91”. [...] Nine city bands took part in the demonstration, by each of which sacred music was played [...]. The Mayor was received with loud cheers. In the course of his address, he said they were assembled on a solemn occasion to celebrate the second anniversary of the death of the greatest man that Ireland had produced in all time. Ivy Day had been celebrated, not alone in Cork, but all over Ireland, and it would continue to be celebrated through all time [...].

CE 5 October 1897.Editorial.Yesterday was the sixth anniversary of the death of the greatest of Irish leaders, but it was not marked by any special observance through the country, the public demonstration of honour being as usual reserved for Sunday next. On grounds which seem open for serious objection, it has been again decided that the principal demonstration shall take place in Dublin. [...] Dublin had not been always remarkable for its national spirit, nor for its devotion to Parnell during the more critical periods of his memorable and most arduous struggle. For many years it had held aloof and was rather inclined to disregard the audacious politician, new to the Irish political world, who dared to attack and pull down institutions to which Dublin had been by tradition and by solid pecuniary interests very closely associated. But in Mr. Parnell’s decline and fall, [...] Dublin stood by him with a constancy quite remarkable. [...] But Parnellites and Nationalists of every class, with distinction, take umbrage, and not unreasonably, at an arrangement by which provincial cities, Cork, Limerick and Waterford, are obliged to permanently take a back seat.
But in which direction was the Home Rule movement progressing? According to Alvin Jackson, the death of the leader and the party gave way to a new age of nationalism, markedly separatist in nature.

The role of the Parnell split and of the 1893 failure was evidently as profound within Irish nationalist politics as within British Liberalism, though the area remains contentious. The death of Parnell and the weakness of the Irish constitutional forces in 1893 were seen by W. B. Yeats as creating the space for a new nationalism, more cultural orientation and less committed to the old parliamentary nostrum. And, indeed, at least on the surface, there is much to commend this argument. The Parnell split opened up divisions within the Home Rule party which weakened its effectiveness, even after the supposed reunification of the warring elements in 1900. These divisions coincided with a flowering of cultural nationalism and separatist conviction, as evidenced by the foundation of the Gaelic League (in 1893), the Irish Literary Theatre (1899), the Abbey Theatre (1904) and Sinn Féin (1907). In this Yeatsian interpretation, there was a crisp dichotomy between the old and new nationalisms, with the latter inevitably superseding the former. The Irish revolution, in this and other readings, flowed automatically from the deep-seated limitations of the Home Rule movement. The integrity of this thesis will be evaluated in what follows; but it should be said immediately that a new generation of historians had provided a subtler picture of the Home Rule movement in these years, and a rather more upbeat account of its effectiveness. Scholars such as Patrick Maume and Senia Paseta have outlined a Home Rule movement that was simultaneously more radical than has hitherto been appreciated, and more deeply rooted in key sectors of Irish society. Still, the case for division and weakness is hard to ignore. The war between the Parnellites (led by John Redmond) and their opponents (led ostensibly by Justin McCarthy, but

---

352 CE 31 October 1893. The Home Rule Cause. Letter from Mr. T.P. O’Connor. The Policy of the Redminites. (Reuter telegram) New York Monday. The newspapers of to-day publish a letter from Mr. T.P.O’Connor, M.P., in reference to the declaration of Mr. John Redmond, M.P., regarding the attitude of Parnellites towards Mr. Gladstone’s Government. “My view,” says Mr. O’Connor, “as to the attitude the Irish Party should take up to the Parnellites has notoriously been that by patience, moderation, and the avoidance of injudicious and offensive epithets. We should be free to prove to their misguided judgment that the apprehensions they had been taught with regard to us were unfounded. The Parnellites, as a body, have supported the Government and the Home Rule Bill loyally throughout the last session of Parliament. They made mistakes, they did wrong things – all that I admit – but considering their difficulties their record on the whole was good. But what is the meaning of this latest cry? […] The fundamental point to be remembered about Home Rule is that it has to pass into law by a majority of British, as well as of Irish, votes. […] What, then, every practical Irish politician has to consider is, what are the methods and the measures by which we can get a majority of British votes for the Liberal Party at the next General Election? Every vote given for the Liberal Party would be given for Home Rule. Now the one means by which we can get Liberal votes is to pass Liberal legislation, and if anybody has any doubts upon it he has only to study the tactics of Tories and unionists. There is no political party that is not agreed in the opinion that if this Ministry has to go to the country without British Legislation their chance of getting a majority is destroyed. What, then, is Mr. Redmond asking? Why, it is that a liberal Government should do the very thing which Liberals and Tories alike believe would lead to their destructive defeat at the next general election. He asks that Irish questions should be dealt with, for that is what his demand comes to, and he asks for a dissolution next year. In other owrds, he asks the Liberal Ministry to tgo to the country without those British measures which would form their one chance of getting a majority. A big Tory majority at the next election would mean, perhaps, destruction of the Home Rule cause in our generation. This, it appears to me, is where Mr. Redmond’s policy is leading us.
with John Dillon, T. M. Healy and William O’ Brien as the key players) did not end with the Uncrowned King’s death in October 1891, or with the comparatively poor showing of Parnell’s supporters at the general elections of 1892 and 1895. Indeed, though the anti-Parnellites secured seventy-one seats in 1892, and their opponents only nine, the extent of the victory was greatly magnified by the first-past-the-post electoral system. The Parnellites garnered around one-third of the nationalist vote, and were thus a much more serious political force than their parliamentary strength suggested. And even with only nine seats, the Parnellites had both outstripped the expectations of their enemies and remained ‘politically viable.’

Gladstone continued to remain unmoved by Ulster Unionism and did not undertake to address the issue of opposition to Home Rule, concentrated in the north of Ireland. This may have been due to the diffuse nature of unionism in Ireland and therefore it is impossible to tell how partition at this point might have facilitated a settlement.

CE 25 October 1893
The Orangeman’s Parliament
Belfast Tuesday. The Ulster Parliament assembled in Ulster hall, Belfast, this morning. The Parliament consists of six hundred, who were elected a few months ago by the Unionists for the purpose of organising resistance to Home Rule. Great interest was taken in the assembly by the citizens and the progress of the members through the streets to the hall was watched by a considerable number of people. About five hundred members answered to their names, and in addition to these all the Unionist members of Parliament for Ulster were present, together with the duke of Abercorn and the Marquis of Londonderry. [...] The National Anthem was then sung with great enthusiasm, and the Duke of Abercorn on taking the chair received a grand ovation.

The Irish Members of Parliament were at this time primarily rearranging their principles and allegiances.

353 Jackson, p.86. Cf. also CE 11 October 1893. The Country and the Irish party. Meeting At Bantry. Speech of Mr. Gilhooly, M.P. [...] The Chairman, who was received with loud applause, said he was very pleased to again meet old friends, and to be in a position to congratulate them on the success which attended the National cause since he addressed them some months ago (cheers). Notwithstanding the action of the Lords the cause of Home Rule was safe, and it only required continued exertions, perseverance, and above all, unity on the part of the Irish people to have self-government for Ireland become an accomplished fact. Mr. Gladstone (cheers) and the Liberal party of Great Britain were pledged to hand over to the representatives of the Irish people the government of Ireland. He (chairman) feared people who grumbled at the delay in the passing of this great measure of autonomy did not realise the importance of it and the great boon it will be to this country (cheers). They have had to wait for 700 years, and surely two or three years will not be too much to possess their souls in patience. Twenty years ago no persons dreamt that such a generous measure of self-government would pass through the British House of Commons; but the fight was not yet over. The organisation throughout the country must be revised; the people must be up and doing and continue to fight until their National Parliament would be restored to them (cheers).

354 Jackson, p.83.
CE 8 July 1895

Editorial

Last night the Redmondite candidates and their supporters held a public meeting. In introducing the speakers, the Mayor laid stress on the point that he and those with him were the supporters and upholders of the policy inaugurated by Charles Stewart Parnell. If his Worship’s assertions were correct, we would be the last to oppose their candidature. Unfortunately for the Mayor his claims are utterly baseless. Mr. John Redmond and his followers are not the men who are carrying out the National policy inaugurated by Mr. Parnell. On the contrary, in one especial feature they have gone directly contrary to the plan of campaign that Mr. Parnell laid down. “Constant and vigilant” was a guiding motto of his, but these men have been neither. During the last two years of the coercion regime and during the whole duration of the late Home Rule Government Mr. John Redmond and his followers have been most conspicuous in Parliament by their absence. That was not the conduct that Mr. Parnell prescribed for his followers. During his leadership of a united Irish Party the man who dared to absent himself from the House of Commons while Parliament was in session without ample cause and justification was made keenly aware of the Chief’s displeasure. Under Mr. Redmond’s sway he and his few followers, though claiming to be Ireland’s watchdogs in a British House of Commons, were found to be most consistent absentee of all those deputed by popular voices to legislate at Westminster. For nineteen-twentieths of the Parliamentary sitting their constituents were practically disenfranchised. Was that carrying out Mr. Parnell’s policy? When they did go there what did they do for Ireland? They harassed and obstructed a friendly Government; they leagued with Orangemen and Coercionists; they did what in them lay to help Balfour and Salisbury to gain a further lease of power and inaugurate a fresh reign of coercion and repression. The Landlord Party were their allies, and they hail with jubilation the possibility of a Coercionist success at the General Election that is upon us. Is that the policy of Parnell? Did he ever advocate the abandonment of a Home Rule Government, did he ever urge callousness towards the settlement of the land question or support of and sympathy with coercion? Yet this is what the Redmondites claim to-day to be the policy Mr. Parnell inculcated. Under Mr. Parnell’s leadership the Cork Constitution was the bitter foe of the Irish Party. To-day it is the staunch supporter of Mr. Redmond and his friends. Under Mr. Parnell the local Tories refrained from contesting Cork because they were afraid of certain and overwhelming defeat. To-day, with Mr. Redmond usurping Mr. Parnell’s place, they do not bring forth any candidates of their own, because they are convinced that Mr. Redmond and his followers, wittingly or unwittingly, will do as much as their own men could for Landlordism and Coercion and against Home Rule. Cork Nationalists should ponder these things. Let them ask themselves why the Constitution is so anxious that Mr. Redmond’s friends should be successful, and there can be little doubt as to how true Nationalists will record their votes at the coming election.\footnote{CE 8 April 1897. The Anti-Parnellite Party. London, Wednesday. The Anti-Parnellite Party met to-day at the House of Commons, under the presidency of Mr. Dillon, and resolved to republish Mr. Blake’s speech on Irish Taxation, with a view to its circulation in Ireland and the Colonies. The Parnellite Party. Circular from Mr. Redmond. Convention Summoned. The following letter from Mr. John Redmond has been sent to the supporters in Ireland of the Parnellite Party. April, ’97, Dear Sir – I have been requested by my Parliamentary colleagues to call a conference of our leading friends throughout Ireland to consider the position and prospects of the Parnellite Party. […] J. E. Redmond.}
Until finally, a re-union of the antagonists was made possible, if not entirely satisfactory for all,

CE 18 May 1897
The Irish National Party. Important Resolutions.
London, Monday
The Press Association learns that at a meeting of the Irish Parliamentary Party this afternoon, the following resolution was passed - “That we renew the expression of our conviction that the re-union of the National forces in Ireland is vital and essential to the success of the National cause. That we are ready to enter into such a re-union pledged against any attempt to renew recrimination as to past differences or to seek either personal or sectional triumph. […] Mr. Healy, who had not been present at the meeting, said he […] attached no value to it, regarding it as the merest hypocrisy and as an attempt to throw dust in the eyes of the public. The first essential to any attempt at reunion was the retirement of Mr. Dillon from his present position. He considered Mr. Dillon had blundered in every step he had taken since he was put into the position of chairman, and that from a Parliamentary point of view he was no credit to the Party.

Be that as it may, the celebration of the Queen’s Jubilee was a sad and quiet affair in Ireland, thereby presenting publicly a picture of a more or less politically united front in the face of foreign rule.

CE 18 May 1897
The Diamond Jubilee
Action of the Dublin Corporation.
Dublin, Monday
A specially convened meeting of the Dublin Municipal Council was held today for the purpose of considering a motion to express loyal feelings to the Queen on the occasion of her Diamond Jubilee. Sir Henry Cochrane moved that an address be presented to her Majesty by the Corporation, congratulating her upon having obtained to the sixtieth year of her reign. He said that the resolution had absolutely no political or party significance, and by accepting it no member of council could be considered as abating his political or party principles. The Queen had nothing to do with politics, nor was she responsible for the initiation of legislation […]

CE 23 June 1897
Jubilee Day in Cork
The celebration in the city of the Record Reign was more scanty and less sympathetic than was anticipated. The banks and the Stock Exchange did their utmost to make Jubilee Day a holiday, and their efforts were seconded by many business firms, which ceased work for the occasion. But the commemorative display was singularly small and poor, and as a holiday Jubilee Day was a failure.

---

356 Jackson, p.87: ‘Dillon, in contrast, was perhaps more Parnellite than Parnell himself; he was certainly a more rigid and conventional political thinker than Parnell. Dillon sought to maintain a centralised party machine on the model of the National League; and he remained loyal, too, to the Liberal alliance that Parnell had formulated. While Dillon sought to keep the Catholic Church at arms length from his political machinery, Healy actively cultivated clerical ties, and his localised movement would, almost by definition, have been strongly influenced by the parish clergy.’
CE 23 June 1897

Remarkable Display in Skibbereen

Her Britannic Majesty’s Diamond Jubilee was celebrated here last evening in the most unique and extraordinary manner. About half past five word was sent to one of the local undertakers, that a horse was wanted at the workhouse. The order was promptly complied with, and when it had reached the outskirts of the town on the way to the workhouse it halted. Above the black mourning plumes was raised a large shield; and on a green ground fringed with deep mourning were emblazoned the words “England rejoices – Ireland mourns. […] Notice, our loyalty is to Ireland, we do not think it necessary to parade our loyalty to England to-day. Famine, hanging, shooting, transportation, coercion, emigration, desolation, are ours.”

Black Flags in Limerick

(Special telegram)
Limerick, Tuesday

The extreme Nationalists in this city made a determined effort overnight to give effect to their views over the continued imprisonment of the Irish political prisoners. They covered the O’Connell, Fitzgibbon and Sarsfield monuments during the night with black drapery, put black flags in the residences of some Unionists and on the Town Hall, and also put a black flag on a flagstaff in the Shannon, close to the Castle Barracks, where a detachment of the Royal Irish Regiment is quartered.

In direct contrast, a far greater enthusiasm to celebrate was observed at the ’98 centenary in the New Year of 1898:

CE 1 January 1898

’98 Centenary


The bells of the city churches had just begun to chime in the New Year of 1898 simultaneously with the assemblage of the populace to do honour to the memory of the men who participated in the movement of 1798. It is nothing exceeding the bold and untarnished truth to say that the demonstration was one unrivalled in the living history of our city. In their thousands the people assembled, regardless of latter day disensions, and it appeared to the observer that each of the many – aye, the many thousands – was vying with the other to show his appreciations of the glorious work for Ireland by the men long since with gone to their repose. The same spirit animated all – magnificent demonstrations of honour to the memory of the ’98 Martyrs was the result. […] As the demonstration passed the ”Examiner Office” in front of which burned a gas device bearing the motto “Remember ’98”, great enthusiasm was manifested.

To the fore at the close of the nineteenth century was the Boer War, with Irishmen in the British army fighting Irish volunteers recruited to support the
Boers, a recurrent feature in a country not yet in possession of an army of its own, one of many factors characterising a sovereign country.

CE 3 October 1899
United Irish League in Limerick. The Transvaal Crisis.
Limerick, Wednesday night.
At a meeting of the Limerick Branch of the United Irish League to-night, Alderman O’Mara said it was a deplorable calamity that Ireland was not united presently in face of the Boer war. If such an event had occurred nine years ago they would have got for Ireland anything they desired. England had gone into a fearful difficulty from which she might not escape successfully, and he spoke the sentiments of every Nationalist Irishman in saying that he hoped the Boers would succeed and England be taught a lesson she would long remember. He did not wish misfortune to anyone, but if there was going to be another Majuba Hill, he for one would not be sorry. Mr. John Crowe said that if the spirit of their forefathers prevailed they would have men in Ireland to back up the Boers. He regretted that Irish soldiers were now on the frontier to oppose the Boers. A resolution was adopted sympathising with the Boers in the manly stand they have taken, as stated, against England.

CE 9 June 1900
The Present Position of the Irish Question
(By John E. Redmond, M.P., in the June “Forum”).
In another way, also, the iniquitous Boer war has served Ireland. It has afforded to English statesmanship a striking object-lesson of the disastrous effects of the past misgovernment of Ireland. Of the policy which led to the war there are many divergent views throughout the British Empire; but once the Empire had become committed to the war, there was an almost unanimous response from all parts of the world from all the children of that Empire to the call to arms. From Australia and Canada willing aid came to the empire in its difficulty and its peril. From one land alone in all that world-wide Empire there was no friendly response, but on the contrary, bitter and uncompromising hostility: and that land was Ireland. From wherever free representative institutions had been conceded to the people, from wherever the people were permitted to govern themselves, came expressions of loyalty; and it was only from the one land which is still denied its freedom that England looked in vain for good will and assistance. This, I feel sure, has sunk into the public mind of England. It has been emphasised in a truly startling manner by the history of the war. On the field of battle England has in the end been obliged to rely upon the genius and valour of the generals and the soldiers who are the sons of that land which is still vainly clamouring for its rights. The recent visit of the Queen to Ireland is a proof of what I say; and more than likely has served to intensify the feeling which undoubtedly exists in England at this moment – that Ireland had been treated unjustly and that the empire itself has suffered severely in its prestige and its power by the injustice. The Queen returns, or perhaps I should say she ought to have returned, from Ireland convinced that if Ireland is worth keeping it is worth conciliating and must be conciliated. […] Whatever party is returned to power, the reunited Irish members, in all human probability, will be

357 CE 9 October 1899. Irishmen fight for the Boers. Johannesburg, Friday. A detachment of 150 Irishmen, who are about to fight for the Boers, left to-night for Natal border. Nearly all the mines have ceased working. – Reuter.
masters of the situation. The educational reform of which I have been speaking, a further reform of the land question, the redress of the financial injustice under which we suffer, Home Rule itself, are all, in my opinion, well within our grasp, if we can preserve our ranks unbroken and can secure the support and confidence of our fellow-countrymen abroad for a few short years more.

Finally, a note upon the technological progress in the printing world, stressing once again the importance of the print media in the country and the direct relation of paper sales to the rise in literacy and political awareness:

CE 5 October 1897
The Progress of the Press
The Cork Examiner

The following, which is marked by perhaps a too kindly appreciation of the conductors of the “Examiner,” and our efforts to keep pace with the advance of modern journalism, appears in the “West Cork Eagle.”

“Of all the strides progress has made in latter years, none have been more important than the achievements in the art of printing, particularly in the production of newspapers. [...] this great stride is, it might be said, altogether due to the abolition of the duty that was levied on paper up to the middle of the present century. The principal agitator against the paper duty, or, what it was then termed, the “tax on knowledge,” was Lord Brougham, who, although the astutest of statesmen, could hardly have foreseen the far-reaching effects of the great reform he advocated so successfully. [...] There was a tax of one shilling and sixpence on every advertisement inserted, and a compulsory penny stamp on every paper printed. [...] Labouring under such disadvantages, young people of the present generation can hardly realize the backward state of the printing industry and the newspaper Press is what might be almost termed the dark ages. Indeed many of the journals of even fifty years ago, are preserved in our museums as curiosities, and curiosities they are when placed side by side with our mammoth sheets of to-day, laden as they are with news only a few hours old from all parts of the habitable globe. In fact, in olden times none but the wealthy could indulge in newspaper reading, for they were published in limited numbers, and at a cost varying from 6d to 1s, while the fall to 4d was considered a great boon. In those days men we now call newsagents actually made a living investing in newspapers and hiring them out at a penny – once twopence – a read. [...] Freedom of the Press meant liberty to the human race, and that material progress which pure freedom only can achieve, for where real liberty does not exist progress is utterly impossible. [The Press] created a necessity for the electric wire to flash news from hemisphere to hemisphere, with a rapidity that enables journals of to-day to give to the reader each morning intelligences of what takes place at the farthest part of the earth. [...] Take for instance, by way of illustration, one of the leading local prints – the Cork Examiner. In days of heavy taxation it was started by Mr. John Francis Maguire, a name still revered in Ireland. Though surrounded with the difficulties referred to, he fought his way upwards and onwards. The price per copy of the first issues of the “Examiner” was, we believe, 1d, and it was printed on what is still known as the Albion hand press, which only produced small sheets at the rate of 200 copies per hour. [...] Next followed the steam engine, then the two-feeder machine, and now, within a week or a fortnight, the “Examiner” will be sent out to its readers under changed circumstances, which at once speak of the marvellous progress both
the Press and science have made within the last fifty years. There are at this moment erected and working in the office no less than 10 linotypers producing reading matter at the rate of ten columns an hour, and there are being erected rotary printing machines, each to produce 12,000 beautifully printed sheets per hour — that is to say, in a few more days the “Examiner” will be produced by means of electroplates and fast machines, at a rate of 24,000 copies every sixty minutes. […] But this notice would not be complete were we to omit alluding to the intellectual power that has from the commencement of its career distinguished this popular journal. Founded by such an able man as John Francis Maguire, its success was assured, although it had to contend with many difficulties, and passed through many trials not known to the journals of to-day. In its earlier career there were also associated with its editorial staff such brilliant writers as Mr. Justin MacCarthy, who, though not yet an aged man, has attained to a high position in the literary world, while his connection with the “London Daily News,” as leader writer, places him also in the foremost ranks of journalism. […] And now, an for a number of years, the paper has been under the sole control of Mr. Thomas Crosbie, of whom it is but the merest truism to say that he is one of the ablest journalists in this country, and who can claim the high distinction of having been chosen for one year to the Presidency of the Journalistic Association of Great Britain, being the only Irish journalist who has been so honoured. […] The Examiner’s impartiality on all broad issues affecting the material prosperity of Ireland — outside the political creed it upholds — is well known. Indeed, it is not too much to say, that this enterprising paper is not only a leading organ of public opinion, but is certain to hold a still more prominent place in the destiny of Ireland.
3. Ireland and the Austrian Empire in the early 20th Century

In the years leading up to the Great War, Ireland was mostly preoccupied with Home Rule and the language question, and though both issues were regularly debated, no satisfactory outcome was obtained. The Austrian Empire, meanwhile, had to contend with similar issues, as whether ‘language of state’ nor ‘language of convenience’ could entirely solve the multilingual dilemma and, regarding federalism, the only achievement of consequence here was the Moravian Compromise of 1905. Common to both was also the Catholic Church in its role in politics, varying between the democratic and the dominant, depending on one’s national allegiance within the British as within the Austrian Empire. Finally, the growth of militarism both on the Continent as in the British Isles gave further definition to evolving nationalist policies. These points naturally intertwine and influence each other, and it is sometimes difficult to imagine how their individual development and impact on nationalism might have been hastened or retarded with or without the other key elements. It is in keeping with the principles of this study to analyse also the roots and spread of stereotypes. In fact, John Redmond, leader of the Irish Parliamentary Party, in a preface to a publication on Home Rule,\(^1\) offers the most compact assessment of Irish problems linked to the Continental conundrum in the years prior to a world war.

It has always been my conviction that one of the chief causes of the difficulty of persuading the British people of the justice and expediency of conceding a full measure of National autonomy to Ireland was to be found in the deep and almost universal ignorance in Great Britain regarding Irish affairs present and past—an ignorance which has enabled every unscrupulous opponent of Irish demands to appeal with more or less success to inherited and anti-Irish prejudice as his chief bulwark against reform. […] The cause of struggling nationality on the Continent of Europe, in Italy, in Hungary, in Poland, in the Slav provinces, has in each case gained sympathy in Great Britain, but the cause of Irish nationality has received far other treatment. That charity should begin at home may be a counsel of perfection, but in point of fact one rarely sees it applied. Sympathy for the poor relation at one's door is a rare thing indeed…. from Shakespeare's references to the “rough, uncivil kerns of Ireland” down to the contemptuous sneers of Charles Kingsley, that most English of all writers in the language, [provides], as I think, a sure index to the feelings of his contemporaries and serves to illustrate the inveterate sentiment of hostility, flavoured with contempt, which, as Mr. Gladstone once said, has from time immemorial formed the basis of English tradition, and in regard to which the locus classicus was the

\(^1\) Michael McDonnell, Ireland and the Home Rule Movement, with a preface by John Redmond, M.P. (Dublin, 1908).
statement of his great opponent, Lord Salisbury, that as to Home Rule the Irish were not fit for it, for, he went on to say, “nations like the Hottentots, and even the Hindoos, are incapable of self-government.”

This dilemma could, therefore, only be solved by incorporating the Irish identity into the British, or rather the securely established English identity, by means of education, in particular eradicating native language and history and substituting them with the culture of the conquerors.

Men like Archbishop Whately, in the middle of the nineteenth century, whose ambition it was to see what they called the consolidation of Great Britain and Ireland effected, were strongly in favour of the proposal, and its rejection on so many occasions has been doubtless due to the fact that to mix and confound the administration of Ireland with that of Great Britain would necessitate the abandonment of the extreme centralisation of Irish Government, and those who were most anxious, as the phrase went, to make Cork like York were the very people who were most opposed to any abdication of Executive powers which an assimilation of methods of government would have inevitably brought in its train. […] The English Archbishop and the Scottish Presbyterian, in whom power was in this way placed, set themselves by their regulations to effect the Anglicising of the Irish children in the schools of the country.¹ The use of the English language was enforced for the education of children, thousands of whom spoke Gaelic, and though this may possibly be justified on grounds of its greater use in the transactions of everyday life, the same cannot be said of the manner in which the history books employed were of a kind in which the subjection of Ireland by Elizabeth, James I., and William of Orange were extolled, as was also the defection from Rome of England in the sixteenth century. […] From the reading-books as first published were expunged such verses as Campbell's “Downfall of Roland” and Scott's “Breathes There a Man with a Soul so Dead,” owing to their tendency, one must suppose, to suggest emotions other than those which it was deemed fitting to inculcate, and in their place was inserted a verse from the Archbishop's own pen which is familiar to most Irishmen, but which is, I find, unknown to most Englishmen: — “I thank the goodness and the grace which on my birth have smiled, And made me in these Christian days a happy English child.”³

¹ McDonnell, preface: ‘Whately's policy was avowedly to Anglicise the children in the schools, to effect the “consolidation,” as he called it, of Great Britain and Ireland, and in a reading book produced under his auspices occur the following lines, written with that aim in view:—“On the east of Ireland is England, where the Queen lives. Many people who live in Ireland were born in England, and we speak the same language, and are called one nation.”

² McDonnell, preface: ‘To appreciate fully the irony of the divergence between the sentiments expressed and the real facts, one must remember that these lines were written at a time when land reform and church disestablishment were regarded by those in authority as the proposals of unspeakable demagogues. […] The trivial fact that the English National Anthem was drowned at the degree day of the Royal University a few years ago by the fact that the students insisted on singing “God Save Ireland” at the end of a ceremony which even in the decorous surroundings of the Sheldonian and the Senate House is marked by a large amount of disrespectful licence, nevertheless provided the Times and the Unionist Press in general, for several days with a text upon which they hung their leading articles in the exploitation of their favourite theme, but no attention has been drawn in these quarters to the periodical threat of Orange exponents of a contingent loyalty to “throw the Crown into the Boyne” as a protest against the various assaults which have been made upon their prerogative by Parliament, and no mention was made in the English Press of the fact that
Pioneers in the Gaelic League were able to snatch a spark from the dying embers and breath some life back into the native tongue and culture.

CE 15 November 1905

**Gaelic League**

Important Resolutions. (From Our Correspondent).

Dublin, Wednesday. At the November meeting [...] the following resolution was adopted – “That we draw the attention of the country to the recently issued notice of the Commissioners of National Education, from which it appears that the Commissioners, whilst making mathematics a compulsory subject in National Schools, and strongly recommending cookery and domestic economy, have refused to meet the national demand for the restoration of the special fees for Irish, or the provision of reasonable facilities in its teaching within ordinary school hours.“ A resolution was also passed protesting against the division of the Exhibitions offered by the Intermediate Board in the modern literary course into two classes, in one of which Irish is not recognised as a subject. A resolution was adopted in reference to the question of scholarships, and the hope was expressed that all friends of the language will in future, when founding scholarships, even in such subjects as classics and mathematics, make a simple qualifying examination in Irish obligatory before the scholarship is awarded. Hope was also expressed that these scholarships would be open to girls, it being of the utmost importance that Irish should be taught as widely as possible in secondary schools for girls throughout the country. In another resolution public Boards throughout Ireland were requested to make Irish a subject of qualification for appointments under their control. It was decided that in future any organiser or district teacher who has not put in a course at one of the Irish Training Colleges be required to do so within twelve months after appointment.

Continental examples of successful linguistic resurrections abounded, though perhaps the comparison is insufficient considering these instances of restored native patois were merely a case of unearthing languages buried by class and not cultural warfare.

The loss of her language by Ireland was, politically, the worst calamity which could have befallen her, for it lent colour to the otherwise unsupported assertion that she was a mere geographical expression in no way differing from the adjoining island. The manner in which the revival of the Irish tongue has been taken up by the whole country with, literally, the support of peasant and peer is one of the most remarkable phenomena of modern Irish life. That it has any direct 4 McDonnell, preface: ‘The ridiculous situation which was allowed by successive Governments to persist in the Gaelic-speaking districts of the West until a few years ago, in which teachers were
political significance is untrue, for the aim of its pioneers in the **Gaelic League** has been fulfilled, and it remains strictly non-sectarian and non-political. From the purely utilitarian point of view, no doubt a polytechnic could provide a dozen subjects in which a more profitable return could be made for the money and time invested than does the study of Gaelic, but book-keeping or shorthand would not have roused the enthusiasm which this revival of a half dead language has evoked and which is incidentally an educative movement in that the learning of a new language is of a direct value as a mental training, while as a social organisation it has done more in inculcating a public spirit and a proper pride than could otherwise possibly have been achieved. **The revival of the Czech language** when almost dead, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and the eminent success of bi-lingualism in Flanders, are hopeful signs for the preservation of a National characteristic, the disappearance of which would have been welcomed only by those who hold that Ireland as a nationality has no existence apart from Great Britain, and the preservation of which will produce the mental alertness characteristic of a bi-lingual people.

On the nature of contemporary emigration, Redmond recalls the fate of the “Wild Geese,” who, forced to leave their native country, contributed manifold to the military prestige of their adopted countries:

The rate war of the steamship companies, which reduced the cost of passage across the Atlantic in 1904, caused the emigration returns to rise from 45,000 to 58,000 in a single year, and at the same time there were employed in Ireland two hundred emigration agents of one company alone—the Cunard—each of whom received six shillings a head for each banished Irishman and Irishwoman whom he got safely out of the country. It is easy for the Irishman to wax eloquent about the exiles who, from the time when O'Neil and O'Donnell weighed anchor in Lough Swilly at the very beginning of the seventeenth century, sailed from their country to seek their fortunes abroad in Church or State or camp, since proscription deprived them of the *carriere ouverte aux talents* at home. The history of the “wild geese” in the service of France, Spain, Italy, **Austria**, Prussia, and of Russia; of the Irishmen who were respectively the first Quartermaster-General of the United States Army and the first Commodore of the United States Navy, or of the **seven Irish Field Marshals of Austria**, or of those who served as Viceroyos to Chilli, Peru, and Mexico, is the story of the citizens of no mean city. Catholic Europe is flecked with the white graves of the Irish exiles of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; from Rome to Valladolid, from Douai to **Prague**, from Salamanca to Louvain, and appointed to the schools without any knowledge of the only language spoken by the children whom they purported to educate, is well illustrated by the statement on the part of one of their number to the effect that it took two years to extirpate, to “wring” the Irish speech out of the children and replace it, one must suppose, by English, and this process, it must be remembered, was gone through with the children of a peasantry whom a distinguished French publicist—M.L. Paul-Dubois—has described as perhaps the most intellectual in Europe. It is characteristic of English government that, whereas from 1878 onwards Irish figured in the programme of the National Board, and Government grants were made for proficiency therein as in other subjects, one of the last acts of the late Government was to withdraw these grants for the teaching of Irish. So long as there was no large number of people anxious to learn Gaelic in Ireland, Government gave help towards its study, but the very moment in which, with the rise of the Gaelic League, the number learning the language began to increase, Government put its foot down and proceeded to discourage it by a withdrawal of grants.
from Tournai to Paris you will find their bones. But the pathos of this is, to my mind, as nothing compared with the pathos of what is occurring now. For one thing, it was only men in those days that went in any large numbers, while to-day it is both men and women. From the point of view of England the result has been in no small degree serious. Of the four million people who have emigrated since the great tidal wave began with the famine, nearly ninety per cent. have gone, not to British Colonies, but to the United States. Of the fifty thousand who emigrated in 1905 more than forty-four thousand went to the North-American Republic.  

As regards the attitude of the Ascendancy on Home Rule, Redmond makes use of the comments of foreign observers on the Irish question to support his own belief in the gradual settlement of affairs on a purely national level, where self-interest is best served by self-government:

The need for exceptional and separate legislation in Ireland has been admitted, and the system which existed in fact, obtained legal sanction only in 1881, to be in its turn swept away by further legislation which will have a deeper economic bearing on the future of the country than any other change since the relaxation of the Penal Laws. For the rest I cannot do better than quote, in this connection, the opinion of the most dispassionate critic of Ireland of recent years—Herr Moritz Bonn. Speaking of the landlord who has sold his estate he says—“He has no further cause of friction with his former tenants, who now pay him no rent. He no longer regards himself as part of an English garrison. He will again become an Irish patriot. He no longer talks of the unity of the Empire, for Home Rule has few terrors for him now. He talks of 'Devolution,' of the concession of a kind of self-government for Ireland. He will struggle for a while against the designation Home Rule, because not so long ago he was declaring that he would die in the last ditch for the union of the three kingdoms, but he will soon be reconciled to it. It will not be very long till the former landlords, whose chief interests lie in Ireland, have become enthusiastic Nationalists.”

Addressing the issue of alleged bigotry upon the part of the Catholic majority and the rising tide of fear spreading among the Protestant men of Ulster, Redmond reminds the reader that the Catholic population had never refused the guiding light of a fellow countryman in attempting to lead them out of bondage, regardless of his religious persuasion:

It was of course natural, when Catholics were excluded from Parliament, that the leaders of the people should have been members of the Protestant Church,

---

5 McDonnell, preface: ‘The temperance work done by the Gaelic League in providing occupation of a pleasant nature and social intercourse of a harmless kind is one of its chief titles to distinction, for in this aspect it has encouraged the preservation of Irish songs, music, dances, and games. One other thing it, and it alone, can do. One-half of the emigrants from Ireland go on tickets or money sent from friends in the United States, and in my opinion one of the most powerful influences in staying the present lamentable tide in that direction will be to foster in the branches in America the notion that the time has come when every Irishman and woman who can by any possible means do so should be persuaded to remain in Ireland, and not to emigrate.’
but in view of the alleged bigotry at the present day of the mass of the Irish people it is surely significant that Isaac Butt and Parnell were both members of the Church of minority, that to take three of the fiercest opponents of the maintenance of the Union John Mitchell was a Unitarian, Thomas Davis an Episcopalian Protestant, and Joseph Biggar a Presbyterian. At this moment of the Nationalist Members of Parliament nine, or more than ten per cent, are Protestants, and one may well ask if the Orangemen have ever had a like proportion of Catholic members of their party, and a fortiori what would be thought of the suggestion that a member of that religion should lead them in the House of Commons. The difficulty experienced in Great Britain by would-be candidates of either party in securing their adoption by local associations if they are Catholics is so common as to make the excessive bigotry alleged against the Irish Catholics, one-tenth of whose representatives are Protestants, appear very much exaggerated.

After all, the consequences of refusing to grant Ireland the legal status it deserved could be readily viewed and appreciated on an international scale:

The Government of Lord North roused the American Colonies by attempts to rule them against their own wishes, and the result was that they secured their independence. Austria refused self-government to Italy, and in consequence lost its Italian territory, while Hungary, to which it granted the boon, was retained in the dual monarchy. Spain, by refusing autonomy to her colonies, suffered the loss of South America, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, and the action of Holland in the same way led to the separation from it of the kingdom of the Belgians.

There were, of course, many positive examples of how the Gaelic culture had for its part succeeded in establishing itself in the lion’s mouth:

The circumstance that in London on the Sunday nearest St. Patrick's Day a service with Gaelic hymns and a Gaelic sermon is conducted every year, and has been conducted for the last three years, at the Cathedral at Westminster, and is attended by 6,000 or 7,000 Irish people, and that last year Dr. Alexander held a Gaelic service in a Protestant Cathedral in Dublin, should do much to show the manner in which the movement is spreading among all classes, and to indicate that it will in time demolish that false situation by which, for the greater part of the Continent, Ireland has been looked upon as merely an island on the other side of England to be seen through English glasses.

Finally, Redmond addresses the issue of the growing momentum of the movements advocating the implementation of physical force over constitutional means in the struggle for self-government. And rather than extolling the virtues of Hungarian concepts much publicised by Sinn Féin founder Arthur Griffiths, Redmond compares the Irish campaign with the plan of action of the Czechs, in redefining their role within the Empire:
The latest aspect which this anti-constitutional movement has taken in Ireland is what is known as **Sinn Féin**, which adopts a rigid attitude of protest against the existing condition of things, and which declares that the recognition of the *status quo* involved in any acquiescence in the present mode of government is a betrayal of the whole position. The existence of this spirit, which is entirely negligible outside two or three large towns, is not surprising; although it advocates a passive resistance it is the direct descendant of the party which advocated physical force in the past, and in so far as it proposes to use morally defensible weapons it is likely to have the more driving power. **The consistent opposition which the Catholic Church offered to revolutionary violence and her sympathy with constitutionally-expressed Parliamentary agitation have resulted in an anti-clerical colour which this new movement has acquired, and to this, force is added by the measure of strength which it has gained among a certain number of young Protestants in Belfast, whose fathers must turn in their graves at this reversal of opinion on a question which was to them a *chose jugee*, a veritable article of faith. The proposals of Sinn Féin include a boycott of all English institutions in Ireland, educational and of other kinds, the abandonment of the attendance of Irish members in the Imperial Parliament at Westminster, elections to which Sinn Féin candidates are, if necessary, to contest on the undertaking that if elected they will not take the oath at Westminster, but will attend a self-constituted National Council in Dublin […]. These proposals, which, until a Gaelic name was thought necessary for their acceptance in Ireland, were known as the Hungarian policy, are admittedly based on the success of the struggle for Hungarian autonomy which culminated in 1867, but the fact which the advocates of the application of this policy to Ireland omit to mention, is that Hungary was face to face with a divided and distracted Austria, defeated by the Prussians at Sadowa, while in the case of Ireland we are concerned with a united Great Britain, which has shown no great signs of diminution in her power. A closer parallel than that of Hungary is to be found in the case of **Bohemia**, which, in respect of general social conditions and the proportion of national to hostile forces, bore a much stronger resemblance to Ireland, and which adopted in 1867 a *policy of withdrawal* of its representatives from a hostile legislature with results so disastrous that after a few years she returned to the methods which the Sinn Féin party are anxious to make an end of in Ireland.6

The following sections of this study are devoted to a closer examination of the key factors influencing national policies in contemporary Europe, beginning with the highly polemical aspect of linguistic independence, the complex battle for cultural separation as perceived in both Ireland and Bohemia, and how in particular the status of the native language was broached by each of these nations.

---

6 McDonnell, preface: ‘All foreign parallels, however, are apt to be misleading, but Irishmen have only to remember the fact that the secession of Grattan and his followers from the Irish Parliament in 1797 paved the way for the passing of the Act of Union to find in it a warning against what is the main plank in the platform of Sinn Féin—“the policy of withdrawal”—which, moreover, would leave the control of Irish legislation to the tender mercies of such Irish members as Mr. Walter Long and Mr. William Moore, which would further involve the condemnation of the policy pursued by every Irish leader since the Union, and would mean the abandonment of the weapon by which every Irish reform has been wrested from English prejudice—namely, an independent party in the House of Commons, backed up by a vigorous organisation in Ireland.’
3.1. The Language Question

In his book on Nations and Nationalism since 1780\(^7\), E.J.Hobsbawm, for example, offers keen insight into the development of the language question in modern Europe in general. The sources he uses pertain to a great extent to the period leading up to and including the Great War, exemplifying once again that the first World War was to a great extent carried by the race of nations to receive recognition, both on a national and international level. The examples selected for this study are those relevant to the Irish and Czech struggle for independence, in relation to their differing degrees of social, economical, cultural, and political autonomy. Regarding the Czechs, for example, Hobsbaum puts forward,

[i]f the choice of the ‘official’ national language were merely one of pragmatic convenience, it would be relatively simple. One would merely have to choose the idiom most likely to be spoken and/or understood by the largest number of citizens, or that which would most facilitate communication between them. Joseph II’s choice of German as the administrative language of his multinational empire was quite pragmatic in this sense […]. In multinational states the problem could be solved in theory, as the Habsburgs sought to solve it from 1848 on, by the device of giving the ‘language of common use’ (Umgangssprache) some official recognition at an appropriate administrative level.\(^8\)

However, one must keep in mind that for those, mostly illiterate, people living in essentially traditional rural life, there were few occasions if any for conflict between one linguistic level, one geographical entity and another. Even at the height of conflict between Germans and Czechs in Austrian Bohemia, it was still possible to write:

In a multinational state we may take it for granted that even those who occupy no official position are under the stimulus, indeed, the obligation, to learn the second language – e.g. traders, artisans, workers. The peasants are least affected by this de facto constraint. For the self-segregation (Abgeschlossenheit) and self-sufficiency of village life, which persist to this day, mean that they are rarely conscious of the proximity of a settlement speaking a different language, at least in Bohemia and Moravia, where the country people of both nations enjoy the same economic and social status. In such areas the linguistic frontier may remain unchanged for centuries, especially since village endogamy and what is in practice the priority right to purchase [holdings] by members of the community limit the recruitment of outsiders into the village. What few strangers come in, are soon assimilated and incorporated.\(^9\)

\(^7\) E.J.Hobsbawm, Nations and Nationalism since 1780. Programme, Myth, Reality (CUP, 2000).
\(^8\) Idem, p. 94.
\(^9\) Idem, p. 95, taken from: Karl Renner, Das Selbstbestimmungsrecht der Nationen in besonderer Anwendung auf Österreich (Leipzig and Vienna, 1918), p.65.
Unfortunately, the idea of a ‘national language’ is rarely a pragmatic matter devoid of passion, as is shown by a general reluctance to perceive them as constructs, and instead constructing romantic traditions for them. Least dispassionate were the ideologists of nationalism as it evolved after 1830. For them, language was the soul of a nation and increasingly the crucial criterion of nationality. Linguistic nationalism is, after all, about the language of public education and official use, it is about ‘office and school’ as Poles, Czechs and Slovenes claimed as early as 1848. There are three main reasons, Hobsbawm argues, why it has not often been recognized how late the ethnic-linguistic criterion for defining a nation actually became dominant. First, the two prominent non-state national movements in the early nineteenth century were based on communities of the educated, united by an established language of high culture and its literature. For Germans and Italians, their national language was not merely an administrative convenience or a means of unifying statewide communication, it was the only thing that defined them as Germans or Italians, and thus their national identity, more so than English for those who wrote and read that language. However, while for the German and Italian liberal middle classes language provided the central argument for a unified national state, in the first half of the nineteenth century this was not yet the case anywhere else. The claims to independence of Poland and Belgium were not language-based, nor were the rebellions of Balkan peoples against the Ottoman Empire, which did produce independent states. Nor was the Irish movement in Britain. Yet there, where linguistic movements already had a political base, as in the Czech lands, national self-determination (as opposed to cultural recognition) was not an issue, and the establishment of a separate state was not commonplace. Since the late eighteenth century, mostly due to German intellectual influence, Europe had been swept by ‘the romantic passion for the pure, simple and uncorrupted peasantry, and for this folkloric rediscovery of ‘the people’, the vernacular languages it spoke were crucial.\textsuperscript{10} While this popular renaissance provided the basis for many subsequent nationalist movements, it was not then a political movement, nor did it profess political aspirations. Usually, the discovery of popular tradition and its transformation into ‘national tradition’ was the work of idealists from the often foreign ruling class or elite, such being the case in Ireland,

\textsuperscript{10} Hobsbawm, p.103.
where the Anglo-Irish, \(^\text{11}\) predominantly Protestant, more often Presbyterian, took charge of the Irish renaissance. \(^\text{12}\) The third reason is based on ethnic rather than linguistic identification, influential theories or pseudo-theories identifying nations with genetic descent. The growing importance of ‘the national question’ in the years preceding 1914 cannot only be measured by its development within multinational empires such as Austro-Hungary and Turkey. It had become significant in the domestic politics of practically all-European states. In the United Kingdom it was not confined to the Irish: the first official recognition of Welsh national interests was made, and Scotland acquired a Home Rule movement, a Scottish Office in government and a guaranteed national share of the public expenditure of the United Kingdom. Before the Gaelic League was founded in 1893, the Irish language had never been an issue in the Irish national movement. It did not figure in O’Connell’s Repeal agitation, even though the ‘Liberator’ himself was a Gaelic speaking Kerryman, and not in the Fenian programme. Even the first serious attempts to create a standard Irish language were not made until after 1900, however, by then, with a vengeance. The Cork Examiner reports on an event sponsored by the Gaelic League in 1913, when the audience is given a reminder that Home Rule means little without the vernacular of the home, the Czechs,

\(^\text{11}\) Sheehan, p.13: ‘The Gaelic League, founded in 1893 by a few enthusiastic Irish spirits, was formed to effect an Irish renascence in matters of the mind and spirit. It was non-sectarian and non-political. Its purpose was purely psychological and educational—it sought the preservation of the Irish language from a fast-threatening decay, it encouraged the study of ancient Irish literature and it promoted the cultivation of a modern literature in the Irish language. Its beginnings were modest, and its founders were practically three unknown young men whose only special equipment for leadership of a new movement were boundless enthusiasm and the possession of the scholastic temperament. Douglas Hyde, the son of a Protestant clergyman, dwelt far away in an unimportant parish in Connaught, and, while still a boy, became devoted to the study of the Irish language. Father O’Growney was a product of Maynooth culture, whose love of the Irish tongue became the best part of his nature, and John MacNeill (now so well known as a Sinn Fein leader) was born in Antrim, educated in a Belfast school and acquired his love for Irish in the Aran islands. It is marvellous to consider how the programme of the new League “caught on.” Some movements make their appeal to a class or a cult—to the young, the middle-aged or the old. But the Gaelic League, perhaps because of the very simplicity and directness of its objects, made an appeal to all. It numbered its adherents in every walk of life; it drew its membership from all political parties; it gathered the sects within its folds, and the greatest tribute that can be paid it is that it taught all its disciples a new way of looking at Ireland and gave them a new pride in their country. Ireland became national and independent in a sense it had not learnt before—it realised that “the essential mark of nationhood is the intellectual, social and moral patrimony which the past bequeaths to the present, which, amplified, or at least preserved, the present must bequeath to the future, and that it is this which makes the strength and individuality of a people.”

\(^\text{12}\) Earlier in history, it had also been the new ruling caste which had been at the forefront of every rebellion and uprising Ireland had ever witnessed, beginning ostentatiously with Wolfe Tone and ending dismally with Roger Casement. Also during the Czech revival in Bohemia, the non-native ruling class, some of whom were actually Irish or Scottish nobles in origin, immersed themselves in the language, culture and traditions of their subject people.
among others having understood this principle precisely and turned it not only to cultural but also political and economical advantage.

CE 19 February 1913

Language and Nationality

The Hon. Wm. Gibson, the distinguished Gaelic Leaguer, delivered a most interesting address on the subject of the Irish language in the courthouse, Clonmel. The Hon. Mr. Gibson, [...] dressed in the traditional Celtic costume, [...] was the guest of Father Walsh. [The] Mayor, in introducing the lecturer, said he was one of Ireland’s most distinguished and patriotic sons. The Hon. Mr. Gibson, who was greeted with loud applause, first spoke in Gaelic. Proceeding to speak in English, of which he said, amidst laughter, that his knowledge was a bit rusty, he said the more one lived and the more one travelled in different countries, the more he realised that a nation without a language was a nation without a soul, and the man who didn’t know the language of his country was a man without Nationality. They came face to face with the National spirit of a country through the language of the people, and when they met that in other countries, they realised the importance of the movement that was going on in Ireland (applause). But, of course, said Mr. Gibson, in Ireland we are not yet in the same position. We have got a long uphill road to travel before Ireland is in a real sense a nation once again (applause). [...] When the Irish people have the power in their own hands, they have got to make use of that power. The mere giving of certain rights – the mere surrender by someone else of certain things into our hands – will not make Ireland a nation. [...] Continuing, he said that some two years ago a Frenchman who was passing through Dublin got into conversation with some members of the Gaelic League, and they asked him his impression of the Irish people, so far as he had known and seen them. The Frenchman replied: "It is a painful thing to live in Dublin, because you are living in the midst of a people which are trying to talk a foreign language, and which possesses no language of its own." The English language was a language which everyone might well admire. It had produced a great literature, it had been used by great men; but the English language was the language of the English people in the same sense as the Irish language was the language of the Irish people (applause). [...] What is happening is this, that the Irish people have lost to a great extent their own language – that is to say, they have lost the vocabulary of it – but the Irish soul has remained in them in spite of themselves, in spite of their history; in spite of the disadvantages of the past, and the Irish language is struggling through the surface even now (applause). [...] If the Irish people are true to themselves, they will revive the Irish language, and they will see that Ireland is a nation in as full a sense as England, as Germany, as Russia, or any other nation on the face of the earth [...]. People sometimes say that if the Gaelic League devoted half the energy which it devotes to the language – if it devoted that energy to the building up of industrial and immediately useful things – it would be doing far better. My answer to that is that without the impetus of the language movement, without the idea that we are saving the Irish nation, we would not take the trouble to be interested in industries or in anything else [...]." The one thing that can possibly inspire any permanent national or industrial movement was the idea that in a real sense Ireland would soon be a nation once again (applause). On the question of the utility of the language, the speaker stated that when in the decayed, though once prosperous town of Galway some time ago he had a conversation with a shopkeeper, who admitted that the language was all right for
children to be taught in schools, but asked what use it could be in a commercial sense. He (Mr. Gibson), by way of reply, told the shopkeeper that commercial travellers from the great industrial city of Belfast acquired a knowledge of Irish to enable them to carry out their business in Donegal and other parts of the country. The lecturer instanced the cases of Germany, Hungary, Bohemia, and Bulgaria, where with the revival of the national language, there came also a great revival of the national life and industrial and material progress generally. The Bulgarians, who had been in a state of serfdom under the Turks, and who had revived their language only 20 years ago, were now under the walls of Constantinople (applause). In conclusion, the speaker said: - I would earnestly appeal to you all to remember the lessons of this movement, to realise that you are taking part in the building up of your nation; that if you are true to Ireland in this matter you will contribute your share towards Ireland taking advantage of the dawn of freedom which is now about to shine upon us (loud and prolonged applause).

It appears that problems of power, politics and ideology and not of communication (or even culture) lie at the centre of the nationalism of language. If this had not been so, and communication or culture had been the crucial issue, the Zionist movement would not have chosen Modern Hebrew, which nobody as yet spoke. Nor would the Irish national movement have launched itself into a campaign to reconvert the Irish to a language most people no longer understood, and which those who were teaching it to their countrymen had only themselves begun to learn incompletely.13

13 Hobsbawm, p.110. Cf. also CE 24 November 1905. Teaching of Irish. Bishops’ Action. (From Our Correspondent). Dublin, Thursday. During the course of a lecture delivered tonight under the auspices of the Gaelic League, by Mr. MacNeill, an important letter was read from the Most Rev. Dr. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin. Mr. MacNeill expressed the hope that the resolution passed by the bishops in reference to the teaching of Irish would be acted on by the managers. They hoped that in making future appointments of teachers they would appoint only teachers that were qualified to teach Irish (applause). They asked that in the meantime the managers to have the existing teachers trained, and made capable of teaching the Irish language (applause), and on this point the Gaelic League offered to co-operate with them. The district Committee of the City of Dublin were prepared to offer the managers to establish in the city a special training school for the purpose of training the teachers in Irish (loud applause). [His] Grace, referring to the position which the Irish language ought to hold in the Irish schools, wrote – “A solution of this question worked out on such lines is all that any reasonable Irishman has ever asked for. In my opinion, it is pressing duty of the hour to give it to be clearly understood by those who for the moment are in control of our various systems of public education in this country, that such a solution the people of Ireland mean to have. It is not for me to make suggestions as to the steps to be taken with a view to giving the most practically effective direction to the movement for placing the national language in the position that it has a right to hold in the Irish schools. But I may, I trust, as a not unfriendly critic, be allowed to say that as I view the matter there is one somewhat serious flaw in our present system of working. I speak now of the schools in and around Dublin. I feel convinced that no real progress is likely to be made, that nothing of an enduring character is likely to be done until some effective system of training the teachers of our National Schools, not only as teachers of Irish, but as speakers of Irish, is set on foot. As to our existing training colleges, controlled in their working as they are by the regulations of the Board of National Education, they never can be made effective for the purpose. This has long since been realised elsewhere, and practical steps have been taken to supply what is wanting. It has been done in the South, it has been done in the West. As a result, we have the Munster and Connaught Training colleges. Ulster, we may be sure, will not fail us.
On Ireland’s National Day, 1913, the Cork Examiner’s Letters to the Editor features The Language Question, defining the status of language and speakers at this given time. It is part of a longer exchange of letters, filled with accusations and counter-accusations relating to the role of language, religion and conquest, offering the past and present reader a glimpse of arguments in use then - and possibly now.

CE 17 March, 1913

Sir, - Mr. McCarthy […] seems fully convinced that the object the English had in view when they banned the Irish language was to crush out Irish Nationality and the spirit of Irish Nationality. To my mind, that is not quite so; the objective of the English apostates of the Penal period was without doubt to eradicate from Ireland the Catholic religion. Had they succeeded in destroying the Catholic religion in the outset, the Irish might have used any language as a national language they wished. The English were in Ireland hundreds of years before the Irish language was banned, but you must remember “the English were all Catholics themselves then,” and there is nothing recorded to prove that they interfered with the national language of Ireland until we come to the great schism or apostasy. On the contrary, we read in history of a Parliament being assembled in Dublin, and one of the Anglo-Norman lords acted as interpreter between English and Irish statesmen. Is this not so? Mr. McCarthy states that “the Gaelic League plays an important part in the creation and sustentation of the National spirit.” How do you arrive at this conclusion, Mr. McCarthy, when other members of the same “Gaelic League” affirm that it is non-political and non-sectarian? If this be the case, I consider such an organisation not only useless, but dangerous to the National and religious welfare of the nation. The other day Mr. O’Hegarty said in one of his letters that persons of all shades of belief and opinion were welcomed to the Gaelic League, but whatever opinions politically they possess they must leave them outside the meeting-houses. How will a crowd of this sort advance the national spirit? […] I can’t agree with Mr. McCarthy when he asserts: “The majority of the teachers of Ireland are in thorough accord with the advancement of the Irish language and year by year the majority is increasing.” The weighty side of the teachers would sing “Te Deum” if the Irish language could be shipped for the South Pole; they know well that parents don’t wish their children to be losing time over a language which will be useless to them as a bread-winner. The unfortunate teachers are in a hobble; the Gaelic men are watching them, so they must agree to the terms of the League, nolens volens […]. Notwithstanding Mr. McCarthy’s excellent prognostication concerning the future of the Irish language, it is not going ahead in Munster and Connaught. Munster lost 48,000 Irish speakers between 1901 and 1911, and Connaught 26,000. I may be told that they left the country; this can’t be so, because the Leinster Irish speakers increased by 14,000 or thereabouts – the best of it is, all the Leinster speakers are English and Irish speakers; not so in Connaught and Munster. Ulster made a slight increase also. Leinster is saying little about the language. Munster has all to say, and the most of the “Irish” of Munster is uneducated Irish – Yours faithfully, J. Twomey

To which Mr. McCarthy replies:
Mr. J.”O’Tuáma” is becoming more and more entertaining and interesting. He is interesting as a psychological study. He is a type of mind that Anglicisation has brought forth in Ireland. I now advance the proposition that without the Irish language there cannot be an Irish Nation or Irish Nationality. “No language, no nation” is an old maxim [sic], and, like many old maxim, its truth becomes more and more apparent as time goes on. To define a nation and nationality is a very difficult task, as difficult as to define soul or spirit. But, so far as we can see, the essential characteristic of a nation is the possession of a distinct language. Freedom is a desirable thing, an eminently desirable thing; a thing worth fighting for and dying for, but a nation may lose its freedom and still be a distinct national entity. It cannot lose its language and its freedom and retain the title of nation. Wherever a people have lost language and freedom they have been absorbed by the conquering people who deprived them of freedom. “The language of the conqueror in the mouth of the conquered is ever the language of the slave” is as old as Tacitus at all events. Hence, I hold and maintain, that the Irish language is an essential of Irish Nationality – the essential, the underlying principle of Irish Nationality. Hence, [had] the Irish people discarded the Irish language 300 years ago, we could not now be talking of a living Irish Nation or Irish Nationality in the future without the Irish language. I contend then that it is the duty, the imperative duty, of all who call themselves Irish Nationalists, to save the Irish language. It is the duty of the Hibernian as well as of the Gaelic Leaguer; the duty of All for Irelander as well as the Sinn Féinidhe or Fenian; the duty of Mr. John Redmond as well as of Mr. Douglas Hyde; the duty of Mr. J.”O’Tuáma” – if he be an Irish Nationalist – as well as of the writer.

Indeed, when the German Casino in Prague that, in the 1890s, declared that learning Czech, the language spoken by 93% of the city’s population, was treason, was not making a statement about communications. For the common people whose world of words was oral, the language of official or any other writing was of no significance except, as a reminder of their lack of knowledge and power. But as the self-sufficiency of the village was eroded, the problem of finding a common language became serious, and the easiest way of solving this was to learn enough of the national language to get by. The need increased as the two great institutions

14 CE 16 June 1913. The Irish Language. Sir. – There can be no objection to people like “Suil na Tire” displaying in your columns their ignorance of the Irish language and all that concerns and makes for Nationality, but when an attack is made on canon O’Leary’s writings it should at least appear over the name of the distinguished critic, whoever he or she may be. The greatest Irish writer of our day is constantly being subjected to veiled attacks of a particularly mean type. In the past they appeared in the form of articles in English, or perhaps I should say Americanese, or “Revival” Irish and lately they found expression in a demand for suitable “literature for students who had acquired a reading knowledge of Irish.” The inference the ordinary reader draws from such a demand is that there is nothing to read in modern Irish – an inference which is too ridiculous to discuss. The annoying thing is that some of the canon’s greatest critics are quite safe from criticism themselves as they have produced no literature of any kind and, in the opinion of those competent to judge, are incapable of producing any. The great point “Suil na Tire” seeks to make about the difference between old, middle and modern Irish proves to demonstration that he or she is as ignorant of the history of English an d other literatures as he or she is of the Irish language and history. – Sean O’Muirrigthe

15 Hobsbawm, p.112.
of mass education, primary school and army, brought some knowledge of the official language into every home. ‘That languages of purely local or socially restricted use should lose ground to languages of wider use, is not surprising. Nor is there any evidence that such linguistic change and adaptation met with any resistance from below.’

The class that profited the most by the official use of the written language was the socially modest but educated middle class, including those who acquired lower middle-class status by occupying non-manual jobs that required schooling. In fact, Socialists rarely used the word ‘nationalism’ without the prefix ‘petty-bourgeois,’ inspired by those who fought for linguistic nationalism: i.e. provincial journalists, schoolteachers and aspiring subaltern officials. Similar arguments may be found in the work of Diarmaid Ferriter, who deals with the complexity of the transforming years of modern Ireland, centring on the Irish revolution and its aftermath.

He argues, for example, that despite the evolution of organised political nationalism in the south in the late nineteenth century, at the dawn of the twentieth century there was considerable support in both Ireland and England for the maintenance of the Act of Union of 1800. […] Gerald Balfour, who as chief secretary in 1900 was effectively head of the British administration in Ireland, which had its headquarters in Dublin Castle, was answerable to the British parliament for some 29 government departments in Ireland, though he denied it, he was said to have coined the phrase “Killing Home Rule with kindness” to describe the Conservative government’s reforms in the areas of land ownership, local government infrastructure and agricultural development, working on the age-old consumption the economic improvement would dilute the potential for radical nationalism in Ireland.

Superimposed on this political backdrop is the emergence of a literary movement incorporating love of native language and traditions, and affiliated organisations into sport and music.

CE 12 October 1908
The Gaelic League.
Skibbereen Branch.

[…] Reports read by the secretaries and treasurer showed that the branch was in a flourishing condition financially and otherwise, and that the work of the year had been successful in every respect. The Rev. Chairman said […] Irish was spoken more widely than it was twelve months ago. It was spoken and known better in the schools, and he believed it was better known in the streets and in the fields than it was twelve months ago, and this was all owing to the fact that the young people of the town and country were taking a greater interest in the Irish

---

16 Idem, p.116.
18 Ferriter, p.29.
revival and the Irish language (applause). Though the advance was not very striking, still it was perceptible, and they had reason to congratulate themselves on it. The Irish tongue was not dead, and it was the duty of them all who had an interest in the welfare of their country, and its traditions to put their right foot foremost and make the best efforts they could to raise up from its ashes the Irish language, so long slumbering and so little used (hear, hear).

---

19 Sheehan, p.15: ‘Its branches spread rapidly throughout Ireland, and the movement was taken up abroad with equal enthusiasm. Irish language classes were organised, Irish history of the native—as distinct from the British—brand was taught. Lessons in dancing and singing were given and the old national airs were revived and became the popular music of the day. It would take too much of my space to recount all the varied activities of the League, all that it did to preserve ancient Irish culture, to make the past live again in the lives of the people, to foster national sports and recreations, to organise Gaelic festivals of the kind that flourished in Ireland's artistic past, to create an Irish Ireland and to arrest the decadence of manners and the Anglicisation which had almost eaten into the souls of the people and destroyed their true Celtic character. Mr P.H. Pearse truly said of it: “The Gaelic League will be recognised in history as the most revolutionary influence that ever came into Ireland.” It saved the soul of Ireland when it was in imminent danger of being lost, and its triumph was in great measure due to the fact that it held rigidly aloof from the professedly political parties, although it may be said for it that it undoubtedly laid the foundations of that school of thought which made all the later developments of nationality possible. And the amazing thing is that the priest and the parson, the gentry and the middle classes, equally with the peasantry, vied with each other in extending the influence and power of the movement. One of its strongest supporters was a leader of the Belfast Orangemen, the late Dr Kane, who observed that though he was a Unionist and a Protestant he did not forget that he had sprung from the Clan O'Cahan. The stimulation given to national thought and purpose spread in many directions. A new race of Irish priests was being educated on more thoroughly Irish lines, and they went forth to their duties with the inspiration, as it were, of a new call. A crusade was started against emigration, which was fast draining the country of its reserves of brain, brawn and beauty. The dullness of the country-side, an important factor in forcing the young and adventurous abroad, was relieved by the new enthusiasm for Irish games and pastimes and recreations—for the seanchus, the sgornidheacht, the ceilidhe and the Feiseanna.

20 CE 12 October 1908.Public Meeting at Valenti.A public meeting under the auspices of the Gaelic League was held at Ballyhearny, Valenti Island, Co.Kerry, immediately after Mass. The weather being delightfully fine, the congregation attended en masse. The objects of the meeting were firstly, to promote the more general use Irish as a spoken medium in Valenti, it being very generally known and understood on the island already, as well as being successfully taught in the schools; secondly, to arrange for inaugurating the evening Irish classes which have done good work in past seasons; and thirdly, to consider the new Universities. Rev. Father O’Kane, P.P., presided over the proceedings. In the course of an eloquent and convincing address, he said – Ireland has within the past 14 years awakened to a new life. In addition to opening up the hidden treasures of the past, which shed glory on our country and race, Ireland has recommenced to produce a literature of its own. An interest is being taken in our native culture, to make the past live again in the lives of the people, to foster national sports and recreations, to organise Gaelic festivals of the kind that flourished in Ireland's artistic past, to create an Irish Ireland and to arrest the decadence of manners and the Anglicisation which had almost eaten into the souls of the people and destroyed their true Celtic character. Mr P.H. Pearse truly said of it: “The Gaelic League will be recognised in history as the most revolutionary influence that ever came into Ireland.” It saved the soul of Ireland when it was in imminent danger of being lost, and its triumph was in great measure due to the fact that it held rigidly aloof from the professedly political parties, although it may be said for it that it undoubtedly laid the foundations of that school of thought which made all the later developments of nationality possible. And the amazing thing is that the priest and the parson, the gentry and the middle classes, equally with the peasantry, vied with each other in extending the influence and power of the movement. One of its strongest supporters was a leader of the Belfast Orangemen, the late Dr Kane, who observed that though he was a Unionist and a Protestant he did not forget that he had sprung from the Clan O'Cahan. The stimulation given to national thought and purpose spread in many directions. A new race of Irish priests was being educated on more thoroughly Irish lines, and they went forth to their duties with the inspiration, as it were, of a new call. A crusade was started against emigration, which was fast draining the country of its reserves of brain, brawn and beauty. The dullness of the country-side, an important factor in forcing the young and adventurous abroad, was relieved by the new enthusiasm for Irish games and pastimes and recreations—for the seanchus, the sgornidheacht, the ceilidhe and the Feiseanna.
Many nationalists in 1900 had a dual attitude to British rule, on the hand, while they would not mourn its loss and might indeed envisage working towards its destruction, most were culturally and politically comfortable with ‘the trappings of empire.’ The middle classes especially held distinctly ‘Victorian’ attitudes regarding social issues and the alleviation of poverty, and indeed all classes had absorbed English popular culture and literature.

Advanced employment and economic opportunities had lead to the emergence of a substantial Catholic middle class, whose support of moderate nationalism was reflected also in the pages of the highly popular and widespread Freeman’s Journal, for example. But while the respectable Irish Parliamentary Party representatives came to be lambasted for perceived selfishness, corruption and laziness, there were those already looking for a new direction, accusing the Irish party of being intent on merely replacing one ascendancy with its own. And it was rather on a local than on a national level that polemicists often focused their attention. ‘One notable question being posted at the beginning of the decade was the extent to which the nation belonged to the MPs or the people,’ as presented by the campaigns of William O’Brien. According to historian Patrick Maume, whose research underlines once again the importance of communications revolution and the increase in the number of nationalist provincial newspapers, D.P. Moran, founder and editor of the Leader,

combined cultural revivalism, criticism of the party’s anti-intellectualism and authoritarianism and the politics of Catholic grievance to provide a rationale for a populist version of the traditional Catholic ‘Whiggery’ that placed Catholic middle-class interests above political nationalism. Arthur Griffith drew on the ideology of young Ireland and on artisan traditions of self-help and anti-
deferentialism to combine a reinvented separatism with the Parnellite legacy and the ‘Hungarian policy’ as the course to be taken by a new Parnell when the party finally reverted to corruption and chaos. The agrarian agitation was, however, making it harder for the British government to manage Ireland.25

Middle-class Catholics were making advances also in the professions, soon outnumbering Protestants in the fields of law and medicine and in the civil service. Also various boards, institutions and councils that the British government administered offered further possibilities of advancement for the educated Catholic elite. Class distinction among the Catholic population was still based on Victorian English norms, prompting journalist D.P.Moran to state that Catholic professionals would ultimately sit ‘fat and comfortable in a mansion in Rathmines,’ a suburb on the south of the city.26

Alf Mac Lochlann’s summary of the ‘Gaelic revival’ was perhaps as good as any, when he wrote that it was a combination of ‘romantic nationalism, second-hand radicalism, European radicalism, middle-class frustration and cultural awareness’. It was inevitable it would be multi-layered given the impossibility of agreeing on one ready-made and fixed Irish identity. James Joyce, in 1903, when reviewing Lady Gregory’s Poets and dreams, suggested the storyteller from whom she took the stories had a ‘feeble and sleepy mind’ and that none of the stories had any satisfying imaginative wholeness, and he referred to the ‘fullness of the senility’ of the ‘folk’ ways.27

It did remain ironic, however, that the attempts to restore the Irish language coincided with the emergence of gifted Irish men writing in English, such as Yeats, Joyce, J.M. Synge and George Moore. But besides rural roots, it was also in fact socialism that became a driving force behind much of contemporary Irish writing, therefore ‘a revival riddled with class differences.’28

25 Ferriter, p.37.
26 Ferriter, p.80: ‘Perhaps there is much truth in the assertion of Paseta that it was less a new world these people wanted than to dominate the old, and it is also the case that despite the vigour of the Gaelic movement British audiences showed little inclination to shun English popular culture. D.P. Moran worked hard to convince them otherwise with vigorous writing and robust criticism - in his view, Protestants could be British as long as they accepted that Ireland was a Catholic country. Often bigoted and utterly uninterested in the exchange of ideas, Moran nonetheless did not sink to the level of vituperation indulged in by J.J. O’ Kelly in the Catholic Bulletin.’
27 Ferriter, p.92.
28 Ferriter, p.92: ‘George Russell (AE), one of the neglected Irish intellectuals of the early twentieth century, wrote widely on economic and cultural development, militarism and the role of labour. He took a communal view of the social order (which he shared with Connolly, Davitt and Plunkett) and articulated the notion that private property was an English imposition on a Gaelic society where the chieftains had held land in trust for the entire people. In holding that view he realised the extent and impact of class antagonism, but also saw Irish intellectuals as part of a broader, international order-for him the acid test of success or failure for Ireland was if they could succeed in making democracy prevail in economic life. In other words, it was for the intellectuals to lead.’
But if a new generation were intent on being free to conceive of themselves, as distinct from accepting traditional definitions of national identity, this involved generational rejection; a revolt by young men against their fathers; men like Simon Dedalus, who in Joyce’s words in portrait of the artist were defeatist and uncreative forward-looking ‘praisers of their own past’. His son Stephen wanted instead to become ‘himself his own father’. The historian Patrick O’Farrell suggested this was the real contribution made by writers in the initial decades of the century: not a smug version of national identity, but the assumption of a European perspective after a century of dreary provincialism. This revival was less an assertion of traditions long-denied than an insistence that Irish people have the freedom to conceive of themselves.  

By February 1901 the Gaelic League had over 200 branches, four years later up to 500 branches, one of its most important functions being to encourage the publication of Irish-language books. Douglas Hyde’s fundraising tour of the United States was organised by Irish-American philanthropists, indicating the central role played by the United States in Irish affairs at this time. Travel writer Louis Paul-Dubois observed perceptively that the Gaelic league ‘is occupied with propaganda, the application of its doctrine of a national renaissance on the basis of the national language. It intends to confer anew upon the country a psychological education.’

CE 28 November 1905

Dr. Douglas Hyde.

Interesting Lecture.

New York, Monday. Dr. Douglas Hyde, President of the Gaelic League, gave a lecture at the Carnegie Hall last night to an audience of Irishmen, who have him an enthusiastic reception. He said the Gaelic revival meant the de-Anglicising of Ireland. He referred to England’s world power and the teeming industries which, he said, existed at the very doors of a country whose half-deserted streets resounded even less than formerly with the roar of traffic, whose mills were silent, whose priceless harbours were deserted, and whose very fields were studded with ruined gables and other memories of the past. Yet around that nation the morality of its life, purity of sentiment, and devotion to its faith and country shed a halo in the eyes of Europe that was all its own. — Reuter

The League had greatly extended its influence also into the fields of economic nationalism, defending Irish industry while maintaining political neutrality before 1915. And they perhaps gave the answer to the reputed query of John Redmond in 1909: ‘Why are the people taking such an interest in education?’

29 Idem.
30 Ferriter, p.98.
31 CE 28 June 1905. Questions affecting the progress of education, whether Primary, Intermediate or University, always have a strong and striking interest in this country. The people, as a rule, have been honestly devoted to educational advancement from the earliest ages, and have rendered
Perhaps that was the significance of the League - its ability to become central to education and cultural questions in the first decade of the century, rather than saving the language. It did manage to place pride in the cultural legacy of Irish, ensuring those not proficient could at least speak a little and perhaps read. But it was also significant in providing for many an antidote to the depression associated with much of the rural hinterland, particularly because of its cross-gender appeal - W.P. Ryan had noted in 1912 that the Gaelic League ‘brought women into pride of place’.32

Though difficult to quantify, the cultural renaissance, in its abundance of books, plays, newspapers, poems and propaganda, and Irish language activism, must have influenced many nationalists. The cross-fertilisation of ideas was rightly recognised as quasi-revolutionary.

CE 28 November 1905
Clonakilty ’98 Monument.

The ceremony of unveiling the Clonakilty ’98 Memorial, which was performed yesterday by the Right Rev. Monsignor O’Leary, was a remarkable testimony to the deep and abiding spirit of pride of race and love of Fatherland indelibly associated with memories of the fateful year of ’98. The brutal measures which the Government of the day, brought into operation to foment rebellion in Ireland, and thereby get an excuse for the introduction of the iniquitous Act of Union, will remain in Irish history as one of the most detestable things to be laid to the charge of British rule in Ireland. On the other hand, the example of sacrifice and patriotism which the sturdy pikemen of Wexford, in particular, displayed in generous assistance and encouragement to all concerned in the great work of instruction and enlightenment. That this country is painfully backward in any comparison with other nations on the Continent or with communities on the other side of the Atlantic, not merely in regard to educational matters, but in nearly every department of civilization, practically goes without saying. We really do sometimes give inordinate room to our capacity for self-examination, and at the same time place too light an estimate on the splendid work that has been performed on the Continent and in America. It is about time that there should be a general waking up and a frank recognition of the fact that the world is not standing still, that certain elements make for progress, and certain others constitute obstruction, and that we should set our arrangements in order for a strong, earnest and unhesitating assertion of National rights in regard to this vital condition of success. The primary conditions cannot be too plainly stated or too plainly impressed. All along the line in every grade and phase of education it is the best-taught person, other conditions being equal, that attains the foremost place. In the arena of the world’s competition, Daily becoming more keen and more anxious, it is the youth that has had the advantage of the best and most practical course of education that can hope to command success. In a world hurrying towards the speediest, the most enlightened and the cheapest methods of advancement and development there is no room for the laggard, and the teachers who do not score in pass lists have missed their vocation. Learning for the pure sake of learning is, fortunately, not altogether dead in the land, and the genuine thirst after scholarship, which was one of the most striking characteristics of the race from early times, has not entirely disappeared.. But it is an utilitarian age, and in a greater measure than living people remember in all their lives the school has become the opening to the avenue which leads to success in professional and commercial pursuits and in every branch of business affairs. For which very sufficient reason the interest felt in everything pertaining to educational matters is very much keener than it was in past years, and has little relation to the academic side of the question.

32 Ferriter, p.100.
defence of their lives and homes, furnishes a contrast which will always evoke the admiration of all who can appreciate a brave fight nobly upheld against grievous odds. The celebrations of the famous centenary year gave sufficient earnest of how Irishmen everywhere cherish these sacrifices, and how deeply the story of this particular time has made its impression on the minds of the people.

And though playwright J.M. Synge pointed out that when it came to speaking the Irish language, there was a distinct gap between enthusiasm and competency, he also ‘captured the collective emotional and political impact of the cultural crusade on its devotees,’ in his striking account of his attendance at a Douglas Hyde play:

at the beginning of the first night it was hard to keep a straight face at the sight of the beautiful Irish ladies of the Gaelic League all around the theatre talking non-stop in the most woeful Irish with their young clerks and workingmen who were quite pale with enthusiasm. But, it happened that during an interval in Diarmaid and Grainne, according to local custom the people in the galleries started to sing. They sang old, well-known songs. Until that moment those melodies had never been heard sung in unison by so many voices with the ancient Irish words. A shiver went through the auditorium. In the lingering notes there was an incomparable melancholy, like the death rattle of a nation. One after another faces could be seen leaning into their programmes. We wept.33

The life of Thomas Kettle exemplifies the dilemma of those loath to define nationalism too narrowly.34 A lawyer, constitutional nationalist and academic economist, his philosophy of politics maintained the moral right of Ireland to rebel, ‘if it were possible.’

CE 17 April 1913
United Irish League.
Cork City Executive. Home Rule Fund. Important Meeting.
A meeting in support of the Home Rule Fund for Cork City will be held in the City Hall on to-night at 8.30 o’clock under the auspices of the City Executive. The Lord Mayor will preside and the proceedings will be of unusual interest to local Nationalists. Among the speakers will be Professor Thomas Kettle,

33 Ferriter, p.113, cf. also : ‘W.B. Yeats had also played his part. His 1902 play Cathleen Ni Houlihan, in which Maud Gonne starred, was a traditional allegorical personification of Ireland in the form of an old woman. She insists on the need of a young man at the time of the 1798 rebellion to sacrifice all for Ireland; and that dying in the process will ensure a patriot will be remembered for ever. At the end of the play she is transformed into’ a young girl and she has the walk of a queen’. The impact and legacy of this play troubled Yeats, particularly after the 1916 rising. It also troubled Stephen Gwynn; so much so that: ‘I went Home asking myself if such plays should be produced unless one was prepared to go out and shoot and be shot. Miss Gonne’s impersonation had stirred the audience as I have never seen another audience stirred.’

34 Ferriter, p.124: ‘Equally, there were difficulties for those who tried to embrace too broad a definition. The leader of the Irish parliamentary party, john Redmond, according to the memoirs of playwright Sean O’Casey, though he kept his hand up to show the people where to go, it shook so much that it pointed everywhere at once’.
Kettle did, however, fight for Britain in the war, believing Ireland was attempting to build an ‘impossible future on an imaginary past,’ forcing English parties ‘to wipe her off the slate of practical politics’. Yet as his friend and colleague Arthur Cleary pointed out after his death in combat: ‘the idea of final self-sacrifice was as much a haunting desire with him as it was with Patrick Pearse’. In this tribute, locating Kettle on Ireland’s political map, Cleary also makes general observations on Irish politics between the 1890s and WWI:

First there was the orthodoxy of the Irish party tracing its apostolic succession from davit to Parnell. It was powerful and popular. But its followers too often came to look on faith-faith in the party-as an all-sufficient substitute for personal good works. Over against them were the ‘good workers’ of various descriptions-language revivalists, industrial revivalists, men who devoted themselves to Irish poetry, Irish music, Irish pastimes, Irish drama or Irish art, many of them heretics or at least schismatic in matters political. But there was also a third movement which never advanced very far but which influenced many thinking minds. A casual observer would describe it incorrectly by some such loose adjective as ‘socialistic’. It was the effort to apply cosmopolitan ideas of regeneration (often without any clear idea of what they were) to the social conditions of Ireland, more especially to the social conditions of its cities-in fact, an aspiration towards modern ‘progress’ of the less brutal kind. Kettle’s effort was to combine the first school with the third-party or orthodoxy with social advance.

He was as Mr (Robert) Lynd put it, European in his sympathies. With the second movement, on the other hand; with everything that could be described as ‘Irish Ireland’, though he sometimes gave it a nominal support in words, he had a very minimum of agreement. He looked upon it as insular and unEuropean.  

“Is it not enough to be Anglicised without becoming European?” is an article written by Fr. T. A. Fitzgerald in the year 1911, at the height of Irish-Irelandism, where he reviews and replies to a collection of essays by Professor Kettle, Irish patriot and committed European.

---
35 Ferriter, p.124.
In the “Apology” to his book containing a collection of interesting papers on various subjects, Professor T. M. Kettle says, inter alia, “My only counsel to Ireland is that in order to become deeply Irish she must become European.” […] It can be gathered that the versatile essayist, by his “European” prescription, means that one will be a better Irish-Irelander by becoming conversant with European thought through the medium of European languages.

In his implied condemnation of that exclusiveness which would freeze out all literary culture except what relates to the Irish language, the majority of readers will be at one with Professor Kettle. Nothing alienates the sympathy of the public, and embitters the feelings of the genuinely patriotic, so much as imprudent and small-souled advocacy. There are tens of thousands of Irish people to-day who, through no fault of theirs, cannot speak Irish and are precluded by domestic and business cares from acquiring it. Many of these, however, are more deeply read in Anglo-Irish literature and Irish History than any Irish-Irelander it has been the present writer’s privilege to meet. Is the finger of scorn to be pointed at these by such as have Irish through the accident of birth, environment, opportunity or education? Are we to disesteem the memory of the departed whose dust fills our Irish graveyards simply because they did not during their life speak the tongue of the Gael? This is one extreme. But it is surely the other to become Irish by becoming European first, as Professor Kettle seems to contend […] All who are in congenial circumstances will try to be abreast of the times on the leading questions that agitate the mind of Europe. It is also patent that a knowledge of German is requisite for the prosecution of Old Irish Studies, and philologists and celtologists will find French absolutely necessary. But it is possible to be European without being Gaelic. Professor Kettle’s book is an illustration in point. Is it not possible to go too far in this European cult? To become European first and Irish afterwards means that the freshness and vigour of mind shall be spent in the cultivation of foreign literature. The best of our intellect should be sacred to the study of our own literature. It is broad-mindedness, if you will, to cull flowers in the gardens of foreign literature, but it is something more – it is noble-mindedness and only pure justice to reserve our best efforts for the sake of the land that bore us. “Before my tongue one accent flung, Ould Ireland you’re my darling.” While admiring Professor Kettle as a scholarly Irishman who has done signal service to his country, we would prefer to see him imitating cultured Irish-Irlanders in their work in the Language Revival, by bringing his brick, great or small, to the restoration of

37 CE 5 July 1912.Gaelic Week has been celebrated in Dublin with much enthusiasm and with a degree of success which augurs well for the final triumph of the ancient language, literature, music and art of the Celtic race and of all that is comprehended in the Gaelic revival. Although in some parts of the country there may be symptoms of decay and of apathy, the festival in the Dublin Rotunda can leave no doubt of the energy, sincerity, and determination of those who have undertaken the propagation and the sustainment of the Irish language, more especially in the districts in which it is still vital and current. The Oireachtas and the Ard Feis are by this time institutions familiar to the present generation, and their principal features do not call for explanation. They are associated with sports, language competitions, poetic compositions, orations in the Irish language, music, vocal and instrumental; games, dramatic representations, and in recent years an Exhibition of Irish manufactures and handicrafts has constituted an important portion of the programme. The Oireachtas opened with sports on Saturday and Sunday last. On Monday Dr. Douglas Hyde, President of the Gaelic League, presided at the opening session of the Ard-Fheis, or Congress of the League in the large Concert Room of the Rotunda, whe numerous delegates were present, representing branches in Ireland, Great Britain, and America, and throughout the week there has been a rich and varied round of entertainments, competitions, and literary exercises, reviving in the prosaic surroundings of modern Dublin some of the most agreeable and picturesque features of the ancient Irish civilization.
Tara’s Halls instead of mooning round the pyramids of Egypt, or becoming lost in the maze of French and German literature.

Turning now to Europe, in regarding contemporary Austria Hobsbawm holds that ‘the battles of the Habsburg politics, when national strife made the Austrian half of the empire virtually ungovernable, were fought about the language of instruction in secondary schools or the nationality of station-masters’ jobs.’

Among the lesser middle strata nationalism thus mutated from a concept associated with liberalism and the left, into a chauvinistic, imperialist and xenophobic movement of the right, or more precisely, the radical right, a move already observable in the ambiguous usage of such terms as ‘patrie’ and ‘patriotism’ around 1870 in France […]. However, even where there was continuity, as in the ‘Turner’, the mass gymnastic organisations of German nationalism, the shift to the right of the 1890s can be measured by tracking the spread of anti-Semitism from Austria into the German branches, and the substitution of the imperial (black-white-red) tricolour for the Liberal–national (black-red-gold) tricolour of 1848, and the new enthusiasm for imperial expansion.

Governments could not control the new nationalism, and new nationalism could not influence governments, but identification with the state was essential to the nationalist petty-bourgeoisie, because only national independence would give them the position they felt they deserved. The return of Ireland to its ancient language was no longer a slogan in evening classes, but the qualification for civil service jobs and passing examinations in Irish would be the criterion of belonging to the professional and intellectual, and therefore to the respectable classes. Their rejection of the new proletarian socialist and definitely international movements supports this argument. This period is, in fact, characterised by the triumph of mass nationalism over rival ideologies, class-based socialism in particular, as is also demonstrated by the outbreak of war in 1914, which showed the hollowness of

---

38 Taylor, p.117.
39 Idem, p.121.
40 CE 10 December 1908. National University. The State of Irish. Dublin, Wednesday. The question of the status of Irish in the National University was considered at a meeting of the General Council of County Councils on Tuesday. An opinion was strongly expressed by some members that no money for the University should be raised by the County Councils if the Senate refused to give the National language its rightful place. Mr. Glynn (Galway) moved: - “That the Council considers that the Irish language should be an essential subject of examination in the University and up to the point where specialisation begins, and that in order that no injustice be done to such schools as are at present not teaching Irish a time limit might be imposed before the rule comes into force.”
41 The same can be said of the Irish version of national sports enthusiasts, the Gaelic Athletic Association, or GAA and common to this day, and the hugely popular and significantly nationalist Czech Sokol movement, which came into being around the same time.
socialist internationalism, and by the ‘principle of nationality’ in the post-1918 peace settlements.

The fact that new mass movements, regardless if nationalist, socialist, confessional or whatever, were in competition for the same masses, suggests that their followers were prepared to entertain various alliances. For example, the alliance of nationalism and religion popular in Ireland and Poland, and the unity of socialist and national liberation of which James Connolly dreamed for Ireland, was actually based on a Polish ideologist, Colonel Pilsudsky.\(^\text{42}\) In fact, the combination of social and national demands proved more effective as a mass mobilizer of independence than the pure appeal of nationalism, limited to the discontented lower middle classes.

CE 23 November 1905

Referring to the **Polish question**, “Truth” states that M.Witte will find it “a hard nut to crack,” and Mr.Labouchere points out that “M.Witte has to find a means to give Poland some sort of autonomy, and to render it impossible for this to be converted into entire separation. The fear of the latter is the reason why Home Rule is not granted to Ireland. I do believe in this danger; but supposing that Ireland were to separate from us, this would not be as harmful to us as the separation of Poland would be to Russia. Ireland is an island, and we could always prevent her from aiding one of our enemies. The Polish frontier marches with Austria and Germany, as well as with Russia, and the precise point where Poland ought to end and Russia to begin is not one on which Russians and Poles quite agree. If I were a Pole, I should be for entire separation from Russia, but this does not alter the fact that there are difficulties in the way of accepting separation far greater than in our granting Home Rule to Ireland. **The anti-Home Ruler, therefore, in England is a little illogical in advocating even Home Rule in Poland, unless he contends that there ought to be one rule for Irishmen and another for Poles.**”

Also, to Taylor’s mind, as regards the Czechs, and, moreover, their national language, they were far from being an oppressed nationality. They possessed their own university and cultural life and gained more control of the administration of Bohemia. Circumstances in Bohemia were not difficult, and it was not, indeed, a conflict for tolerable living conditions but a conflict between two nations, each determined to assert its historical tradition. The Czechs could not be satisfied with the use of their language as they already had it.\(^\text{43}\) It this respect their struggles were decidedly different to the Irish fight for self-determination. The Czech language had never been abandoned, it had merely slumbered as a rural patois. The Irish language was dead in comparison, romantic but remote, yet no effort was

\(^{42}\) Brendan Clifford, Connolly and German Socialism (Athol Books, 2004).

\(^{43}\) Taylor, p.218/19.
being spared at its revival. Decisive proof of the supremacy of national over class appeal in the Habsburg empire, for example, is delivered through the research work of Peter Hanak, ‘based on the analysis of a large body of letters between soldiers and their families censored or confiscated during World War I in Vienna and Budapest.’\textsuperscript{44} It appears that in the first years there was not much nationalism or even anti-monarchism among the correspondents, except for irredentists, such as the Serbs who sympathize as Serbs with the Serbian kingdom and as Slavs and Orthodox with holy Russia.\textsuperscript{45} In comparison, the bulk of nationalist letters from Italians and Romanians came from the middle class or intelligentsia. Major national dissidence was only to be found among the Czechs. Here also more than half the active enemies of the Habsburgs, and volunteers for the Czech forces in Russia, came from the middle class and intelligentsia. Nationality appears as an aspect of the conflict between rich and poor, especially when they belong to different nationalities. But even in letters with a strong national tone, there is also an overwhelming wish for social transformation.\textsuperscript{46} The social note is particularly common in letters from Czechs, Hungarians, Slovaks, Germans and Croats. But

\textsuperscript{44} Hobsbawm, Nations and Nationalism, p.127.
\textsuperscript{45} CE 30 October 1905.Editorial.Anyone having any lengthened experience of the inner working of the enterprising journals which supply intelligence to the British nation will question the genuineness of some of the reports from Russian cities and provinces which now obtain widespread circulation. The experienced eye may trace the hand of the skilful expansionist and may detect and delete the numerous lurid adjectives that never had acquaintance with Continental wires. People in this country have had long and irritating experience of those attentions on the part of pushful London sensationalists. Have the first of the news, true or false, invest it with “human interest,” no matter how fantastic the effort, and there the responsibility and duty of British journalism end. It is not too much to say that a large proportion of the moralising and of the “special reporting” from Fleet Street might have been bated without any material loss to the public or any clouding of the problems now being fought out with crude and brutal implements in every part of the distracted Russian Empire. But after discounting all the inventions and making full allowance for the created imagination of the local correspondents and the disabilities of “specials” not specially fortunate in their relations with Ministers and policemen, it may be freely admitted that the state of affairs in the Russian Empire is extremely dangerous, and that the outlook is bad as bad could be. Another week such as that which has been got through in fits of tremor and of panic though with no great amount of bloodshed, and half the provinces of Russia may be reduced to famine and all its attendant horrors.

\textsuperscript{46} Sheehan, p.25: ‘Meanwhile a remarkable development was taking place in the matter of bringing popular and educative literature within reach of the masses. Public and parish libraries and village halls were widely established. These were supplementary to the greater movements to which reference has been made, but they were indicative of the steady bent of the national mind towards enlightenment and education, and of a desire in all things appertaining to the national life for more and better instruction. Another important movement there was to which little reference is made in publications dealing with the period—namely, the organisation of the town and country labourers for their political and social improvement. It was first known as the Irish Democratic Trade and Labour Federation, but this went to pieces in the general confusion of the Split. It was resurrected subsequently under the title of the Irish Land and Labour Association. I mention it here as an additional instance of the regenerative agencies that were at work in every domain of Irish life, and among all classes, at a time when the politicians were tearing themselves to pieces and providing a Roman holiday for their Saxon friends.
peace and national aspirations were not always compatible because national independence seemed to depend so much on an Allied victory. During the Brest-Litowsk negotiations many nationalist letters disapproved of immediate peace for this reason, especially Czech, Polish, Italian and Serbian elite letters. The October revolution saw the climax of the social element in the public mood, but at the same time the national and social elements in the desire for revolution began to diverge and conflict.

Nationalism was victorious in the formerly independent nationalities of belligerent Europe, to the extent that the movements which reflected the real concerns of poor people of Europe, failed in 1918. When this happened, the middle and lower middle strata of the oppressed nationalities were in a position to become the ruling elites of the new independent Wilsonian petty states. National independence without social revolution was, under the umbrella of Allied victory, a feasible fall-back position for those who had dreamed of a combination of both. In the major defeated or semi-defeated belligerent states there was no fall-back position. There collapse led to social revolution. The soviets, even short-lived soviet republics, were to be found not among the Czechs and Croats, but in Germany, German-Austria, Hungary – and their shadow rested on Italy. 47

3.2. ‘Home Rule is Rome Rule’

The Catholic Church has had to the present day an enormous impact on the image of Ireland at home and abroad. The identity of a nation may rest upon several contributing factors, religion being a variant of many possible elements of a fervid and determining nature. Religion and war combining to shape an identity of Irishness are surely one of the most visible components in a study of considerations pertaining to the national. Military historian Charles Townshend 48 has published a review article 49 on the relationship between war and religion in Ireland and how modern works of history, in particular, pay special attention to the circumstances that have brought about the present crisis in Northern Ireland. 50

Scholarly analysis of the Northern Ireland conflict has, over the last generation, shown a marked reluctance to identify it as a clash of religions or even

47 Idem, p.130.
49 Focusing here on the major publications under scrutiny on 19th century and early twentieth century pertinent to this study, it can be seen that religion does not receive the credit it is due in shaping modern Ireland.
50 At the time of writing the political discord between Rev. Ian Paisley’s Democratic Unionist Party and Gerry Adams’ Sinn Féin has again reached a stalemate, with both extremist factions controlling a large electoral following.
to isolate the religious element in the collective identities of the embattled "traditions" or "communities." As the crisis of the 1970s intensified, heroic efforts were made, and not only by Marxists, to demonstrate that its fundamental dynamic was economic. Sectarianism was de-emphasized. The Provisional IRA's claim to be nonsectarian, heir to the United Irish tradition sanctified by Theobald Wolfe Tone—and indeed by the much-idealized IRA of the 1919–21 "war of independence"—has routinely passed unchallenged. There was in this no doubt an element of wishful thinking, underpinned by a fear that to focus too sharply on religious issues might be to reawaken demons of the past. The past was itself sanitized to some degree. Bien pensant historians talked down the scope, motivation, and impact of the once notorious Penal Laws, for instance. The index of F. S. L. Lyons's magisterial Ireland since the Famine contained no reference to the "Protestant Crusade" or, indeed, to sectarianism. The planners of the volumes on the nineteenth century in the New History of Ireland saw no need for special treatment of religion as a social phenomenon, much less as a political question. Even the volume on the eighteenth century confined itself to the rather anodyne topic of ecclesiastical establishments, ending in 1760. The element of religious warfare in the United Irish rebellion of 1798 has remained a political embarrassment, even—perhaps especially—as recently as the bicentennial celebrations.51

This synergy of religious and political identity may be seen, for example, in Thomas Bartlett's The Fall and Rise of the Irish Nation, which argues that between 1690 and 1830 the "Catholic Question" was redefined as the Irish question. The same topos is also at the core of Marianne Elliott's The Catholics of Ulster, where she has suggested "the Ulster Catholic must be one of the most underresearched figures in Irish history." She has traced the community's history back to "the very earliest of times, when Catholics, strictly speaking, did not exist," to contest the tribal myth that Ulster Catholics are pure Gaels, for such myths, far from being agreeable fantasies, are dangerous self-deceptions which form the parapets of an endless pseudoethnic war. Therefore, the central issue is how the identity of the Catholic community was preserved through generations – if not centuries – of intense pressure, amounting in the collective memory to persecution: the key period that of the Penal Laws, and the key process "the merger of ‘Irishness' and Catholicism."52

Why did Catholics cling to their religion under a pressure that was more intense, certainly, than would be the subsequent pressure to abandon the Irish language? They resisted the first but collaborated in the second, and it was this that determined the nature of Irish identity: in Irish the Protestant Bible, as she notes, was called Bhíobla Gallda the "foreign Bible." The hedge schools, a folk symbol of ethnic resistance, prospered not by preserving Irish but by "meeting the surging demand for literacy" in English (p. 181). The Catholic Church, which also preferred

---

51 Townshend, p.882.
the use of English, was uniquely positioned to provide (as Larkin argued) the
organizational cadres for the nationalist mobilization of the Parnell period: as Elliott
suggests, its involvement was larger in Ulster because the lay leadership there was
weaker. In this process "the Church played a major role in squeezing out the
Protestant voice in Irish nationalism" (p. 292).53

Thus the ‘imbrications of religion and politics has been perpetuated by
multiple mechanisms,’ suggests Townshend, so that is has become invisible to
Catholics, on the one hand, but none the less obvious to Protestants, on the other.
The point has been vividly made by veteran republican organizer and Marxist,
Peadar O'Donnell, whose efforts to recruit Protestants succeeded in at least
persuading several to join a commemoration in Belfast of the 1916 rising, but when
police stopped the march "the whole republican procession flopped down on its
knees and began the rosary." O'Donnell noted that his Orangemen “could have
risked getting their heads cracked with a baton, but they couldn't kneel on the
Belfast streets to say the rosary." In this they differed little from their illustrious
ancestors, the Irish Volunteers of the revolutionary period, ‘who commonly
incorporated attendance at Mass into their Sunday route marches and field days
before the 1916 rising. The first response of the 1916 rising internees, putting to sea
from Dublin in cattle boats, was to kneel amid the dung to say the rosary.’54

All the same, the mutually reinforcing stereotyping of Catholics and
Protestants has been a defining characteristic of intercommunal relations for a very
long time. And as Elliott found when serving on the Opsahl Commission, it was still
very much alive in the last years of the twentieth century. The crudest of these, such
as the Protestant notions of Catholic dirtiness and laziness, are easy enough to
dispose of; others, which may have been still more politically damaging, such as the
conviction that Irish Catholics are "priest-ridden," superstitious, or fatalistic, are
more subliminal. A common finding is that Protestants remain far more aware of
the papal decree Ne Temere (1907) than are Catholics. How far is this awareness a
distortion? As Elliott indicates, some stereotyping is rooted in simple social
observation—for instance, the idea of Catholic willingness to endure hardship (p.
186)—and there have been political and cultural divergences that are not
imaginary.55

The increasingly intense identification of Irishness with Catholicism, in the
absence of a Gaelic-speaking linguistic community, probably comes closest to the
European sense of a "cultural nation," in Herder's terms, a Volk. Donal Kerr, in the

---

53 Townshend, p.883.
54 Townshend, p.884.
55 Idem, p.885.
Festschrift Piety and Power,\textsuperscript{56} points to the revolutionary credentials of the pre-Famine Catholic Church, noting that this was the only period in Irish history in which a substantial number of clerics (including one bishop) apparently upheld the right of rebellion.\textsuperscript{57} In time, the hierarchy became increasingly quietist, often in conflict with the Irish-Ireland movement, which had a strong progressive dimension.

To these proto–Sinn Féiners, the clergy's contribution to the campaign for de-Anglicisation was distinctly ambivalent: Anglophobia helped to launch the Gaelic athletic movement, but it also justified the church's resistance to the teaching of modern science, which made the Irish people less self-reliant. Biletz offers the quirky example of Patrick D. Kelly, a classic returned emigrant with ambitions to shake his countrymen out of their torpor by demonstrating the value of new agricultural techniques, who coined the memorable phrase "parochial terrorism" to describe the clergy's stifling influence on local initiative.\textsuperscript{58}

A further point made in the Festschrift refers to the "contested symbolism of Irish Nationalism," in which Hugh Kearney illustrates that the members of the Catholic hierarchy "saw themselves as leaders of the Irish nation, as much as, if not more than politicians like Parnell, Redmond and Dillon."\textsuperscript{59}

From this point, he tightens the focus to a single moment, the commemoration of the centenary of the birth of Daniel O'Connell, the Liberator, who led the campaign for Catholic emancipation. His centenary was celebrated over three days (August 5–7) in Dublin in 1875. This became, he suggests, a crucial symbolic issue in the defining of Irish identity: Was it religious or secular? The interpretation of O'Connell's achievement—the question of whether Catholic emancipation or the Repeal of the Union movement was more significant—was central to this. In the event, the sheer length of the proceedings seems to have outworn the church's power of influence: by the third day, references to emancipation had ceased and repeal was center stage; there was even "a whiff of popular radicalism about the proceedings" (p. 79). But as Kearney notes, though this symbolic contest was illuminating, it was not final: the clerical interpretation strengthened over the next generation.\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{57} Townshend, p.885: 'This stance was projected into the period of Paul Cardinal Cullen's dominance, when Father Patrick Lavelle challenged the cardinal's application of papal decisions on secret societies to the Irish Republican Brotherhood, on the grounds that although the Fenians were anticlerical they were not (as Cullen maintained) anti-Catholic and that the government was in any case not legitimate.'
\textsuperscript{58} Townshend, p.886.
\textsuperscript{59} Brown and Miller, Piety and Power, p.65.
\textsuperscript{60} Townshend, p.887.
One of the most important and influential political movements based on the Catholic creed in early twentieth century Ireland must be the Ancient Order of Hibernians (AOH). An Irish-Catholic fraternal organisation, with a concept of itself as a continuation of the 1641 rebellion, Defenders and Ribbonmen, it prevailed in the 20th century as a constitutional lay-Catholic mass movement. The AOH had expanded hugely under its Grandmaster Joseph Devlin, later M.P. of Belfast. The AOH was closely associated with the Irish Parliamentary Party, and against all secular ideologies, such as those of the IRB (who in turn regarded the AOH as an old rival 'right-wing' nationalist society). As a vehicle for Irish nationalism, the AOH greatly influenced the sectarian course of Irish politics at this time. The movement had in fact become a mirror image of the Orange Order, affirming its sectarian identity with parades, and though considered a friendly society throughout Ireland, its strongest and most overtly nationalist grip remained on Ulster. Besides national grievances, the AOH had their own interpretation of the development of events in contemporary Europe and their supposed background:

CE 17 March 1913
Dublin Hibernians: First annual dinner

[The] first toast, that of “The Pope,” was suitably given. [The] Very Rev. Dr. Butler [said] that wherever there was a body of Christian men whose boast was to honour and reverence the Pope and the Catholic Church they would not be exempt from the tongue of calumny. No one was so unforgiving as the man who had inflicted injury. No one was so contemptible as the traitor to his cause, and no one was so envious of the success of his neighbour as the unsuccessful man (hear, hear). There were two great secret oath-bound societies in Ireland. One was that rotten faction called Orange Society, who had ever displayed from their origin to the present moment the most intense, innate hatred of the Catholic Church and of Ireland the fatherland (hear, hear). The other secret society was that of the Freemasons, whose history outside Ireland, or at any rate in other lands in the past, and whose record at the present, fully following up the old one, was marked by injustice, by robbery of the Church, by intolerance, by atheism, by murder, by revolution. That was the history of Freemasonry at the present moment in countries of Europe (hear, hear). [He] did not mean to say for an instant that the Freemasons in this country were sullied by these awful crimes which were characteristics of the body on the Continent of Europe and other countries, nevertheless they could not
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61 Founded in New York in 1836, it was to assist Irish Catholic immigrants, especially those who faced discrimination or harsh coal mining working conditions. Cf. Tom Garvin, The Evolution of Irish Nationalist Politics (Gill & Macmillan, 2005), pp.105ff.
62 Joseph Devlin (1871-1934), Nationalist MP, educated at a Christian Brothers School, Belfast, worked as a journalist on the Irish News. He was first elected as an IPP MP in 1902, and was subsequently represented the Falls division of West Belfast from 1906 to 1922, defeating de Valera in the 1918 elections. He became leader of the Nationalist Party, from then based solely in the North. He re-established the Ancient Order of Hibernians and was its president from 1905 until his death. Cf. inter alia, Lyons, pp.262ff, Elliott, p.296ff.
close their eyes to the fact that that great secret oath-bound society of Freemasons was an ever-present danger to fair play and justice in the country (hear, hear) […]

Mr. J. T. Donovan [felt] they were on the eve of victory. They had assembled at that Board believing that before eighteen months had passed away, the sentiment which the toast embodied would be brought to effect, and that Ireland would be again a nation (applause). A good deal of the glory and a large measure of the success that had attended their movement in recent years were due to the steadfast support and practical loyalty of the Ancient Order of Hibernians. The battle was not one for the remnant in the old country. It was a battle for racial pride and national existence. […] The Order was growing day by day and notwithstanding the blizzard of scrutiny to which it had been subjected, it had succeeded in rallying everything that was worth anything in the country to its ranks. [The] members were all Nationalists, good Catholics, honourable and self-respecting men. […] Mr. O’Donovan instanced the growth of the Order in Cork City and county, and stated that from what he had seen in Cork and supposed high and mighty dictator of everything within the boundaries of Cork City and County, would have to look to himself if he was to retain his own seat or those of his followers in the near future (applause). That change in Cork had been due to the Order and the Order would eventually dominate Cork, and Mr. O’Brien might take note of it. 63

And similarly, Nationalists across the country contributed most generously towards the Home Rule Fund, with which varied activities were financed.

CE 29 November 1913
Nationalist Belfast.
Magnificent Subscription. Mr. Devlin’s Letter.
National Club, Belfast, 27th November, 1913.

Dear Mr. Devlin – It is my privilege to be again the medium of sending you cheque for L1,100, Belfast Nationalists’ tribute this year to the Home Rule Fund. From the large list of subscribers you will observe the wide and general character of the support which it embodies. The subscriptions are drawn from all creeds and classes, and constitute a pledge of trust and confidence from the steadfast and unswerving supporters of National Self-government in this city. The contribution may also be said to represent a mark of grateful acknowledgement for the splendid and untiring services rendered by the members of the Irish Party during the past twelve months in Parliament and throughout Great Britain in advancing the cause of National autonomy towards the goal of final success.

J. Devlin’s Reply to National Club, Belfast:

63 The AOH had always been vehemently opposed by William O’Brien, as well as by his party, the All-for-Ireland League. After the Easter rising, the AOH was absorbed into Sinn Fein and the IRA. In many areas the organisation provided by the AOH was the nearest thing to a paramilitary force. Cf. Lyons, pp.262ff., Elliott, pp.296 ff. Cf. Also CE 2 April 1913. The “Cork Constitution” devoted some of its space yesterday to publishing a resolution alleged to have been passed by the Division of the Ancient Order of Hibernians relative to the toast-list at the St. Patrick’s Day Banquet. Our contemporary in its anxiety to besmirch the Hibernian Order in Cork either did not take the trouble to verify the authenticity of the alleged resolution, or maliciously published it with the knowledge that it was bogus. The Ancient Order of Hibernians (Board of Erin) passed no such resolution as appears in the “Cork Constitution”, and the introduction of Mr. Devlin’s name by that journal in its comments on the resolution which it published is obviously due to spite or malignance.
[...] I am well aware, as you point out in your letter, of the many heavy burdens which the Nationalists of Belfast have to bear in maintaining their position in that city. When it is borne in mind, too, that hundreds of Catholics and Nationalists were, as a consequence of outrageous and unprovoked attacks subjected to cruel persecutions, and large numbers of them driven out of their employment, and obliged, with their wives and families, to seek a livelihood in the industrial centres of Great Britain, for no other crime than alliance to their religion and political creed, I feel that in your latest proof of unabating loyalty to your native land you have given an example of courage and self-sacrifice worthy of admiration and emulation by our fellow countrymen, in every part of Ireland. [...] Quite recently Mr. F. E. Smith in the course of a recital of his “galloping” experiences throughout the four “homogenous” counties of Ulster made the impudent declaration that the people of Ireland were neither prepared to pay for Home Rule nor fight for it.

**Excursus: Joseph Johnston**

In his book on the possibilities of civil war in Ireland as early as 1913, Joseph Johnston⁶⁴, whose family had been settled in Ireland since 1620, an ancestor having served in the siege of Derry, had been a student at both Trinity College Dublin and Oxford. His book must be seen in the historical context of the political forces then at work, viz. the Home Rule movement, Irish-Ireland, the Ulster situation, Liberalism and Toryism in England, and in particular in Oxford where he was a student from 1910 to 1912.

Religiously, the Famine was connected with another cultural revolution. Most Irish people outside eastern Ulster had always been at least nominally Catholic [...]. However, it was only in the years after the Famine that they became perhaps the most religiously observant and generally obedient Catholic people in the world. Furthermore, the emergent post-Famine rural Ireland of small- and middle-sized family farms proved to be a very effective source of the vocations to the priesthood, the nunneries and the clergy in general. By the end of the nineteenth century, the Famine had transformed the social landscape of rural Ireland, and consequently the religious landscape of the country.

---
⁶⁴ Joseph Johnston, Civil War in Ulster. Classics in Irish History series (UCD, 1999), first published in Dublin in 1913. Oxford was highly politicised, the debates an entry point into the understanding of the issues of the time, namely Home Rule for Ireland and votes for women. A significant influence was likely to have been H. A. L. Fisher, whose book, The Republican Tradition in Europe, published 1911, was a current topic of discussion. Johnston became a Fellow at Trinity in 1913 and from here felt able to defend Home Rule publicly against the Tory armed conspiracy, the political origin of which he had observed during his time in Oxford. His book is a polemic against Carson and the Tory leaders responsible for the Larne gun-running. Yet his works shows that he seems to have been only marginally aware of nationalists Arthur Griffith and the newspaper Sinn Féin, Bulmer Hobson and Irish Freedom, and D. P. Moran and his paper the Leader. On a world tour as an Albert Kahn Travelling Fellow in 1915 and 1916, his actions after 1916 concentrated on invoking a Canadian model, not unlike what eventually emerged as the Free State. In this context he contributed to the debate in the Liberal press in Britain, such as the Manchester Guardian, supporting also developments within Trinity College, where Sinn Féin’s objectives could be aired in the Thomas Davis Society.
century the ratios of clergy to people of the Catholic population of Ireland were the highest in the world. **Ireland had evolved into a sort of Catholic Tibet.**

Late nineteenth-century Ireland had experienced profound social, political and cultural change, the Irish Famine triggering emigration from the island, mainly from rural areas, to America, Great Britain and Australia. Uniquely in the demographic history of Western Europe, the population fell from nearly nine million in 1844 to about four million in 1900. Demographic recovery was slow, but did not happen for another fifty years. The begrudging acceptance of British rule was replaced by a sometimes mild, but sometimes aggressive, refusal to accord legitimacy to the London parliament in Ireland. This ancient disaffection from British rule gained a force that it had not had earlier. Nationalist and Catholic propagandists built on the perceived negligence and irresponsibility of the London government and proposed political independence as the ultimate solution for all Ireland’s ailments. Irish landlordism received its final blow at the hands of the Land League from 1879 to 1881, led by a peasant Catholic from the western county of Mayo, Michael Davitt, and a Protestant landlord from the eastern county of Wicklow, Charles Stewart Parnell. Then the land fell into the hands of what had been a sort of feudal tenantry which rapidly transformed itself into ‘a piously Catholic, incipiently democratic, free-farmer society.’

Literacy in the English language became widespread, and popular nationalism of a Catholic flavour was preached by a burgeoning nationalist press. Meanwhile, Protestant northeastern
Ireland watched the progress of the Catholic majority with increasing unease, sometimes alarm. Much of its population was of Scottish Presbyterian descent and dated from seventeenth-century settlements. However, the growing political strength of Catholic Ireland made it obvious that pressure would be exerted by Irish leaders on the British government to concede local devolved self-government to Ireland. Though this proposal was anathema to British conservatives, it was looked upon with sympathy by many liberals, often in the form of ‘Home Rule all round’, or devolved parliaments not only for Ireland but also for Scotland and Wales.

CE 5 December 1905
Editorial.

It is for the enforcement and the realisation of the great National reform which will establish a competent legislative authority in Dublin that Parliamentary agitation has been sanctioned by the Irish people, and that the present Parliamentary Party has been supported by the subscriptions of our scattered population in every land. It is not, as Mr. John Redmond has declared, for the institution in Dublin Castle of a finance Authority, on the model of the Viceroy and Council of India, that the Irish people have carried on an arduous, costly and exciting struggle for so many weary years. A settlement of this question on satisfactory lines will be welcomed, no matter whether it comes from Unionist or Liberal. An amicable arrangement would be far preferable to any won through turmoil and struggle. But British statesmen never must forget that until this measure is perfected all other reforms, concessions and improvements must end in disappointment and renewed disturbance. There is no fear of Home Rule being shelved. Even if our own representatives were to neglect their duty, and if English Liberals were to go back of their pledges, there are other forces to compel attention and insist on energetic action. Mr. Balfour and the unionists will not permit the spectre to be laid; the Orange Press will do its duty faithfully by those who would destroy the supremacy of Orangeism in Ireland. Needless to say, the pretensions by

CE 24 December 1908.(Christmas Supplement).St.Elisabeth of Hungary. Joy among German Catholics over the Finding of Her True Remains. The true remains of St.Elisabeth of Hungary have at last been found. The joy with which this good news has been received in Germany will no doubt find an echo amongst the countless admires and venerators of the beautiful mediaeval saint throughout the entire Catholic world. Up to the time of the so-called Reformation, the body of Germany’s favourite saint had been preserved and venerated in her own magnificent church in Marburg, under the special guardship of the Teutonic Knights. In 1539 Landgrave Philip of Hesse, he of the two wives, sacrilegiously removed the body from its resting place and gave the church over to Protestant worship. […] In the November number of the “Historisch-politische Blaetter,” the organ of the Goerres Society, Miss Sophie Goerres, granddaughter of the great Joseph Von Goerres, tells how she discovered the greater part of the relics of St.Elisabeth in the convent of the Elisabethines in Vienna. It came to her knowledge that the nuns of the convent in question had been in the habit of exposing for veneration some relics believed to be those of St.Elisabeth during the octave of her feast. She resolved to probe the matter to its depths. The convent archives were ransacked and an important document brought to light. It is dated 1609, and it is signed by the Archduke Maximilian, grandmaster of the Teutonic Knights. Maximilian testifies that in the year 1588 he had the body of St.Elisabeth removed from Marburg by his almoner [?], Cornelius de Lantere, and at the insistence of his sister, the widowed Queen Elisabeth of France, presented it to the newly erected convent of the Poor Clares in Vienna. Another document proves that when the convent of the Poor Clares was suppressed Joseph II gave the relics to the convent of the Elisabethines, where they have remained ever since. – “Philadelphia Standard”
which those Orange cliques and the Unionist majority have held that supremacy are grotesquely false. But the sham is to-day rampant in the land. No intelligent person, North or South, need be told nowadays that Home Rule is absolutely the one essential to the restoration of peace, good order and progress in this country. A Dublin Parliament would at once attract the loyal support of every friend of progress and order, of every honest citizen who would have the affairs of the country conducted on business like methods, and who would desire to see corruption, jobbery and irregularity relentlessly stamped out. It is also the contention of unionists that Home Rule would mean oppression, corruption, and possibly massacre, and this dishonest fraud has for ages kept the two nations at daggers drawn. We may hope that the stupendous sham, which has wrought so much mischief to both countries will be ended in the near future, and that Home rule may bring peace and prosperity to Ireland.

When in 1906 another Liberal government came to power, a Home Rule bill for Ireland was prepared. Thereupon certain elements in the British Conservative Party, the Irish Unionist branch of that party and the armed forces prepared to resist Home rule, ‘if necessary by force.’ The German government, apparently ‘fishing in troubled waters,’ offered aid to both parties in the Irish conflict, and as the Home Rule bill threatened to become law, Ulster Unionism turned militant. The Provisional Government of Ulster was formed in 1912, along with the Ulster Volunteer Force, guns were smuggled into the province, and a Solemn League and Covenant was signed by thousands.68 This, in turn, had a demonstration effect. The crisis of 1906 to ‘12 gave the IRB its chance to infiltrate nationalist organisations such as the Gaelic League, the Gaelic Athletic Association and what was to become the separatist Irish Volunteers of 1913, later to evolve into the Irish Republican Army. Thus, the Ulster mobilisation accelerated mobilisation in the rest of Ireland, and the outcome in the long run was the end of British rule in Ireland outside the northeastern area, amid much bloodshed.

As Johnston states, the Home Rule for Ireland movement included both Catholics and Protestants. The third Home Rule bill was finally introduced in the House of Commons by the Liberal Government in 1912. A meeting of the All for Ireland League in the Cork City Hall on 31 March 1910, with the Earl of Dunraven presiding, an event recorded even for posterity in the memoirs of the Prime Minister, Asquith, gives an idea of the discussions leading up to the bill. Dunraven represented the Irish gentry that identified with and lived in Ireland. His family had been involved with the foundation of St.Columba’s College, some hundred years earlier, which taught Irish to the sons of the landed gentry to understand their

---

68 Idem.
tenantry. On the platform also were William O’Brien, M.P., who had launched the All for Ireland League that year, and Tim Healy K.C. M.P., once a supporter of Charles Stewart Parnell. The call went out for an all-party conference to consider a federal system for the whole of the United Kingdom. Although the Home Rule bill was attacked as being bad financially, it was thought that the Ulster rank and file would accept a wise measure of Home Rule. It was in fact the Ancient Order of Hibernians, the most powerful Catholic organization in Ulster, which was seen as the enemy.69:

Ulster local newspapers in the latter part of 1913 reveal a growing triumphalist campaign supporting armed resistance to what they regarded as the ‘Home Rule Peril’. Many were syndicated under the ‘Telegraph’ label […] There are scare stories about victimised Protestants in the South: letters from Cork signed by ‘Southern Protestant’ – ‘Ancient Order of Hibernians terrorises Protestant postmaster’, boycotts, and abductions of Catholic servants who converted to Protestantism. A Liberal pro-Home Rule meeting in Ballymoney was, however, reported, exceptionally, in full. […] This meeting was a local reflection of the politics which [Johnston’s] book aimed to support. The hall seated 400, and only Protestants were admitted, so that it could not be said it was packed by Catholic Home Rulers. It was addressed by Sir Roger Casement, by Captain White,70 by Alice Stopford Green and by Alec Wilson J.P., the son of Walter Wilson, a Director of Harland and Wolff […] The meeting passed a resolution protesting ‘[…] against the claims of Sir Edward Carson […] and the self-constituted Provisional Government of Ulster to represent the Protestant community of north-east Ulster in the policy they have announced of lawless resistance to the will of the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland and, further, hereby pledges to offer such opposition as the law permits or enjoins to the arbitrary decrees of an illegal and entirely non-representative body.’71

On the supposed danger to Protestantism, Johnston surmises that what the Irish Protestants really fear at this time is not that they will be persecuted in the exercise of their religion, but that they will be excluded from public appointments, and will be subject to petty acts of administrative unfairness.

CE 14 December 1905
The Irish Leader.
Belfast, Wednesday Night.

69 Idem, introduction, p.xv. ‘Must a man, before he dare call himself an Irishman, have a pass from Mr. Devlin?’
70 Captain Jack White, of Whitehall near Ballymena, had served in the Boer War, in which his father played a leading role, His autobiography, Misfit (London, 1930), shows him untypical of the landed ascendancy. He helped to found the Irish Citizen Army with James Connolly in 1913.
71 Idem, introduction.
Mr. John Redmond, M.P., and Mr. T.P. O'Connor, M.P., were the principal speakers at a Nationalist demonstration held at Belfast to-night under the presidency of Mr. Joseph Devlin, M.P., who, in opening the proceedings, said national self-government was the only guarantee for well-ordered liberty and progress in this country. Mr. Redmond, on rising, received a most enthusiastic welcome. He said the most formidable of all objections which were entertained to Home Rule in Belfast and in certain portions of Ulster was the fear of religious disabilities being imposed by the Catholic majority under an Irish Parliament. Once again at the beginning of what he might call the re-discussion of the Home Rule question, he desired to use the opportunity to respectfully appeal from that platform to their Protestant fellow-countrymen to dismiss from their minds that unworthy suspicion, and he said in the name of Ireland that there was No Safeguard Which Protestants Might Demand on that point which the Nationalists would not have been willing to accept, even though they knew in their hearts that such safeguards were unnecessary, and even though they felt with some bitterness that such safeguards were unjust and humiliating to them (applause).

The Local Government Act of 1898, had been passed by Unionists and had been in force for fifteen years, and there was still a considerable number of Protestants in the service of the local bodies in those counties where the majority of the population was Catholic, whereas in predominantly Protestant parts of Ulster hardly a single Catholic was employed in a position with a decent salary.

If this is a sufficient ground for civil war, the United States would have one after each Presidential election involving a change of party, when there is a redistribution of appointments practically from top to bottom in the whole public service, and all the Irish rebellions that have taken place would have been held justifiable if the leaders only had had sense enough to have stated their case properly. 72

Johnston further points out the great improvements in roads, hospitals and dispensaries, in sanitation and all departments of public effort, that have taken place during the period, and asks why it should be assumed that Ireland is unique amongst the civilised countries of the world in having an inherent incapacity to govern itself?

Do the Ulster Protestants ever ask themselves if they are not to some extent to blame for this estrangement of feeling? Does the public celebration with bands and banners of victories over their fellow-countrymen in the past tend to promote racial harmony? I have yet to learn that the British inhabitants of the Transvaal flaunt in the faces of the Boers the surrender of Paardeberg, or that those in Canada treat the French Canadians as an inferior race on the strength of the victory on the Heights of Abraham. Do the French Republicans go out of their way to remind the population of La Vendee that they crushed them 120 years ago when they

72 Idem, p.18.
happened to take the other side in the civil dissension that then prevailed, and are prepared to do it again as often as necessary? The fact is that principles and methods are applied in Ireland, which in any other part of the world would be considered, to put it mildly, the height of bad taste, and, in view of the manner in which they keep open old wounds, would probably be sternly suppressed by law.73

Johnston continues with some interesting points on general considerations between church and state, where he admits that the theoretical claims of the Church of Rome are great, but enquires for the sake of his Protestant readership where at the present day it is able to give effect to them. At the present point in time there appears to be no overtly Catholic European country offering this possibility. Not France, where the Government is strongly anti-clerical, not Italy, where the Catholic people have in recent times deprived the Pope of his temporal power, and between the government of which and the Vatican there is a standing feud. Through the centuries, until within the last 60 or 70 years when the Pope lost his temporal power, kings and princes were fighting against him temporally while professing obedience to him spiritually, and the author cannot recollect an instance where their subjects refused to follow them. Catholic soldiers fought for King William, after all, and some Protestants for King James, and so topsy-turvy was the state of things at that time, as compared with ‘the simplicity they have assumed since in popular imagination,’ that the sympathies of the Pope were actually on William’s side, and the Catholic court of Austria had prayers said for the success of his expedition.74 Johnston does not cherish the memory of Daniel O’Connell, the Liberator of Catholics, as fervently as his compatriots further south, but does ask a pertinent question of his readership:

Who have been the Irish leaders during the last two hundred years? Except O’Connell, who is pretty well forgotten, practically all the principal ones have been Protestants […]. What regiments distinguished themselves most in the Boer war, and have always done more than their share of whatever fighting was to be done anywhere in the British dominions? They are recruited from the “hereditary enemies” about whom we hear so much in Ulster.75

73 Idem, p.10/11.
74 Idem, p.25.
Johnston then cites Charles Seignobos’ Histoire Politique de l’Europe Contemporaine. This Political History of Contemporary Europe, whose second edition of 1904, describes the settlement following the Restoration of 1814: “The two great Catholic monarchs preserved State control of the church and religious liberty. Austria preserved Josephism with toleration, France the Napoleonic Concordat with equality of creeds.” Austria, in fact, preserved Josephism up until 1848. In that year this system was abandoned, and ecclesiastical authority became paramount. In 1867, however, a new Constitution was established which guaranteed complete religious liberty. Various laws were passed asserting the control of the State over the Church. Moreover, the whole situation has been ‘put in a nutshell’ by the Protestant historian, Lecky, where he says, vide his “Clerical Influences.” Though this essay was written in 1861, the state of things described ‘still exists, and is being carefully kept alive in the interests of class ascendancy’:

“Unfortunately, however, there exists in Ireland a topic that effectually prevents discontent from languishing, or the sentiments of the two nations from coalescing. Sectarian animosity has completely taken the place of purely political feeling, and paralyses all the energies of the people… a national feeling is the only effective check to sectarian passions.”

Johnston assures his readers that they are living in the twentieth century and not in the sixteenth. The religious fears of Irish Protestants form the driving force in their opposition to Home Rule for Ireland, but if there were no religious difficulty practically every Protestant would be a Home Ruler, he believes. Protestants are told that their civil and religious liberty will be endangered if Ireland obtains Home Rule, but many competent observers are of the opinion that the state of things is just the other way about, ‘that it is the artificial nature of the political system which causes the Roman Catholic Church to have so much influence in Ireland, and that with the grant of Home Rule Irishmen will emancipate themselves from excessive ecclesiastical control in the same way as the other Catholic nations of Europe have done.’ This view is shared by the authorities

---

77 As republished by Maunsell and Co., Dublin, 1911, p.24.
78 Johnston, p.39: On the return of Charles II, a very strict Act of Uniformity was passed, with the result that on St.Bartholomew’s Day, 1662, nearly two thousand rectors and vicars (about a fifth of the English clergy) were expelled from their churches and their dwellings as nonconformists, and were henceforth subjected to persecution very similar to that which the Catholics in Ireland suffered fifty years later.
of the church itself whose enthusiasm for Home rule varies inversely with their rank, while the attitude of the Pope can hardly be described as one of benevolent neutrality, sometimes being actively hostile to the movement.\textsuperscript{79} Johnston believes that the British workingman has no sympathy with the religious fears and political predilections of Ulster Protestants, and that this accounts very largely for their “apathy” on the question of Home Rule of which the Ulster leader complains. But the leaders of the Ulster movement are loud in their protests that they are asking their followers to incur no risk to which they are not prepared to expose themselves. Yet he considers it more likely that while heads are being broken in Ulster by irresponsible youths, the responsible leaders of the party have important legal engagements on the other side of the Channel, or consider the opportunity a favourable one for enlightening the British public on the subject of the wickedness of the Government. As Johnston sees it, the Unionist leaders require martyrs, but unless the Government plays their game, they will not get the sort of martyrs they require.\textsuperscript{80} The prospect of Catholic Emancipation had once been held out by British Prime Minister William Pitt as bait to win the support of Irish Catholics for the Union. In the opinion of O’Connor Morris,\textsuperscript{81} the Irish Protestant historian, Pitt was distinctly pledged to accompany the Act of Union by a full measure of Catholic Emancipation. However, having secured the passing of that Act partly as a result of that promise, he threw over his pledges, sheltering himself behind the admitted hostility of the King, which he must have known about all along, and probably a subterfuge, as the King, according to O’Connor Morris, always gave way to the will of a resolute minister. Pitt made no serious attempt to overcome his hostility either then or subsequently, but as a nominal protest he resigned office for a short time. But the history of the movement for Catholic Emancipation did not end there. The agitation was carried on with increasing vigour until it was finally successful. So long as it seemed possible to ignore this movement, the policy of successive British Governments was to withhold the grant. When the agitation on the subject began to threaten the foundations of the State, and the alternative to Catholic Emancipation was a civil war in which the Catholic half of the British Army might have mutinied and arrayed itself against the other half, ‘what was refused to justice

\textsuperscript{79} Johnston, p.31.
\textsuperscript{80} Idem, p.87.
\textsuperscript{81} William O’Connor Morris, History of Ireland 1494-1868, and Ireland from 1798 to 1898, published in 1898, London. ‘Its target readership was primarily the English, whose knowledge of Irish history was even more deficient then it is now’, Johnston, p.105.
was surrendered to expediency.’ Reform, according to Johnston, has only taken place when its delay would have rendered government impossible.82 The question of land was always a matter of contention and always apparently intertwined with religion:

A number of subsidiary causes tended to aggravate the inherent evils of the Irish land system. Tillage was encouraged by the high price of corn in the English market, and this high price was due to the Corn Laws, which were maintained up till 1845. By tillage a farmer can live on a smaller farm than would be required if he only went in for grazing. As a result of the Relief Act […] the forty-shilling franchise had been extended to Catholics, and landlords were tempted to multiply the number of “forty shilling free-holders,” as they were called, in order to gain political influence. […] In consequence of all this, in the words of O’Connor Morris, “the land was split up over immense and ever growing areas, into little patches, often of the minutest extent, the abodes of dense, teeming and poor multitudes.” At the same time a process of consolidation of farms was going on. It was thought that the existence of larger farms would tend to promote more scientific methods of agriculture […]. Unfortunately the consolidation of farms was often combined with the eviction of the occupiers of small farms in order to make up the larger ones, and the “Clearance system”, as it was called, became a term of odious import. The forty-shilling freeholders had been the backbone of the movement for Catholic Emancipation. One of the clauses of that Act abolished the forty-shilling freehold franchise.83

The English Government then tried another remedy with disastrous consequences: they extended outdoor relief to Ireland, imposing a stringent test of poverty of an arbitrary character. No one holding more than a quarter of an acre of land was eligible for relief. Peasants were thus compelled to give up their tiny holdings in order to qualify for relief, and emigration, already large, set in on an enormous scale.

The Government might have controlled the greed of merchants; they might have insisted on regulations being made to secure life and health for their crowds of emigrants; [….] Nothing perhaps contributed so much to the fierce resentment which burned in the hearts of thousands of Irishmen as the apparent neglect of the State in this matter; it left the bitterest memories, which still survive.84

However, in keeping with the traditions of British Government, the disestablishment of the Irish Church was a legislative outcome of the Fenian agitation that convulsed the country from 1864 to 1867. But the real crisis came in 1879, when, owing to a bad harvest, tenants were in many cases unable to pay their

82 Johnston, p.114.
83 Idem, p.121.
rents. A bill to remedy this state of affairs was introduced and passed the House of Commons in 1880, but was rejected in the Lords. The result was that the activity of the Land league increased, and agitation, accompanied in many instances by crime, spread in many parts of the country. Gladstone, who was then Prime Minister, first tried coercion, and then, as usual, concession. He introduced and passed the Land Bill of 1881 that legalised for the first time the principles of Fair Rent, Free sale, and Fixity of Tenure. At the time of the passing of the Land Act, Nationalist opinion as expressed by Parnell was in favour of State-aided purchase of land. This doctrine was heretical while its only advocates were Parnell and his followers, but ‘since 1903 it has been the gospel of the Unionist Party in regard to Ireland.’

If there is to be a civil war, Johnston hopes that the rank and file, especially the agricultural classes, clearly understand what they are fighting to establish, otherwise the splendour of the victory, if there is one, may be dimmed, as in the case of the Balkan allies, by the outbreak of hostilities among the conquerors.

In keeping with the geography aforementioned, and with regard to the language of administration, it is interesting to note here the ideas as put forward by an English-speaking Protestant of Ulster regarding his own ethnically mixed country:

It would also do a good deal to allay the apprehensions of Protestants, who as a rule do not know Irish and do not want to learn it, if a statutory provision were inserted in the bill that the official language should be English, and that a knowledge of Irish should not be a requisite for employment in the public service except in counties or districts where a certain proportion, say 20 per cent, of the population were Irish-speaking.

The General Election of 1900 had witnessed a revival of national interest in Ireland, and while astute Parliamentarians ‘had for the most part wormed themselves into the good graces of the local leaders, and arranged for their own re-election when the time came,’ there was nevertheless a considerable influx of new members, ‘young, enthusiastic and uncontaminated by the feuds and paltry personalities of an older generation.’ These brought ‘a whiff of the free,

85 Johnston, p. 145.
86 Idem, p.149.
87 Johnston, p.164.
88 Jackson, p.101: ‘[…] the evidence for a symbiotic, rather than a parasitical relationship between the old nationalism and the new seems overwhelming. Roy Foster has argued with conviction that much cultural nationalist activity was rooted in the early and mid-1880s, when ‘new’ nationalists were not seeking alternatives to Home Rule, but were in fact planning the cultural life of the emerging Home Rule state. The Gaelic Union (1880) and the GAA (1884) as well as a contemporary literary efflorescence serve to document this view. By extension, the failure of the
Home Rule movement in 1891-92 had direct implications for at least some of this activity: the GAA, for example, went into a sharp, if temporary decline in the early and mid-1890s as a result of both the confusion within parliamentary politics and of divisions within the militant Irish Republican Brotherhood. Both the Home Rule movement and the cultural nationalists of the Gaelic League and Literary revival were helped by the South African war, and the arousal of anti-imperialist and anti-British feeling. This symmetry in the chronology of the old and new nationalism suggests the existence of other, fertile connections between the two. It is certainly true that there was no absolute dichotomy between Home Rule and the new nationalism; on the contrary, one explanation for the health of the Home Rule movement in this period rests with the connections that it sustained with some new nationalist initiatives. Patrick Maume has pointed out that ‘the Irish Party had [not] entirely lost touch with the new Irish Ireland movements’, and has emphasised the links forged between the two by, for example, the gilded youth of Home Rule, the Young Ireland branch of the party organisation, and the United Irish League. It is possible to trace the reasonably extensive involvement of Home Rule politicians in both the GAA and the language movement. In the end, after 1914, these connections were certainly broken, and both the Gaelic League and the GAA pursued increasingly militant and separatist paths. But until at least 1910 it might well have been argued that cultural nationalism, rather than the avatar of a bloody revolution and national independence, was merely the faraday chill of Home Rule. What was true for the artisans and lower professionals recruited to the Gaelic League and the farmer’s sons of the GAA was (as Senia Paseta has demonstrated) all the more emphatically true for other critical areas of Catholic society. Just as cultural nationalism was always to an extent a preparation for the Home Rule state, so the educated and professional elite of Catholic Ireland believed that they were in training for the advent of devolved government - preparing, indeed, to take control of that government. Senia Paseta’s examination of the universities and exclusive Catholic schools in the years before 1914 emphasises ‘the marginal nature of Gaelicist politics’. Neither aspect of the new nationalism, cultural or separatist, had yet made a serious impression upon this aspect of the Irish Catholic establishment, modernism, whether in a political or cultural form, was also marginal. By extension, the iconic figures of modernist literature or of the ‘new’ nationalism - James Joyce, Patrick Pearse, Eamon de Valera - were mostly educated with the Catholic elite at University College Dublin, but were also far removed from its intellectual and political focal points. Instead of a conquest of the old by the new, Paseta sees the ‘institutionalising’ of the Gaelic cultural revival within the Catholic establishment, and argues that the work produced by the revival was tamed and incorporated within an intensely traditional and conservative political framework. The Catholic establishment at this time was interested not so much in creating an Irish Ireland as in colonising Anglo-Irishness: that is to say, they wanted to annex, rather than subvert the existing social, economic and cultural institutions of the country. Indeed, the decisive political shift within this section of Irish Catholic society came not with any conversion to radical separatism, but rather with the acceptance that Home Rule was now a real prospect. At the turn of the century Home Rule started to have a relevance not just for Fenian wannabees, but also for the rich and socially ambitious. Even so, concern for Crown and Empire (even if one was Protestant and the other British) had a surprisingly long tenure within the pre-war Catholic establishment. The consolidation of nationalist conviction amongst upper middle-class Catholic students implied reconciling a newly active faith in Home Rule with a respect for British imperialism. ‘In retrospect’, Paseta concludes, ‘we can see the period as one of preparation not for independence, but for Home Rule and a central role in the Empire.

Sheehan, p.35: I made my first bid for Parliamentary honours in the 1900 election, when I had my name put forward as Labour candidate at the South Cork convention. I was not very strongly supported then, but the following May, on the death of Dr Tanner, I was nominated again as Labour candidate for Mid-Cork, and after a memorable tussle at the Divisional Convention I headed the poll by a substantial majority. Hence I write from now onward with what I may claim to be an intimate inside knowledge of affairs.

Sheehan, p.30: ‘Ever since the first Anglo-Norman set foot in Ireland and began to despoil the ancient clans of their land there has been trouble in connection with the Irish Land Question. The new race of landlords regarded their Irish land purely as a speculation, not as a home; they were in great part absentee, having no aim in Ireland beyond drawing their rents. They had no duties to their tenants in the sense that English landlords have. They had no natural ties with the country and they regarded themselves as free from all the duties or obligations of ownership. They never advanced capital for the improvement of the land or the erection of buildings, and never put a
ongoing drama of national politics at the turn of the century. According to Alvin Jackson, the

history of the Shawe-Taylor initiative is well known and need not be rehearsed at length. Blessed by Dublin Castle, by the support of moderate landlords and by Redmond, a conference was held in Dublin between 20 December 1902 and 4 January 1903. This engaged both proprietors and tenants, and eventually issued a report that advocated a massive scheme of voluntary land purchase. The report, in turn, provided the basis for a land act - the Wyndham Act - passed later in the year. It seemed for a fleeting moment both that the historic land dispute had been resolved and that the style of national politics had been recast along new, conciliatory lines. This, indeed, was William O’Brien’s view, as he hailed not only the Land Conference Report and the concomitant legislation, but also a new form of Irish politics: ‘conference plus business.’

farthing into the cultivation of the soil. The tenant had to do everything out of his own sweat and blood—build his home and out-offices, clean and drain the land, make the fences, lay down the roads and, when he had done all this and made the property more valuable, his rent was raised on him, even beyond the value of the improvements he had effected. Woe to the industrious man, for he was taxed upon his industry! And yet who is not familiar with the foolish and the ignorant tribe of scribblers who, with no knowledge of the facts, prate about “the lazy Irish”? And if they were lazy—which I entirely deny—who made them so? Had they no justification for their “laziness”? Why should they wear their lives out so that a rapacious landlord whom they never saw should live in riotousness and debauchery in the hells of London or the Continent?

91 Jackson, p.90. Cf. also D.D. Sheehan, Ireland Since Parnell (London, 1921), p.11: ‘Accordingly Mr Balfour's good intentions were fought and frustrated from two opposing sources. His Land Act of 1906 and his Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, were furiously opposed by the Irish Unionists and the Dillonites alike. The Land Bill was by no means a heroic measure, and made no serious effort to deal with the land problem in a big or comprehensive fashion. The Local Government Bill, on the other hand, was a most far-reaching measure, one of national scope and importance, full of the most tremendous opportunities and possibilities, and how any Irish leader in his senses could have been so short-sighted as to oppose it will for ever remain one of the mysteries of political life. This Bill broke for ever the back of landlord power in Irish administration. It gave into the hands of the people for the first time the absolute control of their own local affairs. It enfranchised the workers in town and country, enabling them to vote for the man of their choice at all local elections. It put an end to the pernicious power of the landed gentry, who hitherto raised the rates for all local services, dispersed patronage and were guilty of many misdeeds and malversations, as well of being prolific in every conceivable form of abuse which a rotten and corrupt system could lend itself to. To this the Local Government Act of 1898 put a violent and abrupt end. The Grand Juries and the Presentment Sessions were abolished. Elected Councils took their place. The franchise was extended to embrace every householder and even a considerable body of women. It was the exit of “the garrison” and the entrance of the people—the triumph of the democratic principle and the end of aristocratic power in local life.

The publication of the report of the Financial Relations Commission, which had been taking evidence for two years, created a formidable outcry in Ireland. We had long protested against our taxes being levied by an external power; now we knew also that we were being robbed of very large amounts annually. The Joint Report of the Commission, signed by eleven out of thirteen members, decided that the Act of Union placed on the shoulders of Ireland a burden impossible for her to bear; that the increase of taxation laid on her in the middle of the nineteenth century could not be justified, and, finally, that the existing taxable capacity of Ireland did not exceed one-twentieth part of that of Great Britain (and was perhaps far less), whereas Ireland paid in taxes one-eleventh of the amount paid by Great Britain. Furthermore, the actual amount taken each year in the shape of overtaxation was variously estimated to be between two and three quarters and three millions. Instantly Ireland was up in arms against this monstrous exaction. For a time the country was roused from its torpor and anything seemed possible. All classes and creeds were united in denouncing the flagrant theft of the nation's substance by the predominant partner. By force and fraud the Act of Union was passed: by force and fraud we were kept in a state of beggary for well-nigh one hundred
In the fight for unity in the Home Rule cause in 1903-05, Dillon helped create a schism that lasted until the end of his movement’s life. The leading schismatic, William O’ Brien, had ‘a not always reliable political intelligence’, characterised by a manic and uncollegiate political temperament. O’Brien left the party in November 1903, and when he returned in January 1908 ‘to test the strategy of conciliation,’ he discovered that the parliamentary party had regrouped in support of Dillon’s policy.

If a demonstration were needed, this was provided at the notorious ‘Baton Convention’ of February 1909, where O’Brien’s conciliations battalion was routed by a well-regimented group of northern heavies under the leadership of Dillon’s protégé, Joseph Devlin. O’Brien again left the party and used his political base in Cork to launch a centrist machine, the All for Ireland League. At both the general elections of January and December 1910, the All for Ireland League captured eight seats that, while an irritant rather than a threat to Redmond, was not far off Parnellite parliamentary strength in the 1890s. In a sense, then, Dillon had helped to navigate the Home Rule party into precisely the territory that he claimed he was determined to avoid. The political eruptions of 1903 had created a landscape not altogether dissimilar from that of the 1890s.

It should be said, however, that there was no real alternative to the Home Rule movement until 1916, and although Unionism had a great hold, in the sense of a passive acceptance of the link with Britain, the movement was basically cast as an ethnic or confessional enterprise, i.e. to the exclusion of most Catholics. Unionism may have represented a challenge to the Home Rule movement, rather than an alternative, but with the consolidation of northern Unionism after 1904, ‘it was a challenge that was becoming ever more coherent and effective.’

92 Jackson, p.94.
93 Idem. Cf. also p.97: ‘Dillon’s Home Rule movement was in effect a confessional or ethnic body. As Philip Bull had argued, Dillon’s ascendancy in the party was now sustained partly through the Ancient Order of Hibernians, an exclusively Catholic and secret fraternity that had spread from Ulster, and which was under the control of the Belfast nationalist Joseph Devlin. It was the Hibernians, or ‘Molly Maguires’, who policed the United Irish League convention of February 1909 ‘probably the stormiest meeting ever held by constitutional nationalists’ - and assaulted their centrist opponents.’ Jackson, p.99.
Sinn Féin would become, after 1916, the dominant nationalist organisation, clinically dispatching the Irish parliamentary party, but in this period it was scarcely more than an irritant to the Home Rulers. Sinn Féin, ‘we ourselves’, was a label already in circulation in the 1880s and 1890s, but it was annexed in about 1904 by Arthur Griffith, a separatist activist and polemist, as a handy description of his own convictions. Griffith launched the newspaper *Sinn Féin* in May 1906; and though he was hostile to the Sinn Féin league, a party launched by rival separatists in April 1907, he helped to reformulate the League as the Sinn Féin organisation in September 1907. There was already in fact a ‘Sinn Féin’ presence of sorts in local government. Patrick Maume has located the beginnings of a Griffithite influence within Dublin Corporation as early as January 1904, and by 1906 Dillon was complaining that ‘the Sinn Féin business (in Dublin) is a very serious matter and has been spreading pretty rapidly for the last year’. But only with the official launch of the party in September 1907 was there anything resembling national growth.\(^95\) The death of King Edward VII in May 1910 and the accession of George V precipitated an interparty conference that excluded the Irish and might well have produced a Liberal-Tory coalition. This was certainly the hope of Lloyd George and certain Tories, all of whom were keen to be liberated from their respective Irish clients, and to push forward towards an agreed scheme of devolution (or ‘federalism’) for the entire United Kingdom. Some of these Tories would include later Ulster stalwarts like F. E. Smith and even, according to one well-placed source, Andrew Bonar Law. The Unionist editor, J. L. Garvin, gave federalism and coalition his blessing in the pages of the *Observer*. Another Unionist ideologue, F. S. Oliver, pursued a similar course, writing letters to the press under the pen name ‘Pacificus’. On the other hand, Irish and Ulster Unionists were not briefed concerning the progress of the discussions. […]

The failure of the interparty conference and the marginal Liberal victory in December 1910 permitted Asquith to move ahead with reform of the Lords and thus with Home Rule. A Parliament Act was passed in August 1911, which abolished the absolute veto of the Lords, and which therefore paved the way for the enactment of a Government of Ireland Bill. Even before the last battle on the constitution was fought, Liberal ministers and ideologues were beginning to plan for a Home Rule Bill. In January 1911, fresh from the election contest, the cabinet established a committee on the issue comprising Augustine Birrell, **Winston Churchill**\(^96\) (as Home Secretary), Lloyd George, Sir Edward Grey (Foreign Secretary), R. B. Haldane (Secretary of State for War), Lord Loreburn (Lord Chancellor) and Herbert Samuel (Postmaster General).\(^97\)

---

95 Idem, and p.100: ‘Sinn Féin enjoyed some sluggish growth at this time, although by August 1909 there were still only 581 paid-up members in the entire country. And the new party remained a predominantly Dublin phenomenon: 211 of the subscribers were concentrated in the capital, while some areas were barely touched, with County Sligo for example boasting only two Sinn Féin members. According to Michael Laffan, advanced politics in Sligo were represented by a student and a shopkeeper, who could only meet to plan for the millennium whenever the student was given the loan of a bicycle. That the separatist defiance was crushed with such force in 1908 says as much about the febrile defensiveness of the Home Rule movement as it does about the strength of Sinn Féin.’

96 Jackson, p.114.: ‘On 24 February 1911, Winston Churchill submitted a ‘federal’ scheme, elaborated on 1 March, illustrating a plan of division of the United Kingdom into ten constituent territories, including Ulster, each of which to be endowed with its own legislature. This ambitious undertaking embodied the paradox favoured by later Unionist devolutionists, that is preserving the integrity and coherence of the United Kingdom not by a grant of devolution to the Irish, ‘but rather by sweeping grants of regional devolution into which the Irish would be subsumed.’

97 Jackson, p.99/100.
This lead to a detailed consideration of the Home Rule Bill, placed before the Commons in April 1912. Once again, the bill affirmed the supremacy of the parliament at Westminster, but while the bill of 1893 permitted the retention of eighty Irish members, which of 1912 made provision for the retention of only forty-two. The new bill also proposed creating a Senate of forty members, and a House of Commons, comprising 164 members. **Section 3 of the bill dealt with legislation on religious matters and was designed to allay the fears (or, at any rate, to subvert the arguments) of the Ulster Unionists**, including prohibiting legislation that would discriminate either in favour of, or against, any form of religious practice. Thus the Irish parliament was prevented from legislating to ‘make any religious belief or religious ceremony a condition of the validity of any marriage’, 98 addressing Protestant fears concerning the Papal decree Ne Temere, and its effect on mixed (Protestant-Catholic) marriages. These inclusions were regarded as a humiliation by many Irish nationalists, and did little to ameliorate Unionist anger.99

CE 18 March 1913

**Irish National Banquet.**

Speech by Mr. Redmond. Historic Struggle. End at hand. “A Few Short Months”. L2,000 from America. (From Our Correspondent)

London, Monday Night. One of the most surprising evidences of the growth of Irish Nationalist sentiment in London was furnished by the attendance at the annual St.Patrick’s Day Banquet at the Hotel Cecil to-night. […] It is now, in fact, a unique gathering at which Irishmen of all shades of Nationalist opinion assemble to demonstrate their belief in the principle of Home Rule for Ireland and to mark their adherence to the policy of the Irish Party. […] The vast audience were not in their enthusiasm when the Irish Leader and his able colleague Mr.Joseph Devlin, placed before them in burning and eloquent words the hopeful position of the Irish cause to-day […]. One of the most significant features of the assemblage was the presence of a number of Colonial Statesmen, including Sir Joseph Ward, ex-Prime Minister of New Zealand, who was accompanied by Lady Ward, the Hon. Mr.O’Loughlin, Speaker of the South Australian Parliament, Mr. E.A. Holman, 98 Jackson, p.110/111.

99 Jackson, p.113: ‘The Home Rule Bill of April 1912 contained no concession to the Ulster Unionist case, not because Asquith and all of his senior ministers believed passionately in a unitary settlement, but rather because they did not want to conclude a deal before the haggling took place: this was the logical essence of the much-derided Asquithian maxim, ‘wait and see’. There were also some pressures from within the Liberal Party which further confirmed Asquith’s tendency to seek refuge in delay. It has been remarked that between 1910 and 1912 the public debate over Home Rule within Liberalism had little to do with Ulster, and focused instead on the rival merits of colonial Home Rule (‘dominion status’), advocated by Erskine Childers, and of federal Home Rule (the grant of legislative autonomy within a wider federal constitution), as promoted by the Liberal jurist, J. H. Morgan. It has also been emphasised that sections of the party, and in particular the New Liberals, believed more firmly in a single, united Irish government than has hitherto been allowed.’
The ferocity of Unionists had remained ‘comfortably verbal or, at most, gestural.’ But between 1911 and 1913 there developed a militant undercurrent, concurrent with constitutional or, to paraphrase a later Irish leader, ‘nearly’ constitutional forms of agitation. Mass meetings were an important part of this strategy, as was seen at Craigavon, near Belfast, a favoured venue, when on 23 September 1911 Carson was introduced to loyalists as their new leader; and when Bonar Law addressed popular Ulster Unionism at the Balmoral show-grounds, on the outskirts of Belfast, in April 1912. A series of mass meetings was held throughout the north in September 1912, culminating in the signing of a protest against Home Rule, the ‘Solemn League and Covenant.’ Based on sixteenth and

100 CE 21 March 1913. The Carson Covenant. As many of our readers may never have seen a draft of this document, we append a copy, with three deductions therefrom, showing its main obligations and provisions.

The Declaration.

“Being convinced in our conscience that Home Rule would be disastrous to the material well-being of Ulster as well as of the whole of Ireland, subversion of our civil and religious freedom, destructive of our citizenship and perilous to the unity of the Empire, we, whose names are under written, men of Ulster, loyal subjects of his Gracious Majesty King George V., humbly relying on the God Whom our fathers in days of stress and trial confidently trusted, do hereby pledge ourselves in solemn covenant throughout this our time of threatened calamity to stand by one another in defending for ourselves and our children our cherished position of equal citizenship in the United Kingdom, and in using all means which may be found necessary to defeat the present conspiracy to set up a Home Rule Parliament in Ireland. And in the event of such a Parliament being forced upon us we further solemnly and mutually pledge ourselves to refuse to recognise its authority. In sure confidence that God will defend the right we hereto subscribe our names. And further, we individually declare that we have not already signed this Covenant.”

Deductions.

This Covenant pledges these who sign it to three things: -
1. – We who sign pledge ourselves to stand by one another defending for ourselves and our children our cherished position equal citizenship in the United Kingdom.
2. – We pledge ourselves to use all means found necessary to defeat the present conspiracy to set up a Home Rule Parliament in Ireland.
3. – And we pledge ourselves to refuse to recognise the authority of a Home Rule Parliament, should such be forced upon us.

These are the three pledges of this Solemn League and Covenant. Every man over sixteen may sign. No man is to sign twice. Every man signing is to get a parchment copy of the Covenant. It is unnecessary to criticise this extraordinary document at any great length, but the most dispassionate reader of it must be struck by the alarming possibilities contained in deductions 2 and 3 – viz.: “We pledge ourselves by all means found necessary to defeat the present conspiracy to set up a Home Rule Parliament in Ireland.”

These are truly alarming words – “by all means found necessary” – they cover a great deal, an immense deal. Further, “found necessary” by whom? Is it by Sir Edward Carson?

No.3 certainly seems to me to bind the Covenanters to constructive rebellion. “We pledge ourselves to refuse to recognise the authority of a Home Rule Parliament, should such be forced upon us.”

Observe there is no qualification – Forced upon us by whom? Set case, suppose the Irish Parliament, created constitutionally by King, Lords and Commons, what then? Is it still not to be recognised and to be resisted by the Covenanters? Apparently so. Note that this is the manifesto of those who call themselves “Ulster Loyalists” – a strange kind of “loyalty; TRULY: Are Southern
seventeenth century Scottish precedents, it signalled a historical resonance within the Unionist campaign, ever appealing to a popular sense of Protestant tradition, sometimes introducing icons from the seventeenth century to underline the message of historical continuity: a flag carried before William III at the Battle of the Boyne displayed at one of Carson’s meetings. But this dash of colour should not divert from a more sombre strategic thrust, as Unionists were prepared to combine radical political defiance with the use of militant action.

CE 16 June 1913
Lord Charles Beresford.
Glasgow, Saturday. – At Glasgow to-day Lord Beresford denounced Home Rule as an infamous betrayal. If the forces of the Crown were employed to coerce Ulster he was not sure that the officers would shoot down the people who resisted this national infamy. The troops would do what they were told, but they might shoot at the moon.

Gunrunning and military manoeuvres were already being undertaken from as early as 1910, and weapons filtered steadily into the north between 1910 and 1913. Quantities were usually small, however, and most imports fell into the hands of the authorities. But in March 1911 the Ulster Unionists submitted an order of one thousand pounds to a German arms dealer, although no rifles were ever forthcoming and it was believed that the Unionists had been betrayed to the government. And by September the trickle of weapons coming from the continent had been cut off by a series of successful customs raids. Another humiliation came in June 1913 when a consignment of about seven thousand Italian rifles which had been stored at the Windsor Castle Tavern, Hammersmith, was seized by the Metropolitan Police.

“loyalists” signing this precious declaration? It is not easy to say with precision, but we fancy not. It is well to air it a bit. Ta Gomach.

101 Jackson, p.118: ‘But the Unionist’s campaign was also relentlessly modern to the extent that it exploited a wide variety of propaganda media. There was also a traditional emphasis on the printed word, with the production of millions of flyers and pamphlets, but there was also, for example, a responsiveness to the press and to the camera. The Ulster Unionist leadership - even at a local level - was sensitive to the usefulness of the moving picture and the photo opportunity. And they were aware, too, of the extent to which modern mass production permitted the spread of political propaganda, not just in terms of print but also with regard to a wide variety of household or personal possessions - badges, rosettes, medals, chinaware, photographic portraits. The Edwardian equivalent of the e-mail message, the halfpenny postcard, was the medium by which thousands of different Unionist images were conveyed - and indeed the extent to which Unionists exploited this device is striking.

102 Jackson, p. 120.
CE 16 June 1913

Home Rule.

Mr. Devlin’s Views. The Ulster Problem.

(From Our Correspondent) London, Sunday. – Mr. Joseph Devlin, M.P., has been speaking to a representative of the “London Budget” on the question of Home Rule and the threatened resistance of Ulster in the event of the present Bill becoming law, and as usual has something interesting and sensible to say on the subject. He did not express the slightest doubt that the bill would go through all its stages and become law in the May of next year. The representative of the journal spoke about Ulster fighting, and asked Mr. Devlin if he thought that the Hammersmith seizures had anything to do with Ulster’s preparations, either before the Bill becomes law or afterwards. “No,” he said, “Ulster has no intention of fighting. As a matter of fact, there is nobody talking about fighting in Belfast. The talk all comes from a number of lawyers and placemen who want not only to govern Ireland but to run that Empire in their own interest. There is not a single man of any substance in Belfast who has the slightest sympathy with this well-organised state army. Everybody whom I know in Belfast is laughing at the whole proceedings,” he continued. “It is a very curious thing that they allowed these obsolete Italian rifles to be so readily seized. The reason probably is that they could find nobody to use them. The working people of Belfast have something else to do. They are trying to get rid of sweating, especially the sweating of working women, and the sons of these sweated women are not likely to get much encouragement from their mothers and sisters to join the ranks of Carson’s stage army in a fight against those who are trying to put an end to the sweating system.” When the member for West Belfast was asked if he thought there was any likelihood of a general election before the Bill became law, his reply was an emphatic no, to which he added: “There were two general elections, and they both decided in favour of Home rule. The Parliament Act was passed to enable measures like Home Rule and Church Disestablishment to be passed, and until they are passed I am convinced that no general election will take place.

The evolution of a loyalist army continued unperturbed.103 From late 1910 Orangemen had begun basic military manoeuvres,104 an essentially independent activity that posed certain dangers to the Unionist political leadership, and so by the end of 1912 politicians asserted their control by creating a formal structure. ‘This new initiative was the Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF), and its success was such that, by the end of 1913, it was claiming a membership of just under 100,000 recruits.’105

---

103 CE 14 November 1913. Rifles for Ireland. Exported from Birmingham. (Press Association Telegram). London, Thursday Night. – The Press Association’s Birmingham correspondent telegraphs – Inquiries in Birmingham show that recently there have been heavy exports of rifles to Ireland, and several local manufacturers are said to have executed order. In some cases the guns have been carried by motor to various English ports for shipment, principally to Belfast. It is also stated that a short time ago further substantial contracts were entered into by Birmingham firms. The police have knowledge of the traffic, but have not interfered.

104 Ronald McNeil and his classic account of the Unionist campaign, Ulster’s Stand for Union (1922).

105 Jackson, p.120.
The South having by this time also established its group of Volunteers, there ensued an ‘arms race’ of unprecedented proportions, leniency towards illegal imports being fostered in the North and the image of heavy-handed suppression being fostered in the South.

CE 29 November 1913
Speech of Mr. T.P.O’Connor.
Doctrine of Anarchy.

Lincoln, Friday Night. – Mr. T.P.O’Connor, at Lincoln, said there never was a more dangerous or a more odious gospel than that of civil war preached by the party of law and order. If the doctrine of anarchy was allowed to one section it could not be refused to the other. At every Labour disturbance the nation might face the hideous prospect of bloodshed in the streets. There was no necessity for a rebellion in Ulster. Even if the safeguards failed the forces of the Empire would be at the call of the Ulster people if a hair on their heads was touched. Ulster’s demand was not for religious equality, but for religious ascendancy.

CE 8 December 1913
Importation of Arms.

Government Prohibition. Ulster “Army” will Fight.

Belfast, Saturday. – The Press Association’s Belfast correspondent telegraphs – The proclamation against the importation of arms has created a big sensation there. The rank and file of Ulster Unionists regard it as meaning that the Government have flung down the gauge of battle. I am enabled to state as a matter of personal knowledge that a large number of rifles and a quantity of ammunition was removed from Belfast to country towns by motorcar in the small hours of this morning. This action was prompted in the majority of cases by the fear that the Government might at any moment put the Crimea Act into force which would enable them to seize stores of rifles and ammunition in Belfast. In one case this morning weapons and ammunition were removed under the eyes of a sergeant and constable of the Royal Irish Constabulary.

106 CE 15 December 1913. Irish Volunteer Movement. Meeting in Cork. Proceedings End in Disorder. Platform Cleared by Crowd. Chairman Injured. The public meeting held last night in the City Hall, Cork, “to form a Cork City Corps of the Irish Volunteers,” broke up in disorder, the platform being cleared by the crowd who took exception to the remarks of one of the speakers. The hall, floor and galleries, was packed to its utmost limits by a crowd, the overwhelming bulk of which was composed of young men. […] Mr. J.J. Walsh, President, Cork County Board Gaelic Athletic Association, occupied the chair, and amongst those on the platform were – Sir Roger Casement, Professor Owen MacNeill, Dublin; Liam de Roiste, Gaelic League; Mr. Fawsitt, I.D.A., while scattered about the Hall were a number of public representatives. Mr. Fawsitt opened the proceedings by reading the Manifesto of the Irish Volunteers, which states the reason for the organisation in the opening as follows: - “At a time when legislative proposals, universally confessed to be of vital concern for the future of Ireland, have been put forward, and are awaiting decision, a plan has been deliberately adopted by one of the great English political parties, advocated by the leaders of that party and by its numerous organs in the Press, and brought systematically to bear on English public opinion, to make the display of military force and the menace of armed violence the determining factor in the future relations between this country and Great Britain. The party which has thus substituted open force for the semblance of civil government is seeking by this means not merely to decide an immediate political issue of grave concern to this nation, but also to obtain for itself the future control of all our national affairs. […] If ever in history a people could say that an opportunity was given them by God’s will to make an honest and manly stand for their rights, that opportunity is given us to-day.
Commenting on the proclamation the “Northern Whig” (Unionist) says the proclamation will assuredly not have the desired effect, but have another quite unexpected. It will merely make Mr. Asquith and his colleagues look ridiculous. The silly attempt to frighten Ulster loyalists will only cause amusement.

The “Belfast News Letter” (Conservative) says it will cause more mild amusement than dread in the hearts of those against whom it is levelled. If Mr. Asquith and his colleagues think they are going to intimidate the rank and file of the Unionists of Ulster or weaken the purpose of the leaders by this or any other steps they will soon be disillusioned.

The “Irish News” (Nationalist) says those worthy loyalists might have successfully deluded a number of their own silly followers. Many simple-minded Covenanters believed Sir Edward Carson had really intimidated the King and his Ministers. This mistake should be rectified by proclamation.

The London evening papers comment on the proclamation issued last night.

The “Westminster Gazette” says – It would have been well, in our opinion if the precaution of prohibiting the importation of arms and ammunition into Ireland had been taken earlier in the day.

The “Globe” remarks that the Government are getting frightened, and says they realize at last that their derision of “dummy guns” was misplaced. […]

The “Star” says – After the Arms Acts which Tory Governments have passed during the last century for the prevention of armed rebellion by Nationalists it would be too audacious for even the ascendency Press to profess indignation at this measure, and we notice that the cue this morning is to profess indifference.

Until a halt was finally - if inconsequentially - called in December:

CE 13 December 1913.
Arms Prohibition.
Seizure in Belfast.

Belfast, Friday – The Customs officers at Belfast this morning detained two hundred rifles of the magazine pattern, which had been landed at York Dock by a steamer from Hamburg. The goods were consigned to a Belfast firm of gunsmiths, and had been ordered prior to the issue of the proclamation prohibiting the importation of arms into Ireland. The luggage of all the passengers arriving at Belfast to-day from cross-channel ports was examined by the Customs officers, but no arms or ammunition were discovered.

Finally, one of the many evil legacies of the Union appears to have been the necessity of playing to the British gallery, and the consequent temptation ‘to try and make out the native Irish population to be rogues and rascals and, as compared with the peaceful and law-abiding citizens of Ulster, little better than savages, to protect the latter against whom the might of Britain is always necessary.’

CE 16 June 1913
Editorial

Mr. John Redmond has allowed no time to go waste in his pursuit of Sir Edward Carson and the Ulster Unionist brigade. On Saturday the Irish Leader arrived in Glasgow, accompanied by Mr. Joseph Devlin, Mr. W.A. Redmond, and
Mr. Scanlan, and to-night the Nationalist forces will hold a Home Rule meeting in St. Andrew’s Hall. [...] When the Irish Leader set out from London he intimated in the few remarks he made at St. Pancras before leaving that he was embarking on a mission “to defend his country against misrepresentation and calumny,”[107] and that his task in Scotland was easy because for thirty years Scotland had stood at the back of the Home Rule movement. [...] They will show that the Carsonite faction’s “appeal” means that they threaten civil war because Great Britain approves of Home Rule. “If Home Rule is granted,” says Mr. C. C. Craig, M.P., “it will not matter a row of pins whether we are separated from Great Britain or not.” James Chambers, the member for Belfast, told a Belfast crowd that if the King does not break the Constitution and refuse to sign the Home Rule Bill he “will no longer sing God Save the King,” and that that he will say “England, I laugh at your calamity, I will mock when your fear cometh.” Again, Captain Craig is responsible for the following, which in itself should help British audiences to value accurately the worst of Ulster’s “loyalty;” – “There is a spirit spreading abroad which I can testify from personal knowledge, that Germany and the German Emperor would be preferred to Home Rule.” What will Scottish or English Unionists say to that? And a leaflet distributed at a meeting addressed by Sir Edward Carson at Omagh stated in the event of the Home Rule Bill being passed, “we will consider ourselves absolutely justified in asking and rendering every assistance at the first opportunity to the greatest Protestant nation on earth, Germany, to come over and help us,” etc. What do Scotsmen and Englishmen think of that as a specimen of Ulster’s “loyalty,” and what do they estimate such loyalty is worth? It is true that the Ulster faction sing a different key when addressing Unionist audiences in England and Scotland, but the facts we have quoted represent the Orange feeling in Ireland, and it is on behalf of these people that British electors are now being appealed to by Sir Edward Carson and his band of bigots.

Sometimes this strain is varied by the announcement that the people of Ulster are really very warlike, ‘only they usually prefer making money to fighting,’ but if they are sufficiently roused, ‘they are quite prepared to march to Cork,’ and, if necessary, to oppose England and Scotland as well.[108]

---

[107] CE 21 March 1913. At a recent meeting of Dublin Unionists the speeches made by Messrs. Wm. O’Brien and T. M. Healy in disparagement of the Home Rule Bill were quoted by different speakers to help the cause of Unionism. The “Cork Constitution” – the Southern organ of Unionism – also finds Mr. Wm. O’Brien a useful vehicle for supplying material with which to denounce the Ancient Order of Hibernians, and in a recent issue mention in a leading article that “Mr. William O’Brien, M.P., has publicly characterised it (the Hibernian Order) as a sort of bastard Roman Catholic Orange Society.” It is, therefore, evident that the leaders of the All for Ireland movement are extremely useful to Unionist orators and Unionist journalists and that when Home rule has to be attacked or the Ancient Order of Hibernians reviled in gross language, the opponents of Irish Self-Government have only to fall back on utterances of the kind quoted to supply their requirements to the full.

[108] Idem p.180. Cf. also CE 24 April 1913. The Compromise Bogey. Sir E. Carson’s View. No Conciliation for Irish Tory Leader. Sir Edward Carson, writing to the London “Express,” says: - My attention has been called to an article entitled “Home Rule: Is Conciliation Possible?”; in fact, I have seen many statements lately in the Press suggesting that something of an indefinable nature was going on with a view to compromise on the Home Rule question. Personally I have never taken the slightest notice of them, as it was quite plain that they emanated from parties who either wished for political purposes to give the idea that compromise was in the air, or from some well-meaning persons who did not understand the real situation in Ireland and the unalterable objections of the Unionists of Ireland to the Home Rule Bill. I have never believed any compromise possible on
The special role of Cork in this remark may be deduced from the following row of articles published in the Examiner, in which the ethical and practical support of Nationalists in city and county contributed to the prognosed success of Home Rule:

CE 18 April 1913
Home Rule Fund. Great meeting in Cork. Huge Attendance. Remarkable Enthusiasm. Generous Subscriptions. Brilliant Speech of Prof. Kettle. Addresses by the Lord Mayor, Coroner Murphy, Messrs. Geo. Crosbie, B.L.; […]. The Lord Mayor, who was most cordially received, said that he could not tell them how glad he was to be the chairman of that very important meeting (applause) […] Without support Mr. John Redmond, their leader (applause), it was only natural to suppose could not carry out the great work he had in hands at the present time. […] Professor Kettle […] was received with prolonged applause, the large audience rising to their feet […]. The struggle for self-government had been long, weary, and bitter, but the end was now near, and the end was victory (applause). […] The watchword of Ireland, after Home Rule, would be the redemption of labour, the
abolition of the slum, the development of the economic resources of Ireland, the
lifting up of the oppressed poor to some standard of decent human livelihood
(applause). Unless he believed in that as the issue and the outcome of the struggle
for national self-government he would think every moment that had been spent in
the cause mere waste and utter futility (applause). They met, as he had said, on the
eve of victory (applause). He read in the “Cork Examiner” a paragraph that
reminded him that the spirit of Parnell was still the spirit of Cork (cheers). There it
was said that no matter under what circumstances this meeting assembled, no
matter how gloomy it looked, Cork would be found ready and eager to take its
place in the ranks of those fighting or Irish freedom (applause). Cork was always as
ready to join a forlorn hope as a triumphal march (applause). They had been told
that those who were leading the national army still needed money. He would tell
them why. At present there was going on in every part of England an abundantly
subsidised campaign of vilification of Ireland – an attempt was being made to
revive the old anti-Irish prejudice. That attempt had to be countered and defeated,
and if they were determined to defeat it they must meet it with its own weapons,
and if they were to get these weapons they must have at their hand financial
resources (applause). He drew to the conclusion of what he had to say. […] Ireland
had done much for Ireland, but Ireland had done more for the cause of the world’s
civilization (cheers). It was they, their fathers, and their fathers’ fathers who saved
the cause of the small nationalities, and it was they, their fathers, and their fathers’
fathers who showed the hollowness of Imperialism, and who brought back to the
world’s imagination the pride a man had in his own cottage, in his own farm, in his
own home, in his own country (cheers). Ireland had been the pilgrim of freedom for
the whole world (applause). She had wandered with bleeding feet in the waste and
desolate places, but now her pilgrimage, in the Providence of God, was brought to
an end (cheers). And as he looked at it, he thought of that old German legend in
which, at the term of a similar pilgrimage, the spell of a long malediction was
broken, and the power of it was dissolved, and as the pilgrim left before the throne
of the pope the staff that had supported him in his wanderings, that staff of dried
wood blossomed with roses (loud and prolonged cheers).

And equally stirring, within a fortnight, a report on a lecture held by the
owner and editor of the Cork Examiner himself, George Crosbie:

CE 29 April 1913
“Ireland’s Task”

Lecture by Mr. G. Crosbie, B.L., To Cork Hibernians.

The Cork City Divisions of the Ancient Order of Hibernians (B.O.E.)
assembled in the Hall at Morrison’s Island last night to hear a lecture by Mr.
George Crosbie, B.L. […] Taking for his subject “Ireland’s Task in the Future”
Mr. Crosbie began by stating that two hundred years ago one of the greatest
intellects that Ireland has produced dealt with her wants in writings that will never
die. […] What then were Swift’s suggestions? That the forests of Ireland be
protected from the destroyer and extended; that the keeping of land under grass
should be discouraged as much as possible; that tillage should be fostered in every
way, and that industry should be assisted. There is no need for me to recount that
the Imperial Parliament did not during a hundred years of its sway in Ireland lift
one finger to bring about these crying necessities (applause). Under the bill now
before Parliament and which, recollect, is chiefly composed by men from Ireland,
the responsibility for carving out this work, which has been neglected through two centuries, is directly placed upon the shoulders of the Irish nation.

Ireland’s task, it would appear, was also to gather her sons in a manner similar to the Orange men of Ulster and place not only responsibility but a rifle upon their shoulders.

CE 17 November 1913
“Irish Volunteers”

Dublin Corps to be formed. Dublin, Saturday. - A remarkable new development is promised in the immediate future. Steps are being taken to hold a public meeting in Dublin for the purpose of forming a corps of “Irish National Volunteers.” The step seems to have been suggested by the “drilling” of “Volunteers” in Ulster, but the gentlemen responsible for the “National Volunteer” movement declare their purpose to be “to secure and maintain the common rights and liberties of the Irish people.” Articles on the subject have appeared in the new series of “An Claidheamh Soluis” (the official organ of the Gaelic League) and “The Leader.” One of these, by Professor Eoin MacNeill, referring to the “drilling” in Ulster, declared: “There is nothing to prevent the other twenty-eight counties from calling into existence a citizen force.” He advocated the formation of such a force, and his plea was re-echoed by other writers in the same paper and by the editor of another Dublin weekly. The suggestion, we are informed, was taken up enthusiastically by a number of public men, and a meeting was held a few days ago at which ways and means were discussed. A second meeting was held yesterday at which steps were taken to form a Provisional Committee to superintend the formation of a Dublin corps of “Irish Volunteers.” A public meeting will be held in about a week’s time for the purpose of enlisting members. The secretaries of the Provisional Committee are Professor Eoin MacNeill and Mr. Lawrence J. Kettle, M.I.C.E.I. The name of the organisation is to be “The Irish Volunteers” (Oglaigh na hEirean), and its declared objects, “To maintain and secure the common rights and liberties of Irishmen.” The decision was “to enrol a Dublin Corps and promote the enrolment of volunteers throughout Ireland.” The Volunteers, we are told, are to be enrolled “according to locality and not according to any other classification,” except in such cases as educational institutions in which young men live under a special authority.” The provisional Committee state that they are merely a body formed to set the “Volunteers” going, not to control them when formed. On the contrary, they desire that the regiments shall be self-governing. They declare that they “hope that the various organisations having national aims will co-operate in the formation of the volunteers, not by giving their support as organisations, but by affording facilities for the encouragement of enlistment among their members.” The announcement of the time and place of the public meeting for enlisting members will probably take place to-day or to-morrow.

A special Supplement in the Cork Examiner offers the reader a ‘concise history’ of the north of Ireland from a south of Ireland point of view, scathing in attitude but generous in conceits, and prepares the path for the volunteers:
CE 3 May 1913
The Loyal North

That the people of Ulster have a “gude conceit” of themselves is an assertion that will hardly be questioned by anyone who has even a superficial acquaintance with them. They are fond of declaring, we will say boasting, that they are the enlightened, progressive, industrious, and above all the most loyal portion of Ireland. On the last-named virtue they lay particular stress, partly because by so doing they convey a reproach to the other Provinces, who are supposed to be deficient in this particular, and partly because loyalty in Ireland is a badge of distinction, a proof that one is a member of the dominant race. For these reasons, few things exasperate an Ulsterman more than to have his superiority in this respect called in question, and yet few things are more certain than that his claim rests on a very slender foundation. As a matter of fact, loyalty has ebbed and flowed according to circumstances and interest in the North, as in the South, East and West. As every schoolboy ought, but probably does not, know, no less than six counties of Ulster were confiscated by the Crown after the flight of the Earls of Tyrconnell and Tyrone. The North has long been a storm centre, and King James I. and his Cabinet after mature consideration came to the conclusion that the best way to pacify the Province was to turn out the natives and put in Scotch and English settlers, who, it was hoped, might be trusted to remain good and peaceful subjects. The idea was not a new one; plantations had been tried before in Ireland [generally] with very little success […]. What was even worse, the Settlers brought over at much trouble and expense, displayed a singular inclination to inter-marry with the old Irish and adopt their language, manners, dress, and opinions, so that after a generation or so, it was hard to distinguish the two races. What constituted the peculiarity of the Ulster plantation was that for some reason the newcomers did not amalgamate with the old inhabitants of the soil. Why they did not is a curious psychological problem. Some people may be inclined to find an answer to the puzzle in the superior virtue and strength of character of the Ulster planters; but this solution is hardly borne out by facts. […] Probably the true explanation is to be found on the large scale in which the Ulster plantation was made, and the clannish spirit of the people, who were largely of Scotch descent. Their numbers were so great that they were able to form an independent community, and they showed from the beginning a strong disinclination to mix with the natives, and so were preserved from the influences which, sooner or later, changed the character of all the other Colonists.

Whether from a spirit of justice, or because it was found impracticable, the old inhabitants were not entirely driven out of the six counties. Certain portions of land were assigned to them and on these they were allowed to settle. But as the lands given to them were generally of very inferior quality, while the newcomers got the pick of everything, they were anything but grateful, and nourished the bitterest sentiments of resentment against the planters, whom they persisted in regarding as intruders and oppressors. For a quarter of a century they brooded over their wrongs and waited for an opportunity of revenge. In 1641 that opportunity came, and they tried to repossess themselves of the territory from which they had been forcibly ejected. The atrocities with which the attempt was accompanied have been remembered to this day by the Colonists, who, however, have found it convenient to forget the terrible provocation given, and the awful severity with which the insurrection was suppressed. […] The dark year of 1641 taught the Colonists the necessity of keeping up a close connection with the Mother country. Surrounded by a hostile population, their only chance of
preserving their possessions was to cling to England, and cling they did with might and main. They were intensely loyal and intensely anti-Irish; **but their loyalty was to the country and not to the Crown; they had little monarchical sentiment.** [The] doctrine of non-resistance had few adherents in Ireland, and neither the Colonists nor the old Irish believed in the Divine Right of Kings. The former opposed James, not because he was a bigot and a tyrant, but because they were certain to be sufferers to his bigotry if he gained the day; while the latter supported him because his success meant the removal of their religious disabilities and a general improvement of their condition. Neither party cared anything for James personally; both fought for their own interests, but it should not be forgotten that the Catholics were in the majority and that their success meant the welfare of the Nation, while the Colonists were but a minority and an alien minority to boot. Luck was on the side of the Ulster planters. [...] **The devotion of Ulster to the memory of the “glorious, pious and immortal” is a remarkable instance of disinterested attachment for the great Orange Prince in his lifetime showed the most absolute indifference to them.** It may be said that his estimation of their services was not as high as their own; or it may be that he possessed a full share of royal ingratitude, but it is quite certain that when the English Parliament started in its campaign of crippling Irish industries and commerce, William raised no opposition, though he must have known the measures proposed would hit the loyal North as well as the Rebel South. [...] **The English Toleration Act did not extend to Ireland, and all Protestants who did not belong to the Established Church only celebrated their worship by connivance; their marriages, unless blessed by an Episcopalian clergyman, were irregular, and they were excluded from municipal offices.** [Thousands] of Protestant families immigrated to America, where their descendants almost invariably took the side of America in the War of Independence and distinguished themselves by their courage and hostility to England; those who remained in Ireland were bitterly exasperated. Feeling ran high in Ulster as elsewhere. [...] **The general discontent had one good effect – a gradual softening of religious and racial animosities. By dissatisfying all parties, the Government brought harmony out of discord.** However Irishmen might disagree on other matters they were all united in thinking themselves ill-treated by England. A community of grievances being established, much of the hatred they had formerly expended on one another was now directed against the common enemy. **The sentiment of Nationality awoke in the Colonists;** they learned that the country of their birth had the strongest claim to their identity, and ceased to think and speak of themselves as an English garrison in a foreign land.

Of all Ireland, Ulster was the most outspoken in her bitterness. During the eighteenth century **the loyal North was noted for its rebellious spirit** and was a regular thorn in the side of the government. **Republican sentiment was extremely prevalent,** especially amongst the Presbyterians and Independents. [...] **The Government became alarmed: the good old maxim of “Divide and Conquer” seemed to have failed. North and South were joining hands and Catholic and Protestant were forgetting their theological differences.** With the American war on her hands, England had enough to do, and had no desire to face a rising in Ireland. She recognised the necessity of reform and bowed to the inevitable, the religious disabilities were gradually relaxed and commercial restrictions abolished with much benefit to the country. [...] **The United Irishmen Society had many adherents in Ulster, many of it heads were in correspondence with the French revolutionaries and strong party ardently desired a French invasion.** In the early nineties the loyal North was generally believed to be on the verge of rebellion. [...] **Though**
religious bitterness had greatly diminished during the eighteenth century it must not be supposed that it had died out completely, in some parts of the north it was extremely lively. As a rule the Catholics agreed very well with the Presbyterians, but their relations with the members of the Established Church was less cordial – the payment of Tithes acting as a perpetual irritant. In the County of Armagh feeling ran particularly high; many outrages were committed and in one place called “The Diamond” a very serious fight took place between Catholics and Protestants, in which many lives were lost. On the very same day (September 21st, 1796) the Orange Society was formed. The new Society claimed to be a League for mutual defence, and its members were found to maintain the laws and peace of the country and the Protestant Constitution. It was from the very beginning entirely sectarian. The United Irishmen Society had done its best to break down the barriers between the different religious bodies and induce them to work together; it was the object of the Orange Lodges to keep their religion dominant. Catholics were necessarily excluded from the Society, and the spirit which animated it was shown by the terms of its Oath, which bound the members to defend the king and his heir so long as he or they support the “Protestant Ascendancy,” thus making it clear that the loyalty of the Orangemen was strictly conditional and that it was not their intention to work for the general welfare, but for their own particular good.

Encouraged by the suppineness of Government, Orange boldness greatly increased. The Society spread rapidly and wherever it went the fruits of its policy were soon manifest. The flames of religious bigotry which had been dying out were fanned to new activity. In some parts of Ulster there was a regular persecution of Catholics, so that hundreds fled southwards in terror of their lives. Wherever they went they repeated their tale of Orange outrages, and these, sufficiently grave in themselves, were of course exaggerated by popular report, until it came to be commonly believed by ignorant Catholics that the Orangemen had taken an oath to exterminate them. In much higher circles the opinion was current that the Government not only winked at, but distinctly approved, the excesses of the Orange party. […] In the beginning the Orange Society was composed almost entirely of members of the Established Church, but when the discord between the two great religious bodies became more marked, the Presbyterians began to join it, and their old alliance with the Catholics was dissolved. To this circumstance as well as to the repressive measures of the Government, must be attributed the failure of Ulster to take a considerable part in the rising of ’98. […] It is a melancholy fact that the ancestors of the men who are now avowing their determination to die in the last ditch rather than leave the Union required a great deal of cajoling and managing before they could be induced to enter it.

Once the Union was passed, however, they became reconciled to it. The deferring of Catholic Emancipation pleased the bigots, while the prosperity of the Province brought about a change in the opinion of the manufacturing and mercantile classes. The sentiment of Nationality was not sufficiently deep-rooted in the hearts of the Northern people for them to regret for long the loss of independence. […] The old line of cleavage between North and South again became clearly visible. Southern Provinces, as discontented as ever, were jealous of the prosperous Northerners, who affected to look down on them as a subject and inferior race, who were not worthy to be considered compatriots, but merely co-dwellers in the land. The work of the eighteenth century was undone and the two sections which had seemed at one time on the point of uniting drew apart.
Englishmen, or at least the Tory Party, have a tenderness for Ulster and bear her vagaries with wonderful patience. They smile indulgently when the men of the North declare their intention of fighting England if the Government will not obey their behests; they even cheer Mr. Bonar Law when, on the floor of the house, he expresses his belief that Ulster would prefer to be joined to Germany than remain part of the British Empire and live under an Irish Parliament. Such language might be considered seditious in other parts of Ireland, but it is the particular privilege of Ulstermen to preach rebellion in the name of loyalty. Many English people have a notion that Irishmen cannot open their mouths without uttering some absurdity; so when an Orangeman boasts that he once kicked a Crown into the Boyne and is ready to do so again they accept it as an Irish way of expressing attachment to the Throne.

Edward Carson liked to make a show of his acquaintance with the German Kaiser, so it is appropriate here to delve into the special relationship Ireland enjoyed with the German Empire.

3.3. The German Empire

English and Germans belonged to the same Teutonic family, spoke a language derived from a common foundation, and on many a stricken field had fought shoulder to shoulder. Rather than submit to a Catholic ruler the English had called in a German dynasty to rule over them [As] the reign of [Queen Victoria] proceeded, the threads of intercourse, economic, social, intellectual, multiplies between the two counties. Germany became the best foreign customer for English goods, England the most enthusiastic foreign customer for German ideas. […] In view of such circumstances it is not surprising that some British statesmen, impressed by the dangers of “splendid isolation,” should have turned their thoughts towards German friendship. “The most natural alliance,” said Joseph Chamberlain (November 29, 1899), the powerful Colonial Secretary in Salisbury’s administration, “is between us and the German Empire.” The Germans thought otherwise […]. They believed that liberalism, and English poison, after corrupting the aristocratic virtues of the island race, was now doing its devil’s work upon the robust constitution of Prussia.111

In keeping with this sentiment, the centenary celebrations in Germany marking the 1813 rising receive adequate coverage in the Cork Examiner, including the German Emperor’s speech.

CE 10 February 1913

The German Nation

Centenary Celebrations. Speech by the Emperor

The German Emperor and Empress, the Imperial Chancellor, several Ministers, and many high officials were present at the Friedrich Wilhelm University to-day, on the occasion of the celebrations in memory of the rising of

111 Fisher, p.1064.
the German nation in 1813. The Rector of the University was just about to begin the concluding address when The Emperor unexpectedly stepped up to the rostrum, and himself addressed the gathering in a speech which was quite spontaneous. His Imperial Majesty spoke with great emphasis, repeatedly bringing his right hand down with force on the desk. The Emperor said: - “In the old Prussian town of Koenigsberg I called the attention of East Prussia that the seed of that great period of upheaval was to be found in the fact that the Prussian people based its moral view of life on religion – in other words, it had recovered faith in its God. The present generation, which is inclined to believe principally in what can be seen, proved or touched with the hands, and on the other hand shows less capacity for that which is transcendental, puts difficulties in the way of the very word religion. This present generation well may learn how it may get back to the Faith of its fathers. Shortly after the death of the great King, the Prussian people had lost this faith […] Thus in the fear of God an oppressed and dismembered nation rose, and a wonder such as had never occurred before carried everything before it […]. We have visible proofs that He was with us and is with us, and learn from the lessons of the past. The whole of Germany’s youth can forge for itself that shield of faith proved in the fire which must never be lacking in the armoury of Germans and Prussians. Armed with such weapons, we will untroubled from right or left pursue our straight path, eyes upraised, hearts upraised, trusting in God. Then we can all repeat the words of our mighty first Chancellor, “We Germans, fear God and nothing else in the world” (cheers) […] 112

If one is to lend credence to the memoirs of an unknown ‘lady of distinguished birth and title’, then the above speech fits the image she conjures up of the noble German Emperor. As stated in the publisher’s note, the lady author had an intimate knowledge of daily life at court, and a personal familiarity with the scenes described. The author was, in fact, Marguerite Cunliffe-Owen, the Kitty Kelley of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, cloaked under the pen name “The Marquise de Fontenoy.” As correspondent of the Chicago Tribune and Washington Post, she furnished the readers with the gossip about European aristocracy.114 Her

112 Reminiscent of the slogan of Ulstermen during their annual parade in July of the same year, ‘Fear God, honour the King, and follow Carson!’ (film footage 13th July, 2003, marking 100 years RTE-Ireland).
113 Mme. La Marquise de Fontenoy, The Secret Memoirs of the Courts of Europe: William II, Germany; Francis Joseph, Austria-Hungary, in two volumes, Volume I (London, 1900), publisher’s note.
work consisted largely of personal reminiscences, and descriptions of events. Published in 1900, excerpts of her work have been chosen to highlight the then contemporary perception of royalty - the public’s fascination still unabated today - offering insight also into values and mores of times past, which would affect the tone of tabloids and quality papers alike.

Since the days of the canonized rulers of Hungary, Bohemia, Russia, and France, there have been no sovereigns of the Old World who have been so distinguished for their piety and for the fervour of their religious belief as the present Emperors of Germany and Austria, for they both take very seriously to heart their official and liturgical designation as the Anointed of the Lord. It is no mere cant or hypocrisy in their case, but a profound belief in the teachings of the Scripture in which they truly believe is to be found the most powerful bulwark of the throne against the ever-rising tide of democracy, and the fundamental basis of the entire monarchical system. Save for this, their manifestations of Christianity may be said to differ.  

According to the ‘Marquise’, of all the prerogatives enjoyed by his grandmother, Queen Victoria, the one which the kaiser was the most envious was her supremacy of the state Church of England. His ambition is to acquire the same position with regard to the whole Lutheran Church. This dream originated with his great-grandfather, King Frederick-William III, who conceived the idea of a species of Lutheran Caliphate, with its headquarters at Berlin, and its Mecca at Jerusalem. Therefore, William could only be described an Anointed of the Lord a metaphorical sense, as there was a difference of opinion concerning the dignity of a German emperor. William claimed that it identical with the status of the emperors of Austria and Russia, but the non-Prussian states of Germany insisted that it was merely titular.

That is why he has never been either crowned or anointed, differing in this respect from Francis-Joseph, Emperor Nicholas and Queen Victoria, all of whom have experienced both ceremonies, which by the masses of Europe, especially among the uneducated and ignorant, are considered indispensable to endow the majesty of the sovereign with a sacred character. The Hungarians did not consider Francis-Joseph as entitled to their allegiance and loyalty until he had been crowned at Pesth with the crown of St. Stephen, and anointed with the sacred oil, and there is no doubt that the Bohemians would be transformed from the most turbulent, discontented, and troublesome of his subjects into his most devoted lieges, were he to comply with their demands, and have himself anointed and crowned as King of Bohemia, with the crown of Saint Wenceslaus.

115 La Marquise de Fontenoy, The Secret Memoirs, p.90.
116 Idem, p.101, and notably on p.104: William apparently prided himself on his descent through Queen Victoria in an unbroken line from the Biblical King David, and claimed that he belonged to
While, no doubt the Kaiser was a good Christian, he also went about the business of placing Germany first in the arms race. The Cork Examiner features several reports to this effect at the time of the anniversary of the rising.

**CE 15 February 1913**

**Command of the Air, German Advance, French Scare**

General de la Croix, in an article in the ‘Temps’, calls attention to Germany’s formidable lead in military aviation. The writer declares that the empire possesses over twenty dirigibles, mostly of the Zeppelin type, with a speed of fifty miles an hour, armed with quick firing guns and smalls, carrying a numerous crew, and capable of travelling for several days with tons of projectiles and explosives. Besides these Germany has other smaller dirigibles. […] General de la Croix urges the necessity of building a powerful aerial military fleet and supplying the army everywhere with vertical guns for defence purposes.

**CE 15 February 1913**

In the House of Commons late last night, Mr. Borden’s resolution appropriating seven million pounds for the construction of three Dreadnoughts, as Canada’s contribution to the imperial Navy, was carried by a vote of 115 to 83. This was a drop of the Conservative’s normal majority of 15, as several Nationalists voted against the Resolution, and some members were absent. The vote was greeted with an immense outburst of cheering, while the members rose to their feet and sang “God Save the King”, in which they were joined by enthusiastic crowds in the galleries.117

The role played by Britain in encouraging an arms race to begin with is seen in a light most foul by one of Ireland’s more famous patriot sons and martyrs, Roger Casement. In his collection of essays, originally written around 1911, The Crime against Europe,118 furnishes in outline the case for a German-Irish alliance. Casement makes it clear that the chief factor governing the conflict, once war did break out, was the British claim to own the seas and to dominate the commercial intercourse of the world. Germany, on the other hand, was fighting the battle of Europe, the battle of free trade, the fight to open the seas to the world.

---


Excursus: Roger Casement

Roger Casement is probably Ireland’s most noted Germanophile. Although there were others, specially in the radical era of the early 1900s, who advocated closer connections with the German rather than the British Empire, for example Marxist James Connelly, or monarchist Joseph Plunkett, Casement stands out as the most prolific and enthusiastic writer on the positive aspects of the German Empire, foremost its culture, its people and its political stance in opposition to Britain. A biography by Brian Inglis\textsuperscript{119} offers a comprehensive look at his eventful but finally tragic life. Casement, born 1864, at Sandycove, near Dublin, had two elder brothers and an older sister. Both parents died before Roger was ten, and he and his siblings lived with their guardian, a member of his father’s family, in Ulster. He went to school there, and hereafter always considered himself an Ulsterman. His closest family tie was with his mother’s sister, who had married an agent for a Liverpool-West Africa trading company. His aunt looked on Roger as if he were her son; and he often stayed with her family in their Liverpool home. Roger’s favourite cousin was Gertrude, nine years his junior, and they remained devoted to each other. His uncle got him a job in the Elder Dempster shipping line where he eventually persuaded them to let him go out as a purser on one of their ships to Boma, where his uncle was stationed. What he saw while he was there determined him to return and at twenty he joined the unpaid volunteers who were working for Stanley. In 1895 Casement was appointed HM Consul in Portuguese East Africa. He began his investigation into forced labour in the Congo in 1903, a report published a year later. In 1910 Casement met Sir Edward Grey at the Foreign Office to discuss conditions in the Putumayo region of South America. His work earned him a knighthood and a report on the atrocities was published in 1912.

CE 10 April 1913

The Select Committee of the House of Commons appointed to investigate the affairs of the Peruvian Amazon Company, and particularly the Putumayo rubber atrocities, has re-assembled and presently the public may look for some sensational first-hand narratives of the foul work whose exposure first by Mr.Hardenburg, the American journalist, and secondly by Sir Roger Casement, the Colonial Office agent, some time ago shocked the civilised world. […] But in any case it is of importance that the charges preferred against the Peruvian Amazon Company should be thoroughly investigated and responsibility fixed for the atrocities exposed by Mr.Hardenburg. More than two years has elapsed since this

\textsuperscript{119} Brian Inglis, Roger Casement (London, 2002).
gentleman, returning to Europe after a strangely sensational venture into the rubber region put his experiences into the form of a book, for which he was unable to find a London publisher. The fact may not speak well for the courage or the perspicuity of the advisers of the publishing trade, but there are obvious excuses for a reluctance to launch accusations of tremendous gravity against a powerful company, on the word of an unknown and uncorroborated witness. The book was published eventually in America, and though in a time of exciting events it secured only a slight degree of public attention, it came under the notice of the British Colonial Office. It was determined to investigate the occurrences set forth in the grim and forbidding narrative, and Sir Edward Grey selected for this important mission Sir Roger Casement, an Irishman who had been engaged on similar service in the Congo region. This official seems to have amply deserved the confidence of his employers. He proceeded to the Putumayo region, where he remained long enough to explore all the rubber district and to investigate the principal charges made by the natives or their friends against the agents of the Company. The duty was discharged in the face of many difficulties, interruptions and obstructions, but Sir Roger Casement elicited sufficient information to show that the accusations were substantially well founded, and that this region, a vast wilderness, without any recognised government, had been the scene of nameless cruelties perpetrated against a singularly docile and inoffensive race. His disclosures produced a most painful impression in England. The company promptly went into bankruptcy, and its English supporters endeavoured to excuse themselves as best they might.

However, his health had suffered greatly during these years and he had repudiated his regular income by leaving the British Foreign Service. He returned to Ireland for health reasons and would devote himself to Irish affairs for eighteen months, which was, in fact, the rest of his life. Apparently, his father had sympathised with the Fenians when they had attempted rebellion in Ireland in 1867. His mother was a Catholic and although she allowed the children to be brought up as Protestants, she had them baptised ‘conditionally.’ Later, he was to find the library in his uncle’s Antrim home well stocked with books on Irish history, and although he claimed that he learned nothing of Ireland at school he was always conscious of his nationality. The Casements, as a Protestant Ulster family, were traditionally Unionist in their politics, but devotion to King and Kingdom did not preclude regional patriotism in Ulster, where even the most formidable Orangeman did not consider himself British, except in relation to foreigners. Ulster had played a central and exciting part in Irish history, including sagas of King Connor and Deirdre of the Sorrows. St. Patrick is said to have come to found his Church here, and from here Columna sailed for Iona to convert the Picts to Christianity. And it was the men of Ulster, under the O’Neills and O’Donnells, who held out longest in the Celtic resistance to English domination. After their defeat, Ulster had taken a different course from the other provinces.
Earlier attempts to colonise Ireland with British settlers had never been successful, but in the north the ‘plantations’ in the reign of James I were efficient and a recognisably different species of Irishman developed, with few traces of the old Celtic culture which remained elsewhere. As a result, families like the Casements regarded their province’s history as dating only from the beginning of the seventeenth century. The legendary Ulster giants and the leaders of the last stand against the English were part of the heritage of a minority only. Roger Casement took this larger view of his country’s history. According to Gertrude Bannister, he covered the walls of his room in Liverpool with pictures of Irish heroes and they figured prominently in the verses he wrote before leaving for Africa to join Stanley’s men: ‘The Dream of the Celt’ was a paean of praise for the noble Irish deceived by the mercenary English. But Casement was not at this stage a rebel, believing Ireland should sever her ties, and in the Boer War his loyalty was to the Empire. His nationalism was historical, rather than contemporary, but as the French writer R.C. Escoufflaire once remarked, the phrase ‘that’s ancient history’ means something is no longer important; to an Irishman, it means precisely the reverse.\textsuperscript{120} Ireland’s Golden Age as a nation with a highly developed culture of her own, had been a thousand years ago, only traces of it left in 1884 – the year Casement went to the Congo – when an effort was made to prevent the culture from disappearing altogether by the founding of the Gaelic Athletic Association, followed nine years later by the Gaelic League to foster the Irish language. The movement soon had over five hundred branches, including one in Belfast, where the Irish language was not likely to be heard. Enthusiasts there liked to go out to the nearest district where it was still spoken – the Antrim glens, beside Casement’s old family home and, when he came back from the Congo, he had become interested in the movement and decided to try to learn Irish himself. The League’s first President, Douglas Hyde, and later the first President of Ireland, was a Protestant, the son of a clergyman. The co-founder, Eoin MacNeill, came from a respected Catholic family, known to the Casements, from the Antrim glens. He wrote a play on an Irish theme, the Irish Literary Theatre, founded by Lady Gregory, Edward Martyn, and W.B. Yeats, having just merged with the brothers Fay to form the company which the following year found a home in the Abbey Theatre.

\textsuperscript{120} Idem, p.112.
When Casement was told that His Majesty was making him a Commander of the order of St. Michael and St. George, Casement was still no republican. In fact, he had shared the prevailing veneration for Queen Victoria, but with the change in his attitude to England, he now found the honour an embarrassment. The award forced Casement to realise his conflict of loyalties. He had also made contact with the Irish party in the Commons. ‘I am up to my eyes in the Irish question’, he wrote a friend and even confessed that though the Congo was very near his heart, ‘the Irish question is nearer’. At the Foreign Office, he admitted he was worried about accepting the C.M.G. because it would mean he would be regarded askance in every reputable – meaning nationalist - quarter of Ireland.’ He had become a confirmed Home Ruler. 121 ‘Home Ruler’ at that time had two meanings, on the one hand it meant somebody who was a supporter of the Irish Parliamentary Party, which under Parnell had acquired a monopoly of the Irish seats in the House of Commons. On the other, it meant a believer in the principle that the Irish had a distinctive nationality that could not thrive within the existing constitutional framework of the Irish kingdom. Or as in the words of J.L.Hammond, ‘the fortunate peoples of the world think little of their history, those who have suffered are apt to think of little else.’ 122 Wolfe Tone, Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Robert Emmet were a century after their death still part of Irish life, their pictures on shebeen walls, in a way that no English historical figure was, or was likely to be. And although Casement had been raised in what the Irish derisively called a ‘West British’ environment, his knowledge of Irish history was his passport to nationalist politics. Among the influences impelling him towards separatist beliefs were his Belgian Congo experiences: in theory, the State owned it, in practice, King Leopold did. As a result, natives who did not work for Leopold were left with the choice between emigration and starvation. This had been the choice offered to Irish families not so long ago. Before the English conquest, there had been no private ownership of land, but the English had not merely parcellled it out, they had distributed it among themselves and, like Leopold, appropriated its produce. In Ireland the catastrophe had been more sudden than in the Congo, and more devastating, resulting in the Great Famine of the 1840s. It was this knowledge of Irish history which had enabled Casement to understand what was happening in the Congo and, in turn, the Congo had given him insight into what had been happening

121 Idem, p.121.
122 Idem, p.123.
in Ireland, the reason also why he repudiated the unionism of his family, in spite of

evidence that it was finally bringing beneficial results. It was a new style of

unionism, based on killing Home Rule by kindness, i.e. giving state money for

public works and a greater say in how it was spent to local authorities. Attempting
to halt the ‘mercy killing,’ was Arthur Griffith, founder of Sinn Féin. Arthur

Griffith had founded the newspaper the United Irishman to promote the Irish

language, Irish sports, and Irish industries, and though its circulation was small, it

had enthusiastic readers and contributors, including W.B.Yeats. In an attempt to

attract a wider public to the cause an association, Cumann na nGhaedhail – the

Club of the Gael – was formed under the presidency of the old Fenian, John

O’Leary, and in 1904 Griffith began to spread its policy in his newspaper. The

Irish, he suggested, should follow the example of Hungary, which in the 1860s had
decided to boycott the imperial Parliament at Vienna, and to meet instead in

Budapest, not as an Austrian province, but as a Hungarian nation. Finally, the

Imperial Government had been forced to grant Hungary a measure of

independence. This was the policy that the members of the Irish Party at

Westminster should adopt: they should behave as if Ireland had a parliament of her

own again.123

Interestingly, Casement had a family link with the Hungarian

independence movement: his father – also called Roger – had been briefly

involved. When the Hungarian patriots rose under Kossuth against Austrian rule,
his father had gone to join them. Unfortunately, they had already been forced to escape to Turkey, where he found them interned. The Turks would bow to Austrian pressure in time and extradite them, unless the British Government intervened. So Casement set off to England and through Lord Palmerston saved the Hungarians. Kossuth recalled in his memoirs that he had not known who Casement was, but when he was visiting the Niagara Falls years later, a man there gave him a note saying that it had been he who had taken the message to Palmerston.124 Casement’s son made an article of it which he sent to Griffith for publication.

In Ireland, the Irish Republican Brotherhood, had almost disappeared, but in America, John Devoy’s Clan-na-Gael remained an active revolutionary organisation. Devoy had no sympathy with the Hungarians, but he subsidised the United Irishman. When 20,000 copies of Griffith’s Hungarian articles were sold the prospects looked decidedly encouraging. Now was the time to form an organisation to promote his policies and Sinn Féin was created. In the meantime, Casement had become an admirer of Michael Davitt, the founder of the Land League, by which the Irish tenants tried to restore their rights. Also Davitt had urged the withdrawal of Irish M.P.s at Westminster. Casement could not formally join Sinn Féin, but he became an enthusiastic supporter of both movements.

‘I like the Germans, and believe in them,’ Casement had once written. He admired the Germans particularly as colonists, expressing the wish that Germany, rather than the United States, should be the dominant force in South America. One must remember that before the Entente was formed, there had been nothing

124 For an Anglo angle, cf. Fyffe, A History of Modern Europe, p.456 : More serious were the difficulties which arose from the flight of Kossuth and other Hungarian leaders into Turkey after the subjugation of Hungary by the allied Austrian and Russian armies. The Courts of Vienna and St. Petersburg united in demanding from the Porte the surrender of these refugees; the Sultan refused to deliver them up, and he was energetically supported by Great Britain, Kossuth's children on their arrival at Constantinople being received and cared for at the British Embassy. The tyrannous demand of the two Emperors, the courageous resistance of the Sultan, excited the utmost interest in Western Europe. By a strange turn of fortune, the Power which at the end of the last century had demanded from the Court of Vienna the Greek leader Rhegas, and had put him to death as soon as he was handed over by the Austrian police, was now gaining the admiration of all free nations as the last barrier that sheltered the champions of European liberty from the vengeance of despotic might. The Czar and the Emperor of Austria had not reckoned with the forces of public indignation aroused against them in the West by their attempt to wrest their enemies from the Sultan's hand. They withdrew their ambassadors from Constantinople and threatened to resort to force. But the appearance of the British and French fleets at the Dardanelles gave a new aspect to the dispute. The Emperors learnt that if they made war upon Turkey for the question at issue they would have to fight also against the Western Powers. The demand for the surrender of the refugees was withdrawn; and in undertaking to keep the principal of them under surveillance for a reasonable period, the Sultan gave to the two Imperial Courts such satisfaction as they could, without loss of dignity, accept.
eccentric in being Germanophile. Joseph Chamberlain and the Duke of Devonshire had wanted an Anglo-Teutonic movement for world-leadership. But the growing antipathy between Britain and Germany had been noticed in Ireland and separatists remembered how John Mitchel had forecast that in a European war, a nationalist party could grasp the opportunity to win independence for Ireland. Although few Irish separatists shared Casement’s enthusiasm for Germany, it was shared for different reasons by Ulster Protestants. They also were prepared to enlist Germany’s support, should the need arise. Home Rule, they felt, would deprive them of two privileges that they enjoyed: access to British markets, and protection for the Protestant faith.

If Ulster were deserted by Great Britain, Thomas Andrews, the Secretary of the Ulster Unionist Council, was reported by the morning Post of December 19th, 1910, as saying, ‘I would rather by governed by Germany’. Three weeks later, the Morning post carried an echo of that sentiment from James Craig, leader of the Ulster Unionists at Westminster: ‘there is a spirit spreading abroad, which I can testify to from my personal knowledge, that Germany and the German Emperor would be preferred to the rule of John Redmond, Patrick Ford, and the Molly Maguires’ (the southern Irish, the Irish-Americans, and the Ancient Order of Hibernians – the most powerful Catholic organisations in Ulster) […]. The Kaiser was naturally aware of this feeling, and looked forward to being able to exploit it […] and when the leader of the Irish (as distinct from Ulster) Unionists at Westminster, Sir Edward Carson, went to Hamburg in the summer of 1913, the Kaiser invited him to lunch, and tried to draw him out on the Irish issues. Carson refused to be drawn, but the meeting naturally attracted considerable publicity, and was greeted with high glee in Ulster […]. So freely were such sentiments being expressed that Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, referred to them in the Commons: ‘This, then, is the latest Tory threat. Ulster will secede to Germany […].’

It will be remembered here, that while Carson was later to be asked to join the British War Cabinet, Roger Casement was hanged for treason, James Connolly and Joseph Plunkett, among others, executed by firing squads for partaking in the Easter Rising, the ‘German plot’.

If one seeks a Czech counterpart for Casement’s patriotism, it is surely to be found in the person of T.G.Masaryk. There were, of course, countless likeminded Czech politicians and agitators for self-government, for example Dr.Kramar. None, however, reached quite the status in Czech as in world history as Masaryk did.

---

125 Idem, pp.230/231.
126 The Catholic Bulletin, October 1938, one of the foremost opinion-making publications in Ireland in the 1930s: “The seeds of the crisis now agitating Europe were sown at the Peace Conference of Versailles after the first World War, by two men whose greed and malice obliterated their sense of
Naturally, his success in leading Czechoslovakia into independent nationhood far outshines the efforts made by Roger Casement, all but forgotten except in Irish schoolbooks and song. Nevertheless, both were educated men making educated judgements as to how to secure the best possible chances for their respective countries. One succeeded where the other failed, but it is in this stark contrast that the similarities of the ambitions of these two men come into a clearer perspective. They were the traitor-patriots whose selfless passion in the struggle for liberation of their compatriots from oppressive forces came into being after war had begun. Though they supported opposing belligerents, the one looking to Germany for support and inspiration, the other realizing it to be their sole and traditional enemy, their tactics were the same and, more importantly, they knew of each other.

Excursus: T.G. Masaryk

Masaryk’s career began when he obtained a doctorate of philosophy in 1878, the same year he married Charlotte Garrigue, an American music student. As professor at the Czech University of Prague, Masaryk was a social and political critic, influenced by the powerful Czech nationalism of his age, his study of Plato’s logic, Protestant rationalism, and British empiricism. He gained a professorship at the Czech University of Prague in 1882 and four years later helped expose as forgeries a group of ostensibly medieval Slavic manuscripts that had been underpinnings of Czech cultural nationalism. An advocate of democratic reform and confined their vision to the imagined interests and the aggrandisement of their respective countries. As well as exacting Reparations which were an outrage on humanity, they mutilated and manacled Austria beyond recognition, Germany and Hungary less so; and, from the several sections of these dismembered nations, set up a Masonic conglomerate which was christened Czechoslovakia, and has inevitably become the ulcer of Europe.” And November 1938: “The man who designed the State of Czechoslovakia was Thomas Masaryk. This remarkable Czech was a Catholic who deserted his religion and conceived an intense hatred for what remained of the old Catholic fabric of Europe. He laboured with a nationalistic enthusiasm for which we cannot deny admiration, but his anti-Catholic passion led him into disastrous courses, he was supported by Edward Benes, a leader of international freemasonry. In England Mr. Wickham Steed, a former editor of the Times, worked powerfully for Masaryk’s cause. When the Peace Conference came about, Wickham Steed had prevailed so far that the English Premier was ready to secure for Masaryk whatsoever he should demand. It was principally to establish the State of Czechoslovakia that Lloyd George insisted upon the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary[…]. The fate of Czechoslovakia is an example of poetic justice on a prodigious scale. Masaryk invoked the principle of racialism to destroy something nobler and in its nature Christian – the traditional European system. In the name of racialism his State has been dismembered. If it were for the Czechs to live within an ancient federation like the Austrian Empire, how much more irksome was it for the Germans to be forced to live within a small and raw State!” Clifford, Connolly and German Socialism, pp.76ff.

There are any number of books available on the life of the Czech leader Masaryk, including books he wrote himself. One of the most recent publications on his political career is from H.Gordon Skilling, T.G. Masaryk: Against the Current 1882-1914 (MacMillan, 1994).
and Czech autonomy, Masaryk was twice elected to the Austrian Parliament. In 1891 he entered politics and from that year to 1893 he was a member of the Young Czech Party. From 1900 to 1914 he was the leader of the Realist (Progressive) Party and also deputy to the Austrian Reichsrat from 1907-1914. During his career in the Habsburg Monarchy, Masaryk worked for universal suffrage and the federalization of the empire. During World War I Masaryk worked abroad to secure Czech and Slovak independence, gaining Entente and American recognition for the Czechoslovak National Council. Czechoslovakia gained its independence in 1918 and Masaryk was elected the first president of the new state. Masaryk was a religious man, exposed first to the piety of his Catholic mother, he joined the Protestant Church in 1880. When in 1878 Masaryk married Charlotte Garrigue, an American student he had met while at the Leipzig University, and incorporated her maiden name into his own, it was a radical move even by today's standards. What he had to say about women in general was often regarded as heretical by some, but Masaryk argued that social development was leading toward democratic equality of opportunity for both sexes. Masaryk's tendency to intervene on behalf of the rights of minorities in the Habsburg Empire often remained without public support, especially in the unmasking of Czech anti-Semitism. When an East Bohemian girl was killed in 1899, it revived the superstition of Jewish ritual murders for the purpose of using Christian blood in religious ceremonies. A young Jew, Leopold Hilsner, was arrested and, despite his protestations of innocence, was sentenced to death for committing the crime. In a series of articles, Masaryk refuted the allegation of ritual motives, and urged a revision of the verdict. In a subsequent decision the court dropped the accusation. Going against popular opinion, of course, made him a target for the hatred of others.

When war broke out, Masaryk escaped to Italy, in December 1914. He went to Switzerland and afterwards on to France and England. In October 1915, he was appointed lecturer at the newly founded Schools of Slavonic Studies at King's College, University of London. Mr. Asquith, then Prime Minister, prevented through indisposition from presiding at Professor Masaryk’s inaugural lecture on October 19, sent the following message to the meeting:

‘I congratulate King’s College on Professor Masaryk’s appointment, and I can assure him that we welcome his advent to London both as a teacher – the influence of whose power and learning is felt throughout the Slav world – and as a man to whose personal qualities of candour, courage and strength we are all glad to
pay a tribute. We believe that his presence here will be a link to strengthen the sympathy which unites the people of Russia and Great Britain. ’ ‘First and foremost the Allies are fighting for the liberties of small nations, to the end that they may be left in future free from the tyranny of more powerful neighbours to develop their own national life and institutions. Above all, to-day our thoughts and our sympathies are moved towards Serbia, whose undaunted courage wins day by day our unbounded sympathy and admiration.’

When Dr. Edward Benes, lecturer at the Czech University of Prague and author of several studies in sociology, also escaped abroad, the Czecho-Slovak National Council was formed. Professor Masaryk became the president, Dr. Stefanik, a distinguished airman and scientist, Hungarian Slovak by birth, the vice-president, and Benes the general secretary. A French review was consequently started in Paris, La Nation Tcheque in May 1915, which became the official organ of the Czecho-Slovak movement. Undoubtedly, the first political success of the National Council was the Allies’ Note to President Wilson, January 10, 1917. The Czechs were especially grateful to France for this first recognition of their claims, ‘the liberation of Italians, Slavs, Rumanians and Czecho-Slovaks from foreign domination; the liberation of the peoples who now lie beneath the murderous tyranny of the Turks, and the expulsion from Europe of the Ottoman Empire.’

While the general secretariat was working for these concessions in the West, Professor Masaryk devoted his attention to the education of public opinion in Great Britain on the importance of Bohemia, using private memoranda and publishing articles in the New Europe, Weekly Dispatch and elsewhere.

What were Masaryk’s thoughts on Ireland? Did he indeed even contemplate drawing parallels between his native country and Ireland? Masaryk never visited Ireland, but while sojourning in London he met a Czech colleague, Dr. Baudys, an expert on Gaelic and other Celtic languages of the British Isles. Through him and other friends in academic and political circles he met several Irishmen working in administration and related spheres, such as a Mr. Fitzmaurie, expert on Turkey and the Balkans, mentioned in his 1925 publication, The Making of a State. Here he calls to mind that he would care to call on the neighbouring island, if time allowed. However, Irish nationalism was known to him merely through literature and topical politics. And though he acknowledged mutual sympathies between Ireland and his home country, there was a central question praying upon his mind: how to

---

128 Idem, p.61.
129 Idem, p.65.
envisage the Irish character in the modern Irish who do not speak their native language? He professes, in his memoirs, to have knowledge of George Moore, the Irish writer and also significant member of the Irish literary revival movement, who was deeply concerned over the fact that his countrymen did not speak the language of the land, asking if a people were truly alive when their language was dead. This seemed to sum up Masaryk’s involvement in Irish affairs as well.130 The question if religion also influenced his limited desire to acquaint himself personally with Irish affairs remains unanswered. Nowhere does he stipulate a bias towards Protestant England in comparison with Catholic Ireland. However, given his earnest religious leanings, it does not seem implausible to consider that Masaryk felt no compulsion to sympathize with a people who closely identified with a religion he had formerly rejected.

3.4. Austrian Reformers and Recidivists

Catholic Austria at the turn of the century was severely tried by the Eastern question, and the acquisition of new provinces, as well as the continual divisions in the old provinces. Both circumstances taxed the power of Government, which sought to remedy the recalcitrant aggravation through reform. One of the outstanding successes on a national level was the Moravian Compromise, achieved 27 November 1905.

The Moravian Compromise, as the name suggests, divided Moravia into national districts administered in the language of the majority. The personal vote allowed a Czech to vote as a Czech and a German as a German in whatever district he lived, thus nationalities could not fight for control of the Diet where the proportion was permanently fixed at seventy-three Czechs and forty Germans. This apparently ingenious idea ended the national conflicts in Moravia and was held up as an example for the rest of Austria.131 But Moravia was not sacred to the Germans nor to the Czechs, merely an administrative unit created by the Habsburgs. Thus the two nationalities lived side by side as their national difference was not underlined by a conflict of histories and cultures. This principle was

---

131 Though apparently not to the most western part of Europe, as no mention of the compromise could be found in the Cork Examiner around this time. However, lengthy and regular articles may be found on electoral reform.
repeated in the Bukovina, the province severed by Galicia from the rest of Austria. As the Bukovina was not claimed by any one nationality and had no history over which they could fight, the Bukovina worked successfully the Moravian principle of personal nationality and a fixed proportion of nationalities in the Diet.\textsuperscript{132} The Compromise of Galicia followed in 1914. The Moravian compromise and its successors have often been seen as evidence that the feuding nations of the late Habsburg Monarchy could find common ground to live together in harmony. At a time when developing mass political movements were transforming the relationship between society and the state, the Moravian political developments after 1900 were different indeed. The 1905 compromise locked Moravia in a state of endless \textit{``democratising''} that perpetuated the national and social conflicts it was to mitigate, and so, for the sake of stability, the Czech, German, and aristocratic negotiators of the compromise compromised actual democratic reform. \textbf{Electoral geometry effectively barred the various mass parties from equal access to local politics,} the leaders being forced to continue their strategy of undermining the local political order by taking their struggle to the streets.\textsuperscript{133}

---

\begin{flushright}
CE 29 November 1905
\textbf{Universal Suffrage in Austria.}
Vienna, Tuesday.

A great demonstration of organised labour in favour of universal, equal and direct suffrage of the Reichsrath, arranged by the Social Democratic Party, took place to-day. Most of the factories and business houses and many offices were closed in Vienna. The workmen assembled and proceeded to Karlsplatz where a great procession was marshalled at a quarter past ten. The head of the procession reached Parliament Building and a deputation went into the Reichsrath building in order to hand a petition for universal suffrage to the Premier and the Presidents of both Houses of the Reichsrath. The procession meanwhile continued its march past the building. On both sides of the Ringstrasse extraordinary large crowds had gathered to witness the procession, and near parliament House a crowd broke through a cordon of police, but was got under control and driven back. The march of the demonstrators, which was of a perfectly orderly character, was still in progress at 11 o’clock. No untoward incident has as yet been reported. The procession is headed by banners and flags bearing universal suffrage inscriptions. – Reuter.

Vienna, Tuesday, 1p.m.

At half past twelve the procession was still moving, and according to police statements, it will last until half past two. Two hundred thousand men are estimated to be taking part in it. In reply to the address delivered by the leader of the

\textsuperscript{132} Cf. Taylor, p.214/15.

\textsuperscript{133} Cf. inter alia, Gerald Stourzh, Die Gleichberechtigung der Nationalitäten in der Verfassung und Verwaltung Österreichs 1848-1918 (Vienna, 1985), Adam Wandruszka and Peter Urbanitsch (eds.), Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848-1914, III/2, (Vienna, 1980).
deputation who presented the petition for universal suffrage in the Reichsrath, Count Vetter von Der Lilie, President of the Lower House, said the foremost duty of the Legislature was to listen to the cry which reached Parliament from all classes of society for an extension of the suffrage when the Reichsrath was in a position to deal with the question. The deputation would agree with him that so far-reaching a reform, and one rendered so difficult by the peculiar political and national conditions of Austria, could only be brought to an issue satisfactory in all respects when Parliament could perform the difficult and responsible task in perfect tranquility without prejudice or outside influence. The deputation might rely on the intelligence and goodwill of the House. He (President) would, with all his power, promote and support this work of the House. Prince Windischgraeetz, President of the House of Peers, declared that neither was he in a position nor had he the intention to prejudice in any way the attitude that might be taken up by the House of Peers when the matter came before it. He believed, however, he could give an assurance that the House of Peers would strive to fulfil its patriotic duties according to its best knowledge, unswayed by attempts of external influences. Baron Gautsch, Premier, referred to the well-known declaration by the Government published in the Vienna “Abendpost,” and likewise to remarks which the Premier had made to a deputation of manufacturers, in which he had expressed the Government’s views on the question of electoral reform. These views he (Premier) would enunciate in detail in the Lower House, as the proper place, so that within a very short time there would be a clearness regarding the Government’s intentions, and he was firmly convinced that tranquillity and order were the best means for promoting electoral reform.

However, not all leading statesmen agreed with the Government, adding more confusion rather than clarity to a situation already fraught with tension and gunpowder:

CE 12 December 1905

Count Andrassy on Universal Suffrage.

Budapest, Monday. Addressing his constituents at Szombathely, Count Andrassy declared that he did not accept the programme of the government regarding universal suffrage. While desirous of the extension of the franchise to the working classes, he did not consider it in the interests of the country to allow a new and inexperienced element to exercise a decisive influence and supplant the intelligent class in the control of public affairs, moreover, such a sweeping reform as that advocated by the government might without having passed through the transition stage, be fraught with danger to the present character of the nation. – Reuter

Moravia had been an integral part of the Bohemian Kingdom for more than a thousand years, and like many of the inhabitants of the empire, Moravians lived in a world of overlapping identities, and often loyalties. They lived in a state where political conflict divided the population into rival camps and thus were forced to choose the identity that most accurately reflected their personal circumstances, or which seemed likely to yield the greatest personal benefit. Rapid socio-economic
and political changes on a continental scale had resulted in growing demands for democratisation, and a strong pressure for change in the political order had also been building up in Moravia. Mass-based Czech parties were demanding increasingly comprehensive social and political changes and, as would be expected, German parties opposed any substantial change that would lead to a diminution of their position. However, in Moravia, there was a third group, the liberal and conservative Czechs who found themselves in a loose alliance with the great landowners. The Czechs in this group felt torn between their desire to dominate the Czech majority in Moravia, and their fear of the masses. The great landowners were faced with the dilemma of being torn between loyalty to the Emperor, their class, and, for some, their national feelings. And it was in fact this troubled party caught in the middle of the conflict that was responsible for the compromise of 1905. The framers of the compromise achieved their aims, representatives of the political left being shut out of the provincial Diet, and yet creating a power-sharing relationship which allowed the diet to continue to function effectively and thus forestalling direct administration from Vienna. As a result, Moravia’s political elite held onto a much greater measure of power in the monarchy than was the case in Bohemia. The Czechs, in comparison, claimed possession of their ‘national home’ and if this claim were granted by the Habsburgs, the Germans of Bohemia would become merely a tolerated minority and thus ending German Ascendancy in the region. But once dethroned in Bohemia meant being dethroned in the whole Monarchy; and Austria would cease to be a German state. Moreover, the overthrow of one ‘people of state’ would lead to the overthrow of the others and thus the predominance of the Poles, Magyars, and even Italians, was bound up with the national conflict in Bohemia. So the Germans of the rest of Austria, supported by the Poles, encouraged the Germans of Bohemia in the defence of their ‘rights’, and the Czechs of Moravia and the Slovenes supported the Czech aims. The Christian Socialists defended the German monopoly of Vienna, and the Social Democrats split into national parties, with the Czech Socialists working with the other Czech groups in all national questions.\footnote{Taylor, p.229.} Czech-German relations in Bohemia were still the object of endless negotiation, new plans were propounded, discussed, and finally rejected, when Count Stürgkh, the next bureaucrat Prime minister, produced further plans for a settlement, declaring as late as 1914 that the Czechs and...
Germans were separated by a wall ‘the thickness only of a piece of paper’. But even though the Germans were made more assertive by the strengthening of national feeling in Germany, and the Czechs more apprehensive of having to fight on the German side in a likely war between Germans and Slavs, the greatest exponents of obstruction in the Reichsrat were actually the Little Russians. Resentful of Polish privilege in Galicia, they were supported by Czechs and Slovenes on the principle of Slav solidarity. Therefore, the Germans applied obstruction in the Bohemian Diet, and even the committee of the Diet that controlled provincial administration broke down, and in 1913 Stürgkh officially suspended the Bohemian constitution on imperial orders.

On 26 July 1913 Francis Joseph abolished the provincial self-government authorities in Bohemia and appointed a commission to carry out their duties. Because it took place on the Catholic feast-day of Saint Anne, this silent coup d’état became known as ‘Annenpatent’ in Austrian bureaucratese. The ostensible reason for this ‘Staatstreich von oben’ was the financial difficulties of the self-governing authorities: rather like an IMF rescue package, the Annenpatent was designed to save Bohemian finances from bankruptcy. (The takeover of Newfoundland in 1934 might be regarded as something of a parallel, or, indeed, the displacement of Stormont over the last few decades.) […] Bohemian political leaders voiced their protest against government interference in public, but many of them privately welcomed the government’s move and expressed their relief. Moreover, Bohemia was not at all a liability but the most economically vibrant part of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. Impending bankruptcy was due not to reckless spending of the part of the old government board, but to a drying up of revenue that in turn resulted from obstruction in the Bohemian Diet where the German minority had prevented the Czech majority from concluding any business at all.136

Austrians, awed by the Emperor, could not imagine central Europe without the dynasty, even advanced Socialists dreamed of democratic Socialism imposed by dynastic initiative, and Germans who hated Habsburg rule desired instead the rule of the Hohenzollerns.137

CE 1 May 1908
Austrian Emperor’s Birthday.
Numerous Congratulations.

135 Taylor, p.238.
137 This was in keeping also with contemporary Irish nationalism, considering Daniel O’Connell had remained a monarchist (and anti-trade unionist) until his death, Parnell, himself an aristocrat, was popularly known as the ‘uncrowned king of Ireland’, and even among the radical leaders of the Easter Rising of 1916 there was a wish for a separate monarch to rule Ireland, Joseph Plunkett especially wanting Josef von Hohenzollern, a German Catholic duke, to be crowned king of Ireland.
Vienna, Saturday. The ‘Politische Correspondence’ publishes the following list of sovereigns and princes from whom the Austrian Emperor received congratulations on the occasion of his jubilee – King Victor Emmanuel, King Alfons, King Manuel of Portugal [...]. – Reuter.

CE 22 May 1908

**Austrian Emperor’s Jubilee.**

Schoolchildren’s Ovation. Impressive Spectacle.

Vienna, Thursday. Emperor Francis Joseph will receive no more magnificent and spontaneous jubilee ovation than that of this morning, when eighty-two thousand Viennese school children gathered in the Imperial Park at Schonbrunn to demonstrate their loyalty and affection for their revered Sovereign. It was a striking scene – the boys and girls in endless rows extending from the space immediately before the Palace back on the rising ground almost to the Gloriette, eight hundred feet above. The girls were bareheaded, all dresses in white, with sashes of familiar Austrian black and yellow; the boys in dark clothes with red and white scarves. The Emperor stood on the terrace balcony in front of the palace, surrounded by the members of the imperial family and high officers of State. The windows of the palace were all occupied by aristocratic patronesses of the ceremony and their friends, while stands had been erected in the park for the accommodation of State and city officials. In front of the main body of children were two big groups – one of a thousand singers and the other of two hundred and forty children, twelve from each district of the city, dressed in varied costumes, who danced in accompaniment to the music. The programme was a simple one, and lasted only a little over half an hour. It began with the singing of a chorus specially written for the occasion, and was followed by a short address of welcome, delivered by an actress from the Burg Theatre. Then came singing of patriotic airs, with dancing by groups of children, some dressed in the costume of 1830 and others in that of the Radetzky period, the latter keeping time to Radetzky march music and dancing. The evolutions were beautifully performed, bearing testimony to the many patient rehearsals. With a great outburst of cheering and hochs for the Kaiser, the programme was brought to a conclusion. Less interesting, but infinitely more difficult, than the carrying out of the ceremony itself, was the task of bringing such an army of young people from their homes to Schonbrunn and sending them safely back again. Twenty thousand children, whose schools were situate near the park, went on foot, twenty thousand were carried in special trains on the city railway, and the remaining forty-two thousand were brought in tram cars. The children were given a couple of breakfast rolls each before starting from school and were accompanied to the park by the doctors. The heat of the sun was so great that nearly a thousand children were overcome, but only ten of the cases are serious. – Reuter.

In Bohemia, however, the solitary Czech professor Masaryk had confidence in the people and wished them to exercise responsibility themselves. Masaryk had previously offended Czech enthusiasts by exposing sacred Czech manuscripts of...
the early Middle Ages as forgeries of the nineteenth century and had earned the hatred of both Czech and German extremists by his successful defence of a Jew against the charge of ritual murder. Masaryk believed the Czech nation could achieve freedom only on the foundation of truth, not on an artificial, outworn tradition of ‘state rights.’ And while more romantic Czechs conducted nationalist agitation until a government job was offered them, Masaryk kept his independence of the Habsburgs. Masaryk also rejected Pan-Slavism, realising the breach with western civilization that Pan-Slavism would involve, aiming instead to make Prague the centre of a democratic Slav culture. For the Czech people were now a nation advanced in culture, free from aristocratic politicians, and essentially middle class (thus relocating demonstrations from the streets to theatres and universities).

CE 7 December 1908
Austrian Student Riots
Vienna, Sunday.
A German Nationalist meeting, to protest against the ill-treatment of German students at Prague, took place here this morning. After the meeting the demonstrators marched on the University. The police interfered, and there were several conflicts. 27 arrests were made. – Reuter.

CE 14 December 1908
Anti-German Demonstration. Theatre Incident.
Moscow, Saturday.
During a performance of a Viennese troop at the International Theatre Moscow, last night, a noisy demonstration was made by a party of Czechs, who, on an actor appearing in Austrian officer’s uniform, shouted “Down with the Germans!” – Reuter.

It had been wrongly assumed that workers and peasants were free from nationalism, and while this was true in the days of mass illiteracy, now that Austria, or any other European country for that matter, had universal elementary education, every man who could read and write had to define his national allegiance.139 And as economics based on the reviewed Ausgleich with Hungary of 1906 dictated that the great stroke of foreign policy had to be a stroke against Serbia, the fly in the Hungarian ointment, the defeat of the ‘South Slav conspiracy’ eventually became the solution for all the difficulties of the Habsburg Monarchy.

139 Taylor, p.229.
It was the Emperor’s aim to annex Bosnia and Herzegovina, Turkish provinces under Habsburg occupation since 1878, and thus prevent Serbia from acquiring the territory on the collapse of the Turkish Empire. And while Andrássy continued to believe in the might of the Turks and had insisted on occupation, Aerenthal was prepared to dismiss the Turkish Empire and bargain with the Russians.

CE 9 October 1908
Austria’s Coup.
Budapest, Thursday. Addressing the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Austrian Delegation this afternoon, Baron Von Aerenthal, Austro-Hungarian Minister for Foreign Affairs, dealt exhaustively with the situation in the Near East.

After referring to the movement for the restoration of the Constitution in Turkey, and pointing out that as the result of that movement the efforts of the Powers in the direction of reform in the Ottoman Empire had for the time being been suspended, he said in this matter a complete understanding between all the Powers, in two directions may be affirmed. In the first place, all further reform proposals are to be shelved, and secondly, in regard to the future development of things in Turkey, an attitude of benevolent expectation is to be adopted. […]

“We also maintain the most friendly relations with Great Britain and France. We are sincerely endeavouring to proceed in the fullest possible understanding with both Powers. The treatment of the Moroccan incident may be regarded as the touchstone of the peaceful dispositions of the European Cabinets.

CE 9 October 1908
Austrian Army Order
Vienna, Thursday. An army order is officially published containing the command of the Emperor wherein his Majesty directs that recruits drawn from Bosnia and Herzegovina shall in future take the oath prescribed in the army regulations for the Austro-Hungarian army, and that Bosnian and Herzegovian troops, as well as other specifically military organisations of those countries shall henceforth bear the title of the Imperial and royal regiment.

140 CE 9 October 1908. Address To Emperor King. Budapest, Thursday. The Austro-Hungarian delegates were received here-to-day by the Emperor-King. Replying to a loyal address delivered by the President, his Majesty said – The assurance of loyal devotion to my person to which you have just given expression fills me with lively satisfaction and cordial gratitude. A meeting of delegates is this time taking place simultaneously with an event which means that the present possessions of the monarchy are made secure, in that the ties which for thirty years have bound Bosnia and Herzegovina to it have been rendered indissoluble. The untiring and successful efforts of my Government have produced in those countries such a satisfactory progress in civilization that the population can now with profit be called on to take a part in the affairs of the province and a beginning can now be made with the creation of constitutional institutions in accordance with their needs. This however is only possible if a clear and unambiguous legal status corresponding to their actual conditions is given to both countries. Only in this way under present conditions can that stability be achieved which is recognised as a matter of European interest. The withdrawal of my troops from the Sandjak of Novi Basar is an incontrovertible proof that our policy aims at no territorial expansion beyond our present possessions. It is to be hoped that this renunciation in Turkey’s favour will be appreciated at Constantinople in a friendly manner, and will exercise a beneficial effect on our future relations.
Great Britain did not endorse Austria’s policy in the East European territories, and the press details the antipathy with which the news of the annexation is received:

CE 9 October 1908  
To-Day’s London Papers. Examiner Office, 5 o’clock.  
**The Eastern Crisis.**

The “Times” says – The flood which Austria has deliberately let loose continues to rise. Crete sees no reason why treaty should bind her, which Austria and Bulgaria say do not bind them. Montenegro is acting upon the same convenient principle, or want of principle. So is Servia. So, we are told, is Samos. Greece still keeps silence, but her representative in London has expressed his conviction that his Government cannot spurn the spontaneous action of the patriotic Cretan islanders. All the appetites which the Treaty of Berlin has restrained for so many years are hungering for immediate satisfaction. All the petty States whose subjects have been conducting campaigns of organised brigandage against each other on Turkish territory are now lodging their claims for “compensation” at the Turk’s expense. That was inevitable. It is the natural and necessary consequence of the Austro-Hungarian plot. It is a consequence which the plotters must have early foreseen, and which they must have deliberately chosen to provoke when they breached the dam that kept the ambitions and passions of the Balkan creeds and races within bounds. They are responsible for it, and for all the mischief and calamities to which it may too easily lead.

CE 9 October 1908  
**Servia and England**

Belgrade, Thursday. The news that Great Britain declines to recognise the right of any one Power to modify the Berlin Treaty without consultation with and the assent of the signatory Powers has produced an excellent impression in Servian circles.

CE 9 October 1908  
**Britain’s Advice to Servia**

Reuter’s Agency learns that the British Government has both through the medium of the British Minister at Belgrade and also through the Servian Chargé d’Affaires in London counselled the Servian Government to exercise moderation in its own interest and to observe a correct attitude.

Aerenthal subsequently endeavoured to justify the annexation, though it was becoming clear that Austria would have to deal with a fair measure of opposition from the Ottoman Empire.
representatives of almost all parties of the action of the Government in the question of the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and although their recognition of the fact that an active foreign policy was in the interest of the monarchy, the minister said he was not one who trod rightly [sic] in the conduct of the foreign policy; but he also did not wish to awaken a belief that he was one who rushed into things. In the present state of affairs the government had to take their development in hand, because otherwise it might have turned against the Government. In regard to foreign charges of an alleged violation of the Treaty of Berlin the minister declared: Of such there can only be question when a State will not fulfil an obligation to do or not to do something. This, however, has not occurred. The Berlin Treaty does not contain one word about the sovereign rights of the Sultan. Count Andrassy stated with most unequivocal frankness that he only accepted a mandate to occupy and administer Bosnia and Herzegovina on condition that no limit of time was imposed. By this he meant to say that it was a permanent mandate, and that we should not give up Bosnia and Herzegovina at any time. All the Powers were agreed to this and it was only out of consideration for Turkey that annexation was not then and there declared.

CE 3 December 1908

Austria Boycotted. Servia’s Plight. Vienna Disturbed.

Constantinople, Wednesday. It is stated that a letter bearing six hundred signatures has been addressed to the harbour porters congratulating them on persevering in their patriotic attitude in the matter of the boycott. According to the “Shurai Unimet” a representative of an important Austrian factory has arrived in Constantinople, and is reported to have stated, on being questioned about the boycott, that if it lasted another week, a great revolution would break out in Vienna, and that under the circumstances the only possible course for Austro-Hungary was to submit adequate proposals to the Ports for the settlement of the question of Bosnia and Herzegovina, when the boycott would cease immediately. Consequently the journal thinks the next 24 hours should witness important developments.

Furthermore, the Emperor’s Jubilee celebrations in honour of his sixty years of reign were clouded by widespread unemployment on a general European scale and the constant clamouring for electoral reform.

141 CE 2 December 1908. Vienna Calamity. Crush at Illumination. Many Killed. Vienna, Tuesday, 10.45 p.m. Last night Vienna was en fete for the jubilee of the Emperor. As the evening wore on the pressure of the crowds viewing the illuminations became extremely dangerous and many accidents occurred, especially near the entrance to the Hofburg, from the Ringstrasse. At these points the crowd converged from three directions and panic resulted. Herr Hobisl, a member of the Reichsrath, was crushed to death and at another point a woman was killed. Sixty persons were injured, twenty-five seriously. – Reuter.

Vienna, Tuesday (later) Two other persons met their deaths in the crush, one of them a lady. Illuminations were also general in provincial cities, and were everywhere witnessed by loyal and demonstrative crowds. – Reuter.

CE 3 December 1908. Austrian Emperor. Jubilee Celebrations. Several Accidents. Vienna, Wednesday. The Ambulance Society dealt with 108 cases of personal injury sustained in the press on the crowds which witnessed the illuminations last night in honour of the Emperor’s jubilee. Of these 20 were serious. – Reuter.

Vienna, Wednesday (later). It has now been ascertained that during and after the illuminations last night four persons succumbed to heart failure. One of the deceased had on his body several wounds,
CE 9 October 1908
Scenes at Budapest. Police fired on.

Budapest, Thursday. Notwithstanding the prohibition of the Governor of Budapest, the Social Democrats summoned meetings this evening at twenty-one places in the city to demonstrate in favour of universal suffrage. The small gatherings were quickly dispersed, but later several hundred demonstrators reached in a body to Andrássy Strasse, where they were stopped by a considerable body of police. The crowd fired about thirty revolver shots at the police, who replied with their revolvers, and dispersed the mob. Several wounded on both sides and a number of demonstrators were arrested. Everything is quiet now. – Reuters.

CE 9 October 1908
It is questionable if at any time the lack of employment was more general and widespread than it is at present. From Paris and Berlin comes the tale of the dearth of work, and throughout England, as well as in London itself, thousands of breadwinners vainly seek work. The great provincial cities of England echo the cry of the workless, and in Ireland thousands of men tell the same story of enforced idleness. Mr. E Brodie Hoare has just informed the shareholders of the Colonial Bank that at the present time there are in America no less than 4,000,000 qualified workmen unemployed, and that the number was steadily increasing. The outlook for the coming winter is anything but cheering, and hard times are ahead for innumerable families.

However, the person of the Emperor, Francis Joseph, was still held in high esteem throughout Europe,

CE 3 December 1908
London, Wednesday. The Diamond Jubilee of the Emperor Francis Joseph was officially celebrated in London this morning by High Mass, followed by the singing of the “Te Deum” at the Jesuit Church, Farm Street. The large congregation included the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador and most of the leading members of the Austro-Hungarian colony. Sir Edward Grey attended on behalf of the Foreign Office, and the King, and Queen, Prince and Princess of Wales were represented.

and had some ribs broke. There were 104 cases of injury, of which only two are serious. These have been conveyed to hospital. – Reuter.

142 CE 10 December 1908. Plural Voting. Premier and Austria. Budapest, Thursday. The newspapers here have published a letter from Mr. Asquith and Mr. Keir Hardie, in which the British Premier states that he had not expressed any opinion to Count Andrassy, Minister of the Interior, concerning the advantages of plural voting. In regard to this, the Hungarian agency points out that as long ago as Sept. 25th Count Andrassy, on account of newspaper reports which were then appearing, published a communiqué declaring that he had never alluded to any expression of opinion by Mr. Asquith concerning the merits of plural voting, but had mentioned the British Premier’s name conversationally in quite another connection, which was obviously wrongly understood by the reporters. – Reuter.

143 CE 2 December 1908. Disturbances at Prague. Government’s Stringent Measures. Owing to the serious nature which the disturbances at Prague assumed during the last few days, orders have been given by the Government that the most stringent measures shall be taken for the suppression of any further rioting. The local authorities are empowered to use all the means at their disposal for the restoration of order, and should the steps now taken not have the desired result immediately, the Government will not hesitate to order further vigorous measures. – Reuter.

Prague, Tuesday Midnight. Captain Alexander W.W. Forbes, the British Vice-Consul here, was thrown out of a traincar to-day by Czech rioters. – Reuter.
Members of the Diplomatic Corps were also present, including the Turkish, French, German, and American Ambassadors.

Vienna, Wednesday.

All the newspapers to-day publish articles couched in enthusiastic and cordial terms upon the Emperor’s Francis Joseph’s Diamond Jubilee. – Reuter.

CE 4 December 1908

Editorial

 [...] the general and genuine regard entertained for the personal character of the Emperor-King, a Sovereign who has been tried as no other ruler has been in the crucible of suffering and misfortune, and has borne disaster in his family and in his dominion with magnificent and exemplary fortitude. In his sixty years of rule the Emperor-King has experienced vicissitudes of fortune for which history furnishes no parallel and the dignity with which he has borne a long catalogue of adversities and sorrows has won him the respect and veneration of millions who have no concern in the affairs of the congeries of State over which he rules, but who would wish to see his closing days undisturbed by troubles which might culminate in a European war. But although the situation has become more hopeful what has occurred will not be readily forgotten, and must in fact accentuate apprehension as to the future of the Empire once the central or controlling influence has been removed. For a considerable period it seemed as if war had become inevitable and even now the danger is not entirely at an end, if evil counsels should prevail at Constantinople or Vienna or Belgrade. Relations between the courts of Vienna and St.Petersburg are represented as being still very strained and as England is believed to have encouraged the militant attitude of Turkey, hostility to England is as prevalent in Austria as it is in England. […] This country [i.e. Ireland], curiously enough, has supplied Turkey with one very potent weapon which is being directed against Austria with remarkable results. The formidable system of boycotting has been brought into requisition, and Austrian commerce in Turkish ports has been paralysed. […] This state of things has produced much financial loss to Austrian merchants and traders, and violent denunciations have been uttered by newspapers and politicians. […] If the personal intervention of Emperor Francis Joseph has brought about an improvement of the situation which justifies the expectation of a peaceful arrangement, it is not too much to say that Europe is under a heavy debt to the aged Sovereign. […] The ingrained distrust of England and English diplomacy which is found in every European capital constitutes a very formidable obstacle to the acceptance of any scheme originating with a British Cabinet. […] When Francis Joseph dies the crash and the conflagration will be at hand, and may have even been long deferred.

The early 1900s should offer a final glimpse at neutral thought, before the public mind was overwhelmed with the propaganda and personal loss the War entailed. Though the word ‘neutral’ is not entirely appropriate in this context, 1912 and 1913 being the years of excessive Balkan unrest, rightly termed the Balkan wars, the image of Austria-Hungary was already tainted by the stain of Slav blood.144 And in 1913 the strained relationship between Austria and Russia had

---

144 The more so in 1916, when in the third edition of his work, The Balkan Wars, 1912-1913, Jacob Gould Schurman, lays the blame of the War of Many Nations quite squarely on the shoulders of the
resurfaced. Though both were alarmed at the upheaval in the region, the potential for further conflict continued to be high. And by February 1913, Bulgaria had restarted the hostilities. The treaty of London\textsuperscript{145} 30 May ended the war but Serbia remained outraged at Austria-Hungary’s insistence on creating an independent Albania, thus cutting Serbia off from the sea. As Russia decided Serbia was vital to its own survival, ensuring no other nation would capture the Dardanelles’\textsuperscript{146} Austria-Hungary perceived the rising power of Serbia as a threat, where any new confrontation in the region had the potential to develop rapidly into general warfare.\textsuperscript{147} It would have taken a rather educated guess on the part of the average reader of the Cork Examiner, to piece together the relevant facts as they were

---

\textsuperscript{145} CE 1 April 1913.\textit{Message from Emperor of Austria.London, Monday Night.} On the occasion of the death of Lord Wolseley the following telegram was received by the Secretary for War from the Emperor of Austria: - “His Imperial and Royal Apostolic Majesty having been informed to his keenest regret, of the death of Field Marshal Viscount Garmer Wolseley, forwards to the British Army his heartfelt condolences at the loss of the gallant and distinguished General, who, several campaigns, valorously contributed to multiply the glory and renown of the British forces by adding new laurels to their colours, and whose manifold merits will assure him a high rank in military history. His Majesty the Emperor and King beseeches also your Excellency kindly to transmit his sincerest expressions of regret to the relatives of the late Field Marshal, whom his Majesty knew personally.” Colonel Seely replied: - “I shall be grateful if your Excellency will be so good as to report to his Imperial and royal Apostolic Majesty that I beg on behalf of the British Army respectfully to acknowledge with profound gratitude the very touching message of condolence with which the Emperor and King has honoured us at the moment when we mourn the death of Field Marshal Viscount Wolseley. This expression of his Majesty’s gracious sympathy will long be treasured by us and by the late Field Marshal’s relatives, to whom I will at once communicate the terms of your Excellency’s telegram and will add yet further to the ties which bind the Emperor and the King to the British Army.”

\textsuperscript{146} CE 15 February 1913.\textit{Expelling Greeks from Turkey:} The authorities have decided to expel all Hellenic subjects from the Dardanelles and its environs.

\textsuperscript{147} Cassell’s Chronology of World History, pp.474ff.
communicated by the press, and arrive at the conclusion of imminent and world-wide war,\(^{148}\) begun in regions they were not necessarily acquainted with.

CE 15 February 1913

**Austria and Russia**

Anti-Austrian feeling is daily becoming more bitter here, and is voiced equally by the “Novoye Vremya” and the liberal press. Articles on Austro-Russian relations have become far more pronounced since the cordial telegram sent this week by the Czar to the St.Petersburg Slavophiles, which is generally interpreted as meaning that the relations between the two countries have become more strained since the delivery of Emperor Francis Joseph’s autograph letter. The last article published in the “Fremdenblatt” has provoked a storm of indignation and Austria is charged with deliberately insulting and flouting Russia.

The Cork Examiner duly publishes an article to counterbalance earlier suppositions on Austria’s role in the Balkan:

CE 10 March 1913

**Austria and the Balkans**

Referring to the attempts which have been made to portray Austria-Hungary as a disturber of peace in the Balkans, and to throw doubt upon the moral and material strength of the monarchy, the “Neues Wiener Tagblatt” to-day says – The people are not reckoning with Austrian patriotism and the deliberate policy of the Monarchy, which is bound up with its position in the Balkans, where it has possessed territory for generations. Our historic mission and further development have pointed for centuries to South-east, and whenever Austro-Hungarian statesmen have had to take decisive steps they have simply followed the dictates of self-preservation, but they have always held fast to the key work of the independent development of the smaller States. Austria-Hungary’s Balkan problem does not aim at endangering its neighbours, but Austria-Hungary demands respectful consideration for it. Let foreign observers take note that this view, which is unanimous throughout the Monarchy, would ensure a suitable answer being given to any menace to our programme.

And, in the same column, the Balkan Situation is further commented upon in relation to the Ambassador’s Conference in London. The Italian Premier, the Marquis Di San Guiliano, believed:

CE 10 March 1913

Albania ought to have boundaries that would facilitate her prosperity and development. He thought the formula ‘the Balkans for the Balkan peoples’ was the

\(^{148}\) CE 15 February 1913. Europe and War. Belgium Warned. Austria and Russia. Bitter Feeling. Brussels, Friday. According to the “Etoile Belge” at a secret sitting of the Chamber the Minister of War read a statement to the effect that the Powers had manifested a desire to see Belgium fulfil the duties imposed on her by her neutrality. The Minister, however, is stated to have mentioned no power by name.
only possible solution, and it meant the **application of the principles of nationalities** in its practical application on the spot.

Finally, selected articles on the rattling of Austrian sabres, which may or may not have influenced speculation on the role the Empire played in the ensuing slaughter:

**CE 28 April 1913**

**The War.**

Austria’s Resolve To Act Alone If Powers Delay. Troops Move.

Vienna, Saturday. Count Berchtold, Foreign Minister, and Baron Conrad von Holtzendorff, War Minister, had a conference with the Emperor at Schoenbrunn, from 7 until 8.45 this evening, although the Emperor usually retired at 8 o’clock. It is stated in official quarters that Austro-Hungary will wait until Monday for some decisive action of the Powers in regard to Skutari, but should the Powers then fail to agree on united action, Austria-Hungary will proceed alone, considering that not only her political but also her military prestige is at stake. If Italy should give Austria her aid, it will be welcome, but if not, Austria will proceed alone. It is reported that Germany has promised to support Austria under all circumstances. It is also stated that Austria will present a new note to the Powers to-morrow explaining her standpoint. – Reuter.

**CE 28 April 1913**

(“Times” Telegrams, per Press Association, Copyright.

Vienna, Sunday.

**The atmosphere at Vienna to-day is charged with speculation** with regard to to-morrow’s conference in London, and Sir Edward Grey’s speech is expected to be in favour of Austria-Hungary. […]

To-day the Austro-Hungarian heir apparent arrived in Vienna and had a long audience of the Emperor this afternoon. Count Berchtold and the Emperor have been urged of the absolute necessity of some kind of military action to save the prestige of the Monarchy among Southern Slavs, and to raise the moral of the Austro-Hungarian officers, who would be disheartened were their long winter of hardship and effort to end lamely in a demobilization.149

---

149 CE 20 June 1913. **Austria’s Determination.** Ready for War. (“Times” Telegram, per Press Association – Copyright.) Sofia, Thursday. – The journal “Mirs,” which is often well-informed, states that Austria-Hungary is resolved to intervene in the Serbo-Bulgarian dispute should Russia assign any portion of Western Macedonia beyond the contested zone to Servia. Austria-Hungary is firmly determined to prevent Servia’s expansion in the valley of the Vardar, even at the cost of war. (“Times” Telegram, per Press Association – Copyright.) Vienna, Thursday. – Fresh from a conference with Count Berchtold yesterday, the Hungarian Premier, Count Tizsa, took occasion this afternoon to make to the Hungarian Chamber important declarations upon Austro-Hungarian foreign policy in regard to the Balkans and Russia. Count Tizsa’s declarations constitute an official Austro-Hungarian rejoinder to the Tsar’s telegram to King Peter and King Ferdinand. One of the considerations which vitiated the rejoinder is that while recognising the right and freedom of the Balkan States to make war upon each other, Austria-Hungary speaks, not as an impartial observer, but as a strong man armed on the very threshold of two at least of the belligerents in an eventual conflict.
4. Ireland and the Austrian Empire during the Great War
Part I – 1914

In the following chapters focusing on the Great War itself, it is becoming increasingly difficult to treat the advancement of nationalism in Ireland as a separate entity, more or less independent in its development from current European or American thought. Moreover, the British attempt to tarnish the Irish revolution as a ‘German Plot,’ goes a long way to demonstrate the growing links and broadening perspectives between the island west of Britain and Europe, on the one hand, and Irish-American pseudo-political activities in the United States asserting tighter transatlantic ties, on the other. 1914 began on an optimistic note, the Examiner reporting enthusiastically on developments within the IPP, praising the fruits of forbearance and condemning the folly of those who would not follow suit.

CE 1 January 1914
Editorial

Irish Nationalists salute the year with cheery confidence, and look forward to the coming months with the earnest hope that the year which commences to-day may end Ireland’s bitter struggle for freedom, and witness the realisation of the National aspiration, whereby all Irishmen may work harmoniously together for the upliftment of their country, and better and more friendly relations be established with Great Britain. […] Mr. John Dillon has described 1914 as “the most critical and eventful year – for upwards of a century – in the history of Ireland,” but Nationalist Ireland stands united behind the Irish leader, and will never relax her efforts until Irishmen are conceded the right to make their own laws in their own land. […] The remarkable demonstration which took place in Cork last night, when thousands of Nationalists held a torchlight procession in the city, and with bands playing patriotic airs, marched through the streets to the National Monument, where “A Nation once Again” was fervently sung and Home Rule was welcomed as a time when the shackles will be removed from their country, served to prove that the National spirit is as strong now as ever it was, and that nothing except the concession of the right to Irishmen to make their own laws will ever satisfy the Irish people. […] Populations have been roused to enthusiasm in ages past by the voice of the orator and the valour of the chieftain, but in these days of constitutional agitation the answer of Ireland to the taunt of indifference is to be found in a voluntary demonstration by the masses, such as was witnessed in Cork last night.

And just to make sure that Nationalist Ireland did indeed stand behind its leader, Redmond extended his control over the Volunteers by nominating its Provisional Committee:¹

¹ Ferriter, p.126/27: ‘By June 1914, Redmond was still in control of the Irish volunteers, but they split as a consequence of his support for the war. He had moved to place 25 of his nominees on the
CE 29 June 1914
National Volunteers
The Provisional Committee. Letter from Mr. Redmond. Irish Party’s Nominations. (From Our Correspondent).

London, Sunday Night. - The following letter has been addressed to Messrs. John MacNeill and L.J. Kettle, Hon. Secs. of the Irish National Volunteer Movement: - “Gentlemen – In my interview with Mr. Gore and Mr. Walsh, who came to see me on behalf of the Volunteers’ Committee, I made a request that an official list of the Provisional Committee should be sent to me, so that I might know its exact number in view of the nominations to be made by the Irish Party for representation on the Committee. […] After the most careful consideration with my colleagues I have prepared the enclosed list of representative Irishmen, whose presence on the Committee will be a source of strength to the Volunteer movement, and who have consented to act. I would suggest that no time whatever should be lost in co-opting these names, at it is my strong opinion that immediate action ought to be taken to extend and perfect the organisation of the Volunteers and to take the necessary steps for their proper equipment. I am sure we have all reason to congratulate ourselves that all misunderstanding has now disappeared, and that all Nationalists can act cordially together in support of this movement, which has the fullest support and sympathy of my colleagues and myself of the Irish Party. Personally I regard the movement as full of the highest possibilities for the future of our country. I will be glad at all times to place my services at the disposal of the reorganised Provisional Committee. – Very truly yours, J.E. Redmond.

1914 was a watershed in Irish politics, with Nationalists in the South and Loyalists in the North vying for British support for their respective established positions. John Redmond immediately put his Irish Party behind the British war effort, accepting a postponement of Home Rule until after the war was over. More than that, he sponsored a successful recruiting drive for the British army.²

²Diarmaid Ferriter, The transformation of Ireland 1900-2000 (London, 2005), p.126: ‘And where did John Redmond see northern nationalists if all-Ireland Home Rule was not possible? The war was also a watershed for them. In the six counties that were to become Northern Ireland, a conference of nationalists in Belfast in June 1916 witnessed conflict between the old Home Rule party and Sinn Féin. Addressed by Redmond and organised by Joe Devlin, who represented west Belfast in parliament, it voted to accept Lloyd George’s proposal for temporary exclusion of the six north-eastern countries, as the cost of the early implementation of Home Rule. But the delegates were divided by geography, with delegates from Fermanagh, Tyrone and Derry city voting solidly
Redmond and his associates, Dillon and Devlin, enjoyed widespread respect, but there had never been a personality cult surrounding them as in the days of Parnell, and certainly no one looked to the IPP for spiritual blessing. But Redmond had triumphed when on September 1914 he had secured the enactment of Home Rule with the provision that the enforcement of the measure would be delayed ‘not later than the end of the present war.’

Two speeches delivered by Redmond in August and September 1914, one to the House of Commons and the other at Woodenbridge, County Wicklow, have also been deemed as critical turning-points in the regress of Home Rule. [...] The widely held assumption at the time at this time was that the European war (like the Franco-Prussian conflict of 1870) would be bloody but short-lives; and in these circumstances, any political horse-trading, particularly in the context of the Ulster Unionists’ co-cooperativeness, might well have been disastrous to Home Rule. Redmond desperately wanted and needed the speedy enactment of the Home Rule Bill, and it is probable this speech was a means to that end. Certainly on the following day, 4 August, he was writing to Asquith saying that he was ‘convinced in the present temper of the Unionist Party after my speech that course could be safely taken (i.e. enactment of the bill], and I am further convinced that before the winter we and Carson would arrive at an agreement.’

Speaking to his followers at Woodenbridge, Co.Wicklow, Redmond extended his call to include not only the defence of Ireland, but to ‘wherever the firing-line extends, in defence of right, of freedom and of religion in this war.’ This has generally been regarded as a betrayal of Irish nationality, and a blow to the cause of Home Rule. But the speech had been delivered two days after the enactment of Home Rule, and should be seen as Redmond’s view of an historic act of reparation. Moreover, Redmond believed the war created the chance for reconciliation between Ireland and Britain, and more importantly, an opportunity to consolidate the claims of Irish nationality.

CE 19 September 1914
Mr. Redmond
(From Our Correspondent)
Dublin, Sunday Night. – To-day a review of the East Wicklow Brigade of the Irish Volunteers took place at Woodenbridge. [...] Mr. John Redmond, having

3 In comparison, “when the advocates of an Irish republic went to war against the British in Dublin in Easter 1916, their struggle soon acquired an aura of sanctity. The commanders of the rising were popularly seen as men of faith and spirituality, and it became widely known that even the socialist James Connelly had made his peace with the Church.” Jackson, p.142.

4 Jackson, p.144.
received with a great ovation, the throng cheering enthusiastically, said: [...] The interests of Ireland – of the whole of Ireland – are at stake in this war. This war is undertaken in defence of the highest principles of religion and morality and right, and it would be a disgrace for ever to our country and a reproach to her manhood and a denial of the lessons of her history, if Young Ireland confined their efforts to remaining at home to defend the shores of Ireland from an unlikely invasion, and shirking from the duty of proving on the field of battle that gallantry and courage which has distinguished our race all through its history (cheers). I say to you, therefore, your duty is twofold. I am glad to see such magnificent material for soldiers around me, and I say to you go on drilling and make yourself efficient for the work, and then account yourselves as men, not only in Ireland itself, but wherever the firing line extends in defence of right, of freedom and religion in this war (cheers).

The Sinn Féin element in the Volunteers, led by Eoin MacNeill and Padraig Pearse, refused to get involved, but Redmond’s old followers in the South joined by the thousands, as did the Ulster Volunteers in the North. Some 250,000 Irishmen in all, Catholic and Protestant, enlisted in Kitchener’s army as volunteers in the nationalist 10th, 16th, and the loyalist 36th Irish Divisions in the First World War, significantly contributing to the undisputed image of the ‘fighting Irish.’

Although Irishmen served in many other formations, these three divisions were (and are) the most closely identified with Ireland’s wartime mobilisation of military manpower. The 16th Irish Division has come to be seen as most nearly fulfilling the Redmonite ‘project’, but both it and the 10th Division have been regarded generally as representing nationalist Ireland. The creation of both these divisions, however, did not run absolutely smoothly. For both military and political reasons, Kitchener and the War office were unwilling to allow Irish Volunteers en bloc, complete with officers, to be converted into units of the British army. There were disputes about the commissioning of officers for the divisions, and even over the design of a distinctively Irish divisional badge. 6

Among those fighting in France and Flanders over 50,000 were killed, some dying for ideals, others not, but it was those who had decided to stay home that made the lasting impact on Ireland. Although a minor fraction after the split in the

5 Eoin MacNeill (1867 - 1945) was an Irish scholar and revolutionary. Born in County Antrim, he was educated in Belfast at the Royal University, where he studied Irish history. In 1893 he founded the Gaelic League with Douglas Hyde, and became editor of its newspaper - Gaelic Journal. In 1908 MacNeill was appointed professor of early Irish history at University College Dublin. Through the Gaelic League, MacNeill met members of Sinn Féin. He became chairman of the council that formed the Irish Volunteers in 1913, later chief of staff. MacNeill opposed armed rebellion as he saw little hope of success. However, the IRB went ahead with its plans of an armed rebellion with the co-operation of Pádraig Pearse, James Connolly and the Citizen Army. After the surrender, MacNeill was arrested and sentenced to life imprisonment. He was released in 1917 and elected MP for the National University of Ireland. In 1921 he supported the Anglo-Irish Treaty. Following this he became Minister for Education in the first government of the Irish Free State. Cf. inter alia Lyons, Ireland Since the Famine.

Volunteers, Redmond’s opponents, united basically in their common opposition to Redmond and the IPP, set Irish nationalist ambitions moving along a different track. This shift in loyalty to the Crown was not, however, a Volunteer invention, but rather a reaction, once again, to an Orange impulse. The Curragh Mutiny was the first of many incidences, but perhaps the most telling, to demonstrate the weak bond of brotherhood that hardly existed in the first place between the Irish of Ulster and their countrymen in the south.

CE 14 November 1913
The Army and Ulster
Orange Chimera.

A military correspondent of the “Manchester Guardian” writes: - There is an undercurrent of belief among Unionists that in the event – an event that is unthinkable – of it ever being necessary to coerce Ulster by the force which it is legitimate for a Government to employ, the officers of the army would fail to do their duty. This is a mere chimera. The question of Ulster has now been very thoroughly canvassed amongst soldiers, and although there is, as there must be in every corporate body, a percentage of officers whose sentiments might induce them to resign their commissions, there is no reason to anticipate that the corps of officers, or the army, would ever dream of going back on its traditions and refusing to carry out such duties as might be imposed upon it by the King and his responsible Ministers. However distasteful a particular duty may be to a soldier, it is part of his contract to carry out commands without thought of personal feeling or convenience. It is said, however, that as a safeguard against an unexpected wave of feeling on the part of the officers corps there may be a “closed period” for resignations of commissions for a few months after May 15th next. This is, of course, within the constitutional right of the Secretary of State for War. It is doubtful if even then permission would be withheld from officers who desired to resign, but the circumstances impelling their decision would be so declared that the authorities would be within their rights to make such resignations operative only on the understanding that they implied also an abrogation of all claims to pension and compassionate benefits.

‘The Mutiny’ in March 1914, meant 57 British officers stationed in Ireland declared that they would resign if ordered to enforce Home Rule in Ulster. Alvin Jackson offers a concise rendition of the mutiny which never happened and yet retains an almost inappropriate significance in Irish history.

On 11 March 1914 a subcommittee of the cabinet had been formed to monitor the Ulster question, and its members (Birrell, Lord Crewe, Churchill, J. E.

---

7 Lyons, p.308: ‘What happened at the Curragh was not a ‘mutiny’ as it was once usual to call it. It was resignations in anticipation of unwelcome orders, not refusal to obey such orders once issued, that the government was faced with. Even so, it was clear enough that the situation was critical and might get out of hand very easily if a clash were actually to occur between Ulster Volunteers and the forces of the Crown. In such circumstances Asquith, as was his natural bent, thought discretion the better part of valor.’
B. Seely and John Simon) seem to have pushed ahead with a plan to strengthen army depots in the north of Ireland. This was evidently a defensive action, designed to prevent military supplies falling into the hands of the UVF. Ministers were clearly aware that the UVF was growing rapidly, and it had plans to raid official stores. On 14 March the British military commander in Ireland, Sir Arthur Paget, was instructed by telegraph to reinforce arms depots at Armagh, Carrickfergus, Enniskillen and Omagh, all in Ulster; and he attended meetings in London on 18 and 19 March where these instructions were further elaborated. Paget, however, was concerned both that these moves would provoke bloodshed, and that officers with Ulster family connections would be placed in a uniquely impossible situation. Seely, the War Minister, agreed that such men might be allowed to take leave or otherwise opt out of the forces moving north: the broader issue of provocation was discounted. Paget returned to the Curragh and early on 20 March he presented to his officers a garbled version of the London talks and Seely’s concession. It seemed from Paget’s address that a direct military engagement with the Ulster Unionists was in the offing, and that civil conflict was threatened. In these apocalyptic circumstances, sixty of Paget’s officers announced that they would accept dismissal rather than help in the ‘initiation of active military operations against Ulster’.

But in a sense this was only the overture to the crisis. In a hastily arranged meeting on 22 March in London, Seely and Sir John French, the Chief of the Imperial General Staff, gave a written undertaking to four of the leading ‘mutineers’ that the government would not use their right to maintain law and order in Ireland as a pretext for crushing ‘political opposition to the policy or principles of the Home Rule Bill’. Moreover, French accepted a coda to this declaration which assured the Curragh officers that the troops under their command would ‘not be called upon to enforce the present Home Rule Bill on Ulster’. These then were the military events at the heart of the Curragh ‘mutiny’.

Despite the efforts of United Irishmen and those who carried their torch through later generations, there was no solid common ground for the mixed community to tread without suspicion and fear. And the Gaelic revival, though originally the preoccupation of an elite sector among the Protestant Anglo-Irish, much like Home Rule, was a poisoned chalice now returning to plague its inventor. And in northeast Ulster there was conspicuous resistance to the idea that a Protestant minority should be under the control of a Dublin government with a Catholic majority, and two hundred thousand Protestant Ulstermen, following the lead of Dublin-born lawyer, Sir Edward Carson, signed a Solemn Covenant to reject Home Rule at all costs. Perturbed by the conspicuous confidence of the South, and perhaps enamoured by the rise of European militarism, arms were landed in the North at Larne and Protestant Volunteers began to drill openly throughout the province. Slogans such as “Home Rule is Rome Rule” and “Ulster

---

8 Jackson, p.129.
9 Elliott, p.297.
will fight and Ulster will right” voiced the determination of Protestant, Loyalist Ulster, who of course also had their mouthpieces in Parliament:

CE 2 July 1914
Home Rule.
The Amending Bill. Lords Debate […]. Exclusion Condemned. Lord Bryce’s Solution.
In the House of Lords yesterday, Lord Crewe formally moved the second reading of the Amending Bill. Lord Willoughby de Broke made an unsuccessful attempt to have the proposals ruled out of order. Lord Morley said he rejoiced that their lordships did not intend to reject the Bill, that would be fatal to the chance of settlement. In regard to exclusion he insisted that it was an error to suppose that any part of Ulster was homogeneous, and as to the National Volunteers he said they were a serious complication, both for the friends and the opponents of Irish Home Rule. […] Encouragement was now given to resistance by arms to the established Government of the country, and the lessons of constitutional methods were no longer to be trusted, with the result that appeals to violence and disorder must spread to a dangerous extent. He could hardly think that their lordships would have any hand in driving Irish Nationalist feeling back again into the old channels of violence and disloyalty. Lord Lansdowne said the whole of Ireland was now a great armed camp. The result was that this Amending Bill had been introduced in order to reform a clumsy and hazardous amputation. The main defect of the measure was that it was entirely inadequate to accomplish the purpose for which it had been introduced. He doubted whether the policy of exclusion or its merits had any real friends; but if they were to have exclusion they protested against the futile and viscous form offered to them in the bill. […] It must be understood that if they voted for the second reading of the Amending bill it was because they saw in it not a solution of the Irish difficulty, but a makeshift – an emergency measure designed for the purpose of gaining breathing time and averting conflict. […] Viscount Bryce said there was a better remedy than exclusion, and it was local autonomy in the North of Ireland. Lord McDonnell condemned exclusion, and propounded proportional representation to bring about a solution of the Irish question.

There was, of course, reciprocal arming in the South of the Nationalist Volunteer Force, at this stage still on the level of drill and Sunday marches:

CE 30 June 1914
Waterville National Volunteers
The above corps mustered at Waterville on Thursday evening last, and marched to the drill ground, where they got their first instruction in drill from Mr. Kennedy, a military con-commissioned officer. The men were put through a series of evolutions, and they acquitted themselves very creditably. The corps numbered about 250 men, and when drill was over they marched back to the town, where they were addressed briefly by Dr. Trant, who complimented them upon how they went through their first drill. Dr. Trant was loudly cheered. Cheers were called for Mr. Fitzgerald, J.P., who was present as a volunteer, and the response indeed was a loud and spirited one. Cheers when then given for Colonel de Villamill, Royal Engineers (retired), who was with the corps at drill. He then thanked them
for their reception, and said the corps were of the right stuff, and in the course of time he was certain they would prove to be a smart body (cheers).

Similarly, in those parts of the world inhabited by immigrant Irish and their descendents, some looked forward to a constitutional solution of the island’s ills, particularly from the new world came plaudits for both Irish and British determination to secure peace and self-government for small nations:

CE 30 June 1914
On Home Rule
The final success of Ireland’s long and heroic struggle for free government will be an inspiration to liberty loving peoples through all future time. What man has done, man can do. Down-trodden peoples everywhere will take renewed courage from Ireland’s victory. Thus Home rule for Ireland will prove a blessing not only to Irishmen but to all the world. (A. Mitchell Palmer, M.C., Penn.)
I wish to congratulate the “Irish World” and the people of Ireland on their having attained the right of self-government after their weary struggle for so many centuries to accomplish that object. I hope that she will attain the position among the nations of the world which the keen intelligence of her citizens entitles her so. (Harry Lane, U.S. Senator, Oregon.)
I have always had a warm place in my heart for Ireland. On account of my tremendous cares both at home and at the Executive Office, I regret my inability to formulate intelligently an expression with reference to the present Home Rule Bill. I know positively that Ireland will ultimately receive her full rights and privileges. (Hon. W. N. Ferris, Governor of Michigan.)

While others were prepared to keep the fire in Irish hearths burning with prejudice and foul play:

CE 1 July 1914
Australia and Home Rule. The Senate’s Resolution.
Mr. Walter Long has received the following cablegram from Dr. Leeper, the warden of Trinity College, University of Melbourne: “Senate’s resolution misrepresents Australian opinion, proceeds from alliance between Labour, Socialism, and Roman Church. General sentiment entirely against coercion of Ulster and strongly urges referendum. Many here enrolling to fight for Ulster.”

And the Bishop Of Newfoundland, at a festival in County Kerry, the most western point of Ireland, in a region of the Gaeltacht, states:

CE 30 June 1914
On Home Rule

\[10\text{ CE 28 July 1914. Australian Orangemen and Home Rule. A cable message has been received by Mr. Walter Long from Mr. David James Knox, of Adelaide, South Australia, in the following terms: - “Magnificent meetings have been held at Kadina and Brora, at which the Home Rule Bill was denounced. Those present expressed their full sympathy with Ulster, and pledged themselves to help her with men and money.”}]}
In connection with the Tralee Feis, a band promenade was held in the Green
Last night which was attended by large numbers of people of all denominations.

Most Rev. Dr. Howley, Bishop of Newfoundland, who was present, addressed the multitude [...]. He had seen the Volunteers marching that day, and it showed what they could do when called upon to do anything for their country. The appearance of the Volunteers that day was enough to show that the independence of Ireland was secured (cheers). Somebody had asked him what he thought of the chances of Home Rule, and his answer was that it was not a matter of chance at all, that Hole Rule was an existing fact, and only wanted to be put into form – Ireland was now a nation (cheers). He complimented them on the progress of the language movement, and expressed the hope that under Home Rule they would re-establish a line of steamers between Galway and Newfoundland. Mr. Pearse,11 Dublin, delivered a stirring address, in which he briefly traced the history of the language movement, and pointed to the importance of making Irish the language of the schools.

Only the day before, Padraig Pearse had inspected the Volunteer Corps and had delivered an address on the more militant nature of Irish self-awareness.

CE 29 June 1914
Inspection in Tralee. Addressed by Mr. Pearse, Dublin.

[…] Mr. Pearse made a critical inspection of the assembled forces, after which he delivered a spirited address, which was punctuated with enthusiastic cheering. He congratulated the volunteers, Father Brennan, their commander, their company commanders, and instructors, and he thought he could congratulate the whole town and district of Tralee on having such a splendid corps of Irish Volunteers (cheers). He noted their splendid physique, their soldierly bearing, the military precision and accuracy of their movements, and he would like to add that he was most favourably impressed with their splendid turn out at the Railway station last night. These silent, soldierly ranks, every man as straight and steady as a spear in the hands of a warrior was a far more impressive demonstration than the most enthusiastic cheering crowd. They in Ireland to-day were again learning the nobility and dignity of military discipline and military service. It seemed almost like a dream come true. They had at long last an Irish army, and it had been given to the men of this present generation to realise the dream of Irish patriots for the last hundred years – the creation on Irish soil again of an Irish army. It was the most portentous thing in recent Irish history, and would be remembered in history to the credit of the men of this generation, that they had the sight to see their

11 Padraig Pearse, born in Dublin, 1879, to an English father and an Irish mother, became interested in the heritage and history of Ireland at an early age. Pearse became editor of the Gaelic League’s newspaper: An Claidheamh Solais and tried to use education to defeat the English and insisted on the use of the native Irish language. He founded St. Edna’s College near Dublin in 1908, its curriculum based around Irish traditions and culture. Pearse was a pioneer of Irish writing and published poems, stories, articles and essays to further the identification of Ireland as a separate culture. The League attracted militant nationalists and Pearse soon became a great believer in ‘blood sacrifice.’ In 1914 Pearse was made a member of the Supreme Council of the I.R.B. with plans for a full military revolution in Ireland. Cf. Lyons for a more detailed account of Pearse’s life and work. One of his poems, translated from the Irish, is given below (published originally in Poems of the Irish Revolutionary Brotherhood, Boston, 1916):
The world hath conquered, the wind/ Hath scattered like dust/ Alexander, Caesar, and all that shared sway./ Tara is grass, and behold how Troy lieth low –/ And even the English, perchance their/ Hour will come!
opportunity and the courage to seize that opportunity. It seemed to him that they
had there the means of working out good for Ireland, because out of the exigencies
of the political situation they had been able to call into existence an Irish army of
defence, which was not for the present purpose only; but for all time in the service
of the Irish nation (loud cheers). He asked them to recall what had occurred in
Ireland within the past year or two. A certain section of our countrymen, urged
on by a political party in England, had taken up arms against Irish freedom.
We are taunted with not wanting Irish freedom. It was stated that the passionate
desire for freedom had not touched Irish hearts and that there were no men in
Ireland to arm for Irish freedom. The reply we make was the only reply that could
be made – the reply that our manhood was aroused. If North East Ulster armed
against Irish freedom, then, by Heavens, we were going to arm for Irish
freedom (loud cheers); and let there be no mistake about it – as for Irish freedom
that the Irish Volunteers are springing to arms (renewed cheers). The Volunteers
were the most important men in Ireland to-day, and counted more in the present
political crisis and in the future history of Ireland than all the political parties, all
the politicians, and all the newspapers combined (cheers), and it was no
exaggeration to say that the issue of the present crisis depended upon the Irish
Volunteers (renewed cheers). The future of Ireland was in the hands of the
Volunteers, to be moulded as they wished.

A Voice – And it will be quite safe in their hands.

Mr. Pearse continued to say that they were determined to arm the
Volunteers, and that done, it would be impossible for any politicians to force upon
them any solution of the Irish question which they did not wish to accept in the
near future. The Irish Volunteers would be able to beat the British Army in the
field. It would not come to that, please God; but, with the Volunteers behind us,
we shall be able to drive a better bargain with the British nation. It was for us
to say how much freedom we desired to have, and not for England to say how
much freedom she is going to give us (cheers). Though it was true that the
Volunteers were called into existence by the present political crisis, the work of the
Volunteers would not be done when they had an Irish Parliament in College Green.
The work of the Irish Volunteers would be only then commencing. It would be a
national defence force which was not going to be disbanded at the bidding of any
politicians in Ireland or in England (cheers). It was to be an army for the whole
Irish Nation, and was not to be a tool for any one section of Irishmen, or to be
used to obtain ascendency for one body of Irishmen over another (cheers). He
referred to the marvellous growth and success of the movement, which had swept
through the country spontaneously and grown to such enormous proportions in
such a brief period of time, which showed that the movement appealed to
everything that was straight and best and manliest in the Irish heart. Another reason
for the success of the movement was that they pre-organised no sections, but
supplied a platform upon which everyone who gives allegiance to Ireland could
stand. They knew no “ites” or “isms,” but were simply and solely Irish Volunteers
(cheers). He again warmly congratulated all concerned on the splendid discipline
and soldierly bearing of the men he saw before him. They were second to none in
the provinces that he had seen. In fact, the Irish Volunteers mustered more in six
months than an English army in so many years. He commented on the fact that
Ulster was allowed two years within which to arm, and it was only when the
National Volunteers sprang into existence that the importation of arms was
proclaimed. Well, Ulster was able to get arms in spite of the proclamation, and what Ulster did the men of Ireland could, and would, do (loud cheers).

Soon after a cargo of rifles and ammunition was smuggled into Howth in a yacht owned by Erskine Childers, a Protestant clerk to the House of Commons, and son of a former cabinet minister:

the Howth gun-running, in May 1914, the audacious nationalist version of the Larne episode, involved the importation of 1,500 rifles and 45,000 rounds of ammunition. Bulmer Hobson, in his history of the Volunteers, pointed to provocative Ulster rhetoric as one of the reasons why the Irish volunteers became determined to arm, quoting Colonel Hackman, the unionist MP for Wolverhampton, speaking about the UVF: ‘You may be quiet certain that these men are not going to fight with dummy muskets. They are going to use modern rifles and ammunition and they are being taught to shoot […] if the men will only hold them straight, there won’t be many nationalists to stand up against them.’

This time the military did intervene and several deaths ensued.

CE 27 July 1914

Civilians Shot In Dublin By British Troops. Four killed. Nearly 100 Seriously Wounded. Woman A Victim. Seven Women Injured.

The Press Association’s Dublin correspondent telegraphs – A daring and successful effort was made to-day to land guns and ammunition for the Irish Volunteers at Howth. It appears that shortly before noon a boat, resembling a yacht, came alongside Howth Pier, and it was at once seen that she was laden with arms. The Irish Volunteers must have been aware of her expected arrival, for they assembled on the pier to the number of about one thousand, and as the arms were landed, they took possession of them.

The lesson that was drawn was that Northern Loyalists could land illegal weapons while authorities turned a blind eye, whereas Southern Nationalists, doing the same thing, were fired at and killed. American criticism was prompt.

CE 28 July 1914

New York

12 In December 1913, the British issued a Royal Proclamation under the Customs Control Act of 1877, banning the importation of arms or ammunition into Ireland without a permit. Gregory and Paseta, (eds.), Ireland and the Great War, p.96.

13 Ferriter, p.127.

14 CE 27 July 1914. Letter from the Lord Mayor of Dublin: ‘Dear Sir – To-day blood has been spilt and lives taken in Dublin by soldiers. They were ordered out without securing or asking permission of the city’s Lord Mayor. Who was responsible for ordering out the soldiers, supplied with ball cartridge, and who was responsible for the command to fire upon unarmed and defenceless people? The citizens of Dublin – nay, the people of Ireland generally – look with complete confidence to Mr.John Redmond and his colleagues to bring to justice those responsible for the shocking outrage. There must be no longer one law for a section of the people of Ulster and another for the rest of the Irish people. – Yours truly, Lorcan G. Sherlock.’
The Dublin tragedy of yesterday has had an immediate effect upon the Irish Nationalists in this country, and meetings are being held to-night in various cities to pass resolutions protesting against the action of the troops; expressing sympathy with the cause; raising additional funds for the movement, and for the Nationalist Volunteers. The united Irish League of America, taking advantage of the very strong feeling now experienced over yesterday’s affair, have sent out appeals for money broadcast, and money is pouring in great volume. It is estimated that the effect of the collision in Dublin between the troops and people will be to raise an additional £50,000 in this country for “military purposes.” The Treasurer of the Fund already announces that he has subscriptions amounting to £10,000 and anticipates that this amount will be doubled.

Feeling and tension also ran high among the National Volunteers, as can be deduced from movement around Cork:

CE 27 July 1914

The reception of the news in Cork created profound sensation. All through the night a large crowd of people collected in front of the “Examiner” office, and the wanton conduct of the soldiery in Dublin was seriously and bitterly discussed. Members of the Cork Corps of the Irish National Volunteers called at the “Examiner” office at different times throughout the night, and they were deeply moved by the accounts of the tragedy which had been sent over the wires from Dublin. When word reached the headquarters of the National Volunteers in Fisher street the sectional commanders, in the absence of Captain Talbot Crosbie, who had been engaged in inspection duty in West Cork, immediately ordered a parade of the men of all ranks, and it speaks eloquently for the wonderful spirit and the splendid discipline of the Cork Corps that in less than twenty minutes between six and seven hundred men with bandoliers and side arms were assembled. These men were immediately formed into line, and the form fours order having been given they marched through the City headed by the Pipers Band, which played stirring National airs.

An earlier lesson had also been drawn after the Mutiny at the Curragh. However, it transpired that the same fusty loyalty could be expected from Irish regiments favouring nationalist enterprise:

CE 27 July 1914
Sensational Report. Lancer’s Refusal To Attack Volunteers.

A Dublin message states a rumour is current that the 5th Royal Irish Lancers were called on for duty and refused to obey orders. Colour is given to the rumour by the fact that several members of the regiment were cheered through some streets. The rumour is unconfirmed, and discredited. In view of the investigation likely to take place with regard to the gun-running and the events connected with it, both military and police are extremely reticent and it is difficult to obtain trustworthy information.
In the same issue, more credence is given to the above article by reports of Irish army divisions openly flaunting their Home Rule inclinations in song:

CE 27 July 1914
Dublin Fusiliers’ Sing “A Nation Once Again”

In view of recent events, a bit of a sensation was created here yesterday, when a large squad of the Royal Dublin Fusiliers passed through the Main street on their way from the Rifle Range to camp, singing in chorus “A Nation Once Again.” The occurrence formed the subject of interesting conversation all round, but it now transpires that another corps celebrated in no uncertain manner the second reading of the Home Rule Bill recently.

What had been the significance of the Larne exploit? It had shifted the balance of military power in Ulster to the advantage of the loyalists, boosted the credibility of the Ulster Volunteer Force, and their political leadership, and caused further public humiliation for the government.15

Compared to Carson’s militancy, Redmond’s parliamentary thrusts looked feeble; and compared with the Volunteers, the Irish parliamentary party looked enervated and compromised. Even Redmond’s belated annexation of the Volunteers looked like weakness, and a panicked reappraisal of his most deeply cherished strategies. The extent to which the militants remained independent of Redmond is best seen with the Howth gun-running of July 1914. It was the northern Protestant Home Ruler, Sir Roger Casement, who was the prime mover behind the plan to import weapons for the Volunteers. Early in 1914 he raised L1500 which was later used to buy 1500 Mausers and 45,000 rounds of ammunition from a dealer in Antwerp. On 26 July 1914 these were landed by another Protestant nationalist, Erskine Childers, at Howth, north of Dublin. […] The official response to Larne and Howth was ostensibly different: the Ulster Volunteers succeeded in their coup, while the Irish Volunteers were intercepted by the police and army. […] Any discriminatory behaviour on the part of the Crown forces may be detected not in the apparently different reactions to the two landings, but rather in the aftermath of the Howth episode. Returning to their barracks after a humiliating exchange with the Irish Volunteers, some soldiers of the king’s own Scottish Borderers opened fire on an unarmed but hostile crowd at Bachelor’s walk, Dublin: three people were killed and around thirty were injured. English and Irish contemporaries saw a sharp difference in the treatment meted out to hostile nationalists in Dublin, as opposed to the hostile Unionists of Belfast. And, in truth, this perception stands unaltered by the passage of time.16

15 Jackson, p. 134: “[After] Larne the Ulster Volunteer Force remained badly armed, the the extent that they had no more than a total of 40,000 weapons for a force numbering around 100,000 men; and these weapons for a force numbering around 100,000 men; and these weapons were not of a uniform quality or type. [And], indeed Larne may have reinforced Asquith’s conviction that in time Unionists would become the victims of their own militant strategies. It certainly seems to have been the case that the government reverted to ‘masterly inactivity’ for the remaining months of the third Home Rule crisis.”
16 Jackson, p. 135-7.
The ‘political temperature’ had been further increased by Edward Carson’s proposal to exclude all the nine Ulster counties from the proposed Home Rule legislation, and the concurrent failure of negotiations at the Buckingham conference in July 1914.

CE 27 July 1914

The Conference Failure

Sir John Simon and the King. No General Election. Home Rule Must Go Through.

Manchester, Saturday, Night. - The Attorney General addressed a gathering of Altrincham Liberals in a hall at the Belle Vue Gardens, Manchester, this evening, Mr. J.A. Morris, J.P., presiding. Sir John Simon said this has been an eventful week, and it has been full of events of great importance not only at home but also abroad. We have been so filled with our own political development that some of us may not have noticed how serious a situation is threatening on the continent of Europe. [Let] us all resolve that whatever may be the difficulties and dangers which threaten the peaceful relations in Europe, the part which this country plays shall from beginning to end be the part of a mediator […] Now what about the week at home? It began on Monday by the announcement – if I may say so in the presence of the gentlemen of the Press – with a rather premature announcement (laughter) of what has come to be known as the conference. That conference sat on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, and yesterday afternoon, having had those four sittings, the conference disbanded without reaching an agreement. None the less for my part I am very glad the conference took place for in the first place it gave an opportunity for the leader of the different parties in Ireland to meet at the same table and discuss the problems of their common country, and right sure I am of this, that however deep the division may appear to be between one Irishman and another, one Irishman is very much more like any other Irishman than any Irishman is like an Englishman (laughter and hear, hear), and the more we can get the different points of view in this difficult Irish problem discussed by representative Irishmen face to face, the more rapidly and the more certainly shall we reach the time when Ireland realises that it is by taking into her own hands the management of affairs which really are her own that she will reach unity and peace. That is one reason, and there is a second reason why we all of us should be glad that the attempt was made to approach unity by conference. Is it not clear by this time that in all parts of the United Kingdom that this ancient Irish problem should be settled? (loud cheers).

And as the British government had not reacted to increased militancy of both Ulster and Irish Volunteers, they were not in a position to be heavy-handed in dealing with nationalist Ireland. ‘This inaction is partly explained by their preoccupation with international affairs, along with the belief that constitutional nationalists had sufficient control in the south of Ireland, and that it would be dangerous to create martyrs.’ However, when the coalition government was formed in 1915, in response to the First World War, Carson was brought in, where he served briefly as Attorney General, while John Redmond remained outside. ‘The
new consensus between Liberals and Tories thus completely undermined the value of the Irish Parliamentary Party.\footnote{Ferriter, p.129, also: ‘Redmond rejected an invitation to join the government, and was then humiliated by the refusal of the War Office to allow use of the National Volunteers for home defence or to sanction the formation of an Irish division within the British army.’}

**Excursus: Sir Edward Carson**

Born 1854, the son of an architect of Scottish descent, educated at Portarlington School and Trinity College Dublin, Carson was called to the bar in 1877, and became Solicitor-General for Ireland in 1892. The same year he entered politics, by winning the Trinity College seat in the Westminster election. At this time nationalist demands for a separate Irish parliament – the Home Rule campaign – were growing and Protestants throughout the country, but particularly in Ulster, were alarmed by the prospect they felt would end British rule. Carson joined the Unionist government in 1900 and received a knighthood. In Parliament he vigorously opposed any move to weaken the links between England and Ireland, and became leader of the Irish Unionists in 1910. When the Liberals under Asquith introduced the Home Rule Bill 1912, Carson took a leading part in the formation of the Ulster Volunteers, who drilled openly to show that they were prepared to resort to force of arms rather than come under an Irish parliament in Dublin. On 11 September 1913, Loreburn, a former cabinet minister and stalwart anti-partitionist, nonetheless issued a public letter calling for a resolution of the Home Rule crisis on the basis of a conference. The implication of a federal settlement lead Carson to revise his view of exclusion, set out in a letter written on 20 September, considered a pivotal document in the history of the partition issue:

\begin{quote}
I am of [the] opinion that on the whole tings are shaping towards a desire to settle on the terms of leaving ‘Ulster’ out. A difficulty arises as to defining Ulster and my own view is that the whole of Ulster should be excluded but the minimum would be the 6 Plantation counties and for that a good cause could be made. The South and West would present a difficulty and it might be that I could not agree to their abandonment tho’ I feel certain it would be the best settlement if Home Rule is inevitable…Of course the ideal thing would be that this should be part of a general scheme for the UK and even if that question is not practical to settle for the moment it could be drafted in such a way as to make it fit in afterwards.\footnote{Jackson, Home Rule, p.124.}
\end{quote}

Thus Carson had managed to move away from using exclusion to wreck Home Rule towards embracing it to resolve the Home Rule crisis permanently.
And writing to Lord Lansdowne on 9 October 1913, Carson had developed a new impatience, and even contempt for his co-religionists in the South. The additional context for Carson’s letter on the exclusionist cause was provided by Winston Churchill in a speech at Dundee on 8 October, in which special treatment for north-east Ulster was invoked. ‘[Southern Unionists] may think’, Carson wrote:

If Ulster obtains separate treatment that they may have been betrayed, and although I do not think they have been prepared to run any risks, I should be very sorry if the termination of the contest left them under a sense of betrayal by us. At the same time it is hard to see, if separate treatment was given to Ulster, how I could be justified in asking men to go on preparing for resistance when their only object could be to obtain what had been offered to them. On the other hand, if our friends in the South and West say that they prefer that Ulster should be included in the event of a Bill becoming inevitable, it would mean that we should give up the fight, and I do not think anyone could successfully commend that policy to the Ulster people. It is very difficult to ascertain what the South and West expect us to do, as they only talk in generalities, and I do not think they realise that we have no power to stop the Bill and that even if we refuse the separate treatment of Ulster, the Bill will probably become law all the same.\(^{19}\)

A ‘Solemn Covenant of Resistance’\(^{20}\) to Home Rule was signed by hundreds of thousands of Northern unionists, and Carson told them, ‘Don’t be afraid of illegalities,’ and in April 1914 the Ulster Volunteers landed guns at Larne, County Antrim, in defiance of the British government but with the open approval of the Conservative opposition. Carson believed that if unionist opposition could prevent Home Rule in the north of the country, it would not be applied to any part of Ireland. The Home Rule Bill became law in August 1914, but its operation was immediately suspended until after the war. The Ulster Unionists, led by Carson and Craig, were assured by Asquith that the coercion of Ulster was unthinkable. Carson’s Volunteers made up most of the 36th (Ulster) Division which suffered appalling casualties at the Battle of the Somme, their ‘blood sacrifice’ to seal the bargain. Carson was appointed Attorney General in 1915 but resigned in 1916 in dissatisfaction with the conduct of the war. After the Easter Rising he was assured by Lloyd George that the six northeastern counties would be permanently excluded

\(^{19}\) Jackson, p.125: “This letter has a powerful resonance. It incorporated a recognition that, contrary to Carson’s expectations in 1911-12, a deal might well be done with the Liberals on the basis of exclusion. It also embodied a much more direct sense of contempt for southern Unionists than had been hitherto apparent in his letters and speeches.”

\(^{20}\) Not unintentionally, the Covenant recalls the Lords of the Congregation, who in 1557 created the first religious-political Covenant in Scotland, thereby establishing the ‘Confessio scotica’, developed by John Knox and basically Calvinist in content. The second Covenant followed in 1638, when again the Scots had to defend themselves against the evils of ‘Popery’. Cf. Cassell’s Chronology, The Early Modern World.,p.257and Fisher, p.585ff.
from the Home Rule Act of 1914, and he accepted office as First Lord of the Admiralty. When the war ended he became MP for the Dungarvan division of Belfast.

The Guardian 14 July 1919

At a Twelfth of July demonstration at Belfast on Saturday, Sir Edward Caron moved a resolution demanding the repeal of the Home Rule Act, which in the ordinary course should come into operation in six months from the date of the ratification of peace. Sir E. Carson advised his hearers to be prepared for every emergency. He threatened to call out the Ulster Volunteers "if there was any attempt made to take away one jot or tittle of their rights as British citizens." If the Home Rule Act was not repealed he would assemble the Ulster Provisional Government and he himself would then move that the Act be repealed. He said to America: "You attend to your own affairs and we will attend to ours. We will not brook interference in our affairs." The Independent Orangemen also held a demonstration, at which they passed a resolution against partition as "a cowardly desertion of the Protestants of the West and South." Our Belfast correspondent states that it is rumoured in well-informed Liberal quarters there that the Cabinet have decided upon a settlement.²¹

Sir Edward was well-known abroad, and his visit to the Kaiser will not have been missed by ethnic Germans in neighbouring states. Thus it is not surprising to find him quoted on the behalf of Sudeten Germans in Bohemia, in the question of state force regarding the well-fare of a national minority.²² Home Rule for Ireland and the special status of Northern Ireland is here seen as comparable to the case of Sudeten Germans surrounded by Czechs in the newly granted Republic of Czechoslovakia.

²¹ Cf. The Guardian archives online [http://www.guardiancentury.co.uk.] 10.05.2007.

Sir Carson führte u.a. aus:

“… They (die Bevölkerung von Ulster) have, I think, genuine fears for their civil and religious liverty [sic] under the bill, but do not imagine that this is all that these men are fighting for. They are fighting for a great principle, and a great deal. They are fighting… to refuse to come under a government which they loath and detest. Men do not make sacrifices or take up the attitude these men… have taken up on a question of detail or paper safeguards. I am not going to argue whether they are right or wrong in resisting. It would be useless to argue it, because they have thoroughly made up their minds, but I say this: if these men are not morally justified when they are attempted to be driven… under (a government) which they loath, I do not see how resistance can be justified in history at all… Ulster… is not a part of the community which can be bought. She will not allow herself to be sold. You must therefore either coerce her if you go on, or you must, in the long run, by showing that good government can come under (this) bill, try and win her over to the case of the rest of Ireland. You probably can coerce her – though I doubt it. If you do, what will be the disastrous consequences…? Will… the leader of the Nationalist party have gained anything? … will he have gained anything if he takes over these people and then applies for what he used to call – at all events his party used to call – the “enemies of the people” to come in and coerce them into obedience?… You have never tried to win over Ulster. You have never tried to understand her position. You have never alleged, and can never allege, that this bill gives her one atom of advantage. No, you cannot deny… that in the past she has produced the most law-abiding and the most loyal part of the citizens of Ireland. After all that, every time we came before you, your only answer to us – the majority of you, at all events – was to insult us, and to make little of us. I say to the leader of the Nationalist party: if you want Ulster, go and take her, or go on and win her. You have never wanted her affections; you have wanted her taxes…”

The Government of Ireland Act of 1920, setting up a parliament for northern Ireland, was finally supported by the Ulster Unionists on Carson’s advice as their only alternative, since there was no hope of repealing the Home Rule Act.

23 Curtiss-McDowell, pp.304ff.
24 In 1921 Carson was appointed Lord of Appeal in Ordinary and took a life peerage as Baron Carson of Duncairn. He died in 1935 and received a state funeral in Belfast. Cf. online [http://www.thebelfasttelegraph.co.uk] 10.05.2007.
4.1. The Outbreak of War

Sympathy was still well-placed with the Austrian monarch in April, 1914, when his ill-health claimed the attention of the international media. The personal ties held between Ireland and Austria at this time were based on the memories of the late Empress, Elisabeth, who had been a frequent to Irish shores.

CE 21 April 1914
Austrian Emperor. His Majesty’s Illness. Latest Bulletin
[...] The usually well-informed “Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung” declares a marked improvement set in this morning and afternoon and that the Emperor showed all his customary zeal and activity in discharging the affairs of State, and was in excellent spirits. His Majesty, it is added, suffers from catarrh almost every spring and this year the raw cold weather experienced during March retarded his recovery.

And, at the end of June, the assassination of the heir to the Austrian throne was still seen as a family tragedy, perhaps with national but essentially without international consequences. The Examiner published mostly Reuter’s reports, offering own comments.

CE 29 June 1914
News has just been received here in Sarajevo that the Archduke Francis Ferdinand and his wife were assassinated today while driving through the streets of the town. [...] The author of the second attempt was also arrested. Both criminals were almost lynched by the infuriated crowd. – Reuter.
Sarajevo, Later
The town is in mourning. The President of the Bosnian Diet at once forwarded to the Imperial Chancellor a telegram in which he expressed the grief and horror of the whole population at the ruthless crime, and assured the Emperor of the unalterable and faithful devotion to the ruling House. [...] Complete peace and order reigns throughout the country.
The News In Vienna
[...] The news has created painful impressions, but owing to it being Sunday, and to-morrow being the Catholic feast of SS. Peter and Paul’s, a large number of persons have left the city, and since all the unofficial telephone communication with Sarajevo was suspended, the only news available was that contained in the official bulletins.
[...] The Archduke and the Duchess were meeting everywhere with a most enthusiastic reception, and great festivities had been planned for to-day. Sarajevo was gaily decorated with flags. – Reuter.
Further Details
According to reports from a local news agency, a Pan-Servian agitation began in Bosnia when the news of the impending visit of the Archduke was first
announced. Attempts were made to persuade the Archduke to give up the trip, but he determined to go, and only wanted his wife to remain at home.

[...] Although of a retiring disposition and little known to the masses of the people, the Archduke inspired confidence, for he approached all the great questions of the day with an open mind. The duchess of Hohenberg (nee Countess Choteh) was of Czech origin and had many sympathies with Bohemia, and the dismay felt in Prague will therefore be readily imagined.

A day later, the Examiner continues to participate in the general outrage at the killing in Sarajevo, educating their readers on the history of the Habsburgs, their politics and their personal tragedies.

CE 30 June 1914

[...] In yesterday’s issue we referred to the terrible murder, which has removed one of the most striking of European Royal personalities and his wife, and the universal denunciation of the outrage which the Press of all countries has since supplied makes it evident that the sympathy of the civilised world is with the aged Emperor Francis Joseph in his hour of intense sorrow and tribulation. The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy [...] consists of two States, the Empire of Austria and the Kingdom of Hungary, and of the Provinces Bosnia and Herzegovina. Each of the States has its own Constitution and Parliament, and for most branches of State Affairs its own Ministry and Administration; but they are closely bound together by the identity of the Ruler and by a permanent Constitutional union, which upon the common principle of possession and defence was first proclaimed by the Pragmatic Sanction of 1723, and has since been regulated by the so-called “Compromise” (Ausgleich-Kiegyezes) of 1867. In connexion with the Ausgleich-Kiegyezes the two States entered into a commercial and customs union in 1867, by which the two States form one commercial and customs territory, and possess the same system of coinage, weights and measures and a joint bank of issue. The union is renewable every ten years, and was so renewed in 1877, 1887, 1897, and 1907.

The Dual Monarchy is said to be honey-combed with disaffection, and the story of the Royal House of Austro-Hungary is tragic beyond description. [...] The sequence of tragedies that has made the declining days of the Emperor of Austria bitter – the family sorrows of an old man broken with sickness and worn with years – could not have failed to awaken European sympathy. [...] It will be recalled that the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which threatened Europe with war half a dozen years ago, was said to be inspired by the heir Presumptive to the Austrian Empire, and he has been credited with the chief responsibility for the Austrian policy in the Balkans, which led to a serious European situation, and which may present further difficulties if the Albanian experiment does not come up to expectations. The fact that the late Archduke was a devout Catholic may possibly have made enemies for him, who placed blame on his shoulders for which he had no real responsibility, and attributed acts to him to which he was no party. His consistent refusal to pay an official visit to Rome, as he regarded Victor Emmanuel as a usurper of the Papal States, must have excited enmity in high places, and his unflinching adhesion to Catholicity probably explains the suggestions and accusations that have been brought against him of hostility towards Hungary.
The Examiner also recalls the assassination of the Empress Elisabeth in its Notes and Comments section, stressing once more the Catholic bearing of the Habsburg family.

CE 30 June 1914

On Sunday last the latest of the long series of tragedies that have thrown gloom over the imperial House of the Hapsburgs was enacted, when the heir-apparent, Prince Franz-Ferdinand, and his wife were assassinated; verily the aged Emperor and King Francis Josef has to drink the cup of sorrow to the dregs before he passes to the “undiscovered country.” The assassination of his beautiful consort, the Empress Elisabeth, sent a shudder into every corner of the globe. She was one of those women who possessed many eccentricities of character, but who had a large heart and a grateful remembrance of services rendered. **For Ireland and its people she entertained feelings of deep affection, and during the hunting season she was a familiar and indeed a picturesque and stately figure at the famous Kildare hunt.** Her meeting with the present Archbishop of Dublin when he was President of Maynooth College has been already alluded to in this column. The Empress sought shelter within the College walls from a heavy shower, and the President, with grace and dignity, placed his academic gown over her shoulders. His courteous action was thankfully acknowledged, and the hearty cheer which the students sent up when they found that the Empress Elisabeth was amongst them left an impression on her mind to which she frequently alluded in after times. **In the beautiful chapel attached to Maynooth College there is a magnificent suit of vestments, the gift of this ill-fated lady,** and the interest that attaches to them, apart from their sacred character and uses, is enhanced by the consideration that nearly all the exquisite embroidering was done by her own hand.

And through its London Correspondent, the reader of the Examiner is informed that Sarajevo is still the principal subject exercising London minds:

CE 30 June 1914

[...] A gentleman well in touch with the internal affairs of Austria, when asked for his opinion to-day, said “First of all, the late Archduke was part of the European situation. Everybody knew what his ideas were, and that he was a strong, honest man, and very popular with the Austrian army [...]”. What effect the assassination of the Archduke will have on affairs generally it would be idle to suggest. Of course, there is always a hope, that out of an evil to some extent good will come, and that the people with very advanced views in Austria may suddenly come to realise the disastrous nature of this affair. People are apt to talk very wildly at times until their ideas take some such form as this tragedy, and then they become sobered by the awful consequences. It is well to remember, however, that such an incident as this, however tragic it may prove to be, is somewhat on a par with the attempt made on the Viceroy of India, and its true significance may be of a very limited character.

And though a nationalist reason for the assassination could be understood, if not condoned, the idea that socialism inspired the act could not, at least not at this
point in time. The Catholic perspective of the paper was all-encompassing in its commentary, and, though never overtly bigoted, delineates natural alliances in a comfortably moderate way.26

CE 30 June 1914

After the murders yesterday demonstrations of an anti-Servian character were organised by Croatian students. Order was preserved, however, by the ordering out of troops. The troops were received by the demonstrators with great cheering. Gabrinovic was expelled from Sarajevo two years ago, but was recently allowed to return as the result of the intervention of a Socialist member of the Diet. [...] The second prisoner has confessed that since his return from Belgrade he had been determined to shoot a highly placed personage out of revenge for the supposed oppression of the Servian nation [...] Well-informed quarters are convinced that the perpetration of such acts by Bosnians would have been impossible had not, as is well known, an agitation from abroad been carried on among the loyal Servian Orthodox population. This agitation is believed to have gained particular influence among secondary schoolboys and socialists belonging to the Servian Orthodox faith.

On the same day it is also noted that King George’s Representative to the funeral of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife would probably be either the Duke of Teck or Prince Arthur of Connaught, as the Austrian Emperor was a British Field Marshall, and the deceased Archduke a Colonel of a British regiment. And the British Government’s Sympathy was conveyed by Sir Edward Grey through the medium of the British Embassy in Vienna, Sir Edward, as Foreign Secretary, offering his own personal condolences.27 And Paris Press Comments included in the issue also reassured the reader that the assassination ‘is a family catastrophe but not a national catastrophe,’ the death of the Archduke creating

25 The partial merger of socialism and nationalism can first be seen in Ireland two years later, when during the 1916 Rising James Connolly’s Citizen Army support the rebels; and reported on with some enthusiasm regarding the hero-like status of the Austrian assassin, Socialist Friederich Adler.
26 CE 2 July 1914: ‘Sarajevo, According to semi-official accounts the anti-Servian demonstrations were due to the immense indignation of the vast majority of the Catholic and mussulman population, all classes participating. It is pointed out that not a single Servian was killed whereas a Catholic and a muslim were killed by the Servians.’ – Reuter.
27 CE 1 July 1914: ‘England’s Sympathy: The victims were within the last few months guests of our King, and they left behind them among all who had the privilege of seeing and knowing them, a gracious and unfading memory. Their thoughts and hearts turned to the illustrious Sovereign Emperor of Austria, who had for the best part of seventy years sustained on his own shoulders an almost unexampled burden of care and responsibility. Called to the Throne of a vast Empire before the most of those present were born, he had set an example to the rulers of the world for patient assiduity and devoted self-sacrifice in the pursuit of duty, of which there had been few parallels in our own or any other time. In sunshine and storm, whether fortune smiled or frowned, he had been the unperturbed, the sagacious and heroic leader of a mighty State, rich in tradition and associated with us in this country in some of the most moving and treasured chapters of our common history. He and his people had always been our friends.’
neither internal complications nor external danger. It was seen as one more tragedy ‘in the long and dramatic reign of the venerable Emperor. It does not imply either the weakening of the monarchy or a blow to the dynasty.’ The family aspect of the incident is further strengthened by the Examiner in an article relating to an analogy with an Irish clan:

CE 1 July 1914
The tragedy of the Hapsburgs has formed a fruitful theme for newspapers all over the world during the past couple of days. A correspondent who signs himself “Reader of Notes and Comments” writes stating that there is some analogy between the dark spell that hung over the Hapsburgs and that which darkened the lives of the heads of the Beresford family. This influential Irish clan, whose principal member, John Claudius Beresford, commanded almost the entire patronage of the Government in the days that preceded the Union, is supposed to have been cursed, at least so the legend goes, by a poor widow whose son was put to death at the command of the Beresfords, in the courtyard at Curraghmore, because of his connection with the United Irish Society. The widow’s bitter malédiction invoked the vengeance of Heaven on the heads of the Beresford family, and whether the efficacy of her curse is mythical, the fact remains that the deaths of the reigning Beresfords has been peculiar.

“May heaven and hell blast his happiness! May his family be exterminated! May he be smitten in the persons of those he loves! May his life be wrecked, and may his children be brought to ruin!” – such was the terrible curse pronounced on the Emperor Francis Josef, by the Countess Karolyi, whose son was a political victim in the early part of the Emperor’s reign. The history of his reign converts it almost to a prophecy.

However, by the end of July, the threat of war in Europe appeared closer, the London Correspondent commenting on the matter, which resolved itself into one of the Austrian ultimatum and the Servian reply, with the consideration of the preparations by the allied Powers. Interesting to note also is that the war, or rather the preparations to war, would be considered closer than previously experienced, practically ‘live’, due to the transatlantic developments in telephone communication.

CE 3 July 1914
Wireless Telephony
Interview with Mr. Isaacs.
London, Thursday Night. – Interviewed this afternoon by a Central News representative, Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, managing director of the Marconi Co., said his company had now got over the initial difficulties connected with wireless telephonic communication, and expected to make rapid progress. “I have expressed the opinion,” said Mr. Isaacs, “which I repeat, that if Marconi does not talk to New York before the year is out, I shall be very disappointed. He added that successful wireless telephonic experiments had been conducted between London and Berlin,
and London and Chelmsford. […] “We are only on the threshold of wireless development,” declared Mr. Isaacs.

For Irishmen, of course, the effect of the war on Home Rule was the ultimate question to be considered, and newspaper men, currently applying their trade in Ulster, might soon be making full use of the modern means of communication to facilitate the publication of their reports, from Louvain, though, rather than Larne:

CE 27 July 1914

[…] There were people in London to-day who were cynical enough to suggest that Germany had prompted the aggressive Note. There is not, however, any evidence of this […]. If Germany raided the French coast there would be a terrible danger that our navy would be called to the assistance of our friends, and the whole problem would become highly embarrassing for us. […] The real immediate problem is how will this matter strike the British and the Irish imagination. Will it mean that Parliament may have to sit in the autumn when it would not otherwise be sitting? Will the circumstances be used for a remand for prolonging the session, and so delay the passage of the Home Rule Bill? That is scarcely likely […]. It may, however, be used to sway sentiment. We may expect to find the Tory Press raising hands in horror that the Government should be preceding with its Home Rule policy when the United Kingdom needs to show that its people are ready to combine against a common danger. The rejoinder to that is that the House of Commons said its last word on the Home Rule Bill weeks ago, and it will be the Orangemen who will be lacking in patriotism if in a time of crisis for the country through trouble from without they proceed to form a Provisional Government in Ulster and to occupy in civil strife men who will be needed as soldiers for a larger and deeper issue.

It is rather amusing to think that the “Daily Mail” corps of war correspondents, who have so ostentatiously been planted in Ulster to be ready for a hypothetical war, may be required suddenly to go to Europe to witness the real thing and no longer worry about a figment of the imagination. Meanwhile the clouds which arisen so suddenly may as suddenly disappear. It must be admitted, however, that everyone who has taken the trouble to read the terms of the Austrian ultimatum to Servia is agreed in wondering how demands of so extreme a kind can have been made without the deliberate intention to provoke the latter country and her immediate neighbours into war. The situation thus created was critical in the extreme for the continued peace of Europe, and it is not surprising that some observers have recalled what happened a few years ago when in defiance of the wishes of all the other Great Powers, except Germany, and to some extent Italy, the third member of the Triple Alliance, Austria definitely annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina. The trouble has arisen so suddenly and with so little regard on Austria’s part for the customary diplomatic conventions that the debacle on the Stock Exchange has caused little surprise. 28

28 CE 29 July 1914. London Correspondence. (From Our Correspondent). London, Tuesday Night. - […] I said yesterday that under the treaty England had no obligation to enter the fray to assist France, but the entente cordiale would be a hollow farce and worth nothing later if the security of France were threatened by Germany and England were unwilling to help her most intimate friend
There were also advantages to be gained from the situation. Ireland’s tourist industry, for instance, could profit seriously from the unexpected circumstances embroiling the European continent, redirecting tourist traffic to the, in contrast, seemingly peaceful western isle.

CE 30 July 1914
London Correspondence
(From Our Correspondent)
London, Wednesday Night. - [...] The effect of the official knowledge of the declaration of war between Austria and Servia has been much less apparent in the metropolis than might have been expected. The truth of the matter is that Britishers, being a slow-thinking people and little liable to emotion, have refused to believe that the whole of Europe is to be involved in a blaze of warfare. [...] It is an ill wind that does nobody any good, and the chances are that the British seaside resorts will gain very largely to the disparagement of the Continental. This is scarcely a moment for lonely tours in the Austrian Tyrol and even Hamburg and Marienbad are not names suggesting tranquillity utterly unalloyed at the present moment. It is well known that the Irish touring resorts have suffered from the clamour of impending civil war and the ostentatious parades of Irish Covenanters with or without guns, but they would have the preference to journeys for the sake of health anywhere beyond the borders of France. [...] If doubt still exists in some minds as to the effect of the mere menace of serious fighting upon food prices it will be at once dispelled by the leap in prices reported from Vienna, almost before a shot had been fired. The news affords a grim suggestion of what would happen in every large city in Europe if the war which has now commenced should involve a general conflagration. Since the Napoleonic era nations have become so interdependent in a dozen different ways that even the shadow of war among the powers is enough to cause a financial and economic panic, which may well make responsible Statesmen do all in their power to avert a struggle whose end no man can foresee. [...] I may mention in contrast to the excitement in European capitals, the fact brought home to me by an English friend who has been travelling over western Austria for the last two or three weeks. He speaks of the comparative indifference with which the news of the threatened war was received in town and village. During the week-end there was little excitement in the general population, and the soldiery, who promptly put in an appearance for the guarding of railways and high roads, came in for no manifestation of interest, whereas two years ago in similar circumstances there were large groups in every market-place engaged in animated discussion. This time it was difficult to find in the scores of villages traversed by my informant from Saturday to Monday so many as a dozen men assembled to consider the situation. There was a good deal of mobilization of stores here and there, but it proceeded with indifference on the part

and ally. As regards so many other issues, if Great Britain is dragged into the conflict it must affect the Irish problem.

CE 29 July 1914. Irish Party Meeting To-day.London, Tuesday Night. – [...] There is a strong feeling in every section of the House to-day that in view of the gravity of the European situation a solution of the Home Rule deadlock must be found at all costs, and found within the next few days. The Ulster Unionist and Nationalist members realise that great pressure will be put upon them both by the government and by its opponents to take this opportunity to compose their differences, wide as they may seem, and bring to a close the internal crisis so damaging to British prestige.
of the general population, and it was clear that in those early stages the expectations of a diplomatic solution was confident and widespread.

An increase in popularity was also experienced by the IPP, and until the outbreak of the First World War, the Irish Parliamentary Party had regained some of its former strength.

Redmond was also unfortunate in being surrounded by egotistical colleagues, who, as Bew points out, tended to enter and exit stage when it suited them. They gave more room to Joe Devlin and the ancient order of Hibernians (originally a nineteenth-century Irish-American benevolent society, now a catholic political machine for the nationalist party under the presidency of Devlin, which attracted members because of its freemason-style activities, its sectarianism and its rivalry with the orange order) to fill a political vacuum; the party’s belief that the AOH would secure their political rear lead them to drift further out of touch with popular opinion.29

Both Redmond and AOH30 leader Devlin had believed exclusion would be temporary and recommended the scheme. They believed these excluded counties forming Ulster proper, initially nine later reduced to six predominately Protestant counties within Ulster, would be governed from London, rejecting ‘absurd’ claims of an own government.

CE 30 July 1914  
Liberal Demonstration. Support of Government Programme. Speech by Mr.Devlin.  

The threats of civil war in Ireland magnified as they had been, had a more important bearing on the foreign situation than the British public had any conception of. The purpose of their meeting was to declare by resolution that Ireland should no longer be asked to wait for the victory she had so heroically and nobly won (cheers). […] They could not, however, have peace with dishonour. There must be no faltering on the part of the government in regard to their duty to Ireland (cheers). With peace or without it the Government of Ireland Bill must be placed on the Statute Book (cheers). […] Mr.Joseph Devlin, M.P., rising to support the resolution, was received with loud cheering, the audience upstanding.

29 Ferriter, p.130.  
30 CE 4 July 1914.A.O.H.Millstreet Division. Annual Outing.The annual excursion organised by the Millstreet Division of the A.O.H., is an event eagerly looked forward to by the Nationalists of Millstreet and locality. This year’s outing is to be to Youghal and the Irish Rhine [River Blackwater] on Sunday, the 12th inst.  
CE 28 July 1914.Blackwater Scenery. As will be seen by our advertising columns, the Youghal and Blackwater Tourist SS. Co.’s motor boat The Victory will leave Youghal at 3.30 on tomorrow (Wednesday), for the popular short trip up the Irish Rhine. The sailings for this week and all next week afford a good opportunity to visitors via Cork to enjoy the magnificent scenery of the full trip from Youghal to Capoquin, returning back in time to catch the 8.30 train to the city.
It has been argued that in reality militant Ulster Unionists were more perceptive than Redmond at a time ‘when parliament was becoming increasingly irrelevant to what was happening on the ground.’ Redmond did not recognise the development of new strands in Irish political and cultural life, and the class divisions it entailed.

The shopkeepers and large farmers who formed much of the backbone of the party’s support were increasingly open to accusations that they were part of the establishment they decried. Being delighted to stand where Parnell had stood (in the sense of having the parliamentary numbers to demand Home Rule) was a measure of Redmond’s ignorance of the changes in the structure of Irish society since Parnell. In one of his last letters, Redmond, outlining the failure of his own project, foresaw only ‘universal anarchy...when every blackguard who wants to commit an outrage will simply call himself a Sinn Féiner and thereby get the sympathy of the unthinking crowd’. 31

Only the Catholic bishops, fearing for the future of education for the Catholic minority, urged unity among Irishmen of all classes and creeds. 32 In 1914, asked by Redmond to intervene against a march by the Irish Volunteers, which might aggravate Unionist criticism, Derry Bishop, Charles McHugh, made clear his mistrust of extreme Protestantism in power: ‘The Orange Order is never done crying out intolerance and publishing what they would suffer under home rule,’ he said, ‘but there is not a word about what the Catholics and nationalists would suffer if the Orangemen got control and what they have already suffered at their hands.’ The Volunteers were not prepared to accept a state of things worse than if they never stood up for home rule at all. 33 The Catholic clergy were still very much involved in Irish politics at the beginning of the 20th century, especially at a local level were their influence on the masses was as yet unbroken. And though the Church had at first condemned the rise of the GAA and had not been involved in the founding of the Gaelic League, it soon recognised the potential these movements involved and was loath to be marginalized by them. Therefore, in no time at all, local clergy not only vehemently supported regional branches but in most cases actually presided at the head of events encouraging the rediscovered Gaelic tradition. 1914 saw the continuing success of the language movement, now receiving both the unequivocal support of the Catholic clergy and the more questionable, effusive effort of the extremists. It would be difficult to discern

31 Ferriter, p.131.
32 Elliott, p.297.
33 Elliott, p.298.
correctly the line of demarcation, on the one hand approving the patronage of pastors and poets of Gaelic and old glory, and yet relegating the rallying cries of clerks to the realms of manic zeal. Not until the rising of 1916 would such a need arise in the first place, and yet in hindsight there appeared to be numerous occasion for doubt about the revival’s direction.\textsuperscript{34}

CE 6 July 1914
Language Movement.
Aerideact in Dunmanway

[The] above very popular annual fixture [...] was a most successful event [...] thanks to the local committee. Prominent among such are the Rev. Father Magner, P.P., Dunmanway, and his curates, the rev. Fathers Murphy, Cummins, and O’Shea, while Brother Vincent, Superior of the Christian Brothers’ Schools, and Brothers Theodorus and Carthage, the other members of the community have done much to foster and encourage the spread of the national tongue and the fostering of our national pastimes among the youth entrusted to their charge, and might be called the leading spirits of the language movement in the classes and weekly scoreachts, etc., locally. [...] The Rev. Father Magner, P.P., in opening the proceedings, said that ingrained in the soul of every Irishman is a deep abiding love for the old traditions of our country – its games, its pastimes, its language – in all these things, which undoubtedly sink [sic] down into our flesh and blood. At times they were suppressed, at times the ruthless invader tried to destroy them, but they did not succeed, and in these recent years there has sprung up amongst the Irish people the same strong, firm desire for the old Irish pastimes as in the days when our kings and princes reigned in the land. [...] The dances, songs and other items on the programme would remind them of the old times and animate them with a spirit of Nationality and love of Faith and Fatherland which was enshrined in their Irish hearts. [...] Rev. J.C. O’Flynn, Cork, opened the second part of the programme and delivered a stirring address in the course of which he urged upon the people, particularly the young people of our country, to learn the beautiful language of the Gael. A man who learned the language of his country and who took an interest in the promotion of the National pastimes was all the better Irishman for it. The font of Nationality was their native language and if the Irish people were 50 years ago fond of the mother tongue and if they had kept it alive in spite of the efforts of those who tried to kill it, they would not be as they were to-day – looking for Home Rule, because they would have had it long ago (applause). He did not want to talk about politics but suppose home Rule comes now those shoneens who have kept away from all National movements – those good-for-nothing people – will be the very draw back of Home Rule. Those people had not alone shown

\textsuperscript{34} CE 19 September 1914. The Irish Language. On Tuesday night next the coming winter session of the Munster Training College in Irish will begin. Last year a good beginning was made at the winter session, some 110 students having attended the classes. Most of those students were teachers in elementary and secondary schools, for which class of students the work of the college is specially suited. The Christian Brothers have again very kindly placed their colleges in St. Patrick’s Place at the disposal of the Munster College Committee, and the Irish classes will be held there on Tuesday and Friday nights and on Saturdays.
apathy, but even antipathy to every National movement, and they will like a burden on the country’s back until they are in their graves. 35

One opponent of Home Rule, Joseph Chamberlain, was already in his grave. His varied career veered from one extreme to the other, but ultimately ended as a die-hard in the same mould as Edward Carson. Carson never represented a one-man campaign but was rather the figurehead for a large section of the British establishment, centered in Westminster, and peopled by dignitaries such as Joseph Chamberlain. His death in 1914 was politely lamented, and several photographs were published in the Cork Examiner recalling his days of political power and prestige. He was representative of a broad band of politicians who undertook their utmost to prevent the implementation of Home Rule, and his ‘defection’ from Gladstone on the Irish question led to the postponement of a settlement.

CE 4 July 1914
London Correspondence
(From Our Correspondent)
London, Friday Night. - Had Mr. Joseph Chamberlain died thirty years ago Ireland would not have had to wait until now for the consummation of her aspirations, for their [sic] is little doubt that his defection from Mr.Gladstone on the Irish question was one of the events which led to the postponement of a settlement, and through all the weary years that followed with the accompaniment of Coercion Acts, imprisonments, and evictions, he must take his place before the bar of justice side by side with those who were the nominal and with him the participant authors. It is perhaps one of the strangest chapters in English history to review the life of this statesman, who was in his aspirations a Socialist purely and simply, under the guise of a municipal reformer, when he first entered Parliament: then to see him develop into a Liberal, and then almost through pettish spleen join a party which he had nothing in common, simply because he was not allowed to lead his leader. Irishmen can, however, to-day afford to lose a remembrance of his recreancy, and echo the words of Mr.Redmond when he says: “I learn with sorrow of the death of Mr.Chamberlain. Ireland no doubt in the past had bitter memories of his career; but the Irish are a generous race, and long ago these memories were forgotten. There has been in Ireland universal sympathy at the pathetic spectacle of Mr.Chamberlain’s long and patiently borne illness. He was a great man.” Had this great man died fifteen years ago England would have been spared one of the greatest calamities that ever befel [sic] it. The last Boer War would then never have taken place, and the aggressive Imperialism, if no other

35 CE 6 July 1914. United Irish League. West Ward Branch. Letter from Mr.Redmond. At a meeting held in the Council Chamber Municipal Buildings, the following resolution was proposed by Mr.R.J.Hyde, and seconded by Mr. Timothy Coleman and carried unanimously: - “That we, the members of the West ward branch of the United Irish League, reiterate our unabated confidence in the leadership of Mr.John Redmond, and heartily assure him of our loyal support in any actin he may take in the advancement of the Nationalist cause.” (Reply) House of Commons, London, July 3rd 1914. Dear Sir – I am directed by Mr.Redmond to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 2nd inst., with copy of resolution, the contents of which he duly noted, and which he is pleased to receive. – Yours truly, T.J. Hanna, Pierce J.Bradley, Chairman.
motives, which impelled it and which ended in the lowering of England’s prestige before the world would have been held in restraint. [...] To Irishmen it will seem almost a coincidence that his death practically synchronises with the passing into law of Home Rule.\textsuperscript{36}

And in connection with said statesman, the following report is printed in the Examiner regarding the Anglo-German relations dominating the news of the day.

CE 10 July 1914

A writer in the “Graphic” gives an interesting reminiscence concerning the late Mr. Joseph Chamberlain. “One evening in December, 1900,” he recalls, “Mr. Chamberlain invited me into his room at the House of Commons, where, over a big fire and a cigar, he held forth to me at length about the necessity of alliances and more particularly an Anglo-Teutonic Union. I was against him on both points, but he spared no pains to convert me, and on a few questions of fact he certainly succeeded in modifying the basis of my convictions. Here is one example. He had been giving me his impressions of the character and political views of the German Emperor, when I interrupted him with “But what about the Kruger telegram?” He thought for a moment, and then said: “Well, I have passed through the same difficulty, and perhaps the thing that convinced me may convince you. Some time ago the Queen was saying to me pretty much what I am saying to you and like you I said, “Yes, Ma’am, but what about the Kruger telegram?” By way of reply she placed in my hands a letter, and asked me to read it. It was from the Emperor, written a day or two after the Kruger telegram, and I can assure you that no one could read that letter without being satisfied that his motives and objects in sending the telegram had been cruelly misunderstood.”\textsuperscript{37}

As the war was not expected to last for long, the jovial mood of nationalist pride across Europe received a relatively objective presentation in the press.

CE 27 July 1914

WAR.

Germany And Austria. Demonstrations At Berlin

A crowd of several hundreds of people demonstrated in favour of Austria in front of the Austrian Embassy this evening, cheering for the Austrian and German Emperors and singing the Austrian and German national anthems and patriotic songs. The Austro-Hungarian Ambassador appeared on the balcony and thanked the demonstrators. –Reuter.

Scenes At Budapest

On the announcement of the news of the rupture of the diplomatic relations with Servia, crowds paraded the streets singing patriotic songs and shouting “Long

\textsuperscript{36} CE 4 July 1914. Mr.T.P. O’Connor’s Regret. London, Friday Night. - Mr.T.P. O’Connor, M.P., said the Chancellor of the Exchequer acknowledged to him the death of Mr. Chamberlain left him very depressed. Old Parliamentarians could not view the disappearance of such a powerful figure without a pang, said Mr.O’Connor, who characterised the suggestion that Sir Edward Carson and Mr.redmond should confer behind the Speaker’s chair as not a bad one.

\textsuperscript{37} Cassell’s Chronology, p.451: Anglo-German relations are in crisis following the sending of the Kruger telegram. 1 Jan. Boer forces in the transvaal repulse the Jameson raid at Krugersdorf and Jameson himself surrenders (2 Jan.). The German Kaiser sends President Paul Kruger of the South African Republic a telegram of congratulations (3 Jan.).
live the war” and “Down with Servia.” The spirits of the demonstrators were not
damped by the pouring rain. An officer in command of a detachment was carried
shoulder high and his men were wildly cheered. – Reuter.

Austrian Demonstration, Agram

A great patriotic demonstration took place last night in the Jelics Place,
when there were cries of “Long live Croatia” and “down with Servia.” The
demonstration lasted far into the night.38

A particularly stirring account is given on German Feeling in Berlin. A
detailed report by Reuter’s is printed in the Examiner, describing favourably the
violent virtues of nationalism in contrast to the pacifist and, by suggestion,
unpatriotic voice of socialism:

CE 27 July 1914

If the feeling in Berlin is any guide to the sentiments of the country, there is
no doubt that Germany is ready and willing to take all the consequences that her
alliance with Austria-Hungary may impose upon her. The news of Servia’s reply to
the Austro-Hungarian note was spread broadcast this evening by extra editions of
the newspapers, which were distributed gratis in tens of thousands, and were
snatched from the distributors. The contents were passed from group to group, and
by nine in the evening the streets of Central Berlin were littered with sheets.

Shortly after nine, the crowd thronging the Unter der Linden caught the
sound of singing from the eastern end of the street, and possibly 20,000 strong, […]
marshalling in orderly ranks and singing “Wacht am Rhein” and the Austrian
national anthem and popular patriotic and soldiers songs. Cheers were raised
for Austria, intermingled with groans for Servia. The crowds marched past the
Russian and French Embassies without stopping, and proceeded to the Austro-
Hungarian Embassy, where there was a prolonged demonstration, the songs being
followed by prolonged cheers. Two-thirds of the demonstrators were young men,
students, clerks, and shop assistants, most of whom will have to go to the front
themselves if the war becomes general.

Similar scenes of patriotic enthusiasm took place in the popular cafes
and restaurants, the orchestras striking up patriotic ditties, of which, next to the
national anthem, probably “Deutschland ueber Alles” was the most popular,
the guests joining in. To-night’s demonstrations were the first patriotic
manifestations in Berlin, apart from the officially organised celebrations since the
general election in 1907. Early this evening some men were distributing copies of a
manifesto issued by the Socialist “Vorwerts,” appealing to the workers to throng
the meetings on Tuesday night to protest against the war. They were roughly

38 Some reports suggested more hostile reactions, such as CE 27 July 1914: ‘Paris: Shortly before
midday a group of youths and Slav students made a demonstration in front of the Austro-Hungarian
Embassy, shouting “Down with Austria.” One of the demonstrators pulled from his pocket a yellow
and black flag with the object of setting fire to it. The police immediately intervened and dispersed
the demonstrators, some of whom were arrested […] –Reuter. And: “Down With Austria.”
Demonstration at Auckland. A dozen Croatians assembled outside the Austro-Hungarian Consulate
here to-day shouting “Down with Austria,” and expressing the intention of hauling down the
Austro-Hungarian flag and burning it in the streets. They were dissuaded from doing so by the
editor of a Croatian paper. – Reuter.
handled by the crowd, and the manifestoes were snatched from them and torn and trampled under foot. – Reuter. 39

Austrian fanaticism is captured in the Examiner’s Notes and Comments:

CE 29 July 1914

The Austrian Marsellaise, about which newspaper readers see so much during this time of excitement in the Near East, commemorates the daring of that great warrior, Prince Eugene of Savoy. “Prinz Eugen der edle Ritter” tells of the siege and capture of Belgrade from the Turks in 1717 by Eugene. Like many another song that has stirred the blood of the soldier marching to battle it has a camp origin. Indeed, anybody who reads it will readily gather that circumstance. Indeed it was written by a soldier who served in Eugene’s army at the siege of Belgrade under Prince Leopold of Dessau. He struck off the noble rhyme in a moment of enthusiasm and excitement, under such a spell as that which prompted Scott Key, the Washington soldier, to compose “The Star Spangled Banner,” even while he was a prisoner on board a British battleship that was bombarding Washington during the war of 1812.

Demonstration at Ischl.

In a theatre here last night the Austrian national anthem, “Wacht am Rhein,” and the Italian national anthem were sung before the performance began. Mention of the Triple Alliance and the monarchs of the three countries were enthusiastically received. The Archduke Karl Franz Joseph, heir presumptive, arrived here early this morning and was received by the public with tremendous cheers. His Imperial Highness called at the Emperor’s villa at nine o’clock and was received in audience. – Reuter.

Generally, the international press agreed that ‘the last word lies with Germany as it is thought Austria will do nothing without the consent of the Emperor William.’ 40 Also the most eastern European participants were given a warm acknowledgement of their nationalist vainglory:

CE 29 July 1914


(Press Association Foreign Special).

A very warlike tone prevails throughout the Press here. All the newspapers approve the reply given by the Servian Government to the Austro-Hungarian Note. The city presented a scene of great animation on Saturday evening. All the cafes and restaurants were crowded with people, and the events of the day were excitedly discussed on all sides. Many families, in spite of the advice of the authorities, have left the capital. […] Perfect order prevails throughout Belgrade, and the police

39 CE 30 July 1914: Socialists and the War. Demonstrations in Berlin. Twenty-eight mass meetings of Socialist Democrats were held last night for the purpose of passing resolution against the war. All were attended by enormous crowds of men and women. The Anarchists also held meetings with a similar object. The effect of the demonstration was damped by patriotic demonstrations, which in spite of police prohibition, took place in Unter den Linden, crowds parading and cheering for the fatherland and Austria, and singing patriotic songs for hours. Late at night the police came in conflict with the Socialists, whom they charged with sabres, and a number of people were arrested. Considering the crowds the trouble was trivial. – Reuter.

40 CE 29 July 1914.
duties are being carried out by a volunteer corps of gendarmerie composed of
students. According to the newspapers, two thousand volunteers had been enrolled
at noon to-day [...]. Many Austrian and Hungarian families have applied to the
German Consulate for means to return to their native countries, and yesterday and
to-day several hundred families were ferried across to Semlia on board the
Roumanian steamer Bessarab. Count Spee, German Consul, has most energetically
undertaken the task of repatriating the Austrian and Hungarian subjects who
arrived in Belgrade to-day in large numbers from various Servian watering places.

War Hailed in St.Petersburgh.

A crowd of many thousands cheered wildly when the announcement that
the war had been declared was made known. They proceeded to the British
Embassy, and cheered, but further progress was stopped by mounted police. –
Reuter

Excursus: Serbia

The Examiner’s Notes and Comments reported also on the history of
‘Servia.’ Peopled by peasants it may be, but the country’s capital commands
respect for both its culture and heritage. Additionally, there are conclusions to be
drawn on the wisdom of western agrarian custom and the laws governing the land
of Servia. All in all, the Slav country deserves more attention than has previously
been its due:

CE 30 July 1914

Servia, on which the eyes of the world, so to speak, are turned at present,
was granted full autonomy in the same year as that in which the Irish
Catholics were emancipated. The country, notwithstanding the bellicose
reputation it has recently earned, is generally recognised as the Peasant State of
Europe, because of the fact that practically the whole population dwells on the
land, and that the staple industries are husbandry and pig-rearing. The laws
regulating the tenure of land there are very simple and effective. A system of
peasant proprietorship prevails, and the salutary rule obtains that every grown man
can demand from the Government five acres of land, which, as well as its produce,
is free from all claims for debt. There are no poor in Servia, and there are few who
are landless, for the poorest Servian always has to his credit five acres of land. By a
provision of the Treaty of Berlin in 1878 the Kingdom of Servia, as we now know
it, was established. During the seventy years proceeding there were many bitter
conflicts with the Turks, which resulted in victory or defeat for the Servian arms.
Belgrade, the capital, better known as the “White City,” has lost much of its former
semi-oriental appearance. Broad streets, modern buildings, handsome villas and
gardens, electric trams, a National Museum, and a Library of about a hundred
thousand volumes, and many good schools have made the town a well-appointed
capital. “Only the multitude of small gardens, planted with limes, acacias, and
lilacs, and the bright costumes of the Servian and Hungarian peasants remain to
distinguish it from a western capital” is the description of one writer. The city
figured prominently in the struggles between the Turks and the famous Hungarian
patriot, John Hunyady. A military outpost of the Roman Empire two thousand
years ago, Belgrade has sustained more sieges in its long history than even Constantinople.

A recent paper delivered by Serbian-American historian, Carl Kosta Savich,\(^{41}\) draws parallels between the Serb freedom fighter, Gavrilo Princip, and his Irish counterpart, Padraig Pearse, and asks if the individual causes the event or does the individual merely participate in the event? The assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and Duchess Sophie on 28 June, Kosovo Day, in Sarajevo, precipitated World War I, a conflagration that engulfed the globe. Was this a random act, or was it merely the culmination of events that preceded it? In "Searching for Gavrilo Princip",\(^{42}\) Smithsonian, David DeVoss

illustrated perfectly and succinctly the dichotomy between patriotism, regarded positively, and nationalism, regarded negatively and pejoratively, between a freedom fighter and a criminal terrorist. DeVoss noted that while Princip was regarded as the greatest hero in Bosnian history since 1914, since the 1992 Bosnian Civil War his heroic standing had dissipated. [...] Princip went from hero to scoundrel. DeVoss concluded that Gavrilo Princip is "today all but forgotten?" But the more important question is: By whom? And why? One man's hero/freedom fighter/patriot is another man's scoundrel/terrorist/suicide bomber. **But when we deconstruct the rhetoric and propaganda, we find that nationalist movements throughout history and across cultures, religions, and societies, have been guided by the same ideals, by martyrdom and self-sacrifice.** The way Western historiography judged the legacy of Gavrilo Princip was as follows: If Gavrilo Princip's role advanced the Western position/agenda on the characterization/justification of World War I, he was assessed a positive or neutral role in Western history, he was a national hero. But if his role was deemed antagonistic to the Western conception of its role in World War I, his role changed to a negative one, he was a scoundrel. [...] According to DeVoss, Gavrilo Princip was not only a "terrorist", but a "criminal terrorist", an oxymoron and tautologically meaningless term. Is there such a thing as a legal terrorist? Was Vladimir Jabotinsky a legal terrorist in advancing Zionism? Was George Washington a legal terrorist in committing murder and treason against the British Government in advancing separatism/secession? Or were they too criminal terrorists? Or were they freedom fighters? [...] Patrick Pearse was a leader of the 1916 Easter Rising in Ireland. His rebellion was an act of self-sacrifice and martyrdom on behalf of his nation. The goal was to achieve the independence of Ireland from Britain. Like Gavrilo Princip, Patrick Pearse was guided by a national tradition and myth of self-sacrifice and martyrdom to achieve freedom for one's people or country. Gavrilo Princip was guided by the Kosovo myth of the martyrdom of Prince Lazar and Milos Obilic who gave their lives so that the nation might endure. Patrick Pearse was guided by the Irish myth of Cuchulainn who


transcended death by a self-sacrifice for the Irish people/nation. A comparison of the two cases demonstrates that nationalism, patriotism, and rebellion have been unchanging and constant throughout history and have the same features and qualities in every society, country, religion.

The assassination in Sarajevo was the culmination of a chain of events that began with the 1875 Bosnian insurrection against Ottoman Turkey. Bosnian historian Vladimir Dedijer stated that the assassination in Sarajevo, was itself the climax of many long generations of struggle by the Slavs of southern Europe against Austrian and Turkish tyranny. Gavrilo Princip's father, uncle and grandfather, had fought in the 1875 insurgency that began in the Grahovo Valley of Herzegovina. The major stronghold of the insurgents in Herzegovina, was just outside the Princip house. The leader of the insurgency in the Grahovo Polje region of Herzegovina was the Serbian Orthodox priest Ilija Bilbija, who was from the same village as the Princip family and who later would christen Gavrilo Princip. The feudal landlords requested unpaid labour from the serfs, or kmets, and the additional tax burdens resulted in a series of agrarian/peasant revolts in Bosnia-Herzegovina, in 1807, 1809, 1834, 1852-1853, 1857, and 1858.

The Safer Decree of 1859 established the tax regimen for the kmets, who were reduced to tenants on the land: One tenth of their crops were to go to the state, while one third was to go to the feudal landlord, who had full, hereditary title to the property upon which the kmet worked. The kmet of Herzegovina enjoyed minimal/limited civil and human rights. Arthur Evans observed in 1875: "The kmet lies … at the mercy of the Mahometan owner of the soil as if he were a slave….He is thus allowed to treat his kmet as a mere chattel; he uses a stick and strikes the kmet without pity, in a manner that no one else would use a beast." The kmets paid a house tax, a land tax, a cattle tax (Porez), a hog tax (Donuzia), and a sheep and goat tax (Resmi Agnam). The 1875 insurrection began in Herzegovina due to a poor crop yield. Facing starvation and impoverishment, the kmets launched a rebellion that spread to Bosnia. In support of the Serbian revolt in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia and Montenegro declared war on Ottoman Turkey. Turkey was militarily defeated following the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78. At the 1878 Conference of Berlin, however, Bosnia-Herzegovina was transferred to the Austro-Hungarian Empire to administer and occupy. The rising expectations of the Serbian population were not realized. Expecting independence and self-determination, instead, one master was replaced by another. The lot of the kmet improved very little. The Austro-Hungarian Empire sought to maintain the status quo in Bosnia. Agrarian and political and social reforms were not forthcoming. Instead, Austria-Hungary sought to ensure its occupation and administration of Bosnia. This was the historical milieu for the assassination in Sarajevo in 1914.43

43 Savich, p.3.
At school, Princip excelled in his studies, especially in romantic and historic literature, at thirteen, he planned on a military career and went to Sarajevo, but pursued instead a business career at the Merchant's School where he studied for three years. He was described as "reserved", "quiet", "sentimental", "always earnest, with books, pictures", "very fond of reading", a "passionate reader". Princip was described as having an "inferiority complex" because of his small build and lack of physical strength. He read the romances and novels by Sir Walter Scott and Alexandre Dumas. Following his third year, he attended the Tuzla gymnasium. He admitted being an atheist, turning to romantic literature and epic poetry and political tracts instead. He wanted to become a poet and wrote poetic verses.\textsuperscript{44}

In 1911, he joined the Young Bosnia Movement, a group made up of Serbs, Croats, and Bosnian Muslims, committed to achieving independence for Bosnia. Princip became politically active. In February, 1912, he took part in protest demonstrations against the Sarajevo authorities for which he was expelled. Following his expulsion, he went to Belgrade. While crossing the border, he kissed the soil of Serbia. In Belgrade, he sought to gain admission to the First Belgrade High School but failed the entrance exam. In 1912, Serbia was abuzz with mobilization for the First Balkan War. The members of Young Bosnia, Mlade Bosne, were volunteering to join the Serbian army. Princip planned to join the komite, irregular Serbian guerrilla forces under Serbian Major Vojislav Tankosic which had fought in Macedonia against Ottoman units. Tankosic was a member of the central committee of Unification or Death, Ujedinjene ili Smrt. Princip, however, was rejected by the komite in Belgrade because of his small physical stature. [...] Dedijer argued that his rejection was "one of the primary personal motives which pushed him to do something exceptionally brave in order to prove to others that he was their equal." [...] Ironically, he would fire the first shot of the Great War, World War I.\textsuperscript{45}

Young Bosnia was committed to violence and revolution, not gradual, peaceful reform. They led ascetic lives as disciplined, hard-core militant revolutionaries. They took the motto "unification or death" literally, planning to commit suicide by taking cyanide caplets after the assassination of the Archduke. The Young Bosnia Movement was made up of all three major Slavic groups in Bosnia-Herzegovina: Orthodox Serbs, Roman Catholic Croats, and Bosnian Muslims, the Serbs being the largest group. Their goal was the unification of all the South Slavs into a single self-ruled state. Unification was the goal of both German and Italian nationalism in the 19th century, inspired by French unification and nationalism. ‘Serbian and Irish nationalism followed the same pattern and historical

\textsuperscript{44} Savich, p.4.
\textsuperscript{45} Savich, p.5.
In 1914, the Yugoslav idea was a major and guiding principle of Balkan nationalism. Bosnia-Herzegovina was occupied by Austria-Hungary since 1878, annexed outright in 1908. Opposition to Austro-Hungarian occupation and administration was long-standing and widespread, and political assassination attempts were common.

The Kosovo myth/legend was crucial in understanding the assassination in Sarajevo, which took place on June 28, or Kosovo Day, Vidov Dan. The Kosovo myth was revived due to several factors. The 19th century was dominated by romanticism and nationalism which glorified heroism and emotion over reason. Serbian nationalism and literature thrived in this milieu. A symbiotic relationship resulted where each reinforced the other. Johann von Goethe, Alexander Pushkin, Walter Scott, Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm, Adam Mickiewicz, and Lord George Byron, who read Bosnian Serb poetry with much enthusiasm, died in Greece as a volunteer against the Ottoman Turks, were all influenced by Serbian epic folklore on Kosovo, who then in their turn encouraged/influenced Vuk Karadzic and Petar Njegos to preserve the epic Kosovo folklore and songs and legends. Sir Walter Scott translated Serbian epic poetry on Kosovo into English, while Pushkin translated them into Russian, and Mickiewicz into Polish. In 1809 Napoleon Bonaparte created the Kingdom of Illyria consisting of Slovenia, Dalmatia and the Military Frontier, which revived the idea of South Slav unification/federation and represented the genesis of the Yugoslav idea. Influenced by Adam Czartoryski, Serbian Ilija Garasanin began devising plans for uniting Serbian-populated areas of the Balkans. Croatian Roman Catholic Bishop Josip Strossmayer was an advocate of South Slav unity as well and corresponded with Garasanin on the formation of a unified South Slav state. The Yugoslav idea, the unification of all South Slavs in a single state or federation, was developing and evolving.

The Kosovo myth was revived by the Balkan Wars of 1912-13 against the Ottoman Empire. A Slav victory created the precedent of the South Slavs achieving independence on their own, which gave an added stimulus to the Young Bosnia movement. The First Balkan War saw the Serbian army retaking Kosovo after 500 years under Turkish occupation/rule, thus rejuvenating Balkan aspirations for independence, sovereignty, and self-rule. There was, however, a dichotomy in the Bosnian nationalist movement on whether to pursue a policy of "mass revolution" or terror. Not unlike the situation in Ireland. The Kosovo myth itself was similar to

---

46 Savich, p.6.
47 Savich, p.7.
48 'At the Battle of Kosovo in 1389, Prince Lazar met the Ottoman Turkish forces under Sultan Murad I. During the battle a Serbian commander, Milos Oblilic, was able to infiltrate the Turkish lines and was able to assassinate Murad by stabbing him with a knife in the stomach. Murad later died from his injuries. Both Prince Lazar and Oblilic were executed by the Turks. Lazar and Milos Oblilic were enshrined as heroic martyrs in Serbian history emphasizing the ideal of self-sacrifice for the nation, people, and church and martyrdom for liberty and freedom. The Kosovo myth became the unifying idea during the over 500 years of Ottoman Turkish occupation that preserved Serbian national consciousness and the Orthodox Church and that united Serbs as a people.' Cf. Savich, p.8.
the Cuchulainn myth in Irish national history and tradition. In both myths, self-sacrifice for the people leads to a transcendence of death. British archaeologist Sir Arthur Evans emphasized the enduring power of Kosovo, its memory being one of the greatest battles of the world, decisive in its indecisiveness, and remaining alive up to contemporary times. Archduke Franz Ferdinand was the modern-day Sultan Murad I. Vladimir Dedijer explained the Kosovo ethos of self-sacrifice⁴⁹:

No doubt in the social psychology of the South Slavs there have existed these elements of the mentality of persecuted groups, of martyrdom for a higher cause, as in the history of the Jews, the Irish and the Poles. This irrational motive can become a reality in the process of great political strife. A similar phenomenon was observed in the thinking and action of Padraic Pearse, a member of the Irish Republican Brotherhood and an outstanding member of the Irish Volunteers, who distinguished himself in the Dublin uprising in 1916. He urged the necessity of an uprising against all odds and against all military reasoning in order to emphasize the importance of self-sacrifice for the cause of Ireland. This irrational attitude produced a rational result in the fact that only a few years after Pearse's execution, Ireland secured Home Rule.

Disaffection with Austro-Hungarian rule in the Balkans was widespread, Czechs, Slovaks, Slovenes, Croats alike seeking independence and self-rule. Bosnian Nobel Prize winner Ivo Andric, an advocate of Yugoslav unity, noted in his diary entry for June 8, 1912, in commenting on the attempted assassination of Governor Slavko Cuvaj by Luka Jukic: ‘Today Jukic made an attempt on Cuvaj's life…. Long live those who are dying on the pavements, expressing so well our common misfortune.’⁵⁰ Gavrilo Princip was a product of the age. In his book From Sarajevo to Potsdam, A.J. P. Taylor⁵¹ characterized the age and the social climate as being “whatever most Europeans, as citizens, were doing at the time. In the period covered by this book, they were either making war or encountering economic problems. Therefore war and economics make up their civilization.”⁵²

---

⁴⁹ Vladimir Dedijer, The Road to Sarajevo (Simon and Schuster, 1966). Quoted in Savich.
⁵⁰ Savich, p.9.
⁵² Savich, p.9. Cf. also CE 31 July 1914: American News. Reservists returning.(From our Correspondent). ‘Both the Austrian and Servian army reservists throughout America are greatly excited over the war between their respective countries, and everywhere they are flocking to their Consulates to enrol themselves for active service. As fast as they are ready they will be sent home. It is probable that the Austrian Consul here will charter a steamer for the purpose of sending his compatriots direct to Trieste. Hundreds of Hungarians from the Pennsylvania Coal Mines and Slavs from the colorado Mines as well as numerous small shopkeepers in the interior towns, restaurant waiters and furniture makers of Grand Rapids, Michigan, who are among the reservists, have answered the first call immediately, and will soon be on their way to join their regiments on both sides of the Save. Patriotic meetings have been held, and frequent collisions between the Austro-
Gavrilo Princip was tried in 1915 and found guilty, but being under the age of twenty, he could not be sentenced to death. Princip was sentenced to 20 years in prison, dying of tuberculosis 1918 in the Theresienstadt prison in Austria. Like Gavrilo Princip, Padraig Pearse resorted to violence to achieve the goals of Irish nationalism. Princip and Pearse were motivated by the same ideals, nationalism and sovereignty for their respective nationality.\(^{53}\)

Moran applies a psychological analysis of Pearse and of the Irish nationalist tradition by exploring and examining in depth both Pearse's childhood and life and the ancient Irish national myths. For only by examining these aspects can one gain an understanding of the notions of self-immolation, of blood sacrifice, redemptive violence, for Pearse clearly understood the suicidal and futile nature of the Rising, but which he saw as a symbolic act of redemption, a "blood offering" in the name of Irish nationalism. Moreover, Pearse's martyrdom was not a futile and meaningless act but was a calculated and thought-out action that was part of a longer Irish tradition of martyrdom. For Pearse and those who would follow him, his martyrdom had meaning and impacted Irish history and nationalism. Furthermore, Moran argued that Pearse was in a sense merely expressing a "sentiment of his age", the idea that national and personal redemption could be achieved through violence and death. Rupert Brooke and Charles Peguy were discussed, who like Pearse, saw a similar need for redemption in a suicidal act.\(^{54}\)

Pearse lived in a time when patriotic nationalism was at its zenith: Theodor Herzl founded Zionism, the Balkans erupted in the Balkan Wars of 1912-13, and the nationalities problem consumed the Habsburg Empire. Seen in this broader context, Pearse and the Rising appear in perspective.

Pearse was a product of his age, of his time, and of his environment. He became a militant Irish nationalist, took up the cause of Irish national identity, became immersed in Gaelic language, culture, and history. But we also see the inconsistencies and the wavering and the lack of commitment to a single, unified ideology as Pearse struggles to find his role and function.\(^{55}\)

Regarding the tradition of violence in Irish history, Moran maintains that to sacrifice themselves for a cause wholeheartedly required "a concept of the nation" that had psychological depth and meaning for the individual, theological considerations were not enough. This identification was reinforced by Irish

---

Hungarians and Serbs have occurred where feeling ran high. A telegram from Los Angeles, California, states that a number of Servians in that city raided the homes and residences of Austrians, stoning the houses and exchanging revolver shots with their enemies. There was a fierce fight there last night, and the police had to be called out in large numbers to quell the disturbances.’\(^{53}\) Sean Farrell Moran, Patrick Pearse and the Politics of Redemption: The Mind of the Easter Rising, 1916 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1994).\(^{54}\) Savich, p.10.\(^{55}\) Savich, p.11.
Catholicism, poetry, and mythology. The Young Ireland Movement continued this identification through poetry, relying on a Gaelic past. The ancient myth of Cuchulainn is crucial in Irish national mythology because of its theme of transcending death through sacrifice for the nation. (His statue commemorates the Rising in the GPO today.) The Young Ireland Movement had much in common with the Young Bosnia Movement, which in turn was based on the Young Italy Movement. ‘Moreover, the 19th century saw much violence in Ireland which inspired a poetry of sacrifice and a tradition of symbolic violence and death, indeed, an "eroticisation of death"’.

Pearse was talented as a writer, but was not a major literary figure. He wrote plays and short stories for children and nationalist articles, mainly on Gaelic language and culture. His true strength was in speaking. Politically, Pearse was considered "naive" and only gradually became accepted by the IRB, who were looking for someone articulate and committed to the cause of Irish independence. And, as Pearse stated, "Ireland unfree shall never be at peace." Pearse surrendered unconditionally to British forces to prevent further slaughter of Dublin citizens. He was court-martialed and executed along with his brother Willie, in May 1916 at Kilmainham gaol in Dublin.

Nationalism, patriotism, and rebellion are common to all cultures, nations, religions, societies. Martyrdom and self-sacrifice on behalf of the nation are common ideals. Gavrilo Princip and Patrick Pearse embodied these ideals in seeking to achieve independence for their respective nations. This is what emerges when the rhetoric and propaganda is deconstructed and analysed. Their importance or role in history does not change, but our evaluation of their significance and role changes. Moreover, the evaluation changes for different groups and strata and nations. One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter. Indeed, one man's freedom fighter is the same man's terrorist at different moments in time. The labels only change, but what they label does not change.

The Cork Examiner continued to draw comparisons between the plight of Ireland and Serbia as the war continued, and fighting Serbs were portrayed with awe and empathy as heroic freedom fighters:

CE 1 January 1915
Serbia’s War. Fight For Existence. Future of the Slavs.

---

56 Savich, p.12.
For the first time since the outbreak of the present war, I arrived yesterday at Nish, which has become the political capital of Serbia. [...] The Serbs are excellent soldiers, but sometimes they form a turbulent political element. Every man, besides being a soldier, feels that he is a citizen, and is highly and passionately interested in everything concerning his country. The Pasitick Cabinet maintains to-day as before that in the present world struggle, when the whole of Slavdom is allied with the truly civilised nations of Great Britain and France, and fights for liberty, rights and justice against German militarism and the false doctrines of the assertion of German natural supremacy over all other nations, Bulgaria had better side with the anti-German coalition and wait to receive her reward according to her service done to the general cause of the real and legal rights of the Bulgarian nation [...]. The Serbs wished to avoid a struggle with Austria-Hungary, sacrificing for peace even the dignity of Serbia, but Serbia was compelled to fight for the right of her existence [...].

4.2. Militant Nationalism

The shooting of civilians in Dublin during the Howth manoeuvre seemed to kindle a flame that would flicker continuously over the next few years, until finally flaring up to its full potential and setting fire to the streets of Dublin in 1916. Significant at the funeral service staged throughout the capital was the presence of representatives from all classes, adding a sense of unity to the overpowering sensation of purpose and pride.
(From Our Reporter)

Dublin, Wednesday Night. - This evening Dublin witnessed one of those demonstrations which, occurring not in one generation, contribute to shape the course of history, when the three humble victims of Sunday’s military outrage were accorded a public funeral, which might have done honour to the highest in the land. Men, women and children thronged the thoroughfares to see the funeral procession pass, and the available windows along the route were filled with people. The procession itself was of such huge dimensions that the first portion of it must have very nearly reached Glasnevin Cemetery when the last part had passed the O’Connell Monument. As well as being a demonstration of sympathy with the deceased and a protest against the irresponsible and fatal conduct of the military on Sunday, it also served to impress one with the strength and organisation of the National Volunteer Movement. […] The whole front of one shop in Earl St. was covered with a large black flag bearing the inscription R.I.P. At one side of this was hung out an Irish flag and at the other an American one. […] A short funeral service was conducted in the chapel. Close on fifty priests, most of whom walked in the funeral procession, participated in the service, which was extremely impressive in its simplicity. […] Some striking features of the funeral were the attendance of a large number of clergy, the Christian Brothers with several hundred of their pupils. The National Boy Scouts were present in large numbers, and members of the Dublin Cumman na Bhan were strongly represented. With them was the Countess Markievicz.

Concurrent to the histrionic burial of the unfortunate victims of militancy, the Volunteers were themselves redefining the limits of their capabilities and aspirations, and basically building the country’s army: to defend her shores and defy the men of Ulster. To this purpose one needed to draw in more recruits.  

Irish National Volunteers.  
Brisk Recruiting.

Recruiting for the Cork Corps Irish National Volunteers continues at an amazing rate. The number of recruits enlisted since Monday last are roughly – Monday night, 200; Tuesday night, 150; and last night 120. The instructors have been kept busy in putting the new material into shape. And their reports as to its quality have been most favourable. There was a special parade and drill for recruits in the cornmarket last night. All the sectional commanders were present, and the recruits to the number of about 350 went through the various evolutions with smartness and precision. Headed by the piper’s band they marched back to the headquarters in Fisher Street.

Irish Volunteers.  
Arming The Members, Rifles Landed At Tralee. No Police Interference.  
(From Our Correspondent)
Tralee, Wednesday. - [...] The police did not make the slightest attempt to interfere, though they must have known the nature of the Volunteer display. The case containing the rifles and ammunition was quickly unpacked, and cheers resounded through the town when one of the rifles was loaded and the first shot fired in the air.

Gun-Running Near Youghal. Successful Coup.

Youghal, Wednesday. - Intelligence reached Youghal of a successful gun-running coup which came off on the adjoining County Waterford coast late on Monday night. [...] The police have visited the locality since making inquiries.

Gun-Running In The Shannon.
(From Our Correspondent)

Kilrush, Wednesday. - It is extensively reported throughout West Clare today that large consignments of rifles and ammunition were landed this morning about 4 o’clock in arranged parts within the Shannon estuary and along the Clare coast from a swift and well-equipped yacht [...]. There is report in Kilrush to-day that a couple of hundred soldiers are to be sent at once to the Cappa military barracks, disused for some years.60

The importation of arms without additional political connotations did not appear to satisfy the champions of Gaelic aggression, and the most obvious power to involve at this time was Germany.

Excursus: Roger Casement embraces Germany

The Germanophile stand of Roger Casement was not unusual for the time, it only became a source of embarrassment to the Irish establishment once war was declared and Ireland officially sided with Great Britain and the Allies against Germany and the Central Powers. The cordial relationship between Austria and Great Britain never completely disintegrated, war commentary from British dailies earnestly differentiating between the Germans and the Austrians. The Examiner is equally susceptible at this time to an attitude of benevolence, and though Austrian disappointment at British aggression is recorded, the monarchy is not exposed to the same level of derogatory commentary as the Germans ‘Huns’. By the end of

---

60 CE 30 July 1914. Arts Proclamation. Mr. Birrell and Southern Protestants. In the House of Commons last night. Mr. Birrell informed Mr. Newman that the appeal against the validity of the proclamation against the importation of arms in Dublin could not now be held before the long vacation. He had done his best to expedite the matter. Mr. Newman asked whether the right hon. gentleman was aware of the defenceless condition of the Protestant minority in the southern provinces of Ireland owing to their obedience to the proclamation. Mr. Birrell – I think the right hon. member’s description of Protestants in the Southern provinces is misleading (Ministerial and Nationalist cheers). I don’t believe anything will occur to place their lives or property in danger (cheers).
July, 1914, there is heightened activity in the Austrian capital to prepare for a swift victory.\footnote{CE 5 August 1914: Austrian Sunday Laws Suspended By Emperor. This morning the “Wiener Zeitung” publishes an Imperial decree authorising the Minister of Commerce during the continuance of the war either partially or completely to suspend the laws governing Sundays and days of rest. A Ministerial order was issued in consequence suspending these laws until further notice. – Reuter.}

CE 31 July 1914


(Press Association Foreign Special)

The international political crisis appears to be nearing its height. Tension in Vienna to-day is greater than at any time before, and although nothing definite is known to have occurred to change the situation public pessimism seems more widespread and intense. Mr. Asquith’s utterances in the House of Commons on the seriousness of the situation are noted here and thought to be entirely justified. The “Neue Freie Presse” writes most pessimistically, and insists that the Russian War Minister has been gaining time which the Ambassadors and Ministers have been losing in conversations and notes. Other journals strike a similar note of gravity, and declared that \textbf{Great Britain’s generous and sympathetic attitude towards Austria-Hungary at the present has made a deep impression here.} The “Reichspool,” which is closely connected with the Foreign Office and War Office, declares that the monarchy will never forget the support it found in Great Britain in days of gravity and anxiety. The Emperor, who returned from Ischl at noon, received an extraordinary ovation from 200,000 to 300,000 persons. His Majesty was deeply touched by this magnificent welcome. Popular enthusiasm for war throughout the Empire shows no sign of diminution. Hundreds of middle-aged and elderly men show their loyalty by volunteering for military service. These include many members of the \textbf{most aristocratic families in the Empire, Germans, Hungarians, and Czechs,} and some have enlisted as private soldiers.

As a liberal, constitutionalist newspaper, the Examiner supported John Redmond’s Parliamentary Party and his recruiting drive in Ireland. The appearance of Sinn Féin and their determination to befriend an enemy Germany was either ridiculed or condemned. Therefore, all mention of Roger Casement in the Examiner from this time on must be seen in this disparaging light, especially compared to John Redmond who declared his and Ireland’s loyalty to the British flag, seizing the opportunity to align Ireland alongside Britain in a show of pre-self rule independent thought and voluntary stance - as opposed to otherwise humiliating coercion and conscription.\footnote{CE 31 July 1914.Clarke coastguards Called Up.(From Our correspondent). Kilrush, Thursday Night. – All the coastguards in the Shannon [and] along the coast of Clare, have left their stations to-day in connection with the naval mobilisation. Their destination, it is stated, is Chatham. There is an uneasy feeling that this sudden calling away of the coastguard and naval reserves arises owing to...} And, as suggested in the subtitle of

\footnote{The Czechs mentioned, being, of course, the nobility instated in Bohemia by the Habsburgs for services rendered, of Scottish, Irish or other origin, not the native stock. Cf. A.J.P. Taylor, The Habsburg Monarchy, for example, for a more detailed account of ‘Czech’ aristocracy.}
Gregory and Paseta’s publication, Ireland and the Great War, he anticipated a positive response to the question ‘A War to unite us all’?

CE 1 August 1914

Great Britain & War. “We are ready”’. Mr.Redmond’s Assurance.

[...] In the present crisis England has given no promise of anything more than the diplomatic support due to France by reason of the long-standing friendship between the two countries. [...] Germany, it appears, is prepared, if England pledges herself to neutrality, to agree that its fleet will not attack the northern coasts of France. But the British Government think that that is far too narrow an engagement, for amongst other reasons the independence of Belgium had also to be considered by England. [...] Mr.Redmond intervened with an assurance from Ireland that the Government could withdraw every one of her soldiers from this country, and in comradeship with the Ulstermen, the Nationalist Volunteers would defend their country. This announcement was received with general cheering.64

The noble thought carried much weight also in the financial sector, were regardless of political affinities, the economy of the country had to receive precedence over national, or indeed, nationalist contentions.

CE 5 August 1914

Ireland And The Crisis. 65

Mr.Redmond’s Action Endorsed In Tralee.

The war crisis and the temporary closing of Irish banks in consequence were responsible for a history-making meeting of all classes and creeds in Tralee this afternoon when the remarkable speech of Mr.Redmond and the attitude of the Irish Party in the grave crisis received the enthusiastic praise of Unionists and Nationalists alike. Mr.Jerh. M. Slattery, J.P., Chairman of the Urban Council, presided, and gave an assurance that there was no need for panic as far as the Irish banks were concerned. “We have full confidence in the Banks of Ireland,” said the Chairman, “and,” he added, “we have full confidence in the Imperial Parliament and the Government of our country. On behalf of the people of Tralee and voicing the threatened European war over the Balkan States. Meanwhile, the Shannon estuary and Clare coast is being patrolled by a scout cruiser in connection with the gun-running expedition.

64 CE 19 September 1914. Recruiting in Belfast. Nationalists’s Claim. Their Response to the Call. The Belfast Correspondent of the “Manchester Guardian” says: - The Home Rulers of Belfast are indignant at the claim put forward by the Unionist leaders to the whole of the recruits who have joined the Ulster Volunteer Force. Of the hundred recruits who one the average have joined the army each day in the city since August 4 it is known that at least half were members of the Irish Volunteer Force, so that in proportion to their members they have responded better than the Unionists to the call of their country.

CE 19 September 1914. Newry Sends Hundreds. The following letter appears in the “Daily Chronicle”: - (To the Editor “Daily Chronicle”). Sir – The question is frequently asked: - “What proportion of the Irish National Volunteers have enlisted as a result of Lord Kitchener’s appeal? Apart from the 34,000 reservists in the National Volunteer ranks, the action proportion of recruits has been about 20 per cent. In one company composed most exclusively of the well-to-do classes, the proportion was one-sixth; out of the poor districts, where destitution is already doing evil work, the proportion is much higher. [...] A. Newman, national Club, Belfast, September 15, 1914.

65 The ‘Crisis’ was the popular name for World War I in Ireland. World War II was christened the ‘Emergency.’
their feelings, I say we are proud of the action of the Irish Party (cheers). We are proud that we are one and all with England, and when the Irish people speak they mean it (renewed cheers). When Ireland says yes it must be yes (cheers). All over Ireland as well as in the House of Commons it is yes (cheers), and our feeling is that the flag will be successful, and the joy of the country is that Germany will get a smashing from the English that will keep her quiet during our time (prolonged cheering). Mr. J. S. Crosbie, D.L. (Protestant Unionist) proposed a resolution expressing confidence in the stability of the Irish banks. Speaking to the resolution he said that in face of the realities of the uncompromising issues which had been violently in the reckless conduct of Germany this was no time for dealing with the visionary philosophies of the morality of nations in the keeping of national treaties. The issue was at once vital and urgent, and in view of it many of our countrymen and countrywomen were asking, “What can we do?” He would narrow that down, and say, “What can I do?” There were things they all could do individually and collectively. First, they should not disturb the confidence there should be in the wisdom of the Government; secondly, they should all loyally accept their decisions in every matter; thirdly, strive as much as in them individually lay to enforce these decisions, and fourthly, to attest that confidence by keeping calm in the crisis and striving to allay the unnecessary anxieties of those who may be disposed to panic. “One ground of our confidence in this crisis,” continued Mr. Crosbie, “is the fact that we stand to-day as we did not stand last week as one (prolonged cheers), for to-day there are no parties; we are one party (renewed cheers); and I believe when the history of this crisis comes to be written the remarkable, the noble, the hearty speech which came from the lips of Ireland’s Leader will be passed on to posterity as one of the finest pronouncements ever uttered by any man face to face with any great national crisis (enthusiastic cheers). To-day we are united by the bond of imperishable brotherhood by his wonderful, fine, open, patriotic expressions in the House of Commons last night. We thank him and the country thanks him (loud cheers). The resolution was seconded by Mr. John Walsh, J.P., who declared that the bond of brotherhood between North and South, East and West, would result in a lasting bond of friendship and brotherhood between England and Ireland.

Not all Irishmen were, however, as mindful of this opportunity to demonstrate national and imperial unity.

CE 1 August 1914
Orange Riot.
A serious riot outbreak occurred at Ballymacarrett district, Belfast, on Saturday night. The affray originated in the arrest of a man who had cursed the Pope in the vicinity of the Nationalist district on the Newtownards road. […] A Catholic constable on duty further down the road was savagely attacked by a mob and sought refuge in the shop of a Protestant trader, the windows of which were smashed. He escaped later in the night dressed in a postman’s uniform and safely reached the barracks. During the earlier scenes the windows of a number of Catholic houses were smashed. The police remained adjacent to the Nationalist quarters, and prevented the conflict spreading. A number of National Volunteers took up duty in the Catholic quarter.
The need for arms on the part of Volunteers appeared justifiable, when they were to protect their people against the attacks of Protestant mobs.

CE 1 August 1914
Gun-Running. More Rifles Landed.
It is reported that ten thousand rifles were landed this morning near Greystones, Co.Wicklow, and conveyed to Dublin by motor lorries and charabanes. The landing was not interrupted.

After war was declared all round, Casement did not immediately embrace the German side by any formal declarations to the public. While he was staying in Philadelphia in September, 1914, Casement published his views in a survey of the causes of the war, designed to prove it had been rendered inevitable not by the faults or the temper of the Kaiser, ‘but because certain powers, and one power in particular, nourished ambitions and asserted claims that involved not only ever-increasing armaments, but ensured ever-increasing animosities’. He believed Russia craved the dismemberment of the Austro-Hungarian empire, so that she could dominate the Slavs; France wanted the return of Alsace-Lorraine; and this had given England, shaken by the discovery that in the first half of 1914 German exports had almost caught up with British, the chance to carry out her aim: ‘the destruction of German sea power, and along with it the permanent crippling of German competition in the markets of the world’. This survey became The Crime Against Europe and was Casement’s only published book. It is a book about British foreign policy and of Irish foreign policy, and states openly that British foreign policy caused World War. Casement, who had been involved in the founding of the Volunteers in 1913 and had helped organise their arming in 1914, gave a pro-German orientation to the Volunteer minority which rejected Redmond’s leadership. Article Number 2: The Causes Of The War And The Foundations Of The Peace (September 1914), was actually written at intervals between August 1911 and December 1913, without any thought of publication. They were intended for private circulation ‘to illustrate a point of view arrived at after close inspection of the motives, aims and methods of the Power with whose

66 Inglis, p.268.
67 Casement's analysis draws on his diplomatic experiences and personal knowledge of the British ruling class. He blames the Great War on the British intent of annihilating a trade rival. Besides explaining the strategy behind the war, Casement's work provides a context for the Irish rising of 1916.
policy they chiefly deal." Casement believed that to find the motive powerful enough to plunge all Europe into war in the short space of a few hours, one must not seek it in the pages of a “white paper” covering a period of only fifteen days (July 20th to August 4th, 1914), but in the activities that led the great Powers of Europe into definite commitments to each other. For the purposes of this investigation one can eliminate three of the actual combatants, as “accessories after the fact”, Servia, Belgium and Japan, and confine the study to the five principal combatants. The quarrel between Servia and Austria-Hungary is only a side issue of the larger question that divides Europe into armed camps. Austria-Hungary and Germany are indivisible, both have one common bond, self-preservation, that binds them much more closely together than mere formal “allies”. In this war Austria fights as a Germanic Power, although the challenge to her has been on the ground of her Slav obligations and activities. Germany is compelled to support Austria by a law of necessity. Hence, the conflict is between the Germanic peoples of Central Europe and those who quarrel with them. It is not the protection of the Slavs from Austria, herself largely a Slavic Power, but the incorporation of the Slavs within Russia that the mightiest empire upon earth is maintaining the mightiest army upon earth. Its threat to Germany, as the protector of Austria-Hungary, is clear and one-half of the reason for German militarism is across the Russian frontier. But “to protect” the Slavs meant assailing Austria-Hungary (another way of attacking Germany), and to “recover” Strasburg meant a misalliance between democrat of France and Cossack of the Don. Meanwhile, the gun-running to Ireland continued, an action not only lauded by Casement but actually personally supported and carried out at a later stage during the war, when the British authorities obviously could no longer turn a blind eye to the arsenal arriving from Germany.

CE 12 December 1914
Arms and Ammunition.
New Dublin Order. (P.A.Telegram)
Dublin, Friday. – General Hill, commanding the Dublin district, has issued an order authorising the Dublin Metropolitan Police to seize all arms, ammunition, and warlike stores, except shot guns and sporting ammunition in the United Kingdom, and except rifles of a calibre not exceeding two-tenths of an inch and two-hundredths of an inch, and ammunition ordinarily used for rifle practice only,

69 Clifford, Casement, p.70.
which may, henceforth, be landed at the port of Dublin, and to detain same pending further instruction.

On September 16, 1914, Casement wrote a letter to the Irish Independent protesting against Ireland’s involvement in the war on Britain’s side. He did not recommend Irish support for Germany; but in a memorandum to the Ambassador, Bernsdorff, he made some practical suggestions how Germany could support nationalist movements in India and Egypt, as well as Ireland. At the end of September, he went to the German embassy to meet Papen, to discuss the possibility that Irish troops captured in the German advance might be persuaded to change their allegiance. Had Casement not sent his letter to the Independent, he might have come back to help O’Neill rebuild the Irish Volunteers, but unhappily the letter had attracted attention and copies had been sent to the Foreign Office and to Sir Edward Grey. Although Sinn Féin’s policy came close to Casement’s, Arthur Griffith himself did not believe the Germans would care about Irish independence. If they came, they would ‘come to stay and rule the Atlantic from our shore’. ‘We are Irish nationalists’, he claimed, ‘and the only duty we have is to stand for Ireland’s interests, irrespective of England or Germany or any foreign country.’ James Connolly, Irish Labour leader, told the readers of his Irish Worker the Germans should be supported - provided they gave adequate guarantees for Irish independence. Privately, he was once supposed to have confided in fellow conspirators, Pearse and Clarke, that he thought the Germans as bad as the British; ‘do the job yourselves!’ And they did. While it is true that a number of Irishmen, some actually serving in the Crown forces, had a notion of Germany coming to the aid of Ireland, the lack of tangible economic and hence political ties between the countries meant also a lack of knowledge, if not actually ignorance of one another’s notions and ambitions:

CE 28 September 1914
Soldier from Coleraine Shouts for the Kaiser.
And Beats Dublin Police.

Dublin, Saturday. – To-day, in the Southern Police Court, before Mr.Swifte, K.C., a private in the 8th battalion Royal Dublin Fusiliers, named James Harte, stationed at Portobello Barracks, was charged with assaulting Constable William Gilmore […] Constable Barton stated that the constables assaulted were engaged in bringing two female prisoners to College street Station when they were followed by a hostile crowd, led by the accused. Some of the crowd and the accused were

70 Inglis, p.268/9
71 Inglis, p.273.
shouting for the Kaiser and the Germans. [It] was the intention of the military authorities to discharge him from the army for misconduct. [A] sentence of six months hard labour was imposed.

By the same token, many ardent Irish Nationalists could be counted on to strengthen the ranks of the British King in his fight against the German Kaiser:

CE 28 September 1914
Ireland and the War.
Kaiser’s Illusions.
London, Sunday. – The “Globe” says: - It was one of the surest calculations of the enemy that the hands of Great Britain would be enfeebled and perhaps paralysed in this war by faction and disaffection in Ireland. That being so the incident of last night, when the Prime Minister addressed an enthusiastic meeting in the capital of Ireland in furtherance of the recruiting movement must be a very rude shock for observers on the other side of the North sea. Mr.Asquith said he appeared in Dublin as the head of the King’s Government to summon Ireland to take her place in the defence of the common cause. A very short while ago such an incident would have been impossible, but among the triumphs that German statesmanship has wrought must be reckoned its handsome contribution to this wonderful result. The singing of “God Save the King” by Irish Nationalists is a spectacle that has not been seen before, and it means more to our power of curbing the arrogance of Germany than many an army corps.

Also the majority of Irish-American opinion seemed decidedly on the side of the Allies, greatly influencing Ireland’s stand on the issue:

CE 8 October 1914
Irish-American Opinion.
Mr. P.R. Fitzgibbons, a well-known Irish-American, writing from St.Louis to a Cork correspondent, says: - “Ninety-nine per cent of Irish-American opinion is in harmony with Mr.Redmond. I had read the White papers issued by England and Germany containing the diplomatic correspondence leading up to the gigantic slaughter which has crimsoned the fields of Europe with the blood of some of its best peoples, and I am fully convinced that Germany is responsible. The day that the Home Rule Bill passed on American papers gave it full notice. Mr.Redmond’s speech in the House, when he promised that the Volunteers would protect Ireland, made home Rule certain. Had Redmond not taken that opportunity at that time he would have missed the chance of a lifetime. Mr.Asquith has kept faith with Ireland. The postponement of the operation of the bill for a year or until the war is over matters little after the years of struggle, and at the same time it is the proper thing to do under present circumstances. Sinn Féin may say and have said that Mr.Redmond and his party are pro-English, and are recruiting for England, but Mr.Redmond has accomplished something, and has lifted our race all over the world to a pedestal that they had not occupied for centuries. Sinn Féin has done nothing, it can do nothing, its general policy is impossible and impractical. The Sinn Féin party has no support or standing in America, and its following does not number one tenth of one per cent of the race here. We have been deceived too long by the ‘professionals’ who have been living off their misguided
countrymen; we have not forgotten heir action during the Boer War, neither have we forgotten how they appropriated the money raised for the small Republics to themselves. To-day we find that tried and gallant soldier, General Botha, on the side of England. Why? Because South Africa enjoys self-government; and no reason can be assigned that will hold water why Ireland should not be as magnanimous. Sinn Féin will not tell us that Germany gave up Napper Tandy to England, and that France had him released. Sinn Féin will not tell us that Germany sent her Hessians to Ireland, and France sent us De Ta[illegible], St.Ruth, Hoche, and ever had for us a warm heart and generous hand. Sinn Féin (or rather the leaders of Sinn Féin) know all this, but the malignant hate of these leaders for Mr. John Redmond is responsible for the campaign of misrepresentation and slander, which they have been carrying on against him for years; but he can afford to smile. The thinking world recognise his pre-eminent ability and his name will ever brighten history as the one destined by Providence to lead his people out of their bondage. We have many Germans here. Our Government is neutral, as is proper, but the Press and heart of the American people are with their sister Republic (France) and her Allies, and hope and pray that success may crown their arms – and it will." 72

Had Casement returned to Ireland before going to the Continent, he might have realised how few people actually shared his enthusiasm for the Germans and he would not have expected to recruit many Irish prisoners. When the majority of Irish Volunteers preferred to stay with Redmond, even when he asked them to go fight in Flanders, it was unlikely that Casement would find many recruits for his cause among those who had volunteered for service in the British army before war broke out. When the men at Sennelager, the prison camp where they had been the largest Irish contingent, had been told they would find their new camp more comfortable, the camp commandant received a message from the Irish regiments saying that although they appreciated the efforts made on their behalf, they wanted no concessions unless they were shared by all prisoners; ‘in addition to being Irish Catholics, we have the honour to be British soldiers.’ 73 While the Boer War had not been popular in Britain, it had been easy for the Boers to persuade captured Irishmen that they, like them, were victims of Britain’s imperialistic greed. But to the Irish involved in the retreat from Mons, it was the Germans who had appeared

72 James Connolly, Notes on the Front. A Mixture of All Sorts. 15 April 1916. In America papers like the New York Sun, which even in normal times is notorious for its snobbery and devotion to English interests and its contempt for American, are the favourites to which the Freeman's Journal turns when seeking American opinion on the war. Even on the matter of the recent Irish Convention it is the editorials of this lickspittle journal that the Freeman's Journal quotes to show the trend of Irish opinion upon this historic gathering. Never did the Sun in recent years show anything but contempt and hatred for all sincere Irish movements against English rule, but nevertheless on Monday, April 10, the Freeman's Journal gravely cites the paper in question in the defence of John E. Redmond against the angry denunciations of the American Irish.

73 Inglis, p.288.
to be the imperialistic aggressors. The conditions they had met in captivity had done nothing to endear the Germans to them either. In fact, of all Casement’s projects, the Irish Brigade was to be the most destructive of his reputation. Bryan Kelly, an Irish student who was in Germany when war broke out, and had been in the civilian internment camp in Ruhleben was in Limburg when Casement arrived on his second visit, and heard him greeted by cheers for Redmond, and shouts of ‘how much are the Germans paying you?’, which had led to his leaving the camp in disgust.74

Excursus: James Connolly And German Socialism

In Irish Foreign Policy 1919-1966: The Evolution of Irish Foreign Policy, Professor Ronan Fanning writes that in 1913 Roger Casement pseudonymously published an article on ‘Ireland, Germany and the Next War’, which put attractions of neutrality for Irish revolutionaries in stark terms: ‘Ireland, already severed by a sea held by German warships, and temporarily occupied, might well be permanently and irrevocably severed from Great Britain, and with common assent erected into a neutralised, independent European state under international guarantees.’75 James Connolly, Socialist and another more internationally minded Irish revolutionary,76 was similarly attracted by neutrality and in 1914 became President of the Irish Neutrality League, seen as the most appropriate Irish policy towards the Great War. But neutrality had become unachievable when the Home Rule leadership abandoned earlier aspirations towards foreign policy. It was then that Connolly decided to engage in military action in alliance with Germany. The Liberty Hall slogan, ‘We serve Neither King Nor Kaiser But Ireland,’ does not actually rule out the possibility of alliance with the Kaiser. Neutrality was seen as

74 Idem, p.289.
75 Clifford, Casement, p.16
76 Connolly, one of Ireland’s best-known revolutionary and Socialist thinkers, was born in Edinburgh, 1868. From the age of eleven, Connolly worked to help support his poor Irish parents. In 1896 he came to Ireland as paid organiser of the Dublin Socialist Club. He soon founded the Irish Socialist Republican Party (ISRP) and argued that only a Socialist Republic could realize the ideals of Tone. Connolly went on a speaking tour in Scotland in 1902 and then moved with his family to America in 1903, where he helped to form the International Workers of the World in 1905. In 1910, Connolly returned to Ireland. He quickly joined the Socialist Party of Ireland, which was the successor to the ISRP. In 1911, he became Ulster organiser of the Irish Transport and Workers’ Union. In 1912, Connolly, along with James Larkin and William O’Brien, founded the Irish Labour Party as the political wing of the Irish Trade Union Congress. When James (Jim) Larkin was imprisoned in 1913 during the Lock-Out, Connolly forced his release by closing the port of Dublin. Connolly soon became Commandant of the recently formed Irish Citizen Army (ICA). Cf., inter alia, Lyons, Ferriter, Jackson.
an assertion of dissent from the British war effort, leading, when it failed as a policy, to alliance with Germany.

“What then becomes of all our resolutions; all our protests of fraternisation; all our threats of general strikes; all our carefully-built machinery of internationalism; all our hopes for the future? Were they all as sound and fury, signifying nothing? When the German artilleryman, a socialist serving in the German army of invasion, sends a shell into the ranks of the French army, blowing off their heads; tearing out their bowels, and mangling the limbs of dozens of socialist comrades in that force, will the fact that he, before leaving for the front, ‘demonstrated’ against the war be of any value to the widows and orphans made by the shell he sent upon its mission of murder? Or, when the French rifleman pours his murderous rifle fire into the ranks of the German line of attack, will he be able to derive any comfort from the probability that his bullets are murdering or maiming comrades who last year joined in thundering ‘hochs’ and cheers of greeting to the eloquent Jaurès, when in Berlin he pleaded for international solidarity? When the socialist pressed into the army of the Austrian Kaiser, sticks a long, cruel bayonet-knife into the stomach of the socialist conscript in the army of the Russian Czar, and gives it a twist so that when pulled out it will pull the entrails out along with it, will the terrible act lose any of its fiendish cruelty by the fact of their common theoretical adhesion to an anti-war propaganda in times of peace? When the socialist soldier from the Baltic provinces of Russia is sent forward into Prussian Poland to bombard towns and villages until a red trail of blood and fire covers the homes of the unwilling Polish subjects of Prussia, as he gazes upon the corpses of those he has slaughtered and the homes he has destroyed, will he in his turn be comforted by the thought that the Czar whom he serves sent other soldiers a few years ago to carry the same devastation and murder into his own home by the Baltic Sea?”

A reverse development occurred in Italy, which was a member of the Triple Alliance Germany/Austria/Italy. The Italian irredentist movement pressed the Government to break the Alliance and declare neutrality in 1914 and when this proved successful, it pressed for a declaration of war on the other side, and thus became an ally of Britain in May 1915. It appears that John Redmond played a part in the negotiations that brought Italy into the War. Seventeen articles in all were written by Irish Socialist James Connolly on the World War, published originally between August 1914 and January 1916, and show that Connolly’s position on the war was essentially different from Lenin’s. His first response (A Continental Revolution, August 15, 1914) was similar to Lenin’s, where he said it would be better for the worker’s of each country to die doing battle for the freedom of their class with their own bourgeoisie than to die in battle against each other. Lenin persisted in this attitude after the majority of workers in all belligerent countries

---

77 James Connolly, Labour and Easter Week, article 5, p.39.
78 Clifford, Connolly, p.17.
went off to war, but Connolly did not. Once a war between the states of Europe was under way, Connolly took sides. He supported Germany, and he did so for reasons beyond the “Ireland’s opportunity” principle.\textsuperscript{79}

“Remember that the war found England thoroughly prepared, Germany totally unprepared. That the British fleet was already mobilised on a scale never attempted in times of peace, and the German fleet was scattered in isolated units all over the seven seas. That all the leading British commanders were at home ready for the emergency, and many German and Austrian officers, such as Slatin Pasha, have not been able to get home yet. Remember all this and realise how it reveals that the whole plan was ready prepared; and hence that the cry of ‘Belgium’ was a mere subterfuge to hide the determination to crush in blood the peaceful industrial development of the German nation. \textit{Already the British press is chuckling with joy over the capture of German trade.} All capitalist journals in England boast that the Hamburg-American Line will lose all its steamers, valued at twenty-millions sterling. You know what that means! It means that a peaceful trade built up by peaceful methods is to be struck out of the hands of its owners by the sword of an armed pirate. \textit{You remember the words of John Mitchel descriptive of the British Empire, as 'a pirate empire, robbing and plundering upon the high seas’}.\textsuperscript{80}

Sympathy was also reserved for the Austrians, whose history Connolly seemed to have acquainted himself with.\textsuperscript{81}

\textit{The Tyrol} is in reality a section of the Alpine range of mountains—that section which stretches eastward from the Alps of Switzerland, and interposes between the southern frontier of Germany and the northern frontier of Italy. It is part of the territory of Austria; \textit{its inhabitants speak the German language, and for the most part are passionately attached to the Catholic religion}. They are described by Alison, the English historian, in terms that read strange to-day in view of the English official attitude to all things German. \textit{Alison says: ‘The inhabitants like all those of German descent, are brave, impetuous, and honest, tenacious of custom, fearless of danger, addicted to intemperance’}. The latter clause was in itself not sufficient to make any people remarkable, as at that period heavy drinking was the rule all over Europe, and nowhere worse than in these islands. But

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{80} James Connolly, \textit{Socialism and Nationalism}, article 28, p.243.
\textsuperscript{81} James Connolly, \textit{The Workers’ Republic}, article 38, p.428: “When the reverend lecturer hurls at the Socialists the taunt that they are the worst enemies of their own country, whatever that country be, he is only repeating against us the accusation made more truly in times past against the order of which he is such an ornament. The Jesuits have been expelled from every Catholic country in Europe, and the grounds on which they have been expelled were everywhere the same, viz., that they were the worst enemies of their country, and were constantly intriguing against the government and national welfare, that their teaching made bad subjects, and all their influence was against the welfare of the state--just what they allege against Socialists to-day. They were expelled from Venice during the first half of the seventeenth century, from Portugal in 1759, from the French dominions in 1764 and 1767, from Spain in 1767, from Naples, Parma and Modena about the same time. Maria Theresa of Austria and Emperor Joseph, her son, also expelled them. […] As the Catholic author of the article on the Jesuits in the \textit{Encyclopaedia Americana} truly says, ‘They have been expelled over and over again from almost every Catholic country in Europe’.”
\end{flushright}
the Tyrolese were also well accustomed to the use of arms, and frequent target practice in the militia and trained bands as well as in hunting had made excellent shots of a large proportion of the young men of the country.”

There was in Eastern Europe a socialist party with a view of the relationship of socialism and nationalism that was of a kind with Connolly’s: Pilsudski’s Polish Socialist Party, denounced by Lenin. The Polish socialist movement was more advanced than in Russia. In fact, there was no All-Russian Social Democratic Party in existence when the formation of the PSP provoked the establishment of the SDKPiL in opposition to itself. Connolly, like Pilsudski, eventually established a nationally based socialist organisation, even though Lenin argued that socialist organisations should be based on states, and condemned nationalist forms of socialist organisation. Connolly, like Pilsudski, combined nationalism and socialism ideologically, and successfully developed strong nationalist feelings in their movements. Connolly and Sinn Féin both supported the Central Powers, which consisted of Catholic Austria and socialist Germany. Sinn Féin attacked the Home Rule party for supporting the war of Protestant/Atheist Britain against the Hapsburg monarchy, which was the last secular bastion of Papal power in Europe, the Austrian veto in Papal elections had actually only been abolished in 1903. And Germany began to be represented in the Workers’ Republic as a socialist state which capitalist Britain was intent on destroying because of its peacefully thriving economic activity. But the scale and manner of Connolly’s and Pilsudski’s military involvement differed greatly because their circumstances were very different.

---

82 James Connolly, Insurrectionary Warfare, article 3, p.456.
83 Idem, p.22. Cf. also James Connolly, Socialism and Nationalism, article 6, p.43: “As far as I can understand these latter, their argument seems to be that they did their whole duty when they protested against the war, but that now that war has been declared it is right that they also should arm in defence of their common country, and act in all things along with their fellow subjects—those same fellow subjects whose senseless clamour brought on this awful outburst of murder. We are told, for instance, that the same policy is being pursued by all socialist parties. That the French socialists protested against the war—and then went to the front, headed by Gustave Hervé, the great anti-militarist; the German socialists protested against the war-- and then, in the Reichstag, unanimously voted 250 millions to carry it on; the Austrians issued a manifesto against the war-- and are now on the frontier doing great deeds of heroism against the foreign enemy; and the Russians erected barricades in the streets of St. Petersburg against the cossacks, but immediately war was declared went off to the front arm in arm with their cossack brothers. And so on. Now, if all this is true, what does it mean? It means that the socialist parties of the various countries mutually cancel each other, and that as a consequence socialism ceases to exist as a world force, and drops out of history in the greatest crisis of the history of the world, in the very moment when courageous action will most influence history.” Gustave Hervé was for many years an ‘anti-patriot’ and advocate of ‘revolution sooner than war’. His propaganda earned him repeated imprisonments. Connolly in the Harp wrote critically of the Hervé brand of French anti-militarism. On the eve of the 1914 War, Hervé changed his views, and later became a violent nationalist. Cf. online wikipedia, oxford biography.
Poland was a battlefield, whereas Ireland had many of the characteristics of being neutral. Also, what national oppression had been exercised by the British in Ireland during the years preceding the war, it was seen as harmless compared with the national oppression that had been conducted in Poland. Thus, while Connolly counted his soldiers in tens, Pilsudski counted them in thousands. Pilsudski also commanded a Polish Legion in regular warfare as part of the Austrian army between 1914 and 1916, while, for instance, Casement’s efforts to raise an Irish Legion in the German prisoner of war camps failed. Connolly was finally persuaded by the IRB to support the 1916 Rising, and about 120 ICA members took part. He was the Commandant-General of Dublin, and led the assault of the GPO in Dublin, the rebels' Headquarters. Court-martialled for his role in the Rising, he was executed by a British firing squad at Kilmainham Gaol on 12 May 1916, whilst strapped to a chair.\footnote{Clifford, Connolly, Lyons, pp.275ff, online: wikipedia, oxford biography.}
5. Ireland and the Austrian Empire during The Great War
Part II – 1915

‘Some nations must go down in this war. We are not going down [...]. There seems to be more joy in political circles of a particular character over one nationalist that enlisted than over a whole Ulster Division.’

Sir Edward Carson, speech at Bangor, Co.Down, July 1915.¹

One such Nationalist referred to by Carson could have been Tom Barry, commander of the West Cork Brigade of the IRA in 1920-21. This is a passage taken from his autobiography, recalling the motives that sent him off to fight as British Army soldier in World War I:

In June 1915, in my seventeenth year, I had decided to see what this Great War was like. I cannot plead that I went on the advice of John Redmond or any other politician, that if we fought for the British we would secure Home Rule for Ireland, nor can I say that I understood what Home Rule meant. I was not influenced by the lurid appeal to fight to save Belgium or small nations. I knew nothing about nations, large or small. I went to war for no other reason than that I wanted to see what war was like, to get a gun, to see new countries and to feel like a grown man’ (Guerrilla Days In Ireland, p.2)²

1915 sees the Germans blockading Britain with submarines, making use of poison gas at Ypres, sinking the SS Lusitania off the coast of Ireland, and overrunning Poland. Italy declares war on Austria-Hungary in the hope of consolidating their national territories, while Austria-Hungary invades Serbia. In Britain, Asquith forms a coalition government, a serious blow to Redmond’s authority because Asquith brings in the Unionists, including all the most vehement anti-Home-Rulers – Bonar Law, Carson and F.E.Smith. To the world, the new Government might have appeared as a sign of political solidarity, but to the Irish, it could only be interpreted as a warning that the Home Rule Act was, as Carson had described it, ‘a scrap of paper’.³

¹ Inglis, p.297.
² Clifford, Connolly, p.67.
³ Inglis, p.297. John Redmond’s role regarding the new coalition, is a subject fraught with speculation, although documentation to this situation exists. Alvin Jackson, p.148, holds that ‘the creation, in May 1915, of the first wartime coalition government, and the recruitment to office of leading Unionists [effectively] brought to an end the informal alliance between the Liberals and Home Rulers which had dominated the politics of the United Kingdom for the preceding five years: the Tories now had a very considerable presence in government. Sir Edward Carson, who had been associated with acts of illegality during the Ulster crisis, was appointed as Attorney-General. Redmond, however, who had pursued a scrupulously constitutional agitation for Home Rule, was
In 1915, the causes of the war that was refusing to end seemed manifold: the Austrians held ‘it was the outcome of a Servian conspiracy in Bosnia, and relations became strained between those unequally matched countries.’ In view of the fate of Bosnia, many saw in the Austrian attitude an attempt at annexation and vengeance towards Serbia. Russia stepped to aid fellow Slavs; Germany sided with Austria; France came to the aid of Russia, and England was involved in the neutrality of Belgium. The sympathy of most Irish people was still with the Allies, against Prussian militarism, however, serious events unfolded for Irish manpower abroad that called this hitherto undebated stance into question.

CE 1 January 1915
Serbia’s War.
Fight For Existence. Future of the Slavs.
(From the “Daily Telegraph” Special Correspondent)
Nish, Wednesday. - For the first time since the outbreak of the present war, I arrived yesterday at Nish, which has become the political capital of Serbia. […] Political life here is very animated, and Nish is very busy discussing in what form and by what ideas the southern Slav question must be definitely solved. There is harmonious co-operation through all parties in the Skupshina, and in the present crisis a coalition Cabinet was welcomed as the best augury, and produced even upon the soldiers on the battlefield the happiest impression. The Serbs are excellent soldiers, but sometimes they form a turbulent political element. Every man, besides being a soldier, feels that he is a citizen, and is highly and passionately interested in everything concerning his country. The Pasitick Cabinet maintains to-day as before that in the present world struggle, when the whole of Slavdom is allied with the truly civilised nations of Great Britain and not included in the coalition ministry. It is still occasionally said that Redmond was denied office, though Asquith’s repeated offers of a ministerial place to him are well documented. The appointment of Carson, especially as senior law officer, was in a sense understandable, given his seniority on the Tory front bench, his reputation at the bar and the fact that he had already held office as Solicitor-General (1900-5). But in the immediate aftermath of the Ulster crisis, and in the absence of an Irish nationalist, this was also a highly controversial undertaking which apparently affirmed Ulster military while simultaneously slighting Irish constitutionalism. On the other hand, Redmond’s refusal of office was also highly questionable, certainly when judged with the benefits of hindsight. One of Redmond’s chief difficulties was, as has been noted, that he had no executive authority – that he carried responsibility without power.”

4 Cf. R.W. Seton-Watson et al, The War and Democracy (The Workers’ Educational Association, 1915), p.3: ‘And yet, throughout these two generations of economic and social development, the fear of war has never been absent from the mind of Europe. Her emperors and statesmen have talked of peace; but they have prepared for war, more skilfully and more persistently than ever before in the history of Europe or of the world. Almost the entire manhood of every European nation but England has been trained to arms; and the annual war budget of Europe rose, in time of peace, to over 300 million pounds. The States of Europe, each afraid to stand alone against a coalition of possible rivals, formed themselves into opposing groups; and each of the groups armed feverishly against the other, fearful lest, by any change in the diplomatic or political situation, they might be caught unawares and suffer loss. Thus, it ought not to have surprised us that finally, through the accident of a royal murder, the spark should be fired and the explosion ensue, and that merchants and manufacturers, propagandists and philanthropists, scholars and scientists, should find the ground shaken beneath their feet and the projects patiently built up through years of international co-operation shattered by the events of a few days.’
France, and fights for liberty, rights and justice against German militarism and the false doctrines of the assertion of German natural supremacy over all other nations, Bulgaria had better side with the anti-German coalition and wait to receive her reward according to her service done to the general cause of the real and legal rights of the Bulgarian nation. Therefore a change of Cabinet, uniting all parties, and a declaration by the present Government openly announcing to Europe and to the Serbian nation their purpose with regard to the present struggle, had the happiest results. United in one political national purpose, the Serbs saw in the present Cabinet the best and greatest guarantee of resolute firmness in maintaining that natural ideal for the realisation of which they are enduring all their present hardships and are pouring out like water their best blood. That was the last but not the least element which contributed to the brilliant Serbian victory on the slopes of the Rudrick Mountain. The Serbs wished to avoid a struggle with Austria-Hungary, sacrificing for peace even the dignity of Serbia, but Serbia was compelled to fight for the right of her existence. The Serbs are sure that only unity in a free and independent State of all the youngest Slavs, on the basis of perfect equality for every member will attain the moral purposes of the present world-struggle. Whilst assuming that they will be lasting, they will be able to develop freely and to be a mighty wall against any imperialistic and Napoleonic ideas of world supremacy from whichever side they may come.

Many Irish in the past admired the German nation and for what it accomplished in the fields of art, literature and science, but this sympathy was being eroded in the non-nationalist press by the steady reports of the barbarous treatment of the Belgians, and in particular the burning of Louvain, which had so many connections with Ireland in the dark days of her history. Thousands of Irishmen had joined the colours for many varied reasons since the war began, in addition to the tens of thousands already serving, and, according to newspaper reports supplied by British reporters on the front, rendered an extremely good account of themselves in every battle in which they were engaged, adding more substance to the image of the ‘fighting Irish.’ The Ulster question was seemingly forgotten in the greater question of defending the country as a whole. Moderate Irish nationalists were now, that England had kept faith with them and was waging a war ‘in defence of the integrity of a small nation,’ prepared to support her to the utmost of their ability. ‘When the time comes to put the Act into operation it is not improbable that the differences between the two sections of Irishmen will have been very appreciably turned down, and a settlement will be easily arrived at.’

---

5 Seton-Watson, The War and Democracy, p.4: ‘Englishmen sometimes forget that there are worse evils than open war, both in political and industrial relations, and that the political causes for which their fathers fought and died have still to be carried to victory on the Continent. Nationality and their national institutions are the very life-blood of English people. They are as natural to them as the air they breathe. That is what makes it sometimes so difficult for them to understand, as the history of Ireland and even of Ulster shows, what nationality means to other peoples. And that is
Disorders reported from Bohemia suggest that a different attitude was prevalent among the Czechs towards their masters regarding loyalty in war, than was prescribed for Irish Nationalists by their elected leaders, thus adding greatly to the picture of a nation in motion.

CE 8 February 1915: 
Further Disorders Reported in Bohemia. Alleged Attempts to Dynamite Politicians. (Press Association Foreign Special). 'New disorders are reported to

why they have not realised, not only that there are peoples in Europe living under alien governments, but that there are governments in Europe so foolish as to think that men and women deprived of their national institutions, humiliated in their deepest feelings, and forced into an alien mould, can make good citizens, trustworthy soldiers, or even obedient subjects.'

have taken place at Prague, where the arrest of Czech students and journalists has greatly irritated the inhabitants. It is said that there have been five dynamite attempts against political personages in Bohemia since Feb. 1st.

A necessary digression here into the work of R.W. Seton-Watson\(^7\), specifically his publication The War and Democracy, adds depth to the above argument, displaying as it does the perspective of the Anglo-Saxon majority, particularly regarding events in Central and Eastern Europe, regions not entirely familiar in Britain to the elected, not to mention the electorate. Seton-Watson’s publication is doubly interesting for this study as it frequently quotes from various works of H.A.L. Fisher, whose History of Europe, for example, is one of the basic reference books of this paper. In The War and Democracy, Seton-Watson attempts to clarify the terms nation and nationality in regard to the war, the Austrian and the British empires. ‘Sixty-two years ago reaction reigned supreme in Europe after the great national and social uprisings of 1848, and England looked on passively while the hopes of freedom were crushed in Bohemia, Hungary, and Italy’, but today England has stepped into the arena, declaring herself ready to take part in the organisation of the European task; fighting, moreover, not only on behalf of ‘the threatened freedom of Belgium, France, and Serbia, on behalf of the unborn freedom of Poland, Alsace-Lorraine, and the subject races of the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman Empires, but also on her own behalf.’\(^8\) The social idea and the national idea are seen to have been for a century the pivots of European development, the political structure of the Continent oscillating according as these ideas assumed ascendancy over men's minds; ‘and when, as in 1848, both claimed attention at the same time, the whole edifice was shaken to its very foundations.’

---

\(^7\) Robert William Seton-Watson, (1879-1951), British historian. During the 1910's, he edited a journal called The New Europe, 1916-20, in which he openly advocated for the independence of Czechoslovakia, Romania, and the creation of a union of Southern Slavs, Yugoslavia. Seton-Watson was personal friends with Masaryk, first President of Czechoslovakia, and Edvard Benes, his successor. He spent most of the war in London, collaborating with the Czech government in exile. He arrived at Vienna University in 1905, the beginning of a life-long interest in the history and politics of Central and South East Europe. He travelled widely in Austria-Hungary prior to the First World War and published a number of books and on the national conflicts that existed within the Austro-Hungarian Empire. In 1918 he became a supporter of the newly-created states. As an expert on the area with many personal contacts, he was able to exercise influence as a member of the Intelligence Bureau of the War Cabinet (1917) and the Enemy Propaganda Department (1918) where he was largely responsible for the British propaganda that was disseminated to the Austro-Hungarian people. He played a prominent role in establishing a School of Slavonic Studies at Kings College in 1915 (later SSEES). Seton-Watson was appointed the first holder of the Masaryk chair in Central European history in 1922, a post he held until 1945. In 1945 he was appointed to the new chair of Czechoslovak Studies at Oxford University, a post he held until his retirement in 1949. For additional information and links cf. [http://www.en.wikipedia...org]. 20.10.06.

\(^8\) Seton-Watson. The War and Democracy, p.9.
Whereas in England the social idea alone has been a motive force in the nineteenth century, although ‘she has always had to reckon with the national idea across the St. George's Channel.’

Owing to her geographical situation, she acquired national unity centuries ago, always able to defend it against external aggression. Hence the national idea has ceased to be an aspiration and a revolutionary force. ‘And yet, unless the significance of the principle of nationality and the part which it has played in the history of modern Europe be realised, it is impossible to enter fully into the true meaning of the present tremendous conflict.’ What then is nationality?

A nationality is not quite the same thing as a nation. For example, there is a German nation, ruled by the Kaiser Wilhelm II, but this does not include twelve million people of German nationality who are the subjects of the Emperor of Austria; or again, there is the Swiss nation, which is made up of no less than three distinct nationalities. Still less are the terms state and nationality synonymous; for, if they were, then the natives of India might claim to be of the same nationality as ourselves, or, vice versa, the United States would be regarded as part of the British Empire because a large proportion of their inhabitants happen to be of British descent. The word “race” brings us somewhat nearer to the point, but even this will not satisfy us when we remember that the Slavonic race, for example, consists of a large number of nationalities, such as the Russians, the Poles, the Czechs, the Serbs, the Montenegrins, etc., or that the English (as distinguished from the other three nations of the United Kingdom) belong to the same Teutonic race as the Germans. Nevertheless, a belief, whether well grounded or not, in a common racial origin is one of the root principles of the idea of nationality.

Thus, nationality is always striving to become a nation, and a nation is simply a nationality that has acquired self-government, nationality plus State. ‘“Ireland a nation,” the war cry of the Irish Nationalist party, is a claim, not a statement of fact; Ireland will become a nation when its desire for self-government is satisfied.’ The self-governing Dominions of the British Empire and the Magyars of Hungary, for examples, are nations, even though they are subordinate to their respective imperial governments in questions of peace and war, treaty obligations. The overthrow of Napoleon was due in large to the spirit of nationalism, but the rewards of that overthrow were not reaped by the peoples, but by the dynasties and State-systems of the old regime. The 1814 Congress of Vienna was a disappointment; ‘and we, who are now hopefully looking forward to a similar Congress at the end of the present war, cannot do better than study the great failure of 1814, and take warning from it.’

---

9 Idem, p.10.
10 Idem, p.11.
But why should England worry about the preservation of small nationalities at all? From 1814 to 1848, the larger nations were exhausted by the effort of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars and disillusioned by reactionary statesmanship, but Belgium and Greece secured their liberties, and outside Europe the national movement spread throughout the South American Continent. In 1848:

There is no more remarkable example in history of the contagious quality of ideas than the sudden spread of revolutionary excitement through Europe in 1848. In the course of a few weeks the established order seemed everywhere to be crumbling to pieces. The Revolution began in Palermo, crossed the Straits of Messina, and passed in successive waves of convulsion through Central Italy to Paris, Vienna, Milan, and Berlin. It has often been remarked that the Latin races are of all the peoples of Europe most prone to revolution; but this proposition did not hold good in 1848. The Czechs in Bohemia, the Magyars in Hungary, the Germans in Austria, rose against the paralysing encumbrance of the Hapsburg autocracy. The Southern Slavs dreamed of an Illyrian kingdom; the Germans of a united Germany; the Bohemians of a union of all the Slavonic peoples of Europe. The authority of the Austrian Empire, the pivot of the European autocracy, had never been so rudely challenged, and if the Crown succeeded in recovering its shattered authority it was due to the dumb and unintelligent loyalty of its Slavonic troops.11

The Czechs of Bohemia, the Roumanians of Transylvania, and the Southern Slavs, and smaller subject races, were demanding their freedom from the joint tyranny of Vienna and Budapest. Russia had not yet solved the problem of Finland, nor England the problem of Ireland. The Turk still occupied Constantinople. And finally, the Prussianised nationalism of Germany had created new questions of nationality in Alsace-Lorraine and Schleswig. The conflagration of 1914 was proof of a profound dissatisfaction among civilised nations with the existing political structure of the Continent. Alsatians, Poles, Czechs, Finns, Serbo-Croats, Roumanians, and the rest struggle ‘for country and liberty; for a word inscribed upon a banner, proclaiming to the world that they also live, think, love, and labour for the benefit of all. The framework of society does not fit the facts of nationality, and so the framework has gone to pieces.’12

In recent years it had become a cheap journalistic commonplace to refer to the coming “inevitable” struggle between Teuton and Slav, and the present war is no doubt widely regarded as proving the correctness of this theory, despite the fact that the two chief groups of Teutons are ranged on opposite sides, and that the Slavs enjoy the active support of Celts and Latins also. That such a struggle has come is in the last resort due to the false conceptions of Nationality which underlie

---

12 Idem, p.35.
the policy of the two central Powers, Germany and Austria-Hungary. The freedom from foreign oppression which the Germans so nobly vindicated against Napoleon has not been extended to their own subject races, the Poles, Danes, and Lorrainers; and recent years have seen the accentuation of a conflict the germs of which may be detected as far back as the fatal crime of the Polish Partition in the eighteenth century. The policy of Germanisation in Austria has been gradually undermined by causes which it would take too long to enumerate, but its sting has survived in the maintenance of a foreign policy which treats 26,000,000 Slavs as a mere *annexe* of militant Germanism and as “gun-fodder” for the designs of Berlin; while in Hungary the parallel policy of Magyarisation has increased in violence from year to year, poisoning the wells of public opinion, creating a gulf of hatred between the Magyars and their subject races (the Slovaks, Roumanians, Croats, Serbs, etc.), and rendering cordial relations with the neighbouring Balkan States impossible. Nor is it a mere accident that official Germany and official Hungary should have pursued an actively Turcophil policy; for the same tendencies have been noticeable in Turkey, though naturally in a somewhat cruder form than farther west. Just as the Young Turk policy of Turkification rendered a war between Turkey and the Balkan States inevitable, so the policy of Magyarisation pursued by two generations of Hungarian statesmen sowed the seeds of war between Austria and the Southern Slavs. In the former case it was possible to isolate the conflict, in the latter it has involved the greater part of Europe in a common disaster.13

The period from the death of Joseph II. to the great revolutionary movement of 1848 is regarded as far as Eastern Europe is concerned, as a period when nationality was simmering everywhere. The first stage was the long Napoleonic war, the second, the era of reaction and political exhaustion, ‘when all that was best in Europe concentrated in the Romantic movement in literature, art, and music. For Austria this period was bound up with the name of Metternich, who personified the old hide-bound methods of the bureaucracy, the diplomacy of a past age, to which the nations were mere pawns on a chessboard.’14 Rampant Clericalism, financial ruin, and stagnation followed. The war with Napoleon III. ended in Austria's loss of Lombardy and the creation of the Italian kingdom. Faced by the bankruptcy of the whole political and financial system, Francis Joseph launched a period of constitutional experiment. Following the line of least resistance, he inclined now to federalism, now to centralism, and he was still experimenting when the war of 1866 broke out. ‘For Austria this war was decisive, for its results were her final expulsion both from Germany and from Italy, and the creation of that fatal Dual System with the Magyars of Hungary which has distorted her whole subsequent development.’ The remaining eight races were not considered at all.

---

13 Idem, p.59.  
14 Idem, p.60.
The history of the past forty-seven years is the history of the gradual decay of the Dual System. Austria has progressed in many ways; her institutions have steadily grown freer, her political sense has developed, universal suffrage has been introduced, racial inequalities have been reduced though not abolished, industry, art, and general culture have advanced steadily. But she has been continually hampered by Hungary, where racial monopoly has grown worse and worse.15

Seton-Watson holds that the growth of national feeling among the minor nationalities and their steady emancipation from ‘the economic thraldom of the German and the Jew—all this has slowly but surely undermined the Dual System and rendered its final collapse inevitable.’ What then are the forces that have held Austria-Hungary together? The repetition of a known stereotype, the ‘Lotus-Eaters’ of Austria, best personified by the bureaucratic system of bungling incompetence and an army well-dressed but inefficient, at best promotes tourism, but at least exonerates Austria from the more damning image of Prussian militarism. What follows is a descriptive passage on the ‘Austrians,’ informing the reader of English of the quaint feudal charm of the Empire and its suggestive connotation of being relatively harmless in the scheme of a great war. First comes the dynasty; for it would be difficult to over-estimate the power exercised by the dynastic tradition on the many races under Habsburg sway. Next comes the Joint Army; ‘for there is no finer body of men in Europe than the Austrian officers’ corps, poorly paid, hard-worked, but inspired to the last man with unbounded devotion to the Imperial house, and to a large extent immune from that spirit of caste which is the most offensive feature of the allied German army.’ It is not a “preserve” of the aristocracy, being largely recruited from the middle and even lower-middle class. And finally:

Hardly less important are the Catholic Church, with its vast material resources and its powerful influence on peasant, small tradesman and court alike, and the bureaucracy, with its traditions of red tape, small-mindedness, slowness of movement and genial Gemuetlichkeit (“easy-goingness”). It is only after these forces that we can fairly count the parliaments and representative government. And yet there are no fewer than twenty-three legislative bodies in the Monarchy—the two central parliaments of Vienna and Budapest, entirely distinct from each other; the two Delegations; the provincial Diets, seventeen in Austria, one in Croatia; and the Diet of Bosnia, whose every legislative act requires the ratification of the Joint Minister of Finance and of the Austrian and Hungarian Governments. Against all this there is one supremely disintegrating force—the principle of Nationality.16

---

15 Idem, p.63.
16 Idem, p.65.
In support of this argument the Examiner publishes a lengthy article by a Russian reporter on his travels through war-torn Europe:

CE 10 February 1915
Russian “Eye-Witness.”
War Narratives. Austria’s Troubles. Racial Differences.
(P.A. Special).

London, Tuesday. - The Press Bureau this morning issued a communication received from Professor Pares, the authorised correspondent at the Russian headquarters. Under date December 24th he says: - Our train made its way through to the furthest point up. We had to stop several times to let through the ambulance trains, already charged with wounded. At point after point, and especially on the Austrian sides of the rivers, we passed lines of carefully-prepared trenches. The damage done by the artillery fire was sporadic – here a smashed station building, there a town where several houses had suffered, but there was nothing of the indiscriminate. The Polish population, which showed no sign of any hostility to the Russians, seemed to find the war conditions livable [sic]. I had some talk with a few Austrian Germans from Vienna. They were simple folk, and seemed to have no grudge against the Russians. They apart as far as possible not only from their captors, but from their fellow prisoners from Bohemia and Moravia. 17 When I asked the latter how they stood with the German troops, instead of the sturdy “gut” of their Viennese fellows, they answered with a slang word and gesture. Asked as to the Russians, they replied in a quite matter of course way – “we are brothers and speak the same tongue. We are one people.” These Czechs confidently assured me that any Russian troops that entered Bohemia would be welcome as friends, and they claimed that not only the neighbouring Moravians and Clovaks [sic], but also the Croats further south were to be taken as feeling as they did. The Bohemians and Moravians seem to be surrendering in largest number of all, and though the Viennese claimed that large numbers of Russians had been taken, I cannot regard as anything but exceptional the enormous batches of blue uniforms that I passed on Christmas Eve […]. Christmas day I spent in the hospitals. In one ward at a local Austrian hospital, now full of wounded, I found that almost every one of the nine patients was of a different nationality. The German stood out from the rest. He was a bright, vigorous boy of 20, had gone as a volunteer, and was tremendously proud of the spirit of the German army

17 Although there is never a specific interest shown by CE in the fate of Moravians or even a clear distinction created between them and other Slavs of the region, there is a bond between Moravia and Ireland that must already have been forgotten by the beginning of the twentieth century. As previously mentioned in a different context, Ireland was not immune to the Battle of the White Mountain. Protestant refugees from Moravia and the German Palatinate poured across Europe. Some came to Belfast and Dublin. There is still a Moravian tradition in Belfast, and interestingly, there is also a Moravian Church in the centre of the village of Lower Ballinderry, Co.Antrim. In Dublin, in a less congenial climate, the Moravians melted into the Catholic culture, but some names still survive. The Palatinates settled in Limerick and although they thrived they were never fully accepted by the community. Perhaps their alienation was furthered by their multi-faceted self-sufficiency which helped them survive the famine, in comparison to their starving, potato-based farming neighbours. The contact between Protestant Palatinate and Limerick Gael is caught in song, ‘Inion an Phalitinig,’ the Palatinate’s daughter. These people were part of Ireland for 300 years, their tradition remembered now solely by the prosperous Switzer’s store in Dublin’s prestigious Grafton Street. It is an intersting point that the Hussite tradition of Bohemia, the historical forces which indirectly formed the Orange Order, was crushed by a bigoted Catholicism. [http://www.catholicity.com/encyclopedia/] 20.10.06.
He himself was wounded in both legs. When I asked whether the people of Germany were keen for the war he answered with astonishment. The people thought that the war was not to be avoided, but that was at the start. Now it is different. He asked if there were many other Englishmen in Russia, and when I answered that there were some, he said, to my surprise – “The English are everywhere. They are a fine people – noble.” Much of our talk turned to the Austrian army. The Germans said that it could not hold out unless it was properly led by Germans. In Bohemia and Moravia the regiments were mixed of Slavs and Austro-Germans, and, according to Moravian soldiers, were constantly quarrelling. All the officers were Austro-Germans, and even some of the Hungarian regiments seemed to be commanded by Germans. The young German spoke of frequent quarrels, and even brawls, between Servian and Hungarian fellow-soldiers. The great wish of all was that the war should end. When I said the end was not in sight, the German exclaimed, “More misery, more misery.” Another said, “Oh, jammer, jammer,” and another had tears in his eyes. In another ward I heard more of the Bohemians. There Prussia is the antipathy. They appear to be Czech officers only in the Reserve. After the outbreak of the war the Austrians made wholesale arrests among the educated Czechs, quite apart from party politics, and were particularly severe on gymnastic volunteer organisations, “Sokols,” which are popular among all the Slav nationalities in Austria. The whole regiment of my informant had surrendered en masse, and even in the mobilisation of 1909 a Prague regiment had refused to march against Russia, and several of the men had been shot. I was told that the Austrian army was much weaker in Reserves than the Russian. […] The cold weather – and it is freezing now – will be welcomed on this side, and the Russian winter kits, which are already supplied, are immeasurably better than the thin blue great coats of the draggled and demoralised Austrians. The numbers of Austrian units are so reduced that they are only shadows of what they were and some seemed to have disappeared altogether. Ordinary drafts came in some time ago are now exhausted. Such is the testimony of Russian officers. Russian recruits, on the contrary will join the colours shortly. From the beginning of the war Mosinans (who are really Russians) surrendered in large numbers. Then the Poles began to come in fast, and now the Bohemians. Hungarians are sure to go on to the end, but Rumanians and Italian soldiers of Austria have also come over very easily. In front of Cracow, a Russian officer, under fire, came on a whole number of Bohemians, who sang Sokol songs, and shouted as they came into the Russian line. These wholesale surrenders have, I think, an extremely interesting political significance. When the government turned a whole people into an army, it was clear how the people under army discipline could express itself. These surrenders in their general character and in their difference of detail are a picture of the feelings and aspirations of the various nationalities bungled together under the name of Austria.

Again, while Austria merely ‘bungled’ together her oppressed peoples, the Germans ‘trampled’ upon their submerged nationalities with a ‘jackboot’:

18 CE 1 May 1915: Demoralised Austrians. Companies Desert. (P. A. War Special). A telegram from Schio states a whole company of Austrian soldiers, consisting of 200 men and eight officers, have deserted near Asiago, and fled across the Italian frontier. The wounded from Galicia sent home to recover have also fled into Italy. When ordered to return to the front they assert the Austrian Army is demoralised, and that the soldiers prefer to be captured rather than fight.
CE 10 May 1915
The Prussian Tyranny. **Submerged Nationalities.**

[...] Prussia has always insisted that her dependents should Prussianise themselves. Their language must be her language; they must think her thoughts; they must become cogs and bolts in her gigantic labour-mechanism... The folly of the interminable attempts to impose Kultur on the Poles in Prussia can only be fully appreciated by those who consider the all-important part which the polish race, chief of the submerged Slav nationalities, is certain to play in the general anti-German movement in middle-Europe. If the Poles could have been persuaded to mitigate their historic hatred of the Prussians they would have constituted a species of buffer race or collusion cushion against the ever-increasing pressure of Pan-Slavism. [...] There are not a few Irishmen who fondly believe that Ireland under the protection of the German Empire would enjoy much more liberty to govern herself in accordance with “Irish ideas” than she is likely to possess in any form of partnership with Great Britain. Those purblind persons believe the German declarations to that effect, and look forward to a day when, thanks to the waning of British sea-power, it would be possible to become subjects of the German Emperor. [...] How long, then, would it be before the shamrock, as a badge of racial spirituality was trampled into the mire by the Prussian jackboot?

However, according to Seton-Watson, Count Forgach, ‘the arch-forger of the Austrian Legation in Belgrade,’ permanent Under-secretary in the Foreign Office, and as Count Berchtold's right hand and prompter in Balkan affairs, was directly responsible for the pronounced anti-Serb tendencies that dominated the foreign policy of the Dual Monarchy since the rise of the Balkan League. ‘As a Magyar nobleman with intimate Jewish connections,’ Forgach was an invaluable link between Magyar extremist policy and Berlin on the one hand and Salonica and Constantinople on the other. 19 A similar report is published in the Examiner, although not citing Forgach, but another Austrian Minister, Baron Giesl, adding some credibility to the accusation that Austria was indeed more than a German pawn in settling loose the dogs of war:

CE 8 February 1915
Cause of War.
**Austria’s Responsibility.** Striking Criticisms by Vienna Papers.
(P. A. War Special)
Venice, Friday. - Advices from Vienna say that considering the extraordinary severity of the Vienna censorship, some journals seem to have been allowed unusual latitude in criticising the Red Book.

19 Idem, p.75. Cf also CE 20 April 1915. **500 German Officers Arrive at Constantinople. Previous Officers killed by Turks.** (P. A. War Special).Paris, Monday. - [...] The greatest number of the missing officers were killed by the Turks, who detest the Germans, regarding them as butchers. By a law passed at the beginning of the war the Germans strove to remedy the state of things by conferring on superior officers the right to kill offhand and without trial subordinate officers and soldiers who refused to obey blindly their orders. The law had the effect of checking revolts, but the Turks found means to kill their German officers during battle.
The Socialist “Arbeiter Zeitung” bluntly declared that the first demand for war came from the Austrian Minister, Baron Giesl. In a remarkably violent despatch, dated July 21, Baron Giesl writes: “One judges that Monarchy from internal and external grounds as powerless and incapable of energetic action, and believes the serious words spoken in responsible quarters to be only bluff. That the War Minister and Chief of the General Staff are both on leave strengthens the conviction of the weakness of Austria-Hungary. It is not more evident that this picture of anti-Austrian feeling forces us to the conclusion that the reckoning with Serbia and a war for the position of the Monarchy as a great power, or even for her existence as such, cannot long be averted. If we neglect to clear up our relations with Serbia we shall be guilty of participation in the difficulties of a future conflict which sooner or later must be undergone. [...] Half measures in formulating our demands, long discussions and a final weak compromise, would be the hardest blow that Austria-Hungary’s prestige could suffer in Serbia, and to her position as a great Power in Europe.”

Regarding the The Future of Austria-Hungary, Seton-Watson establishes that he has always regarded Austria-Hungary as ‘an organism full of infinite possibilities of progress and culture, a State modelled upon that diversity of type which Lord Acton held to be the surest guarantee of liberty.’

The war-fever which seized upon the populace of Vienna and Budapest last July typified the feelings of the three dominant races in the Monarchy, the Germans, the Magyars, and the Jews; but it is no criterion for the attitude of large masses of the population. In fact, the war has accentuated the centrifugal tendencies which were so marked a feature of recent years, and which the introduction of Universal Suffrage and the annexation of Bosnia arrested but failed to eradicate; a stringent censorship may conceal, but cannot alter, this fact. Disaffection is rife in portions of the army and affects its powers of resistance, while the financial and economic crisis grows from week to week. Cynics have tried to define the mutual relations of Germany and Austria-Hungary by comparing the former to a strong man carrying a corpse upon his shoulders, and the course of

---

20 Cf. also CE 21 April 1915. German and Austro-Hungarian Socialists. Call for Peace. (P. A. War Special). According to a Berlin telegram the Socialist Party Committee states that at a conference, which was held in Vienna, representatives of German and Austro-Hungarian Socialists unanimously decided to make the following statement: “Despite the long duration of the war the people of all countries are inflexibly determined to defend their integrity and independence with all their strength. But the war has caused horrible misery everywhere, with resulting growth of a desire for ending the war in all countries, and even neutral States. This desire springs, not from a feeling of weakness, but from a desire and power to maintain independence. The inevitable result, however, is that only such peace is possible which humiliates no people, and such peace alone will guarantee permanent collaboration of all civilized peoples.

21 Idem, p.114.

22 CE 25 May 1915. Feeling in Vienna. (P.A.War Special) Amsterdam, Monday. - A Vienna telegram says – The patriotic demonstration reached a climax this (Sunday) evening. After Italy’s declaration of war and the Emperor’s manifesto to his people were made known by special editions about nine o’clock, crowds gathered in allparts of the city, singing patriotic songs and raising cheers for the Emperor, the Monarchy, and the Allied armies and navies. Before the War ministry patriotic speeches were delivered, and officers and soldiers were greeted with frantic cheers. Indignation against Italy found expression in cries of “Down with the Traitors!” “Down with Italy!” No excesses, however, occurred. – Reuter.
the war during the first three months would seem to confirm this view. So far as
Austria-Hungary is concerned, its two outstanding features have been the signal
failure of the “punitive expedition” against Serbia and the debacle of Auffenberg's
army in Galicia. Friendly observers were prepared for a break-down in the
higher command and were aware that many Slav regiments could not be
relied upon, but they had expected more from the German and Magyar sections of
the army and from the very efficient officers’ corps, as a stiffening element. It is
now known that despite the aggressive policy of its chiefs, the Austro-Hungarian
army was far from ready, and that its commissariat and sanitary arrangements
utterly broke down.23

The Dual System abolished with a reconstruction of Austria-Hungary on a
modified federal basis was essentially a peace-ideal. ‘The war, far from kindling a
common patriotism which in Austria-Hungary was so conspicuous by its absence,
has placed a gulf of blood between race and race, and rendered their continued
existence under the same roof not only difficult but undesirable.’ 24 It would be
possible to reconstruct the State on a federal basis, Seton-Watson argues, with five
main racial units, the Germans, the Czechs and Slovaks, the Magyars, the Slovenes,
and the Italians (i.e. minus Galicia). ‘Certain unimportant racial minorities would
still be left, but these could unquestionably be dealt with by a law of guarantees,
similar to those which have played so conspicuous a part in the theory, but
sometimes also in the practice, of the Dual Monarchy.’

Moreover, there can be no doubt that one of the surest means of bringing
Germany to her knees is by crushing her most formidable ally, and thus tapping
some of the sources of her own military and economic strength. It is safe to assume
that this consideration plays an important part in the military plans of Russia; and
for many reasons—political, strategic, and economic—a Russian occupation of
Bohemia must be regarded as the essential prelude to a decisive victory of the
Allies. 25

And there seemed no doubt that a Russian army was well capable of
fulfilling this mission, given the great adaptability of the Russian peasant to war
both on a physical as well as mental level:

CE 8 February 1915
Story of the War. Special Despatches.
(By arrangement with the London “Daily Telegraph” we are enabled to
publish the special despatches from the front sent them by their own
correspondents – Copyright.)
A Wonderful Army.

23 Idem, p.115.
24 Idem p.118.
25 Idem, p.120.
(By Grenville Fortescue in the “Daily Telegraph” – Copyright.)

The Russian army is gradually shaping into one of the mightiest war machines the world has ever seen. [...] The Russian peasant develops into a good soldier with surprising rapidity. In the first place, he is a splendid physical specimen [...] Judged from a physical standard, the Tsar’s subjects are all latent soldiers. On the mental side they are not wanting. The life they lead develops in each of them some degree of native shrewdness. No farmer in any land is without a fund of knowledge by which he solves most of the problems he meets in daily life. [...] He has also begun to appreciate the sport of war. A corporal and his squad in the somewhat informal Russian way asked to see their commanding officer. It was the night before the Russian New Year [...] “What is it my children?” The Russian captain is the father of his company. “To-morrow is New Year’s day, well-born. [...] We should like permission to go out to-night and catch a few Germans. It would be a New Year well begun.” It was just the sort of request I should have expected from some of my Irish non-commissioned officers in other years, but it was not what I was led to expect in the Russian army.

But for Seton-Watson, the most striking result of the partition of the empire would be the revival of the mediaeval kingdoms of Bohemia and Hungary as independent States. ‘Thus would be realised the dream of two races, the Czechs and Magyars, whose national revival forms one of the most romantic incidents of the nineteenth century.’

In Bohemia the Czechs, after losing their religious and civic liberty and enduring for two centuries the domination of the Germans, raised themselves once more in the course of two generations, by sheer force of character and tireless industry, to a position of equality, and reorganised their national life on an essentially democratic basis [...] The Czechs are beyond all question the most progressive, the most highly civilised, the most democratic of all Slavonic nations. The stubborn spirit of John Hus is still alive among them to-day, and their recent achievements in music, art, and industry are in every way worthy of the nation which has produced Comenius and Dvorak and first lit the torch of Reformation in Europe. The ancient city of Prague contains all the elements of culture necessary for the regeneration of Bohemia, and the mineral riches and industrial resources of the country are infinitely greater than those of many European States which have successfully led a separate national existence.26

The liberation of the Czechs would not be complete unless the Slovaks were included in the new Bohemian State, the Slovaks, who suffered from the gross tyranny of Magyar rule, their schools and institutions suppressed or reduced in numbers, their press muzzled, their political development arrested, their culture and traditions discouraged and hampered at every turn. ‘The Slovaks are a race whose artistic and musical gifts, whose innate sense of colour and poetry have won the

26 Idem, p.124.
sympathy and admiration of all who know them; and their systematic oppression at
the hands of the Magyar oligarchy is one of the greatest infamies of the last fifty
years.’ Unless British statesmen renounce that principle of nationality that they
have so loudly proclaimed, the Slovaks cannot be abandoned to their fate, for they
form an essential part of the Bohemian problem. The Slovak districts form the
natural continuation of Bohemia and are the necessary link between it and Russia,
upon whose moral support the new State must rely.27 The main difficulty that
would remain would be the fate of racial minorities:

the natural solution would be to pare down Bohemia by assigning to the
neighbouring provinces of Germany the German fringe which almost
completely surrounds the Czech kernel. So far as the south-west and north-east
districts of Bohemia (near Budweis and along the German Silesian border) are
concerned, the historic boundaries might fairly be revised on ethnographic lines,
and in the same way the line of demarcation between Bohemia and Hungary could
in the main be made to follow the racial boundary between Slovak and Magyar and
later between Slovak and Ruthene. But in the north of Bohemia there are
insurmountable objections to any revision of the historic frontier of the
kingdom; for not merely is its industrial life concentrated to a very
considerable degree in the German districts, but this fact is responsible for the
existence of important Czech industrial minorities, which it would be difficult to
sacrifice. So far as there is to be any sacrifice, it must be made by the losers rather
than by the winners in this war. But it ought to be possible, under the rule of some
carefully selected western prince as ruler of Bohemia, to devise proper
administrative guarantees for the linguistic rights of minorities in every mixed
district of Bohemia, whether it be Czech or German.28

Finally, what is to be the fate of the German provinces of Austria? If the
map of Europe is to be recast on a basis of nationality, Seton-Watson holds that one
cannot withhold from the great German nation that right to racial unity which
would be accorded to the Czechs, the Poles and many minor races. The seven
German provinces, reconstituted as a kingdom of Austria under the House of
Habsburg and augmented by the German population of western Hungary, would
become an additional federal unit in the German Empire. And if Germany lost
Alsace-Lorraine and Posen, the loss would be made good by the incorporation of
German Austria. The result would be the subtraction of six million inhabitants and
the addition of eight million others, a transaction that would not unduly alarm the
British Jingo, and at the same time might render defeat less galling to the German
patriot. However, the idea of admitting eight million additional Catholic subjects

27 Idem, p. 126.
28 Idem, p.127.
into Germany might arouse misgivings in Prussia among the stricter Protestants and the far more active section of “intellectuals” who merely regard Protestantism as a political asset in the struggle against Latin and Slavonic influences. The Austrian voters would greatly strengthen the two parties to whose existence Prussia has never become reconciled—the Clerical Centre and the Social Democratic Left, while contributing little to the parties of the Conservative Junkers or the middle-class “Liberals.” The influence of Austrian Germans, already so marked in literature, art, music, and above all in political theory, might make itself felt in other spheres also. The influence of the Catholic Church was indeed still great in the Austrian Empire, and Seton-Watson may have been right in reading future German scepticism into a plan of ethnic German amalgamation. The Habsburg had a long tradition of close relations with the Vatican, a connection perhaps tighter than the alliance with Protestant Prussia.

CE 24 March 1915
Austria and the Pope.
Despatch of Special Courier.
Paris, Tuesday. - A message from Rome states that a courier from the Austrian Imperial Court arrived there and went direct to the Vatican. It is stated in high ecclesiastical circles, the message adds, that this courier was instructed to convey to the Sovereign Pontiff an autograph letter in which the Emperor Francis Joseph begged Benedict XV to release him from certain oaths which he had formally taken in the interests of the peace of his empire and his dynasty. It is interesting to note that these oaths included declarations never to cede without armed resistance an inch of territory, never to recognise the spoliation of the temporal power of the Pope, and never to abdicate. All sorts of conclusions are being drawn from this information. – Reuter.

Moving on to the Irish perspective on the war, there were no doubts as to the causes from the viewpoint of the Cork Examiner, supporting Redmond’s recruiting drive, in close association with the Catholic Church of Ireland.
CE 1 January 1915

1914 – A Retrospect

[…] This time twelvemonth, only three indications of strife were to be found in widely separated parts of the globe, and none of them were looked on as serious. A revolution in Mexico was dying out; there was some chronic bickering in the Balkans; and, here, at home in Ireland, we were threatened with civil war if Home Rule was put into operation. All these things are now forgotten in the light of the conflagration that is raging through Europe and directly or indirectly affects the whole world. Men have been for a quarter of a century dreaming and writing of the next great war […]. There were people, too, who, with a fair regard for the progress (if progress it can be called) made by modern science, looked forward, to see to what extent the new implements and systems, largely constructed on theoretical calculations, would work out in practice. No war had yet given a real scope to modern science […]. The immediate cause of the war is, as everybody ought to know, the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, heir to the Austrian throne, at Sarajevo, on the 23rd June. The Austrians held it was the outcome of a Servian conspiracy in Bosnia, and relations became strained between those unequally matched countries. Having, in view the fate of Bosnia, a few years ago, many saw in the Austrian attitude an attempt at annexation, as well as vengeance. Russia stepped in to the aid of Servia; Germany sided with Austria; France came to the aid of Russia, and England was involved in the question of the neutrality of Belgium. What the verdict of future historians will be as regards the real cause of the war is another matter. Some see in the preparedness of Germany a solution to the problem; others assign other causes. […] The sympathy of the Irish people as a whole was with the Allies in this fight against Prussian militarism. A good many in the past had a high admiration for the German nation and for what it accomplished in the fields of art, literature and science. But whatever lingering sympathy may have existed in the minds of any section of Irishmen was utterly dispelled by the barbarous treatment of the Belgians, and the burning of Louvain, which had so many interesting connections with Ireland in the dark days of her history, caused a wave of horror to pass over this country […] thousands of Irishmen have joined the colours, in addition to the tens of thousands already serving. An Irish Division – or, as it is more popularly termed, an Irish Brigade – has been formed. The Irish regiments at the front have rendered an extremely good account of themselves in every battle in which they were engaged […]. The Ulster question was one might say forgotten in the much greater question of defending the country as a whole. Irish Nationalists gave proof that while in the past they did not regard the defence of England or the British Empire as any immediate concern of theirs, they were now, that England had kept faith with them, and that she was waging not a war of aggression but one in defence of the integrity of a small nation, they were prepared to support her to the utmost of their ability […]. When the time comes to put the Act into operation it is not improbable that the differences between the two sections of Irishmen will have been very appreciably turned down, and a settlement will be easily arrived at. One remarkable feature of the past year was the growth of the Irish Volunteer movement. Twelve months ago it had no official recognition, but there was something in the movement which had a strong attraction for young Irishmen, and when the Irish National leader formally approved of the organisation

beyond all doubt that the sympathy of the Pope and of Cardinal Gaspari are with France and her Allies. – Reuter.
corps sprang up almost spontaneously all over the country. [...] For some time the Volunteers had much difficulty in obtaining arms owing to restrictions imposed by the authorities on the landing of military arms. This resulted in gun-running at various parts of the coast. The opening year promised a continuance and increase of the wave of prosperity that has been flowing over Ireland for some years back. [...] The manufacturing industries and the commerce of the country did not sustain any set-back until the outbreak of the war [...]. However, as regards Ireland, it is doubtful whether the war has caused any material loss on either manufactures or commerce, as a whole, while undoubtedly it has caused increased activity in some departments. Happily the country was free from serious labour disputes during the year. The great Dublin strike which started in 1913 dragged on for part of 1914 until it was finally settled [...].

Roger Casement came to the fore in the Irish media in this year, and though unremarkable concerning Irish politics until this point in time, Casement now appeared in a distinctly poor light for the scandalous path he had chosen. Although in keeping with his previous endeavours for suppressed peoples, such as the widely appreciated Putumayo report of 1912, the Irish were no longer as suppressed as he believed and seemingly did not require a champion for their cause. John Redmond still had the country’s confidence, Sinn Féin evolving steadfastly in the wings. Casement had no wish to be marginalized and seized all options open to him with his diplomatic background to further the Irish cause of independence at full throttle. The non-nationalist Irish press fed the populace on mock and derision of Casement and his ilk. Most of the mockery was in connection with a German scholar, Kuno Meyer, who had been a prominent member of the Royal Academy in Dublin, for his role in furthering the studies of the Gaelic language and its literature, and had

32 The Cork Examiner appealed to a population largely involved in agriculture, labour disputes belonging to the realms of cities greater than Cork. Traditionally also, unions and labour disputes did fit the pattern of a Catholic country and in the same way Martin Luther did not support peasant revolts in Europe, neither did the Liberator, Daniel O’Connell hold with consolidated labour and their issues. Cf. J.Clarkson Dunsmore, Labour and Nationalism in Ireland (Columbia University Press, 1925). Cf. also Emmet O’Connor’s paper on ‘Labour History in Other Lands: Ireland’: The first problem is what might be called a limited and broken popular memory of labour history, and a narrow conception of the subject. In the 1970s there was a consensus that Ireland had “little labour history,” and less of any importance. Most people understood “history” to mean political history; and politically, the left in Ireland was marginal. Since independence, successive generations have been schooled in the nationalist orthodoxy, which presented the past as a series of struggles against foreign occupation. Labour intruded into the story in only two respects; the Dublin lock-out of 1913, and the Easter Rising of 1916, in which James Connolly and his Citizen Army fought alongside the Irish Volunteers. (Footnote 2: The memory of the lock-out survived partly because of the scale of the dispute: some 25,000 workers were locked out for over four months. Labour leader Jim Larkin's theatrical flair for myth and imagery also ensured that the Dublin conflict was well remembered.) [Labour] underwent a heroic phase of struggle between 1907 and 1923, but from then to the 1950s the movement was bedevilled by internal divisions, from which no one emerged with any great credit. William O’Brien, for example, refused to take his memoirs beyond 1923, although he did not retire as general secretary of the Irish Transport and General Workers’ Union until 1946. Cf. Inter alia, Michael Gallagher, Political Parties in the Republic of Ireland (Manchester, 1985), and William O’Brien, Forth the Banners Go (Dublin 1969).
been made a freeman of both Dublin and Cork in 1912. However, once war broke out, his ultimate empathy lay with the German people, and thus his reputation in Ireland was significantly marred. On the outbreak of war, Meyer left Ireland for the United States, where he lectured, among others, to Clan na Gael. Meyer's pro-German opinions caused predictable outrage in Britain and Ireland, and he was removed from the roll of freemen in Dublin and Cork, and his Honorary Professorship of Celtic at Liverpool.

CE 2 January 1915
Dublin and Kuno Meyer. Alderman Quaid sends us for publication the following correspondence:

My Dear Alderman Quaid – I beg to acknowledge receipt of your favour of the 28th inst. If Professor Kuno Meyer is seeking to suggest in America that any section of public opinion in Ireland worth considering is antagonistic to the interests of Great Britain and her allies in the present world-wide war, he is simply making an absolutely false representation of the facts. During the last three months I have had the opportunity of travelling a good deal throughout Ireland, and I have never known such a complete unanimity of feeling as that to be found in favour of the movement which stands for the smashing of Prussian civilisation, as it is now understood. The enormous demonstrations which Mr. Redmond has addressed should make it impossible for even a Professor with a lively imagination to distort or misconstrue the position. – Yours faithfully, Lorcan G. Sherlock.

31st Dec., 1914.

My Lord Mayor – As your lordship’s letter of yesterday avoids intimating any intentions of taking action to remove the stigma on the city escutcheon owing to the inclusion of Professor Kuno Meyer’s name on the Honorary Roll of City Freemen, I am proceeding in the matter myself. – I am, my Lord Mayor, yours faithfully, - D.A. Quaid. The Right Hon. The Lord Mayor of Dublin, Mansion House, Dublin.

To explain further the stigma now attaching to Kuno Meyer, the following article in the Examiner details the activities of Meyer in the States:

CE 4 January 1915
Ireland and the War.
T. P. O’Connor on Professor Kuno Meyer. “Palpable Mendacity”

Kuno Meyer (1858 – 1919) was a Celtic scholar. He studied at the University of Leipzig, and received his doctorate for ‘Eine irische Version der Alexandersage’ in 1884. He continued to publish on Irish and Celtic language topics, and in 1904 Meyer became Professor in the Celtic Languages at the Royal Irish Academy and editor of Ériu, the journal of the School of Irish Studies in Dublin (now part of the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies). He had acquired a thorough knowledge of Modern Irish and the Irish literary tradition from the substantial community of speakers and native experts in Cork and its hinterland during his youth. He held a full-time appointment for two years as professor at the School, and then in 1909 was appointed to the Chair of Early and Medieval Irish at University College, Dublin. [http://www.ucc.ie/celt/] 20.10.06, University College Cork, online resource for Irish history, literature and politics.
In response to an invitation by the Central News for an expression of opinion in regard to the speech of Professor Kuno Meyer, which is alleged to have been delivered to an Irish audience in New York, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, M.P., has made the following reply: - “The resentment which Professor Kuno Meyer’s speech has created in Ireland may be judged from the comments of the “Freeman’s Journal,” the chief Nationalist organ in Ireland. ‘Dr. Kuno Meyer’, says the ‘Freeman,’ ‘appears to be inflected with some of the least admirable qualities of his race.’ ‘I’, said Mr. O’Connor, ‘don’t wish to use language so harsh to one of Dr. Meyer’s intellectual gifts and amiable personality, but I cannot restrain a feeling of disappointment that the Professor should try to exploit the respect which his contributions to Celtic literature have won him among Irishmen, to tempt them to courses at ruinous and base. It is characteristic of the gentlemen in Berlin who have sent Dr. Meyer on this mission to the Irish in America, that with cold calculation and selfish regard for the interests of German militarism they should instruct Dr. Meyer to ask Irishmen to make Ireland the tool and the victim of German policy.

“Statesmen who acted to Belgium as they did cannot surprise anybody by endeavouring to make Ireland another Belgium. What are Irish Nationalists asked to do? To fight against the principle of nationality – the principle for which Ireland has fought during seven centuries of repeated defeat, and has now finally vindicated. Irish Nationalists are to help Germany in destroying the principle of nationality in the case of Belgium, of France, of the poles, the Danes, and the Frenchmen of Germany, and, finally, in the case of the slaves of Germany’s ally in Austro-Germany. “Ireland, a small nation, is to lend her forces to the extinction of other small races like Belgium and Serbia. To Germany Ireland has never owed anything. To France Ireland looked, and not in vain, for sympathy and help during Ireland’s darkest hours. In Belgian schools, as at Louvain, the Irish student found for centuries the learning he could not get at home. And these ancient friends, Celtic lands like Ireland, democratic communities like the Irish, are to find Irishmen fighting against and helping the savage invasion of Germany to conquer and hold them down. So far as England is concerned, our fight is over, because Ireland has conquered the convictions and the goodwill of the English people. It was part of the contract in the fight for Home Rule that if England conceded good Government, Ireland should concede goodwill, and this treaty Ireland cannot with honour treat as a scrap of paper.

As to the promises of a separate and independent Ireland which Dr. Meyer professes to offer Ireland in return for abandoning the policy of national honour and national safety, it is not his or his country’s to give, and if Germany could conquer England and rule Ireland, I assume that Ireland would have the same toleration for her National aspirations and her language as Germany so generously bestows on her poles, her Danes and her Frenchmen. But Dr. Meyer knows that the German Navy has as much chance of invading Ireland successfully as of reaching the moon. If Ireland, then, sold her honour to the German master he could not pay the price. “Some of the statements which Dr. Meyer makes with regard to the Irish soldiers who are prisoners in Germany, and who, he suggests, are ready to join a German expedition, excite fierce and justly fierce resentment in Ireland. The “Freeman’s Journal” calls the suggestion a lie and an insult to the Irish soldiers. This statement is accompanied by another pro-German advocate to the effect that the Munster Fusiliers ‘wiped out’ the Scottish Borderers in France. Any propaganda may be easily judged which requires such absurd and palpable mendacity to build it up. Ireland has a right, according to every honest, sincere and sane supporter she has found in America, to choose her own leader and her own
policy. Her leader is Mr. Redmond, her policy is the support of the principle of nationality of small nations, of democracy and civilisation against the mediaeval barbarism of German militarism. Any other course would mean the dishonour and the destruction of the Irish cause at the hour when Ireland’s leader and Ireland’s policy have brought her to security and liberty.34

Believing Casement to have the ear or at least his finger on the pulse of the Irish at home, Kuno Meyer enthusiastically embraced the Irish patriot in spirit, himself in America to arouse Nationalists sympathy for the German-Irish cause.

CE 15 February 1915
Professor Kuno Meyer and Sir Roger Casement.35
("Times" War Telegram, per P. A. – Copyright)
The “Times” says – According to a report in the Continental “Times,” which is published in English in Berlin and scattered broadcast over the continent for the purposes of the German Government, Professor Kuno Meyer, in his notorious speech in Brooklyn, included the following in an enthusiastic reference to Sir Roger Casement: “When I met him the words of the old song kept running in my head, with some slight variations:
‘I met with Roger Casement, And I took him by the hand, And I said, How is poor Ireland, And how does she stand? Oh, she’s the most distressful country That ever yet was known, For they’re shooting men and women In the streets of Dublin town.’

By March, Roger Casement’s thoughts on the causes of the war were not only in circulation among sympathisers in America, but had caught the attention also of the Irish press, mystified by the seemingly treacherous exploits of a knighted servant of the Queen.

34 CE 25 January 1915, London Correspondent: ‘[…] The Germans have decided to invade Ireland. The business forms an important part of the plan of the German headquarters. The visit will almost certainly take the form of an invasion, or attempted invasion, by water. The enemy plan is built upon the notion that the arrival of a German force upon the coast would inspire the Irish people to rise up and throw off the English yoke, and looks to the advantage to be gained from keeping in Ireland the troops at present in the country, and demanding the transfer to Ireland of large reinforcements from the armies at present in Great Britain, thus preventing the despatch to France and Belgium of large numbers of the Kitchener armies, and thus easing for the enemy the situation on the western battlefield. Such is the substance of a silly and confident story sent to the ‘Sunday Chronicle’ by the Dublin correspondent of that paper.’
35 CE 15 February 1915: Sir Roger Casement. Ridiculous Story. (P. A. War Special). ‘The German and Austrian newspapers are publishing a letter purporting to have been written by Sir Roger Casement to Sir Edward Grey, narrating in detail the alleged attempt by the British Minister at Christiania to bribe a Norwegian servant of Sir Roger’s to assist in putting him away. The “Handelsblad,” which reproduces the statements made in the letter, ridicules the whole story.’
CE 1 March 1915
Sir Roger Casement

One of the strange series of articles written by Sir Roger Casement for private circulation among his friends long before the war was thought of appears in the “New Statesman.” These secret articles have been collected by Professor Kuno Meyer, and have been published by the Celtic press at Philadelphia. In one of the articles “The duty of Christendom,” written last November, Sir Roger wrote: - “The day the first German comrade lands in Ireland, the day the first German war ship is seen proudly breasting the waters of the Irish Sea with the flag of Ireland at her fore, that day many Irishmen must die, but they shall die in the sure peace of God that Ireland may live.” In the “Freedom of the Seas” he wrote “A victorious Germany must so draft her peace conditions as to preclude her great antagonist from ever again seriously imperilling the freedom of the seas. I know of no way save one to make free the open seas – Ireland, in the name of Europe, must be withdrawn from British custody and restored to Europe.” In March, 1913, Sir Roger was writing “as an Irishman I have no fear for Ireland from German triumph. I pray for it.”

To counteract possible accusations of sedition and perfidy, the Parliamentary Party lost no time in assuring not only the British but also the influential Irish vote in America of their loyalty to constitutionalism and economy.

CE 23 October 1915
Ireland and the War. American Tribute To Irish Party’s Action. Testimony to Mr. Redmond’s Statesmanship.

The following appears in the “Lowell Sun,” Mass., USA: -

The campaign which was started soon after the outbreak of the European war to vilify, discredit and malign the Irish Parliamentary Party has now spent its force, and the only result attained is to stir up a certain class of men who never did much for the Irish cause beyond criticising those who have been on the firing line through thick and thin for the past thirty years. There is no secret as to who is at the bottom of the movement. Germany had hoped that Ireland would rise in rebellion as soon as the war started. She had her agents ready to put money into the movement, and they undoubtedly found a certain type of Irish men not only in Ireland but in this country ready to accept whatever loose cash they had to spare. Sir Roger Casement spent some time in Germany and was credited with being the apostle of the movement: but although there was good reason to doubt his honesty of purpose, so far as Ireland is concerned, he helped materially in the opposition to Mr. Redmond and the policy of constitutional agitation by which Ireland has already accomplished a peaceful revolution, the real fruits of which cannot be fully realised until after the war. […] The campaign was planned to aid

---

36 CE May 5 1915 :Sir Roger Casement. Inquiries made in Dublin to-day have elicited that there is no foundation for the statement which has gained circulation to the effect that Sir Roger Casement would be put forward by the Sinn Féin Party as a candidate for the College Green division of Dublin for the seat rendered vacant by the death of Mr. Nannetti.

37 In August 1915, Irish Volunteers were subjected to the first campaign to end in enormous bloodshed and loss of lives, at Suvly Bay. This event, detailed in the Conclusion, was largely kept out of the non-nationalist press for fear of compromising recruitment, paved the way for nationalist policy, fulminating in the Easter Rising of 1916, and Sinn Féin election success in 1918.
Germany and not Ireland, and it was similar to the attempt made to precipitate a rebellion in India where the leaders were arrested and are still in prison. [...] In this war the fate of Ireland is linked with that of England, and if she attempted to remain neutral or to oppose England, as the pro-German shouters would have her do, she would simply become the ally of Germany, and would undoubtedly pay the penalty for such madness. Such a course would be on a par with that of the dog that, while crossing the stream with a bone in its mouth, dropped the bone to grasp at its shadow in the water. Ireland by her present course is serving her own best interests, and should not heed the attacks upon her tried and true leaders by men who are not above suspicion, and whose aim is to bring destruction and defeat. We venture to predict that after the war the differences between Ulster and the rest of Ireland will disappear, and that even Mr. Carson will join Mr. Redmond and the other leaders in building up a prosperous Irish nation under the fostering care of the new Irish Parliament.

The Catholic Church had given their full backing to John Redmond and the Parliamentary Party. Considering the emancipation and education of Catholics a fait accompli, there appeared no reason to continue unnecessary hostility towards England. Independence was not central to Irish politics at the time, merely the sincere wish for self-rule and a central role in the running in the Empire, as elsewhere in Europe and beyond. The Irish Republican Brotherhood had by this time been excommunicated, the Church taking the same anti-rebel stance as it had since the rising of Wolfe Tone.

CE 18 November 1915
Duty of Irishmen. Tipperary Priest’s Speech.
Speaking at a recruiting meeting in Cahir, Rev. W. P. Burke, C. C. said – We are now, to my mind, confronted with the most serious crisis that has occurred for three hundred years – since Cromwell made preparation at Bristol for the invasion of Ireland. Don’t think it is England’s fight only. As sure as England goes down, we will go down, too (applause). If England goes down, and if the spiked helmets come into sight of Ireland, do you think that Professor M’Neill and

39 The IRB, or Fenians, were often threatened by excommunication, Pope Pius IX officially placing the Church ban on them in 1870, which has to date not been rescinded. Cf. also Nelson J. Callahan and William F. Hickey, Irish Americans and Their Communities of Cleveland (Cleveland Ethnic Heritage Studies series, Cleveland State University 1978), p.109/10: ‘Since the Catholic Emancipation Act had been passed by Parliament only a few short decades before (1829), the Irish bishops wanted no rocking of the governmental boat, especially by a group of wild-eyed revolutionaries. When Charles Stewart Parnell and others founded the Irish National Land League and encouraged the peasants to withhold rent from their landlords, the bishops, in return for certain favors by English government officials, condemned the plan as immoral - the peasants were guilty of thievery - and threatened anyone so doing with excommunication. [...] The Irish have never been an anti-clerical people. They had shared too much mutual suffering with the clergy and had seen too many priests go to the gallows on their behalf for that. However, after the Irish bishops sided with the British government in the mid-19th Century, they lost their affection for men of that clerical rank. The kindest words the Irish accorded their bishops was they had to act as they did, lest the Church would have lost its government dole.’
the Sinn Féin Party can keep them out of Ireland? No. In this matter we are all in the same boat. For fifty years this German cloud has hung over Europe. Fifty-one years ago Germany crushed Denmark; four years afterwards the Austrians went under to the Germans; and six years later France […]. Tell me, as reasonable men, if the Germans are going to treat Ireland differently from Poland? Believe me, my friends, this is a war of conquest and the Germans mean to exchange the arid wastes of the Baltic and the sands of Brandenburg for the rich pastures of Ireland.

This had proved to be especially called for in the aftermath of the disastrous Suvla Bay campaign of August 1915. Casement’s exploits at the POW camps in Germany had been an embarrassment, the pride in the Allied cause seemingly overriding nationalist sentiments, the loyalty among the soldiers apparently too great. If this Irish loyalty to the crown could not be shaken on battlegrounds or prison camps, where, it must be remembered, Irish soldiers were lead by British officers, it could be called in question at home. There has been a plethora of history books of late, which concentrate on Ireland’s role in the Great War, most particularly Jeff Kildea’s Anzacs and Ireland, bestowing special attention on the effects of the Suvla Bay campaign of August 1915 upon the spirit of nationalism and recruitment drives.

On the morning of 7 August, while the men of the 3rd Light Horse Brigade were being sacrificed at the Nek and the 29th Brigade was waiting at Anzac Cove in support of the main force, the remainder of the 10th (Irish) Division was landing at Suvla Bay. The scandalous failure of Lieutenant General Sir Frederick Stopford, the elderly yet inexperienced commander, to order his corps to advance immediately from the beachhead and seize the high ground when landing was relatively unopposed is notorious […]. For Australians, Suvla is considered a bad joke, an irrelevance synonymous with inertia which […] provokes a smirk or a sneer of inverted colonial snobbery. However, for the Irish, Suvla is no joke. Coming at a sensitive time in the relationship between Britain and Ireland, with the divisive issue of home rule having been tentatively put on hold, it became politicised, symbolising the waste of young Irish lives and English indifference.

---

40 Jeff Kildea, Anzacs and Ireland, p.41/42. Cf. Also p.47: For some it was Gallipoli rather than the Easter Rising of 1916 that marked ‘the moment their feelings towards the British began to turn.’

41 CE April 1916.Uproarious Scenes. Sir Roger Casement’s Position. Von Tirpitz’s Resignation.Amsterdam, Saturday. - Yesterday’s sitting of the Reichstag was again marked by uproarious scenes. The military estimates came up for debate, and votes for the military camps were being discussed.Dr.Liebknecht (Socialist), intervening in the debate, said – I repeat that I have documents in my hands showing that agreement was made between the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Herr Zimmermann, and Sir Roger Casement, by which British prisoners of war were to be drilled to fight against England.

42 James Connelly believed opposition to republicanism was stifled by ‘economic conscription,’ cf. Keith Jeffery, Ireland and the Great War (CUP, 2000) p.47.

43 Thomas P. Dooley, Irishmen or English Soldiers (Liverpool University Press, 1995); Jeffery, Ireland and the Great War; also mentioned in Frank Callanan’s biography of Tim Healy, T.M.Healy (Cork University Press, 1996).
The 10th (Irish) Division suffered severely during the Suvla campaign, being not only inexperienced, but also ill-equipped and under strength. […] Over the following weeks they suffered heavy casualties, particularly in the assault on the high ridge of Kiritch Tepe Sirt, which had been reinforced by the Turks following Stopford’s delay in moving from the beachhead. Their plight was not helped when, in the middle of the battle, their divisional commander, Lieutenant General Bryan Mahon, resigned in a fit of pique, after he was passed over for promotion to corps commander following [the sacking] of General Stopford on 15 August […]. Attack after attack failed to dislogde the Turks and when the action was called off more than a third [1300 men] of the attacking force had been killed or wounded.

These losses, which were the first experienced as such since recruitment of volunteers began in August 1914, had a deeper impact at home than previously imagined. Although it would be difficult to find a contemporary military report in a pro-recruiting paper - such as the Cork Examiner at the time - condemning the campaign at Suvla, it is by far more revealing to consider the implications for both sides of the recruitment drives in the months leading up to the Easter Rising.

Because of their dampening effects on recruitment, Redmond did not acknowledge increasing doubts and misgivings in his public statements. […] None the less, a speech by Redmond in Waterford during August 1915 in which he proudly referred to the gallantry of the 10th (Irish) Division at the recent Suvly Bay landings, was well received. ‘Already,’ he told the gathering, ‘we have seen in the casualty list the toll which has been paid by these gallant brothers of ours from the Curragh and from Dublin.’

The Cork Examiner, supporting Redmond and his party politics, continued to print speeches at recruitment drives, which invariably placed the loss and carnage suffered by Irish soldiers within its mythical perspective.

44 Cf. Jeffery, Ireland and the great War, p.42: Bursting with the enthusiasm of youth, the poet Francis Ledwidge, who was with the Inniskilling Fusiliers at Kiritch Tepe Sirt, wrote that ‘it was a horrible and a great day. I would not have missed it for worlds.’
45 Thomas P. Dooley, Irishmen or English Soldiers (Liverpool University Press, 1995). In her 1919 Memoirs, Katharine Tynan, Irish poet and novelist, wrote: There was a rather sad visit to Dublin the September of 1915, for Lord and Lady Aberdeen were going to America; and before that there had been Suvla Bay, when blow after blow fell day after day on one’s heart. So many of our friends had gone out in the 10th Division to perish at Suvla. For the first time came bitterness, for we felt that their lives had been thrown away and that their heroism had gone unrecognised. Suvla – the burning beach, and the poisoned wells, and the blazing scrub, does not bear thinking on. Dublin was full of mourning, and on the faces one met there was a hard brightness of pain as though the people’s hearts burnt in the fire and were not consumed… One met mourners everywhere… At least we started with utter enthusiasm for the war and its purposes. One did not know all that would happen, how it would drag and drag, till weariness of it and longing for it to end overcame all other feelings.
46 Dooley, Irishmen or English Soldiers, p.137: In the opinion of some, public speaking was of little use in recruiting as there was a ‘national tolerance’ of oratory. We go to public meetings willingly and cheer whatever is said to us, but we do not enlist merely because we are told to do so in resounding periods.
CE 17 December 1915
Recruiting Meeting in Dingle.
Canon O’Leary and the Sinn Féiners.

A recruiting meeting was held in Dingle on Sunday immediately after last Mass at which stirring speeches were delivered by Very Rev. R. Canon O’Leary, P.P., V.F., D.D., who presided; Mr. D.J. Reidy, Castleisland, Sergeant major O’Rahilly (Connaught Rangers) and Mr. T.P. O’Donnell, M.P.

The band of the Munster Fusiliers attended and played some stirring airs. [...] Just as the meeting started a number of local Sinn Féiners collected at the bridge, at the lower end of the town and kept cheering and shouting during the progress of the recruiting meeting. [...] The Very Rev. Chairman said it might be [...] supposed that because there was some small number in this district who did not approve of the objects of the meeting and showed their disapproval in a certain way (A voice – They are Carsonites), it might be said that because of this he was afraid of them (cries of “no”). Well he was there to show in the first place that he was not afraid of them (cheers). [...] All the men of worth and intelligence and everything else worth considering were in favour of getting a sufficient number of soldiers to keep out of our country the Huns and the Turks who want to overrun the whole of Europe – our own Country included (cheers).

 [...] Mr. Denis J.Reidy, Castleisland, who was cheered on rising, said he came there on the invitation of the gallant and brilliant representative of the constituency, Mr.Thomas O’Donnell (cheers) to associate himself with his work and the work of the men of Ireland [...]. He said the men of Ireland advisedly because it was the fighting men of Ireland had gone into the trenches and the cowards and humbugs and little blackguards, remained at home (hear, hear and cheers). Those who had gone and were going to the front had the true blood and the true fighting instincts of the chivalrous Irish race, while the cowards who disrespected their religion, their country and their race were shouting cries from the corners (hear, hear). He proceeded to deal with the whole situation from a purely National standpoint comparing the failures of all physical force movements of the past, with the great success of the constitutional movement culminating in the winning of Home Rule by John Redmond and the Irish Party [...]. Sergeant Major O’Rahilly [...] would not like to say hard things to those young fellows, as he believed them to be hypnotised and carried away from the path of their fathers by ingenious individuals, whose mission amongst them was the lure of lusty gold. He pitied those youths who were in the enemy’s camp, and tarnished the glorious reputation of hundreds of thousands of our gallant countrymen in the battlefields of Flanders and the Dardanelles. [...] Ireland’s cause and honour were getting weighed at present by the whole civilized world [...]. It would be wrong to conclude, said the Sergeant Major, that because Sir Edward Carson and the leaders of the Sinn Féin movement were against recruiting by not identifying themselves with Mr.John Redmond, that the followers of those people, in all cases, were against recruiting. Such was not the case [...]. He could get no warmer reception then he got in the towns and districts in the north of Ireland, where the population was almost entirely Orange and Unionist, and not alone did they give men, but their expressions of friendship and goodwill towards their South of Ireland brothers, from whom they were sadly separated in the past, was such that it left no doubt on his mind about entering on a new happy and united Ireland, that would build herself in a future prosperity and contentment that would astonish Europe and the whole world (applause). [...] What better proof of a United Ireland could they have than Orange and green fighting side by side in the
trenches, and Protestant and Catholic, Unionist and Nationalist, together on their recruiting platforms. 47 [If] Robert Emmet, Wolfe Tone and Lord Edward Fitzgerald were that day alive they would be on this platform helping under the Very Rev. and distinguished Chairman to procure help to go and strike a blow for Ireland’s sake and the cause of justice (applause). […] Remember that Ireland is now a new Ireland, restitution has been made for the wrongs done us in the past, and the teaching of our holy faith is to forgive as we would wish to be forgiven.48

47 CE 1 January 1916. Ireland and Compulsion. Action of Unionist Alliance. The following is a copy of the resolution adopted by the Executive Committee of the Irish Unionist Alliance on the subject of compulsory national service – “That this committee, representing the Unionist opinion of the three Southern provinces, desires to place on record its opinion that in the event of a scheme of national service being introduced by the government, it would be a national disgrace if Ireland were excluded or any differentiation made in regard to this country.”

48 Although, there always were, particularly among the lower rungs of church hierarchy, the parish priests and curates who would not usher their flock unthinkingly into British arms, and recall instead their first duty to their country and culture.

CE 1 January 1915. [Anniversary of death of Fr.John Casey, parish priest of Valentia, Co.Kerry – oration by John Murphy, ex-M.P. for South Kerry. Excerpt:] As a patriot, he stood out before them all, surrounded by proofs of his devotion to the cause of Ireland (cheers). Michael Davitt said that Ireland owed a debt of endless gratitude to priests like Father Casey, and the memorial under which they stood and the meeting there that day were proofs of the readiness of the people in all conditions to show that gratitude (cheers). With a hundred Father Caseys Ireland’s freedom would be won under any conditions (cheers). He was constant, unchanging, and wise in his actions in all things (cheers). To the Irish people at home and abroad his name was an inspiration and hope (cheers) […]. In the day or night he was ever at their disposal, animated by the same proud purpose – the betterment of his people, the liberty of his country, and the unchanging motto of his life was “Ireland over all” (loud cheers). What a proud record it was for him then to be able to say in 1901 that 22,000 out of the 25,000 acres in his beloved Abbeyfeale were owned by the people, and that the landlords had to go (cheers)? Cromwell would go down before the spirit inspired by Father Casey, and landlordism went (cheers). […] He read one day in an English newspaper that their motto was: “Beer, Bacon, Beef, Britannia, and Bull-dog Breed.” (laughter). He hoped Ireland would remember instead the motto of Father Casey: “Land, language, and liberty” (cheers).

CE 18 November 1915. The National Cause. North Kerry Rally. Meetings in causeway and Ballyheigue. Successful meetings were held on Sunday at Causeway and Ballyheigue, when branches of the United Irish League were re-established. […] Canon Hayes, speaking at Ballylongford the other day, said rightly that the United Irish League was the lineal descendant of the Land League and the Irish National League, identified with the names of Parnell and Davitt (cheers). The objects of these organisations were one and the same, namely, to win for Ireland a native Parliament in College Green and to get back the land of Ireland for the people of Ireland (cheers). […] and though Home Rule was on the Statute Book, they were told that if Ulster was included, Carson and the Orangemen of the North would rebel and revolt against constitutional authority. But the people of Ireland would not permit the fair Province of Ulster to be filled from them – the Province of the O’Neills and the O’Donnells (cheers), and that was one of the reasons why they should come into the League and insist that Ulster should remain part and parcel of Ireland […]. The Ballyheigue Meeting. Immediately after last Mass a large and representative meeting was held in the chapel yard. […] Rev. M.D.Allman, P.P., took the chair. He thanked them for asking him to preseide at that fine gathering. It was a position that he accepted with the greatest of pleasure. It was not a recruiting meeting (hear, hear), neither was it to be a meeting in favour of conscription (cheers), […] because he was of the opinion that while all the honour that could be paid to the brave man who volunteers to handle his gun and go and fight for the colours and the Empire, while all honour was due to such men, he did not think it was right for any man, especially an Irishman, to put any pressure to bear upon men to do so (hear, hear)
Excursus: T.M.Kettle - an Irish soldier in the army of Europe

On April 28 1915, CE records that Lieutenant Kettle Receives Staff Appointment. ‘It is understood that Lieutenant T. M. Kettle has received a staff appointment, and he will probably be transferred to the Belfast district.’ In a recent study, Ireland and the Great War, Kettle’s role as journalist, intellectual, and, finally, pro-Allies recruiter, shows him to have had a more immediate and intimate knowledge of the outbreak of the Great War than any of his political colleagues. Kettle’s support for the allied war effort was sparked by his horror at the events he witnessed in Belgium, but it was buttressed primarily by wider ideological considerations. ‘I have a confession’, he declared in 1915. ‘I care for liberty more than I care for Ireland.’ Kettle was sent to Belgium on a gun-buying mission for the Volunteers in 1914 when he heard the news of the German invasion and he remained in Belgium as a war correspondent for the Daily News for two months. ‘Little Belgium’, with a largely Catholic government, was held in high esteem and parallels with ‘Catholic Ireland’ were well established. Kettle had travelled to the continent as a student, studying the geography and languages of Germany, France and Belgium. Europe had become for him a sanctuary in times of distress, and he spent a year reading philosophy and history at Innsbruck University. His stay in Germany greatly influenced his developing philosophical and political thought. He admired Nietzsche in his youth, but denounced him when he saw in German militarism his philosophy made real. Kettle believed that ‘a natural alliance’ existed between England and Ireland and that the gulf between the two nations was but little more than misunderstanding, but nonetheless as prolific journalist he remained one of the most acerbic critics of British policy in Ireland, writing on various aspects of British mismanagement. In his publication ‘The Open Secret of Ireland’, with an introduction by John Redmond, MP (IPP), Kettle opens with a suitable proverb:

‘Also it is a proverbe of olde date, ’The pride of Fraunce, the treason of Inglande, and the warre of Irelande, shall never have ende.’ Which proverbe,
touching the warre of Irelande, is like alwaie to continue, without God sette in men's breasts to find some new remedy that never was found before.”

State Papers, Reign of Henry VIII.

Kettle wrote this paper before England had rehabilitated itself, in his eyes, first by passing the third Home Rule Bill in 1912 and then by taking up the Belgian cause. Here, however, the reader is given a taste of his extraordinary wit and insight into his personal crusade, before the Great War could influence his political rhetoric.

The Kingdom of Earth is to the thick-skinned, and bad manners have a distinct vital value. A man, too sensitive to the rights and the charms of others, is in grave danger of futility. Either he will become a dilettante, which is the French way, or he will take to drink and mystical nihilism, a career very popular in Russian fiction. Bad manners have indeed a distinct ethical value. We all experience moods in which we politely assent to the thing that is not, because of the fatigue of fighting for the thing that is. A temperament such as has been delineated is therefore, as human types go, an excellent type. But it has its peculiar perils. To ignore the point of view of those in whose country you eat, drink, sleep, and sight-see may breed only minor discords, and after all you will pay for your manners in your bill. But to ignore the point of view of those whose country you govern may let loose a red torrent of tragedy. Such a temper of mind may, at the first touch of resistance, transform your stolid, laudable, laughable Englishman into the beastliest of tyrants. It may drive him into a delirium of cruelty and injustice. It may sweep away, in one ruin of war, wealth, culture, and the whole fabric of civilisation. It may darken counsel, and corrupt thought. In fact, it may give you something very like the history of the English in Ireland. Now it is not denied that most Englishmen believe the English mind to be incapable of such excesses. This, they say, is the Russian in Warsaw, the Austrian in Budapest, the Belgian in the Congo, the blind fool-fury of the Seine. But it is not the English way. Nor is it suggested that this illusion is sheer and mere hypocrisy. It is simply a hallucination of jingoism. Take a trivial instance in point. We have all read in the newspapers derisive accounts of disorderly scenes in the French Chamber or the Austrian Reichstag; we all know the complacent sigh with which England is wont on such occasions to thank God that she is not as one of those. Does anybody think that this attitude will be at all modified by recent occurrences at Westminster? By no means. Lord Hugh Cecil, his gibbering and gesticulating quite forgotten, will be assuring the House next year that the Irish are so deficient in self-restraint as to be unfit for Home Rule. Mr Smith will be deploring that intolerant temper which always impels a Nationalist to shout down, and not to argue down an opponent. Mr Walter Long will be vindicating the cause of law and order in one sentence, and inciting “Ulster” to bloodshed in the next. This is not hypocrisy, it is genius. It is also, by the way, the genesis of the Irish Question. If anyone is disposed to underrate the mad passions of which race hatred can slip the leash, let him recall the crucial examples which we have had in our own time. We have in our own time seen Great Britain inflamed by two frenzies—against France, and against the Boer Republics. In the history of public opinion there are no two chapters more discreditable. In the days of Fashoda the Frenchman was a degenerate tigre-singe, the sworn enemy of...
religion and soap. He had contributed nothing to civilisation except a loathsome science of sensuality, and the taint of decay was in his bones. In the days of Spion Kop the Boer was an unlaunched savage, fit only to be a target for pig-stickers. His ignorance seemed the most appalling thing in the world until one remembered his hypocrisy and his cowardice. The newspaper which led the campaign of denigration against France has come to another view. Its proprietor now divides his time between signing L10,000 cheques for triumphant French aviators, and delivering speeches in which their nation is hailed as the pioneer of all great ideas. As regards the Boers, the same reversal of the verdict of ten years ago has taken place. The crowd which in 1900 asked only for a sour appletree on which to hang General Botha, adopts him in 1911 as the idol of the Coronation. At this progress towards sanity we must all rejoice. But most of all we have to ask that these two sinister pageants of race hatred shall not be suffered to dissolve without leaving some wrack of wisdom behind. Writers on psychology have made many studies of what they call the collective illusion. This strange malady, which consists in all the world seeing something which in fact does not exist, wrought more potently on the mind of England than did reason and justice in the Home Rule controversies of 1886 and 1893. What has occurred may recur. And since we are to speak here with all the candour of private conversation I confess that I cannot devise or imagine any specific against such a recurrence except an exercise in humility of the kind suggested by Mr Chesterton. My own argument in that direction is perhaps compromised by the fact that I am an Irishman. Let us therefore fall back on other testimony. Out of the cloud of witnesses let us choose two or three, and in the first place M. Alfred Fouillee. M. Fouillee is a Platonist—the last Platonist in Europe—and consequently an amiable man. He is universally regarded as the leader of philosophy in France, a position not in the least shaken by Bergson's brief authority. In a charming and lucid study of the “Psychology of the Peoples of Europe” Fouillee has many pages that might serve for an introduction to the Irish Question. The point of interest in his analysis is this: he exhibits Irish history as a tragedy of character, a tragedy which flows with sad, inevitable logic from a certain weakness which he notes, not in the Irish, but in the English character.52

52 Lyons, Ireland Since the Famine, p.187: ‘[There was a ] widely prevalent notion that whatever Gladstone might say and think, the Irish were still not to be trusted to rule themselves. There was, a recent authority has suggested, ‘a deep chasm between the Anglo-Saxonists, who argued that Irish character made the Irish unfit for self-government, and the environmentalists, who believed in the potential equality of mankind and contended that historical circumstances had made the Irish what they were. The suggestion here is that the opponents of home rule were, consciously or unconsciously, permeated by ‘Anglo-Saxonist’ attitudes which assumed an inherent superiority for those of Anglo-Saxon stock and a corresponding inferiority for others, including of course the ‘Celts’. Considerable evidence has been adduced to indicate that such ideas were more widely held by Victorean intellectuals than has generally been supposed, but of course racism was no monopoly of the educated classes. It reflected, also, popular prejudices about the Irish in Britain, working often at lowly and ill-paid employment, living in squalor, by turns sycophantic and aggressive, suspect in their religion, deposed (and sometimes feared) as drinking too deep and quarrelling too often. It fed also on the incidents inseparable from agrarian warfare – on the atrocities against animals, on the boycott, on the shootings and stabblings of Irishmen by other Irishmen. It was by no means impossible for ordinary British citizens, whatever their politics, to feel at one and the same time that the Irish were deeply to be pitied for their backwardness, their illiteracy, their supposed domination by their priests, they were fundamentally unsuited to have charge of their own affairs. This was a jaundiced view that could be changed, and presently would be changed, but it was unreasonable to expect it to change overnight or to find either in parliament or in the constituencies much sympathetic understanding of Gladstone’s insight into the Irish question.’
His notions were that Irish identity could not rest entirely on ‘native’ influences, he feared ‘Irish-Irelandism’ would exclude European ideas from Ireland, and hated the backward-looking and unintellectual way in which nationalists like Arthur Griffith simplified economic rejuvenation and cultural development. In short, he looked to Europe to internationalise Irish nationalism. Ireland could retain its strong links with the United Kingdom, but it should also realise its role in the larger context of continental history. Ireland was already in the mainstream of recent European political developments, and, he maintained, Ireland’s struggle for democracy and progress, including Catholic Emancipation and the abolition of tithes, was similar to campaigns in countries such as Belgium, Italy and Germany. Thus, he argued that ‘whatever gloomy mood we fall into in the struggle for autonomy we have certainly no justification for feeling lonely.’ Thus, the recognition of similarities between Irish and continental struggles supported not only Ireland’s claim to nationhood but also proved that the slow and arduous constitutional path towards Home Rule was the only legitimate one, particularly in view of the challenges posed by advanced nationalism to the Irish Party and its political programme. This meant that European citizenship carried obligations as well as privileges, and refusal to participate in the allied war effort was ‘tantamount to relinquishing any claim to such communion. As his wife later wrote, ‘It was as an Irish soldier in the army of Europe and civilisation that he entered the war.’ He considered the split among the Volunteers to be the first blow to the Irish war effort. His efforts to draw various forms of nationalism into the one movement were abandoned as a war of words erupted between Kettle and the anti-war press, because Kettle understood the value of propaganda:

The first thing I noticed on coming back to Ireland was the absence of cheap literature on the right side. You have a daily, a weekly, and a monthly all chorusing the praises of Germany, and denying her barbarities in Belgium.

In Belgium, meanwhile, the Germans were cultivating Flemish separatism, and as the strains of war mounted, Hungary practically cut off food supplies to Vienna and interfered with military dispositions. In all European states, the fault lines persisted and national questions remained unresolved. In the United States also there was an upsurge of nationalist sentiment amongst immigrants, ‘national

---

55 Idem, p.18.
committees’ supporting one or other side in the war. Irish America was the
groundbreaker in this respect, flattered by a host of imitators. But Ireland was
almost unique in that advanced nationalism led to an uprising against the
government whilst the war was in progress, a rising undertaken despite its military
hopelessness and lack of widespread paramilitary support. In republican
mythology, the Easter Rising of 1916 was the true expression of essential Ireland,
the blood sacrifice of Pearse and his fellow rebels merely reawakening Irish
opinion to the essence of their colonial subjugation. On the other hand, the events
of Easter have been presented as a historical aberration, an outbreak of fascistic
violence thwarting a peaceable and democratic settlement of affairs. A broader
perspective provides some balance here: the obsession of Pearse with redemptive
blood sacrifice was not solely Irish in nature, his views did not differ essentially
from those of Peguy, Brooke or D’Annunzio. Moreover, the students who died at
Langemarck, and were subsequently mythologized by German nationalists, were
similar to those who fought and died at the Dublin Post Office. Another
unrepresentative armed minority undertaking an urban coup in the name of great
historical forces was carried out successfully in Petrograd in 1917 and
unsuccessfully in Berlin in 1918. Lenin, in fact, noted the 1916 Rising with
approval as an example of socialists and nationalists combining against
imperialism. The European empires had indeed gone to war to defend the ancien
regime, but a people’s war unleashed forces they could not control. Of these forces
nationalism proved more formidable than communism. In contrast to the nationalist
rebels, the Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF) was characterised by its losses on 1 July
1916 during the Battle of the Somme. The fact that two years earlier it had been
threatening armed rebellion against the British government utilising German-
supplied rifles was, of course, forgotten. However, the immediate glorification of
the republican minority left the larger numbers who had fought for the cause of
small nations, tainted with the stain of collaboration. At best they were

56 Zdenek Benes and Vaclav Kural (eds.), Geschichte Verstehen, p38. ‘Emigration’:Vorstellungen
über die tschechoslowakische Staatlichkeit bildeten sich während des Ersten Weltkrieges zunächst
im Ausland heraus, wobei Tomas G. Masaryk die Hauptrolle spielte [...]. Die Werte der
tschechoslowakischen Staatlichkeit setzte man im Ausland bei Versammlungen
landsmannschaftlicher Vereine in Europa und in den USA durch. Die Landsleute unterstützten den
Exilwiderstand bedeutend. Die Meinungen und politische Ausrichtung dieser Vereine drückte
meistens die politische Atmosphäre und politische Kultur der Länder aus, in denen die
tschechischen Landsleute lebten. Eine sehr große Bedeutung hatten Erklärungen und
Veranstaltungen der Vereine in den USA. Bekannt ist vor allem der Pittsburgher Abkommen vom
30. Mai 1918, das die Atmosphäre und Erfahrungen in den USA wiederspiegelte.

57 Gregory and Paseta (eds.), p.3.
discriminated against, at worst they were murdered. ‘The rebels,’ as Tom Kettle once told his wife, ‘spoiled it all’.  

58 The murder of his brother-in-law, Francis Sheehy Skeffington, popular intellectual Dublin activist, further deepened his despair, but did not threaten his resolve. Indeed, the Rising strengthened his determination to emphasise the righteousness of the allied war effort. Unfortunately, his battle with alcoholism often thwarted his desire to see active duty. When finally offered a staff appointment, his refusal to accept a safe position just before his Division’s assault on Ginchy, and his belief that his death might influence the Home Rule settlement, seemed to point to ‘some self-conscious collusion with the hoped-for-cult’.  

59 Kettle’s surviving letters do not contain many references to the political situation in Ireland, but a strange combination of foresight and gloom at the direction Irish politics might take. Commenting on the Easter rebels, that ‘these men will go down in history as heroes and martyrs, and I will go down – if I go down at all – as a bloody British officer,’ anticipated the changing allegiances of nationalist Ireland and the subsequent negation of the nationality of the Irish men who fought.  

50

5.1. Censorship and Propaganda in World War I

Thomas Kettle was not of course the only one to identify the power of propaganda. Both the Allies and the Central Powers were well aware of the influence of printed matter and pictures in swaying the minds of possible supporters. Attacks and counter-attacks in the press began as unsophisticated rumours spread about the enemy and equally appallingly unbelievable reports of one’s own valour and success.

CE 22 January 1915

Enemy’s Treachery.

Campaign Amongst Russian Soldiers. Grand Duke’s Army Order.

(P. A. War Special)

Petrograd, Thursday. - The General Staff communicates under yesterday’s date the following army order by Grand Duke Nicholas to his troops: -

“Our enemy has recently had recourse to all kinds of proclamations and appeals to the troops and inhabitants in the districts where the operations of war are going on, calling upon them to cease fighting and make peace. The Austrians in this respect surpass all limits in insolence and baseness. Their soldiers, specially

58 Idem, p.21.
59 Idem, p.22.
60 Idem, p.22.
selected for the purpose, are circulating among our troops, proclamations which our impudent enemy dares address to you, noble sons of Holy Russia, invoking the sacred name of the Emperor, and bearing what purports to be his signature […] Our enemy, no longer counting upon the strength of his arms for success in the field of battle, has tried to carry out a disgraceful act by a low treachery […]. I order that anyone captured with similar proclamations shall at once be brought before a courtmartial and be judged with all the severity of military laws as guilty of felony.”

CE 25 May 1915

Views of Austrian Press.

The “Narodni Politika” of Prague says – The monarchy has no fear of a war which it will carry through victoriously and gloriously with all the more certitude because it is sure of the loyal assistance of the German Empire.

The “Hlas Narodna” declares that the peoples of Austria-Hungary much prefer a passage of arms with Italy to an untrustworthy and untenable friendship purchased with the heaviest sacrifices.61

CE 26 October 1915

Austrian Allegations. Italian Denials.

(Press Association War Special)

A semi-official communiqué published here says – The “Fremdenblatt,” the organ of the Austrian Foreign Office, recently published some entirely fictitious stories tending to show that the Italian troops were guilty of atrocities towards the inhabitants of the occupied territories at the beginning of the war. The allegations of the Viennese newspapers are entirely devoid of foundation. Our officers and our men might more truthfully be accused of weakness through excess of humanity rather than to cruelty […]. In numerous cases the inhabitants were even allowed to remain in parts from which they ought to have been removed, but then it was that the Austrian guns sowed death and terror among these unfortunate

61 More credible appear the reports of CE 20 April 1915: “Bread or Peace.” Austrians’ Plight. Serious Disturbances. Demonstrations dispersed.(P. A. War Special). An increased shortage of food is occasioning great discontent amongst the population of Austria. Disturbances are reported in several districts of Trentino and Bohemia […]. At Leitmeritz, Bohemia, an infuriated mob destroyed a hundred waggon loads of flour destined for the military authorities. Equally harsh appear conditions towards the end of the year, although it is difficult to assess the tone of the article correctly, while no doubt advertising the fact that the ‘enemy’ is suffering due to the Allied war effort, it does appear there is a distinct amount of sympathy for the sufferings of the population of Vienna:

CE 14 December 1915. Vienna’s Distress. (Press Association Foreign Special). Zurich, Dec. 10th. - All efforts of the Viennese authorities to improve the provisioning of the city have so far met with little success. A special deputation sent to Galicia and Russian Poland to see what foodstuffs could be had from there returned with the report that there is nothing to be got but potatoes and possibly a few pigs. The municipality has bought a thousand cows, half of which will be distributed amongst city dairymen and the other half sent to the country, the farmers undertaking to send milk into the city. In view of the approach of Christmas, the city authorities have consented to give out a certain quantity of rice which had been purchased for hospitals and public institutions. It will be retailed to the public at a shilling a pound for the best quality. With the approach of winter the crowds of homeless persons in Vienna have increased enormously. The six night shelters in the city gave food and lodging to 116,000 people between the 15th November and the 2nd December, some 19,000 more than in the same period last year. In last week 48,000 persons were taken in, of whom 8,700 were men, 16,600 women and 22,500 children. Distress in the city generally is very great, and the shortage of coal is causing much suffering, as the railroads are short of waggons, and local transportation in the city is greatly hampered by the scarcity of labour.
people, who till then had belonged to the Austrian Empire [...]. The irony of such charges is only too striking, coming as they do from a people who were guilty of unspeakable horrors in reoccupying Galicia, who raised a system, the war of methodical oppression against whole peoples, and who confined in concentration camps thousands of innocent persons who nevertheless are yet considered subjects of Austria.

Popular also in Ireland were the lectures organised sometimes even held, by the Catholic Church to rally support for the Polish and Belgian causes: 62

CE 10 February 1915
**Distressed Belgians.**
**Cardinal Mercier’s Appeal.** Cork Diocesan Collection.

The collection in the diocese of Cork made by permission of his Lordship Most Rev. Dr. O’Callaghan, in response to the appeal of Cardinal Mercier, has realised £76 2s 10d. This sum represents a generous response, but does not fully state all that the Catholics of Cork have done for the stricken Belgians. It is only a princely addition to the vast sums given for the refugees who have found here a comfortable home and been provided with all the necessaries of life. There are in all about 100 refugees sheltered in Cork, and that the people have cheerily taken the responsibility of maintaining them until they can return to their own country speaks eloquently of the local admiration for Belgium and its people, and also the activities of the sympathy felt for the distress of their country. The appeal of their patriot Cardinal stirred universal attention, and it is gratifying to find that the answer of the Catholics of Cork was as spontaneous as have been all their efforts – efforts in which they have reason for pride, to help the Belgians in the sorrow and privation of their awful trials in the present crisis.

CE 20 November 1915
**Cork Hibernians.** 63

---

62 Although sometimes a mild eye was also cast upon the average, humble German, far removed from high command of the army: CE 15 February 1915. Glasgow Bishop’s Pastoral. Glasgow, Sunday. - Archbishop Maguire, in a pastoral letter to the Catholics of Glasgow Archdiocese, read today, said the Germans were naturally peaceful, kindly, and industrious people, but they have been seduced into hatred of their neighbours by unscrupulous politicians and journalists, and had been led like sheep by ambitious soldiers with a monk soldier at their head to be slaughtered in hundreds of thousands, not for faith or the fatherland, or for liberty, but in order that one man should be master of Europe on land and sea. It was Christianity against paganism – the Cross and its civilisation against the Crescent and its barbarism – against the even worse, because deliberate and calculated, barbarism of the War Lord.

63 CE 1 May 1915. Address to Cardinal [Irish delegation in France] Mr. Joseph Devlin, M.P., read the following address: - To his Emminence Cardinal Amette, Archbishop of Paris. Monseigneur – At our annual meeting we, the members of the Ancient order of Hibernians, one of the oldest and most widespread Catholic organisations in the world, resolved that it was our duty to offer to your Emminence an expression of the profound sympathy for your beautiful country which is felt for her in this hour of trial by the members of our Society. [...] In such suppression of the supreme right of every population to choose its own country and its own government as the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine we saw an outrage against the principle of nationality, for which Ireland herself has struggled for seven long centuries. The conditions of today are different, both for your country and for ours. After centuries of misunderstanding and of conflict – military and diplomatic – between you and the British Empire are now united in a great alliance for justice and liberty. In the same way the concession which has been made to us by the Imperial Parliament of the right of self-government has reconciled the masses of our people to the masses of the people of the
Poland and the War. Lecture by the Very Rev. Father Thomas.

Under the auspices of the Cork divisions of the Ancient Order of Hibernians (Board of Erin) a very interesting and highly instructive lecture entitled “Poland – the Land of Tragedy,” was delivered by the Very Rev. Father Thomas, O.S.F.C., in the City Hall last night. The lecture was illustrated with limelight views thrown on the screen from a lantern [...] and the audience were afforded an excellent opportunity of becoming acquainted with the scenes being enacted in Poland. These views brought home to every member of the gathering the terrible disasters to which the people of that country have been subjected by the Germans and Austrians. [...] The Lord Mayor presided, and was supported on the platform by Rev. J. Russell, C.C (Spiritual Director), the City High Sheriff (Mr. R.H. Tilson, J.P., T.C.) and Mr. G. Crosbie, B.I. [...] The lecture had proved a thrilling episode for the audience, and they had learned a great deal and seen many events that would bring home to them, as well as the people of Ireland, the necessity of doing their share to enable the Allies to bring the present war to a successful issue (applause). He was sure that the people of the country were inspired with one ideal – the victory of the Allies and the determination of the Allies for the preservation of the small nations of the earth (hear, hear). Great nations might bear down on smaller nations, but it was the duty of the civilised world to see that the small nationalities should be preserved (applause). [...] it was therefore with great pleasure that [the High Sheriff] proposed that their best thanks be tendered to the Rev. Lecturer for his brilliant and able lecture (applause). Mr. Crosbie seconded the motion, and said that it had been his privilege to hear the Rev. Father Thomas on more than one subject and on more than one occasion, but his eloquent and burning words that night exceeded all his previous performances (hear, hear). The subject with which the Very Rev. Father Thomas dealt with was worthy of the lecture and in passing he (Mr.Crosbie) would remark that while they all hoped to see out of the terrible turmoil and bloodshed of the present deplorable war Poland arise glorious and free, there was an immediate duty on the citizens of Cork, and that was to subscribe to the fund which was already been raised for the benefit of the unfortunate refugees of Poland, whose predicaments Very Rev. Father Thomas had so forcibly described to them (applause).

The biggest market for propaganda from both sides, though, was America. Neutral at the beginning of the war, it was correctly believed to be only a matter of time before American opinion swung either way, dictated by the masses who descended from both sides of the belligerent powers. German and British propaganda64 aimed at Americans during the First World War are both characterised by four main trends: blaming the other for the war, claiming America’s interests were antithetical to those of the enemy, exposing enemy’s atrocities, and claiming cultural or even racial solidarity with America. The Great War has also been labelled the first modern propaganda war, particularly true in the

---

64 This chapter is based on a paper given to NYMAS (New York Military Affairs Symposium) on December 1, 2000 by Jonathan A. Epstein, CUNY Graduate Center /NYMAS.

Empire. The Entente Cordiale between France and Great Britian sees also at the same hour the Entente Cordiale between Ireland and the British Empire.
United States, where compulsory education had created a literate public, ripe for messages transmitted by cable or wireless, of the two warring sides. The Germans painted the conflict as a war between the Teutons or the white race against Slavic or Asiatic barbarism. In this context, Russians were condemned as Kossacks or half-cultured Tartars, and the British and French were reprimanded for employing coloured ‘savage’ troops and encouraging Japanese intervention. The conquest of German territories would halt the universal progress of the white race, it was claimed. German-born Harvard psychiatrist and leading pro-German propagandist, Dr. Hugo Münsterberg prophesied Britain and her colonies conquered by the Russians and the United States destroyed by an Asian alliance.

CE 3 November 1914
German Campaign in America at a Standstill.
(From Gerald Morgan in the “Daily Telegraph” – Copyright)
New York, October 23rd. – I met Dr. Dernburg, the leader of the German movement in America, for the first time the other day. He is short and stout, heavily bearded, a self-made man of the people – one of the very first of that class to achieve the coveted honour of a place in the Imperial German Cabinet. But under the appearance of a ploughman in Sunday clothes, he possesses an intelligence absolutely of the very first order. The trouble with him – and one cannot hear him speak for five minutes without realising it – is that he understands only too well the difficulties of his enterprise. Others he may deceive, but he cannot deceive himself. Count Von Bernsforff, the German Ambassador; Professor

65 CE 13 November 1913. Ireland’s national cause. German National Alliance Endorses Home Rule Movement. The following is a copy of resolutions adopted by the Irish Fellowship Club, Chicago, and forwarded to Mr. Redmond: - “Resolved – That the Irish Fellowship Club of Chicago extends its hearty thanks to the German-American National Alliance of the United States for its endorsement of the Home Rule movement in Ireland; and that we recognise in this friendly action of the German Alliance a sympathy with the national aspirations of the Irish race.” “Resolved – That we can assure our German fellow citizens that in the world-wide field of human progress – that progress which overflows the boundaries of nations and becomes the common property of mankind – we recognise and appreciate the large measure contributed to the welfare and happiness of the world by the great Teutonic race. [...] In forwarding these resolutions, P.T. Barry, a former president of the club, spoke in part as follows: - “It is no small compliment to us as a people to be deemed worthy of the commendation and to have the unqualified endorsement of the mighty Teutonic race in our efforts and methods for the resurrection of the land from which we sprung from the thraldom of ages, and placing her once more among the live and progressive nations of the world. There is not, perhaps, in all the world another people who have contributed so large a proportion to the measure of civilisation of justice and happiness enjoyed by mankind to-day as has been the contribution to it by the great Teutonic race. That grand old people, who, like the Irish themselves, have swarmed out upon the world bearing torches of light, of civilisation, of liberty, of order and of law to the remotest confines of the civilised world. That historic people who have done so much for this new world of ours, and who have done so much, especially for this great Republic in which we live, and in which we all have a common destiny, who have done so much to build up our ships and our cities, who have done so much to subjugate the wilderness, train and rear it into a noble civilisation, and so far consummate the Divine purpose of creation. We can assure our German-American fellow-citizens that we appreciate and value that sympathy and endorsement for all it is worth to us as a people at this time.”
Munsterberg, Herman Ridder of the “Staats zeitung” may fancy they are making progress, but Dr. Dernburg is far too clever for that. He knows that he has been condemned to a campaign which was lost before it was ever begun. He is like a political candidate obliged to offer an endless contest in a constituency where he knows that 80 per cent of the voters have always voted and will always vote in the opposition. [...] The truth of the matter is that the Americans made up their minds at the very beginning of the war, and they have not changed them since. They were in favour of England then, and they are now. Dr. Dernburg can argue forever that all nations break their treaties. So they do, say Americans, but that don’t make breaking a treaty a nice thing to do, and you, Germans, broke the last one. The atrocities are lies, says Dr. Dernburg. “Very likely,” we answer, “but that’s not the point. You, Germans, want to rule the world your own way, and if you do it won’t be a pleasant world for us to live in. In fact, you would tear up the Magna Charta and the Declaration of Independence. They’re only “scraps of paper,” too, and Dr. Dernburg has no answer to that.

CE 21 February 1916
German-American Relations
(P.A. Foreign Special)
New York, Monday. - While the undignified publicity propaganda of the Austrian and German Embassies in Washington has long been the subject of scandal, the situation as finally revealed yesterday has created a sensation overshadowing all other international developments. The insidious methods by which the Teutonic diplomats are using the American Press to serve their ends would, doubtless, have been still kept from the public had they not finally overstepped the mark by divulging information and issuing reports which threatened seriously to embarrass the Government. Mr.Lansing, however, denies any intention of asking for the recall of Count Bernsdorff, but it is generally believed that unless the latter and his diplomatic associates immediately stop their disgraceful activities the State Department will have to take into consideration the question of asking for their withdrawal. The habitual Teutonic perfidy and their propensity to misrepresent the entire attitude of the American Government for their own improper purposes are referred to by the “Herald’s” Washington correspondent.

The Germans did not shirk the work of spreading propaganda in Europe either, believing it would fall on particularly fruitful ground in Ireland:

CE 6 November 1914
Editorial
The disclosure made by the Lord Mayor of Dublin a few days ago as to the circulation of German money in Ireland came as no surprise. There is an echo of the circumstance in a letter to the “Berliner Tageblatt” from Dr. Julius Pokorny, lecturer on Celtic Philology at the University in Vienna. The learned professor draws the journal’s attention to certain anti-English leaflets sent to him from Ireland. The leaflets are supposed to have been some of those that were printed in Germany and circulated in Ireland by German agents. Dr.Pokorny writes: “It is interesting to note that leaflets sent to us from Ireland assert that a single German army corps could seize Ireland in consequence of the total lack of fortifications, arsenals and trained soldiers. The Irish could not desire a better lot
than to be administered like Alsace-Lorraine by the German Empire, and would be
delighted if they were treated as the Prussian Poles are,” and concludes with the
pious hope that the Germans will not fail to hear the cry for help of the Irish people.
The letter has its little humours, and in particular the thought of being treated like
the Poles of Prussia will bring joy to the hearts of the Irish farmers. But there is a
serious meaning in it, too, for the writing reveals how firmly the idea of dominion
is fixed in the German mind. The ambition of the learned man is not to liberate the
country, but to rule Ireland.

CE 8 December 1914
Irish Pro-Germans.
Berlin Paper’s View. “Least Possible Importance.”
amsterdam, Monday. – The London correspondent of the Berlin newspaper
“Vorwaerts,” discussing the significance of the Sinn Féin and other similar
movements in Ireland, says the strength of the movement, which has without doubt
been organised by Irish-Americans, is not easy to discern. It would, however, be
wise for Germans to attach the least possible importance to it and to base no hopes
on it. – Reuter.

The British simply blamed Germany for the crimes of its allies as well as
itself. Tomas Masaryk, campaigning for the Allies, claimed Emperor Franz Josef
had ceded sovereignty to Germany by giving Germany effective control over the
army, while Arnold J. Toynbee, eminent historian, placed responsibility for the
genocide of the Armenians on the Germans for not stopping the Turks. Lewis
Namier, another respected historian, blamed the Russian pogroms on the Germans
resident in Russia. Pro-British propagandists, in general, differentiated between
German militarism, which Britain was fighting, and German culture, which it was
not, a claim, of course, repudiated by pro-German propagandists.

Both sides used films, radio broadcasts, books, pamphlets, reprints of
speeches, periodicals, and cartoons, to influence American opinion and to convince
it of their view of the world, the war, Europe’s best interest, and America’s best
interest. In the end, the British were more successful, but it was not an even fight.
The British benefited from a common language, a common culture, and direct cable
contact (the first British offensive move was to cut the cable running between
Germany and America), and thus, more means of communication. A November
1914 poll of American newspaper editors revealed that only a few supported the
Germans, and so Germany’s first propaganda action in the US was to establish the
German Information Bureau. Next was the foundation of the Zentralstelle für
Auslandsdienst, funded by the Foreign Affairs Department of the German
Government, its main task to distribute German material abroad. German
propaganda was usually reactive in character, defending Germany against Entente
charges of all sorts of crimes, including the invasion of Belgium, unrestricted 
submarine warfare, and, more to the point, the sinking of the Lusitania.66

CE 10 May 1915
German Press Comments
P.A. War Special
Amsterdam, Saturday. - According to a Berlin telegram the “Lokalanzeiger” 
writes: - “The Lusitania on the order of the British Naval authorities, was guilty of 
a misuse of the flag when some weeks ago she entered Liverpool. We can, 
moreover wager a thousand to one that she had this time also her holds crammed 
with an abundant supply of American arms and ammunition, and that these 
somewhat combustible and explosive objects contributed to the disappearance of 
the grand ship within twenty minutes.67

The German Ambassador to Washington, Count von Bernstorff was one of 
the main German propagandists in America. Among his colleagues were Dr. 
Heinrich Albert of the German Department of the Interior; Professor Münsterberg, 
who first tried to nurture pro-German sympathy in Theodore Roosevelt and then 
threatened President Wilson with an electoral backlash should he persist in his pro-
Entente bias. The Germans also made use of American authors, such as Irish-
American Frank Harris, whose autobiography was banned in the US, and peace 
movements, to keep America out of the war.

One of their major themes was the appeal to the American idea of fair play, 
an attempt to offset the pro-Entente bias of the American press and elites. They 
delved into American history to find examples of British offences against either the 
United States and other nations with many emigrants in America, such as Ireland. 
The Germans also reached out to American minorities, especially the black and 
Jewish population. The German propaganda was distributed by The German-
American Alliance (also known as "The National German-American Alliance"), 
founded in 1901. The 6,000-plus Lutheran congregations in America also passed

---

66 This particular ship already caused a bit of furore for passengers quite early in the year when it 
reportedly entered British waters under an American flag: CE 8 February 1915. Lusitania Incident. 
Association Birmingham’s correspondent telegraphs – Passengers arriving in Birmingham to-day 
who travelled by the Lusitania, which reached Liverpool from New York this morning, state that 
when off the coast of Ireland they received a wireless message from the Admiralty that they were to 
hoist the American flag. They did so and sailed under it to Liverpool in safety. The incident caused 
considerable excitement on board.

67 CE 10 May 1915.Austrian Jubilation.Anxiety regarding Italy. The Censor busy.(P.A. Foreign 
Special) Venice, Sunday. - The Vienna papers all publish a report of the torpedoing of the 
“Lusitania”, but refrain from comment. The "Neue Freie Presse," which is written in a 
characteristically callous and brutal strain, says: - “German submarines have registered an 
immense success. Perhaps Messrs. Churchill and Asquith will now speak less contemptuously of the 
German blockade and the dread of submarines will increase still more.
on bulletins from the German Press Bureau and Information Service and Germany actually purchased the New York Evening Mail to reach urban readers. However, the Germans, as the British, preferred to reach out to influential individuals: the German embassy had a list of 60,000 people, mostly through the manifests of the Hamburg-Amerika Linie, but politicians, clubs, and colleges were also included.  

CE 26 October 1915  
Anglo-French Loan.  

**German Propaganda in the United States.**  
Chicago, October 4th. - Finding their desperate efforts to influence American opinion against the Anglo-French Loan futile, German propagandism in the Middle West have turned to another tract. In a case in which a woman policy-holder suit has been brought against the Mutual life Insurance Company to restrain them from investing ten million dollars in the Anglo-French Loan Bonds, the main charge is that such investment would stir up race hatred among the policy holders. It is far-fetched hope of the backers of this suit, most of whom are prominent in the councils of the so-called National Peace Congress, that a favourable local decision from the court would enable them to exercise legal pressure against other corporations who contemplate investing in the loan. – Reuter.

Unfortunately, some incidents damaged German propaganda efforts in America, including the infamous "Zimmermann Telegram." Though the damage started well before the war, when, for example, President Theodore Roosevelt invoked the Monroe Doctrine against German military threats to recover debts from Venezuela, the sinking of the Lusitania on May 7, 1915, which the Germans blamed on the British putting American passengers on a munitions ship, and the execution the same year of Edith Cavell, the British nurse who confessed to helping Entente prisoners. July 24, the aforementioned Dr. Albert forgot his briefcase containing papers concerning German propaganda efforts in America on a train. By the time he realized his mistake, another man had walked off with it: US government agent, Frank Burke, of the Secret Service. The papers were passed to the New York World for publication, the first instalment appearing August 15. On August 30, British authorities detained James Archibald, an American journalist working for the Central Powers, en route to Germany from America. They found a letter from German Military Attaché Franz von Papen noting that "I always say to  

---

68 CE 1 January 1915. Editorial. […] The complete withdrawal of the American mail steamers from Queenstown on the west bound voyage, while causing no great surprise to those who followed the events of the past five or six years, certainly caused no little disappointment. A great meeting of delegates from the principal public bodies in the country was held at Dublin in February to protest against the action of the Cunard Company. The Irish-Americans also exerted their influence in the matter, but no satisfactory result has been so far attained.
these idiotic Yankees that they should shut their mouths and better still be full of admiration for all that heroism (of Germans on the Eastern Front)." But the bombshells were papers from the Austro-Hungarian ambassador to Washington, Constantin Theodor Dumba, to his government, in which he proposed and requested money to subsidize labour agitation among American munitions workers of Austro-Hungarian descent. Thereupon, President Wilson asked Dumba and Bernstorff to cease their propaganda activities and on September 30, the New York Times declared "Never before has there been another diplomatic representative who has in such an open and unabashed way taken measures to make himself altogether unacceptable." September 23, the Boston Post gloated: "O Constantin Theodor Dumba/ You’ve roused Uncle Sam from his slumba:/ That letter you wrote/ Got the old fellow’s goat--/ Now his path you’ll no longer encumba!

Finally, Germany and her allies lost this war of words with the resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare, and the Zimmermann Telegram in early 1917. The telegram from the German Foreign Secretary Arthur Zimmermann to Bernstorff, to be relayed to the German ambassador in Mexico City, promised the Mexicans land they had lost to America, should Mexico join in an attack on America as a Central Power. The British intercepted and decrypted the telegram and sent it to Washington, and Wilson released it to the press on March 1. Public opinion, as well as that of Congress, demanded war against Germany, declared April 6, 1917.

The British were much more effective in America, a major reason being that the Entente powers, especially the United Kingdom, dominated the influx of war news to America. Early British propagandists were essentially cautious and defensive, although they increasingly used aggressive counter-propaganda. Admiral Sir Reginald Hall, the head of British Naval Intelligence and his Naval Attaché in Washington Sir Guy Gaunt realized counter-propaganda would expose Central Powers' activities in America, especially those that endangered US neutrality. With the help of Emmanuel Voska, a colleague of Tomas Masaryk, Gaunt developed a net of counter-propaganda agents in the US. Sir Gilbert Parker of the Foreign Office made sure that books by German nationalists and militarists, such as von Treitschke, Nietzsche, and Bernhardi, were published in English in America. It was considered a subtle way of painting the Germans as barbarians
themselves. One early propaganda organization was the Press Bureau, divided into four parts including an Issuing Department that was the conduit for official government information to the press and the Military Room that dealt with all press material other than cables. But the military did not trust Fleet Street and so the former did not use much of the latter’s vast propaganda potential in the early part of the war. The War Office so feared the publication of military information that it banned war correspondents from the front until May, 1915. On September 11, 1914, the Press Bureau and the Home Office formed the Neutral Press Committee to disseminate news to friendly and neutral nations, placed under G. H. Mair, formerly the assistant editor of the Daily Chronicle. Mair allowed neutral journalists to write their own articles after giving them official information. This was of special importance to American journalists, as it helped camouflage the official source of the propaganda, making it more palatable to the public.

CE 9 December 1914
Sir John Simon.
Speech at Bolton. Defence of the Press Censorship.

Bolton, Tuesday Night. – Sir John Simon, the Attorney General, who spoke at Bolton to-night at a recruiting meeting in company with the Earl of Crawford and Mr. Will Crooks, M.P., defended the Press censorship against the criticisms which have recently been made. There were two mistakes constantly made in criticising the work of the Press censorship, Sir John said. In the first place, it was apparently supposed in some quarters that when, as sometimes happened, the publication of a piece of news was delayed or denied, that was done for fear of the effect on the British public. According to that theory the British people would be unduly elated by news of success and dangerously depressed by news of a misfortune. “That,” the Attorney General declared, “is a ridiculous misunderstanding. Our people will receive the news, whether it is good or bad, with composure and moderation. A message of success will not distract them from steadily pursuing the task before them. The report of a loss would only make them more determined to regain the lost ground, and to make our ultimate triumph doubly sure. That was perfectly obvious to all, and was perfectly well understood by those who gave orders to the Press Censor. The one and only reason why any news is ever withdrawn from circulation,” Sir John Simon continued, “is because its publication would injure us or help our enemy. The enemy is assisted by knowledge of our plans or our movements, or of the numbers and condition of our forces. It was by the bold use of the censorship that the whole of the British Expeditionary Force crossed the Channel and was safely established on the other side without the slightest risk of attack on the way. […] The second mistake was even further removed from the true facts. It seemed to be imagined that when the order went forth that for reasons of national policy and military strategy certain information had to be withheld, it was the Press Censor who decided the matter in his own discretion and at his own whim and pleasure. Surely those who criticised ought to remember that in times of war these difficulties must be decided by those who had the best means of forming a judgment. […] Germany was used to the
Press censorship. We were not, and it was a healthy sign that the British people did resent the censorship. If the present struggle terminated as we resolved it should, we would return in times of peace to the principle long established, the temporary suspension of which was the cause of the misunderstanding.

Another early introduction was the News Department formed by the Foreign Office to issue news to journalists. It compiled news articles with the Press Bureau and the NPC to cable to lands such as the United States that were too far away for effective wireless dissemination. The News Department also supplemented Reuter’s news services. In December 1915, censorship regarding foreign affairs was abolished, putting responsibility on the individual newspapers and led to a new era of openness between the Foreign Office and the press, while also allowing the News Department to concentrate on propaganda. Just like the Germans, the British diplomats distributed pamphlets and the like, frequently put them in waiting rooms to reach casual readers.

The most important British foreign propaganda outfit was the War Propaganda Board, more commonly called after the location of its offices Wellington House. Wellington House was formed by then Chancellor of the Exchequer David Lloyd George, to counter the torrent of German propaganda, especially in the US. By 1917, Wellington House had 54 staffers, making it the largest British foreign propaganda organization, its governing body - The Moot - included advisors such as Arnold Toynbee and Lewis Namier. Wellington House operated in secret, not even Parliament was aware of it. It used well-known private figures, private printers, and private shipping to mask the official nature of its propaganda. Its practice was established through two conferences in September 1914, the first consisted of literary people such as J. M. Barrie, G.K. Chesterton, Arthur Conan Doyle, and H.G. Wells; the second hosted representatives of the press. The War Propaganda Board was the official organization most responsible for earning the British a reputation for lurid propaganda, in fact, its refusal to lean on its writers led to frequently inconsistent and contradictory propaganda. Wellington House relied mainly on pamphlets that emphasized facts so readers could make up their own minds. They aimed at opinion-makers, not opinion itself. Its propaganda in America was written for an educated audience by such luminaries as H. G. Wells, Namier, and Toynbee. The only damage to the British propaganda effort was their repression of the Irish Easter Rising.
Both sides disputed who had created the preconditions for the war. For the British, the cause was German imperialism. Namier argued that the principles of German imperialism were expansion and dominion, and that while it had failed to politically expand abroad, Germany had partially succeeded in seeding German colonies throughout Eastern Europe. **Namier compared German eastwards expansion to an octopus surrounding the Czech lands and cutting them off from the Poles, the whole history of the Czech nation being the history of resistance against German encroachment.** Namier claimed that if Germany had kept to the line of foreign policy laid down by Bismarck, she would never have actively interfered in Balkan affairs, and that Kaiser Wilhelm II was the perfect embodiment of the new German imperialism, the chief German Kulturträger. For their part, the Germans blamed the British monarch Edward VII for creating the Entente of hostile states that encircled Germany. Professor John Burgess noted that Edward VII united Pan-Slavic Russia, revanchist France, and jealous Britain, that his policies of encouraging Japan against Russia, inciting the French, seducing Italy, and creating the Entente threatened Germany and the Dual Monarchy. Dr. Münsterberg summed things up by observing that the spark was thrown by the Servian murderer of the Austrian archduke, the explosive was heaped up by King Edward VII, who created the mighty alliance of Great Britain, Russia, and France, but the powder was made from the political jealousy of Europe against ascending Germany. In the case of Russia, this meant the control over the Balkans in aid of Pan-Slavism. The actual trigger was the assassination of the heir to the thrones of the Dual Monarchy Franz Ferdinand on June 28, 1914 by an ethnic Serb armed with a Serbian pistol provided by a Serbian secret society dedicated to a "Greater Serbia" and run by a the head of Serbia’s military intelligence, \(^{69}\) and the Austrian

---

\(^{69}\) G. K. Chesterton, The Barbarism of Berlin (London, 1914): Turning to ‘the facts which involved Europe’ in the introduction, ‘the prince who practically ruled Austria was shot by certain persons whom the Austrian Government believed to be conspirators from Servia. The Austrian Government piled up arms and armies, but said not a word either to Servia their suspect, or Italy their ally. From the documents it would seem that Austria kept everybody in the dark, except Prussia. It is probably nearer the truth to say that Prussia kept everybody in the dark, including Austria. But all that is what is called opinion, belief, conviction, or common sense: and we are not dealing with it here. The objective fact is that Austria told Servia to permit Servian officers to be suspended by the authority of Austrian officers; and told Servia to submit to this within forty-eight hours. In other words, the Sovereign of Servia was practically told to take off not only the laurels of two great campaigns, but his own lawful and national crown, and to do it in a time in which no respectable citizen is expected to discharge an hotel bill. Servia asked for time for arbitration—in short, for peace. But Russia had already begun to mobilise; and Prussia, presuming that Servia might thus be rescued, declared war. The Servians may not be a very peaceful people, but on the occasion under discussion it was certainly they who wanted peace. You may choose to think the Serb a sort of born robber: but on
response, which was an ultimatum making such demands on Serbia’s sovereignty that it would be rejected, which rejection would be a casus belli. Since educated opinion is still divided on the subject, it is not surprising that both alliances claimed the mantle of victimhood. Professor Burgess and the authors of the German White Book agreed that Serbia was looking to avoid performing what the Austrians felt was their duty to detect and punish the Serbians responsible for the murder and that the Dual Monarchy had to take the actions the Serbians would not. The German Foreign Office claimed that Serbia would not have acted without Russian support. The Central Office for Foreign Services declared the House of Habsburg must be sustained in its defence against Russian arrogance. Austria-Hungary delivered the ultimatum to Serbia on July 23. The next day, the Imperial and Royal Army partially mobilized. Serbia called up its reserves on July 25, the day it responded to the ultimatum. Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia on July 28, 1914. The next day, Russia mobilized in support of Serbia against the Dual Monarchy, but not yet against the Germans. The latter then began mobilizing. The next day Nicholas II authorized full mobilization. Meanwhile, Wilhelm and Nicholas, who were friends and first cousins, were telegraphing each other, trying to prevent a Russo-German war. Austria mobilized against Russia on July 31. France called up her troops the same day. On August 1, Germany declared war on Russia, who changed the name of her capital from the Germanic "Saint Petersburg" to the Russian "Petrograd." On August 2, the first German patrols crossed the French border. That same day, Germany requested free passage through Belgium. The Belgians refused. On August 3, Germany declared war on France and invaded Luxembourg and Belgium, while at the same time crossing into Russia in the east. On August 4, Britain, which had demanded Germany not violate Belgian neutrality, declared war on Germany. Europe was at war. Both alliances tried to fob the responsibility for the conflict on the other, while posing as the workers for peace. Namier’s analysis was that the first war was fought because of Austria-Hungary’s internal problems, but both Masaryk and James H. Beck claimed that Austria was a pawn of Germany, who knew and approved of the Dual Monarchy’s policy toward Serbia. Masaryk pleaded for the long deserved punishment of Austria for having attacked Serbia and
by this unleashed the dogs of war. Moreover, Austria’s minorities, largely Slav, did not want the war. Russia, far from stiffening Serbia, as the Germans claimed, urged the Serbians to yield, while the Germans urged the Austrians on. Meanwhile, Sir Edward Grey, the British Foreign Secretary, proposed a four-power (Britain, France, Germany, and Italy) conference to mediate while Russia pleaded for time to resolve the issue. But Germany rejected Sir Edward Grey’s proposal, and so did Vienna. The Tsar did not suspend mobilization but actually signalled the French to mobilize. Just as the British blamed the Germans for not restraining the Austrians, the Germans blamed the British and French for not restraining the Russians. The Germans claimed that they were prepared to spare France in case England should remain neutral and would guarantee the neutrality of France. But the German battle plan already called for an attack into France. The German Secretary of State Gottlieb von Jagow claimed that the moral responsibility for the war lay with Britain who encouraged the Belgians to resist and encouraged the chauvinistic anti-German tendencies in France and Russia. Münsterberg declared that although Germany made the declaration of war against Russia and France, this was a war against Germany, and it was a sin against the spirit of history to denounce Germany as the aggressor. The invasion of Belgium was important because it allegedly brought Britain into the war but also because it gave Germany a bad reputation in the United States. Dr. Charles Eliot, late President of Harvard, condemned the invasion of Belgium and the German "might makes right" ideology. Dr. Münsterberg asserted that Belgium chose to put itself on the side of France, against Germany. In fact, according to the Germans, the French had guns and troops in Belgium by July 30 and the British had landed in Ostend the same day. Dr. Münsterberg attempted to take the edge off Germany’s invasion by citing the necessity to invade Belgium to pre-empt the French and argued Germany promised to repay any damage and not only guaranteed the integrity of the land but was most willing to make every possible restitution. Germans, with some justification, condemned what they took to be the hypocrisy of the British claim to have gone to war over Belgium. Münsterberg observed it was absurd when England claimed that it had to go to war because it could not tolerate the moral wrong of Germany’s using the Belgian railways, England which had broken pledges upon pledges in Egypt, in Tibet, in South Africa. And Frank Koester added that from a nation that for hundreds of years fattened off of the lifeblood of subjected races such a protest
was an unparalleled piece of national cant. The effect of these claims on American public opinion is not known, but the implied criticism of the treatment of the Irish in Koester’s declaration may have aroused some Irishmen in America. The British took the offensive in publicizing atrocities allegedly or actually committed by soldiers of the Central Powers, focussing on German and Turkish massacres, especially of Armenians (to obscure Russia’s reputation among American Jews) – for example, a report in the Examiner:

CE 26 October 1915

Armenian Atrocities. **Speech by Lord Bryce.**

Speaking tonight at Manchester on the Armenian atrocities, Viscount Bryce said these horrible massacres were ordered by the Turkish Government to exterminate the Armenians on account of their Christianity. The devilish ruffians who had got possession of the Turkish Empire also suspected the Armenians could not but sympathise with the Allies. It was hopeless to say that the Armenians had provoked these outrages. His lordship appealed for help and paid a high tribute to the great assistance of the Armenians, whom he described as tender-hearted and liberal as any people in the world. **Bishop Weldon denounced Germany for encouraging Turkey to annihilate a Christian people.**

The British also concentrated on German behaviour in Belgium, whose citizens and valiantly resisting army already had the sympathy of many Americans.

CE 1 January 1915

**German War Methods**

(Press Association War Special)

[...]

CE 10 February 1915

**German Atrocities.** Men and Women Murdered. Pillage and Burning. Belgian Committee’s Report (P.A. War Special).

---

70 CE 9 March 1916. Massacre of Armenian Population. (Press Association War Special). Petgrad, Wednesday. - According to information which has reached here, the population of Erzerum before the fall of the fortress included 40,000 Armenians, of whom the Russians when they entered the town found only 16 alive. A Turk of Erzerum stated that a few days before the capture of the fortress all the Armenians in the town were driven out by the police in a westerly direction, where Kurds, who had been forwarned, massacred them all.
On September 2nd a German patrol came as far as Lebbeve. Under the pretext that they were avenging six German soldiers shot by Belgian troops on the lands of Lebbeve they set on fire three farms in the hamlet of Hizzide. On September 4th the German army entered Lebbeve and began to shell Termonde, and soon after entered the town. The soldiers pillaged the cellars and shops, and confectioners, bakers, grocers and spirit merchants. [...] German officers told the inhabitants to go as the town was to be destroyed. [...] The hospital was not spared. It was drenched with petroleum and set alight. The sick, wounded and dying were carried out [...].

The most important document spreading reports of German atrocities was the Bryce Report. Officially called The Report of the Committee on Alleged German Atrocities, it was published in an American edition and many Americans accepted the truth, later found to be much exaggerated, of the Bryce Report because Viscount Bryce, the chairman of the committee, had been the ambassador to the United States, 1907 to 1913. The committee had been appointed by Prime Minister Asquith on December 15, 1914. Arnold J. Toynbee draws on The Report for his own The German Terror in Belgium: An Historical Record. Because atrocities occurred wherever the Germans advanced, but only for the first three months of the war, Toynbee concluded systematic warfare against the civil population was a policy in the campaigns of 1914. In addition to crimes against civilians, the Germans were accused of many instances of looting and arson, the most noted case being the burning of the university town of Louvain in which the library, repository of priceless ancient documents, was torched. British propagandists also described atrocities in Austria-Hungary. The Czech National Committee in London wrote a book71 describing the suffering of the Czechs and Slovaks, using Dr. Kramar, leader of the Young Czechs, arrested on a charge of high treason at the behest of the Imperial and Royal Supreme Military Command and sentenced to death on June 3, 1916, as a metaphor for the suffering of the nations. Masaryk declared that Austria-Hungary was not only at war with Russia and Serbia but also with its own minorities. They argued that the Czech lands had suffered terribly at the hands of the Austrians and it was futile to hope the Dual Monarchy would treat its nations fairly. The fact that the Government was obliged by arrest or flight to get rid of the leaders of the nation showed what the real situation in Bohemia was.

The property of Czech soldiers captured by the Russians or fighting for the Serbians was confiscated and the pensions for their families were suppressed. They asked how many women and children are reduced to starvation to satisfy the vengeance of the Austro-Germans. The Slovaks were suffering as well. Other alleged atrocities the British brought to the attention of the world were Zeppelin raids on British towns, U-Boat warfare, especially concerning the Lusitania, Arabic, Sussex (sunk March 1916), and the return to unrestricted submarine warfare in January of 1917; the starvation of Poland, the murder of prisoners; and during a cholera epidemic at the POW camp at Wittenberg, the German medical staff left the camp, allowing the British to die or take care of their own problems. Sometimes German propaganda was aimed distinctly at Americans, with the war placed in an American context, comparing the fate of the province of West Prussia with its capital Danzig if handed to the Slavs, to New England handed over to Mexico as a Mexican colony with General Villa as dictator in Boston. One campaign was to convince the Americans that their side had the political system most worth supporting (and the other did not). The Czecho-Slovak declaration of Independence, had, after all, drawn heavily on the American model and had been drafted with the help of American friends of Tomas Masaryk.72

The British were generally careful to make a distinction between that, which was their enemy, and German culture, which was not. Michael Kunczik sees this distinction as aimed at German-Americans, as Mr. Beck declared in visiting its condemnation upon Germany, the Supreme Court of civilization should distinguish between the military caste, headed by the Kaiser and the Crown Prince, which precipitated the real calamity, and the noble and peace-loving and deceived and misled German people.

In German propaganda, the Kaiser was routinely portrayed as a peace-loving ruler, despite the image he cultivated as warlord73 and Germany’s record of

---


73 In the memoirs of a ‘lady of distinguished birth and title’ (publisher’s note) writing under the nom de plume of Marquise de Fontenoy, The Secret Memoirs of the courts of Europe: William II,
having kept the peace for forty years was emphasized. The Germans were not particularly militaristic, they claimed. Germany’s pacific and industrious population had only the one wish to develop its agricultural and industrial, its cultural and moral resources. The similarities between the German and American constitutions were emphasised, both being a union of a number of Independent States, who have given part of their sovereignty in favour of the Union. Frank Koester, who was apparently not a paid German propagandist, claimed Germanic superiority in all areas of life over Anglo-Saxons, including manners: Anglo-Saxons ate greasy food with their fingers, spit, put dirty feet on chairs and tables, smoke in the presence of ladies, chew gum and tobacco in cow-like fashion and even Anglo-Saxon women got drunk; German women did not. German-Americans had much to be proud of their fatherland for in culture, science and industry. German propagandists were not shy about stressing German advances and took great pride in Germany’s military achievements.

Frank Harris took the lead in condemning British society. He condemned its love of aristocracy, the soul-destroying influence of this privileged, parasitic, idle class, its libel laws resulting in a society with less free speech than Russia, and its soullessness. In fact, the only hope for Britain was a stunning defeat that would inspire the decent classes of Britain to overthrow their parasitic lords. German propagandists reminded Americans of how America had suffered at the hands of these British. Koester also quoted a 1797 speech by Thomas Jefferson warning against excessive British influence amounting to domination. Koester also appealed
to the Declaration of Independence and observed that America would be a sparsely inhabited dependency of England had England won the Revolution and put into effect the measures she adopted against Ireland. It is not surprising that in a land with as many Irish immigrants as America the Irish question should come into play. Sir Roger Casement, hanged for high treason in 1916 after returning to Ireland from Germany where he had been soliciting aid, appealed directly to Irish-Americans.74

In this war, Ireland has only one enemy. Let every Irish heart, let every Irish hand, let every Irish purse be with Germany. Let Irishmen in America get ready. [...] Let Irishmen in America stand ready, armed, keen and alert. The German guns that sound the sinking of the British Dreadnoughts will be the call of Ireland to her scattered sons. The fight may be fought on the seas but the fate will be settled on an island. The crippling of the British fleet will mean a joint German-Irish invasion of Ireland and every Irishman able to join that army of deliverance must get ready today!

The bloody suppression of the Easter Rising, with British repressive activities in India, turned much US opinion against the British and united Irish-American groups. The British responded to these controversies by publishing details of a German medal struck to commemorate the sinking of the Lusitania and releasing excerpts of Casement’s diary indicating he was a homosexual. "An English Catholic" wrote a pamphlet trying to defuse the situation, admitting past English wrongs to the Irish and claiming England had changed. The author emphasized the Communism of the Citizen Army that joined the Sinn Féiners for the Rebellion. This must have aroused Irish-Americans who were devout Catholics living in an anti-Communist society. The author also argued the rebellion was supported by the Germans. It was averred that the rising failed because most Irishmen were satisfied with British rule and the promise of Home Rule, which was interrupted by the war. England, fighting for her life, had to take stern measures to put down a rebellion fomented by Germany. The British policy of naval blockades of ships, including neutral ships, carrying goods, including foodstuffs, intended for the Central Powers, was also unpopular in the States. The British tried to rationalize the effects of this starvation policy by citing the involvement of all Germans in the total war. Robert Lansing felt German propaganda targeted American businessmen suffering from the British blockade. In most propaganda

74 New York, September 1 1914, quoted in Brendan Clifford, Roger Casement: The Crime Against Europe (Athol, 2003), p. 63..
campaigns there was a tit-for-tat strategy, but his does not seem to have been the case regarding race. The Germans posed as defenders of the white race, the reasons the Germans thought this angle would prove popular in the States, as well as the reasons the British could not reply in kind are clear. Many Americans of Western European descent were concerned about the influx of immigrants from Southern European and Slavic countries and were calling for immigration reform, an effort which came to fruition only in 1924. On the West Coast, there was great concern about Asian immigrants, who were first banned in 1882. A new Ku Klux Klan was formed in 1915, combating not only Blacks but Jews, Catholics, and immigrants. And Birth of a Nation was a successful film. The Allies were the ones allied to the Russians, Chinese, Japanese and also the users of African and Asian troops. The British also saw the war as a conflict between Teuton and Slav but did not attach the same significance to it in the way the Germans did. Pan-Germanism, the belief that all Teutonic people were linked by blood and represented the deserved master race of Europe was a late nineteenth century development and Pan-Slavism was only slightly older, and so this was the first clash between these two ideologies. German propagandists made great use of the race theory: Professor Burgess referred back to Bismarck, who imbibed the doctrine that the great national, international and world purpose of the newly created German Empire was to protect and defend the Teutonic civilization of Continental Europe against the oriental Slavic quasi-civilization on the one side, and the decaying Latin civilization on the other.75

CE 14 December 1915
Central Powers.

**World Empire, Hamburg to Bagdad.**

Zurich, Dec. 9th. - Lecturing on “The Future of Central Europe and Bulgaria,” Dr. Heinrich Friedjung, the well-known Austrian historian, is reported as saying: “By the Balkan War of 1912-13 conflict between Turkey and Bulgaria

75 Chesterton, The Barbarism of Berlin, chapter 1: ‘It is essential to emphasise this consciousness of the thing under discussion in connection with two or three words that are, as it were, the key-words of this war. One of them is the word “barbarian.” The Prussians apply it to the Russians: the Russians apply it to the Prussians. Both, I think, really mean something that really exists, name or no name. Both mean different things. And if we ask what these different things are, we shall understand why England and France prefer Russia; and consider Prussia the really dangerous barbarian of the two. To begin with, it goes so much deeper even than atrocities; of which, in the past at least, all the three Empires of Central Europe have partaken pretty equally, as they partook of Poland. An English writer, seeking to avert the war by warnings against Russian influence, said that the flogged backs of Polish women stood between us and the Alliance. But not long before, the flogging of women by an Austrian general led to that officer being thrashed in the streets of London by Barclay and Perkins' draymen.’
had been finally ended. An understanding had been come to between the two States which during the present war led to an alliance, and thus there came together of themselves these systems of alliances from the North Sea to the Persian Gulf. Between Hamburg and Bagdad had now arisen not only a world Empire, but a strong union mightier than the two world Empires of Russia and Great Britain, with their Allies taken together. Already the great war has performed a miracle in the rejuvenescence of Turkey, regarded as lost by all the world. Another equally forcible an event is the banishing of the spectre of Pan-Slavism. This is a praiseworthy deed of Bulgaria and her king. Discussing the future position of Serbia, Dr. Friedjung, referring evidently to the statements recently attributed to the Bulgarian Premier, said that the portions of Serbia inhabited by Bulgarians go to that country which then becomes a neighbour of Hungary. Regarding the Serbian territory adjacent to Greece, a Greek-Bulgarian agreement would be come to. Austria for decades had declared herself territorially satisfied and desired no more surfeit. Hungary wanted no more incorporation of Slavs. In any case, Austria must demand a regulation of the frontier, preserving their control of the Danube bank on the south side, and Belgrade was regarded by the military authorities as a strategically indispensable bridgehead for Austria in connection with Semlin. As for the rest of Serbia, it might perhaps continue to exist as a state without the Katageorgevitch dynasty, and in close union with the Central Powers. – Reuter76

The German Government defended its support of Austria-Hungary in the Serbian crisis by observing that if the Serbs continued with the aid of Russia and France to menace the existence of Austria-Hungary, the gradual collapse of Austria and the subjection of all the Slavs under Russia would be the consequence, thus making untenable the position of the Teutonic race in Central Europe. Dr. Münsterberg called the war between Germany and Russia "moral" because it represented an unavoidable and necessary clash between the two civilizations. Sir Roger Casement warned that Britain, the foe of Europe and European civilization was prepared to betray Europe to the Russians in her pursuit of the destruction of Germany. The Russian/Slavic domination of all Europe was portrayed as the inevitable result of Germany’s defeat. Münsterberg made this point and warned that a triumphant Tsar would "liberate" India and then, somehow, free Canada and Australia, and England was making a grave mistake in fighting Germany. There seemed to be the belief that using coloured, and therefore inferior, troops against the Teutonic whites was somehow degrading to the Germanics forced to fight them, similar perhaps to the feeling of Confederate troops fighting Union black

76 CE 14 December 1915. Austrians and Peace. (P.A. Foreign Special) Zurich, Dec. 10th. - Addressing his official staff the new Austrian Minister of Commerce, Dr. Spitzmueller, declared future economic relations between Austria-Hungary and Germany constituted the greatest task before the Ministry. […] This new organisation, which would have to be carried ot in connection with the conclusion of peace, must include the completion of the Austro-Hungarian commercial political relations with the Balkans and the Near East, which formed the natural and traditional markets for both halves of the Monarchy.
troops. Koester frequently complained about the temerity of the British using Arabs and Indians against white men. The Germans emphasized the primitiveness of the Allied native troops, with pictures of African soldiers portrayed as cannibals, British Fijian troops labelled as former cannibals. Interestingly, the Germans rationalized fighting alongside the Japanese in the Second World War, and seemed to have had no problems serving with Turks in the first. The racial element was new to European wars, a product of new European ideas about nationalism.

CE 30 December 1915
Editorial
The strained relations between the United States and Austria appear to have reached the breaking point, and the opinion has prevailed in Washington Press circles for some days past that the Austrian reply to the United States Notes on the torpedoing of the Ancona, will not be of a satisfactory character. [...] However, one must not expect lofty ideas of humanity from the Huns or their Allies, as the attempt to torpedo the hospital ship Asturias so completely demonstrated. Following Austria’s reply, the public will look forward to the action of the United States with curious expectancy.

77 Chesterton, The Barbarism of Berlin, chapter 1: ‘The friends of the German cause have complained that Asiatics and Africans upon the very verge of savagery have been brought against them from India and Algiers. And in ordinary circumstances, I should sympathise with such a complaint made by a European people. But the circumstances are not ordinary. Here, again, the quiet unique barbarism of Prussia goes deeper than what we call barbarities. About mere barbarities, it is true, the Turco and the Sikh would have a very good reply to the superior Teuton. The general and just reason for not using non-European tribes against Europeans is that given by Chatham against the use of the Red Indian: that such allies might do very diabolical things. But the poor Turco might not unreasonably ask, after a week-end in Belgium, what more diabolical things he could do than the highly cultured Germans were doing themselves.’


79 CE 1 January 1916. American News. The reply of Austria to Mr. Lansing’s second Ancona note is officially regarded here as satisfactory. There is indeed considerable relief at what was thought to be a difficult situation being settled so comparatively easy [...] and in one way the Note is more satisfactory than the submarine promise extorted from Germany.
6. Ireland the Austrian Empire during The Great War
Part III – 1916

Here’s to you, Pearse, your dream, not mine.
But yet the thought, for this you died,
Has turned life’s water into Wine.
AE.

It seems almost incredible that in 1916, a week long battle in the streets of Dublin, lead by less than a thousand and claiming the lives of a few hundred, could leave a more indelible mark on the course of Irish history than the comparatively greater events unfolding on the Continent: the battle of Verdun claims 400,000 men on both sides; Germany and Austria-Hungary declare war on Portugal; the Brusilov offensive and the battle of the Somme take their extraordinary toll on human lives; Romania declares war on Austria-Hungary; Italy declares war on Germany; Turkey declares war on Russia; Bulgaria declares war on Romania. The tank is invented but remains largely ineffective.\(^1\) Franz Josef, Emperor of Austria-Hungary, dies, succeeded by his grand-nephew, Karl I. In Britain compulsory military service is introduced. To this is now added the Irish Easter Rising, crushed by British forces, the 16 leading rebels executed and thereby immortalised. Roger Casement is hung as traitor for his role in the Rising. And yet, as Thomas Kettle correctly foresaw, the rebels harvested the anarchy they sowed as political inspiration and spiritual veneration. The hundreds of thousands of volunteers who returned from France and Flanders and Mesopotamia, or ‘wherever the firing line extended,’ received no welcome, no memorial and no ‘Poppy day.’ At best they were ignored, or taunted for their troubles, at worst murdered.\(^2\)

\(^1\) CE 28 December 1916. The tank idea has set to work the engineering talent of America. Mr. Frank Shuman, who is said to be a well-known American engineer, has decided that there is no limit possible to their size. He describes the destroyer of the future as being an enormous wheeled structure, heavily armoured and capable of travelling at high speed, possibly of such size and weight that its impetus would supersede guns. […] “Armies,” says the projector of this phantasmagoria, “would be as helpless in offering resistance as a flock of geese in the path of an automobile.”

\(^2\) Ferriter, p.132: “It was being recognised by the end of the twentieth century, particularly in the context of the peace process of the 1990s, that historical neglect of southern Ireland’s participation in the First World War was shameful. A ‘collective amnesia’ referred to by F.X. Martin as far back as 1967 came to be seen not only as immature, but as a denial of the true complexity of Irish political, social and cultural allegiances, during a period of shifting, and contradictory, loyalties. Underlining the work of the pioneers who broke this silence, in particular Keith Jeffery, was a belief that the war was the single most central experience in twentieth-century Ireland and that the events of the war years, whether in the general post office in Dublin at Easter 1916, or at the battle front in Europe, constituted a ‘seamless robe’ of Irish experience, a cautionary warning to those who view Irish history through this period as a history of differences”. In the eight volumes of Ireland’s
6.1. The Easter Rising - social or national revolution?

[To] imagine that social revolution is conceivable without revolts by small nations in the colonies and in Europe, without the revolutionary outbursts of a section of the petty bourgeoisie with all its prejudices, without a movement of politically non-conscious proletarian and semi-proletarian masses against a landlord, church, monarchical and other oppression – to imagine that means repudiating social revolution. Very likely one army will line up in one place and say, ‘We are for socialism’, while another will do so in another place and say, ‘We are for imperialism’, and that will be the social revolution! Only from such a ridiculously pedantic angle could one label the Irish rebellion a ‘putsch’. Whoever expects a ‘pure’ social revolution will never live to see it.

Lenin, 1916.3

Lenin saw the Rising as a natural phenomenon of the period because of the break-up of imperialism. For example, the Brusilov offensive launched to relieve pressure on the Italians buckling under an Austrian offensive in 1915, did actually devastate the Austro-Hungarian army, but it cost the Russian army one million casualties and seriously fuelled revolutionary discontent at home.4 In the 1915-16 run of James Connolly’s The Workers’ Republic, it is clear that Connolly did not see the war as a senseless carnage, that he did not see it as a matter of indifference to socialists which side won. He supported Germany not only because of tactical military or nationalist notions. He wanted a German victory in the interests of socialism.5 In the spring of 1916, it also became possible for the I.R.B.6 to plan

memorial records produced in 1923, 49,435 Irish were listed as having died in the war, though exact definition of ‘Irish’ remained uncertain. The Irish journalist Kevin Myers suggested a figure of 35,000 deaths, and he wrote with great passion about the scale of the official neglect of such huge loss of life and what is revealed about the selective culture of Irish nationalism. David Fitzpatrick has calculated that Ireland’s aggregate male contribution to the wartime forces was 210,000. Enlistment figures revealed that 50,000 joined up in the First six months of the war and 90,000 in the succeeding 45 months, with a particularly remarkable response to the 1918 recruiting campaign, when between August and November alone 1918, 9,845 were recruited. F.X. Martin made much of the fact that, according to figures he used in 1916, there were 150,183 Irishmen serving with the British forces of which 99,837 were recruits who joined up after mobilisation in August 1914. There were also 1,121 members of the Dublin metropolitan police and 9,501 members of the RIC and in addition 105,000 volunteers loyal to John Redmond - a total of 265,000 serving with, or in alliance with, the British forces, against about 12,000 Irish volunteers opposed.”

3 Clifford, Connolly, p. 29.
4 Cassell’s Chronology, p.478/479.
5 Clifford, Connolly, p.31.
6 Jackson, p.152: “After the division within the Volunteers in September 1914, there existed a cohort opposed to Redmond’s strategy: these men, numbering perhaps 12,000 (out of an original total of around 170,000 Volunteers) were concentrated in Dublin, under the leadership of Eoin MacNeill, an elder within the Gaelic League and Professor of Early Irish History at University College Dublin. There was an overlap between these reformulated Irish Volunteers and the Irish Republican Brotherhood, but it was within the latter organisation that the plans for a rebellion against the British were hatched. Even within the IRB, however, there was no general pressure for military action: the constitution of the Brotherhood required an electoral mandate before any
seriously for a rising, with German help. They no longer had to worry about ‘jeopardising Home Rule,’ the coalition had done that for them. Redmond also helped them by identifying all forms of separatism with Sinn Féin, which he referred to as a ‘temporary cohesion of isolated cranks.’ Unfortunately, for Redmond and the IPP, his successful recruiting drive had deprived the party of its voters.

The initial success of Redmond’s call to arms meant that it was his most enthusiastic supporters among the Volunteers who went to France and to the deaths. Some of his immediate friends and colleagues fought and fell: Major William Redmond, his brother, died in June 1917 from wounds received during his service with the Royal Irish Regiment; a former member of the parliamentary party, Lieutenant T.M.Kettle, was killed in action with the Royal Dublin Fusiliers in September 1916. Thirty thousand Irishmen were killed in the First World War, and while the casualties sustained by the Ulster Division were indisputedly horrific, the sacrifice of Redmond’s National Volunteers was probably no less awful, and certainly (until very lately) only inadequately recognised. Exact figures are still wanting, but it might be estimated that a little less than half of the total number of fallen Irishmen were Redmonite Home Rulers. **In supporting Irish engagement with the war effort, the Irish party had embarked upon a career of self-mutilation.**

In a letter to the Editor, a reader in West Cork sums up the mood of the nation: chivalry is not dead in Ireland, and small nations like herself can count upon her sons rallying to the fore, but the country being small there is not an endless supply of men and money available to contribute to the war effort ad infinitum, as it appeared to people in 1916, and who would run the country once Home Rule was established, if there still was a chance of its actual implementation.

CE 16 February 1916
Letters to the Editor
Where does Ireland stand?
A Cara – Is it not about time that the country should speak out in the present serious position of our National affairs, and that our elected representatives should know that the breaking point has almost been reached? **When the present calamitous European war broke out our representatives pledged Ireland’s aid to England in the war, and the country did not complain, at least not very**

---

7 Inglis, p.298.
8 Jackson, p.150.
much. Some few there were who ventured to suggest that the Irish Party should have summoned a convention and taken council with the country, and not acted with Kaiser-like highhandedness in deciding Ireland’s position in the war, but they were overborne by public opinion. The hatred for German methods and militarism was too intense. The chivalrous heart of Ireland went forth to the cry of small nationalities and Belgium’s trampled land, and ruined temples and homesteads, and outraged people and religious, captured the imagination of our warm-hearted people. The Irish people are now, however, beginning to complain. What is bringing about the change in Irish sentiment? The toll of lives and treasure that the war is claiming to itself, the price namely, that we are called upon to pay, plus our uncertainty as to our own future, when the Allies come victorious out of the war, as, please God they will. Ireland has out of the poor remnant of her population that emigration has left behind contributed something like 100,000 men to the battle front, making no account of the 50,000 men or so that belonged to the Army and Navy when the war broke out, and taking no account either of the Irishmen that volunteered from other countries, it is reckoned that, all told, Ireland can number 300,000 of her children – the sea-divided Gael – at the various fronts. In addition to the blood tax which she has to pay, her yearly taxation has been raised from £9,600,000 before the war to £17,500,000 for the first year of the war, and this taxation is destined to increase in future years and to weigh like a millstone around our national neck to generations yet unborn. Not bad this for a bankrupt country that had to depend on the generosity of her wealthy partner. Where then do we stand? Is Ireland satisfied with such a state of things? We probably would be willing to grin and bear it stoically and with resignation if the term of our sacrifices were in sight and if freedom were assured to us beyond question with the end of the war. But the end is not yet to be seen, and supposing even the Allies to issue victorious, the fabric of our freedom, it is to be feared, rests on very insecure foundations – our charter is after all only a mere “scrap of paper,” and we know how little value is set upon such things in the time we live in. Ireland’s history should teach us that the Prussian spirit that we had to deal with cared little for scraps of paper at any time in the past. The war demand upon us for the remainder of the war is at the rate of 1,100 men per week, and John Redmond told us in Galway last week that on the condition of supplying this demand our liberty depends - in other words, that Home Rule is endangered if we fail to come up to this mark.⁹ The splendid response made by Ireland up to the present is not

⁹ CE 19 February 1916. The Irish Leader. Manifesto to Irish People. London, Friday Night. - The Press Association says Mr.Redmond has addressed the following manifesto to the people of Ireland:- “At the very commencement of the war I made an appeal to the Irish people, and especially to the young men of Ireland, to mark the profound change which has been brought about in the relations of Ireland to the Empire by wholeheartedly supporting the Allies in the field. I pointed out that at long last after centuries of misunderstanding the democracy of Great Britain had finally and irrevocably decided to trust Ireland, and I called upon Ireland to prove that the concession of liberty would, as we had promised in your name, have the same effect in our country as in every other portion of the Empire, and that henceforth Ireland would be a strength instead of a weakness. I further pointed out this was a just war, provoked by the intolerable military despotism of Germany, that it was a war in defence of the rights and liberties of small nationalities, and that Ireland would be false to her history and every constitution of honour, good faith, and self-interest if she did not respond to my appeal. I called for a distinctively Irish Army, composed of Irishmen, led by Irishmen, and trained for the field at home in Ireland. “I acknowledge with profound gratitude the magnificent response the country has made. For the first time in history we have to-day a huge Irish Army in the field. Its achievements have covered Ireland with glory before the world, and have thrilled our hearts with pride. North and South have vied with each other in springing to arms, and, please God, the sacrifices they have made side by
enough; the men that have been sent, the money so lavishly spent, will be of no avail unless we give more and more, and still more, and bleed ourselves white, and exhaust ourselves beyond the possibility of recovery. We thought that Home Rule was safe, that the king could not disown his sign-manual. We were assured of this often enough by all the prophets, but it appears that now our position is not at all secure, that not only does the question of the Amending Bill remain to be settled – we may add the re-adjustment of the Financial Clauses of the Act – but that we must continue to exhaust our resources of men at the rate of 1,100 per week for an incalculable time in order to qualify for the simulacrum of freedom that Home Rule contains. Where is the line to be drawn? Are we so sure of England’s word and faith that we should thus consent to this interminable bleeding process, and put ourselves beyond the possibility of recovery or self-defence. Irish agriculture is to be denuded of its labour supply, and while, apparently, the English Government is giving special assistance to English agriculturalists, and undertaking not to interfere with their labour supply for the purpose of recruiting. Seadh, a cara, is it not about time that we should find out our bearings. We are not pro-Germans, not anti-recruiters, and Germany has no claim upon our affections. We hate and detest Prussian methods, and all the works and pomps of Prussianism, and we pray for their confusion, but we do not know what vicissitudes of fortune may yet be before this small nation, what troubles she may have to encounter, and that too, from those who have been our hereditary enemies, when the war is over. We cannot afford to exhaust ourselves too much in the present struggle. If our traditional enemies want to procure plenty Irishmen to fight the common enemy, the means to get them is in their own hands. Let them abandon once and for all their hostility to our national demands, let Bonar Law unsay the words he uttered not long since, that his views side on the field of battle will form the surest bond of a united Irish nation in the future. We have kept our word. We have fulfilled our trust. We have definitely accepted the position and undertaken the obligations of a self-governed unit amongst the nations which make up the Empire. “One more duty remains to be fulfilled. We have to stand by and maintain the Irish army at the front. We must not, and will not, tolerate the idea of our Irish regiments being reinforced by any but Irish soldiers. Ireland must maintain the Irish regiments until victory has been won. The gaps in the ranks of our Irish army must be filled, not by Englishmen or Scotchmen or Welshmen, but by Irishmen. Our gallant fellow countrymen at the front commissioned me to make this appeal. They appeal today through me from the trenches to the farmers, labourers, artisans, and to every class of our people, not to desert them. In your name I promised them in France and Flanders that Ireland would stand by them. Will you fulfill that promise? The task is not difficult. Fill up the reserve battalions. Your brothers in the trenches are not only upholding the honour of Ireland before the world – they are defending Ireland itself from ruin and destruction, from murder and sacrilege, from confiscation of the lands of the Irish farmers and the wrecking of property, and the prosperity of every class of our population. You are under no compulsion save that of duty. “In the name of honour, justice and religion, in the name of common gratitude, and in their own highest self-interest, I appeal to the young men of Ireland who are still available, to form reserve battalions, and to commence their training, so that in the event of the war not speedily ending they may be ready to fill every gap in the ranks of the Irish army at the front.”(Signed) J. E. Redmond.”

10 CE 16 February 1916. Ballingeary Arrest. Dear Sir – An incident recently occurred in Ballingeary which if it has an element of tragedy, has also a large element of comedy. An Englishman (Professor Chevasse) wearing the Irish kilt, and refusing to speak but the Irish language, was arrested by an Irish policeman wearing the English uniform, and ignorant of the Irish language, lest he might injure the realms of England. To add to the humour of the situation, the Irish soldiers are helping England in her battles to preserve the rights of small nationalities, including their language, whilst an Englishman in his campaign to preserve the Irish language is fined by a bench of Irish magistrates. To prevent such an incident from occurring again, I am writing to ask the Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary to send at least one Irish speaking policeman to Ballingeary. This is the more necessary as during the season of the Irish College in July and August at Ballingeary the students are supposed to speak nothing but Irish, and in doing this they
on past controversies had undergone no change, let the representative Unionists and Orangemen declare that the fight of centuries is over; let the Coalition Government throw open the doors of an Irish Parliament, and the Act of this Parliament will be a vote of 50,000, yea 100,000 more men from Ireland to crush Prussian militarism, and Irishmen, all the world over, will flock to the standards of those who, whatever they may have been in the past, will, by this gracious act have shown themselves to be real champions of small nations, at home as well as abroad. Now is the time. The suspensory period of the Act expires apparently on next March 17th. May we dare to say so much to our elected representatives? May they dare to repeat so much to their English Allies? - Liam O hUallachain, C.C., Bealad, Clonakilty.

The Examiner, though still very much on the side of Redmond and the IPP, covers a lot of ground in south west Ireland and controversy engenders readership, thus publishing all sentiments on the recruiting drives.

CE 15 March 1916
Letters to the Editor
Ireland and the War

Sir – In my last reply to “Nationalist” I endeavoured to show that if Germany was successful in breaking up England’s sea power, the conquest and occupation of Ireland by the Germans would follow as a matter of course. This, in my opinion, is the strongest reason for joining in with Irishmen out at the front, as some men must have a material interest to guard before they see the point of fighting at all. Of course, by so doing, we must necessarily be allied with France, Belgium, England, Scotland, and Wales on the Western front, and in the East with Russia and Serbia. Some call this “fighting for England,” as if there was not a community of interest amongst the Allied Powers. The ancestors of these cranks must have objected to the Irish Brigade fighting for France, a hundred years ago, when glory for Ireland was the only gain. […] When O’Connell laid down the dictum “England’s difficulty is Ireland’s opportunity” England was exhausted by the strain of the Napoleonic wars. Ireland had failed in its effort to free itself by the United Irish movement. We depended upon the French to drive the English out of Ireland, as we could not shake off the oppressors’ yoke ourselves. Napoleon gave up his plan of landing a strong force in Bantry Bay, and his Irish supporters suffered death on the scaffold in consequence of the Corsican’s

may get into trouble if there is no policeman there who knows the Irish language. This incident moreover would lead one to think that a movement should be set on foot to make a knowledge of the Irish language compulsory for candidates for the Royal Irish Constabulary. – Yours truly, James O’Leary, P.P. Ballingeary.

CE 21 February 1916. The Irish Language. Under the auspices of the Cork Branch of the Gaelic League a public meeting was held in the city Hall last night. Mr. Liam de Roiste occupied the chair, and there was a large attendance. The Chairman said the object of the meeting was to protest against the revival of the penal laws against the Irish language. The first law in that respect was passed 550 years ago, and their enemies had not yet succeeded in suppressing that language. It was their intention and determination to keep and speak the Irish language, no matter what might happen. Mr. P. O’Hanrahan… [said it] was a national work to keep alive their traditions, and they would lose their nationality if they did not learn the Irish language. He appealed to the people to join a branch of the Gaelic League and do something to learn the Irish language. […] Mr. C. Chevasse next addressed the meeting […] The Irish language was the finest language in the world, and it had a special claim on the people of the country, and by helping the Irish language they would be helping the real genuine small nationalities.
desertion. We expected to get some return from France for the magnificent service of the Irish Brigade, but a Bourbon no longer ruled as King of France. We were fools to have trusted the adventurer Bonaparte, but it was a most natural mistake for a nation to have made. O'Connell, educated in France, knew that if ever Ireland was to be free she would have to work out her own salvation. A good start was made at the battle of Fontenoy, when the English were beaten. The Penal Laws forced Irishmen to fight for France, but when the Hanoverian King of England realised this, the first blow was struck for Catholic Emancipation by the victorious Irish Brigade. For the sake of my argument we must find out the condition of Ireland when O'Connell started his Constitutional agitation so as to contrast it with the times we now live in. Any student of Irish history must come to the conclusion that all the advantages wrung from England by Irishmen have been by means of Constitutional methods. George K. Chesterton, the eminent English essayist, alluding to the change in Irish conditions wrought by clever Parliamentary agitation, terms it a bloodless revolution. Lecky, in his historical writings, has given us a vivid picture of Irish life and conditions, but I prefer, for obvious reasons, the observations of a German writer, J.G. Kohl, who wrote an account of his travels in Ireland, in the early forties, afterwards translated into English. “Since I have seen Ireland I find that even the poorest of the Lettes, Estonians, and Finlanders dwell and live very respectably. To him who has seen Ireland no mode of life, in any part of Europe, however wretched, will seem pitiable. Nay, even the conditions of the savages will appear endurable and to be preferred […] The savage’s nakedness is warmed by the sun […]. Ruin, decay, rags, beggary and misery are to be seen all through Ireland, not merely in the wild districts of Clare, Donegal, Mayo, and Kerry […] but equally throughout the most beautiful and most fertile plains.” This was the condition of our native land, given by one whose nation is now ever-ruining Europe. Kohl gives wonderful descriptions of our fertile soil and beautiful surroundings in his book. Some Irishmen wish the Germans to come to Ireland to [illegible] out England for the miserable past inflicted on our forefathers by years of oppression and misgovernment, believing that the Prussian will not be tempted to seize our fine farms, our cattle, the moneys in our banks. He is a fool who trusts the Prussian Junker. The argument that the Lusitania sinkers will free Ireland must have been first heard within the walls of the Cork Lunatic Asylum. Let me remind “Nationalist” of the state of Ireland to-day, which I suggest is worth defending and retaining. The land belongs to the farmer occupier, and in the majority of cases he has bought out the fee simple with moneys provided by the imperial Legislature. The landlord has got his price, and has given up his claims. The farm buildings have improved, and the land has been cleared, drained and tilled. No more nakedness and starvation. The Grand Jury and ex-officio Poor Law Guardian systems have disappeared. The control of municipal county and rural government is in the hands of popular Councils. The labourers hold comfortable dwellings and plots, built out of public funds at small rents. Large grants of money have been voted by Parliament towards primary, secondary and University education. Technical instruction and science education have not been neglected. Libraries have been provided in our cities and towns. Railways, tramways, and good roads traverse the four provinces. Piers have been built, harbours developed, and loans

11 Ferriter, p.137: “In the battle for allegiance between pro- and anti-war sides, both saw the countryside as the true repository of the Irish spirit. The department of recruiting in Ireland went to great lengths to enlist farmers, informing them: ‘every one of your farms is carefully mapped and recorded in Berlin’.”
given for fishing boats and gear. The Medical Charities Act assists the sick poor, and the Agricultural Grant relieves the rates in rural Ireland. The old people have pensions of five shillings weekly. We have complete religious freedom, and fine churches, convents and schools, built by public subscription, have sprung up everywhere. Our poor no longer sleep upon straw, nor do they feed upon potatoes and yellow meat in our workhouses. They have reasonable comforts, and are cared by Irish Sisters of Mercy. There is no serious crime in the country, and our prisons are not filled. Loans for land improvement schemes were freely lent by the Board of Works at a low rate of interest. The Congested Districts Board looks after congested areas in Cork, Clare, Kerry, Mayo, Galway, Sligo and Donegal. The Lord Chancellorship of Ireland, the judicial bench, and high offices of state are open to Nationalists and Catholics; the magisterial bench has representatives from the farming and shopkeeping classes. The Irish representatives have been able to push national interests to the forefront in Parliament, and in a great measure to control the Irish Government. Before the war broke out all our revenue was spent at home, and no contribution given to Imperial purposes. The moneys on deposit in our banks and Post Office have greatly increased and multiplied. The farmers have benefited by the nine years boom in trade in England, and the high prices for cattle and agricultural produce have enabled them to save money. A great fillip has been given to home industry, and the trade in our cities and towns has vastly increased. As England is our only market, and farming our principal way of living, we have become more and more dependent on England. When there is unemployment across the water there is distress in Ireland. Mutual trade between England and Ireland has created a better understanding, but Ireland’s wealth and happiness altogether depends on English demand for her produce. In conclusion I must remind “Nationalist” that the improved conditions in Ireland have changed the times. There must be a necessary modification of our policy towards England. We must be above parochial and ward politics, and as a great nation of free men, we must be definite in our aims, and take a broad view of the situation created in our land by the greater war in the history of the world. – Your obedient servant, D.M.J. O’Connell. Killeena, Creagh, 10th March, 1916.

Sir – Two years ago, when Ireland seemed on the verge of civil war and as if nothing human could avert the peril, during a discussion when the question was raised, “Could anything now possibly prevent civil war?” one of my sons answered, “Yes; war with Germany – every Irishman would then fight shoulder to shoulder.” It was a prophecy, and it has been fulfilled; he did his part, he gave his all; he fell with his gallant countrymen whom he loved; he gave up his life with them, fighting “shoulder to shoulder” for the country they loved and for the sacred trust their God had committed into their hands – the maintenance of Christianity. The prophecy has been fulfilled, for every true Irishman, whether of

---

12 CE 15 March 1916. Sir – I thank Mr. O’Connell for his compliments. My friends and I are not a bit surprised to hear from him the same arguments used at recruiting meetings. Blue Books and the geography are made out by men like cases are made out by solicitors. What we want is hard facts to answer our queries in my last letter. We hope somebody will answer them. We wouldn’t care who answers us so long as they are hard facts, undisputed facts. The true and good answers of a quay labourer would be more convincing than the puzzling answers of a solicitor or a gentleman with a big name and a big salary. We don’t mean to make nothing of Mr. O’Connell’s letter. It is a very clever letter, but we consider the answers not suitable for us. They were good enough for very high people, and we could not take answers that may be good enough for the very high. Because no one answers my questions I believe they have no answers. When we are convinced that Irishmen should fight there will be plenty of recruits. – Yours truly, Nationalist. Cork, March 9, 1916.
North or South, Roman Catholic or Protestant, Unionist or Nationalist, peer’s son or labourer’s son, has answered to his country’s call and is “doing his bit” in the terrible struggle that Right may conquer Might. Were the truth but known, every man who has held back is at heart a true Irishman; he has put personal grievances, personal safety, personal gain, everything and anything personal, before his country’s need, and were the enemy at our shores, the safety of his country would, I fear, be as sadly insecure, if entrusted to the honour of the selfstyled patriot, as in the hands of the slacker and the shirker. Should he wish to prove he has in reality the honour of his country at heart, let him come boldly forward before it is too late – even now – and volunteer to do whatever may be required of him to help his country in its hour of greatest need; to respond to the call of his fellow countrymen in the trenches; to avenge the death and sufferings of those who have done so nobly; and be willing, if needs be, to give up his life for the preservation of Christianity and for the honour and safety of his country. – Yours, etc., “An Irishwoman.” 3rd March, 1916

However mixed the mailbag may have been, the Editorial of the Examiner brought its own opinion to bear upon the readers, extolling the virtues of commercial and religious freedom and constitutional methods of obtaining them – and going to war to secure these privileges permanently – and damning in the same breath those who would dare to disturb the status quo and shake the foundations of friendly relations with England. And how could a fraction of the population possibly persuade the majority that they had got it wrong?

CE 24 April 1916
Editorial

The situation that has been created by the war in many parts of the United Kingdom, however unpleasant it may look to the ordinary man, has been evolved by conditions that are in themselves unusual and disturbing. No part of these island countries has been free from internal trouble. In Wales the miners have given the authorities cause for grave anxiety; in Scotland workers on arms […] threw down their tools, while hardly an English port has been free from disputes […]. Ireland has been fortunately spared much of the dislocation that has hit our neighbours pretty hard, but we have to deplore a menace which has, indeed, been largely exaggerated for party purposes, but still whose existence we must admit. We allude to those men, young and inexperienced in most instances, who have defied or disregarded the advice of the elected representatives of the people, and without mandate or justification have set out to take the course which they believe is best in the interests of Ireland, though warned by those who know that they are not only endangering themselves but the cause of their country. They form, we believe, only a fraction of the people and are generally known as the party of Sinn Féin. They themselves will readily admit that they by no means think alike. A very small percentage, indeed, are well wishers and admirers of the Kaiser. Some because of the “treasured wrongs” of centuries, and […] are against the Allies because they want to see England beaten, while others hold that as it is not Ireland’s war Ireland should take no part in it. The great majority are animated with sentiments which for our own part, though we do not agree with them, we cannot deny have some force. They say we believe in Self-Government, and would be
satisfied with it. We are confident the English people would give it to us if they had the power, but day by day we see the enemies of our aspirations everywhere in ascendency and loudly proclaiming that now as before and as they ever will be they are ready to prevent by force of arms the people of Ireland ruling their own land. [But] there are many other reasons of a more abstruse kind put forward to justify the course so irresponsibly taken by others who fill the ranks of the dissentients from the general voice of Nationalist Ireland. There are, in fact, as many shades and cults included in their sympathisers as there are in the Christians sects outside the Catholic Church. The only common belief, indeed, that they share is distrust of Mr. Redmond and the Party of which he is the head. That their numbers are insignificant and unrepresentative may be proved from the fact that no elected man of any of the popular Boards throughout our broad county is identified with the movement, and the vast bulk of the people look on them with distrust and disfavour. So far their efforts on behalf of Ireland have consisted in obstructing recruiting. These efforts are neither magnificent nor are they war. We have ourselves always insisted that there are many sound reasons that would account for the number of men enlisting from Ireland not being as large as the proportion joining from other centres of the United Kingdom. The arguments in proof have been repeatedly given and do not require repetition.

It must be remembered that no one in Ireland is compelled to join the army. That being so, we do not think it unfair if the authorities claim on the other hand that no one has the right to dissuade anyone who of his own will, and because of the dictates of his own conscience feels called on to help a cause which besides being identifies with civilisation and freedom closely concerns our own land. Nor do we believe the efforts made with the object of stopping recruiting have had much success, but they have undoubtedly provoked much irritation in circles that have some claim on Ireland’s gratitude, while they have given to the enemies of our National rights a weapon which they have unscrupulously used, as many of the Sinn Féin party have recognised and admitted. In its wildest dream this party cannot hope to accomplish any more. It is, of course, possible that it may get into trouble some of its hot-headed members, who will not even then command the sympathy of the community, which in all truth has already supped full of other horrors. And may we in all good faith and friendship strongly urge on these young men to reconsider their position, to examine and judge for themselves the injury they may do to the cause of their country. To read the history of their land and learn its lesson. The condition of our people to-day is very different to what it was when Wolfe Tone sunk serene or when Davis wrote his immortal ballads. We are at least as well off individually as most lands, and for us the future holds prospects as hopeful as for any in Europe. […] We are striving for an Ireland united North and South. That too is their dream. Is the attitude they have adopted in the present fateful crisis likely to attract our northern compatriots, who up to now have been hostile, to take their part with us in the regeneration of our country. Already thousands of our brave men have gone to their doom, animated with the hope that their generous sacrifice will help to bring nearer the race who have been kept sundered so long.13 Grudgingly indeed have their gallantry and sufferings been

---

13 Ferriter, p.132/3: “The reasons they joined in such numbers were manifold. Army officials were probably correct in believing social and economic factors were more important than political conviction. Tom Kettle, mentioned earlier, in a sonnet to his daughter, days before he was killed in the Somme in 1916, suggested that ‘we fools’ did not die for flag, nor king, nor emperor, ‘but for a dream born in a herdsman’s shed and for the secret scripture of the poor’. For many it was about a transition from boyhood to manhood; a shared excitement, despite the literature of disillusionment...
acknowledged, grave indeed will be the responsibility of the man whose actions would tend to overshadow and minimise the harvest that Ireland hopes to reap from the glory of the men whose bones lie whitening from Dunkirk to Belgrade. [...] The higher commands of both the army and the navy, quite unconstitutionally we know, were in sympathy with Orange Ulster. That is not so to-day. The great Conservative Party are most emphatic on the necessity of a Federated Empire after the war. How can they approach the Cape, Australia, or Canada unless they have settled with Ireland? [If] they treat the Irish Parliament Act like the Germans treated the Belgian treaty, as a mere scrap of paper, what prospect have they of concluding an arrangement that will be helpful? The perfidy would be so great that, setting aside all the interest the Irish vote wields, the distrust engendered by such an action would prevent America from dealing with such a power. How can we ingratiate ourselves with Ulster if even a fringe of our population refuses to be bound by the promises and protestations of our public men for the last thirty years? [...] The man who cannot forgive an injury is contemptible. The nation whose only policy is revenge does not deserve to exist. All through our history our patriots strove, not as red Indians might for the scalps of their enemies, not to bring England to the dust – “They rose in dark and evil days to right their native land,” because they were patriots. The honour of our country stands committed in such a way that no Irishman is entitled to repudiate now the offers that were repeatedly made on behalf of the nation by our trusted men. Our interests, too, demand that we are true. [...] Mere hatred of England, it has to be recollected, does not always ensure that one is not a traitor to Ireland.

which followed the conflict, reflected in Michael MacDonagh’s The Irish on the Somme (1917), which contended that ‘this was a dastardly massacre and not manly warfare’. It is also another step in the growing militarisation of Ireland and indeed Europe, and the similar sufferings of both Irish and British soldiers would undermine the myth that the Irish were a exceptionally combative or martial race. Practical considerations were understandable in the decision to join; steady employment and (hopefully) a pension at the end. A typical volunteer was James English, a 38 year old labourer from county Waterford, married with five children. By enlisting, he instantly increased his family’s earnings by 154 per cent, and if anything was to happen to him, his wife was guaranteed a pension. Peer pressure in male environments undoubtedly played a part also, though Jeffery has suggested that ‘the large numbers of Irish women engaged in undoubtedly less exciting, though still serious wartime activities as yet constitute a kind of historically hidden Ireland’. There were for example 2,000 people employed at Kynoch’s high-explosives plant in Arklow. The divisions most obviously Irish were the 10th and 16th Irish divisions and the 36th Ulster division. Bryan Cooper in his history of the 10th division wrote of glorious death, ‘yet their springs from their graves a glorious memory for the example of future generations’. For the fighting men from Ulster this was reflected hideously in just two days of the battle of the Somme, when 5,500 of all ranks were killed, wounded or missing.”

14 Ferriter, p.133/4: “For unionists, the appeal of involvement in war was undoubtedly more politically focused: a public pledge reaffirming their imperial values, which in any case had formed such an important part of the battle against home rule to date. It was also something they expected a political return from. Gillian McIntosh wrote that ‘the province’s protestant combatants were mythologised, transformed into historic figures from the past as the war became a version of the battle of the Boyne transferred to a time (and a past) which bore no resemblance to the reality of the First World War’. McIntosh noted with regard to the unionists that: In their public presentation of events, Home Rule and German aggression came to embody parallel threats to the Empire which they had been vociferously claiming to defend since 1886. Edward Carson’s rhetoric about, and attitude towards, the Empire (which epitomised that of unionists generally), like Redmond’s, was complex, being both sincere and manipulative. Both political camps expected the gratitude of the British administration for their willingness to sacrifice themselves and the rank and file of their parties. Neither foresaw that in the First World War all special interests would be expendable.
As has been mentioned above, the main difference between the southern and northern Irish war experiences was on their return home, it being particularly difficult for returning southern servicemen, given the changed political circumstances in the country. In fact, many who allied themselves with Sinn Féin had seen active service in the British army, not only in France and Flanders and Suvla Bay, but also in the catastrophic Mesopotamian campaign in 1916. Erskine Childers and his cousin Robert Barry became prominent republicans. The IRA veteran Ernie O’Malley, author of two classics on the 1916-23 period, On Another Man’s Wound and The Singing Flame, already had a brother in the British army and was planning to join up himself before the rising ‘shifted his allegiances.’ As pointed out by Deirdre MacMahon: ‘these complex ties and allegiances, covering the First World War, the war of independence and the civil war, were repeated in hundreds of families’.

It was the changed political circumstances when they returned home which ensured a degree of subsequent silence; the lost generation, so relevant to post-war Britain, was more associated in Ireland with the ‘big house’. The fate of these Anglo-Irish residences, when they became republican targets of hatred, was memorably encapsulated in Elizabeth Bowen’s The Last September, when she wrote that ‘the death, execution rather, of the three houses occurred in the same night. A fearful scarlet ate up the hard spring darkness. It seemed, looking from east to west at the sky tall with scarlet, that the country itself was burning’.

15 For insight into the more ‘exotic’ battlefields of the Irish in World War I, cf. Philip Orr, ‘The road to Belgrade: the experiences of the 10th (Irish) Division in the Balkans, 1915-17,’ in Gregory and Paseta (eds.), pp.177-189. The reaction to the rising of Irish soldiers serving in the Balkans is rather sketchy, p.183: “If there is a good record of how Irish soldiers perceived the Balkan region, there is less evidence of how these men pondered upon the political conflicts of their own homeland […]. One of the Division’s officers, having heard of the Easter rising, claimed in correspondence that he was too disgusted to even think about it, never mind write about it […]. Only one significant record seems to survive of Macedonian ‘home thoughts from abroad’. That record is in the form of a poem by Frances Ledwidge, a former Irish Volunteer, serving with the 5th Inniskilling Battalion. It was written before the watershed of Easter 1916, and contains a reflection – from a distant vantage-point of mountains near Kosturino – on the prospects for Irish national renewal:

‘Serbia, 1915’

Beside the lake of Doiran/ I watched the night fade, star by star/ And sudden glories of the dawn/ Shine on the muddy ranks of war./ At night my dreams of that fair land/ Were full of Ireland’s old regret./ And when the morning filled the sky/ I wondered could we save her yet./ Far up the cloudy hills, the roads/ Wound wearily into the morn./ I only saw with inner eye/ A poor old woman all forlorn.

There is no relationship drawn between the cultural dilemmas of Irishman and Serb and no awareness suggested of the painful territorial conflicts always involved in ‘national renewal’; conflicts evident in the town of Doiran, with its shop sign painted and repainted in Bulgarian and Serb scripts […]. The soldier of the Saloniki Force did, in a sense, ‘dip his toe’ into a sea of conflict, which between 1912 and 1923 would send two and a half million refugees back and forward across the region, as the Ottoman, Romanov, and Hapsburg empires dissolved, and the ‘small nations’ of South Eastern Europe found themselves caught up in hazardous dreams of national expansion or bitter arguments over the rights of recalcitrant minorities.

16 Ferriter, p.134/5.
the war, some Irish residents in Britain chose to return rather than be subject to conscription.\textsuperscript{17}

Southern Ireland produced a considerable body of war literature (including Patrick MacGill’s \textit{The Red Horizon}, celebrating the positive inter-action of Irish and British soldiers; the poet Francis Ledwidge celebrating and deploring the war: ‘a soldier’s heart is greater than a poet’s art and greater than a poet’s frame, a little grave that has no name’), and the contemporary \textit{Irish Catholic} newspaper revealed a certain contempt for pacifism, represented among others by Fr Bernard Vaughan, the London preacher who denounced those ‘shirking from the war.’ \textsuperscript{18}

Nonetheless, there was also considerable opposition to the war in Ireland. It was a major theme in advanced nationalist propaganda and anti-war feelings were important in building limited support for republicans in the lead-up to the 1916 rising. Even though it was but a small fraction of the total propaganda circulating in Ireland during the war, there were 12 nationalist newspapers with a national circulation, including \textit{Sinn Féin, Eire Ireland, Irish Volunteer, Irish Freedom, Worker’s Republic} and \textit{Nationality}. But their reaction to the war also revealed contradictions and inconsistencies, given that many of the journalists were capable of demonstrating pride and sympathy with the Irish volunteers in the British army. The tendency to base some propaganda on the supposed sexual immorality of England and outsiders led one journalist to suggest that Irish men, in contrast, were ‘incapable of ruining women’, while Germany was elevated to the status of a ‘morally and religiously pure’ country like Ireland.\textsuperscript{19}

Many who wrote in an extreme and generally propagandist mode were in real life often-practical moderates, whose chief concerns were the economy, such as Arthur Griffith. Bemoaning Britain’s control of the Irish food market, Griffith insisted: ‘an Ireland ringed around with a wall of steel could not be starved. A besieged Ireland at the present time could feed a population of 7 million indefinitely.’ Or Eoin MacNeill, who did not believe blood sacrifice was necessary for the preservation of Irish nationality. It is true, however, that a brutalisation of discourse was gaining ground in Ireland, both north and south.

\textsuperscript{17} Ferriter, p.134: “They included the artist Sean Keating, who in his famous painting \textit{Men of the West} (1916) sought to concentrate on images of ragged bandit Irish warriors; while it was years before the Irish theatre could deal with (135) Sean O’Casey’s \textit{The Silver Tassie}. Staging a play that expressed the horror of the war and its aftermath was politically difficult in an Ireland that did not want to acknowledge participation in the Great War. As Ray Foster has demonstrated, W.B. Yeats also found himself grappling with this issue, after the death in the war of major Robert Gregory, son of his confidante, lady Gregory. He actually wrote four poems about Robert Gregory, as much to figure out his own stage of artistic and personal development as to commemorate the dead pilot. In \textit{An Irish Airman Foresees His Death}, it was significant that Gregory’s commitment to fighting is somewhat existential, Yeats even suggesting he was alienated from the Empire, and he identifies Gregory with Galway and Ireland.”

\textsuperscript{18} Ferriter, p.135.

\textsuperscript{19} Ferriter, p.137.
Advanced nationalists like Desmond Fitzgerald worried that a sense of Irish independence was being obliterated by a World War that was not being waged in the Irish people’s interests. The machinations of the Irish Republican Brotherhood in infiltrating the volunteers, and secretly planning for a military rising, contingent on German help during the war complicated the picture. No one would maintain that the insurgents who proclaimed a republic in Dublin during Easter 1916 had a popular mandate; but it had also been pointed out that there was an absence of democratic politics in Ireland during this period. Electoral politics was about sending (after often uncontested elections) representatives to Westminster, and Tom Garvin maintained that the constitutional relationship between Britain and Ireland prohibited normal democratic politics; that British policy in Ireland was not democratic in the sense that Ireland was ruled according to British contingencies. There is a strong case to be made for the argument that 1916 forced the increasing democratisation of Irish life which British governments had prevented.20

Padraig Pearse, chief instigator of the Easter Rising, hinted at what he had in mind in his funeral oration for the Fenian Jeremiah O’Donovan Rossa, whose remains had been brought back from the United States for burial in Ireland. The Volunteers, he claimed, did not exist simply for the negative purpose of holding the British Government to Home Rule. Theirs was the positive goal of the freedom of Ireland; ‘and we know only one definition, it is Mitchell’s definition; it is Rossa’s definition’.21 This was, of course, also Casement’s definition: an Ireland separated from Britain, and the Empire, except voluntary association. But he did not know the plan that Pearse was evolving to secure that separation, and if the Germans sent arms, Pearse was willing to accept them, but he did not rely on getting them or an Irish Brigade, as Casement assumed the separatists would. ‘How can we defend such men,’ a Connaught volunteer asked him, ‘who take an oath to fight in the British army, of their own free will, and then break it?’ And Pearse felt the same way. Until the Rising, Casement was regarded in England as a curiosity, but when the rising was over, he appeared ‘the foulest of traitors’22. But even before the action began all hopes were dashed, when the Aud, a German vessel supplying German arms, was captured by the Royal Navy.

Germany, the major source for arms imported into Ireland before the First World War, was mostly out of the picture after the outbreak of war.... the erstwhile MP Tom Kettle, was so horrified by the German atrocities he witnessed in Belgium in August 1914 while attempting to purchase arms for the Volunteers that he

20 Ferriter, p.138.
21 Ferriter, p.146, Lyons, pp.333ff.
22 Inglis, p.319.
immediately volunteered for the British army. This left the German market open to the Irish Volunteers and their more extreme supporters in New York, the Clan-na-Gael, who sent Joseph Plunkett, Robert Monteith and Roger Casement to Berlin between 1914 and 1916 to negotiate for German support for a future Rising. Originally, the Germans planned not only to send the armed force of Casement’s Irish Brigade, but also a shipment of 20,000 modern rifles, 10 machine guns and 5,000,000 rounds of ammunition. In the end, the Germans reneged on their initial promises, and sent the Aud loaded with antiquated rifles (mostly Russian in manufacture). Scuttled off the coast of Galway, the Aud’s existence was enough to guarantee the execution of Roger Casement and Patrick Pearse. German support for Irish rebellion in the explicit form of arms supply does not appear to have been taken very seriously by British authorities. Rather, it seems that British officials involved in dealing with arms during the years preceding the Easter Rising preferred to ignore the threat, and focus instead on controlling other means by which arms were brought into Ireland.23

CE 26 April 1916

German Descent on Irish Coast. Attempt to Land Arms and Ammunition. Sir Roger Casement Arrested. Press Bureau, 10.25 p.m.

The Secretary of the Admiralty announces – During the period between p.m. April 20th p.m. April 21st an attempt to land arms and ammunition in Ireland was made by a vessel under the guise of a neutral merchant ship, but in reality a German auxiliary, in conjunction with a German submarine. The auxiliary sank and a number of prisoners were made, among whom was Sir Roger Casement.

The Press Association adds – Sir Roger Casement was in the British Consular service for 18 years, and was appointed British Commissioner to investigate the methods of the rubber collection and treatment of the primitive Indian tribes in the region known as Putumayo, on the Upper Amazon, a region dominated by the Peruvian Amazon Company. The publication of his report in July, 1912, which revealed the systematic perpetration of appalling atrocities committed by the Peruvian agents of the company occasioned profound indignation throughout the civilised world. He relinquished the Consul-Generalship at Rio de Janeiro in 1913, and afterwards took active part in the Home Rule controversy in Ireland on behalf of the Nationalist cause. Shortly before or a little after the outbreak of the war he was in America, and gave voice to pro-German views. He subsequently went to Germany, and was reported to have been received by high State officials in Berlin, who welcomed him for his anti-British sentiments. Reports from British prisoners of war incarcerated in Germany have made grave accusations Sir Roger Casement of attempting to induce Irish soldiers in the prisoners’ camps to renounce their allegiance to the British cause.24

---

24 CE 1 May 1916. Capture of Sir Roger Casement. Outline of German Plot. (From the “Daily Chronicle”) (Special Correspondent-Copyright). Lord Lansdowne imparted to the House of Lords on Wednesday a brief outline of the German plot which designed to land Sir Roger Casement and some of his fellow-conspirators on Irish soil and simultaneously to supply arms and ammunition to his deluded followers by means of a German vessel with false papers and disguised as a neutral trading vessel. But to begin with, it should be made quite clear that the enterprise, futile as it must appear in British eyes, was seriously meant. The suggestion had been made that it was in part a strategem to get rid of Casement, whose presence was no longer desired in Germany, and that the submarine commander had orders to dump him on Ireland and leave him to his fate. That is quite a
Even though the rising had not been a success, outside Dublin there had been little action, but in Dublin itself the rebel force of less than a thousand men and women had held on long enough to lift the rising out of the category of earlier failures. ‘Germany plotted it,’ Redmond claimed, ‘Germany organised it, Germany paid for it.’

CE 28 April 1916
Editorial

The lamentable outbreak that bids fair to complete the financial ruin of Dublin, already staggering for the last three years from blows directed from the same source, will be read with grief and indignation throughout the country. The mad project, which apparently originated at Liberty Hall, which has so often been the storm centre from which trouble has issued, has succeeded in spreading consternation all over the country and has cut off all communication from outside, with the Irish capital, which so far as food and coal are concerned must be reduced to the extremity of a beleaguered city. The lot of the poor there, bad at most times, must be little better than that of world-famous victims of the war. The full facts are not known [...]. It is quite out of keeping with what was the known ideas of the Sinn Féiners, who have always declared, and acted up to their declaration, that they existed for defence. They were, as is well known, first called into being by the action of Sir Edward Carson and his Ulster followers, who announced to the world that under certain conditions they would march to Cork. He, an ex-law officer of the Crown, proceeded to procure weapons and ammunition for his battalions unimpeded by the forces of the Administration. It was not to be hoped that his action would be taken without a countermove on the part of those he regarded as his enemies. He and his associates were warned that arming to resist the law was an expedient that offered a precedent that would be sure to entail serious consequence. With the connivance and the money of the wealthiest people in the land, with the support of those holding high office in the Army and Navy, and with the benediction of the ecclesiastical authorities, they imported arms, drilled their men, and threatened to defy and to fight the forces of the constituted authorities. In vain it was pointed out to them that it was a game that would assuredly be played by two, whilst a strong probability was prophesied that the labour element would also follow suit. The Nationalists in their turn therefore armed, and the proletariat ruled by the proprietors of Liberty Hall quickly adopted the example of their “betters.” From the beginning the Nationalists, who banded themselves together to protect their country, were governed by irresponsible and comparatively unknown men, who successfully kept their hold on a large body of the Volunteers, who were originally called into being to curb the Orangemen. The delays and disappointments in connection with the passing of the Irish Parliament Act, and the defiant and insulting conduct of the Ulster contingent, strengthened the section of

mistaken view of German psychology, which still cherishes the notion that Ireland can be roused to serious rebellion if the proper instrument is employed. Sir Roger Casement was regarded as this instrument, and it is probable that he was able to impress the German Government with an exalted idea of his influence and of the number of followers if he could be placed at their head. There is something almost pathetic in the infatuation which has now been dispelled by the fiasco of the “landing” and its aftermath.

25 Lyons, pp.378ff.
Nationalists who disassociated themselves from Mr. Redmond, while the carping criticism of men who had once been Nationalists as to the meagreness of the Home Rule Bill and its little chance of becoming law, had a very disturbing effect on the opinion of the country. The members of the Nationalists who sympathised with those opposed to the Irish party formed an insignificant part of the population. Outside the ranks of the Irish Volunteers they are merely fractional, and that body itself is not, when the extent of the country is taken into account, very large. They are controlled by men from whom we strongly differ, but who are not in the least likely to sacrifice human life wantonly or embark on an adventure which would be fraught with death and disaster to their followers in an rebellion which has apparently the interest of Germany at heart rather than Ireland. Volunteers forbade the assembling of any of that body in any part of Ireland for Easter. This order was almost universally obeyed, though efforts were made, it is believed, to prevent Prof. MacNeill’s instructions from being carried out. On Easter Monday the storm burst in Dublin. It has assumed dimensions which are worth the issuing of a something equivalent to a war despatch, but it is evident that the trouble is nearing its end [...]. Never, we believe, in the history of our land was there a more perplexing or mysterious situation or one that is fraught with more dangerous possibilities. All fair-minded men will admit that National Ireland is in no way responsible for the Dublin trouble, grave and “bloody” as it may be. So far it is only an incident which may be branded “made in Germany.” [...] The winning cards to-day are in the hands of Sir Ed. Carson, but all the stakes are not in this game. The German Emperor, whose latest scheme, let us admit, has had more success than his diplomacy, can heretofore boast not so many months ago brought North and South into an unwanted sympathy. Is it possible that Liberty Hall may complete that much-desired result. The Orangemen at no time hated Mr. Redmond and the Irish Party more cordially than the governors of Liberty Hall. Has Sir Edward Carson any reason to love them? We, the Nationalists, have had to forget much and forgive injuries that are not yet quite ancient history. Can the North rise above old prejudices? Are the protestations of hatred of Prussia hollow and unreal, and their genuine sentiments undying dislike to their own countrymen? We hope, nay, we believe, that this is not so. An opportunity presents itself to Ulster men that may not arise in many to-morrows. Make peace here and now with the Nationalists, and a blow will be dealt to Prussia at least as great as when Ireland was the only bright spot in a gloomy landscape. Do the Irish soldiers in the trenches deserve no effort on the part of the North to hearten them when they hear that Dublin is in “rebellion?”

26 Jackson, p.152: “MacNeill, who had been kept in the dark, discovered the plans for the rising on Holy Thursday, only three days before it was planned to begin. On Good Friday he issued an order cancelling the volunteer mobilisation which was to have served as an essential preliminary to the insurgency. The thwarted conspirators were forced to delay their action until Easter Monday. On that day, Patrick Pearse proclaimed the creation of an Irish republic on the steps of the General Post Office in O’Connel Street, Dublin. [In] total perhaps 700 men and women turned out on easter Monday, while a few more joined the rebel colours as the week wore on. At its peak, the insurgent forces numbered around 1500, although, as Michael Laffan has wryly commented, the numbers of veterans of the rising multiplied as the years passed. Some 450 people died and 2500 were injured in the fighting of Easter week, 1916.

27 CE 3 May 1916, Irish Division’s Gallantry. Poison-Gas Attack Stopped. Answer to German Intrigues. (From the “Daily Chronicle.”) (Special Correspondent – Philip Gibbs) With the British Armies in the Field. France, April 29. - Whatever comfort the Germans may get out of their plot to stir up trouble in Ireland by inciting a few fanatical men to rebellion, they found no comfort at all but cold steel and machine-gun fire, when they came up at the same time against the Irish race in the
be friends, but -. Let the Tory papers take notice – and indeed so far we have only
seen one, and it was quite sympathetic – that they may at their peril declare Home
Rule is dead. As reasonably might they attempt to revive the conspiracy Act
because of the action of the Clyde munitions workers or the Welsh miners[].
England, we believe, is ready, as she has been for some years past, to trust us and
to be friends. **Prussia and Ireland offer to-day to grasp the red hand of Ulster.
Which shall she take?** It is for Sir Edward Carson and those who have acted with
him to say.

It has been noted that one of the main differences between the 1916
rebellion and previous ones was the ease of movement potential rebels enjoyed
through government inactivity. Thus about 1,000 men and 200 women, members of
the volunteers, the ICA and the IRB, were able to answer the call of an Irish
republic, with Padraig Pearse as commander-in-chief, and defend for nearly a week
the provisional government before surrender. The women involved in 1916
considered themselves combatants and non auxiliaries, passing messages under fire
or actually firing themselves, with Cumann na mBan, the female wing of the Irish
volunteers, formed in 1914, maintaining their own command structures[].

field of battle. It was a splendid coincidence that on the very night when Sinn Féin was trying to
besmirch the honour of Ireland in the streets of Dublin some of the Irish battalions here at the front
should have been in the fighting line at one of the points of the German attack and should have
given by great gallantry, a proof to the world that the heart of Ireland is true and loyal. For, after all,
the heart of Ireland is out here, and its blood has been shed on many battlefields since the beginning
of this war on behalf of the same ideals for which England is fighting, and France [...]. The soldiers
in the Irish division are boys from Leinster and munster, from Connaught and Ulster – from Dublin
or Cork, Galway or Donegal. Catholics and Protestants stand shoulder to shoulder, forgetting old
feuds. There are no politics in the trenches, but the old fighting qualities of the Irish race and the
fine spiritual fire in the Irish hearts have been revealed on many days of great ordeal, so that the
folly of a rebellious rabble is made ridiculous – and hateful to the men out here. [...] “Poison gas
[...]. Put on our helmets.” The Irish boys grabbed the helmets [proof] against the cloud of death.

And “**I wish Sir Roger Casement could get a taste of it down his throat,**” said an Irish soldier.
Cf. also D.G.Boyce, ‘That party politics should divide our tents’: nationalism, unionism and the
First World War.’ in Gregory and Paseta (eds), p.198: “The news of the Easter rising was greeted by
the Irish soldiers in France with a mixture of incredulity and shame; the efforts of Sir Roger
Casement to recruit an ‘Irish Brigade’ in the service of Germany from the Irish Prisoners of War,
and to encourage enlistment from the front, were met with scorn and derision.” And p.199: “But there
were signs of political division as well when, in 1917, ‘a Royal Munster fusilier officer proposed a
toast at Christmas dinner in the Tipperary depot: ‘More sacred to many of us than any King, Ireland
a nation’. When this struggle was decided, ‘there was another coming’.”

28 CE 24 April 1916.Editorial.The situation that has been created by the war in many parts of the
United Kingdom, however unpleasant it may look to the ordinary man, has been evolved by
conditions that are in themselves unusual and disturbing. No part of these island countries has been
free from internal trouble. In **Wales the miners have given the authorities cause for grave
anxiety; in Scotland workers on arms […] threw down their tools, while hardly an English port
has been free from disputes […]**. Ireland has been fortunately spared much of the dislocation that
has hit our neighbours pretty hard, but we have to deplore a menace which has, indeed, been largely
exaggerated for party purposes, but still whose existence we must admit.

29 Ferriter, p.142: Later in the century, women were completely written out of the narrative of the
rising. Brian Moore’s poem **‘Invisible Women’** was a reminder of the women’s historical neglect:
For he sings of the bold Fenian men and/ The boys of the old brigade/ What about the women who
stood there too?/ When history was made?/ Ireland, mother Ireland with your freedom-loving sons,/
CE 1 May 1916
Latest from Dublin.

The following is a copy of an order issued from the Irish Command Headquarters to be circulated by R.I.C.: - Sinn Féin rebels in the area of Capel street, Great Britain street, and Lower Gardiner street are completely surrounded by a cordon of troops, which is gradually closing on the centre. The troops, assisted by artillery, are gradually overcoming resistance. One of the principal rebel leaders, P.H.Pearse, is known to be inside the cordon suffering from a fractured thigh. The woman known as Countess Markevic h has also been seen inside. Another leader, James Connolly, is reported killed. The adjoining area, containing the Four Courts, is also surrounded by a cordon, which is closing on its centre and containing therein most of the rebels. A division complete with artillery is now operating in the Dublin area and more troops are constantly arriving. Arrangements are being made to intern in England all Sinn Féiners captured or surrendered who are not dealt with here. Roger Casement has declared that Germany has sent all assistance she is going to send, and this is now at the bottom of the sea. – Inspector General. R.I.C., Dublin Castle. […] It was Bank Holiday and consequently most of the places of business were closed. The presence of numbers of Irish Volunteers in the town attracted no attention; it was thought that they were only going to have an ordinary parade. These “Irish Volunteers” must not be confused with the “Irish National Volunteers.” The number of this latter body have dwindled away. The majority have joined the Irish divisions in the British Army. A few turned aside to the Irish volunteers, which are dominated partly by the Syndicalists and partly by the “Sinn Féin” movement.

The British and American press seemed to agree with the moderates, denouncing the rebellion as foolishness and the work of confused and easily lead hot-heads, invariably stemming from the lower echelons of society.

---

30 Constance Gore-Booth was born in London and grew up in Lissadell House, County Sligo, studied art at the Slade School, London, and later lived to Paris. Here she met and married a Polish Count, Casimir Dunin-Markieviez, in 1900. They lived in Dublin where Markievicz immersed herself in revolutionary politics, joining Sinn Féin and James Connolly’s labour movement. Markievicz also worked for women's suffrage and the national cause, delivering lectures and writing articles for Bean na hÉireann, the journal of Inighnidhe na hÉireann [Daughters of Ireland]. In 1909 Markievicz founded Na Fianna, the boys wing of the IRB, whom she drilled in the use of firearms in the Dublin mountains. In 1913 she joined the Citizen Army, and in 1914 Markievicz became a founder member of Cumann na mBan, the women's branch of the IRB. Markievicz was instrumental in organising the 1916 Rising and, as a Major in the Citizen's Army, she was second in command of the College of Surgeons, St. Stephen's Green. Markievicz was sentenced to death but because of her gender this was commuted to life imprisonment. Markievicz spent a year in prisons in England where she was baptized a Catholic before returning to Ireland a heroine. In 1918 Markievicz was again imprisoned in Holloway Gaol, London and during her imprisonment became the first woman to be elected to the House of Commons. However, like the other Sinn Féin MPs, she refused to take her seat. On her release she became President of Cumann na mBan which rejected the 1921 Anglo-Irish Treaty. Markievicz worked for a united and socialist Ireland, making lectures tours of America and working with the poor of Dublin, frequently imprisoned until her death in 1927. The Prison Letters of Countess Markievicz were published posthumously in 1934. Cf. Joe McGowan, Constance Markievicz: The People’s Countess (Aeolus Books, 1998).
CE 1 May 1916
Ireland Pays.

The “Star” says - [...] It is a very difficult problem. The roots of it is the tolerance which was extended to the lawlessness of the Carson party in Ulster. How can a Government permit one section to import arms from Germany and to equip and organise rebellion without weakening its power to suppress another section. Equality of tolerance is the doctrine which flowed directly from the rise of Carsonism, backed as it was by the whole Unionist Party in Great Britain and Ireland. Sauce for the Carson goose became sauce for the Sinn Féin gander.

The main thing for the English people to grasp is the deep gulf between the Irish Nationalist Party and the Sinn Féiners. Lord Lansdowne stated that at Drogheda the Nationalist Volunteers turned out with arms to assist the government. Note also that two loyal Volunteers were killed. These “Nationalist Volunteers” are Catholics and Home Rulers, and they are deadly foes of the “Irish Volunteers,” who are the Sinn Féiners. The confusion between the “Nationalist Volunteers” and the “Irish Volunteers” puzzles the uninstructed English public, which is apt to imagine that all Catholic Irishmen are “rebels.” This grotesque blunder ought not to be allowed to prevail. The truth is that the Sinn Féiners are a miserable faction who have fattened on Carsonism. Their recent growth is due directly to the appointment of Carson as Attorney-General in the Coalition Government, and to the attempt to make Mr. J. H. Campbell Lord Chancellor of Ireland. The Sinn Féin hotheads came to the conclusion that rebellion is the only thing that pays in Ireland. They took a leaf out of the Carson book; the German agents financed them; and the Dublin disorders are the result. As usual, it is Ireland that pays.

CE 1 May 1916
American Views. A Futile Attempt.
(From the “Daily Telegraph”)
(Special Correspondent –Copyright)
New York, Wednesday (delayed). - Irishmen and Irish-Americans here are greatly excited over the news of the Dublin revolt and the capture of Sir Roger.
Casement, but none could be found who would admit that they had had any hand in or foreknowledge of these events. As early as last Monday, rumours were circulated in Irish-American circles of serious rioting in Ireland, and yesterday, many hours before the official announcements were printed, news was received here in code of the Dublin fighting. Amongst the American members of Clan-na-Gael and Sinn Féin there was considerable rejoicing over yesterday’s news. There can be little doubt these agitators have been encouraging such an uprising with money, although, as the “New York World” says to-day, “Irish revolutionists in the United States always leave the shooting and getting shot to the less sophisticated Irishmen in Ireland.” Amongst the large majority of Irishmen and broad-minded Irish-Americans who have thrown off the heritage of hatred for England, however, rebellion “made in Germany” is condemned as being traitorous to the 200,000 Irishmen who are fighting the Germans and its early suppression is confidently predicted. Both the Dublin riots and Sir Roger Casement’s attempted “invasion” are regarded by Americans as the work of the dupes of German propaganda and not as representing the real sentiment in Ireland. “If a balance be struck,” says the “New York Evening Post,” “between discontent in Ireland and India and the magnificent showing of the self-governing Colonies – Anzac, Canada and South Africa – the German forecast of dissolving the British Empire is only another of those astonishing dreams to which a supposedly practical people is addicted.” The consensus of American opinion is that Sir Roger Casement’s conspiracy and the riots incidental to it are not aimed against Great Britain, but against Mr.Redmond and the Irish Nationalists, who have remained loyal to the British Empire in the war with Germany. The rebellion is only a futile attempt by a small minority, fomented by a paid group of Fenian agitators, which is foredoomed to failure. […] The “New York Evening Sun” says: - In so far as Germany has been the instigator of the Dublin outbreak she has incurred a degree of guilt not far behind that which attaches to her invasion of Belgium. It is in the wanton sacrifice of Ireland and the Irish that the offence lies. Germany cares nothing about Irish rights or wrongs.

In order to clear up any uncertainty regarding the allegiances of any body using ‘Volunteer’ in their title, or any Gaelic name that might be open to interpretation, the Examiner prints an article taken from the British press on a history of Sinn Féin, for its readers both home and abroad. Although it only became clear at a later stage that Sinn Féin had not actually instigated the rising, it was the party to profit the most from this myth at the General Elections of 1918.

CE 2 May 1916

“Sinn Féin” and its History.

A correspondent of the “Manchester Guardian” writes. Not since 1798 has Dublin been in the hands of revolutionaries, and then it was but for a few hours. The rebellion of Lord Edward Fitzgerald was ill-starred and abortive, and he paid the penalty with his life. “Sinn Féin” means “Ourselves alone.” It was adopted as the watchword of a new movement started about 15 years ago, and it was intended to be explanatory of the ideals and methods of the party. Ireland, it was contended, could do no good by looking anywhere but to herself. There was no use in anything which did not put Ireland not merely first but as the sole object to be served. It is a
curious fact that the large following in any individual class that the movement obtained at any time was among young men in the Civil Service, and especially such branches of it as the Post Office, the Savings Bank, the Customs, and the Excise. It was, in fact, largely a movement among young men who had inherited patriotic conditions, but had received a rather better education than their fathers, and who, in consequence, had a tendency to look down on the existing Nationalist movement. It is also a curious fact that when Sinn Féin started first – it was an offspring, by the way, of the Gaelic League, or Irish language movement – it received a good deal of support from Irish Unionists, who no doubt saw in it a chance of damaging the orthodox Nationalist movement. Sinn Féin in those days was thus a sort of mildly intellectual movement. It produced, in fact, several minor literary men of talent. But it was not revolutionary in those days. Indeed, its official exponents more than once declared that while they had no use for the Irish Parliamentary Party they were not in opposition to it. They simply ignored it. The movement was never strong in numbers, even in Dublin. Outside Dublin it was unknown except in the larger towns where a small knot of the right sort of young men could be got together, though, of course, there were individuals here and there who sympathised with Sinn Féin ideals and kept in touch with the leaders. While it was abstract and ideal the movement was always sure of a certain amount of general support, and it even once nearly drew a prominent member of the Irish Party into its ranks. Its organ was a weekly paper called “Sinn Féin,” and in a burst of enthusiasm the promoters turned this into a daily. The capital was somewhere about a hundred pounds, but the sheet, which was very vivaciously written on original lines, managed to struggle along for several months. It was about the last useful thing that Sinn Féin did.

As the years went on, the movement was crystallising along more definite lines, and circumstances gave to these a bias along a very dangerous course. When Sir E. Carson started the Ulster Volunteers, some patriotic Nationalists in the South started a body of National Volunteers. Some of the prominent Sinn Féin men in Dublin threw themselves into the thing. When Mr. Redmond took command of the movement, they resented this bitterly, and the result was a split that has continued to this day. The “National Volunteers” have sent a good many thousand men into the army, but the “Irish Volunteers,” the Sinn Féin organisation, remained aloof. These Irish Volunteers are numerous, chiefly in Dublin, and in Dublin also is still another volunteer organisation – that which was started by the notorious strike-leader Jim Larkin. The news that has come through from Dublin is so scanty that it is impossible to say to what extent either the Irish Volunteers, who may be taken as Sinn Féin in its active aspect, or the Larkinites are involved.

In 1913 Padraig Pearse was asked to hold the oration at the annual Wolfe Tone commemoration ceremony, under the auspices of the IRB. Pearse chose to recall not only Tone’s objectives but also his methods: ‘To break the connection with England, the never-failing source of all our political evils, and to assert the independence of my country – these were my objects. To unite the whole people of Ireland, to abolish the memory of all past dissensions, and to substitute the
common name of Irishmen in place of the denominations of Protestant, Catholic and dissenter – these were my means.”

To this he added he own spoken thoughts:

[Such] is the high and sorrowful destiny of the heroes: to turn their backs to the pleasant paths and their faces to the hard paths, to blind their eyes to the fair things in life ... and to follow only the far, faint call that leads them into the battle or to the harder death at the foot of a gibbet.

One may take it that Pearse was not only moving towards the physical force camp, but actually propelling it along with, among other ideas, a series of inflammatory articles published in Bulmer Hobson’s Irish Freedom.

It was the time of Larkin’s fight against the Dublin employers and this set Pearse on a train of thought which in the end was to bring him into close sympathy with that other great original thinker in the revolutionary group, James Connolly. But it was an instinctive, not a doctrinal, sympathy. ‘I am nothing so new-fangled as a socialist or a syndicalist,’ Pearse wrote in October 1913. ‘I am old-fashioned enough to be both a Catholic and a Nationalist.’

CE 5 May 1916
Mr. Asquith’s Statement
Three Other Leaders Sentenced.

London, Thursday. – Mr. Asquith stated in the House of Commons yesterday that P.H. Pearse, T.J. Clarke, and Thomas MacDonagh, three of the Irish rebel leaders who had signed the Republican proclamation, had been tried by court-martial. They were found guilty and sentenced to death, and the sentence was duly carried out yesterday morning. Three other leaders were sentenced to three years’ penal servitude. The names of the men sentenced to three years are McDermott, Ceannt and Plunkett. Mr. W. Thorne asked the Premier when Sir Roger Casement, who was the forerunner, was going to be tried. Mr. Asquith intimated that he would be tried with the utmost expedition. Mr. Thorne – He was arrested before those men who have been shot.

Reaction in Ireland to the courtmartials and first hasty executions were, in general, in agreement with the British government and their sense of justice. Commendations were received from clergy and men of commerce:

---

33 Lyons, p.333.
34 Idem. The boy who entered St Enda’s, the bilingual school founded by Pearse, would find himself confronted by a fresco with the words emblazoned on it: ‘I care not though I were to live but one day and one night, if only my fame and my deeds live after me.’ Cf. Lyons, p.332.
35 Cf. also his publication ‘The Murder Machine,’ printed 1912, on the English education system in Ireland. He found two essentials missing from this system, freedom and inspiration. ‘Without these two things you cannot have education, no matter how you may multiply educational programmes. And because those two things are pre-eminently lacking in what passes for education in Ireland, we have in Ireland strictly no education system at all.’ Quoted in Lyons, p.89.
36 Lyons, p.333.
37 Ferriter, p.151: “But Church disapproval was by no means unanimous. Like their lay contemporaries, the clerics were often caught between conflicting loyalties. Class and respectability
CE 5 May 1916
Cardinal Logue and the Revolution.
Message to the Pope.
The “Daily Mail’s” Rome correspondent wired on Tuesday: - Cardinal Ogue, Archbishop of Armagh, addressed the following telegram to the Pope today: - “Insurrection happily terminated. Insurgents have surrendered unconditionally. Hope peace soon re-established.” This message gave the Pope much pleasure. At the Vatican the Irish clergy are greatly praised for the zeal with which they supported the efforts of the Government to resume order.

CE 6 May 1916
The Dublin Rising.
Condemnation by London Irishmen.
At the close of a business meeting of the Irish Self-Help Society, held in High Holborn, Mr. William O’Sullivan presiding, the recent rising in Dublin engaged attention. The Chairman, in reply to a member, said he thought it would not be wise to discuss the affair while it was sub-judice. Mr. J. McCarthy said the time-revered phrase, Sinn Féin had been dragged into the mud by a pack of German hirelings. No one should sympathise with them […] Mr. P. J. Murphy said the so-called Sin Féiners no more represented the men of ’98, ’48, ’67, or the brave Land Leaguers than they did the South African Boers. They received German gold for their hellish work, and the Kaiser got bad value for his money. Mr. Meehan said they were not Sinn Féiners, but “Hun helpers,” and the name should stick to them. A resolution was adopted, on the motion of Mr. O’Connell-Cassidy, seconded by Mr. Michael O’Keely, deploiring the Dublin rising, and its terrible results, sympathising with the citizens of Dublin, loyally approving the attitude of Mr. Redmond and his colleagues, hoping the Government would cause the most searching inquiry to be made with regard to the negotiations with Germany by certain Statesmen as to resisting the operations of the Home Rule Act, and trusting the originators and fomenters of “the foul, murderous and bloody conspiracy,” as well as those actively engaged in it would be made amenable to justice.

were not the only factors in determining the church’s attitude to the rising. The bureau of military history statement of Fr Thomas Duggan, secretary to bishop Daniel Cohalan of Cork, is illuminating in this regard. Many in the Church, and indeed in the republican movement, saw no contradiction in supporting Irish republicans and simultaneously administering to wounded Irish soldiers in the British army:

My generation in Maynooth embraced the ideals of Easter week 1916 with a hundred per cent fervour. That did not prevent us from becoming chaplains in the British army. In the first world war there were well over 100,000 Irish Catholics in the fighting ranks… everyone admitted that these boys were spiritually intractable to anyone save to an Irish priest. Hence, when in 1917 Cardinal Logue issued a special appeal for Irish chaplains, I volunteered. And I went off to France with the blessing and encouragement of every friend I had in advanced Sinn Féin circles in Dublin.”

38 CE 8 June 1916. Recent Rising. Tipperary and the Party. Writing to the Clogheen District Council Mr. John Cullinan, M.P., says – It is to my leader, my colleagues, and myself a source of much satisfaction and encouragement to learn that the members of your Council, like those of so many other public bodies in Ireland, have publicly and unhesitatingly, in the hour of their country’s difficulty and trials, proclaimed their adhesion to the old – and what cannot be denied – successful policy of Constitutionalism, and declared their confidence in their great leader, Mr. John Redmond.
The first reaction of the people of Ireland had been anger with the rebels, but as the week of fighting drew on, pride began to develop over the fact that a small body of men were withstanding the might of the British. The rising was crushed after six days of intensive fighting by the combined effort of British army and navy, manned - one should recall - by a high percentage of Irishmen, many of them on leave from the trenches. The trials and executions of the leading insurgents began immediately afterwards, secretly and in batches, the ‘policy of dribbling executions,’ as John Dillon called it. With wholesale arrests of over 3500 suspects, including men and women of all ages, some children and some in their nineties, and although most were only held for brief periods and subsequently released, the conversion of the initially hostile population had begun. Parliamentarian, Tim Healy, in a letter to his brother a month after the rising, mused on the political and moral ironies of the rebellion:

The London Government now admits that Maxwell’s ferocity was a mistake, but they can’t get rid of him, and they can’t release their victims for fear of their becoming further centres of ‘infection’. [...] I don’t know if the Dublin feeling has spread to Cork, but amongst moderate Catholics who are intensely loyal I find nothing but Sinn Fein sentiment. I don’t care to mention names, as letters are opened, but I heard of one man, whose son was burned alive at Suvla Bay, who said he would now rather the Germans won.

The news that Francis Sheehy-Skeffington had been arrested and shot, caused a new feeling of revulsion against the British. ‘A very honest man,’ Casement wrote of Skeffington, when he heard of his death, ‘trustworthy in every way’; and ‘he was a pro-German’. He was in fact in favour of many unpopular minority causes, such as socialism and women’s suffrage, but a popular and well-
known man in Dublin society, very much like the leaders of the rising themselves, Pearse, Connelly and MacDonagh being popular figures in middle-class Dublin. Thus, Skeffington became the first martyr of 1916, the blood sacrifice which Casement and Pearse had believed necessary to rouse the Irish people. But the authorities ignored the public reaction to Skeffington’s death, and General Maxwell, who had spent much time in the colonies, insisted that the forms must be observed. ‘You took care that no pleas of mercy should interpose’, the Catholic Bishop of Limerick wrote, ‘I regard your action with horror, and I believe that it has outraged the conscience of the country.’ And Arthur Griffith, who might have resented the way the junta had deceived him, wrote, ‘but something of the primeval man woke in me, I clenched my fists and ground my teeth and longed for vengeance on the murderers.’ In the House of Commons in May, Dillon held a surprisingly stirring and provocative address, denouncing the killings and praising the bravery of the insurgents:

I say I am proud of their courage and if you were not so dense or stupid, as some of you English people are, you could have had these men fighting for you, and they are men worth having…it would have been a damned good thing for you of your soldiers were able to put up as good a fight as did these men in Dublin.

There needed to follow some action on a political level to curb the growing discontent. Asquith visited Ireland for a week following Dillon’s speech, gathering shutters on the windows of the House to prevent men who demanded the vote from smashing them. They might have to resort to the same expedient at Dublin Castle. Mrs. Hoskins, suffragist, who was released from Tullamore Gaol on Saturday through the collapse following a hunger strike, was today in a critical condition. The remaining three prisoners have abandoned the hunger strike on the promise that political prisoners’ privileges would be accorded them.

The general revulsion was followed by a drastic fall-off in recruitment to the army, and a threat to impose conscription united resistance further. Cf. CE 6 October. 1916. Editorial. Conscription as a Political Manoeuvre. There is already abundant evidence that the renewed cry for conscription in Ireland is a political move by the persons who oppose Irish Self-government and who wish to discredit the country so as to help Unionist interests. Sir Edward Carson’s letter to the London ‘Times,’ to which we referred yesterday, contained the damaging admission that the Ulster Unionists are not over-anxious to fill up the gaps in the Ulster division, but he adroitly tried to explain away that significant fact by stating that “many men in Ulster object to go and leave their places to be filled by men from the South and West, and by shirkers who will not do their duty.” [It] will strike most impartial observers as being peculiarly odd that Sir Edward Carson should endeavour to indict Irish Nationalists while he is unable or unwilling to induce his own immediate followers to join up. It is, therefore, manifest that his object in writing to the London “Times” is, like the whole conscription campaign, to discredit Ireland just before Parliament meets, and compulsory service may be put into force.

The general revulsion was followed by a drastic fall-off in recruitment to the army, and a threat to impose conscription united resistance further. Cf. CE 6 October. 1916. Editorial. Conscription as a Political Manoeuvre. There is already abundant evidence that the renewed cry for conscription in Ireland is a political move by the persons who oppose Irish Self-government and who wish to discredit the country so as to help Unionist interests. Sir Edward Carson’s letter to the London ‘Times,’ to which we referred yesterday, contained the damaging admission that the Ulster Unionists are not over-anxious to fill up the gaps in the Ulster division, but he adroitly tried to explain away that significant fact by stating that “many men in Ulster object to go and leave their places to be filled by men from the South and West, and by shirkers who will not do their duty.” [It] will strike most impartial observers as being peculiarly odd that Sir Edward Carson should endeavour to indict Irish Nationalists while he is unable or unwilling to induce his own immediate followers to join up. It is, therefore, manifest that his object in writing to the London “Times” is, like the whole conscription campaign, to discredit Ireland just before Parliament meets, and compulsory service may be put into force.

The general revulsion was followed by a drastic fall-off in recruitment to the army, and a threat to impose conscription united resistance further. Cf. CE 6 October. 1916. Editorial. Conscription as a Political Manoeuvre. There is already abundant evidence that the renewed cry for conscription in Ireland is a political move by the persons who oppose Irish Self-government and who wish to discredit the country so as to help Unionist interests. Sir Edward Carson’s letter to the London ‘Times,’ to which we referred yesterday, contained the damaging admission that the Ulster Unionists are not over-anxious to fill up the gaps in the Ulster division, but he adroitly tried to explain away that significant fact by stating that “many men in Ulster object to go and leave their places to be filled by men from the South and West, and by shirkers who will not do their duty.” [It] will strike most impartial observers as being peculiarly odd that Sir Edward Carson should endeavour to indict Irish Nationalists while he is unable or unwilling to induce his own immediate followers to join up. It is, therefore, manifest that his object in writing to the London “Times” is, like the whole conscription campaign, to discredit Ireland just before Parliament meets, and compulsory service may be put into force.

43 Inglis, p.323.
44 Jackson, p.154. And p.155: “But Dillon was also damming a liberal-dominated government and this, in turn, was the repudiation of an alliance that he had himself pursued since the death of Parnell. Moreover. His taunting of the British army was in effect the repudiation of a recruiting policy that his party had endorsed since September 1914.”
opinions from high ranking civil servants through to imprisoned republicans in Mountjoy gaol. On his return a cabinet meeting was held, placing the offer of the Chief Secretaryship to Lloyd George and a commission to negotiate between the Irish parties, whereupon Lloyd George attempted to strike a deal between Redmond and Carson on the basis of a six-county exclusion.

CE 8 June 1916
Irish Negotiations.
Ulster Nationalists to Meet.
(From Our Correspondent)
Dublin, Wednesday Night. – It has been decided to summon at the earliest possible date a conference of Nationalist representatives of the province of Ulster to consider the proposals suggested by Mr. Lloyd George for a settlement of the Irish question. The date and place of meeting will be announced as soon as possible. 45

Partition, or more specifically its future, was the crux in all of this. It was essential for the purposes of agreement that the time-frame for partition should be kept as ambiguous as possible. In the past Lloyd George has frequently been blamed for keeping the two Irish sides in the dark and offering each mutually incompatible promises […] There was in fact very little difference in the deal outlined by Lloyd George to both Carson and Redmond. The distinction lay in the fact that Lloyd George affirmed to Carson not that partition was permanent, as is frequently stated, but rather that ‘at the end of the provisional period Ulster does not, whether she wills it or not, merge in the rest of Ireland.’ Only George Boyce has fully recognised the ambiguity with which these apparently reassuring words were charged. Ulster’s exclusion from Home Rule would not cease automatically at the end of he ‘provisional period,’ but would depend rather on the action of the London government. This, in turn, hinged upon the result of a general election, and the sympathies of the party in power. 46

Some journals, notably Belfast’s Morning Post, believed they already had an answer to the Irish question, served on a platter by the rebels themselves:

CE 19 July 1916
Editorial
It would be difficult to find a parallel for the act of cynical treachery that the “Morning Post commends to the Government and to the British public as the

45 CE 8 June 1916. Sir E. Carson in Belfast. Belfast, Wednesday. – Sir Edward Carson to-day paid a visit to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, sitting at Belfast, and received a hearty welcome [...] Sir Edward Carson said his interest in Ulster, and his interest in the Presbyterian Church, and indeed in all Protestant churches, was not merely a matter of politics. He had learned to love Ulster, to love Ulster’s men, and, might he say, Ulster’s women, in a manner far different from the way in which political leaders granted a kind of temporary allegiance for the purpose of procuring followers and votes. [...] Sir Edward, in conclusion, said he had learned to love Ulster above all parts of the United Kingdom, and whatever remained to him in the life before them he would always do what little he could in carrying out and fulfilling all that tended to the happiness of those who had gone out to fight their battles at the front.

46 Jackson, p.158.
proper method of dealing with Ireland. In yesterday’s issue that journal throws off the mask and advocates a policy towards this country which, if it were adopted, would cover Great Britain with dishonour and disgrace, and place her in a position before the world similar to that which Germany occupies for her violation of her treaty with Belgium. Perfidious is an adjective which must be familiar to the “Morning Post,” and a greater act of perfidy towards Ireland (who has cheerfully given her best blood and her wealth when Great Britain asked for aid) could not be contemplated than that which the die-hard journal advocates with all the brazen effrontery of an ingrate and trickster. “The Home Rule Act,” says the “Morning Post,” “was passed when the British people did not see the dangers which they now see before them. […] After the rebellion in Ireland no one can say that there is no party in Ireland capable of shooting our soldiers and intriguing with our enemies. No one can now deny it, for it has happened. Therefore, the rebellion wipes the Home Rule Act off the Statute Book.” That is the essence of the policy of the “Morning Post” (and it is also the policy of the Imperial Unionist Committee, though the latter organisation has not yet exposed to the public gaze the knavery of Lord Lansdown’s supporters), and neutral countries can now judge of the ineffable trickery of those Unionist Britshers who profess to have taken up arms to fight for the rights of the smaller European nations while they would betray the Irish nation, which has fought their battles, and is still valiantly fighting them in France and Flanders.

Although the settlement broke down at the end of July, with Lloyd George’s ‘perfidy’ highlighted and damned by both Unionists and Home Rulers, it is likely that both parties were aware of the insurmountable difficulties involved. The failure of the negotiations apparently left Redmond utterly demoralised, the IPP stagnant and its constituency organisation, the United Irish League, in a state of torpor. The only reason that there was no sudden collapse of the constitutional Home Rule movement was the fact that, until mid-1917, there was as yet no well-organised alternative. From the newspapers and his visitors, the imprisoned Casement realised that the rising had not been a failure, his only consolation in custody. His connections to Germany as part in the rising, his background and his ‘black diaries,’47 forged or not, clouded the issue. When Casement was in custody, Redmond did not mention him by name but he clearly had him in mind when he referred to those men who had tried to make Ireland Germany’s cat’s-paw,48 an understandable conclusion given the press reports on Casement’s activities in Germany the Irish had become accustomed to.

47 It has never been ascertained if the diaries – including the damning accounts of homosexual encounters – were written by Casement or part of plot to discredit him. Either way, despite countless pleas for clemency, public opinion swung against him.
48 Inglis, p.355.
CE April 1916

Uproarious Scenes.

Sir Roger Casement’s Position. Von Tirpitz’s Resignation.

Amsterdam, Saturday. - Yesterday’s sitting of the Reichstag was again marked by uproarious scenes. The military estimates came up for debate, and votes for the military camps were being discussed. Dr.Liebknecht (Socialist), intervening in the debate, said – I repeat that I have documents in my hands showing that agreement was made between the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Herr Zimmermann, and Sir Roger Casement, by which British prisoners of war were to be drilled to fight against England. Dr.Paasche, Vice-President, interrupting, pointed out that these remarks had no connection with the Estimates. Dr.Liebknecht replied – We have here treasonable propaganda, officially encouraged, going on in these troop camps. After being called to order, Dr.Liebknecht continued – Mohammedan prisoners of war are also being systematically forced into the service against their own country. The speaker was called to order. Dr.Liebknecht – You are systematically gagging me. Shouts from all parts of the House, “Traitor,” and “You ought to be in an asylum.” Dr.Liebknecht was then forbidden to continue his speech.49

In London, regarding Casement’s defence, Charles Gavan Duffy knew some briefless King’s Counsel could be found for a large fee. But where was the money to come from? One possibility was Bernard Shaw’s wife Charlotte, who was reputedly a millionaire. Shaw had been the first to warn the British public in a letter to the Daily News that the inevitable consequences of the executions would be to hand Ireland over to Sinn Féin. Although, he himself had been a consistent critic of Sinn Féin, with one of his attacks on the movement appearing in the Irish Times only two days before the Rising, and he had disagreed strongly with those nationalists looking to Germany as liberator, the news of the executions appalled him. They had done what the Rising itself had failed to do:

[It] is absolutely impossible to slaughter a man in this position without making him a martyr and a hero, even though the day before the rising he [i.e. Pearse] may have been only a minor poet. The shot Irishmen will now take their places beside Emmet and the Manchester Martyrs in Ireland, and beside the heroes of Poland and Serbia and Belgium in Europe; and nothing in heaven or earth can prevent it.50

Casement had been working on his own defence and he planned to make the most of the analogy with other ‘traitors’ like Garibaldi, who had been helped and

49 cont.: Subsequently the Estimates for the Navy came up for debate. Dr.Liebknecht was the only speaker […] - The conflict between the policy of Berlin to Baghdad and the policy of annexations in the West and East had already begun at the outbreak of war. In this conflict the interests of various capitalist groups are opposed. After the war had begun with the battle cry against Tsarism the aim was soon shifted westward […].

50 Inglis, p.326.
revered by the English in the past. He wanted to bring it up to date by citing contemporary examples and he asked Gavan Duffy to persuade his friends, including Robert Lynd, an Irish friend working as a journalist in London, to find the evidence he needed: ‘try to find me in the English press any references to the “Polish Legion”, the “Czech Legion”, the “Alsatian Corps” or any other of the numerous bodies of “traitors” and “renegades” being “seduced from their allegiance” on behalf of the immortal allies to fight against their own sovereigns’. The case of the Czechs seemed to him particularly relevant; and it was in fact closer than he had known.51 The Czechs had achieved Home Rule before the war, and their leader in exile, Thomas Masaryk, had been a member of the Czech legislature, and had pledged allegiance to the Austrian Emperor Franz Joseph. It had been the Emperor, too, who had intervened to secure him his university professorship because he had been regarded as a political moderate. But when war broke out, Masaryk had chosen to become a traitor to his country; and in December 1915 he had obtained from Asquith a declaration similar to the one Casement had obtained from the German government, accepting Czechoslovak aspirations. Masaryk, too, had refused allied money, but accepted it from his compatriots in the United States.

In Austria men were too awed by the physical presence of the Emperor to imagine central Europe without the dynasty: even the most advanced Socialists dreamt of a democratic Socialism imposed by dynastic initiative, and those Germans who hated Hapsburg rule desired instead the rule of the Hohenzollerns. Only the solitary Czech professor Masaryk had confidence in the peoples and wished them to learn reality by the exercise of responsibility. Masaryk brought to the cause of intellectual integrity the same fanaticism which others brought to nationalism.52 […] Masaryk hated, equally, the pretence of Pan-Slavism; he understood the nature of Russian tsardom and recognized the breach with western civilization that Pan-Slavism would involve. He aimed instead to make Prague the centre of a democratic Slav culture.53

51 Inglis, p.328.
52 Taylor, p.244: “He had offended Czech enthusiasts by exposing sacred Czech manuscripts of the early Middle Ages as forgeries of the nineteenth century; he had earned the hatred of both Czech and German extremists by his defence of Jew against the charge of ritual murder. He believed that the Czech nation could achieve freedom only on the foundation of truth, especially the truth that the ‘state rights’ of Bohemia were an artificial, outworn tradition; he believed even that the Habsburg Monarchy could find a new vitality, it it rested on honesty and popular will, instead of an intrigue and dynastic interest. Where other more romantic Czechs conducted nationalist agitation until a government job was offered them, Masaryk kept his independence of the Habsburgs and yet hoped to transform the Habsburg Monarchy.”
53 Idem.
Masaryk had, in direct contrast to Casement, strong links with the Czech people: ‘a nation now advanced in culture, yet free from aristocratic politicians, middle class from top to bottom, and with a deeper respect for intellectual leadership than any other in Europe’.\textsuperscript{54} ‘There are said to be twelve regiments in the Russian service now fighting “to free Bohemia”’, - Casement observed; ‘and yet Bohemia has her parliament, and the Czech language is spoken in it. And Ireland? Ireland has got John Redmond, and Sir E.Carson, and Galloper Smith prosecuting \textit{me}, and Home Rule on the Statute Book, be Jabers.’\textsuperscript{55} He felt it would be useful for his defence to have English expressions of approbation of what the Czechs were doing, to set off against their disapprobation of an Irishman who had tried to do the same thing. He wanted to show that the idea for the rebellion arose with Irishmen in Ireland, ‘ourselves alone’, that it was a Sinn Féin rebellion, and his going to Germany was only to get guns and such help as was possible to allow Irishmen to fight at home, instead of talking. ‘We have to show that it was no ‘German plot’, that there was no ‘German gold’ in it, and that it sprang from the fixed resolution of the Irishmen themselves. This I can do. For it \textit{is} the truth, and in accepting, to the full, responsibility for my share in inspiring that action, I am only shouldering the burden that is mine.’\textsuperscript{56} At first, the American newspapers had regarded the Easter Rising as treacherous, and Casement as a traitor. But after the executions, feelings turned against Britain. But Woodrow Wilson, who had been asked by Casement’s sister, Nina, to intervene on the ground of her brother’s service to humanity, refused. ‘It would be inexusable to touch this.’ The reason Wilson was so positive that he could do nothing, when historical precedent indicated that he could, was to be hinted at by Spring-Rice, the British Ambassador in Washington, a few months later: ‘the President is by descent an Orangeman and by education a Presbyterian’. Wilson’s sympathies were with the allies, and with Ulster.\textsuperscript{57} William Randolph Hearst, however, threw his newspapers behind the cause, arguing if Casement were guilty, so were John Adams and the other signatories of the Declaration of Independence, all should have been hanged. Although little use had been made of the Czech parallel at the trial, friends of Casement had been drawing attention to it and in a letter to the Guardian July 27,  

\textsuperscript{54} Taylor, p.245.  
\textsuperscript{55} Inglis, p.329.  
\textsuperscript{56} Inglis, p.329  
\textsuperscript{57} Inglis, p.357.
his friend Alice Green reported that at a State Banquet in Paris, given by the French President, four ‘traitors’ had been honoured for their services to the allies: ‘all four men had left their native land, and were occupied in raising troops of their fellow countrymen, whether prisoners of war or émigrés, to fight against the Austrian and German Empire’. In 1916 also the Polish General Joseph Pilsudski gained recognition of an independent Poland from the Central Powers. He had commanded a Polish force that had fought for Germany on the Eastern front. Perhaps it was a mistake for Casement to go to Germany after the outbreak of war, and he made further mistakes while he was there. But the closest parallel is Thomas Masaryk, lionised by the allies at the same time that ‘the pitiable Casement’, as he referred to him, was awaiting death. A passage in Wickham Steed’s introduction to Masaryk’s memoirs offers some proof of this.

To Masaryk and to the Czechs, the name ‘Austria’ meant every device that could kill the soul of a people, corrupt it with a modicum of well-being, deprive it of freedom of conscience and thought, undermine its sturdiness, sap its steadfastness, and turn it from the pursuit of its ideal. Since the Hapsburgs with their army, their church, their police and their bureaucracy were the living embodiment of this system, Masaryk after long hesitation turned against them and opposed them in the name of every tradition, conviction and principle he held dear. He knew the dimensions of the venture [...] it would mean a choice between a Hapsburg gallow and lifelong exile.

Like Masaryk, Casement turned against the country to which he had given his allegiance. He felt that his people were being stifled, body and soul, a process he likened to the way the Sipo Matador, an Amazon fig vine, destroys the tree to

58 Inglis, p.362. Cf. Also Taylor, p.257: “Masaryk did not ‘destroy’ the Habsburg Monarchy; this was done by the Germans and Magyars. What Masaryk did was to create an alternative, or to seek to do so. Masaryk had none of the illusions about the strength of national states attributed to him by later admirers. Germany would remain a Great Power, despite defeat, and therefore the six million Czechs could not maintain their independence without assistance. Masaryk did not share the Pan-Slav belief of Kramar that the Czechs could rely on Russia alone: he understood her better than any man outside Russia and knew that a peace settlement depended solely on her would always be endangered by her profound indifference to European concerns. Masaryk, the heir of Metternich and the Habsburgs, had to prove that his state, too, was a ‘European necessity’; where Metternich preached resistance to ‘the revolution’, Masaryk preached ‘democracy’ – the rule of law and the Rights of Man. This was the idea with which Masaryk came to England in 1915; he hoped to win England, France, and ultimately America for his programme.

59 Taylor, p.252: “The Polish members of the Reichsrat declared their support for the war, when all other Slavs were silent; and some Poles, led by the military adventurer Pilsudski, formed a Polish Legion under Habsburg authority. Pilsudski hoped to find in the Habsburgs an alternative that was neither Russian nor German; and his dream of a Great Poland, an independent Great Power in eastern Europe, was as antiquated as the Habsburgs themselves.”

60 Inglis, p.396.
which it attaches itself. The vine, apparently, first spreads its mould over one side of the tree (‘the Pale!’ Casement once commented) until the flow of sap ceased.61

CE 4 August 1916

Sir Roger Casement Executed

London, Thursday. – The Press Association telegraphs – Casement was executed in London this morning.

A large crowd of people assembled in the neighbourhood of the front of entrance to Pentonville Prison, on the Caledonian road, composed chiefly of women and children. [...] The Rev. James McCarroll, a priest of the Catholic Church at Eden Grove, was present at the execution, and afterwards told the Press Association representative that Casement went to his death strong and erect like the man he was.62

CE 4 August 1916

Sketch Of His Career
(Special to the “Examiner”)

The family from which Roger David Casement sprang has been settled in the County Antrim for some considerable time. They belonged to the small landlord class, and, possessing a propriety interest in the country, they did not as far as written records go, support any of the popular national movements. They were rigid Protestants, whose neighbours did not regard them as particularly broadminded on the question of religious beliefs, and who never gave any evidence of disloyalty to the Crown or discontent at the English connection. Capt. Casement,

61 Inglis, p.396.
62 CE 4 August 1916. The Inquest. London, Thursday. – An inquest on the body of Casement was held in Pentonville Prison. Mr. Gavan Duffy formally identified the body, and said the deceased’s age was between fifty and sixty. [...] Mr. Gavan Duffy said he had applied to the Home Office for permission to have the body. He considered it a monstrous act of indecency to refuse it. [...] Mr. Duffy stated he understood that the doctor had had the prisoner under observation for a month, and he (Duffy) wanted him to say, as a result of the observation, whether there was any truth in the suggestion which had been made in the Press. The doctor replied that he saw no evidence of insanity. A formal verdict of death, due to execution, was then returned by the jury. Official Statement, Press Bureau, 9.50 p.m. The Press Bureau is instructed to place the following statement at the disposal of the Press – All the circumstances in the case of Roger Casement were carefully considered by the Government before the decision was reached not to interfere with the sentence of the law. He was convicted and punished for treachery of the worst kind to the Empire he had served, and as a willing agent of Germany. The Irish rebellion resulted in much loss of life, both among soldiers and civilians. Casement invoked and organised German assistance to the insurrection in addition. Though himself for many years a British official, he undertook the task to induce soldiers of the British army, prisoners in the hands of Germany, to forswear their oath of allegiance, and join their country’s enemies. Conclusive evidence has come into the hands of the Government since the trial that he had entered into an agreement with the German Government, which explicity provided that the brigade which he was trying to raise from the Irish soldier prisoners might be employed in Egypt against the British Crown. Those among the Irish soldier prisoners in Germany who resisted Casement’s solicitations of disloyalty were subjected to treatment of exceptional cruelty by the Germans. Some of them have since been exchanged as invalids, and have died in this country, regarding Casement as their murderer. The suggestion that Casement left Germany for the purpose of trying to stop the Irish rising was not raised at the trial, and is conclusively disproved, not only by the facts there disclosed, but by further evidence which has since become available. Another suggestion that Casement was out of his mind was equally without foundation. Materials bearing on his mental condition were placed at the disposal of his counsel, who did not raise the plea of insanity. Casement’s demeanour since his arrest and throughout and since his trial gave no ground for any such defence, and indeed was sufficient to disprove it.
father of the subject of this sketch, entered the army as a young man. It is known that he possessed rather strongly marked individuality and independence of mind. Perhaps these traits do not make for success in an organisation where straightlaced discipline is necessary. [...] Roger Casement was born in the year 1864, and apparently received his early education in his native district. He is described by one who knew him as a bright boy, of a distinctly adventurous disposition, who was always prepared for an escapade. He was very gifted intellectually [and] also of poetic turn of mind, and possibly this accounts for much that occurred afterwards. As a young man he travelled a good deal, and for some time engaged in trade in the Niger coast of Africa. He studied commercial conditions and opportunities and his knowledge and ability led to his being appointed on the Consular service. [In] 1895 he was Consul at Lourence Marques at the head of Dulago Bay, in Portuguese East Africa. During the South African were he was in a position to render much assistance to the British army authorities, and he was duly thanked for his services. Subsequently he was appointed Consul to the Congo Free State, and it was in connection with his work here that he first came prominently before the public. His reports of the doings on the great rubber plantations caused a great sensation. [...] While serving in Brazil his reports on the conduct of the rubber companies drew attention to great abuses that had been allowed to grow up. [His] Putumayo report created even a greater sensation than the Congo reports. It attracted the attention of the entire civilised world, and independent investigation proved the accuracy of his charges. In 1911 he received a knighthood and the Coronation Medal. Public opinion held that her service to the State and to humanity merited all the honours that could be bestowed on him. In 1913 he retired owing to ill-health from the consular service, and was allowed the usual pension – quite large enough to maintain a man in comfortable circumstances. After retirement from the service, Sir Roger Casement (as he then was) interested himself in Irish questions [and] it is right to say that he appears to have from an early age felt a poetic pride in the fact that was an Irishman. [As] a Civil Servant, he could not take part in political controversy, and, in any case, his absence from Ireland made it impossible for him to take an active part in the Irish movement. Towards the end of 1913 he appeared for the first time on a public platform in his native county, and made a speech in favour of Home Rule. He next took a prominent part in the formation of the Irish Volunteers, and attended and spoke at several organising meetings. He visited cork in company with Professor Eoin MacNeill for the purpose of addressing a meeting at the City Hall in support of the Volunteer movement, but the meeting was by no means a success. Sir Roger Casement was, however, interested in another matter. About the same time the Cunard Company were withdrawing their big liners altogether from Queenstown. Public men spoke very strongly of this boycott of Ireland by the great shipping companies that in the past had profited very materially by the Irish trade.63 The people of all classes in Ireland and the Irish-Americans on the other side of the Atlantic felt much resentment at the action of both the White Star and the Cunard Companies. Casement was a prime mover in arranging with the Hamburg-Amerika Company to allow their steamers to call at Cork Harbour. In more ways than one it was an attractive scheme, for it opened up

---

63 CE 1 January 1915. Editorial. [...]The complete withdrawal of the American mail steamers from Queenstown on the west bound voyage, while causing no great surprise to those who followed the events of the past five or six years, certainly caused no little disappointment. A great meeting of delegates from the principal public bodies in the country was held at Dublin in february to protest against the action of the Cunard Company. The Irish-Americans also exerted their influence in the matter, but no satisfactory result has been so far attained.
the possibility of direct trading between the South of Ireland and continental countries, as well as being a set-off against the desertion of the port by the big Cunard and White Star liner. Suddenly the arrangements that had been made were cancelled, but no explanation was given to the public as to the reason. No one in Ireland dreamt then that before the year was out England and Germany would be at war. Thenceforward casement devoted himself very much to the Volunteer movement. He went to the United States ostensibly to collect money for the volunteers. He was there when the war broke out. The next heard of him was that his sympathies were against England, and later on the news came rather dramatically, that he was in Berlin. Stories, somewhat disconnected, came from time to time about his efforts to raise an Irish Brigade from amongst the Irish prisoners of war in Germany. [The] next act in the drama opened with his landing, with Monteith and Bailey, near Ardfert on the morning of last Good Friday. [...] That he loved Ireland passionately and sincerely, almost to the point of fanaticism, few will now question, as he has given his life for the faith that was in him. [...] After his conviction some of the most influential organs of English opinion favoured a commutation of the death sentence, if only as a matter of policy. [...] Petitions were promoted in England and Ireland for his reprieve, and were influentially signed. It would have been a gracious act, and leniency to a fallen foe is supposed to be one of the traits of the English character. [...] After his conviction opinion was prejudiced against him by innuendos regarding his private life. These were supposed to be based on a diary which he kept at some unstated time period and why this should have been disclosed at all is not explained. It would be impracticable at the present time to attempt to deal adequately with the complexity of Casement’s character. Some future historian will have an opportunity and more materials available to deal with the whole Irish situation of the present day. He will also be in a position to pronounce on the wisdom or otherwise of the government in exacting the extreme penalty in the case of Roger David Casement.

Roger Casement and Tomas Masaryk had both been eminent public figures in their respective states: the British Empire and the Austro-Hungarian Empire. And each committed treason to his state by going into the service of an enemy state during the Great War. While Casement went into the service of Germany and Masaryk into the service of the British Empire, Casement was hanged by Britain for being a traitor, while Britain recruited Masaryk to be a traitor. In the case of Roger Casement, treason was portrayed as something essentially dishonourable and an underground slander campaign was set in motion to destroy his private reputation along with his public, while in the case of Tomas Masaryk treason was an honourable patriotic activity.65

64 CE 4 August 1916. Received into the Catholic Church. London, Thursday. – The Central News says: - Casement, shortly before execution, expressed a desire to be received into the Catholic Church. Two chaplains were fetched, his Confession heard, and Holy Communion administered. Two Catholic priests led the procession to the scaffold, reciting the Litany of the Dying, Casement responding in low tones. A group of thirty Irishmen and women assembled outside the prison, and knelt and prayed as the death bell tolled.

The New Statesman 29 July 1916

On the Casement Hanging

There is another “Irish question” which has to be settled immediately, and that is the fate of Roger Casement. It is announced that he is to be executed on Thursday next. The case for carrying out the sentence is very strong. Nevertheless, to carry it out would be a great blunder. We are not thinking of its probable effect in Ireland – we do not know whether there it would be great or small – but its certain effect upon Great Britain’s moral position throughout the world. Casement was not taken in arms against the Crown; he has never been the cause of any bloodshed; his only connection with the Irish rebellion was that he wished to stop it – not, it is true, because he did not sympathise with it, but because he knew it must cause useless loss of life. His crime is simply that of conspiring against English rule in Ireland, and foolishly endeavouring to persuade Irish soldiers to be false to their oath of allegiance. The fact that his efforts came to nothing may not have been his fault, but it remains a fact. No life has been lost for which he must pay. His case is identical in almost every respect with that of Dr. Kramarzh, the Czech patriot whom the Austrian Government has sentenced to death, and who, if he is saved, will be saved because the public opinion of the whole non-German world is on his side. To us Casement may be a traitor, to the world he is a patriot, and if he is executed next week there will be no two opinions outside this country as to his having died a patriot’s death.

Masaryk recorded August 1916 in his memoirs: “The pitiable Sir Roger Casement was, at that moment, about to meet his fate.” 66 Musing over the leaders of 1916, Yeats asked, ‘And what if excess of love bewildered them till they died?’ Casement, at least, had the consolation of living long enough to know that they had achieved what they had set out to do. ‘Irishmen!’, he wrote in his last message, the day before he was hanged, ‘live unselfishly and die bravely for Ireland, as the men of 1916 have done, and no power of man nor Empire of Gold can withhold freedom. Ireland alone went forth to assail evil, as David, Goliath; unarmed, save with a pebble; and she has slain, I pray to God, the power and boast and pride of Empire. That is the achievement of the boys of 1916, and on it the living shall build with a sterner purpose and bring it to a greater end.’ 67 Casement had come nearer to grasping the point missed by the leaders of the new Ireland after 1921, that if Ireland was ever to be united, it could only be by winning the trust of the Ulster Protestants. 68 Eventually, former revolutionary and later Irish President, Eamon de Valera, who had thought force was morally justified to restore unity, recognized

67 Inglis, p.398.
68 CE 23 October 1916. Gaelic Association, Leinster v. Ulster. Some 5,000 spectators witnessed the All-Ireland football semi-final between Leinster, represented by Wexford, and Ulster, represented by Monaghan, at Carrickmacross to-day. It was the first occasion on which an all-Ireland semi-final was played in the Northern province, and the keenest interest was manifested in the fixture […].
this contribution, when Casement’s remains were at last returned to Ireland in 1964. It was undeniably the Great War that gave the stimulus to the profound changes within Irish politics, with the Home Rulers who had encouraged recruiting weakened by the unexpectedly bloody nature of the conflict, and the traditional farmer support of the Home Rule movement shaken by wartime taxation and the enforcement of compulsory tillage. In the same way, radical separatism was encouraged by the war, and especially by the setbacks experienced by the British on the front. Thus one may surmise that the Easter Rising received a tangible moment of success with the backdrop of the European conflict - assuming that if the insurgents had embarked upon a peacetime rebellion, official repression might have been less severe and therefore less controversial. Added to this dilemma was the disappearance of traditional emigration opportunities, creating a population of thwarted and economically ambitious young men over under the theoretical threat of conscription. ‘It is frequently argued that radical separatism drew upon the social and economical resentments of young Catholics blocked by the conventions of the old regime in Ireland, and such arguments have enhanced relevance in the light of wartime constraints.’69

War had a direct and crucial impact upon the British administration. Senior British ministers were preoccupied by the conflict, and often (as in the case of Asquith, Bonar Law and Long) experienced bitter personal loss. On the other hand, the demands of the war effort, particularly the need to mollify opinion in the Dominions and the United States, underlined the need for action, or at least the appearance of action, when often ministers had little interest in revisiting the complexities of Irish self-government. […] The Home Rulers were unquestionably demoralised and damaged by the collapse of the Lloyd George negotiations in July 1916. There followed a period of relative passivity, during which radical separatism gained in terms of organisation and electoral credibility. The internment of many separatists in the aftermath of the rising created a more cohesive and discrete revolutionary elite than might otherwise have been the case: the internment camps, with their relatively lax conditions, served as revolutionary academies for a thrusting generation of young radicals. The release of these prisoners in late 1916 augmented the ranks of the separatists, and by early 1917 this strength was being converted into electoral success.70

---

69 Jackson, p.175.
70 Jackson, p.176.
6.2. Affairs of State in Austria

Austria was also rattled by unexpected events in 1916. The Austrian Minister President, Count Karl von Stürghk, was assassinated at a hotel in Vienna, October 21, by Dr. Friederich Adler, a Social Democrat and son of Dr. Viktor Adler, leader of the Party. A month later, on November 21, Austrian Emperor Franz Josef I died at his residence Schloß Schönbrunn, in Vienna. Thus the year also proved to be a time of undue strain on the ruling elite of the Austrian Empire in an already tense atmosphere of war and internal strife. The regular reader of the Cork Examiner might have expected a change in the printed attitude towards the Austrians on account of the war dragging on mercilessly and the oppressive Empire, der Völkerkerker, obviously sharing the responsibility. The British press lost no time in stripping their German cousins of all Christian virtues, the Irish press, up to a point, following suit. Whatever the extreme Irish nationalist papers and orators made of Germany and the Kaiser, either as models of Imperialism, Socialism or piety – or merely as the enemy’s enemy providing guns – the author of this study has not yet come across references of invoking similar aid from Austria. In the days of the Wild Geese it was still hoped that Austria would lend herself to the task of emancipating Irish Catholics, and the frequent visits of Empress Elisabeth at least provided moral support in later years. However, by the onset of tourism in the Victorian era, Austria had slipped into the quaint role of antiquarian, whose military prowess, which never matched the success of her matrimonial policies, gave way to powerlessness - unless accompanied by Prussian militarism, as reported in the chronicles of the crisis. Therefore, it seems apt at this point to refer in greater detail to the stereotyped image of Austria, Alpine or Viennese, which infiltrated the reports of the period.

The popular image of joie-de-vivre Vienna has endowed the literary household with enduring conceptions of Viennese attributes. Peculiarities of habit and tradition that aroused the curiosity of travellers and scholars of bygone years became gospels of distortion and parody. Popular or highbrow literature, travellers’ guidebooks written by authors of various distinction and nationality over the centuries astonish due to the affinity of judgement, the over-lapping of experiences, and the use of similar expressions of almost condescending enjoyment of the

---

ancient, multicultural city. However, profuse evidence has revealed an active Viennese policy in the past of drawing analogies between themselves and the mythical lotus-eaters – and if flippancy is sought after, flippancy is found. It only takes a small percentage of the population to transmit a comprehensive image, all the more if it reveals delectable impiety.\textsuperscript{72} The image of joie-de-vivre Vienna, alive since the days of Biedermeier and purposefully nurtured by clever politicians, always met with opposition and consternation among insurgent Viennese. Always popular is the image of the music-loving hedonist, the friendly, pleasure seeking, sensually fixated Viennese. Their Golden Viennese heart, their \textit{Gemütlichkeit} and their süßes Mädel from the Vorstadt destined these fortunates to pursue lighthearted enjoyment of the arts, dwell at considerable length upon banalities which do not tire the intellect, or exchange resolute opinions in the countless coffee houses dotting the Ring. Subconscious perversities are suppressed, perfect manners preside, and play-acting, to which may be ascribed the love of theatre and the homage paid to opera, have become a way of life.

CE 21 February 1916
Back from Vienna
London, Sunday.- Miss Nella Wailes, a Tynesider, who had been over four years governess in Vienna, has just returned home. She describes Austrians as a kind-hearted, lovable, easy-going people, who before the war had great respect for England and the English people, but are now embittered because they think England caused the war for commercial reasons, and that but for England it would have been over long ago with victory for the Central Powers. English residents in Vienna have, says Miss Wailes, been well treated during the war, and she went freely about. \textit{Vienna is gay and bright}, but food prices are very high, while potatoes, milk, and white bread are unobtainable. Men up to 55 have been called up.\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{72} As far back as the 15\textsuperscript{th} century, Enea Silvio Piccolomini, later Pope Pius II, recalling his clerical days in Vienna, depicted his diocese as rampant with gluttony and prostitution.

\textsuperscript{73} A more damaging report on Viennese circumstances comes from the Neue Freie Presse: CE 15 March 1916. \textbf{Food Scarcity in Vienna. Austrian Admissions.} (Press Association Foreign Special) Zurich, March 10\textsuperscript{th}. - Writing on the present provisioning situation in Vienna the “Neue Freie Presse” says – The surprising and unfounded scarcity of provisions was the most prominent feature in the street life of the city yesterday. Placards “Sold Out” hung on the door of nearly every shop. Bread, flour, sugar, coffee, potatoes, cigarettes and tobacco were either not obtainable at all or else only at certain hours, and then only in the most meagre portions. In large families nearly every member of the household was out to buy food of different kinds, standing here and there in long lines outside the shops, waiting hours to get small packages, which at best served only for the needs of the day. Potatoes are plentiful enough in the country, and flour too, within the prescribed limits, not to speak of sugar. The greatest rush is after bread, potatoes and sugar. Everybody is trying to lay in the permitted stock of sugar, 5lbs for each member of the household, before the sugar cards come into effect at the middle of March. After prophesying an improvement in the existing conditions the “Neue Freie Presse” goes on to say that nothing would be more erroneous than to imagine that this temporary shortage in food supply indicates any real scarcity in the country. It is due rather to difficulties in transportation, to faulty administrative methods, and in the case of potatoes
CE 25 March 1916
Neutral’s Impressions In Austria
(From to-day’s “Daily Chronicle”)
(Special Correspondent – Copyright)
Geneva (Received yesterday). - A neutral who has lived for many years in Austria, relates the following impressions gained during a series of war time journeys in Austria. The terrible effects of the war are at once visible on arrival at Vienna; the large restaurants brilliantly lighted at night and resounding with the music of the Zigane orchestras, are almost empty. Occasionally a few Boulevardiers stroll in and take places at the tables, but they rarely dine there. As I was just leaving the hotel where I had been staying I asked for the ration of bread due to me for the evening meal. This was refused me, the excuse given being that any guest leaving before the meal could not be supplied, and that the rations thus left over were supplied to the inhabitants of the quarter.

At Vienna on the day when the fall of the krone (the Austrian monetary standard) was particularly accentuated, I was able to hear the lamentations of the public at the pay desks of various banks. One phrase constantly recurred in this “chorus of imprecations” – “Germany has deceived us; Germany has lied to us.” The constant news of victories spread by the Wolff Agency have no longer the desired effect upon this happy frightened flock which represents the Austrian people. I heard the following remarks made by a high court official. “If our armies were not so inextricably tied to the German armies we should have made separate peace arrangements long ago.” The only place in the whole country where passable food may be obtained is at Feldkirch, and in the Tyrol districts towards the Swiss frontier. In Vienna, as well as at Berlin, enormous quantities of postal packages are received from neutral countries. These packages contain grain, and also very often fat. It seems to me that countries where grain supplies are assured would not practice such a slow, costly, and insufficient system of supplies. It is well known in Austria that the Bulgarians experienced heavy losses during their offensive against the Serbians – some say the half of their effectiveness. But while people in Vienna talk about the Bulgarian losses, no one speaks of the Austrian losses. It is, however, easy to see that everyone’s mind is occupied with nothing else. The Austrian women do not affect that horrible impassibility that certain German women have tried to make “a la mode.” Many Austrians, especially the “elite,” deeply deplore the new entente that has arisen between the Emperor, formerly a typical feudal monarch, and the Bulgarian Comitadjis – professional brigands and assassins, without a vestige of scruple, whose “business” in ordinary times consists of obtaining ransoms from their captives. The war, with its inflexible logic, has put these mediaeval people into their right place, and the prestige of William of Germany, unable to bear the light shown by certain facts, has severely suffered in the eyes of certain Austrian gentlemen who still retain their ideas of honour. Austria has in store for the Kaiser more than one surprise. For the moment, however, the Germans dominate the country, and nothing more astonishes the “Germanisers” in Austria than to find that their Allies detest them almost as much as their enemies.

Undoubtedly to speculators holding back supplies. The journal adds that it is necessary to point this out lest the idea should get abroad that the starvation plans of the Entente had some probability of success.
Conversely, the typical Viennese may plummet to despairing depths of melancholia, attributed to their soul-searching Jewish-Hungarian heritage. During the time of Metternich, security of near labyrinthine quality protected these modest desires, with spies, vice squads, censors, radical clergy and unbounded bureaucrats acting as vigilant monitors. While red-tape defeated revolutionaries, a totally inept army sported the most fashionable uniforms in Europe. And although the analysis of Irish-Austrian/Bohemian relations is now reaching well into the 20th century, one still finds oneself confronted by the images of a bygone era. A piece of this picture, at least, was shattered when Adler assassinated the Premier. If the Irish act of open rebellion inspired or motivated Adler in any way would be an interesting point of research. One can only surmise that since Padraig Pearse and James Connolly often cited European examples in their provocative literature, it is equally possible that Friedrich Adler read details of the rising in Austrian papers. There are, of course, obvious differences in the events, the first one being that in Dublin’s case an army, albeit a small one, was lead into rebellion and destroyed half the inner city, while in Vienna one man acted alone and caused, besides the death of the Premier, minor damage in a hotel dining room. The similarities are also striking, however. Adler was protesting against his country’s involvement in the war, the oppression of a minority, and had distinct leftist leanings. The Irish plot has been briefly highlighted, so what had lead Friederich Adler to this calculated act of sedition? Adler was engaged in the international trade union movement and

---

74 The picture of the old-fashioned coffee house, so naturally associated with Vienna, is already considered a relict in fashionable English cities: CE 21 February 1916. The problem at the moment in some of the English cities is that of the public house during prohibited hours, the dilemma lying between total closing and a temporary transformation into a café “without the option.” In the city of London the café idea has triumphed. The transition from whisky to tea has been secured through a soup stage, which has helped by a cold spell at the critical time. One may be allowed to wonder (says a writer in the “Guardian”) whether it would help Manchester if she could throw back memory a couple of centuries to the great days of the coffee and chocolate houses (tea being then a luxury for the rich). There is an aroma about “coffee house” which certainly does not belong to “café.” There would be the house of the merchants, the house of the county gentlemen riding in to exchange gossip and talk of crops and tenants. There was certainly a Jacobite house; there was, no doubt, a Catholic house for the families of the old faith in Lancashire and Cheshire; and there would be a literary house, pale reflection of Dryden temple in London, but still claiming a certain position. Why not, asks the writer, an attempt at a return to that old custom? It is true that Hazlitt poured scorn on coffee-house politicians in the best of his “Table Talk,” but then the coffee-house politician would not be harder to bear then the public-house politician, nor more like “an oyster at the ebb of the tide, gaping for fresh tidings.” Men who spend most time in public-houses are generally clubable men without clubs. The revival of the coffee-house would supply that want, at least until we are told that it is unpatriotic to drink imported tea, coffee and chocolate.

75 Adler, born 1879 in Vienna, the son of Victor Adler, studied science in Zurich before returning to Austria in 1897 to become a member of the Social Democratic Party. From 1907 he was editor of the magazine Der Kampf. He was also a good friend of Albert Einstein.
in 1911 he gave up his scientific activities to become the secretary-general of the
Austrian Socialist Party, an office he held until 1914. He became the spokesperson
of the left wing of the party and after the start of World War I he agitated
particularly against his own Party’s policy of supporting the war. And in his fight
Adler turned to drastic means. On October 21, 1916, in the dining room of the
Viennese Hotel Meißl und Schaden, he shot the Minister-President Count Karl von
Stürghk with a pistol three times, killing him. For this act Adler was sentenced to
death, a sentence that was commuted to 18 years imprisonment.77

Count Stürghk, born 1859 in Graz, had entered politics as an
ultraconservative and clericalist member of the Austrian Reichsrat. As a measure of
his implacable opposition to liberal or constitutional reform, he opposed the reform
of Austria's electoral system in 1907. He served in government as Minister of
Education in 1908, and then, in November 1911, in the midst of ongoing
parliamentary disagreement between Czech and German nationalists, he was
appointed Austria's Minister-President.

Czech-German relations in Bohemia were still the objects of endless
negotiation: new plans propounded, discussed, amended, and finally rejected…
Stürghk, another bureaucrat who became Prime minister in 1912, produced further
plans for a settlement and declared in 1914 that the Czechs and Germans were
separated by a wall ‘the thickness only of a piece of paper’. […] Now the Germans
were made more assertive by the mounting strength of national arrogance in
Germany; and the Czechs ever more apprehensive of having to fight on the German
side in a war between Germans and Slavs. The greatest exponents of obstruction in

76 CE 22 March 1916. Serbia’s Agony. AUSTRIANS AND BULGARS. HORRIBLE CRIMES. (From to-day’s
“Daily Telegraph”) (Special Correspondent - Copyright) Rome, Monday, 6.45p.m. - The
Governments of the Allies have secured evidence and documents which will shortly be published
proving that Austria and Bulgaria have been guilty of horrible crimes on Serbia, where the
massacres committed were worse than those perpetrated by Turkey in Armenia […]. According to
reliable information, the victims of the Austrians and Bulgarians exceeded 700,000. Whole districts
with towns and villages have been depopulated by massacres. Women, children and old men were
shut up in churches by the Austrians, and either stabbed with the bayonet or suffocated by means of
asphyxiating gas […].

CE 5 May 1916. Pope and the War. VIGOROUS PROTEST AGAINST AUSTRIAN BARBARITY. (From the
“Daily Telegraph.”) (From A.Beaumont) Milan, Sunday. - Cardinal Gasparri has written a letter in
the Pope’s name to the Bishop of Treviso, where, it may be remembered, the Austrians made an air
raid at night some two weeks ago, killing several women and children. This letter of Papal
sympathy and condolence indicates that a considerable change is taking place in the feeling in
Vatican circles at the continued violations of civilized methods of warfare by the Austrians […]. The
Pope is evidently disposed more and more to defend the cause of Italy against Austrian barbarity.

77 However, after the outbreak of the revolution of 1918, he was released and he played a
significant role as leader of the Arbeiterräte (workers' councils) and as a member of the national
Council of Austria. From the mid-1920s he was mainly active in the Socialist International, whose
secretary-general he was to remain for over 15 years.
the Reichsrat were the Little Russians, resentful of Polish privilege in Galicia; and they were supported by Czechs and Slovenes on the principle of Slav solidarity.78

Stürgkh's relationship with parliament was never a happy one, it was he who dissolved the Bohemian Diet in 191379 and prorogued the Reichsrat in March 1914, a few months before war broke out (the Reichrat was actually converted into a hospital during the war). Governing by decree, Stürgkh's political and public popularity plummeted as the effects of policies of strict press censorship and restrictions upon the right of public assembly mounted. Conditions since the outbreak of war were catastrophic, regarding health, food shortages and finance.

CE 3 April 1916
The War in Austria-Hungary.
Child Sufferers.
(Press Association Foreign Special) Zurich, Sunday. - That the war has seriously affected the health and general physical condition of children is now freely admitted by the Viennese doctors who have investigated the question. Dr.Romi Monti, chief physician of St.Anne’s Hospital, the largest children’s hospital in Vienna, says that while no great increase in sickness among children can be recorded, it is an undeniable fact that the general strength of children, in comparison with normal times before the war, has seriously decreased in consequence of the changed conditions of life. This is shown in a greater liability to illness, and a lessened power of resistance during its course. This is especially true in the case of diphtheria and measles. Amongst the various causes for these conditions Dr.Monti mentions changes in food and nourishment, inferior quality of food, the scarcity of certain very essential articles of diet, and finally the great increase in the cost of living. And to these he adds unfavourable dwelling conditions, due to the decreased incomes of so many thousands of families. Dr.Monti supports his opinions by various official statistics […].

CE 25 April 1916
The effects of the War in Austria
(Press Association Foreign Special)
Zurich, April 18. - Harvest prospects in Austria-Hungary continue none too favourable. […] Prices of men’s clothing in Vienna have been advanced 50 per cent […]. Wages are said to have gone up 30 per cent since the war, and the cost of materials, cloth […] have risen from 100 to 300 per cent. More than 2,000 women conductors are now employed on the Vienna tram-cars […]. Recently women have been employed in repairing the streets in Vienna, and they are said to do the work quite well.80

78 Taylor, p.238.
79 Idem: “The Germans, on their side, applied the same method of obstruction in the Bohemian Diet: even the committee of the Diet which controlled provincial administration broke down, and in 1913 Stürgkh suspended the Bohemian constitution.”
80 CE 20 March 1916. The War in Austria. Harvest Anxieties. (Press Association Foreign Special) Zurich, March 15. - Weather conditions in Austria-Hungary are causing much anxiety to agriculturalists and to the military authorities who are gravely concerned about the results of the next harvest. The winter had been mild and wet and the ground is still far too damp for the spring
Foreigners were still treated well and though they noticed and felt the shortages themselves, they were not subjected to undue rationing or other inhospitable treatment.

CE 13 April 1916
Conditions in Germany and Austria.
Distress in Hungary.
(Press Association Foreign Service)
Zurich, Wednesday. - Travellers coming from Hungary, who have visited the country districts there, report great suffering among the peasantry. Meat is absolutely unobtainable in the villages, the butchers being unable to buy any cattle, as it is all commandeered for the army. Even bread is very dear, and butter, when it can be got at all, costs four shillings a pound [...] The few English persons remaining in the country are very well treated. They have to report themselves to the police only once a week, and are allowed to visit theatres, music halls, and cafes quite freely. It is more difficult now to get permission to come away, and travelling is very tedious and attended with all kinds of interruptions. Two Englishwomen, who have just arrived from Buda Pesth, were detained twenty-four hours at Salzburg, because they left the train to get a cup of tea in the refreshment room on the platform. At the Swiss frontier all travellers, Austrians and Hungarians too, are compelled to wait eight days.

Austrian political turmoil gathered until, on the night of 21 October 1916, Stürgkh was assassinated by Adler. His loss was not greatly felt and he was succeeded as Minister President by Ernst von Korber.81

CE 23 October 1916
Austrian Premier Shot Dead
Amsterdam, Saturday. - According to a telegram from Vienna, the ‘Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung’ gives the following particulars about the murder of Count Stuerghk. He was sitting, as usual, in the dining room of his hotel in the company, on this occasion, of Baron Aehrenthal, brother of the former Foreign Minister. Seated three tables further up the room was the Vienna journalist, Dr. Friederich Adler (son of the Reichsrat Deputy, Dr. Victor Adler), who suddenly jumped up, moved three steps towards Count Stuerghk’s table, and fired three shots. Count Stuerghk at once collapsed, and died immediately. Baron Aehrenthal, who was hit in the foot by one shot, caught Count Stuerghk in his arms as he fell. The Red Cross was at once informed. When the shots rang out a number of Austro-Hungarian and German officers rushed with drawn swords upon the assailant, who gave his name, saying, “Please, gentlemen, I know what I did. I will not resist sowing to begin [...]. The peasants are begged to cultivate every inch of soil with grain, fodder or vegetables, and then, if only the weather conditions improve, it is hoped that the total harvest may prove less disappointing than has been the case in the last two years. While Viennese cigarette smokers are promised by the tobacco Government monopoly seven million more cigarettes than in the corresponding month of the last three years, they complain that the tobacconists have none for sale... At any rate, it is next to impossible to get cigarettes at any “tabak trafik” in Vienna at the present time.

arrest.” Questioned by an officer as to why he committed the crime, he replied: “I have to account for this before the court.” A Red Cross doctor meanwhile had arrived, but he could only certify that death had taken place. A few minutes later the Directors of the Ministries of the Interior and of Commerce, the Governor of Moravia, Baron Regner de Bleyben, Prince Liechtenstein, and the Police President, Herr Gorup, appeared on the scene. The assailant was arrested and handed over to the police. The news, which was at once spread throughout by special editions of the papers, aroused everywhere feelings of indignation and sympathy.

In Socialist circles in Amsterdam it is stated that Friederich Adler is the publisher of the newspaper “Der Kampf,” editor of the Vienna “Arbeiter Zeitung,” and secretary of the official Social Democratic Party. For a long time past he had been considered eccentric. Latterly, like Dr. Liebknecht in Germany, he was in opposition to the majority of the party. He married a Russian lady of Mongolian extraction. The **Austrian Socialist Party**, it is added, and the **“Arbeiter Zeitung”** have nothing whatever to do with the attack on Count Stuergkh. They have both supported the Government. – Reuter.

The “Korrespondenz Willhem” of Vienna gives the following details about the assassination of Count Stuergkh. The man Fritz Adler was born in Vienna in 1879. He studied in Vienna and Switzerland, and his father is the Reichsrat Deputy, Dr. Victor Adler. The family of the assassin, who is married, has been in Switzerland for the last two years. Dr. Fritz Adler was the chief editor of the journal “Das Volk,” the publication of which was discontinued at the beginning of the war. He then published the monthly periodical “Der Kampf,” and acted as its chief editor. The “Der Kampf” is a scientific publication which deals with all problems of the Social Democratic movement. Fritz Adler was also Secretary of the German Social Democratic Party, but in many respects he was in conflict with them. He is very wealthy, and has the reputation of being a self-willed man, with very Radical opinions. His Radical views found little support or sympathy with the party, and he was therefore condemned to a life of inactivity, which he felt very deeply. Owing to his opinion he was almost always in conflict with the Social Democratic Party leaders, and he even quarrelled with his father. Considering his views and his conduct, **the only permissible conclusion is that the hideous murder is the act of a fanatic. When he was examined the assassin showed no trace of regret [...]** Immediately after the news of the death of the Hungarian Minister, Baron Roszner visited the Premier’s department to express the deepest sympathy on behalf of the Hungarian Government – Reuter.

Comment, so far, from Austrian and German sources on the assassination of Count Stuergkh shows a remarkable anxiety to create the impression that political motives have had nothing to do with the deed. Thus, the “Koelische Volkszeitung” writes – “Austria’s enemies will in no case be able to draw from this deed any kind of political conclusions as to Austria’s internal situation.” On the other hand, **the deed is regarded in certain Socialist circles here as the outcome of the persistent refusal to re-establish Parliamentary Government in Austria.** In this connection it is interesting to note that according to a Vienna telegram of Friday’s date to the “Frankfurter Zeitung” the police had prohibited a meeting summoned by a number of University Professors for to-day to discuss the question of summoning Parliament. About fifteen thousand persons were to have been invited to the meeting, which was to be addressed by a number of Parliamentary Deputies. A meeting of the German Democratic party had also been prohibited. The “Vienna Fremdenblatt” states Dr. Adler has declined to answer several of the questions put to him, but that he has repeatedly declared he was fully aware of the significance of
his act, upon which he had determined after full and mature deliberation, and that he carried it out without the instigation of accomplices or any assistance whatever. He wished to reserve his full defence until his trial. Some of the assassin’s statements, the journal declares, are so confused and absurd that doubts have arisen regarding his mental responsibility. Some papers state his sister has for several years been in a lunatic asylum. Spectators of the crime agree in declaring that Dr. Adler gave the impression of external calm, and allowed himself to be conducted to the police prison without resistance. The Browning pistol with which he committed the deed was in his possession before the war, and he always carried it about with him. All investigations made after the murder indicate, it is declared in Vienna, that it was a crime of an individual who, owing to overwork and quarrels with his party and his father, was in a state of mental tension and high nervous over-excitement. – Reuter.

A Political Motive
(From to-day’s “Daily Chronicle”) Amsterdam,

The murder of the Austrian Prime Minister by the well-known Socialist writer, Dr. Friederich Adler, will probably have the immediate result of bringing to a head the internal troubles in Austria-Hungary which have been acutely critical during the last few weeks. The assassination is undoubtedly the outcome of political feeling. Probably efforts will be made to spread the story that the murderer is crazy. But a most superficial study of the conditions in the dual Monarchy in the latter phases of the war make it plain that there was bound to be an outburst of one nature or another. Food conditions are said to have become intolerable. The Czech rebellion was an ever-growing menace, the rival Hungarian and Austrian ambitions were continually clashing, and amongst the thinking part of the population was an increasing discontent with Count Sturghk’s repeated refusal to call together the Parliamentary representatives.

82 CE 23 October1916. The News in Rome, Rome. The news of the assassination of Count Sturghk has produced the deepest impression at Rome. The event is generally regarded as a sign of Austria’s disintegration. The news has evoked profound feeling at the Vatican, where His Holiness the Pope and Cardinal Gasparri have received telegrams with particulars of the tragic occurrence, which it is thought may have an important bearing on the further continuation of the war. – Reuter. The “Tribune”, commenting on the death of Count Sturghk, declares that he was the representative of an essentially despotic policy, which throughout the history of the House of Hapsburg has been the guarantee and price of its preservation. The “Idea Nazionale” recalls that Count Sturghk was the most tenacious opponent of every national aspiration of the component peoples of the “mosaic” empire. The “Giornale d’Italia” says Dr. Adler was not an anarchist or a pauper, and his action must therefore be regarded as a protest against a policy which is inevitably bringing the Empire to the brink of an abyss. Count Sturghk, it says, paid for himself and for the Court camarilla. - Reuter.

CE 24 October 1916. Austrian Premier’s Assassination. Amsterdam, Monday. A Vienna telegram to the « Vossische Zeitung » declares that the day before the murder there was a meeting of delegates of the Social Democratic Party in that city. Friederich Adler severely attacked the party management, saying that matters could not go any further, and that it was now time to act. Sfter the war people would demand of the responsible Socialist leaders the reasons for their silence. A demonstration must take place. All present opposed Adler, but the latter, ina highly excited mood, thumped the table with his fist, and left the conference room, saying “If you do not know what has to be done, I know.” These words were generally regarded by those present as an expression of Adler’s intention to resign from the Party.

The Irish Times 23 October 1916. Count Sturghk. The assassination, says The Times, of the Austrian Premier, Count Karl Sturghk, is by far the most noteworthy incident in his career. An impecunious Styrian nobleman of commanding stature, modest academical attainments, and limited intelligence, he entered the Austrian Parliament some thirty years ago as a nominee of the big landlords, who up to the introduction of universal suffrage in 1907, were represented in the Reichsrat by a special category of curia of deputies. He first acquired influence by his support of the
CE 24 October 1916
Story of the War
(Through our Private Wire) („Examiner“ Office, 2-4 Tudor Street)
The Murdered Premier
(From to-day’s „Daily Telegraph“) (Special Correspondent – Copyright.)

Rome, Monday, 10.20 a.m. – According to Austrian information, the police in Vienna have made wholesale arrests of Socialists who are accused of complicity with Dr.Friedrich Adler. It is stated that Dr.Adler’s father has also been arrested. The police are trying to provide a fresh anti-Jewish agitation. The situation in Vienna appears to be extremely grave.

It seems a peculiar circle that began with the assassination of Franz Ferdinand, encompassing a world war, was now beginning to close its orbit.

The men who provoked war, Berchtolf, Conrad, and the rest, had no idea what they wished to achieve. All kinds of schemes were aired: a punitive expedition, followed by an indemnity; annexation of part of Serbia; partition of Serbia […]. These schemes were ruled out by Tisza […] the only man of resolution or clarity of purpose: faithful to Hungary’s needs, he agreed to wait only on condition that Austria-Hungary should not acquire any Serb territory. War without change was the only thing which could preserve Great Hungary […]. Tisza’s veto would have made the war pointless, had it had a purpose. In fact, war was the purpose. It was an end in itself; the countless problems which had dragged on so long could all be crossed off the agenda. ‘Provisional absolutism’ became ‘absolutism for the duration’: no more suffrage bills in Hungary, no more bargaining between Czechs and Germans, no more throwing of inkpots in the Reichsrat. Tisza and the gentry officials, Stürgkh and his bureaucrats, the aged Emperor and the general staff – these directed the lives of fifty million people. There was no opposition to the war, even a certain enthusiasm. The Germans recognized that it would restore their waning hegemony in Austria; the Magyars,
relieved at the elimination of Francis Ferdinand, welcomed the recruiting of German power in an anti-Slav crusade; the Poles of Galicia were glad of a war against Russia; the Croats, easily shaking off the few South Slav intellectuals, were the most eager for war against Serbia; even the Slovenes hoped that the war might turn against Italy; only the Czechs were sullenly acquiescent. The Austro-Hungarian army, invading Serbia, was driven out, and instead the Serbs invaded Hungary [...]. The greater part of the Austrian army was sent to meet the Russian attack; it also failed [...]. Instead Austria-Hungary was ‘saved’ by Germany; this ‘saving’ marked the real end of the Habsburgs. They had offered a tolerable alternative to German rule; the alternative ceased to exist when the Germans took over the military and political direction of Austria-Hungary. Early in 1915 German troops and German generals directed the campaign which destroyed independent Serbia and carried the Central Powers to the gates of Salonica. Germany was now committed to a bid for the mastery of Europe; and the Habsburgs were no more than German auxiliaries.83

A month later, Austria’s venerable monarch died, of natural causes. Franz Josef, born 1830, the eldest son of Archduke Franz Karl, the brother and heir of Emperor Ferdinand I., became heir-apparent after his father renounced his right to the crown. Already in decline as a major power, with Franz Josef losing the war with France after his accession, Austria’s influence further declined throughout his reign, for a variety of reasons: Austria's relationship with Russia was irreparably damaged when Austria withheld support during the Anglo-Russian Crimean War of 1853-56, a factor in the July crisis of 1914, when Russia entered into an alliance with France and Britain against Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy. And Italy's growing strength following its reunification meant the loss of almost all of Austria's Italian possessions, including Lombardy and Venetia. Finally, but perhaps most importantly, Germany's rise to dominance following its success in war with Austria in 1866, and its subsequent reunification under Bismarck in 1871, rendered Austria the weaker of the two Germanic powers. Within the Empire, Franz Josef had also to contend with Hungary's growing demands for autonomy and agreed to a dual monarchy in 1867. But it was Franz Josef’s wife, Elisabeth, who was regarded by many Hungarians as their true monarch, having also played a role in the discussions that resulted in the shared power arrangements. But it was probably her temperament, beauty and love of travel that endeared to her to many nations she visited, including Ireland. As dual monarch, Franz Josef announced his intention of granting a form of self-government also to his Slav population. However, he was frustrated in this by the German and Magyar politicians who

83 Taylor, pp.249-251.
effectively ran the empire, and who firmly opposed any extension of power sharing to include the Slavs. His failure to enact change led to increased dissatisfaction among Austrian Czechs and Serbs, as well as straining relations with Russia, the natural champion of the Slav peoples. His only triumph seemed to have been the international acclaim won by his inner strength and faith in dealing with extraordinary personal tragedy regarding his closest family members.

CE 23 November 1916
Editorial

**Emperor Francis Joseph’s death** has produced a profound sensation throughout his own Empire, and in other countries will give rise to much speculation as to its effect on the future of the war. **In many ways the aged Emperor was a remarkable ruler.** When he was but 19 years of age he succeeded to the throne of Austria in 1849, when the Empire was shaken by internal dissensions. Grappling sternly with the alarming difficulties that prevailed, the young ruler first assumed absolute power, and for two years maintained a Government responsible only to himself. In the course of time he centralized the Government of his heterogeneous nationalities at Vienna and inaugurated a series of fiscal and commercial reforms. Early in his long reign he quarrelled with Russia over her plans against Turkey, and continued antagonistic for many years. By the sanction of the Congress of Berlin he occupied the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which formerly belonged to Turkey, and it is remarkable that those two provinces loom largely in the scheme for the readjustment of the map of Europe after the present war. Indeed the ostensible cause of the existing hostilities concerned the assassination of Francis Joseph’s heir apparent.

CE 23 November 1916
Death of Emperor Francis Joseph

His Last Days
Amsterdam, Wednesday. – As is apparent from bulletins, which gave the unvarnished truth about the Emperor’s condition, his imperial Majesty continued his usual mode of life and occupation right up to yesterday, but he overtaxed his power, persisting in spite of a rising temperature and irritating cough, in receiving the usual daily reports. He also gave long audiences, during which he spoke a good deal. […] He received the archduke Frederick in an audience lasting three-quarters of an hour. In the Emperor’s immediate circle, however, his condition caused serious anxiety. Recently the Archduchess Marie Valerie has always kept close at hand. His eldest daughter, Princess Gisela of Bavaria, and his sister-in-law the Archduchess Carl Theodor of Bavaria had now arrived in Vienna, where the heir to the Throne and his consort had remained continually. […] In spite of the evening bulletin, which left no doubt about his Majesty’s serious condition, people still maintained a firm belief in his power of recuperation, and the news of his death, which was published about 11o’clock, had absolutely a paralyzing effect on the public, which could hardly credit it. All amusements were at once suspended. According to the semi-official “Fremdenblatt” those present in the death chamber when the emperor died, included all the members of the Imperial House who were in Vienna, the court dignitaries, Baron Burian, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, and Dr. Von Koerber, now Austrian Premier. The Archduches Marie Valerie read the
prayers for the dying. According to a Berlin telegram the “Lokalanzeiger” says: -
The Austrian Emperor’s death will create a great gap, especially as it occurs at a
moment when immense events are deciding Austria’s future. There is therefore no
doubt that the enemies of Germany and Austria will joyfully record this event on
their credit sheet, but the near future will show them their calculation is a mistaken
one. The will to victory of the Austro-Hungarian peoples will lose none of its
strength.” – Reuter.

Sketch of his Career

[…] The tragedy of Sarajevo was the immediate cause of the present
terrible war; and though it is probable that had the heir to the Austrian throne
escaped the assassin, or had no attempt been made on his life, the nations of
Europe would some time come to measure swords, Austria is blamed and will be
blamed for the humiliating terms of reparation which she sought to impose on
unhappy Serbia. Francis Joseph, as the head of the Austro-Hungarian State, will
without doubt be censured by the historians of the present war for playing into the
hands of the German Emperor by not accepting he amends which Serbia was
prepared to make. Be that as it may, it is very likely that had the ruler who has now
passed away been a free agent he would have in some way made peace with Serbia,
for it has to be remembered that since 1848 he ruled a most heterogeneous
collection of peoples, possessing widely different national ideals and speaking a
multiplicity of languages. He guided his empire through many difficulties, and
taken as a whole his reign was an era of peace and progress for Austria-Hungary.
When men can estimate his character as a monarch with the necessary calmness, it
will be agreed that he was one of the best rulers which the House of Hapsburg gave
Europe. Francis Joseph, eldest son of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand, brother of
Ferdinand, Emperor of Austria, was born on the 30th Sept., 1830. Ferdinand was a
weak or at all events an unsuccessful ruler, and after a period of trouble and
discontent abdicated on the 22nd December, 1848, in favour of his nephew, Francis
Joseph. When the young Emperor succeeded thus to the throne the conglomeration
of States, great and small, known as the Austrian Empire, was seething with the
elements of revolution. Hungary was asserting her distinctive nationality. The
Hungarians were successfully reviving their Magyar language, and were on the eve
of declaring themselves an independent republic. Bohemia was following suit. At
first the young Emperor was to a great extent in the hands of the politicians who
surrounded his Court, but in a short time he proved to be a man of intellect and
independent mind. Having learned all the principal languages spoken in his
realms he visited the different countries, and by showing them sympathy with
their national ideals he won their esteem and loyalty. The Magyars were a
difficult people to handle, but eventually a compromise was arrived at. […] In 1866
he agreed to the establishment of Constitutional Government on a representative
basis for Austria. But in some measures he remained an autocratic monarch
preserving and asserting the right to appoint and dismiss his ministers and to direct
the policy of the Austrian Government. [He] centralised the government of the
various States and kept them in hand. While the Bohemians, for instance, were
willing enough that Francis Joseph should largely direct the affairs of their
kingdom, they were altogether adverse to any interference from the Magyars,
while the Magyars would not tolerate any interference from the Austrian
Poles. None but a man of good common sense and strong character could keep so
many peoples with such divergent ideals together for sixty-eight years. […] Like
all members of the Hapsburg Dynasty, Francis Joseph was imbued with the idea of
the Divine right of the kings and was slow to yield any of what he conceived to be
his rights as a royalty. As Archduke of Austria, he retained a hereditary right of veto in the election of a Pope; and it will be remembered that he asserted this archaic prerogative against Cardinal Rampolla when the Cardinal met to appoint a successor to Leo XIII. […] Francis Joseph was a sincere practising Catholic, and a strong support to the church when enemies threatened her.\(^{84}\) His foreign policy was not as successful […]. In 1854 the Emperor married Elisabeth of Bavaria, a woman of elevated mind and character, who proved a great help to him in managing his people, and a comfort to him in many trials. For years his life was constantly in danger and several attempts were made to assassinate him. In 1889 his only son and heir was murdered under circumstances which have never been fully cleared up, but which gave much scope to the scandal mongers. The crowning tragedy of his life came in 1897, when the Empress Elisabeth was assassinated at Geneva by an Italian. This event cast a heavy sorrow upon the Emperor, and would have completely broken a man less strong than he was. The Empress was well known in Ireland, where she spent much time hunting, and her death was very deeply regretted here. Then came the Sarajevo assassination in 1914, which caused much bitterness and led to the present war. Whatever his failure, and however his people may blame him for his acquiescence to Prussian aggressiveness, it will be conceded by future historians that he governed his Empire with foresight and judgment, and whatever the future may have in store for Austria-Hungary – whether dismemberment or union – the people he ruled, and Europe in general, will remember him as a man who had faults, but who was one of the most successful members of a Royal House which gave many rulers, good and bad, to the countries of Europe.

The issue of succession to the throne was complex, next in line for the throne being Franz Josef's younger brother, Maximilian. However, he had been shot by a Mexican firing squad in 1867. Brother Karl Ludwig's eldest son, Franz Ferdinand, then emerged as heir. But Franz Josef had little affection for Franz Ferdinand, disapproving of the man, his politics and also his marriage to Sophie Chotek von Chotkova, who was not of royal birth. The marriage was allowed only after he agreed to renounce all rights of his children to succeed him on the throne. Franz Josef pointedly did not attend the marriage - or the funeral - after Franz Ferdinand had been assassinated. After issuing an ultimatum to Serbia, and then declaring war after Serbia quibbled with one of the demands, Franz Josef left the conduct of the war to his military officials. Following his tour of Europe in 1910, American President Theodore Roosevelt once declared that none but the Austrian Emperor had truly impressed him. Emperor Franz Josef died on 21 November 1916

---

\(^{84}\) CE 23 October 1916.Church Bells for Guns.P.A. Foreign Special. Zurich Oct. 18th. - From Prague, known as the City of a Hundred Towers, 152 church bells, weighing altogether 76 tons, have been taken away for melting down into cannon and munitions.
after reigning for 66 years. His grand-nephew, Karl I, assumed the throne until 1918 as the last Habsburg monarch.85

CE 24 November 1916
Late Austrian Emperor
The Obsequies.
Amsterdam, Thursday. – A Vienna telegram states that after the usual ceremonies the body of the late Emperor will be removed on Monday evening from Schoenbrunn Castle to the Chapel at Hofburg, where it will lie in state until noon on Nov. 30. At 3 o’clock in the afternoon of that day the body will be conveyed to St.Stephen’s Cathedral, where Cardinal Piffl will perform the solemn consecration. The coffin will then be taken to the Capuchin Church, where it will be placed in the imperial vault. The members of the Government to-day renewed their oath of allegiance in the name of the Emperor Karl the First. The generals, officers and military officials also renewed their allegiance. – Reuter.86

The year ends with reflections on possible conferences and peace treaties, not only regarding the Continental situation but Ireland in particular.

CE 28 December 1916
Editorial
Conferences
Neither Germany nor Austria have lost any time in replying to the suggestion made by President Wilson,87 but as these suggestions run on practically parallel lines with the German proposal for a conference of the belligerents at which peace terms might be discussed, there is nothing very remarkable in the alacrity with which Germany has acquiesced and endorsed its own policy by adopting President Wilson’s. […] France, Russia, and Great Britain have declared to agree to such a conference until Germany had made definite proposals. […]88 The calling together of the Colonial Prime Ministers in an

86 CE 24 November 1916. Kaiser and Dead Emperor. Amsterdam. Thursday. – A Berlin telegram says that the German Emperor has sent a telegram to the new Austrian Emperor expressing deep sympathy with him on the occasion of the death of Emperor Francis Joseph […]. Emperor Karl replied – “I thank you for the sympathy which you, dear friend, have shown, and for the genuine friendship which you manifested towards the dead Emperor, who held you in such high esteem. As your and his loyalty to the Alliance stood firm as a rock in this world-war, so shall it remain for us.” – Reuter.
87 Discontent is also widespread in the United States: CE 28 December 1916. The present cost of living has become a burning question in America, and both, by letterpress and illustration many of the papers are allocating the cause to Europe’s pressing needs. The “Nashville Tennessean” has a cartoon showing a very small and lean Uncle Sam looking at a giant hand marked Europe clutching a heap titled “Wheat Flour,” and ticketted “American Food Supply.” […] That the food question is causing considerable concern to the American people may be learned from the fact that the Bakers’ Organisation made a poll of papers in the States, and they claim that a strong feeling was showing in favour of an embargo being placed on the exportation of foodstuffs.
88 CE 25 April 1916. The German Mind Munich Professor on German Nervousness. (Press Association Foreign Special) Zurich, April 18. – […] Professor F.W.Foerster, of Munich University, contends that the present evils are due to the common sins of all the so-called cultured nations in Europe, and not to Prussian Germany. He goes on to say that every nation suffers from a certain nervousness, due to historical or geographical causes, and that Germany’s arises from her central position, and fears of French revenge and Russian Pan-Slav expansion
Imperial Conference naturally suggests possibilities that are of extreme interest to Ireland, and it may be that the new Government is more disposed to grapple promptly with the Irish situation than the outside public realises. [...] A War Cabinet that has been created mainly for the purpose of getting on with the war must feel that with Martial Law and discontent in Ireland it is not alone handicapped in many ways even now, but that its position when peace terms come to be discussed is, to put it mildly, somewhat anomalous. That may be one of the impelling forces which is causing British Ministers to turn their eyes towards Ireland, and it is quite on the cards that the Colonial Premiers, who have all identified themselves with Ireland’s demand for Self-government, will find the session of the imperial Conference a suitable time in which to deal with Ireland, whose rights are entitled to as much respect from Great Britain as Belgium’s are from Germany.

policy. There is no opposition, he says, between the German nation and the German military organisation. The latter was the answer of the nation of thinkers and poets to the terrible humiliations inflicted on the German people by Napoleon. “This great complicity of France in the militarising of Europe,” the writer says “must not be overlooked.” Professor Foerster also remarks that it is most unfortunate that Germany has no really great statesman of the first rank to-day, who could make an end of the present chaotic conditions in Europe by a policy of wisdom and federation. “But in which country,” he asks, “can one find far-seeing statesmen? One looks everywhere, and sees only political chessplayers or even gamblers?”
CE 1 January 1917

Though 1917 will see the war continued – the allies reply broadly states their position – still there is every reason to look forward with increasing hope. Right will triumph over might, and the year now entered upon will, one may hope, go down in history as the period during which civilisation and humanity triumphed over greed and barbarism. For Ireland, too, the prospects are healthy, and with the coming of the Imperial Conference it should not be too much to hope that the long deferred aspirations of Irishmen for freedom will be satisfactorily realised. If the Allies believe that the reparation of violated rights and the restitution of freedom for Belgium are essentials for which it was necessary to plunge Europe into war and to continue fighting, there can be no question that the case of Ireland is in accord with the principle on which the reply to the German Note is based. Irish Self-government must as surely come – its delay has done Great Britain much injury in her colonies and in the United States – and the year now entered upon should see an end of the hesitancy and vacillation that has in the past marred British statesmanship in its dealings with Ireland.

In Europe Germany pronounces a policy of unrestricted submarine warfare, the February Revolution in Russia (our time March) gets under way, and though there are widespread demands for peace and land reform, the Russian provisional government, later headed by Alexander Kerensky, reassures the Allies it will remain in the war. The Tsar abdicates, the US enter the war. In Britain, George V drops all his German titles and adopts the dynastic name of Windsor. The Germans help Lenin return to Russia from his exile in Switzerland and the Bolshevik October Revolution (November) begins. Kerensky has lost the support of the people and a Bolshevik government, called the Council of People’s Commissars, is formed under Lenin. Lev Davidovich Bronstein, known to his followers as Leon Trotsky, becomes commissar for foreign affairs, while Josif Vissarionovich Dzhugashvili, immortalised as Joseph Stalin, becomes commissar for national minorities. The new government offers an armistice to Germany and Austria-Hungary.¹

7.1. A Turning Point in the War

Compromise or the knock-out blow was the issue which lay behind the events of the bitter winter of 1916-17 – behind the rise to power of Lloyd George as much as behind the fall of Bethmann Hollweg, behind the changes which followed the death of Francis Joseph in November 1916. The old Emperor had sustained the routine of administration to the end. Even the assassination of Stürghkh, the Austrian Prime Minister, by a pacifist Socialist had not broken the deceptive calm; Francis Joseph had merely recalled Koerber, the Prime Minister of fifteen years before, to occupy the empty desk […]. With Francis Joseph gone there went the last fragment of Habsburg core.²

In A.J.P. Taylor’s analysis, Charles, the new Emperor, was an émigrés king, not the ruler of a real empire.³ ‘The fantastic loyalties, the repetition of ancient policies, the divorce from reality – these recalled the Young Pretender, ‘ and to complete the effect of a fantasy in progress, the Empress Zita, often considered the inspirer of her husband, came from the Bourbon-Parma dynasty⁴ which had been dead for fifty years.

CE 1 January 1917
Karl Crowned

Amsterdam, Saturday. - Message from Budapest states that the Coronation of the Emperor King Karl and the Empress Queen Zita took place to-day in Budapest with old-fashioned pomp […].

The king ascended the mound and waved the sword of St.Stephen towards the four corners of the earth in order to symbolise that he, as supreme guardian of the Empire, will protect it against all its foes.

Charles attempted internal reconstruction without much success, weakly emulating the hostility of Francis Ferdinand towards the Magyars. In this he tried to avoid his coronation at Budapest which meant taking the oath to the Hungarian constitution, not to mention acknowledging the integrity of the ‘lands of

² Taylor, p.259.
³ Taylor, p.259.
⁴ CE 5 February 1917. Austrian Empress Brothers Join Belgians. (From to-day’s “Daily Telegraph”) Two brothers of the Empress of Austria, the princes Sisto and Santo, have arrived at Viareggio wearing the uniform of Belgian officers. The present Empress of Austria was, before her marriage to the Emperor, then the Archduke Charles, Princess Zita of Bourbon-Parma.
St. Stephen’. ‘Tisza answered by threatening to stop the food supplies of Vienna; and Charles, cowed by reality, played his part in the thousand-year-old performance – the last occupant of a throne already vacant.6

CE 4 January 1917

Austria’s New King
(From Mr. A. Beaumont, Special Correspondent of the press Association and “Daily Telegraph”).

Milan, Wednesday. - The first authentic reports to hand of the coronation scenes at Budapest last Sunday show that the young Emperor was hailed by the populace as a new biblical prince of peace. Conviction has taken deep root in the nation’s mind that King Charles is thinking for and with his people of nothing else, and that he ascended the Hungarian throne for no other purpose but to bring them glad tidings.

Given his vulnerable stand within and without the Empire, it was hoped that the young and inexperienced Emperor might personify instead the Messiah of Peace. The hardships of war had dampened near all the enthusiasm the Austrian troops could muster, not to mention the weak national links binding them in the first place.7

CE 2 January 1917

Story of the War. Special Despatches. (By arrangement with the London “Daily Telegraph” we are enabled to publish the special despatches from the front sent them by their own Correspondents. – Copyright).

Political Crisis in Austria.
(From to-day’s “Daily Telegraph”).
(Special Correspondent Mr. A. Beaumont – Copyright).

The attitude of the new Austrian Emperor in trying to force peace negotiations may be a revelation. He doubtless interprets the desire of the vast majority of his subjects to have done with the war. His policy amounts almost to the menace of leaving Germany in the lurch at a most critical moment […]. The Emperor practically puts himself at the head of an Austrian Peace League. A curious light is thrown on the state of things by a letter from Vienna, published this morning in the “Gazette del Pololo” of Turin. The letter, written by an Austrian

---

5 Count Istvan Tisza (1861-1918), Hungarian politician and statesman 1903 to 1905, Austro-Hungarian Premier, 1913 to 1917, cf. Urban, appendix.
6 Taylor, p.260.
7 CE 26 July 1917. How Kaiser Karl Came to Trieste. (From to-day’s “Daily Chronicle”) Milan, Wednesday. - The tragic comic side of Emperor Karl’s recently vaunted triumphal entry into Trieste amidst “the enthusiastic acclamation of the populace” is described in the local Press here by an eye-witness. Three days beforehand General Friessken, military governor of the place, issued an order to all residents in the streets through which the Monarch would have to pass to quit their houses during the whole period of the imperial visit after carefully closing all windows, locking all doors, and consigning the keys thereof to the civil police. When Karl arrived he announced his intention of traversing the town on foot. It needed the repeated earnest entreaties of the governor to prevent his carrying out his resolve. So far as the civil population was concerned, the city of Trieste remained practically a wilderness, and Karl’s acquaintance of the townsfolk was limited to a proclamation of thanks for their kindly consideration.
politician, says – “If a referendum could be taken among our patriots, including those who have on their conscience to-day’s catastrophe, I believe all of them would be disposed to sacrifice, without much remorse, any slice of territory, to issue as soon as possible from the present horrible situation. Our patriots do not confess it openly because they are afraid not of our authorities, who at bottom think as they do, but of our unspeakable protectors in Berlin. The latter themselves take no other view, and are the first to give us to understand, without an apology, that if any concessions are to be made, they will be at our expense. They only hesitate to say so openly, for fear of making the enemy more exacting, and demanding perhaps some German territory too. Here they shout to the four winds. ‘We are victorious, and over victorious, and it is only out of magnanimity that we offer peace.’ Our protectors are mistaken, though, if they think that the world is still afraid of them […]. The writer then says he thinks the young Emperor too weak, but adds, “He, at any rate, has understood one thing – the country is weary and is suffering terribly from war. Hence he tries to persuade his people in all manner of ways that he also ardently desires to conclude peace speedily, and to devote all his energies to alleviating the distress of his subjects. William came for the funeral, but he left after a few hours, having taken cold. The Viennese did their share in giving him as cold a reception as they could. He wanted a big funeral, with all the pomp and exaltation of the glories of war. The Viennese promptly gave him to understand that they wanted nothing of this. The whole Stephan Platz and Ringstrasse were crowded on the day of the funeral by people who had on their lips only one thing – peace. As the procession passed there was a deep religious murmur, ‘Let us pray for our Emperor, and may he also implore the Almighty to grant us peace.’ Fly sheets were distributed and eagerly taken up, containing the word ‘Peace’ heavily underlined, and every instant one heard the crowd murmur in unison with a sort of religious fervour an invocation for peace. William judged the spirit of the Viennese rightly, and it was as well that he left. Unpleasant incidents might have happened had he remained.9

In trying to consolidate the image of the Prince of Peace, Charles made some gestures of appeasement to his people: Czech leaders who had been convicted of high treason, were amnestied, and the Reichsrat was reopened and met on 30 May 1917.

---

8 CE 11 July 1917. Notwithstanding the close censorship that is being exercised by Germany, it is known that Austria-Hungary is war-weary, and that the liberty-loving tendencies of the people have grown to such an extent that they fear the dual Empire incurs grave risks in remaining the representative of “an out-worn political system” in a democratised Europe.

9 CE 4 January 1917. Austria and Peace. (From Mr. A. Beaumont, Special Correspondent of the press Association and “Daily Telegraph”). Milan, Tuesday Afternoon. - The Austro-Hungarian Press is almost unanimous in declaring that the new year just begun will positively be the last year of war. Peace, the newspapers declare, is bound to come before long, and, despite the Allies’ reply, hope continues to flourish on the banks of the Danube. The Workmans’s Association of Vienna organised a big meeting last Thursday evening, at which Herr Viktor Adler was the principle speaker. He affirmed that, despite appearances, the peace initiative taken by Austria and Germany would yet be efficacious. He proposed to send a message of thanks to the American President, and a resolution to that effect was immediately voted upon and adopted unanimously.
CE 4 July 1917

**Austrian Emperor’s Amnesty.**

Amsterdam, Tuesday. - The “Fremdenblatt” says that by the amnesty several members of the Reichsrath will regain their liberty, namely M. Klofoe, “who is on trial, although he has not yet been sentenced.” Reuter.

Reuter adds that M. Klofoe has been in prison for three years, and so far has hitherto been known without any trial, and ex-deputies Choe, Burwal, Vogna, Netplitzky, Grafenauer, Markow, Kurilowicz and Rasin. Regarding **Dr. Kramarcz**, the “Fremdenblatt” proceeds – The amnesty order does not say whether he also is included. **Among those who fled abroad and who are, therefore, excluded from the amnesty order are the Deputies Professor Masaryk, Dr. Pittaece and Candussa, and Herr Giarde, Dr. Otruriewski and Dr. Gregorm.** Reuter adds that Dr. Kramarcz is the young Czech leader, who was sentenced to death, though his sentence was commuted towards the end of last year. – Reuter.

(From to-day’s “Daily Chronicle”)

Zurich, Tuesday.

According to a wire from Vienna the Emperor has granted an amnesty to all persons condemned for treason and sedition and other political crimes with the exception of those who have fled the country, deserted to the enemy, or failed to return to Austria since the outbreak of war.

As a result of this proclamation Dr. Kramarcz and other Czech Deputies now imprisoned will apparently regain their liberty. There had been great agitation in Parliament to secure this amnesty, and the Emperor’s decision must be regarded as a new attempt to placate the Slav opposition. However, the Czechs now demanded quite aggressively the union of all Czechs and Slovaks ‘in a single democratic Bohemian state’. There is a distinct increase in the level of political and military activity from 1917 onwards on the part of the Czechs, reflected in the number of reports on Czech individuals and Bohemia in general in this news year and the next. Receiving several mentions in the Cork Examiner in recognition of his role as an important figure in the modern Czech nationalist movement, is Karel

---

10 CE 28 November 1917. **Emperor Karl’s Private Cabinet.** Zurich, Tuesday. - The Slav influences in Austria-Hungary have sustained a severe blow in the resignation of Count Polzer Hoditz, Chief of the Emperor’s Private Cabinet. News of the retirement has created a great sensation in Vienna and Budapest, where it is regarded as an important political event. Although occupying a purely court position Count Polzer Hoditz has been accused of influencing the political decisions of the emperor always in favour of the Slavs. **The amnesty of July 2 releasing hundreds of Slav political prisoners, which was proclaimed without any previous consultation of the responsible minister, was believed to be due to his influence, as was also the inaugurations of the Slavophile policy of Austria. Count Polzer Hoditz’s activities led to the conflicts with both Count Czernin and Dr. Wekerle. The Budapest “Az Est” states his retirement was brought about by them.** – Reuter.

11 CE 19 July 1917. **Situation in Austria.** Zurich, Wednesday. - The Vienna correspondent of the “Deutsche Tageszeitung” asserts that the policy of the Slav parties in the Austrian Parliament is in full agreement with the leading elements of the Entente. No German, it says, can doubt that an alliance or understanding exists between the Austrian Czechs, the Austrian Poles, and other non-Germans in Austria on the one hand, and France, Great Britain and Russia on the other. The amnesty, it declares, was the first result of this policy of blackmail, must be considered as a victory for the ante-German parties.
Kramar. He publicly advocated Czech autonomy within the Austrian Empire but privately favoured an independent Czech state within a Russian-led Slavic federation. During the course of World War I he led the resistance movement of the Czech nationalists at home, while Thomas Masaryk and Eduard Benes led it abroad. In 1916 he had received a death sentence for treason, but the sentence was commuted to life imprisonment. The amnesty of 1917 brought about his release.

In a speech to the Young Czech Party before its dissolution, Dr. Kramar had openly declared that

“...at the moment of the outbreak of the war it became quite clear that, despite all tactics of opportunism, our party remained true to the programme of Czech independence. It became at once evident to all of us that the chapter of our former policy was forever closed for us. We felt with our whole soul that the Czech nation would not go through the sufferings of the world war only to renew the pre-war tactics of a slow progress towards that position to which we have full historical rights as well as the natural rights of a living and strong nation.”

And again, in an article in the Narodni Listy of December 25, 1917, Kramar wrote under the heading “By Order of the Nation”:

“We have sought with utmost sacrifice to find a compromise between our just claims and the international situation which was unfavourable to us. The war has completely changed all our policy, removing the possibility of a compromise to which we might have been disposed, and we cannot once more roll up our flag now so proudly unfurled, and put it aside for the next occasion.”

When Kramar in 1917 again took over as leader of the Young Czech Party, leading to the amalgamation of four nationalist parties, a change took place in the leadership of the Czech Social Democratic Party, hitherto in the hands of a few demagogues, such as Smeral, who dominated the majority of the members. The
return of the Socialist Party to its revolutionary traditions and its entire approval of
the Bohemian state right and the national policy of Czecho-Slovak independence
meant a complete and absolute consolidation of the whole Czech nation.16

CE 13 January 1917
Story of the War. Special Despatches. (By arrangement with the London
“Daily Telegraph” we are enabled to publish the special despatches from the front
sent them by their own Correspondents. – Copyright).
Situation in Austria
(Special Correspondent, Mr. A. Beaumont – Copyright)
Milan, Thursday, 11.45 p.m. - News from the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy
shows that the political position is still very unsettled through the conflicting
pretensions of the various factions, and above all owing to the absence of any
strong hand in Vienna. The young Emperor may be trying to assert his personality,
but he seems to have uphill work, and now, just when the Clam Martinitz Cabinet17
was about to get to work to set things in order, there are reports that its days are
also numbered. This time it is the Czech element that is working behind the
scenes for their undoing, as both Martinitz and Czernin, 18 whilst Czech in origin,
are described as Czech renegades […].

Unfortunately Austria’s hopes of peace, at least with the Allies, were also
shattered when the British Prime Minister rejected Austrian overtures. Although it
has often been stated that the Allies never intended to dismember the Austrian
Empire, considering the American President’s fourteen point plan it would be
difficult indeed to imagine an ‘Empire’ after it had been stripped of its irredentist
provinces.

CE 15 January 1917
Austria and Allies’ Reply
Amsterdam, Saturday. - According to a Vienna telegram, the Austrian
papers are indignant over the Entente’s Note in reply to President Wilson. The
“Fremdenblatt” calls it a rough rejection of President Wilson’s action, and speaks
of the Entente’s war aims as Utopian. Referring to the demand for the liberation of

16 On October 28 1918, Kramar led a bloodless coup in Prague, making Czech independence from
Austria a reality. From 1918 to 1919 he was the first premier of the new state under President
Masaryk, but was forced to resign as a result of his opposition to land reform and other progressive
measures. After 1919 he led a rightist minority against Masaryk and Benes.
17 Cf. Otto Urban, Die Tschechische Gesellschaft, pp.874-875: ‘Karl I waren die Verhältnisse in
Böhmen gut bekannt, zu seinen Prager Lehrern hatten […], der Historiker Jaroslav Goll […] gehört
[…]. So verwundert es nicht, dass der neue Kaiser den Ministerpräsidenten seines Vorgängers
bereits am 20.Dezember 1916 gegen Heinrich Clam-Martinic, den Neffen des ehemaligen Führers
des böhmischen konservativen Adels, Jindrich Jaroslav Clam-Martinic, austauschte. Zwei Tage
später berief Karl I auch den bisherigen Außenminister, Baron Burian, ab und betraute den
österreichisch-ungarischen Gesandten in Bukarest, Graf Ottokar Czernin, mit dieser wichtigen
Funktion. Sowohl Clam-Martinic als auch insbesondere Czernin gehörten zu den führenden
Persönlichkeiten des Kreises um den ehemaligen Thronfolger Franz Ferdinand.
18 Eugen Czernin (1851-1925), Bohemian aristocrat and member of the Bohemian Conservative
the Slavs, Rumanians, Czechs and Slovaks, the paper expresses the opinion that many peoples under the rule of the Entente would be happy if they possessed the rights and liberties possessed by those peoples. The paper adds that Mr. Lloyd George’s speech shows where the centre of the opposition to the peace idea lies. – Reuter.

And thus Austria is forced to amass fresh troops from its pool already near depletion and subjected to constant affrays among the multi-ethnic ranks.19

CE 16 January 1917
Austria Massing Fresh Troops For Spring Offensive.  
(From to-day’s “Daily Chronicle”)
(Special Correspondent – Copyright).

Rome, Monday. – [...] News brought from Innsbruck recounts frequent sanguinary affrays between the soldiery of divers nationalities, particularly between Bohemians, Germans, and Hungarian Croats. Three days ago a serious mutiny occurred in a regiment mainly composed of raw recruits on the score of the uneatable quality of the bread rations.20

CE 17 October 1917
Mutinies in Austria.

Rome, Tuesday. - The “Journal d'Italia” has received a message from Berne, stating, in spite of the closing of the frontier by Austria, with the object of preventing the circulation of reports sympathetic of the dissolution of the monarchy and of the recent disturbances in Bohemia. It is learned from a reliable authority that several extremely serious mutinies, big scenes of terror and bloodshed have occurred in the Austrian navy [...]. The outbreak is reported to have broken out owing to the tyranny of the Germans, who are becoming every day more unbearable, and make the Austrians feel their share of vassalage and inferiority [...]. The effervescence in the Austrian navy has not yet subsided, but, on the contrary, it is increasing in a threatening manner, owing to the condition of life to which the men are subjected. – Reuter.

As A.J.P. Taylor points out, the ‘master-races’ of the empire, the Germans and the Magyars, were responsible for the eventual downfall of the Monarchy, not the subject nations under contention.

To suppose that the dynasty could impose concessions on the ‘master-nations’ had been the great blunder of those who had placed their faith in Francis

19 CE 17 December 1917. Austrian Army. Zurich, December 14. – At Thursday’s sitting of the Military Committee of the Austrian Delegations, the Socialist Deputy, Herr Gloeckel, made a sweeping attack on the administration, charging it with negligence, incompetence, extravagance and waste of both men and material. He declared that the nation had lost all confidence in the conduct of the Army Command. Everybody believed that successes were only gained when the capacity of the Austrian troops was united to that of the Germans. It was the general opinion that there had been great and unnecessary sacrifices of life. [...] Only severe and just criticism could effect any change of improvement in the conditions. – Reuter.

20 CE 2 August 1917. Austrian. (P. A. War Special) (Admiralty – per Wireless Press) Eastern Theatre of War. – To the north of Casinu Valley violent attacks of the enemy again broke. The 32nd Szokel Infantry Regiment fought here with their customary strength [...].
Ferdinand; it was an even greater blunder in 1917. A ‘federal’ reconstruction of the Habsburg Monarchy could have taken place only as a voluntary concession from the Germans and Magyars. Michael Karolyi preached national conciliation to a handful of followers in Hungary; he had no counterpart among the Germans. The Germans and Magyars had won and held their dominant position by their strength; hence the weaker the dynasty became, the more it had to go with them. […] For the hold of the two ‘master-nations’ could be shaken only by defeat in war; and this defeat would destroy, even more certainly, the hold of the dynasty.  

CE 26 January 1917
Austria and Peace. Premier’s Declaration.

Amsterdam, Thursday. - According to a Budapest telegram, in reply to a question by the Opposition Party regarding President Wilson’s address to the Senate, Count Tisza, Premier, said – […] The principles of nationalities in the formation of national states […] can only unrestrictedly prevail where single nations live within sharply marked ethnographical boundaries, in compact masses, and in regions suited for the organisation of a state. **In territories where various races live intermingled it is impossible that every single race can form a national state.** In such territories only it is possible to create a state without national character, or one on which **the race which by its numbers and importance predominated imprints a national character.** In such circumstances, therefore, only that limited realisation of the principle of nationalities is possible which the President of the United States rightly expresses in making the following demands - That security of life, religion and individual and social development should be guaranteed to all peoples. I believe that nowhere is this demand realised to such a degree as in both States of the Monarchy. I believe

---

21 Taylor, p.262. Cf. also CE 29 January 1917.Story of the War. Special Despatches. (By arrangement with the London “Daily Telegraph” we are enabled to publish the special despatches from the front sent them by their own Correspondents. – Copyright). Hungary’s Plight. (From today’s “Daily Telegraph”). (Special Correspondent: - A. Beaumont – Copyright) Milan, Friday Night. - […] The condition of the popular classes in the Austro-Hungarian Empire […] is most critical. A lurid light is thrown upon these conditions by a letter of an Austrian received via Berne, and published by the “Gazetta del Popolo,” of Turin. It says: “The utter failure of the new Ministry’s policy in Bohemia has not sufficed to banish dreams of conquest from the minds of our patriots. Famine is at our door. The situation in many provinces is horribly gloomy. We hear of attempts at revolt suppressed in blood and yet there are still men among us with the delusion that we are going to annex new territories. Our people are becoming impatient. Those under Hungarian domination are becoming defiant. Thus the tension during the past few weeks in the relations between Count Tisza and the Croatians has become heightened after the refusal of members of the Diet for Zagabria to attend the coronation of the new Sovereign […]. It is curious to place this letter side by side with the self-complacent articles on loyalty of the various populations in Austria-Hungary printed in these days in the Vienna papers […].

22 CE 6 March 1917.German Language For Austria. A Vienna telegram published in the German newspapers reports that German will be introduced as the official language throughout Austria. Bohemia will be divided into districts. In regard to the special position of Galicia no final decision has yet been reached.

CE 23 April 1917."When Thieves Fall Out "-(From to-day’s “Daily Chronicle”).Amsterdam, Sunday. - German comments on the Austrian political crisis show that the Central Powers are not such a happy alliance as they would generally have us believe. Though the majority of the papers in Germany demand postponement of German domestic reform until after the war, they do not hesitate to criticise severely any similar disposition in Austria. **That is because the promised reforms in Austria were for strengthening the German position and language in that country, and for the re-division of Bohemia into constituencies which would favour the Germans as against the Czechs.** So the anger of the German Press over the cold shouldering of the only two Germans in the Austrian Cabinet is perhaps natural.
that in the regions of South-eastern Europe, which are inhabited by a varied mixture of peoples and nations, the demand for the free development of nations cannot be more completely realised than it is by the existence and domination of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy (cheers).  

There are two factors of uncertainty facing the Allies at this time, Austria on the one hand, and Russia on the other. Since the Revolution, Russia has been in a state of turmoil, its leadership as changeable as its policies; and Austria, though now invested with a new monarch, has not the strength to either support or defy Germany.

**CE 14 May 1917**

Russia and Austria

[...] The situation in Austria is also a matter of extreme importance, and one point in the vague official account of Mr. Lloyd George’s statement is worthy of note. He is stated to have commented on the internal situation in Austria, and there is reason to believe that the Premier had ample material for expanding his subject had he seen fit to do so. It is understood that *since the Emperor Karl came to the throne there has been a considerable change in Austrian policy, for the new Emperor possesses a mind of his own*. The late Emperor Francis Joseph was an old man, and largely in the hands of the Austrian General Staff, which is believed to have been under the control of the German Staff. Emperor Karl is no doubt more accurately informed of the actual state of things than his predecessor was, both as regards military and economic matters. He has eliminated the German elements in the Austrian Ministry, and Germany seems to have taken alarm at the attitude of her Ally. Recently a Bavarian journal openly referred to the possibility of the frustration of Germany’s annexation wishes by her Allies, and the feeling is growing that the difference between the Central Powers is that Austria *would not be adverse from coming to terms at an early date*, while Germany hopes that by continuing the struggle better terms may be secured. The outlook is not by any means clear as far as the Russian situation is concerned, but in the case of Austria there is more ground for hopefulness.

23 CE 27 January 1917. Editorial. *The Paths of Peace*. The statement of the Austro-Hungarian Premier relative to the possibilities of peace following President Wilson’s carefully studied utterance on the same subject, is not without significance [...] *Count Tisza holds that in territories where various nationalities live intermingled it is impossible that every single race can form a national State, and that in such territories it is possible only to create a state without national character*. All this goes to show that while Austro-Hungary is willing to assent to an agreement which will guarantee peace to Europe, she still believes that Austro-Hungary must continue to dominate the areas of South-eastern Europe which are inhabited by mixed peoples and nations. It may be that this preamble is but the preliminary to early developments, and that Austro-Hungary desires to state her case fully and clearly before a process of bargaining on a more elaborate scale is entered upon [...].

24 CE 30 June 1917. Austrian Plots Against Germany. Amsterdam, Friday. - The Vienna correspondent of the “Ostdeutsche Rundschau,” as quoted by the “Hamburger Nachrichten.” Reports that plots are being fomented, especially in the industrial districts of Austria, against Germany. It is said that Austria-Hungary could have had peace long ago if she had not been bound by the alliance to Germany, and that Russia alone is to blame for the continuation of the war. There is also [...] dissension between Austria and Germany. In Bohemia and Moravian districts, and even Vienna, the rumour circulates that the economic distress in Austria is solely due to the fact that great quantities of corn must be sent to Germany [...].
Perhaps some of this hopefulness stemmed from popular Austrian reaction to the trials of Socialist assassin, Friedrich Adler. Rejoicing with the anarchist simultaneously meant rejecting the conservative and thereby being open to new and perhaps more realistic policies regarding not only the war but the future governing of the country, or indeed a future country at that.

CE 22 May 1917
Austrian Premier’s Assassin.
(From Mr. A. Beaumont, Special Correspondent of the Press Association and “Daily Telegraph.”)

Milan, Sunday. - The trial of Frederick Adler, the Austrian Socialist who on the 20th October last year shot and killed the Austrian Premier, Count Sturgkh, in hotel Meissl, Vienna, was begun on Friday morning before a special penal court, because during the suspension of the constitutional guarantees the regular assize courts and trial by jury stand abolished. The trial was followed with immense interest in Vienna, as it constituted a scathing indictment of Government politics and also because Dr. Viktor Adler, prisoner’s father, is actually the confidential emissary of the Austrian Government. Adler was accused of having committed the crime from political motives. “Yes,” replied the accused boldly. “My crime was committed for political motives and no other. It is a shame that my country was reduced to the state it was by the suspension of all political and constitutional guarantees. This court itself before which I am tried is proof of it. Where are our liberties? Where are our guarantees? We are under the heels of an odious tyranny. My Socialist comrades themselves are so crushed that they have no voice and had I merely made speeches to them they would not have had the courage to listen. I decided to sacrifice my life to make them see, and all Austria see the depth to which we had fallen. The government had promised in 1896 never again to apply Article 14, suspending the constitutional guarantees, and yet on July 25th, 1914, even before the war had been actually declared, Count Sturgkh suspended the juries and the constitutional guarantees. Since then scores of Czechs have been tried, hung and shot. Deputies to the Reichrat were not even spared, and you have sentenced to death Deputies Kramarz and Markoff and numerous others without right or constitutional justice. I am not mad. I would protest if my advocate put that plea. I knowingly and deliberately give my life for what I consider the cause of justice.”

The trial has caused a tremendous sensation in Austria, where Adler is looked upon as a victim and a hero.

CE 23 May 1917
Dr. Adler’s Trial.
Amsterdam, Tuesday. - According to the “Vossische Zeitung’s” report of the Adler trial, Dr. Adler, when leaving the court shouted, “Long live Revolutionary Social Democracy.” This outburst was greeted with loud applause from the gallery, where several women waved their handkerchiefs to the

25 One cannot help but notice a striking similarity between Friedrich Adler’s ‘speech from the dock’ and those which rendered Irish revolutionaries immortal, such as Wolfe Tone and Robert Emmet. There must have been a certain amount of satisfaction involved in printing this heroic account of ‘blood-sacrifice’ for the greater good, shaking off the shackles placed by a tyrant and fearing no consequences for oneself. Although it must be said that the sentiments felt by the Irish Nationalist reader must have differed somewhat from the original intentions of the writer.
condemned man. Four persons were arrested as the result of the demonstration, which continued outside the precincts of the court, where eight or ten more persons were arrested. – Reuter.

Once Parliament was reopened, the peoples ‘stated their wishes for the last time within the framework of the Habsburg Monarchy:’

All were conscious that a revolutionary situation was approaching, and they formulated anew, almost without change of phrase, the programme of 1848. The Germans were committed to the Easter manifesto of 1915; they were satisfied with the virtual incorporation of Austria into Greater Germany which had already taken place and complained only of attempts to recover dynastic independence. The Poles, too, combined to the last liberty for themselves and subjection for others;

they wished to recover the monopoly of Galicia which had been infringed during the war and the military occupation, yet sought the aid of the Habsburg army in order to tear Ukranian territory from prostrate Russia.

Although it is pointed out once more in the editorial, that Poland and Ireland share a common history of hardship, and therefore it is thereby suggested that Ireland must support Poles in their struggle for a United Poland:

CE 27 January 1917

Of course everybody takes for granted that when the Peace Conference assembles the future of Poland will receive very serious consideration. The Polish nation are conducting a propaganda to secure the sympathy of neutrals as well as of the entente Powers. Poland and Ireland have been frequently compared, and there is not a little in common between their histories. But while Ireland remains a national unit Poland was split up amongst Austria, Prussia, and Russia, and were it not for the present war it is unlikely that she could retain the independence which was lost from 1772 and 1795. The complaint of the Poles has been that they were persecuted by all three predominant Powers, though mainly owing to the fact that the Poles are Catholics, the tyranny of Austria was on the whole less pronounced than that of others.

CE 31 May 1917

Feeling in Austria

[…] A Vienna message to the “Rheinisch Westfallische Zeitung,” discussing the situation in Austria, points out that the Polish Party has announced that the sole endeavour of the Polish nation, with which the correspondent agrees, is the re-establishment of an independent and United Poland with an outlet to the sea […]. The message further points out that on the occasion of the meeting of

26 CE 22 June 1917. It is considered that if the powerful Polish Party continues resolute in its refusal to come to the aid of Count Clam Martinic, the dismemberment of the Austrian Empire is imminent. To delay this it is thought probable that the Reichsrat will be dismissed, and that the government of the country will be carried on a as long as possible without a Parliament. – Reuter

27 Taylor, p.261.
Parliament all the Slav groups are emphasising the old national demands. – Reuter.28

The challenges facing the new Emperor mirror the beginning of the reign of his predecessor, who, also young and basically inexperienced was launched upon the empire as a symbol of peace, unity and progress. While Franz Joseph was able to abate the nationalist conflicts around him for over half a century, the reign of Emperor Charles would be cut dramatically short.

CE 1 June 1917

Emperor’s Speech.

Amsterdam, Thursday. - A Vienna telegram of to-day’s date gives the following account of Emperor Karl’s speech from the throne at to-day’s solemn opening of the Reichrath […]. I am convinced that the happy development of constitutional life after the unfruitfulness of past years, and after the exceptional political conditions of war time, apart from the solution of the Galician question, for which my illustrious predecessor already indicated the way is not possible without expanding the Constitution and the administrative foundations of the whole of our public life, both in the State and in the separate kingdoms and countries, especially Bohemia. I trust that the recognition of your serious responsibility for the formation of political conditions, and the belief in the happy future of this Empire, so splendidly strengthened in this terrible war, will give you, honourable gentlemen, strength in union with me, speedily to create conditions which will give scope within unity of the State, and while reliably safeguarding its functions, to the free national and cultural development of equality of privileged peoples.

Apart from the Poles, it was indeed the Czech element agitating for some modicum of independence that created a political stalemate. However, Charles could only offer the Czechs and South Slavs ‘negotiations without substance.’

He proposed a ‘ministry of the nationalities’ under Professor Redlich, profound exponent of the ‘Austrian problem’; in this way the nationalities would be brought to ‘recognize’ the continued existence of the dynasty. Czechs and South Slavs still hoped to turn the dynasty to their own purpose and would therefore recognize it; they would not, however, recognize the Hungarian frontier.29 Besides,

28 CE 6 December 1917. Poles, Slavs and Peace. Reuter’s Agency is informed that the Czech Deputy Habermann has been personally assured by the Polish Deputy Dasynski, that there is not the least foundation for the rumour, published by the “Neue Freie Presse” and other Austrian papers, to the effect that the Poles would with all means in their power oppose the Czech Yugoslav and Ruthene demands for independence, which are known to embarrass the Austro-Russian peace negotiations. – Reuter.

29 CE 6 December 1917. Austrian Delegation and Peace. A telegram from Vienna says the Austrian delegation held its opening session on Monday. Almost all the delegates put in an appearance […] Herr Kramar, in the name of the Bohemian and South Slav delegates, made a declaration regarding the right of peoples to dictate their own destinies and at the same time attacking the declaration on this subject made by the Austrian and Hungarian Prime Minister. He was called to order by the President for a depreciatory remark against Hungary. This caused lively opposition from the Czechs and South Slavs […].
they would not enter a ministry in order to continue the war; Germany would not tolerate a ministry formed to make peace.30

As this concept proved to be a failure all round, Professor Redlich returned to academia and Charles turned to another bureaucrat, Seidler, who offered ‘cultural autonomy’ to all, the Socialist ploy for keeping peoples without power in Imperial affairs. However, this also proved fruitless, as cultural autonomy had its moment in peace, in war only ‘autonomy’ to escape fighting had any meaning.31

CE 1 June 1917
Austrian Parliament.

Amsterdam, Thursday. – [...] After the election of secretaries the President asked authority to send a message of loyalty to the emperor, and telegrams of greeting to the Parliaments of Hungary and the Allied States. The Czech deputy, Herr Stanek,32 and the South Slav deputy, Herr Korosci, then made statements expressing a desire for the union of the territories of the monarchy inhabited by Czechs, Slovaks, Croats and Serbs into an independent State under the dynasty of Hapsburg. The Czech deputy, Herr Kalin, expressed sympathy with the Russian revolution and the principles it represented, namely, the liberty, equality and fraternity of all nations.33 Herr Petruscsiewiecz presented a demand for the

30 Taylor, p.262.
31 CE 23 June 1917. Austrian Catholics Demand Peace. Amsterdam, Thursday. - The Catholic [illegible] reproduces the programme which has been issued as the result of a meeting of Catholics in favour of peace, held on Whit Sunday at Graz, in Syria [sic], Austria. The programme contains twelve paragraphs which inter alia demand putting an end to the senseless extension of military power on land and water. Credits for military objects, it says, are needed for maintaining internal order. Racial conflict of one nation with another must cease, and the natural right of every people should be recognised to develop undisturbed its own language and civilisation. - Reuter.
32 Frantisek Stanek (1867-1936), was a wealthy landlord and a member of the Czech Agrarian party. From 1901 to 1918 he became member of the Austrian Reichsrat, and from 1916 to 1918 he was leader of the Czech Club in the Austro-Hungarian Reichsrat. He receives several mentions in CE, but Deputy Stanek’s role in the fight for an independent Czechoslovakia is best summed up in the credit he receives in a letter from Edward Benes, at the time Minister of Foreign Affairs and of the Interior, dated October 14, 1918, addressed to all the Allied Governments, in reply to US recognition of the Czech-Slovak National Council as de facto Government of an independent Czechoslovakia, here an extract: “I have the honor to inform you that our decisions have been taken in agreement with the political chiefs of our countries. During three years our entire political and military action was exercised in complete understanding with them.” Cf. Nosek, pp.130/31. Finally, on October 2, 1918, the Czech-Slovak Deputy Stanek, President of the Czech Union in the Parliament at Vienna, announced solemnly that the Czech-Slovak National Council of Paris as the supreme organ of the Council’s armies is called upon to represent the Czechoslovak Nation near the Allies and at the peace conference. On the 9th of October his colleague Deputy Zahradnik speaking in the name of the same union announced that the Czech-Slovaks had definitely left the Parliament of Vienna, thus breaking for ever all ties with Austria-Hungary. Cf. also Urban, appendix.
33 CE 22 June 1917. Austria’s Trouble. Reuter’s Agency learns on good authority that while no definite news has been received as to the loss of life caused by the military suppression of the riots in Prague and other Bohemian towns there is little doubt that the troubles are by no means over. Since June 12th, when Count Clam Martinic refused to accede to the Polish and Jugo-Slav request for independence, the disorders have been steadily growing. The cheers which greeted the Czech Deputy, M. Stransky, leader of the moravian progressive Party, when he denounced the Hapsburgs as “tyrants,” who have trampled under foot the liberties of the Czech Slovak nation, showed very plainly the great hopes entertained by the Czechs, the Poles and the Jugo Slavs on this the first occasion of their complete union.
creation of such a de jure union of the Ukranian districts within the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. He protested against incorporation in the new Kingdom of Poland of Ukranian districts of [?] and welcomed the efforts of the Ukranian population in Russia for independence. Speaking on behalf of the German National Union and Christian Socialists Herr Pacher declared that any attempt at the revival of Bohemian independence and any efforts by South Slav deputies for independence would meet with determined opposition from the Germans in Austria.

CE 24 August 1917
Grave Situation in Austria.
(From Mr. A. Beaumont, Special Correspondent of the Press Association and “Daily Telegraph.”)

Milan, Wednesday Evening. - News, just received via Berne, depicts the situation in Austria as grave. Violent disorders have occurred in Bohemia during the past few days which were more serious than on any previous occasion, and were due more to famine among the workmen and peasants than to political agitation. It, however, also had a share in the troubles. Guerrilla bands, described as revolutionaries, scour the country districts, inciting the peasants and villagers to revolt, and crying for peace. There have been numerous conflicts with the police and gendarmerie, and a hundred of so-called rebels are reported to have been arrested by order of the military authorities. A state of siege has been proclaimed in all Bohemia.

With the development and increasing sophistication of the channels of communication available, the possibilities to enhance one’s own campaign and

---

34 Rafael Pacher, as leader of his Party, declared on 4 October, 1918, their aim of realizing the project of an independent province of German Bohemia. A provincial assembly was convened on 24 October, on the basis of independence having been declared by Poland on 7 October, and by Hungary on 16 October. Cf. Urban, Die Tschechische Gesellschaft, Appendix.

35 CE 22 June 1917. Bohemian Village Burnt. Amsterdam, Thursday. A “Berliner Tageblatt” report from Königsgrätz, in Bohemia, says the German village of Gross Borowitz in Bohemia has been completely burnt out. – Reuter.

36 CE 1 September 1917. Disorders in Bohemia. (From Mr. A. Beaumont, Special Correspondent of the Press Association and “Daily Telegraph.”) Milan, Tuesday (delayed). - Further news has been received of the extent of the disorders in Bohemia by the “La Sera,” via Berne – Strikes broke out paralysing munitions works at Prague, Pilsen, Mlada Boleslaw, Pardubice, Brno, Morowka, and Ostrava. The workers complained that Bohemia through the export of quantities of foodstuffs to Austria and Germany was reduced to starvation. The strike movement began at Brno on July 31, and the disorders continued for several days until they were stopped by the military. By August 6 the disorders had assumed a decidedly revolutionary aspect, and reached their maximum at Prague, where large mobs paraded the streets demanding an immediate cessation of the war. Merciless repression was exercised by the military. Machine guns were used at every street corner, and hundreds of demonstrators were killed or wounded. The Austrian Governor, Count Coudenhove, is now so hated that his life is no longer safe, and he has gone to Vienna to report. Similarly, German inhabitants of Bohemia feel themselves victimised by the Czech authorities:

CE 8 September 1917. Food Shortage in Austria. Zurich, Friday. - The growing scarcity of foodstuffs is causing much local strife and bitterness in Austria. Not only the Crown lands, but the small political districts are now beginning to prohibit the export of their produce outside their own borders, and the Central Food Bureau has been obliged to intervene and to forbid all such prohibitions without special consent being first obtained. The representatives of German inhabitants in Bohemia have held a Congress in Prague to protest against the food export prohibitions which the Czech authorities are making against the German districts. The speakers declared that there is an abundance of foodstuffs in the Bohemia districts, and also in Hungary, which the Germans are only able to obtain at exorbitant and usurious prices. – Reuter.
damage the morale of the enemy grew concurrently and by multiple mechanisms. So far, this study has mostly highlighted the positive and negative aspects of the great German empire and its people, science and culture vying with Prussian militarism, in contrast with the benign or banal anthology of Austrian chronicles. Over a time span of approximately seventy years, critical comments on Austria’s reactionary monarchy, yet altruistic monarch, and the charming diversity of its multiethnic Viennese culture charmed the reader of the Cork Examiner. Yet when racial tension disarmed the army and dismembered the empire, it was that the Czechs of Bohemia began to make a more lasting impression on the casual reader, their exploits receiving adequate coverage and individual agitators were given appreciable measures of recognition and appeal. And thus the year ends unspectacularly for Austria: it is to be crushed – not because it is the most feared opponent, but because it represents the weakest link.

CE 1 September 1917
End of Austria?
(From to-day’s “Daily Chronicle”)
Paris, Friday. - The possibility of putting Austria altogether out of the fight is being discussed in Paris. The Press points out that Austria is militarily and politically the weakest and most vulnerable member of the enemy coalition, and strategy counsels invariably in principle the aiming of a crushing blow at the weakest point of any front.

Austria does not need to be humiliated in an exemplary manner, it is defiantly deferential, its humbleness construed as courtesy – similar German advances decried as humbug,

CE 24 September 1917
The terms of the awaited reply of the Central Powers to the Pope’s recent peace message were made known on Saturday. Contrary to the expectation that existed some weeks ago, these Powers did not present a joint note, but, in a measure, their notes are very similar in tone. As becomes the head of a great Catholic country, the reply of the Austrian Emperor is more deferential, and, to some extent, more direct than that from the Kaiser. There can scarcely be a doubt as to the sincerity of the Austrian Note, for since the present Emperor succeeded to the throne he has made no denial of his anxiety to secure peace for his country. The German reply is almost as insistent on the desire of Germany for a just and enduring peace, but possibly many in the different countries will by cynical about Wilhelm’s sincerity [...]. A certain section of the English Press, for

37 CE 10 November 1917. Austria and Peace. Zurich, Friday. – […] The “Lorodny Listy” (Prague) learns that the Austrian Government is preparing a very sharp pronouncement against Czech agitation for the independence of Bohemia, which will be made at the meeting of the Austrian delegation. – Reuter.
some time back appear to have adopted a policy of recrimination – the least likely
to help any movement for peace. It is scarcely to be hoped that the replies of the
Central Powers will alter this policy.

And when the United States declare war\textsuperscript{38} on Austria it is not to abase the
enemy, but to aid the even more hapless ally.

CE 6 December 1917
America and Austria.
New York, Wednesday. - A correspondent of the Associated Press at
Washington telegraphs – During a conversation with the Congressional leaders
before leaving the Capitol on Tuesday, the President said he had advised a
declaration of war against Austria, largely because it might be necessary at any
time to send American soldiers to the aid of Italy. – Reuter.

7.2. Sinn Féin Progression

The suppression of the Irish rebellion must be judged to have been, by
British standards, abnormally severe. It was an aberration generated by the pressure
of the war. Only a much more rapid reassertion of political authority could have
mitigated its impact, but it is clear that those who might have imposed such limits
did not see the need to do so. They were after all British and no doubt represented
in this the general opinion of the British public.\textsuperscript{39}

It was the wholesale incarceration of like-minded republicans that lead to
the collective concentration on constitutional plans for the future. As the so-called
‘followers’ of Sinn Féin would have pointed out themselves, they were a
mismatched group of conflicting interests, yet their organisational abilities
developed in gaol lead to a flourishing movement which swept the country like a
wave of inspiration, carrying along the youth of Ireland in particular. The fact that
the rising was being erroneously referred to by the British as a ‘Sinn Féin rebellion’
helped to elevate the small organisation to previously unknown heights of

\textsuperscript{38} Fisher, p. 1141: “The next year (1917) was big with two events each destined to exercise a far-
reaching influence on the history of the world: the entry of the United States into the war, and the
Russian revolution. The German naval and military chiefs must accept the blame of provoking the
hostility of the United States. [T]he adoption of “unrestricted U-boat warfare,” which meant that
submarines would hereafter sink merchantmen at sight […]would bring down upon themselves the
enmity of the United States, for a submarine not two years before had sunk the passenger ship
\textit{Lusitania} off the Irish coast, and nearly provoked a declaration of war from Washington; but they
calculated that, before American soldiers could effectively appear on the battlefields of France, the
U-boats would have starved England to submission. […] So reckless was the German Government
in the opening of 1917 that it tried to tempt the Mexicans to attack their neighbours by a promise of
Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona […]. The intelligence of this offer, which was intercepted by the
British Admiralty and communicated to Washington, finally drove America into the war.

popularity and, given the public revulsion at the executions, political moderates like Arthur Griffith\(^{40}\) had an opportunity to exploit this new-found fame for their peaceable pretensions, ‘though where exactly the more radical republicans would fit into the changed political environment outside was far from clear.’\(^{41}\)

According to the Soviet leader, Lenin: ‘the misfortune of the Irish was that they rose too soon before the revolt of the European proletariat had matured’. Declan Kiberd pointed out that Conor Cruise O’Brien agreed when writing in 1966, suggested that they had waited until 1918 they would have found a country united against the threat of conscription. The problem with all these assumptions is that they presuppose a popular desire for socialist revolt that was innovative and aggressively contemporary, whereas, as Kiberd himself admits, Irish innovations were dominated by the rhetoric of the past, because of the conversation of the contemporary audience. James Connolly, for example, soothed fears of socialism with his claim in the *Reconquest of Ireland* that an Irish republic would simply mean a return to the Gaelic system of landholding, except that now the government rather than the chieftain would hold land in the name of the entire community.\(^{42}\)

The Irish Parliamentary Party was at this point still a force to be reckoned with and by constitutional means still the organ of Ireland to be heard at Westminster, albeit with increasing curbs.\(^{43}\) John Dillon, who replaced the ailing John Redmond as head of the Party, had adopted a more aggressive tone in Parliament and used every opportunity presented by events of the war to further the cause of Ireland and ultimately Home Rule.

**CE 18 January 1917**

The Position of Ireland

[...] **Mr. John Dillon**, at Swinford, was not slow to discern and to show that the question of Ireland has become a crux for Great Britain which must be

---

\(^{40}\) CE 24 September 1917. *Sinn Féin in Cork*. A number of speeches were delivered in Cork yesterday by Sinn Féin leaders of greater or less prominence, and now that they have strutted and fretted their hour upon the stage, all the eloquence does not seem to have brought an Irish Republic perceptibly nearer. Mr. Arthur Griffith, who appears to be the brain-carrier of the Sinn Féin organisation, was particularly frank, and admitted that “it would be foolish to ask the people of Ireland to go out and try to assert by force of arms the freedom of Ireland.” We agree, and are glad to observe that some of the Sinn Féin leaders are apparently moderating their opposition to constitutional methods. If Mr. Griffith’s view prevails there will be no necessity for enthusiasts to prepare for the death or imprisonment of which the Countess Markievicz spoke in this city some time ago. Instead of being red revolutionaries, Sinn Féiners of the Griffith type now desire that Irishmen should organise and back the claim of Ireland at the Peace Conference [...] and while apparently there is no objection to exploit the men who died during Easter Week, there is, on the other hand, no anxiety to emulate them.

\(^{41}\) Ferriter, p.155.

\(^{42}\) Ferriter, pp.156/7.

\(^{43}\) CE 23 February 1917. The Chancellor of the Exchequer announced in the House of Commons last evening that discussion on the Irish Party’s motion will take place on Wednesday next [...]. The fact that a number of arrests and deportations have preceded the discussion which is to take place on the foregoing motion may be merely due to chance, but the coincidence cannot fail to strike even the most detached and aloof of political observers [...].
solved, as it has become an Imperial necessity, and has, in fact, developed into an international question. Mr. Dillon believes that at the present moment Ireland occupies a position of unparalleled strength, and that in the negotiations which must take place as a preliminary to peace America will take occasion to remind the British people that they owe a duty to Ireland more sacred than the Tsar ever owed to Poland.  

At the beginning of the year the Examiner warned its readership of the likely problems to be encountered by the Government upon introduction of conscription to Ireland. Due to the ever falling number of voluntary recruits from Ireland, the idea of introducing conscription was kept alive primarily, it is believed, to gather more number from Britain itself, where enthusiasm to step forward had also been considerably muted.

CE 9 February 1917
Editorial

[...] Compulsory national service, however, is a different matter altogether, and one which Ireland will have to watch very closely and very carefully. Mr. Neville Chamberlain has intimated that Ireland is to be included in the voluntary scheme, and that is well and good. Ireland is and always has been thorough in her support of voluntaryism, though so far she has got but scanty thanks for it. But when national service becomes compulsory, as will inevitably happen in the near future, the position of Ireland will be one that will have to be sedulously watched and guarded. Conscription has been averted thanks to the solidarity of the Irish Party and the country behind it, and now there is no Minister in England so foolish as to think its introduction a matter of practical politics. [...] It has been declared over and over again as the essential principle of Empire that in all Colonies and Dependencies where self-government does not exist the duty of the Imperial Government is to govern in the interests of the governed. While Martial law is in existence, and while the Irish people are denied the Self-government which the Home Rule Act by Parliament, and bearing the signature

---

44 CE 9 February 1917. Irish Party and Home Rule. [...] The Act is already on the Statute Book, and there should be no difficulty in making it operative if the Government decided to do so. The Tsar has promised Poland her independence, but Great Britain foolishly hesitates in fulfilling her promises to Ireland [...].

45 Adrian Gregory, ‘You might as well recruit Germans’: British opinion and the decision to conscript the Irish in 1918, in Gregory and Paseta, Ireland and the Great War, pp.113-132.

46 CE 14 August 1917. Not so long ago one of the arguments frequently urged against any proposal to give Ireland Home Rule was that Irishmen were not capable of managing the public affairs of their own country. The fallacy of this contention was exposed many times, but sometimes, judging from letters which appear occasionally in the “Morning Post,” [organ of ulster Unionists] the tradition still lingers amongst a section of the old High Tory school. If there are any people who still seriously entertain the opinion that all the administrative ability is possessed by Britons and that Irish Celts have little or none, recent events should disillusion them. The much exploited National Service scheme, which it was sought to make compulsory for the whole United Kingdom, has turned out an expensive fiasco so far as Great Britain is concerned. A separate Voluntary National Service Department was established for Ireland, and there is a reasonable prospect that it will turn out useful. Ireland has good reason to remember Lord Davenport’s attempts to regulate the prices of foodstuffs, for most of the orders he issued had the effect of increasing prices here. This may be ascribed to the futility to regulate affairs in Ireland from London.
of the King, has, in theory, conferred upon them, it cannot be truthfully alleged that their interests are being considered or recognised. Therefore, as a logical consequence of this flagrant injustice it has been open to the enemies of the Allies to point to the case of Ireland and assert that their professions of sympathy with the rights of small nations were hypocritical, and that the Allies repudiated the principles of Nationality as far as Ireland was concerned.

And the case of Ireland was indeed the focal point of many Notes and propaganda employed by the Central Powers to discredit the Allies, to right or not.

**CE 13 January 1917**

New German Note
Reference to Ireland

Amsterdam, Friday. - […] Our enemies, in whose power it was to examine the real value of our offer, neither made any examination nor made counter proposals. Instead of that they declared that peace was impossible so long as the restoration of the violated rights and liberties, the acknowledgment of the principles of nationalities and free existence of small States were not guaranteed. The sincerity which our enemies deny to the proposal of the four Allied Powers cannot be allowed by the world to these demands, if it recalls the fate of the Irish people, the destruction of the freedom and independence of the Boer Republics, the subjection of northern Africa by England, France and Italy, the suppression of foreign nationalities in Russia, and finally, the oppression of Greece, which is unexampled in history […] 47

**CE 15 January 1917**

German Note. British Reply.
(P.A. War Special)

London, Saturday. - […] The Germans state that the proposals of the Allies as to the rights of small nationalities lack sincerity in view of the treatment of the Irish people, of the Boer Republics, of the subjection of Northern Africa by England, France and Italy, of the suppression of foreign nationalities in Russia and of the treatment of Greece. As for Ireland and South Africa, their sons have shown on many a battlefield in the present war, as the Germans know to their cost, that whatever differences there may have been between those countries and Great Britain, they are united with the rest of the Empire in repelling German aggression.

---

47 CE 15 January 1917. The Kaiser’s Manifesto and the Allies’ Note. […] The war is, according to the Allies’ declaration, a war of liberation, and, it may be added, compensation for every section of Europeans who either now or in the past have, contrary to their wishes, come under the domination of Germany, Austria, or Turkey. From the point of view of Ireland it is satisfactory that the Allies have set out so definitely their aim to reorganise Europe “on the principles of nationality and the rights of all peoples, great or small, to the enjoyment of full security and free economic development.” […] Even now Germany points to Ireland as a country where that principle has been ignored by Great Britain […] The Allies’ Note is of value, therefore, not only because it binds its signatories to the terms on which it is based regarding Germany, but it also brings into prominence Ireland’s right to the same recognition which must be accorded to Belgium, Serbia, and the other European nationalities that are suffering under the yoke. Peace is not yet in sight, but one of its by-products must assuredly be the full recognition of Ireland’s nationality by the free operation of Irish Self-government.
The official congratulations of the British government to the Russian people had much the same effect upon the Irish population – still struggling to become a recognised nation:

CE 23 March 1917
Ireland

[…] Mr. Bonar Law’s notion offering the fraternal greetings of the House of Commons to the Russian people, and tendering “its heartfelt congratulations upon the establishment among them of institutions in the full confidence that they will lead to rapid and happy progress of the Russian nation,” sounds strangely hypocritical while the free institutions which would produce similar results for the Irish people are denied them by the British Government. Ireland is much nearer to Westminster than Petrograd is,⁴⁸ and British Ministers would be more usefully employed in doing justice to the small nation at their doors than in paying compliments to the Russian people, who would probably regard Great Britain’s fine phrases as being of more value if Great Britain herself lived up to the principles she advocates and rendered to Ireland the justice that is her right. Mr. Bonar Law possibly believes in the brave music of a distant drum, but it certainly looks something strangely like a travesty that he should have been chosen to congratulate the Russian people on their acquisition of liberty, as he has championed the cause of Orangemen, and declared that they preferred to be under the Kaiser than under Mr. Redmond. Mr. Law apparently favours liberty in Russia, but in Ireland, in the past at any rate, he has been accustomed to see through Orange spectacles.⁴⁹

And thus, having endured continuous humiliation at the hands of the British Government, the IPP and one of its modest organs, the Cork Examiner, are forced to admit they misinterpreted British designs and misjudged the estimation of their influence. Nonetheless, they refuse to admit defeat and cling to the principles of conviction over coercion in winning over Ulster. The belief is strong at this stage

⁴⁸ CE 24 March 1917 Ireland and New Russia. The London correspondent of “Birgovyia Vodomosti” (“The Bourse Gazette”), Petrograd, has received the following message for publication in his journal from Mr. John Dillon, M. P.: -

“The magnificent uprising of the people of Russia against a hateful bureaucracy and a vile police system is one of the most glorious and far-reaching events in the history of Europe. It marks a great epoch in the long struggle of the peoples of Europe against reaction and oppression. From all parts of the civilised world to-day lovers of human liberty and believers in the sacred rights of peoples to free Government are looking to Russia with heartfelt congratulations and prayers for her success in the new path in which she has entered. The Irish have always loved the Russian people and hated the Russian Government. We have been the better able to appreciate their suffering because we too have suffered and are suffering under a bureaucracy and police rule. To the new Russia the Irish nation sends its heartfelt sympathy and admiration. To Ireland the fall of the Russian bureaucracy and the emancipation of the Russian people comes as the dawning of a new era of liberty in Europe. It is one great result of the war, and I regard it as a splendid justification of those of us who saw in this war a great fight for freedom and human right and who counselled our nation, in spite of all the oppression and injustice to which has been subjected, to stand with the Allies for justice and freedom to all nations.”

⁴⁹ CE 9 February, 1917. Editorial. Compulsory national service, however, is a different matter altogether, and one which Ireland will have to watch very closely and very carefully.
that a united, self-governing Ireland is still within their grasp, and that the Irish Convention will arrive at an all-round satisfactory settlement soon, thereby making the Sinn Féiners obsolete and their case recompensed.

The conference, the Irish Convention, had suffered from disputes since it was engendered, its chairman, Sir Horace Plunket, inclined to see its origins in his own Recess Committee of 1895, thrashing out ideas for the improvement of Irish agriculture; and F.S.Oliver, writing as ‘Pacificus’ in 1910, ‘had looked forwards to a wide-ranging conference that would address the Irish question and other constitutional problems.’

[In] the spring of 1914 Oliver’s federalist colleagues were also encouraging the notion of an all-party conference. More recently, in October 1916, a proposal for a conference had been mooted by Joseph Devlin in the House of Commons. [...] In a wider sense, the convention may be seen as the apogee of the ‘conference plus business’ approach championed by William O’Brien and other centrists in the early Edwardian period. It should be stressed, however, that O’Brien himself eventually repudiated the notion that the convention was rooted in any way in his own ideals and achievement: ‘the conference, conciliation and consent child was stolen by gypsy statesmen only to be disfigured to make it pass for their own,’ he fumed in a characteristically brutal passage published in 1918. The convention, he added, was ‘a showy exhibition of puppets for spectacular effect in America.’ Setting said his racist imagery, there is some truth in O’Brien’s argument that the conference ideal had been annexed by Lloyd George with a view to mollifying American opinion.

Summarily, one could say that the Convention, or the idea of it, was the brainchild of several statesmen, or at least men with the state of Ireland in mind, who believed in their own integrity and that of their fellow allies and adversaries. Unfortunately, Ireland remained a small problem during the Great War and it seemed impossible to regulate Irish affairs while simultaneously regimenting an army. This seemed a relatively understandable predicament for the British Government and members of Parliament, the backsliding on Home Rule was untenable considering the pretensions on which the war was based.

CE 20 July 1917
Editorial
Truth on the Situation
In another column we reproduce a very able article which appears in “Truth” dealing with the last few year of Irish politics in a temperate and moderate way. It recalls incidents that should not be overlooked, such as the different treatment of the Ulster men who engaged in gun-running to that meted out to the Nationalists, and the course taken by the Irish Party that in the light of subsequent happenings have proved blunders, principally the acceptance by them of Mr.Asquith’s pronouncement, “that the coercion of Ulster is unthinkable.” We

50 Ferriter, p.178.
51 Ferriter, p.178.
admit now that the position then laid down by the ex-Prime Minister was absolutely wrong, but we do not feel called upon to blush because in common with many others we accepted that dictum, for we then had high hopes and we still believe with good grounds, that Ulster was to be won, not conquered.

Indeed, studying the article in “Truth” carefully, it is clear that the mistakes of the Irish Party – and in all their mistakes we admit we shared – were the result of trusting to Englishmen and relying on peaceful suasion to eradicate the prejudices of our Northern fellow-countrypersons. The course taken by the Nationalists may not have been heroic. The raw head and blood bones methods might have been more efficacious; but honourable men themselves find it hard to be suspicious, and it is not always the sign of a coward to exhaust every means to get his claims recognised before he resorts to force. To-day it is the fashion for men and newspapers who assuredly cannot point to much brave or unselfish work done for their country to hurl such epithets at the Irish Party as “corrupt traitors” and “slavish followers” and “fulsome adulators” of the Liberals. The very head and front of their offending, we submit, is that they designed to argue with, rather than slaughter their countrymen who did not see eye to eye with them. They are accused of “selling” their country, and the price that was paid over to them is even stated – a breakfast at the table of Lloyd George. They entered Parliament to serve their country as poor men, and poor men, in spite of their “traitorism” to-day they remain. This, we take it, is another instance of their incapacity, because the same cannot be truthfully said of many of their critics. We feel quite satisfied that in spite of the slanders and libels hurled at them by the unthinking that the public in a short time will come to realise that the mistakes they made were the mistakes that honest men might easily fall into, and we trust that time will not justify them by showing that the abandonment of the course they pursued led to bloodshed and disorder and misery. […] The reason for calling the Convention together is admittedly to avoid the necessity of dividing Ireland. […] Yet we do not despair that a way can be found out of our difficulties if the members of the Convention make an honest effort to find a solution. The findings ought to be submitted to the public for approval. […] If a referendum is decided upon, we would suggest that it is taken by provinces, or even by counties, so that an indication would be found as to where objection to the scheme was taken. On the Convention must rest the responsibility of arriving at a settlement. All steady opinion wants it, and so long as it shows that a genuine effort has been made to give freedom and fair play to all, we believe the public will respond with sympathy and support, knowing well that the task they essayed was not only no light one, but that we, too, share the responsibility involved for finding a peaceful way out of the difficulties that beset us.  

52 CE 27 August 1917. Hospital Aeridheacht [open-air entertainment]. (From our Reporter). […] The fixture has always proved most popular, but the visit of Mr. De Valera, M.P., and Countess Markievicz to yesterday’s reunion increased the interest in the proceedings with the result that contingents from many parts of Tipperary, Limerick and Cork were in attendance. [The] contingents, which comprised Volunteers and members of Sinn Féin Clubs, and which were accompanied by many bands, formed into processional order and marched through the historic hamlet to a field in which the aeridheacht was brought to issue. [The] Chairman said the Gaels of the district were assembled to prove to their oppressors that they intended to manage the affairs of the country in their own way. He advised them to study the Irish language, as it was the speakers of that language would get preference in the management of the country’s affairs. He criticised the Irish party, and said they had done nothing for the country.

53 CE 20 July 1917. The Irish Convention. Statement in the Lords. In the House of Lords last evening. The Earl of Dunraven asked the Government whether in view of the present political situation in Ireland, they would undertake not to introduce a bill embodying any proposals of the forthcoming Irish Convention until these proposals had been submitted to the Irish people. He said
By 1917 the two main challenges to improving living conditions in the country were not the moderates versus the men of action, but sanitation and the isolation of TB sufferers. It was revealed in a medical report, appearing in Studies, that many believed as ‘revolutionary’ the suggestion that no profit should derive from a house which was not in good sanitary condition and in habitable repair.

CE 20 July 1917

The deaths from all causes in the under mentioned areas for last week and for the past four weeks respectively, were equal to the following annual rates per 1,000 of the population: - Nineteen Town Districts, 13.5 and 13.8; Dublin Registration Area, 15.0 and 14.9; Dublin City, 15.7 and 16.0; Belfast, 14.7 and 12.9; Cork, 8.2 and 16.2; Londonderry, 10.4 and 13.0; Limerick, 5.4 and 10.8; and Waterford, 5.7 and 9.0. The deaths from certain epidemic diseases registered in the 19 town districts during last week were equal to an annual rate of 0.6 per 1,000. Among the 111 deaths from all causes for Belfast are one from measles, two from whooping cough, and one from diarrhoea and enteritis of a child under two years. The Cork deaths included one from pulmonary tuberculosis, and two from other forms.

The church was also drawing attention to the lamentable conditions of the poor. 1914 had already seen the publication of the English Jesuit Charles Plater’s...
The Priest and Social Action, which proved very popular, highlighting the gulf between charity and social action. It is fair to say that in particular Jesuits and the educated Catholic middle class responded to a certain extent in producing articles and researching pamphlets, for example, the work of Lambert McKenna and Alfred O’Rahilly invoking the writings of Frederick Ozanam, founder of the Saint Vincent de Paul society, still popular and active in Ireland today.\(^{54}\)

Many were also politically inspired - to prevent socialism and communism - but ultimately it was not something the middle class as a whole responded to, while the working class remained obsessed with distinguishing between poor and poorer, or in Frank O’Connor’s words the way in which going to a pawn shop in Cork for his mother ‘meant an immediate descent in the social scale from the “hatties to the shawlies”; the poorest of the poor’. For O’Connor himself, nothing could persuade him that he belonged to a class to which boots and education came naturally.\(^{55}\)

In 1915, a Cork cleric had made a detailed study of poverty in his city, basing his analysis on 495 families. He divided the group earning under 21 shillings into two categories: those earning under 19 and those between 19 and 21, establishing that just 3 shillings made the difference between being ‘acceptably’ and ‘unacceptably’ poor. It was made evident from the large shares of their income spent on rent that those just over the 19 shillings threshold were determined to live respectably, sacrificing food for a better address. One of the reasons for there being a focus on poverty in Cork was the activities of aforementioned Alfred O’Rahilly, an academic from University College Cork, deeply involved in Catholic social activism. His suggestion how the poor managed to die so slowly ‘baffled both the economist and physiologist,’ claiming that attempts made to ascertain poverty in Cork city ‘tallied with the research of Booth in east London and Rowntree in York.’\(^{56}\) Another particular concern during the war was the huge increase in the retail price of food, as asserted by T.A. Finlay in the Freeman’s Journal in May 1917:

\(^{54}\) Ferriter, p.160/1.
\(^{55}\) Ferriter, p.161: “Poverty was not only confined to Catholics; there was 92,328 Protestants living in Dublin city during this era, and they comprised 16 per cent of the white collar and manual workforce. The historical geographer Jacinta Prunty suggested that the role of charitable and church institutions in dealing with the Dublin poor was also marked by an at times virulent denominational struggle between catholic and protestant charities in the battle for the souls and bodies of the poorest slum dwellers.”
\(^{56}\) Ferriter, p.162/3.
It is well demonstrated fact now that very large numbers of the children perish absolutely from want of food. That assertion has been called into question by some of the authorities. I have gone into the matter more fully and have got the actual facts, names and addresses. I maintain the assertion that children of the people are undoubtedly dying here merely for the want of nourishment.

The war had, of course, accentuated this process, allowing some areas of industry and agriculture to boom on the one hand, while actually intensifying national poverty on the other. O’Rahilly made the important, if unwelcome, assertion, that most of the poor were not in such condition through their own fault, and announced plans to establish a Catholic Social League, whereby the domestic ignorance of slum women could be solved by the ‘leisured and educated women of Ireland, if they had the mind’. The Letters to the Editor in this year also included many ideas to alleviate the general shortages caused by the war.

CE 27 January 1917
Sir, - as one interested in the food supply of the coming year, having a family to support, may I draw the attention of the officials of the department and the public in general to the large amount of land around the city at present used for grazing purposes. Walk up Fair Hill and continue on till you come to the Blackstone Bridge, two miles from the city; look round at each side of the road as you pass on; every foot of ground as far as you can see is all under grass and in possession of some grazier or cattle dealer. Go up Blarney street and on to Clogheen Cross and from that place into Blarney; then turn across the fields to the Kerry Pike, and with the exception of a few farers’ places, all the land you can see

57 CE 23 March 1917. Potato Shortage in Dublin.
58 Orders created at Westminster were automatically administred in Ireland also, although the Irish conditions, based on scale and tradition, were hardly ever suited to the circumstances drawn upon in England, e.g. regarding the terms of the growing and selling of potatoes, dated 1916. CE 8 February 1917. The Order applies to Ireland as well as Great Britain, and in some respects furnishes another example of the uselessness of trying to administer Ireland from London. The price of L8 per ton, or a shilling a stone, must be a fairly renumerative one for Irish growers. Usually they got considerably less at this time of the year. On the other hand, consumers have to consider that a greatly diminished supply would be available were it not for the public opinion that compelled the Department of Agriculture to prevent the export of potatoes from this country. Had the export trade continued there would be a real scarcity of potatoes in Ireland just now. [...] Actually, the small farmers are the best suppliers to the Irish markets, and these do not, as a rule, sell potatoes by the ton.[…]
59 Ferriter, p.164. Cf also p.165: “Most commentators on social conditions (and they were a small group) also drew attention to excessive drinking as a significant factor in contributing to the squalor of working-class communities. The founder of the pioneer association, Fr James Cullen, insisted in 1916 that ‘the only thing wrong about Ireland is the excessive amount of drinking going on’. The war years had seen a rise in temperance activity, with protests by the national total Abstinence Congress, and Cullen proudly announced that one fourteenth of the entire Catholic population had joined the Pioneer Association. But alongside this there was notable comment about increases in the number of females drinking (largely as a result of money being sent back from Irish soldiers in Europe). The column in the Irish Catholic newspaper devoted to the pioneer association remarked that ‘In her case it is unspeakably worse. Somehow or other her degradation is more rapid and her demoralisation more complete’. A whole raft of temperance literature was centred around the construction of a contradictory piety for women who were still seen as temperance’s most ardent champions, but if they drank, as its most deplorable victims.”
is under grass. Then go out the commons road, or out the New or Old Mallow roads, or the Ballyhooly road, for miles outside the city, and the same conditions prevail. Such a state of things constitutes a real grievance. The opinion is strongly held by the vast majority of the people of this city, and country districts as well, that a large portion of this class of land should be immediately commandeered by the department and divided among the people willing to till it. If the owners are brought to court for disobeying the order in reference to the tillage of ten per cent of their land they will pay a fine willingly, and can well afford to do so owing to the great profits made out of cattle and pigs at the present time. - A Working Man.

And several reports also show a greater interest in encouraging efficient use of natural resources to power homes and industry,

CE 14 August 1917
As was expected after the recent announcements, an Order has now been made to regulate the supply of coal for household use. […] How far it is intended to apply this Order to Ireland is not clearly indicated, though the intention seems to be that a fair distribution should be secured here. […] It has to be taken into account that the largest section of the population of this country live on agricultural holdings. These require coal or coke for more than strictly household use – for instance, to prepare foodstuffs for animal consumption, or for dairy purposes. It will be in many cases a little difficult to decide how much coal a farmer, or even a cottier, would be entitled to. At the same time it may be observed that if the native supplies of peat were adequately utilised for fuel, there would not be much need for imported coal.

Imitating useful industrial initiatives on the Continent is another aspect of resourceful housekeeping on a national level,

CE 9 February 1917
Whenever any new industrial project for Ireland is mentioned, one of the first questions that somebody asks is how is the power to be supplied. It appears to be taken for granted by outsiders, who know little or nothing about this country, that we are very much handicapped because the Irish coalfields are not as extensive as those of Great Britain; and the suggestion to use turf for power is often more likely to cause merriment than serious reflection. […] Irishmen with a little enterprise might usefully employ a source of power that since the introduction of the steam engine has been less and less utilised […] the Irish rivers, streams, and mill races which at one time turned so many wheels still remain. There is no reason why these should not be once again harnessed to supply power for native industries. It is no exaggeration to say that more energy flows waste in our rivers than would supply power, in the form of electricity, sufficient to keep the whole population of the country in profitable industrial employment. France is not

---

60 CE 23 March 1917. Tillage in Ireland. “During the last month,” says the “Daily Mail,” “a miracle has been accomplished in the soil of Ireland. One million acres have been added to the ploughed lands of that country, which will be used to produce food for the people. […] There is a case on record of a woman whose husband is an officer lying wounded at Saloniki, who took her horses out of her carriage, put them into the plough, and ploughed the land herself, and this is not an isolated example of the kind.
overburdened with a native coal supply, but she utilises her water power, and at the present day all the silk looms of Lyons are driven by electricity generated by the River Rhone. Other great French industries are worked in the same way, and there is no reason why what has been done in France cannot be done in Ireland.

Regarding the progress made on increasing the economic, political and social rights of women, there were indeed many obstacles to overcome, but it would also be inaccurate to view politicised women as a homogeneous mass, their politics frequently differing according to class. Although a Dublin women’s suffrage association had been formed in 1896 (it counted 43 members in 1908), it was not until the formation of the Irish Women’s Franchise League in 1908 by Hanna Sheehy Skeffington and Margaret Cousins that a more vigorous approach was undertaken to encourage the participation of women in the politics of Ireland. Some members had, after all, achieved third-level education. Considering the continued work of all the old Leagues and Orders, and the barrage of the new movements for the betterment of the country, it appropriate here to recall Padraig Pearse’ prediction in November 1913 in An Claidheamh Soluis (the newspaper of the Gaelic League) that:

There will be in the Ireland of the next few years a multitudinous activity of freedom clubs, young republican parties, labour organisations, socialist groups and what not. Good men and bad men, many of them seemingly contradictory, some mutually destructive, yet all tending towards a common objective… the Irish revolution.

Thus the years 1917 through to 1918 may be defined as the period dominated by efforts ‘to ensure that the capacity for mutual destruction by all these groups would be contained, and to build a single movement around which a majority could rally.’ This shows that despite all the activity of the anti-

---

61 Ferriter, p.175: “In 1912 Louie Bennett inaugurated the Irish women’s suffrage federation, the same year that saw the launch of the suffrage newspaper the Irish Citizen under the editorship of Francis Skeffington and James Cousins.”

62 CE 20 July 1917. Kilkenny Elections […] Mr.De Valera said that the Gaelic League programme was largely responsible for the reawakening in Ireland to-day.

63 CE 16 March 1917. Cork Hibernians. The Annual Triduum. Further evidence of the success of the annual Triduum of the Cork Divisions of the Ancient Order of Hibernians was afforded last night by the fine attendance which filled the Cathedral in practically every part. […] Before the sermon father Gleeson made a sort reference to the Order. He said, their numbers, so large and so representative of the Catholic life of the city, increased his faith in the goodness and power of God. […] The Church was devoted to their interests […] The Triduum, as already announced, will close the general Communion at 8 o’clock Mass on Saturday morning, at which His Lordship the Bishop will attend.

64 Ferriter, p.179.

65 Ferriter, p.179.
conscription campaigners, from 1914 to 1916, there was no actually unified ‘Sinn Féin’ movement at the end of the rising, and this despite the repeated use of the phrase by those hostile to Irish republicans,\textsuperscript{66} actually preferring to call them ‘Shinners’ among other derogatory titles. Those labelled ‘Sinn Féin’ were often dual monarchists and socialists\textsuperscript{67} unable to formulate their opposition to the existing state of affairs, preferring in the end to collaborate with Sinn Féin as the lesser of other evils. So throughout most of 1917, those sympathetic to the ‘Sinn Féin’ sentiment had to rally the disparate members for the coming election in order to defeat their common foe: the Irish Parliamentary Party. The campaign received added support from the subsequent release of the remaining 1916 prisoners in June, part of Lloyd George’s efforts to placate American opinion, and reflecting an Austrian counterpart, the amnesty offered by Karl I of Austria to his treacherous Czechs. Coinciding with the release of political prisoners was an Irish Convention, hoped to settle Irish affairs and thereby allow Great Britain more potential room to manoeuvre at a Peace Conference. Unfortunately, the Convention on Home Rule for Ireland was doomed to failure from the beginning, since it was boycotted by republicans. The republicans, in turn, could afford to feel powerful and aloof.

It was tremendously exciting time for many young political activists, even though many of them could not yet vote. In January 1917, Laurence Ginnell, shortly to join Sinn Féin, reassured Count Plunkett, the successful candidate in the north Roscommon by-election of that year, and father of Joseph Plunkett, who was executed after the 1916 rising, that ‘we have all the young, male and female’. It was significant that the Irish volunteers were now applying their military discipline to canvassing, and roundly abusing the Irish parliamentary party while attempting

\textsuperscript{66} CE 28 February 1917. The National Teachers of Ireland, as a body, are very capable of defending themselves in any controversy, and are unlikely to let go unchallenged the statement appearing in yesterday’s London “Daily mail,” from a special correspondent, who, presumably, is still in Ireland, that “Most of the National Schools are inoculated, and inoculated deeply, with the Sinn Féin germ.” But intentionally or otherwise, the author of that statement places teachers, or an advocate in their behalf, at some disadvantage, for in the course of a highly imaginative and impressionist article he appears to identify a multiplicity of Sinn Féin types, ranging from revolutionary to constitutional, and does not say which is to be found prevailing in the schools. Everyone remembers the general statements and charges made last summer against the national system of education, and the teachers employed under it. The whole Dublin outbreak was attributed by some minds to the fact that a little Irish history was taught in the schools and strangely enough, one would infer from the charges that the teaching of the Irish language was even less harmful than the history. Of course the people who made those charges had no practical experience of the schools or of the system, and were not aware that all books used had to be sanctioned by officials of the Commissioners of National Education, the great majority of whom never displayed very warm sympathy with any expression of Irish nationality.

\textsuperscript{67} CE 14 May 1917. Liberty Hall. Saturday’s “Evening Telegraph” said – Liberty Hall is draped today with Republican colours. In the front of the hall was printed in black letters on a white sheet – “James Connolly, murdered 12th May, 1916.” The inscription was removed by the police, but some time afterwards a scroll bearing similar words was put up near the top of the building.
to maximise sympathy for the 1916 rebels. Women were particularly important in this regard, spreading the new doctrine while many of their male colleagues were interned.  

Leading up to the elections of 1918, it had to be made clear to the new generation of the electorate and their alternative representatives that it was important to bury their divisions under their shared aim of supplanting the Irish Parliamentary Party. An attempt was made to reach agreement at a conference in April 1917, and a compromise was reached in that it suggested each fraction would preserve its distinct identity but co-operate with an organising committee. And although feuding between radicals and moderates continued, they now had new impetus, and by May, in the words of historian Michael Laffan, ‘Sinn Féin was the fad or the craze of 1917’. In subsequent by-elections moderates and radicals co-operated successfully, although these constitutional encounters were the focus of violence and intimidation by both Sinn Féin and the Irish Parliamentary Party. A victory for Sinn Féin candidates was achieved in South Longford in May 1917,

**CE 14 May 1917**

**Irish Problem**

Discussing the coming week’s work in Parliament, the political correspondent of the “Evening Standard” says – “The results of the South Longford election has added to the interest with which the Premier’s statement on Ireland, on Thursday, is awaited, when the Government plan for dealing with the home Rule problem will be put forward.”

South Longford

At the Tipperary Board of Guardians on Saturday a motion congratulating the electors of South Longford was defeated by 9 votes to 3.

And further successes in East Clare and Kilkenny followed for two future Irish prime ministers, Eamon de Valera and William Cosgrave.  

In June 1917, a police inspector in West Cork had suggested that ‘this Sinn Féinism is of a very undefined sort. It is anti-British, anti-recruiting and above all anti-Redmondite. It is a voting, a shouting, a marching Sinn Féinism, but it is not a fighting one.’ This was a misjudgement. Marie Coleman had noted that in East Clare in 1917, following de Valera’s victory, a banner declared: ‘Irish party wounded in north Roscommon killed in south Longford and buried in East Clare.

---

68 Ferriter, p.179
69 CE 20 July 1917. Kilkenny Election. (From our Correspondent). Countess Markievicz was presented with the freedom of Kilkenny last night. Accompanied by Mr. Wm. T. Cosgrave, T.C., Dublin, who has been selected as the Sinn Féin candidate for the Parliamentary vacancy in Kilkenny.
RIP.’ Indeed the emergence of Longford as an IRA stronghold had much to do with seeds sowed (181) during and directly after the 1917 by-election in Longford. 70

These elections were also successful in that they encouraged the creation of a broad consensus among the population. The Sinn Féin October convention, for example, seemed deliberately vague on possibly contentious issues so that their hold over public opinion could not be weakened through acrimony and splitting hairs. At the convention Eamon de Valera was elected president and in his address he promised the people independence and that they could decide which form of government they wanted. ‘It heralded a new unity, and by the end of 1917 the volunteers and Sinn Féin seemed unassailable.’ 71 This did not mean that their opponents, still a sizeable proportion of the community, would accept the situation lying down. The Cork Examiner, ever the friend of conventional and constitutional means of progress, and self-proclaimed supporter of the IPP, continually expressed its opinion on the illusionary tactics employed by the republicans to deceive the people, mocking their ideals and ridiculing their pretensions.

CE 14 August 1917
Editorial
The Republic of the Countess Markievicz.
The Countess Markievicz has visited Cork and Clonalkilty, and during her short sojourn in the South has talked a lot of airy generalities about an Irish Republic. Like Mr. De Valera, Count Plunkett, and others of the new school of revolutionaries, the Countess has presented to the people of the South of Ireland with a political policy, and offered the credulous a recipe which she claims is an amalgam of Wolfe Tone and Parnell, and warranted to prove effective as a Republic producer if the Irish people are willing to go to gaol, and if that proves inadequate, are ready to die for Ireland […]. Practical Irishmen know that Parnell’s policy was founded on constitutional effort, and that dying on the scaffold as a policy for the remedy of Irish grievances has long since been rendered obsolete by more modern and much more effective political methods […]. From beginning to end of the jumble of inconsistencies and contradictions, of weird proposals and foolish incitements to martyrdom, not a single constructive proposal emerges for the practical advantage of Ireland. The support of Germany and Austria (which the Countess regards as her allies) is invited at the Peace Conference, whilst the efforts of Irishmen in Ireland to devise a Government to ensure their country’s progress and prosperity is spurned by the lady who professes to believe that Irishmen should rely on themselves alone.

70 Ferriter, p.181: “The mix of views within Sinn Féin did not seem overly problematic at this juncture. As Laffan points out, on de Valera’s way to winning the East Clare-by election of 1918: ‘The difference was one of degree rather than one of kind, and the lines between the groups were not clear cut. De Valera and Griffith provided two poles, the one frequently stressing his republicanism and the other never going into details about systems of government, while the rest of the Sinn Féin leaders came somewhere between them.’”
71 Idem.
Sinn Féin Inconsistency.

Speaking at the Ballyvourney Feis, the Rev. J. C. O’Flynn, Cork, said his ears had been broken from hearing the “Soldier’s Song.” He saw fine stalwart men marching behind the Sinn Féin flag – men who were not afraid to die for Ireland, men who feared not imprisonment or anything else […] he had asked these men again and again to learn the Irish language, and they would not.72 That was due to ignorance […] “If not, take down your flag, be ashamed of yourselves, because you are not fit to be soldiers sworn to the cause of Ireland. We want to-day not only the Sassenach73 out of Ireland, but everything belonging to him. Out of the Language Movement sprang such men as Father O’Growney and John MacNeill. There is a living spirit abroad now, and if we could only catch it with the language Ireland is saved. Ireland is saved if you do it. Your flag-waving and screeching is no more good than the cry of the ‘prechaut’.” 74

No doubt, the Examiner and its readership were greatly disappointed that neither the methods nor the manpower subscribed and conscripted by the IPP, nor indeed the hype surrounding the nationalist hybrid of political parvenus were able to create international support for the Irish cause:

Sinn Féin. A Study In Illusions.

[…] President Wilson, while still a neutral, pointedly omitted all mention of Ireland from his references to small nations entitled to independence. A similar omission from the recent Papal Peace Note has a special significance for Catholic Ireland. Neither the ties of race nor religion prompted any international recognition of the Irish problem on the part of the two most influential neutrals. It is not likely, if the Press of the allies is an indication, that France or Italy will feel particularly benevolent towards a country whose indifference to the war is beyond question. The peoples who have bled and suffered to overthrow Prussian militarism will have little sympathy for the complaints of a party claiming to speak for the “men of Easter Week” and their “gallant Allies in Europe.” But Sinn Féin circles are oblivious of the estimate in which Ireland is held in the belligerent countries. They imagine that all the details of Irish nationalist politics are perfectly understood, whereas even Englishmen who have observed the country at close quarters for generations cannot fully grasp all the shades of the problem.

As a matter of fact, such European countries as pretend to the slightest knowledge of Irish affairs – and they are few – base their judgement on the records of the constitutional parties. Mr. John Redmond and Mr. T. P. O’Connor represent Irish nationalism to the vast majority of foreigners, who know nothing of Mr. De Valera or Mr. Arthur Griffith. The Nationalist Party alone has the ear of those outside the United Kingdom, who are interested in the subject of Home Rule for

---

72 CE 5 November 1917. Speech of De Valera. (Passed by Censor) Mr. De Valera was the principle speaker at a meeting in Athy yesterday under Sinn Féin auspices. Mr. De Valera, who was well received, referred at the outset to the fact that the Irish language was essential to their success. They would never have Ireland a nation really and truly unless they had Ireland an Irish speaking nation, and he went on to allude to what he described as the garbled reports that appeared in the Press of their proceedings […].

73 The English.

74 The crow.
Ireland. The supporters of Sinn Féin, even in the United States, are a minority chiefly composed of the Clan-na-Gael, a name odious at all times to American ears. Since America has joined the Allies, the plight of Sinn Féin on both sides of the Atlantic is worse, for the Americans have from the beginning detested the pro-Germanism of the Clan-na-Gael. The unconstitutional Nationalists of Ireland must resign themselves to the fact that in no country in the world have they any political standing. In America, where they might be understood, their pro-German supporters have caused them to be ostracized. In other countries, Ireland means either nothing whatever or constitutional Home Rule, [...] At present the illusion is fostered that the powers of Europe are consumed by an altruistic ambition to devise model constitutions for small nationalities. Profoundly ignorant of international politics, and thrown back upon herself for centuries, Ireland preserves a naive belief in the quixotism of every country but England. A moment’s reflection would show that small nations are protected precisely in so far as their preservation seems to guarantee the welfare and security of their neighbours. Even were the wildest dream of Sinn Féin realised by representation at the Peace Conference, it would be impossible for a benevolent tribunal to make a decision against England. Ireland has supplied many thousands of troops in the present war, her soldiers have fought for England in many a campaign, how, then, is the charge of oppression and the right to complete separation to be established? No assembly of nations could be expected to unravel the knot of Irish politics. They would accept the evidence of Ireland’s cooperation with the Allies, rather than the rising of 1,100 men in Dublin,75 as indicating the true state of Irish sentiment.

Added to this humiliation is the increased threat of enforced conscription, an issue reintroduced in 1917, but which will sway public opinion still further in 1918 in support of Sinn Féin, and lead to the ultimate downfall of the IPP.

CE 17 December 1917
Irish Conscription

“One important point is missing from the speech of the Premier,” says the “Globe” on Saturday, referring to the absence from Mr. Lloyd George’s speech of

75 CE 5 November 1917. Casement Revelations. Zurich, Sunday. - The “Zurich Volksrecht,” the leading Socialist organ of Eastern Switzerland, publishes a number of important German official documents relating to the Casement conspiracy. The first letter written from the Berlin Foreign Office, under date December 28th, 1914, is addressed to Casement by the Undersecretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Herr Zimmermann. It states that the imperial Government has accepted Casement’s proposal for the formation of an Irish Brigade to fight only in the cause of Irish nationality under the conditions contained in the contract already concluded between Casement and the German Government. These conditions provided that in certain circumstances the Irish Brigade should be sent to Ireland well furnished with stores, and munitions to help to equip the Irish for a united attempt to restore the freedom to Ireland by force of arms [...] - Reuter.

The subsequent document in the German official report is dated August 20th, 1915, and is from the commander of the Crescent Camp at Zossen, where the Mohammedan and other coloured prisoners of war were interned. This letter announces the arrival there of 55 Irishmen, one of whom had a broken leg. The party included two sergeant majors, three sergeants, six corporals, and 44 privates. The report shows the Irishmen resented being herded together with oriental prisoners, and that much dissatisfaction and trouble ensued. In conclusion, the report states that the Irishmen were no longer German prisoners, but they would be furnished with Irish uniforms of hunter’s green, and treated as comrades. Some Irishmen maintained correspondence with Casement, who defied the fact that only fifty Irish soldiers joined the Irish Brigade. Casement appears to have visited the camp only once [...] - Reuter.
conscription for Ireland, and it then goes on to remark: - “We can only regard this omission as very unfortunate. There is a rumour afloat that the War Cabinet do not as a body contemplate drawing on this reserve, and they are to be content with further calls on England, Scotland and Wales, leaving the question of service from Ireland on a voluntary basis in this vital crisis for the preservation of our liberties. In other words political considerations are to rule military necessities. That cannot go on. It is high time to speak plainly, and we are convinced that the overwhelming majority of the people of this country are of that opinion.”

“There must be no craven fear of Sinn Féin or Nationalist bickering – for that is all they amount to – at this period. We – that is, the four nations – must throw our whole available man-power into the field. Unless we do that, and do it without delay, there will not only be no hypothetical or parliamentary independence for one nation, but that of the whole Kingdom will be swept away.”

76 CE 17 December 1917. **Dean of Cashel and Conscription**. War certificates were presented to the relatives of soldiers from Cashel district. [...] In proposing a vote of thanks to major General Doran and Mr. Scully, D.I., Right Rev. Monsignor Innocent Ryan, P.P., V.G., Dean of Cashel, was enthusiastically received, and said – My principal business here to-day, in fact, I might say, the only business that brought me here, is to express my sympathy with and my word of encouragement to the wounded of the war whom we have in our midst (hear, hear). [You] are all aware, and there is no use in mincing matters – let us have the truth – that in Ireland from the beginning of this war, and on several occasions during its history, it has been a cause of complaint that sufficient acknowledgment has not been given, publicly at least, of the bravery and the undaunted courage of the Irish soldiers (applause) [...].
Now the nation is not, of course, an eternal category, but was the product of a long and complicated process of historical development in Europe. For our purposes, let us define it at the outset as a large social group integrated not by one but by a combination of several kinds of objective relationships (economic, political, linguistic, cultural, religious, geographical, historical), and their subjective reflection in collective consciousness. Many of these ties could be mutually substitutable - some playing a particularly important role in one nation-building process, and no more than a subsidiary part in others. But among them, three stand out as irreplaceable: (1) a 'memory' of some common past, treated as a 'destiny' of the group - or at least of its core constituents; (2) a density of linguistic or cultural ties enabling a higher degree of social communication within the group than beyond it; (3) a conception of the equality of all members of the group organized as a civil society.¹

Miroslav Hroch, Czech political theorist, definition of "nation."

Civil societies in the year 1918 are still engaged in World War, the Russians pulling out, however, on ruinous terms. German storm troopers enjoy some success before the Allied lines stabilise again, and a Congress of Oppressed Nationalities, the subject peoples of the Habsburg empire (including Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Romanians, Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) is held in Rome. The nature of these varied actions, however, seems far from pragmatic but appears instead to stem from inherent qualities within these nationalities – an ‘old issue’, as an article in the Examiner recounts, but still topical:

CE 29 May 1918
The Coming Age
“Civilian” in the London “Daily Express” says – Nothing has been so constantly debated as the question which influences character most – education or environment? And the rapidity with which the Prussian military schoolmaster has changed the whole character of Germany has given the old issue a new life […] . Disraeli, as usual, foreshadowed it when he said, “All is race.” Mr.Bernard Shaw put it into a definite theory when he said that the nationality of Ireland is its climate […] . Look at Germany before 1866 – sentimental, idealist, home-loving, beer-loving, peaceful. That Germany went down in ’66 in Saxony and Bavaria and the Rhine provinces almost without a struggle before the Prussian aggressor – brutal, militarist, stupid, material, and practical. The whole force of the new State was then turned to the education of the conquered provinces. The officer, the pastorate, the professor, the magistrate, all servants of the State – army, Church, university, tariff workshop alike were sprung like a tremendous engine on

the **plastic soul of a somewhat slavish race**. In two generations the work was accomplished, and Germany of to-day insults the sun. We had underestimated the effect of State propaganda, judging it by the individual efforts made in Victorian England. The fact may give us cause to reflect on the influence of the war on our national character, and on the hopes and fears of reconstruction. Clearly, outside pressure does affect character, and if you make a joint effort you can to some extent change your nature. The outside pressure during the war has turned us from individualists into bureaucrats. The trouble is that it has turned us into bad bureaucrats. Before the war, like most people who had studied social effects of **laissez faire**, I was for far more State control. Now I am doubtful, for I have seen something of the inside of Government offices. Bureaucracy in theory should be amazingly effective. In France and Germany it actually is so. **On British minds it seems to bring a kind of blight, depriving them of their natural powers of initiative and courage**, and giving little worth having in return. [...] To ask why this is so would be too long an inquiry. But something in our nature moves uneasily in the shackles of departmentalism, and it would probably be unwise and impossible to try to educate ourselves out of this feeling. **Our environment of individual action is too strong.** Anyhow, we are not in the least likely to be departmentalised.²

So, when the British Prime Minister, Lloyd George, extends conscription to Ireland, revokes it and Home Rule, it is obvious that he uses the conscription threat merely as a ploy³ to relieve the ‘fighting Irish’ from the responsibilities of State which their changeable Celtic nature is not predisposed to fulfil.

**CE 29 May 1918**

**Why Ireland Refuses to be Conscripted**

The branches of the United Irish League of Great Britain are putting in a considerable amount of work defending the attitude of the people of Ireland in reference to conscription. Though their own kith and kin in Scotland are under conscription, this has not deterred Nationalists from presenting the Irish case against its application to Ireland. Evidence of propaganda work of this character is found in a meeting on Sunday in the Free Gardeners Hall, Edinburgh, under the auspices of “Dawn of Freedom” of the United Irish League. Mr. M.Giblin presiding. Mr. J. O’D. -Derrick said that to admit Britain’s right to conscript the people of Ireland would be a betrayal of the principle underlying the forty years’ constitutional struggle for Home Rule. The House of Commons passed the Home Rule Bill, and the King, by his signature, made it law. These facts constituted Britain’s recognition of Ireland’s status as a nation with power to make her own

---

² Fisher, p.1151: “The temporary eclipse of personal liberty, coupled with a vast increase in state control are necessary consequences of modern war. Both evils were cheerfully endured. The English people, less patient of regimentation than other nations, were nevertheless induced to accept conscription and the rationing of food, and a measure of drink control which would have been thought impracticable in time of peace. In every country it was considered necessary to secure national solidarity by elaborate propaganda, holding up the enemy to scorn and hatred. To the cruelty and carnage of war there was added the evil of subsidized prejudice and mendacity. In this respect no belligerent country can claim to be exempt from guilt.”

³ Cf. Gregory, ‘You might as well recruit Germans’: British public opinion and the decision to conscript the Irish in 1918.”
laws, but in any case the people of Ireland absolutely denied the right of any force, foreign to the Irish Parliament to conscript Irish flesh and blood for any purpose.

The Czechoslovak National Council in Paris, endorsed by the British, organizes a government and independence is proclaimed. General Josef Pilsudsky\(^4\) becomes president of the new Polish Republic, but old Austria has become an entity of the past.

---

CE 18 June 1918
The Crisis of Austria
(From to-day’s “Daily Chronicle”)
(Special Correspondent – Geo. Renwick,- Copyright).
Amsterdam, June 16\(^{th}\) – “This is not a Parliamentary or a Cabinet crisis but a State crisis – the crisis of Austria. The old Austria of the 1867 constitution has ceased to exist […] People in Berlin must clearly recognise that this contracting party to the old alliance is no more, and that no power on earth, not even the might of German support, can restore it to life.” In these words, cautious and moderate, the Vienna correspondent of the “Berliner Tageblatt” sums up the Austrian situation, adding that the whole machinery of government has come to a standstill. […] There are three great factors in the Austrian situation. First and foremost comes that of the oppressed nationalities […].

The former Tsar and his entire family are shot by the Bolsheviks, Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany and Emperor Charles I of Austria prefer to abdicate. Hungary proclaims independence, and the kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes is proclaimed under the rule of Prince Alexander Karageorgevic, Alexander I of Yugoslavia. Britain extends suffrage to women over 30, and men over 21, with severe consequences for the peace within the Empire:

The democratic strength of the separatists was further enhanced by the Representation of the People Act, which came into operation in time for the general election of December 1918. The separatist cause was strong among the young and with women, and the Act gave the vote to men aged twenty-one and over and to women aged over thirty. This reform, allied with the disastrous history of Home Rule, meant that Sinn Féin secured a sweeping victory in December, winning seventy-three parliamentary seats, as opposed to the six gained by Dillon and his supporters.\(^5\)

Sinn Féin wins the elections, but their candidates remain imprisoned. Women’s emancipation has been advanced by their role in the war effort and their

---

\(^4\) Pilsudsky, a prisoner of the Germans since 1917 when he was accused of helping the Allied war effort, is released November 1918, becoming president January 1919. Cf. Clifford, Connolly.

\(^5\) Jackson, p.186.
work in factories. Thus 1918 meant rewarded efforts for some, disappointment and frustration for others. Ireland participated on the side of the victors, yet was denied the right of self-determination bestowed on other nations deemed more worthy, a perspective shared by the Czechs. Austria becomes a Republic against its will, but Bolshevism and bread rations take precedence in the public mind, monarchical or otherwise. In the following sections, an exceptionally large amount of reports on the progress of anarchy and autonomy in 1918, regarding the development of Czech independence, Irish Home Rule, and Austrian atrophy will be dealt with. In the words of H.A.L. Fisher, in 1918 the unprecedented power of propaganda enabled nations to rise or fall:

In those belligerent countries which were relatively civilized so long and cruel a war could be maintained only by an immense effort of massed propaganda. Recruiting was nourished by war speeches and war speeches by war fables. Even in England the gravest acts of injustice were committed against enemy aliens who were interned, deprived of their property, and in the concluding stages of the war deported to Germany. To weaken the morale of the army by distributing leaflets from the air became during the concluding stages of the struggle a feature of increasing importance. Germans endeavoured to inject mutiny into Russians; English propaganda led many Germans to doubt the justice of their cause and to impugn the veracity of their leaders. The dissolution of the ill-compacted army of the Austrian Empire was accelerated by skilfully devised appeals, prepared in London and distributed by air, to the subject races who had long chafed under Austrian rule. Perhaps the most striking monument of the success of wartime propaganda is the sudden emergence of the wreck of the Austrian Empire of the Republic of Czecho-Slovakia. Most states have been fashioned by the sword or have grown out of colonization. Czecho-Slovakia is the child of propaganda. How two able exiles, Masaryk, the son of a Slovak coachman, and Benes, the son of a Czech peasant-farmer, set alight an agitation for the liberation of the Czechs and the Slovaks, with what wholesale desertions from the Austrian army their efforts were rewarded, how French and English brains were enlisted in their cause, with what enthusiasm the evangel of Czech liberation was received in Chicago (the second largest Czech city in the world) and with what sympathy by President Wilson, how 45,000 Czech war-captives in Russia formed themselves into an army, marched across Siberia, and were thence transported to their native country – the narrative of these events constitutes one of the most surprising chapters of modern history. It is not wonderful that the railway station in Prague is called, not after the name of any Czech general or victory, for there were no such names to be inscribed on the humble annals of this peasant and subject race, but after the American president who, impressed by the skilful propaganda of the two illustrious exiles, proclaimed that the establishment of a Czecho-Slovak republic was among the war aims of the allied powers.  

---

6 Cassell’s Chronology, pp.482ff.  
7 Fisher, p.1155.
8.1. **Independent Bohemia**

Vladimir Nosek’s publication, *Independent Bohemia*, offers a contemporary summary of the events that lead to the autonomy of his country, and includes also pragmatic views on the struggling Irish. Curiously, many actions undertaken by the Czechs revolting against Austrian tyranny bear an uncanny resemblance to actions demanded and at times carried out by Sinn Féin. These similarities of purpose and perpetration are never mentioned in this work. The position of Vladimir Nosek and the timely publication of his collection of material supporting their cause, makes *Independent Bohemia* the obvious choice to offer a contemporary perspective, which may then be juxtaposed with relevant articles and reports in the Examiner. Terrorism in Bohemia during the war is one of the main points focused upon in the book.

Austria-Hungary declared war not only on her enemies outside her frontiers, but also on her internal enemies, on her own Slav and Latin subjects. From the very first day of war terrorism reigned supreme in Bohemia, where the Austrian Government behaved as in an enemy country. Three political parties (the National Socialist, Radical and Realist Parties) were dissolved and their organs suppressed. Fully three-quarters of all Czech journals and all Slovak journals were suspended. Political leaders were arrested, imprisoned, and some of them even sentenced to death. Many leaders have been imprisoned as hostages in case an insurrection should break out. Over 20,000 Czech civilians have been interred merely for being “politically suspect,” and about 5000 were hanged in an arbitrary way by military tribunals, since juries had been abolished by an imperial decree […]. Czech troops were marched to the trains watched by German soldiers like prisoners of war. Thousands were massacred at the front. The property of those who surrendered was confiscated, while the families of those Czech leaders who escaped abroad were brutally persecuted.⁹

One of the most important leaders arrested was Dr. Kramar, the most moderate of the Czech leaders. He was arrested May 21, 1915, on a charge of high treason as the leader of the Young Czechs. Also arrested with him were his colleague, deputy Dr. Rasin, Cervinka, an editor of the Narodni Listy, and Zamazal, an accountant. On June 3, 1916, all four of them were sentenced to death, though no substantial proofs were produced against them. However, the sentence was commuted to long term imprisonment, but after the general amnesty of July, ⁸

---

⁸ At the time the publication was put together, Vladimir Nosek was Secretary to the Czecho-Slovak Legation in London.
⁹ *Nosek, Independent Bohemia*, p.33.
1917, they were released.\textsuperscript{10} The Narodni Listy, Kramar’s organ, was twice suspended, and in May, 1918, suppressed altogether because it ‘fostered sympathies for the Entente.’\textsuperscript{11}

CE 30 May 1918
Czech Leader
Amsterdam, Tuesday. – The Vienna newspapers report that Dr. Kramarak [sic], the Czech leader, has been expelled from Prague by the police for an indefinite period. He is at present at a small village near the Bohemian capital.- Reuter.

An interesting document focused on in the book is the interpellation of deputies Stanek and Tobolka on the persecutions against the Czech nation during the war. The interpellation was published as a book of 200 pages, prohibited by Austria to be sent abroad, but a copy nevertheless reached Nosek in London. The following are extracts from the volume, for example, under the heading The Persecutions of the Sokols, one is informed that:

Terrible persecutions were inflicted on the Sokol Gymnastic Association during the war. The sphere of the Sokol’s activity does not touch political affairs at all, being reserved to gymnastics and spiritual education. Their activity was public, open to official inquiries and supervision. […] The first persecution was already committed in 1914 in Moravia, when some branches of the Sokol Association were dissolved for various reasons. Numerous societies were afterwards dissolved throughout Bohemia and Moravia. On November 23, 1915, the Central Czech Sokol Association (Ceska Obec Sokolska) was dissolved as the centre of the Czech Sokol movement, which before the war kept up lively relations with foreign countries and manifested brotherly feelings of sympathy towards Serbia and Russia. It was alleged that the Central Sokol Association had had relations with the American Sokol branches during the war through its president, Dr.J.Scheiner,\textsuperscript{12} and conducted an active propaganda against Austria. […] Dr.Scheiner was arrested and kept in prison for two months.\textsuperscript{13}

Characteristic was the way the military authorities treated the members of Sokol societies. Soldiers, especially recruits, were questioned whether they belonged to the Sokol Association and the authorities searched for Sokol badges or membership cards. Those who were found to have these in their possession were severely punished. The chapter dedicated to Suppression of Czech Schools and

\textsuperscript{10} Idem, p.34.
\textsuperscript{11} Idem, p.39.
\textsuperscript{12} Josef Scheiner, President of Sokol, arrested May 1915, but released due to lack of evidence. Cf. Urban, Die Tschechische Gesellschaft (p.853), Sokol was a paramilitary organisation, which the Austrian authorities correctly identified as the origin of the later Czech army.
\textsuperscript{13} Nosek, p.45.
National Literature deals with the usual governmental reprisals in the case of emerging national self-awareness of a conquered people.

‘Words, sentences or whole paragraphs in school books were found objectionable, since they were alleged to propagate Pan-Slavism and to encourage in the pupils hostile feelings against Austria’s allies. According to the official ideas about Austrian patriotism, purely educational paragraphs were considered as wanting in patriotic feeling; not only literary but also historical paragraphs were ‘corrected,’ and official advice was issued as to how to write handbooks on patriotic lines on special subjects, as for instance on natural history […]. The foundations of all knowledge to be supplied to the pupils in the public schools had to reflect the spirit of the world war.’

The opening of Czech minority schools was postponed since the beginning of 1914. Consequently the Czech School Society paid their expenses. On the other hand, many German schools were established in Bohemia. ‘The steps which are being taken against Czech schools in Lower Austria, especially in Vienna, are not only contrary to the standing laws but also to the decisions of the ministry concerned.’ In the chapter entitled How the Czecho-Slovaks at Home assisted the Allies, the following points are drawn up:

1. Since they could not think of revolting, the Czecho-Slovaks at home tried to paralyse the power of Austria in every way. Not only individuals but also Czech banks and other institutions refused to subscribe to the war loans […]

2. Politically, too, they contributed to the internal confusion of the Dual Monarchy, and to-day their opposition forms a real menace to the existence of Austria. Czech political leaders unanimously refused to sign any declaration of loyalty to Austria, and they never issued a single protest against Professor Masaryk and his political and military action abroad […]

3. But the most important assistance the Czechs rendered to the Allies was their refusal to fight for Austria. Out of 70,000 prisoners taken by Serbia during the first months of the war, 35,000 were Czechs […]. The remaining 3000 were transferred to France and voluntarily joined the Czecho-Slovak army.

Though over 300,000 Czecho-Slovaks surrendered voluntarily to Russia, whom they regarded as their liberator, the old regime in Russia did not always show much understanding for their aspirations. As they were scattered over Siberia

---

14 Idem, p.46.
15 Idem, p.49.
16 CE 28 May 1918. Prague Disturbances Renewed (Exchange Telegraph). Zurich, Monday – The manifestations at Prague were renewed on Friday. The police dispersed the crowd and made numerous arrests. They also pulled down the Slav flag, which was displayed at several houses, notwithstanding the prohibition against doing so. The Municipal Council at Prague and the Chamber of Commerce protested against the suppression of the “Narodni Lists” and the Society of Journalists also made an energetic protest to the authorities.
17 Idem, pp. 50ff.
and cut off from the outside world, often abandoned to the ill-treatment of German and Magyar officers, it is estimated that over thirty thousand of them perished from starvation. It was only after the Russian Revolution, and especially when Masaryk himself went to Russia, that the Czecho-Slovak National Council succeeded in organising them into an army. Finally, when Austria began again to employ Slav troops in the campaign against Italy, she failed again, once more due to the disaffection of her Slav troops. Slav regiments were intermixed with German and Magyar troops, but up to 1916 some 350,000 Czechs out of a total of 600,000 in the Austrian army surrendered to the Allies. From the very beginning of the war Czech soldiers showed their real feelings. They were driven to fight in the interests of their German and Magyar enemies against their Slav brothers and friends under terrible circumstances. And during the offensive of June, 1918, the Austrian press openly attributed the Austrian failure to ‘Czech treachery’, asserting that the plan of the offensive was communicated to the Italian headquarters staff by Czecho-Slovak officers. In the chapter The Military and Political Action of the Czecho-Slovaks Abroad, it seems the Czechs were infinitely more successful than their Irish counterparts in acquiring foreign support for their cause.

When war broke out, the Czecho-Slovaks all over the world felt it their duty to prove by deeds that their place was on the side of the Entente. The Czecho-Slovaks in Great Britain, France and Russia volunteered to fight for the Allies.

---

18 CE 18 June 1918. Situation Reviewed. (P.A.War Special) The Press Association dealing with the military situation in Italy says: - [...]The impression is that on the British front the Austrians suffered a severe defeat, and that their men are not of the finest fighting quality. There are also reports that the Czecho-Slovaks are blowing up the Austrian ammunition dumps. It must be remembered, however, that on the Piave the Austrians proved themselves good fighters.

19 CE 28 May 1918. Pro-Germans in U.S. (From to-day’s “Daily Chronicle”) (Special Correspondent – Frank Dilnot. Copyright). (By special arrangement with the “Daily Chronicle”) New York, Monday. – The “New York World,” which is usually very moderate, has a strong editorial on the pro-German Irish-Americans. “A few fanatics,” it says, “may be under the delusion that they are freeing Ireland when they make common cause with Germany, but if Germany happens to be at war with the United States they enter into her service at their peril. In time of peace we have sheltered many political refugees from Ireland, some of whom, we are sorry to say, have abused our hospitality. Although the circumstances which have made the United States and Great Britain companions in arms are no doubt displeasing to this element, its obligation not to give aid and comfort to the enemy is just as strong as though we were fighting without allies or associates. If the Government in London has proof, as it says, that Irish-Americans intrigue with Germany is still in progress, and that the important feature of every plan even now is “the establishment of submarine bases in Ireland to menace the shipping of all nations,” our perverted Sinn Féiners and Clan-na-Gaels have done more than give aid and comfort to the enemy; they have in fact made war upon the United States, and, on conviction deserved to be hanged by the neck until they are dead. Besides the imperative duty of self-protection, the United States Government is likewise bound in fairness to loyal Irish-Americans – good citizens and good soldiers – to go to the bottom of these hideous charges. A race misrepresented will rejoice with a nation vindicated. If traitorous guilt is established, the sternest degrees of justice shall fall swiftly and unerringly.” - Frank Dilnot.
while in the United States of America, where there are some one and a half million Czecho-Slovaks, they have counteracted German propaganda and revealed German plots intended to weaken the American assistance to the Allies [...] many Czechs living in Great Britain at the outbreak of the war joined the French Foreign Legion in France, and after His Majesty’s Government allowed Czechs to volunteer for service in the British army in the autumn of 1916, practically all Czechs of military age resident in Great Britain enrolled so far as they were not engaged on munitions. In Canada, too, the Czechs joined the army in order to fight for the British Empire.20

The Examiner reports on the multinational taskforce of Czecho-Slovaks fighting for the Allies:

CE 1 July 1918

Czeeko-Slovak Regiments
(P.A. War Special)
(From the Press Association’s Special Correspondent).

With the French Army, France, June 30. – To-day President Poincare presented the national standards under which they will fight to the Czecho-Slovak regiments formed in France from volunteers belonging to the Slav nationalities of Austria-Hungary. They know they will receive no quarter if they are captured, but the knowledge makes them only the more resolved to fight. There are several Czecho-Slovak regiments with the Italians and more are in arms in Russia. The Czecho-Slovak soldiers in France wear the French uniform with a distinctive national badge on the shoulder and on the helmet.

Those Czechs serving in Russia, however, made the greatest contribution towards the establishment of independence for their nation:

The most important part was taken, however, by the Czecho-Slovak colonies in Russia and America. In Russia, where there were large Czecho-Slovak settlements, numbering several thousand, a Czecho-Slovak legion was formed at the outbreak of the war which has rendered valuable services, especially in scouting and reconnoitring. This legion grew gradually larger, especially when Czech prisoners began to be allowed to join it, and finally, under the direction of the Czecho-Slovak National Council, it was formed into a regular army. In September, 1917, it had already two divisions, and in 1918 fresh prisoners joined it, so that it counted some 100,000.21 [...] The spontaneous and unanimous political action of the Czecho-Slovaks abroad became co-ordinated when Professor Masaryk escaped from Austria and placed himself at the head of the movement.22

The Czechs had begun to feel embittered against the Bolsheviks because in defiance of the agreement their troops were constantly being held up by local
Soviets.\textsuperscript{23} The Bolsheviks finally broke their word, and Trotsky issued an order to ‘all troops fighting against the anti-revolutionary Czecho-Slovak brigades.’\textsuperscript{24} The first victories gained by the Czecho-Slovaks over the Bolsheviks were at Penza and Samara. In Siberia they defeated a force of German-Magyar ex-prisoners in Krasnoyarsk and Omsk and established themselves firmly in Udinsk. On June 29, 15,000 Czecho-Slovaks occupied the city without much resistance. The Czecho-Slovaks, assisted by Japanese and Allied troops, then proceeded to the north and north-west, while the Bolsheviks and German prisoners retreated to Chabarovsk.

CE 1 July 1918
Siberian Fighting.

Peking, Wednesday. – A Harbin telegram states that Austro-German ex-prisoners of war have occupied the town of Irkhutsk, and the Czecho-Slovak troops have withdrawn towards Krasnoyarsk. The telegram adds that it is generally believed that the Czech-Slovaks, though desirous of fighting on the Western front, will be obliged to remain in Siberia. – Reuter.

CE 2 July 1918
Austrians and Czechs

(“Times” War Telegram, per P.A. – Copyright).

Tokio [sic], June 26th. – Reports are reaching Tokio of the slaughter of captured Czechs by Austria. Col. Hurban, the Czech leader, who is in constant cable communication with M. Masoryk [sic] in Washington, has informed him that the Czechs in power in Siberia will exact terrible reprisals should the Austrian outrages continue. He is in communication with M. Masaryk on the matter. He says he desires to act in strict conformity with the Allies but the 200,000 Germans and Austrians in the power of the Czech forces will not escape should the Czechs in Italy continue to be shot when captured.

\textsuperscript{23} CE 28 May 1918.Jews and the Bolsheviks.A correspondent writing on the subject of the relations of the Jews and the Bolsheviks in Russia says:– […] the development of the political consciousness goes on quickly in Russia at present, and the state of mind of the nation quickly approaches its crisis. Very soon the whole of Russia may grasp and acknowledge the great historical significance of the Alliance between the most civilised nations of the globe and the nation which is called upon to promote the European culture in the East, though fatally enough it has itself remained the most retrograde of the European countries. This process of enlightenment which is now going on in Russia deserves the greatest attention and moral support on the side of the Allies. What has been done up till now is not sufficient. We all hope that the awakened national consciousness and the renaissance of the sense of patriotism will soon call forth a national movement which will lead Russia out of the horrible straits into which the Bolsheviks have thrown her. The overwhelming majority of the Jewish political workers have from the first days of the Revolution most energetically opposed the Bolsheviks. All impartial observers state that in this campaign the Jews have displayed much more enthusiasm and persistence than the politicians of any other of the Russian nationalities, much more even than the native Russians themselves, who by the way are extraordinarily passive at this most fateful moment of Russian history. I believe that all the efforts of the Russian reactionaries to divert the Russian national enthusiasm against the Jews will be of no decisive character, and that the more progressive representatives of Russia will rally all the nationalities of the great Empire to the end of preserving the Russian State and of its regeneration on principles of liberty, equality and friendly co-operation of all its nationalities.

\textsuperscript{24} Nosek, p.71.
CE 3 July 1918
Bolsheviks and Czecho-Slovaks
(From to-day’s “Daily Chronicle”)
(Special Correspondent – Copyright).

Stockholm, July 1. – I am informed from a Russian source that Germany has claimed not only the disarming of the Czecho-Slovaks, but even their surrender to Germany, and that the Bolshevik Government has accepted this claim. In the Government of Samara the Bolsheviks have been overthrown, and some members of the Constituent Assembly have formed a provisional Government. In a proclamation to the people they declare they will exercise the power until the Constituent can meet. Travellers from Russia arriving here say that the peasant movement in the Ukraine against General Skoropadsky and the Germans is growing rapidly.25

In September the Czech and Allied troops from Vladivostok joined with the Czecho-Slovaks from Irkutsk and Western Siberia and gained control over the trans-Siberian railway. ‘They have done great service to the Allies, especially to Great Britain, by defending the East against the German invaders.’ Furthermore, it was the Czecho-Slovaks that induced Japan and America to intervene in Russia. ‘Let us hope that their action will lead to the regeneration and salvation of the Russian nation.’ Mr.Lloyd George sent the following telegram to Professor Masaryk on September 9,

‘On behalf of the British War Cabinet I send you our heartiest congratulations on the striking successes won by the Czecho-Slovak forces against the armies of German and Austrian troops in Siberia. The story of the adventures and triumphs of this small army is, indeed, one of the greatest epics of history […]. Your nation has rendered inestimable service to Russia and to the Allies in their struggle to free the world from despotism. We shall never forget it.’26

---

25 CE 6 July 1918. At Vladivostok. (“Times” Telegram, per P.A. – Copyright) Tokio, June 29th. The Russian Consulate at Kobi has received advices that the Czecho-Slovaks are in control at Vladivostok. The Commander, General Dietrichs is issuing a proclamation closing the port to shipping at night time. This is the bare news, which has not yet reached the Foreign Office.

CE 6 July 1918. Bolshevik Defeat in Siberia. (By special arrangement with the “Daily Chronicle”). The “Daily Chronicle” says: - A telegram received in official quarters from a British source announces the substantial defeat of Bolshevik forces by the Czecho-Slovaks to the west of Irkutsk in Central Siberia.

CE 8 July 1918. M.Kerensky’s Views. Paris, Sunday. – The Associated Press correspondent asked M.Kerensky his opinion on the reported assassination of Count Mirbach. M.Kerensky replied that he deplored the taking of human life, but he was glad that Mirbach had been killed. His death was a fortunate occurrence for Russia, and would mark the beginning of the Renaissance of that country. M.Kerensky added that it is from Moscow that a movement will start against Germany, and it is now certain that the Germans will occupy Moscow. Count Mirbach was the real ruler of Russia, and got on so well with Lenin and Trotsky that he did not need to call in the Germans. Reuter.

CE 9 July 1918. Bolsheviks Decline. Reuter’s Agency learns – According to trustworthy information from Japanese sources in various parts of Russia there are indications that the position of the Bolsheviks is becoming increasingly serious, and the position of the Czecho-Slovak army is much stronger than was at first supposed.

26 Nosek, p.73.
Masaryk arrived in the United States in May 1918. He was accorded a reception at Chicago with 200,000 Czecho-Slovaks, as well as various Allied representatives, greeting him. His presence in the United States stimulated recruiting among Czecho-Slovaks. And at the end of May, Mr. Lansing issued the following statement:

‘The Secretary of State desires to announce that the proceedings of the Congress of Oppressed Nationalities of Austria-Hungary which was held in Rome in April have been followed with great interest by the Government of the United States, and that the nationalist aspirations of the Czecho-Slovaks and Jugoslavs have the earnest sympathy of this government.’ This declaration was endorsed by the representatives of Great Britain, France and Italy at Versailles on June 3, 1918.27

It is understandable that the Irish reaction is somewhat lacking in enthusiasm for the newfound freedom of these former subject races. How much more gratifying and resounding the echo in Ireland would have been could they have joined in the celebrations to mark an end to imperialist despotism.

CE 8 June 1918
London Correspondence
(Through our Private Wire)
“Examiner” Office, 24 Tudor Street.
Thursday Night. – […] One wishes that it were possible to look upon the latest declaration of the Premiers of Great Britain, France and Italy at Versailles from another aspect than that of diplomatic strategy. They say that a free and united Poland with access to the sea is a condition of a just peace and of the rule of right in Europe, and they express sympathy with the national aspirations of the Czecho-Slovaks and Yugo-Slavs. The first thing that rises to one’s mind in contemplating such an announcement is the omission of Ireland. It is quite true that a free and united Poland ought to be a condition of peace. Poland and Ireland have often been compared, because both countries, robbed of their freedom by larger and more powerful neighbours, have never ceased to claim the rights of nationhood. For the national aspirations of the Czecho-Slovaks and Yugo-Slavs one has also profound respect (not unaccompanied with a strong suspicion that it would tax a good many of the supporters of the British Premier very hard to explain who these races are). But, again, what about the national aspirations of Irishmen? In fine, why have the three Premiers suddenly made this declaration? Why do they merely express sympathy in the case of the Czecho-Slovaks and Yugo Slavs, while they declare that all free and united Poland is necessary for the peace of Europe, and why do they not go further and declare that they intend to make the realisation of all three essential conditions of peace. It is to be feared that the answer must take account of strategy. They say nothing of Ireland because Ireland is not in their programme. They talk about the Poles and the others without committing themselves to a programme, because they are making a bid for the

27 Idem, p.76.
sympathies of the peoples concerned, and they distinguish between the Poles on the one hand and the other two races on the other in proportion to the extent to which they are looking for a return from these respective races [...]. The one thing that can key up these pious opinions into “firm offers,” and that include along with them not merely the restitution of national rights to the nations injured by the Central Empires, but to Ireland as well, is the pressure of America. America, at all events, has no selfish ends to serve.

At the same time in Austria, the Emperor issues a statement to his peoples:

CE 28 May 1918
Austrian Emperor.

Amsterdam, Sunday. - During the course of his reply to the representatives of Southern Alpine deputations, according to a Vienna message, the Emperor Charles declared – Much in the conditions for the national and cultural development of the individual races in this country needs improvement and my Government is zealously endeavouring to find the right way to a solution satisfactory to all sides. Such a solution can only take place within Austrian limit. It must not in the slightest degree prejudice the historic peculiarities of the different States, the firmness of their union, the freedom of our great economic routes or the intellectual and material foundations of the unity, strength and prosperity of the State. Do not be anxious therefore, lest an agitation against the unflinching adherence to these supreme guiding lines should spread unhindered, much less actually realise its aims, in the future development of affairs. You may be sure that such a cordially expressed Austrian idea will ever find in me a strong and never-failing shield. Finally, addressing a deputation of the German Women’s League of Styria, the Emperor expressed the confident hope that a final, just, blessed and lasting peace would be attained at a not too far distant time. This, he said, was the greatest aim of his life. A great and important share was destined for the German people in Austria in the work that in the future would bring within the bounds of the great Fatherland a share worthy of its incomparable achievements during the war. “For the future, too,” said his Majesty. “I count upon the loyal and proved cooperation of the Germans in the care of State interests. You may be fully assured the rights of the German people, and the requisite conditions for the preservations and development of their nationality, and their tested part in the State, will never in any way be prejudiced.” – Reuter.28

---

28 CE 30 May 1918. Austria’s Surrender to Germany. (From to-day’s “Daily Chronicle”)
(Special Correspondent, Julius West – Copyright) (By special arrangement with “Daily Chronicle”) Geneva, May 28 (received yesterday) – Reports received from Vienna indicate that Emperor Charles, in spite of his desire for peace, is not prepared to allow a change in the internal policy of Austria in regard to subject nationalities. On Sunday the Emperor received in the presence of the Premier several deputations from the Western Provinces of Austria. [T]he Emperor said: “My Government will always be on the side of those who wish to keep intact the sacred heritage of our glorious past, and preserve it intact for future generations.” Other points in his speech laid emphasis on Austria’s obligation to Germany [...].”Be fully assured that never in any manner whatever will the rights and development of the German inhabitants of Austria be checked.” Perhaps not unconnected with this touching surrender is the news that disturbances have broken out in the districts whence come the members of these deputations. At Graz and Laibach there have been serious disorders, and it appears that troops had to be employed to disperse the crowds. At the same time, the disturbances at Prague were renewed, although details are vague. Persons in Switzerland regarded as being in close touch with Austria are distinctly disturbed by these reports, and are said to regard the spread of disorders in Vienna highly probable. – Julius West.
In July, the Emperor is even willing to go one step further to pacify the insurgent nations, offering – upon German suggestion – to establish parliaments in the capitals of his provinces.

CE 6 July 1918
Subjection of Austria.
(P.A. War Special) (From Mr. A. Beaumont, Special Correspondent of the Press Association and “Daily Telegraph”).

Milan, Thursday. – The main principle of the new Pragmatic sanction that has just been ratified at Salzburg, that hereafter the Austrian Army will be under German Command. In return for this which, of course, means absolute military annexation, Germany is disposed to be very liberal towards the various subject nationalities, and this accounts for the suggestion to create Parliaments at Prague, Cracow, Lemberg, and Sarajevo, in addition to those at Vienna and Budapest [...]. To the surprise of his own Generals, the Emperor yielded, and consented to sign the decree submitted by Ludendorff.

The Czecho-Slovak brigades, however, had been making a name for themselves through successful military offences in Russia. More or less left to their own devices, they managed to break through Bolshevist lines of defence and secure vital passageways for the Allied armies in Siberia. Apart from the strategic victory, these triumphs also earned them the gratitude and respect from the Allies soon to be granting independence to favoured nations.

CE 15 July 1918
Bolshevik Retreat
Harbin, Sunday. – After the Czecho Slovaks took Nilosk on Saturday, the Bolsheviks retreated towards Harbarersk, [...] The Czecho Slovaks on the same day, near Chila, defeated the Bolsheviks who also retreated towards Harbarosk [...]. It appears probable that General Horvat, who is the chief of the Harbin Railway Administration and with whom Colonels Semenoff and Orloff and General Kalmikoff are co-operating, may reach an agreement with the Czecho Slovaks.29

CE 15 July 1918
Siberian Situation
(“Times” Telegrams per Press Association. Copyright.)
Peking, Sunday. – One of the present difficulties in the situation in Siberia is the fact that three different parties are proposing to form a new government [...]. In Siberia itself the government emerged a fortnight ago at Novo Nikodaievsk, now apparently transferred to Omsk,30 and aided by the Czecho Slovaks, and the

---

29 CE 15 July 1918. Russian Situation. Harbin, Sunday. – General Horvat’s Government is temporarily located at Grode Kovo, from which place he is negotiating with the Czecho Slovaks.
30 CE 15 July 1918. Soviet Difficulties. (“Times” Telegrams per Press Association. Copyright.) Stockholm, Saturday. – A telegram from Moscow, dated July 9th, to a Swedish telegraph agency, states that the Soviet Government is about to be moved from Moscow to Murom, and that Trotsky had informed the Soviet Congress that Soviet troops in certain districts had been guilty of
growing volunteer force appears to be in control of the situation in so far as control has been achieved. The principal need of the moment is that the Czecho Slovaks operating in the Vladivostok region should be given every facility to cross Manchuria and effect a junction with their compatriots at Irkutsk. Whether the Government at Omsk is capable of assuming control remains to be seen, but it is obvious that it has sprung into being through the action of the Czecho Slovaks, and the Allies should give all possible support to the Czecho Slovaks as the only tangible power in Siberia at the present moment. When the Bolsheviks are completely crushed in Siberia and the prisoners in Trans-Baikalia and the Amur are eliminated, it will be time enough to consider the question of the nature of the new government. As regards the ability of the Czechs to muster a prisoner-cum-Bolshevist force in Trans-Baikalia little doubt may be entertained, provided they are granted access through Manchuria and are properly supplied from Vladivostok and backed by Colonel Semenoff and other local organisations.

Towards the end of July, the war has not been decided but it did appear that the Allies were relatively certain of their victory, and the spoils of war go traditionally to the victors. In the case of Ireland, however, due to increasing ‘omissions,’ it was unclear if this nation was to be placed on the side of the victorious or the vanquished, to be ‘liberated’ or to be suppressed?

CE 20 July 1918
Roosevelt and Peace
Saratoga Springs, New York State, Thursday. – Patriotism was the outstanding feature of the opening to-day of the session of the Republican State Convention. Heartfelt sympathy was expressed with the Roosevelt family on the death of Lieut. Quentin Roosevelt. The ex-President, who, laying aside his personal feeling, had come straight from his griefstricken home, delivered the principal address. He laid stress on the necessity of the vigorous conduct of war. There must be no peace, he said, until Germany was beaten to her knees. To leave her, he declared, with a stranglehold on Russia, and, through her vassal allies, Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey, dominant in Central Europe and Asia Minor, would mean that she had won the war. He added that Belgium must be reinstated and reimbursed; France must receive Alsace; Italy, the Italian Austria; Rumania, Rumanian-Hungary; Turkey must be driven from Europe, Armenia freed, the Jews given Palestine, the Syrian Christians protected, and the Slav races

insubordination, some having even gone over to the enemy in consequence of which a state of war had been proclaimed on the Murman coast and along the Murman railway […]. The sudden decision to transfer the Government [from] the capital to Murom [is] inexplicable if the Bolshevist victory over the insurrection at Moscow was as complete as asserted, unless the insubordination of the troops referred to applies to Czecho-Slovaks, and the counter revolutionary movement connected with their expected march on Moscow, as well as to the troops in the Murman who are known to have joined the foreign contingents.

31 CE 19 July 1918. Czecho-Slovaks and Allies. Tokio, Saturday (delayed). – Reuter’s correspondent is reliably informed that the Czecho-Slovaks are receiving moral support from the Allies and America, and that it is very probable they will soon receive also material assistance from Japan; and the Americans’ attitude, it is added, may now be considered as practically decided to help the Czecho-Slovaks in their endeavour to overthrow the Bolsheviks. The Japanese government is seeking the advice of the special diplomatic commission and the Genro (Council of Elder Statesmen) before coming to a final decision. – Reuter.
released from the menace of the German sword. Unless we do all this, he concluded, we shall have failed in making secure the liberty of well-behaved, civilised people.

Events in Russia came to a head when the Czar was executed, leaving the country in greater turmoil. Without the traditional Head of State for the multitude to gaze upon, it required great powers of leadership to quell unrest and stabilise the country. ‘As Russia descends into civil war, the Bolsheviks will show themselves to be ruthless and pragmatic.’

CE 22 July 1918
Allied Troops in Russia
(P.A. War Special)
(Admiralty, per Wireless Press.)
(News transmitted through the wireless stations of the Russian Government.)

To all Commissaries for War: The following order has been given by L.Trotsky: - In connection with the landing of English and French detachments on the Murman Coast, and the open participation of French officers with the counter revolutionary mutineers – the paid Czecho-Slovaks – I order all military institutions and soldiers not to support the French and English naval and military officers; not to permit them to go from one town to another […].

Ex-Tsar Shot
(P.A. War special.)

Amsterdam, Saturday. – A Berlin telegram says that according to a report from Moscow, the ex-Tsar was shot at Ekaterinburg on July 16th. The approach of the Czecho-Slovak bands, the German report says, was the cause. The Red Ural Government would not let the ex-Tsar fall alive into their hands. An Exchange telegram says: - A Russian official telegram says: Recently Ekaterinburg, the capital of the Red Ural, was threatened by the approach of a Czecho-Slovak band, and a counter revolutionary conspiracy was discovered, having for its object the wresting of the ex-Czar from the hands of the Council. The President of the Ural therefore ordered the shooting of the ex-Czar, which was carried out on July 16th. His wife and son were sent to a place of security.

Although the Austrian Emperor had not been executed himself, his loss of power put him into an equally impotent position. Despite his earlier declaration to allow greater sovereignty to his provinces, there followed the declaration of his British counterpart, His Majesty’s Government issued the following statement 9 August 1918:

In consideration of their efforts to achieve independence, Great Britain regards the Czecho-Slovaks as an Allied nation and recognises the unity of the three Czecho-Slovak armies as an Allied and belligerent army waging a regular

---

32 Cassell’s Chronology, p.483.
warfare against Austria-Hungary and Germany. Great Britain also recognises the
right of the Czecho-Slovak National Council as the supreme organ of the Czecho-
Slovak national interests, and as the present trustee of the future Czecho-Slovak
Government to exercise supreme authority over this Allied and belligerent army.33

This recognition was of importance because Great Britain had always been
considered a traditional friend of Austria, and was known for conservatism in
foreign politics. Thus this step proved ‘the deep sense of justice and the far-
sightedness of British statesmen.’ On June 15, the National Socialist deputy
Stribrny, had openly demanded the creation of a Czecho-Slovak Republic, and on
June 26, Dr. Soukup, the leader of the Czecho-Slav Social Democratic Party, had
asked if ‘a nation numbering over ten million and boasting of a highly developed
civilisation’ could breathe under such oppressive conditions, ‘seeing what an
important role is being played by four million Bulgars, two million Greeks, two
million Danes and other small nations?’

CE 17 June 1918
Austrian Insurrection
(“Times” Telegrams per Press Association. Copyright.)

Milan, Saturday. – The new Austrian Minister of the Interior has had
manifestoes published throughout the Empire announcing the government has been
informed of preparations for insurrection, and warning the population any attempt
of the sort will be put down by forces of arms. These manifestoes were torn down
in all the Slav provinces, and the police are obliged continually to replace them.
The agitation in Galicia is growing daily, and disorders in the Southern Slav States
are becoming as bad as those in Bohemia.

After the Amnesty of July 1917, which was intended to appease the Slavs
but had the opposite effect, Slav resistance was strengthened, and acquired fresh
strength and impetus by the return of the old leaders. ‘Kramar was hailed like a
sovereign when he entered Prague again. He now became the recognised leader of

33 Idem, p.79.

CE 14 August 1918. England Recognises Czecho-Slovaks (P.A. War Special).
The following declaration has been made by his Majesty’s Government: - Since the beginning of the
war the Czecho-Slovak nation has resisted the common enemy by every means in its power. The
Czecho-Slovaks have constituted a considerable army on three different battlefields, and attempting
in Russia and Siberia to arrest German invasion. In consideration of its efforts to achieve independence Great Britain regards the Czecho-Slovaks as an allied nation, and recognises the unity of the three Czecho-Slovak armies as an allied and belligerent army waging regular warfare against Austria-Hungary and Germany. Great Britain also recognises the right of the Czecho-
Slovak National Council as the supreme organ of the Czecho-Slovak national interests, and as the present trustees of the future Czecho-Slovak government, to excersise supreme authority over this allied and belligerent army.
the whole nation.'\textsuperscript{34} And on September 26, the Czech Agrarian deputy, Zahradnik, made the following declaration in the Reichsrat:

It is necessary to secure for all peoples, great or small, the right to decide their own destinies. This applies also to the ten million Czecho-Slovaks who, moreover, cannot rightly be considered merely as a ‘small’ nation… We do not want anything but an honourable peace which would bring equality to all peoples, a peace assuring liberty to all, and not a peace which would leave our fetters unbroken. We regret that the Pope omitted to mention the Czechs in his peace offer although he mentioned the Poles. But we shall obtain our right without alien support.\textsuperscript{35}

On July 13 1918, an important event took place in Prague: the Czecho-Slovaks established an inter-party council, as part of the Provisional Government of Bohemia, whose programme was identical with that of the Czecho-Slovak Provisional Government in Paris. Another significant speech was that of Dr.Stransky in the Austrian Reichsrat on July 23, exceptionally frank in anti-Austrian spirit and expression, and not particularly sympathetic towards the Irish problem either:

‘One of the obstacles to peace is the oppression of nationalities in Austria and their domination by the Germans. In this war the Germans […] have come to the conclusion that the German hegemony in Central Europe […] is standing on its last legs. Since they see that their predominance can no longer be maintained, they endeavour to translate all that they have acquired into reality, so as to secure the spoils for themselves. Thus the Germans conceived the idea of establishing a province ‘Deutschboehmen’ which must be prepared by the establishment of district governments. From this a very interesting conclusion may be drawn – that the Germans themselves lost faith in the further existence of Austria, otherwise they would not be in a hurry to save their province Deutschboehmen in the present Austria. […] But then we must ask the Germans to take nothing with them that does not belong to them. It is more than questionable whether Deutschboehmen really is German. \textbf{There is another reason which speaks against the creation of a Deutschboehmen. I am convinced that if a plebiscite were carried out among German people in Northern Bohemia, they would declare against separation from Bohemia. Why? Because the Germans are too clever not to know that Bohemia forms not only a historical and geographical unity, but that this unity has besides a historical basis, also a practical foundation.} The relation between the Czech part of Bohemia and Northern Bohemia is to a large degree the relation of the consumer and the producer. Where do you want to export your stricles if not to your Czech hinterland? How could the German manufacturers otherwise exist? When after the war a Czecho-Slovak State is erected, the Germans of Bohemia will much rather remain in Bohemia and live on good terms with the Czech peasant than be identifies with Germany, boycotted, opposed and hated by the whole world,

\textsuperscript{34} Idem, p.87.
\textsuperscript{35} Idem, p.89.
especially if we guarantee, not only by promises, but by deeds and laws, full autonomy to the German population within the Bohemian State. [...] And if Czecho-Slovak brigades are to-day fighting against Austria-Hungary it is only a proof that there is something very wrong with Austria, that Austria is more rotten than Shakespeare’s Denmark. 36 For what other state has soldiers who ran over voluntarily to the enemy? You keep on saying that England has the Irish problem. Did you ever hear of Irish brigades, 37 did you ever hear that any French legions were fighting for the Central Powers against France, or Russian legions against Russia when we were at war with Russia? Indeed, gentlemen, not even Turkey has any legions fighting with the enemy against her. There must therefore be some deep reason for Czecho-Slovak, Polish and Yugoslav legions fighting on the side of the Entente?38

On the jubilee celebration of the founding of the National Czech Theatre, the first speaker was Dr. Kramar who declared:

‘Allow me to make a personal remark. We were far away from public life, confined in prison, and only very little news reached us. Various events filled us

---

36 CE 26 July 1918. Czechs and Austria. Amsterdam, Thursday. – In the debate in the Austrian Lower House, on a motion demanding the indictment of ministers for their decree ordering the partition of Bohemia, the last speaker was the Czech Socialist Deputy, M. Soukue, who, according to the Berlin “Lokalanzeiger,” concluded his speech with the words “Away from Germany.” The galleries at the time were crowded with strangers and journalists, but these were subsequently cleared. The Czech Deputy, M. Strauski [sic], in moving the indictment, said they will hate and fight Austria for ever, and, God willing, they will in the end destroy her completely, because Austria embodies a century-old crime against the liberty of mankind. The highest national duty of the Czechs is to harm Austria wherever and whenever possible. This we owe to the Czech people and to our loyalty to the Bohemian Crown, which loyalty can only be put into practice by betraying Austria. “We are, therefore, determined to betray her whenever we can. Austria is no State at all, but a bad century-old dream or nightmare, and nothing else. It is a State without patriots and without patriotism, which came into being by the piecing together of eight unredeemed countries, Germany included. It is a monstrosity. We no longer expect in this desirable State which is called Austria the righteous cause of the much-insulted Czech people will ever be defended. Only after the death of two-thirds of the population of this State will there be no two-thirds majority against the Government. You imagined it would be very easy, and that by first creating districts which would become German centres, the end would be the establishment of a province of German Bohemia. The way to Germany is free, but we must ask you to take nothing with you that belongs to us. Much more loyal than Czernin and the Premier in dealing with internal policy was the German Ambassador at Vienna, who, when the German delegation requested him to intervene in their favour, advised them to seek an understanding with the Czechs. By reflecting the motion you pave the way to our liberation, our independence and our Bohemian State.” – Reuter.

37 CE 10 July 1918. London Letter (Through our private wire) “Examiner” Office, 2-4 Tudor Street. Tuesday Night. - I mentioned yesterday that the defence set up on behalf of the soldier Bailey, who was tried with Casement was that he only pretended to accept the offer made in Limburg Camp that he should join the German “Irish Brigade,” and that his action was merely a ruse to get back home [...]. What will happen to Dowling, who has appeared before a different kind of tribunal from that which Bailey had to face, will presumably appear in due course. [...] The landing of Dowling was made by the Government to serve the part of a leading – if not actually the leading – piece of evidence of their cock-and-bull story of a German-Irish plot. The “plot” was given as the excuse for arresting and deporting and imprisoning without trial a hundred Irishmen and Irish women, and further, as the excuse for dropping Home Rule [...]. Moreover it was industriously circulated in support of the “plot” story at the time that important papers had been captured on the man from the submarine, but it appears that nothing whatever was found on Dowling. As a matter of fact, as his counsel pointed out to-day, no evidence was brought forward that he ever did land from a submarine [...].

38 Nosek, pp. 102-104.
with anxiety and despondency. Bohemia seemed to be like a large, silent and dead churchyard. And all of a sudden we heard that underneath the shroud with which they tried to cover our nation there still was some life. Czech books were read more then ever, and the life of the national soul expressed itself in the performances in the National Theatre. When we heard about the storm of enthusiasm which greeted the prophecy in Smetana’s opera Libuše, we felt suddenly relieved, and we knew that our sufferings were not in vain.39

In the chapter entitled Bohemia as a Bulwark against Pan-Germanism, the author argues on lines similar to those used by Sir Roger Casement arguing the economic case of Ireland.

In the past Bohemia was the richest part of the Habsburg Empire, with well-developed agriculture and industries […] and Pilsen beer is known all over the world […]. As regards trade, almost all the business between Bohemia and Western Europe has always passed through Vienna, which of course greatly profited thereby. This will cease when Bohemia becomes independent.

As regards England, in 1914 L2,676,000 worth of goods were exported to Austria-Hungary, the greater part of which again was destined for Bohemia, the chief articles being printing and agricultural machines and textile manufactures. England will after the war find a good market in Bohemia, and valuable assistants in Czech banks and business men in the economic competition against the Germans in the Near East, since the Czechs boycotted German goods even before the war […]. Also the future relations of Bohemia with the British colonies are not without importance. More than half the trade of Austria with the British colonies was transacted by the Czechs, and Austria-Hungary exported to British colonies L3,500,000 and imported from them L10,500,000 worth of goods annually.40

It was believed that the cause of Bohemia was of great importance to the existence of the British Empire. ‘If Germany succeeded in preserving her grip on Austria-Hungary, the Balkans and Turkey, she would soon strike at Egypt and India, and thus endanger the safety of the British Empire.’ Germany would be enabled to reach world-domination in a short time. On the other hand, if non-German nations of Central Europe were liberated, Germany would be prevented from repeating her present exploits and a permanent peace in Europe would be assured. Thus with the cause of Bohemia the cause of Great Britain would either triumph or fall.41 ‘Bismarck truly said that the masters of Bohemia would be the

39 Idem, p. 115.
40 Idem, pp.122/123.
41 CE 6 August 1918. Russian Situation. A Moscow Telegram, via Berlin, says that numerous meetings were held at Moscow on Friday to incite the workmen to fight against the Czecho-Slovaks and the counter-revolution […]. M.Lenin said the enemies of the Soviet Republic are encircling us with a ring of iron by deception and lies. The British have occupied Mursman and then taken Nem. They found allies in its Czecho-Slovaks. **It was British gold that won them over [...].**
master of Europe. Among the fourteen terms of peace which the president formulated at the time occurred the following: The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development. Since that sentence was written and uttered to the congress of the United States, the government of the United States has recognised that a state of belligerency exists between the Czecho-Slovaks and the German and Austro-Hungarian Empires, and that the Czecho-Slovak National Council is a de facto belligerent government, clothed with proper authority to direct the military and political affairs of the Czecho-Slovaks. It has also recognised in the fullest manner the justice of the nationalistic aspirations of the Yugo-Slavs for freedom. The President therefore is no longer at liberty to accept a mere ‘autonomy’ of these peoples as a basis of peace, but is obliged to insist that they, and not he, shall be the judges of what action on the part of the Austro-Hungarian Government will satisfy their aspirations and their conception of rights and destiny as members of the family of nations.

It is interesting to note here that no similar plan of action was arranged for Ireland. However, once independent, Eamon de Valera – as president of the assembly of the League of Nations – approved the Munich Agreement in 1938, and later as Taoiseach sent condolences to Germany on the death of their Head of State, Adolph Hitler.

CE 7 August 1918
Allies in Russia
(P.A.War Special)
Amsterdam, Tuesday. – According to a Moscow telegram received here via Berlin, the semi-official organ “Ivestia” states that the well-known Czech leader, Professor Masaryk, has arrived at Vladivostok, on route for Samara. The Social Revolutionaries’ organ published in Ufa reports that negotiations between a committee of members of the Constituent Assembly and representatives of the Siberian Government in Samara have led to an agreement in principle. A general sitting of the members of the Constituent Assembly of Samara will shortly be held in various towns in Siberia.
The following reports appear in succession to allow the reader the full impact of the political consequences of the British Government’s action in recognising the Czecho-Slovak nation and denying the Irish.

CE 14 August 1918
London Letter

[…] It is rather significant that the British Government has to-night issued a declaration recognising the Czecho-Slovaks as a belligerent Power. The three battle fields on which they are fighting are presumably in Siberia, to the northeast of Petrograd, and on the Western front. The council which is directing operations is not a new body. It was joined by Professor Masaryk many months ago and has been in close touch with the Allied governments. The Czecho-Slovak movement is one of the most extraordinary of all the strange things that has happened in the war. The bulk of the troops that are fighting were Russian prisoners and deserters from the German and Austrian armies. That they have been able to hold together, to organise themselves, and to emerge as great national armies seems almost miraculous.

CE 17 August 1918
“Our New Allies”

For some days past the columns of most of the London newspapers have been loaded with platitudinous admiration for “our new ally,” the Czecho-Slovak nation. This people of Eastern Europe, about whose existence the average Britisher was only dimly conscious not so very long ago, have now risen to an important place in the affairs of the world. This orientation cannot fail to be of interest to Irishmen for reasons which will be presently indicated. The homeland of the Czechs is Bohemia; and it is worthwhile noting that at least one ultra-patriotic journal refers to the Czecho-Slovaks as Bohemians. This description is not quite accurate, inasmuch as the newly recognised belligerent nation extends beyond the confines of Bohemia. Broadly speaking, Bohemia bears to the Czecho-Slovaks of the Austrian Empire somewhat the same relation which Ireland bears to the Irish nation scattered throughout the British Empire. Long before the outbreak of the war the Nationalist party in Bohemia was a thorn in the side of the Austrian Government. A continuous series of movements, some of which could be describes as constitutional, others more or less extremist, were carried on to secure for Bohemia greater freedom of action. A large section imbued with the Nationalist spirit were quite content to advocate complete autonomy within the Austro-Hungarian Empire, while others looked forward to the recognition of a completely independent State. The spirit of the Bohemians infected the Moravians and other
neighbouring and related nationalities, all for the time being owing allegiance to the House of Hapsburg. Since the outbreak of the war the Czech Nationalists have carried on a vigorous propaganda in the Allied countries. They issued quite a number of periodicals, pamphlets, and books in Allied capitals, explaining their standpoint and the basis on which they claimed independence. One publication, “La Nation Tcheque,” has not been unknown in Ireland for the past four years, but it does not appear to have very seriously interested those who conduct British newspapers, least of all those in charge of the high Tory journals. The cause of this apparent neglect has not yet been satisfactorily explained. Possibly there was too much similarity between Bohemia demanding freedom from Austria-Hungary and Ireland presenting the same demand to Britain. Time has evolved a change in the affairs of Eastern Europe, and unless the oracles lie, the Czechs are coming into their own.

It is strange that those who have grown so solicitous about the national rights of the Czecho-Slovaks and other subject races in the East of Europe cannot perceive the inconsistency of expressing such warm sympathy with them while ignoring the demands of Ireland, much nearer home. Irish Nationalists have no quarrel with the Czecho-Slovaks, and do not grudge Bohemia all the liberty which she can obtain. They believe in the right of every nation having control of its own destiny, and there exists a certain bond of sympathy between Ireland and Bohemia. But when John Bull proposes to assume the role of knight-errant and goes out to break lances for the freedom of enchained peoples in the East of Europe, the least one is entitled to ask is that he should prove his sincerity by allowing to Ireland the same measures of freedom which he seeks to secure for the oppressed races of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Otherwise a callous world may entertain doubts as to the disinterestedness of his motives.46

The following account of the triumphant return of Masaryk to Prague in December 1918 is taken from Masaryk of Czechoslovakia by D.A. Lowrie,

As the President himself said, that day seemed like living in a fairy tale. Three centuries of oppression ended; the ancient Hapsburg autocracy gone overnight. Yesterday at Budejovice [a.k.a. Budweis], as they crossed the border of

---

46 CE 12 August 1918. Mr. George on Conquest. [...] In seeking an historical parallel to corroborate and justify his belief that Germany was foredoomed to failure in her effort to dominate and rule by force the small European nations, Mr. George has told the citizens of Neath that the Roman reign of conquest in Wales failed in the end because it did not win the hearts of the people over whom it governed. That interesting statement seems to coincide agreeably with President Wilson’s formula that good government depends on the just consent of the governed [...]. Ireland is at the present time ruled by force, and Mr. George denounces force as an effective weapon when used by ancient Romans or modern Germans. How then can he justify its application to Ireland by Great Britain in the twentieth century? Does the Prime Minister of England hope to win the hearts of the Irish people by denying them the freedom which he admits is their right? Does he conceive that the arrest on suspicion and deportation and imprisonment of Irishmen and Irish women without open trial will endear British rule to the people of this country? [...] Does Mr. Lloyd George believe that intelligent Irishmen can esteem a system of government which places the minority in control and discards the opinions of the majority? And if he does not believe these things – he is too astute an individual to believe that such flagrant injustices could win anything but the contempt of a gifted and liberty-loving race – does he think that the position is improved by pledge-breaking, or by citing of historical instances to prove that a reign of conquest must fail which does not win the hearts of the people over whom it governs? Mr. Lloyd George must admit his own inconsistency. He cannot justify Prussian methods in Ireland and condemn them in Belgium and Poland [...].
their own country, many of the legionaries, home again after four years in prison camps and foreign armies, had knelt in true Slavic fashion to kiss the soil of their fatherland […]. 47

That day the London Times wrote that perhaps never again in one day and place would the true significance of the Great War and the sanctity of the Allies’ cause be so completely evident. If only the whole Allied world might have been in this city on the banks of the Moldau to witness the joy of this nation redeemed from bondage through the victory of the Allies. They would say with the heroes who died to bring it about: ‘It is enough; it is worth the price we paid’ 48

8.2. Independence for Ireland?

In Ireland the newly democratised electorate was voting for the establishment of an independent Irish Government. ‘But the sanctity of the Allies’ cause was such that the democratic mandate given to Sinn Féin was met with Black-and-Tannery. The Hapsburg Empire had been developing as a federation of nationalities, unlike the British Empire, which had an authoritarian structure, and in 1914 Bohemia/Moravia had much greater autonomy than Ireland (which in fact had none at all above County Council level) and greater participation in the general conduct of the state. Yet it seems inconceivable that Vienna should have responded to a Czech election result in the way that Britain responded to the Irish election result of 1918. 49 To achieve a better understanding of the status of Ireland within the British Empire in an era of self-determination, it is appropriate here to refer to one of Ireland’s leading historical figures of the 20th century: Eamon de Valera’s political career began in earnest in 1916, became established in the election campaign of 1918, and culminated in the presidency of the republic founded thirty years later.

Excursus: Eamon de Valera

Originally named Edward de Valera, born in New York 1882, of a Spanish father and an Irish mother, he was sent to live in Ireland at the age of two,

47 D.A. Lowrie, Masaryk of Czechoslovakia (Oxford University Press, 1930), quoted in Clifford, Traitor Patriots, p.22.
48 Clifford, Traitor-Patriots, p.22.
49 Clifford, Traitor-Patriots, p.42.
following the death of his father. He was brought up in County Limerick, attended national school and later Blackrock College, Dublin. He finally graduated from the Royal University, Dublin, and became a teacher of mathematics - and an ardent supporter of the Irish language revival. In 1913 he joined the Irish Volunteers, and in the Easter Rising in 1916 he was the last commander to surrender. Due to his American citizenship, however, he was not executed like his compatriots but was instead sentenced to penal servitude. De Valera is probably the most fitting counterpart of Tomas Masaryk in the period covering the end of the war and the rearrangement of Europe, having also achieved national presidency to crown his career. Irish estimation of Czech Nationalism climaxes appropriately in 1918, when the daring feats of the Czech legion in Russia on behalf of Allied forces are popularised in print. But until those events take place and precedence, and the successes in battle of the Czech legion are finally converted into political currency, the Irish media is still concerned with the “disclosure”, if de Valera or his followers were intriguing with Germany or not.  

CE 28 May 1918
Editorial

[…] The “disclosure”, however, misses the main point, i.e., that De Valera or his followers were intriguing with Germany. If the Premier and his Cabinet colleagues think that Ireland is disposed to accept the government’s published “disclosures” as the last word on the German Plot and that public opinion in Ireland or in the United States will accept the doctrine that imprisonment and deportation without open trial is to be regarded as the equivalent of liberty in this country, they are adding another to the many grave errors that have characterised the dealings of the Coalition with Ireland. To make that treatment more cynical still the farce of keeping up pretence about some kind of a Home Rule Bill is still being played. According to the latest accounts the cadre of the bill is itself going through some process of reformation, and it is being tinkered in such a way by the Unionists that are engaged in making it suitable for Scotland and Wales that its applicability to

50 Lyons, p.395/6: “Such was the so-called ‘German plot.’ Few people outside official or unionist circles believed in it at the time, and it has generally been scouted by historians since, especially as the authorities refused to produce the evidence on which they had acted. There was, in fact, rather more to the matter than met the eye. Bits and pieces of information had been reaching the government from time to time that the American Irish, more specifically the irrepressible John Devoy, had renewed their contacts with Germany within a few weeks of the rising, that there had been discussions about further landings of arms in Ireland, even that some German weapons had been sent to that country but had failed to arrive. Apart from this fairly steady exchange of messages between the Irish-Americans and the Germans, there were scattered indications that U-boats had been in contact with agents off the west coast of Ireland, and there was what seemed more substantial proof when one of Casement’s ill-fated Irish brigate, James Dowling, was arrested in Galway after having landed from a submarine. […] But in all of this there was no sign of a concerted ‘plot’ and no evidence that the sinn Féin leaders were in any way implicated. What the government needed was a colourable excuse for shutting up the principal opponents of conscription and this the ‘German plot’ provided.
Ireland is just as remote as Ireland’s complicity in a German plot. As far as may be judged it is being designed to satisfy nobody, so that its rejection may be assured. The “Morning Post” – probably the most bitter Die-hard and anti-Home Rule journal of them all - asserts that the Government pledge to produce some kind of a Bill still holds good, though it regards “the more sacred pledge” given to the Unionists of Ulster as more binding on the pledge-breakers.

De Valera had been temporarily released in 1917, but re-arrested upon his involvement in the 1918 Sinn Féin election campaign, and deported to England.

CE 18 June 1918
Deportation of Irish Prisoners
Bishop of Limerick’s Letter
(As passed by Censor).
A public meeting was held on Sunday night at the Crescent, Limerick, to adopt a resolution of protest against the deportation to England of the prisoners Mr. De Valera and others, and their detention without trial. The meeting took place at the foot of the O’Connell monument […]. Most Rev. Dr. Hallinan […] wrote: - “The Palace, Corbally, Limerick, 13.6.’18. Dear Sir – Though I cannot be at your

---

51 CE 28 May 1918. German Band at Dublin Port. Extraordinary scenes were witnessed at the ports of Dublin, says the “Irish Times” in connection with the deportation of 450 alien civilians of German and Austrian nationality who have been interned at Oldcastle, County Meath, for a period dating back to shortly after the outbreak of war in 1914. Special arrangements for the deportation had been made, and one of the Isle of Man Steampacket Company’s excursion steamers of other years arrived at the North Wall in the morning and was berthed at the London and North-Western Company’s jetties. The Dublin relatives of the men to be deported had apparently been made aware of the fact and from an early hour wives, daughters, and children of these aliens assembled outside the gates of the L.N.W.R. Station at the North Wall, but were not allowed inside the premises. A very strong military force was present, and took complete possession of the railway station, the quay outside and the transit sheds and jetties alongside which the excursion steamer was berthed. In addition there were extra police of the D.M.P. under an inspector and a couple of sergeants, and these preserved order outside the premises. In advance of the special train conveying the 450 deportees to Dublin from Oldcastle there arrived by goods train ten railway waggons containing the “luggage” of the alien enemies, and this amounted to some 30 or 40 tons of the most extraordinary baggage which ever was handled at the Liffey side. Pianos, Double-bass violins and the instruments of a camp band, sailors’ sea trunks, a grandfather clock and theatrical “properties” which told of entertainments past or for future productions were shipped. Meanwhile the train with the German and Austrian travellers arrived in the station across the road from the river, and was vociferously cheered by the crowds outside the gates. Instantly a rush was made towards the quayside but the military and police allowed no entrance to the transit sheds or jetty, and the women and their friends then took up positions on top of timber and cargo stacks lower down the North Wall, where the boat they were interested in could be seen after she had left the wall. Sinn Féin colours and green scarves were worn by many of the female relatives of the men being sent away, and over on the South Wall – across the river – crowds numbering hundreds of both sexes were congregated. They sang the Sinn Féin “Soldier’s Song” and cheered as the alien deportees were brought from the railway station and on to the decks of the steamer and the cheers were answered from the north quays. Suddenly the strains of a brass band floated out on to the water. It was the aliens camp band in action – and the excursion idea was complete. Cheers were raised again; the steamer departed, and the military and police returned to barracks.

52 CE 29 May 1918. Germany and the Arrests. The arrest of the Sinn Féin leaders naturally, says the “Daily Mail,” attracted front page attention in the German Press. What the huns hope for is indicated by a typical observation in the “Lokalanzeiger” - England’s action in creating these hundreds of new martyrs is certain to cause bitterly bad blood. The Government controlled organ solemnly describes the Dr. Dillon arrested in Dublin as “John Redmond’s successor as leader of the Irish Party.”
meeting on Sunday evening, I am in agreement with the resolution to be proposed, as it is “condemning the recent arrests and deportation of our fellow countrymen.” “Nothing that I have heard or read of in modern times of the exercise of autocratic power by Kaisers or Czars has exceeded in despotic tyranny the treatment of these men and women by the pseudo democrat Mr. Lloyd George and his Government. The leaders of an open, above-board political movement in Ireland are arraigned before the whole world for being involved in a plot with Germany. They are arrested, exiled and imprisoned, and that without a scrap of evidence, the benefit of a trial or a legal sentence. We may safely conclude that the German-Irish plot is a bogus one. There is, however, perhaps a real plot on foot, and that is a British Government one, against the only political movement in Ireland which it fears.

Sinn Féin is evidently on the right road to the freedom and independence of Ireland, and hence the action of the Government. The plot seems to be to deprive Sinn Féin of the benefit of the guidance of its prudent and trusted leaders. Will the present leaders of Sinn Féin fall into the trap? Let us hope not. Anybody who advises either course is not a friend, but an enemy of Ireland, and is playing into the hands of her enemies. Salvation will not come to Erin in either of these ways. […] - Denis Hallinan “Bishop of Limerick.”

According to Ferriter, the arrival of the Catholic Church on the platform of opposition to conscription was significant in that no opinion had been formally voiced prior to this, given the differences of opinion which existed within the hierarchy itself regarding political involvement and the expression of political views.

Efforts by the British foreign office to have the pope restrain the Irish bishops failed. Interestingly, there was no significant debate about what the bishops’ statement of opposition, which included the contention that opposition to conscription could take any form that was ‘consonant with the laws of God’ actually meant. They saw their influence as cementing opposition and preventing chaos. MacRory the bishop of Down and Connor, remarked that the opposition of the hierarchy was based on the principle that a nation had to have a right to say when and why it would shed blood,’ and also on the ground that no power has any moral right to coerce young Irishmen to fight in the alleged interests of freedom until they have being allowed to enjoy freedom for themselves’. 53

Sinn Féin’s successful emotional appeal to the population was not lost on the stagnant remains of the IPP. Recognising both the futility of John Redmond’s consensual position and his own personal sympathy with the impassioned Sinn Féin leadership, Dillon soon aligned the party with the Sinn Féin stand. Things came to a head upon the threat of conscription, when Dillon, as the nation’s formal representative, was required to take a stand.

53 Ferriter, p.182.
The situation on the Western Front served to eliminate any vestigial hopes of an agreement. The massive German offensive of 21 March for a time swept all before it. It seemed that the Germans, having broken through Hubert Gough’s Fifth Army, would reach the Channel coast and turn the Allied lines. There was a manpower crisis: on 28 March the Cabinet agreed in principle to extend conscription to include Ireland. [Though] it must have seemed logical to tie the convention’s key recommendation to the needs of the war effort, this ‘dual policy’ of conscription and devolution, which was agreed by ministers on 5 April, signalled the end of a political era. A constitutional strategy that was struggling for the oxygen of political support was now connected to, and suffocated by, the military draft.54

Following the official announcement of the dual policy of Home Rule and conscription, Dillon led his men out of the Commons, reflecting also Sinn Féin’s strategy of abstentionism. The Home Rulers then united ostentatiously with the separatists in the anti-conscription pledge of 21 April 1918, and in a great one-day strike 23 April. ‘But this radicalisation of the Home Rule movement55 came too late to stem the electoral tide: Arthur Griffith, the founder of Sinn Féin, defeated J.F.O’Hanlon, a Home Ruler, in East Cavan on 20 June.’ 56

CE 22 June 1918
East Cavan.

The return of the Sinn Féin candidate for East Cavan with a majority of over 1,200 votes will, no doubt, be claimed by the advocates of the policy as a signal triumph, and it may be admitted that the result of the poll cannot be regarded with satisfaction by those who have not been enamoured of the wisdom of the Hungarian policy, and the abstention from Parliament and disenfranchisement of the constituencies which the success of such a programmes connotes

What with the IPP and the Catholic hierarchy now taking a sympathetic view of the Sinn Féin movement, it was up to eloquent speeches in the Commons to try and salvage what vestiges of support they could still possibly muster for keeping the Irish manpower in the trenches and Sinn Féin out of Parliament57 – which they would not have recognised anyway if given the opportunity to do so.

54 Jackson, p.183.
55 Ferriter, p.183: “In May 1918 the government, having decided to postpone the implementation of conscription in Ireland, decided instead to focus on Sinn Féin and arrested 73 prominent members, on a pretext that a German agent had been arrested of the coast of County Clare, and that there was a necessity to stamp out ‘Pro-German intrigues ‘ in Ireland. This also got rid of many of the moderates for some time (though Griffith in prison was elected in an East Cavan by-election), strengthening the hands of people like Harry Boland and Michael Collins, who had evaded arrest. While, officially, conscription was postponed, in reality it had been abandoned.”
56 Jackson, p.186.
57 CE 4 July 1918.The Dublin Gazette last night contained a special proclamation under the Crimes Act declaring the following associations to be dangerous – The Sinn Féin Organisation, the Sinn Féin Clubs, the Irish Volunteers, the Cuiann Na mBan and the Gaelic League.
The continual allusion to the ‘German plot’ seemed to be the only ploy available to name and shame and draft unwitting recruits into the British army.  

CE 26 June 1918
Irish Crisis. Commons Debate.

[…] Mr. Shortt made a statement as to the position in Ireland […]. From the year 1911 onwards German agents had looked upon Ireland as a ripe field in which to sow embarrassment for Britain and the British Government. No one could doubt that the rising of 1916 was fomented and to some extent financed by Germany […]. When he and Lord French went to Ireland they learned that certain propaganda and certain documents which for some time had disappeared had begun to reappear, and he quoted from certain documents, which, he said, were written in pencil and posted on the walls, one of which said that “When the Germans come, they will come as friends, and put an end to English rule in Ireland. Therefore, stay in your homes and assist the German troops. Any stores taken by the Germans will be paid for by them” (laughter). He also read extracts from speeches delivered by Sinn Féiners […]. "They must make it impossible and unprofitable for England to govern Ireland, and that could best be done by a drilled and disciplined army of Volunteers who could strike a blow for Irish freedom, and it looked as if the opportunity would come soon.” Another said that Germany had guaranteed them a Republic when she was victorious. The Government found that towards the end of March or beginning of April, Germany was again in touch with Ireland, and they were informed that an agent from Germany would be landed, as he was, on April 12th, on the west coast of Ireland. Towards the end of April the Sinn Féin leaders were expecting arms to be landed in Ireland. […] Those in Ireland who were concerned in this matter were the men who were concerned in the rising of 1916. In view of these facts, it became the duty of the government to strike quickly and to strike hard, and they did so (cheers). [Lord French] also hoped it would be possible by degrees to obtain the full manpower of Ireland to take its part in the war. He hoped that no one would allow the story of the German plot to blacken the fame of Ireland. Ireland was not responsible for what the Germans and a few hundred Irish extremists might do. The heart of Ireland he believed to be sound as towards the Empire (cheers).

58 Ferriter, p.181/2: “In June 1918, a number of women’s organisations, including Cumann na mBan and the IWFL, pledged that their members would not take up posts vacated by conscripted males. They later declared that coercion had ‘rendered the carrying out of suffrage activities impossible’. In the view of G.K. Chesterton, the decision to impose conscription in Ireland was (182) ‘a piece of rank raving madness’. Manufacturing German sympathisers ‘steadily and systematically as if from a factory’. It was also a decision he believed would alter the mood of America.”
59 CE 26 June 1918. London Correspondence. (Through our private wire) “Examiner” Office 2-4 Tudor Street. Tuesday Night. – […] It is necessary to follow Mr. Shortt’s [the Irish Chief Secretary] conscious effort to sustain the case of a German plot by circumstantial evidence […]. Quotations from pamphlets were rather solidly made. [But] the parts of Mr. Shortt’s speech which appeared to impress the House most were the references to outside communication. He insisted that this April there was communication by Germany with Ireland, and from Ireland to Germany; that a plan for a rising was arranged; that German submarines were found in waters where they could not have been seeking to destroy ships […]. So much for the plot. Mr. Shortt insisted that it had disturbed the whole situation, but he was emphatic in letting the House know in his opinion not more than two or three hundred Sinn Féiners were infected with treason, and that the core of Ireland was sound. In regard to the anti-Conscription movement, his attitude was much the same. He spoke of it as serious, the physical force men having captured the organisation. He went out of his way to repeat twice that he was satisfied that the clergy and the Nationalists had used influence effectively to keep the peace.
De Valera, one of the chief ‘plotters’, was acclaimed instead by the Irish as the chief survivor of the anti-British uprising and was subsequently elected president of the Sinn Féin Party. As Michael Laffan pointed out, on de Valera winning the East Clare-by election of 1918:

The difference was one of degree rather than one of kind, and the lines between the groups were not clear cut. De Valera and Griffith provided two poles, the one frequently stressing his republicanism and the other never going into details about systems of government, while the rest of the Sinn Féin leaders came somewhere between them.60

Even under the leadership of John Dillon,61 the IPP as whole could do little then continue to along its established path, supporting Britain in the war effort, albeit with less enthusiasm. He did voice his disappointment with the British Government’s handling of the Home Rule issue, i.e. using a small nation to fight for its freedom in a common battle and then rescinding on its word. At this stage, however, no Parliamentary speaker could be loud or aggressive enough to make himself adequately heard across the water.

CE 30 July 1918

Wriggling and Falsehood
The Debate on Mr. John Dillon’s motion in the House of Commons yesterday, which was defeated by 245 votes to 106, was, in effect, an impeachment of the British Government both for its broken pledges and for its rule in Ireland, which is based on force and not on the consent of the governed […]. Mr. Dillon’s speech was a concise indictment of the Government’s Irish policy – a ruthless exposure of the devices that have been adopted to deceive Ireland, and then to coerce and humiliate her – and it also served to lay bare the intrigue and hypocrisy that British Ministers adopt when dealing with a small nation that now is ruled by methods that savour strongly of those which the British public like to characterise as German. Mr. Dillon faithfully based his charges on facts […] truth cannot be suppressed any more than the Irish nation can be suppressed by the unscrupulous politicians who profess to champion the rights of small nations while coercing and dragooning the Irish people […]. The spectacle of Mr. George and his colleagues weeping in unison at the woes of the Belgians, the Lithuanians, the Poles and the Czecho-Slovaks might possibly impress France and America if the debate on Ireland had not demonstrated that the tearful Ministers regard pledges as mere strategical manoeuvres, while treating Ireland as a vassal State and the Irish people as the merest Serfs […]. Why the very fact that the Ascendancy, which represents force, dominates the vast majority of the Irish people is in itself conclusive proof that the tongue-in-cheek statesmen who permit such a travesty of good government

60 Ferriter, p.180.
61 Jackson, p.183: “Redmond had long been ill and he died on 6 March: with his demise an eloquent voice for moderation was silenced. His successor, Dillon, was much less consensual and more sympathetic to the aspirations and strategies of Sinn Féin.”
(as defined by President Wilson) are mere political tricksters who, whatever
sympathy with liberty they may profess for Belgians and Poles, still follow the
traditional British repressive methods towards Ireland. It is not necessary here to
dwell on the case made by Mr. Dillon, but his challenge to the Government to
produce any evidence of a new German plot stands, and his declaration that the
visit of Von Kuehlmann to Ulster before the war was far more formidable, was a
direct challenge to the Government of which Sir Edward Carson was for so long a
conspicuous ornament. Mr. Dillon [...] made the suggestion that President
Wilson should be asked to settle the Irish question, and he asserted that if that
were not done the British government would be forced hereafter to submit the
matter to a League of Nations unless the Premier in the meantime took his courage
in his hands and settled the matter himself [...]. The Chief Secretary [denied] that
the Government had ever attempted to put down the Irish language. Why did the
police prevent the singing of Irish songs at Ballymacoda and at other places
throughout the country?

During this time of rapid decline, the Home Rulers still retained a
considerable following in Ireland, ‘particularly in Ulster where Joe Devlin was well
liked, and where the party machine, the Ancient order of Hibernians, continued to
dominate.’

CE 29 June 1918
What Should Ireland Do?

Mr. John Redmond, M.P., said: -
[...] “It is a just war, provoked by the intolerable military despotism of
Germany. It is a war for the defence of small nations, and the respect and
enlargement of the great principle of nationality. Involved in it is the fate of France,
our kindred country, the chief nation of that powerful Celtic race to which we
belong; the fate of Belgium, to whom we are attached by the same great ties of race
and by the common desire of a small nation; and the fate of Poland, whose struggle
bears so marked a resemblance to our own [...].”

Mr. John Dillon, M.P., said: -
“[...] If the Germans were to win in this war, we are told by some of their
champions in this country that their first care would be to set Ireland free, and to
start her on a career as an independent nation. Nothing could be more absurd. One
of the striking characteristics of Prussia is this that in the whole course of her
history, from the time when the Elector of Brandenburg became King down to the

62 CE 17 September 1918. Mr. Hayden and the General Election. Speaking at a largely attended
meeting at the A.O.H. Hall, Ballinaheglish, Roscommon, Mr. John P. Hayden, M.P., said the
General Election was probably not far off, and in South Roscommon it was stated a contest was
certain, and the Press had published the name of a certain gentleman who had been selected in
opposition to the constitutional movement [...]. The Sinn Féiners required the people to elect them
to sit in Dublin and issue orders and regulations, but who was going to obey these orders? There
was little use in men constituting themselves into practically a Government unless they had power
behind them to enforce their laws. What, he asked, had been done by the advocates of an Irish
Republic to secure the maintenance of the friendship of America? They had described President
Wilson as a hypocrit. In Galway the Sinn Féiners burned the Stars and Stripes, and in Cork
American soldiers and sailors were insulted by the Sinn Féiners.

63 Jackson, p.177.
present hour, the Prussians have never set any nation free and have never taken the side of human liberty in any of the many wars in which they have been engaged.”

Mr. Joseph Devlin, M.P., said:

[…] “Is there anything in common between Irish Nationalism and the brute force and ruthless war upon small nationalities, and upon humanity and civilisation which Germany represents to-day? Whatever may be the demerits of British rule in Ireland, does any sane Irish Nationalist imagine that matters would be better under the despoilers of Belgium and the ruthless persecutors of Poland? […] The Irish frontier is not now conterminous with the coast line of Ireland. The Irish frontier is wherever the Allied forces are engaged in battle with the common enemy.”

The ‘common enemy’ may have been precisely delineated on maps and propaganda leaflets, but it is questionable if the correct measure of enthusiasm to specifically ‘thrash the Huns’ was ever present and properly executed – above and beyond the duty of soldiers, loyalty to comrades and visions of adventure and fair-play. It seems that all too easily, the population was induced to swing the pendulum of political support towards the adversaries of Allied ascent; Britain, the ‘traditional enemy’, was returning to reproachable methods to retract Home Rule and enforce conscription; and Ireland – regardless of economic boon – was arming itself physically and religiously to assert their claims to self-determination.

CE 6 August 1918

“Hold Fast”

[…] The Premier’s message must be regarded as a renewed declaration of unwavering persistence in a policy that will reverse German control over all Russian lands, will make Poland independent, will apply the national principle to the subject people of Austria-Hungary, and also deal equitably with the Italo-Slav

64 CE 30 September 1918. The Wider Outlook. […] We have already referred to Mr. Asquith’s declaration at Manchester with reference to “a clean peace,” and to the necessity for having justice and Self-government conceded to Ireland as a preliminary to securing it, so that Great Britain can go into court with her own hands clean [and] proves the necessity for prompt action on Great Britain’s part to put her own house in order [and] the question of Irish Self-government no longer remains a party question, but has attained the rank of international importance […]. It is not astonishing, therefore, that Mr. Asquith, when recently defining the aims of British Liberalism, should have dwelt on the disaster it would be to the political party of which he remains the accredited leader, and the discredit which would attach to British statesmanship if England enters the Peace Conference as the champion of Self-government for every country except Ireland […]. The wisdom of the Irish leaders and of the National Party is being indicated by the progress of events, and whether Irish Self-government precedes the advent of peace or follows it, its coming is as certain as that peace will be secured on the Allies’ terms […]. At Ardee yesterday, Mr. Joseph Devlin delivered a powerful and reasoned speech on the Irish situation […]. He emphasised the absurdity of British Ministers denouncing the treatment of the Belgians, the Serbians, the Armenians, the French and the Russians by the occupying armies of the Central Powers, and at the same time asserting to the military occupation of Ireland, and to a policy of coercion. Ireland is, in the words of Mr. Devlin, the test of the good faith of the Allies’ professions […]. The question of Ireland must occupy more of the time of the Government and of the Legislature than those who are glibly talking of the conscription of the Irish people would willingly allocate to it. Government Ministers will be compelled by the Irish Party to account for this policy towards Ireland, not only before the electors, but before the civilised world.
problems. Belgium is to be reinstated [...] Alsace-Lorrain will also be restored to the French, and justice will be secured for the Czechs, Poles, Jugo-Slavs, Greeks and Rumanians. It is a comprehensive policy, and the Premier invites the people of the British Empire to Hold Fast until victory crowns the Allied arms and makes justice, based on the principle of nationality, possible in Europe. **While Irishmen will endorse it cordially, they will at the same time remind the Premier of his pledges, and ask him has he forgotten Ireland in his scheme for dealing out justice to oppressed people [...].** In no other country, except Ireland, is the minority allowed to dominate the majority. When 150,000 Irishmen willingly went to France to fight for liberty, they did so on the understanding that their own beloved land should share in the freedom which they bought with their lives [...]. Meanwhile military law and coercion and a Unionist Administration are the outward symbols of British rule in the country. Ireland is not being governed with the consent of the governed. While the Premier’s message, which promises liberty to Poles, Belgians, Czechs, Jugo-Slavs, Greeks and Rumanians appeals to the people of the British Empire to “Hold Fast” in order that it may be secured and the world set free from war, **Irishmen, too, will Hold Fast to their treasured ideals and will never relinquish their right to nationhood, for which their fathers bled and died in the past, and for which in the present war their sons in thousands have laid down their lives in France and Flanders.**

Home Rule encompasses more than just judicial or legislative powers, it is on a level of Realpolitik the measure of economic independence sought after to guarantee national prosperity for the cultivators, not the colonialists.

**CE 6 August 1918**

The Lord Lieutenant is very optimistic regarding the future prosperity of Ireland, but he evidently sees the shadow of those baneful politicians (whether constitutional or Sinn Féin does not quite matter) across the charming prospect. Otherwise why should he say: “There is peace, prosperity and plenty for all within our grasp if we will only cease to follow will-o’-the-wisps and settle down to hard

---

**65 CE 9 August 1918. [...] Irish people were enthusiastic regarding the war and tens of thousands of the best manhood in the country enlisted. Now the chief reason why so many Irish Nationalists joined the army was that they believed England was prepared to make restitution for past wrongs. The Home Rule Act was placed on the Statute Book, and everything gave promise of a permanent friendship between the two neighbouring countries. But the irreconcilable opponents of Home Rule grasped every opportunity to belittle the war effort of Ireland, and it is common knowledge that high officials in the war Office and in the Army Command were not inclined to conciliate Irish sentiment. Later on events occurred which sapped Irish confidence in the pledges and promises given by British Ministers. Later still, the screams of the irreconcilables for the conscription of Irishmen embittered feeling here. And while British statesmen were declaiming in favour of the right of self-determination for all small nationalities – except Ireland – those who govern this country followed a policy of irritation and coercion. As Mr.O’Connor was in a position to affirm after his tour of the States, Americans follow the Irish situation with intense interest, mingled with anxiety. To them one of the tests of the sincerity of English concern for the rights of small nationalities will be her treatment of Ireland. **If Britain persists in refusing to Irishmen the rights which she is so anxious should be enjoyed by the subject races of Austria, it is not surprising if some millions of people at the western side of the Atlantic feel doubts about British sincerity.** But the question is, will the leading members of the Government take heed of the warnings conveyed in Mr.O’Connor’s speech. They may; but the blundering displayed in dealing with Ireland for the past three years gives little hope that even at the present hour they will make an honest effort to retrieve the situation.**
and earnest endeavour.” Does **Home Rule, or to use a more modern term, “self-determination,”** come within the category of the will-o’-the-wisps? A prosperous people may like to hold their own purse strings and manage their own business. It may be convenient now for England that this country should be gradually (or rapidly) transformed into the Denmark of the United Kingdom, but the Irish may possibly imagine that they are quite capable of doing this themselves if allowed to do so. When the war is over other countries besides England – France and Belgium for instance – may like a few Irish breeding cattle to fill up depleted herds, and Irishmen may see no reason why they should send these on through an English broker. Again, some people will differ with the Lord Lieutenant’s statement that the Imperial Parliament has done everything that could possibly be done to enhance the prosperity and well-being of the Irish farmer.

Equally so, the spiritual ties of loyalty and liberality had been gravely damaged by partiality. Barrie, the Ulster Unionist leader, had once wavered towards a settlement with the Irish Party, yet had been reined in by an advisory committee reinforcing partitionist demands. Divisions were also becoming visible within important institutions of Irish Protestantism, such as the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, and the situation on the Western front eliminated any remaining hopes of an agreement. Ireland was not unique in its ethnic intricacies, apparent in Dillon’s speech to the House, impressively invoking the Germans of Bohemia as the ‘Ulstermen’ of central Europe.

---

66 CE 24 October 1918. Ireland and Self-Determination. Mr. Dillon’s Motion. The Central News says – Mr. John Dillon, M.P., has tabled the following motion – “That in the opinion of this House it is essential that before the British Government takes part in any proceedings for the re-settlement of Europe on the conclusion of peace the Irish question should be settled in accordance with the principles laid down by President Wilson that all nations, large and small, should have free self-determination as to their form of government, and that no people should be ruled and dominated, even in their own internal affairs, by arbitrary and irresponsible forces instead of by their own will and choice – principles for which, in the words of the Prime Minister,
to describe in scathing terms the course that had been taken by the Chief Secretary, who had suffered a sea change. Formerly a Liberal, a Home Ruler, and an anti-conscriptionist, he had crossed to Dublin, and after a week there he had altered all his views, and was apparently satisfied that he knew all about Ireland. “You have decided,” said Mr. Dillon, turning in the direction of Mr. Shortt, “that there are possibilities of success in voluntary recruiting. I tell you that you can make no sort of progress until you have abandoned the idea of conscription. You will never be able to enforce conscription in Ireland, and if you persevere with the attempt the only result will be that you will have Ireland maddened, and that you will have embroiled America.” The conscription of a people against their will is one of the greatest crimes of which any statesman can be guilty. It is the worst form of slavery.” […] Mr. Shortt, his face twitching, sat doubled up on the Treasury Bench, making notes on a pad which rested on his knee, but never once looked up.

Continuing his denunciation of what he described as the “foolish, futile and preposterous policy of conscription,” Mr. Dillon made an excellent point in regard to Mr. Lloyd George’s announcement that the Czecho-Slovaks and Jugo-Slavs in the service of Austria had deserted by the hundred thousand to the Allies. Did the Prime Minister realise what he was saying? “By what ties are we in Ireland bound to this country,” asked Mr. Dillon, “more than the Czecho-Slovaks to Austria?” Yet, he went on to remind the house, when an attempt was made to seduce Irish soldier prisoners in Germany, out of thousands of them who were offered all kinds of considerations only a score succumbed. Incidentally, Mr. Dillon observed, that there was an exceedingly close parallel between the Czecho-Slovaks of Bohemia and Ireland, even down to the fact that the former had an Ulster of their own, inhabited by Germans who considered themselves a superior race […].

The matter of conscription was to be over in a very brief time, due to the imminent armistice, yet it provided the mainstay of the election campaign that brought Sinn Féin to power. The Cork Examiner was doing all within its power to support the Parliamentary Party, overtly suggesting to its readers the international acclaim of its constitutional representatives and reminding Irishmen of their

the Allies are ostensibly fighting in every other country – and that by the application of these principles the system of coercion and military rule under which Ireland is at present governed should be brought to an end.”

67 CE 23 October 1918. Allies and Ireland. Dr. John G. Coyle, in an article in the New York “Advocate,” writes – The Allies cannot undertake to free peoples under the dominion of the Central Powers only. America, at least, speaking through its President, declares that “the liberties of every other people” are involved and are to be made “secure” as well as the liberties of America. When Lloyd George says that the German Kaiser and his coterie can have peace at once by accepting President Wilson’s terms, does he think that the case of Home Rule for Ireland is still to remain a “purely domestic” question for Great Britain? Does he imagine that Irishmen are to be excluded from the opportunity to make “free acceptance” or rejection of any settlement offered by Great Britain? If he does think so, he will find that American public opinion will not tolerate a coerced, martial-lawed Ireland, the great majority of whose people desire Home Rule, whose right to Home Rule was specifically granted by the British Parliament, and whose cause has been approved by the world at large for generations before the outbreak of this war […].

68 CE 19 November 1918. Editorial. Ireland and the General Election. […] The Nationalists of the city of Cork are to meet to-morrow night to select candidates for the constituency, if in the meantime an agreement on national unity has not been reached. Mr. Wm. O’Brien, who has decided voluntarily to go down and out – a course which many will regard as a wise precaution – has issued another valedictory address which may be described as his expiring blow at the Nationalist Party.
political responsibilities, regardless of scheming British statesmen, and trusted methods of dialogue in democracies, which, of course, also comes at a price:

CE 9 November 1918
Editorial

**General Election Fund**

[...] It is manifest that unless some modus vivendi be reached between the different sections of Irishmen, who all seek the freedom of their country, that Parliamentary contests on such a large scale will entail a heavy expenditure. The National Trustees have consequently made an earnest appeal to Irish Nationalists to enable them to meet the situation which now presents itself, and it is gratifying to find that the response of the people, as indicated by the first list of subscriptions, gives promise that Irishmen realise their responsibilities to their country. Whatever views may exist regarding the shameful juggling of British statesmen in their dealings with Ireland, it is clear that it is only in the House of Commons itself that such charlatanism can be effectively exposed, and Ireland’s voice through the mouths of her Parliamentary representatives made to reverberate through the world.  

Juxtaposed to the plea of employing the ballot to defend the Irish realm, the population was exposed to far less subtle implorations on avoiding the imposition of conscription. Ernest Blythe, for example, composed a reactionary article entitled “Ruthless Warfare” – obviously anonymously – to encourage Volunteers to meet an act of war with war:

If England decided on this atrocity, then we, on our part, must decide that in our resistance we shall acknowledge no limit and no scruple. We must recognise that anyone, civilian or soldier, who assists directly or by connivance in this crime against us, merits no more consideration than a wild beast, and should be killed without mercy or hesitation as opportunity offers [...] thus the man who serves on an exemption tribunal, the doctor who treats soldiers or examines conscripts, the

---

69 CE 9 November 1918. Ireland’s Future. Sir, - To the minds of all decent people, the attitude of the present Government towards Ireland revealed in Parliament on Tuesday is simply disgusting. What can we do? Armed risings? Acts of sabotage? Unfortunately, we are too well aware that nothing would give greater pleasure to the enemies of Ireland. Gladly would they avail of such convincing arguments for stirring up fresh prejudice against our country. The men now in command of British destinies are of the type who are accustomed to bloodshed. Ruthless repression would be the response of British Prussians to any manifestation of irritation on the part of the Irish people. As for the Peace Conference, I doubt if we have much ground for hope. It is sure to be a very give and take affair, and the British Government will play the part of a benevolent sun to an imposing array of satellites. President Wilson, for all his honesty and sincerity, will be only one voice amongst many. If the British Government insists on treating Ireland as a purely “domestic question,” it is far too certain that despite all arguments an overwhelming majority will support the view. What then remains? The most formidable weapon of all! British democratic opinion. This is the instrument with which once and for all we may crush our English and Irish reactionaries. Remember what happened in December 1905, when we saw the aftermath of the South African war. That will appear infinitely small in comparison with the uprising of democracy which will follow this war; already it is heaving and gathering its strength. If we can have patience for a little while longer, in the meantime lending every endeavour to organise and educate the working classes of Great Britain, the first general election after the war will surely see our final triumph – Yours, etc. Munsterman.
man who voluntarily surrenders when called for, the man who in any shape or form applies for an exemption, the man who drives a police-car or assists in the transport of army supplies, all these having assisted the enemy must be shot or otherwise destroyed with the least possible delay.

The armistice ended the conscription debacle but it did not put an end to the ‘mood of cold savagery’ that had permeated Irish politics since 1916, and all the passion and determination Sinn Féin had mobilised against the threat of military service was channelled into the election.

CE 12 November 1918
General Election
Sinn Féin Activities. Letter from Mr. De Valera.

Our Dublin correspondent says: - Sinn Féin opened the Election campaign in Dublin last night with a public meeting in the Mansion House. There was a large attendance. When the meeting was in progress for sometime, Rev. M. O’Flanagan, acting President of the Organisation, arrived, and was cordially greeted. Ald.

70 This portends grave consequences for those who would return from active service, and there were not a few who refused to be seduced into the ranks of Roger Casement’s Irish Brigade:

71 Quoted in Lyons, pp.397/8.

72 CE 12 November 1918. Editorial. Peace. The armistice with Germany was signed yesterday morning, and as the terms of the truce preclude the possibility of a resumption of hostilities, the world again enters on the paths of peace. After the appalling years of slaughter, of devastation of land, and of revolting massacres at sea, mankind cannot but find relief in the news that the greatest war in the world’s history is over. […]

73 Lyons, p.398.
T. Kelly presided. A letter was read from Mr. Eamon De Valera, in which he said: -

"I have received yours of Oct 22 informing me officially of the Standing Committee’s ratification of my selection as Sinn Féin candidate for East Clare, Belfast and South Down. As you are aware my views I may not give. The world is to be made safe for democracy, and the British government cannot risk the cause of small nations rightly struggling to be free by tolerating political reference in our correspondence. Still we have been permitted to gain a partial knowledge of the doings of the Organisation, and here to-day we think of the hosts of Ireland’s dead. We rejoice to feel that they can have no regrets, that they gave up their lives to preserve the birthright for men and women of our time – no haunting fears [illegible] the nation seven and a half centuries of foreign tyranny could not kill might in an hour of folly be guilty of the crime of self-destruction. From what we know then we are confident that every true son and every true daughter of Ireland is mindful of what the motherland demands in the time that is upon us, and that every individual opinion and individual interest, with an ability befitting the occasion, will all be subordinated to the necessity of proclaiming unequivocally to an attending world that it is not a slave’s status that Irish heroes have fought and died for but the securing for their beloved country her rightful place in the family of nations, a true sister among the free. It is then with no uncertainty that we all place ourselves in your hands and it is not in accents of despair that we join in common with our glorious dead, and pray “God save Ireland.” – Eamon De Valera." The following resolution was adopted: - "That we, the citizens of Dublin, take our stand by Ireland a distinct and separate nationhood, and affirm the principles of liberty, that Governments derive their just power from their consent of the Governed; deny the right of England or any foreign Power to rule our country, and with the cessation of hostilities we demand that the Irish people shall have full, untrammeled self-determination and to this end we demand – (1) the restoration of our independence; (2) the evacuation of our country by the armed forces of England; and (3) the immediate release of all political prisoners."

With the end of the war in November 1918, the government was now faced with the obligation, under the terms of the Home Rule suspensory measure of 1914, to return to the Irish Question. Many people who did not share Sinn Féin

74 Lyons, p.398: “In essence [the message] was a reaffirmation of the republican ideal, which was to be achieved by a four-opint policy. These four points were first – withdrawal from Westminster; second – ‘making use of any and every means available to render impotent the power of England to hold Ireland in subjection by military force or otherwise’; third – the establishment of a constituent assembly, as ‘the supreme national authority’; and finally – to appeal to the Peace conference ‘for the establishment of Ireland as an independent nation.’ Such a programme proved irresistible. In vain the parliamentary party raised its sights to what appeared to be a demand for dominion status. The lure and glamour of the republic – which, apart from its intrinsic attractions, was the natural focus for the all-prevailing hatred of England – carried everything before it.”

75 CE 13 November 1918. Dublin Celebrations. Flags were again floating yesterday from the public buildings in the city in celebration of peace. The citizens took things more quietly yesterday, but still it was evident that the excitement of the previous day had not passed off. His Excellency Field Marshal Lord French was present at an official Thanksgiving Service in St. Patrick’s Cathedral, together with naval and military representatives.

CE 13 November 1918. Belfast Scenes. Right up to the small hours of yesterday morning crowds of people, bands and torchlight processions praded through Belfast, and a conspicuous place in the general demonstration was taken by large groups from the west side of Belfast, carrying green flags and American flags, and singing “A Nation Once Again,” which was lustily chorused. At Castle Junction the rowdy elements in the crowd had a chance of asserting themselves, and there were
ideals wished to prompt politicians to return to the successful methods of Parnell to secure a satisfactory answer to the Irish question.

CE 13 November 1918
Ireland’s Future
(To the Editor of the “Examiner.”)
Sir – […] There is one method of dealing with the situation which promises better results. It was devised, developed, and practised with enormous success by the late Charles Stewart Parnell, and the fact that is has been allowed to fall into disuse is responsible for many, if not most, of our troubles. **It is for our members of Parliament to be unremitting in their attendance at Westminster and equally unremitting in their efforts to stop all kinds of business there until Ireland’s business has been attended to.** There will be a desperate amount of work to be done, a great congestion in all departments of the Legislature. English members will not like to have their legislation hampered. That will be the real opportunity for such a body of men as Parnell led. Have we such a body? Time will show, but I am sure we might have if we combined instead of quarrelling, and tried to take real stock of our possible representatives instead of acting as we are now doing. That policy in parliament is exactly the kind of policy which would not please either Carson or the Junkers or the Die-hards, or any of the bitter and hereditary enemies of Ireland. Are we not out to displease these persons and incidentally, no doubt, to gain our own freedom? […] X

It seemed that the hands of the Irish parliamentarians were tied by the British refusal to acknowledge Home Rule for the whole of Ireland. Unable to offer their country the guarantee of nation status through constitutional means, it is not surprising that Sinn Féin won – less than more fairly according to records – the general election.

CE 13 November 1918
Mr.George and Ireland
(From to-day’s “Daily Chronicle.”)
(Parliamentary Correspondent – Copyright.)
(By special arrangement with the “Daily Chronicle.”)
One of the greatest outbursts of applause during the Liberal meeting was aroused by Mr.Lloyd George’s declaration that “with regard to Free Trade and Ireland we do not propose to depart one jot from the principles laid down by our predecessors.” He pointed out that clause 3 of President Wilson’s charter precludes

several instances of looting, while the Panopticon Picture Theatre was invaed by large crowds, and damage amounting to L100 was done to the furniture and fittings. Raids were also made on the Monico Bar and on an oyster saloon, while Woolworth’s shop was made the object of a rush for flags. Smithfield market was closed for the day, and in the Falls district the millworkers turned out en masse and marched and counter-marched, wearing Irish and American flags. The crowds in the centre of the city were unprecedented in numbers. Rejoicings were being continued yesterday in Belfast on an extreme scale. The city is gaily decorated with bunting, and crowds are parading the streets singing patriotic songs.

76 Jackson, p.186, and: “In addition to this statutory responsibility, political pressure was also being applied in Ireland by militant separatists who, in January 1919, began an offensive against the Royal Irish Constabulary and other Crown forces.”
the idea of an economic war to follow the war of arms. As to Ireland, she has been sullen, refractory, foolish. While the greatest struggle for liberty and the rights of small nations has been fought, some of her leaders have stood ostentatiously aside. None the less, we must approach this Irish problem with a calm mind, and with our old faith in Liberal principles, for with liberty will come healing. One limitation, however, must be imposed upon the granting of Home Rule to Ireland – there must be no coercion of north-east Ulster.

CE 14 November 1918
London Letter
(Through our Private Wire)
“Examiner” Office, 2-4 Tudor Street.

Wednesday Night. - […] It is interesting to notice that English politicians are following with intense interest the Sinn Féin operations. To-day’s “Westminster Gazette” points to them as among the foremost reasons which have inspired Mr.George to rush the General Election. His calculations as to his return to power are based on the possibility of Sinn Féin being able to win a certain number of seats, and thus reduce the numbers of the opposition against him. To put it quite bluntly, every Sinn Féin victory in an Irish constituency is a victory for the arch-humbug who has tricked Ireland over Home Rule, pursued coercion in Ireland, and done all that he could to impose conscription on Ireland. It is now, by the way, beyond doubt that the “Home Rule” which Mr.George pronounced himself in favour of at his meeting yesterday is a scheme of permanent partition. Is there not something bitterly ironical in Sinn Féiners assisting him to force permanent partition upon Ireland? […] A very fair appreciation is given in the “Westminster Gazette” to-night on what it calls Ireland’s “Great Contribution to the War.” The writer points out that for a population of four millions not less than 250,000 have fought for the Allies, “and if we add the Irish in the Dominion contingents and the Irish who have fought in the navy – to say nothing of the Irish who have come over in the Americans, the total would probably be not less than half a million.” Conscription, it is pointed out, could only, if it had succeeded, have brought in not much, if any, more than another 100,000. “The Irish regiments,” says the “Westminster Gazette,” “have by common consent fought splendidly, and it will be a thousand pities if some public opportunity is not taken of acknowledging the debt that the country owes to them.” All this is in explanation to the readers of the paper of the enthusiasm in Ireland over the victory and peace. The writer says he believes that even the “rebel Irish” joined in the rejoicings. “Most of them,” he adds, “have always protested that though anti-English and willing to use Germany against England, they were not pro-Germans.” He concludes – “Indeed it would be difficult to imagine anything more antipathetic to the Irish spirit than the German, and I should be much surprised if most Irish rebels do not secretly in their hearts rejoice at the downfall of the Kaiser and the liberation of the little nations. It is, after all, quite an easy feat for a rebel Irishman to be glad that Germany has been beaten and sorry that England has won.”

Less humorous, perhaps, were the machinations of Edward Carson in Ulster. Secure in the knowledge that Home Rule would not incorporate the Northern provinces, he was able to pour more oil upon the fires of disaffection that impede a peaceful settlement for all parties concerned. Appealing to the solidarity
of loyalist workers, Carson painted a sordid picture of betrayal and cowardice regarding their southern brethren, and denounced the intolerable apparition of Home Rule.

CE 15 November 1918
Carson in Belfast.
“Up Ulster. No Home Rule.”
Our Belfast correspondent, writing last night, says: - Sir Edward Carson arrived in Belfast this morning and was received by crowds of shipworkers who have not returned to their occupations since Monday. [At] the Ulster club he addressed the gathering and said: **“We in Ulster will never give up our freedom and our liberty for any man.”** Ulster has taken a splendid part in the war. The soldiers have been of the best; her heroes have been of the greatest; the men of the shipyards have saved the country from starvation, the men and women at the linen factories have covered our aeroplanes so that they have been enabled to maintain the majesty of the air. I wish I could say as much for the rest of Ireland. With some splendid exceptions they have been thinking of treason while we were thinking of our country. We will never forget that, England and Scotland will never forget that in the darkest days in our history the contribution of the South and West of Ireland to the Empire was a rebellion in which they shot our soldiers. Shame be upon them. […]” Concluding the Ulster leader led three cheers for “No Home Rule.”

The facts were before the nation: Home Rule would only be considered applicable to the provinces surrounding Ulster; Irish Parliamentarians lacked national as well as political clout; and Sinn Féin candidates, who refused to bend to British dictum and had established a strong base through by-elections, would be imprisoned.

CE 23 November 1918
Coalition and Ireland
**Sir. H. Plunkett. Scathing Protest.**
Our Dublin Correspondent writes: -
In the course of a letter to the Press, Sir Horace Plunkett says: - Ireland, ground between the upper and nether milestones of Northern and Southern Sinn Féin, has sunk to the depths of political humiliation. In an exchange of confidences between the leaders of the Coalition her doom has been pronounced. **Only to a small corner of our country are the principles for which the Allies fought to be supplied; for the rest of us, our behaviour has been such that we are beyond the pale.** We are, however, told that if we conduct ourselves with such decorum that the Viceroy can give us a certificate of good conduct, **we may at some indefinite period be rewarded – with the partition of our country.** The stupefaction of my countrymen at this amazing announcement will not be lessened by the cynicism of its explanation. [The] declaration that **Ulster will not be coerced**, Sir Horace says, gives fresh prominence to the most mischievous of all false issues which block the road to an Irish settlement. Let me tell the truth about the coercion of Ulster. Physical coercion has not for generations been applied to Ulster, and never will be
applied. No body of Irish opinion that counts thinks it right or desires it. **Moral coercion, however, ought to be applied.** Ulster does not hesitate to apply it to the Government, who pass it on to the rest of Ireland in the shape of forcible coercion. If, at the gravest crisis of the war, which happened to synchronise with the presentation of the Convention report, the government had the moral courage to make the right appeal to Ulster, I personally believe Ireland would have been brought as enthusiastically into the war as she was kept indignantly out of it. 

There was a remnant of hope left in the IPP and its dwindling circle of followers, the notion that American President Wilson would break a lance for Ireland and secure for her the measure of recognition already bestowed upon other ‘small’ nations whose causes had been equally ‘defended’ by the Irish. In hindsight, this honest anticipation appears quaint and totally unrealistic, but for contemporaries, immediately those who returned from the fight, the realisation of Allied principles, applied to their own country, must have seemed natural and just.

**CE 21 December 1918**

**Irish Cable to Mr.Wilson**

Claremorris District Council has cabled congratulations to President Wilson and earnestly appealed to him to advocate the application of self-determination to Ireland. America, Mr.M.Nally declared, had saved England and France from destruction, and now she would save Ireland from the oppression and tyranny of England. A resolution asking President Wilson to let nothing deter him from putting into practice the noble principles which he has advocated with reference to the rights of small nations was unanimously adopted by Listowel Urban Council. The resolution also emphasised that England governed Ireland against the will of the people. 

Wrapping up the context in which the enfranchised Irish would be casting their votes, IPP member T.P. O’Connor blamed the government for creating the hotbed of indignation and resentment that gave rise to Sinn Féin.

**CE 30 December 1918**

**Mr.T.P.O’Connor and the Government**

---

77 CE 23 December 1918.Editorial. **Ireland and Dr.Wilson.** The magnificent meetings held yesterday in Cork, Dublin, Limerick, Queenstown, Waterford, Ennis, and elsewhere, for the purpose of extending a cordial invitation on behalf of Irish democracy to President Wilson to visit this country, clearly demonstrates that Irishmen keenly appreciate the principles that the President has laid down not only for the purpose of ending the war, but for securing justice and freedom for small nations as well as large in the future.
Mr. T. P. O'Connor, speaking in Liverpool yesterday, said the Irish Party were under a debt of gratitude to many Liberals for loyal and consistent support, but the debt had been paid, and in his opinion their whole forces and interest as Irishmen would drive them almost to a man in support of the Labour Party at the next election. The present election was one of the most dishonest in English history. An honest patriotic Coalition would have finished not only the war, but the problems connected with the war before calling on the nation to approach the problems of peace. The Government had driven Ireland to a state of passionate, and some of them thought unwise, resentment, and the Government must take the responsibility of the situation. If to-morrow morning sixty or seventy members of Irish constituencies were inmates of Irish gaols, it would not be a logical or consistent position for a Government proclaiming itself the liberator of small nations.

With the imprisoned de Valera as Party Leader, Sinn Féin won three-quarters of the votes of all the Irish constituencies in December 1918.

On the eve of the dissolution of parliament Dillon's party held sixty-eight seats, William O'Brien's following and a handful of Independents together

---

78 CE 27 November 1918. Editorial. The Cork Contest. […] At many periods in the political history of this country, Cork has figured prominently and honourably at critical times, and now, acting in accord with its traditions, it still stands for Constitutionalism and political sanity. Cork Nationalists will not shirk the fight, despite the braaodocio of those who, by advocating a policy of Parliamentary abstention, hope to hand over the constituency to the enemy. […] The citizens of Cork who believe in Constitutional effort will accord hearty support to Messrs. O'Connor and Tilson, and thus endorse the National policy of the past 40 years as against the scrapping of that policy, and the adoption in its stead of one that can only result in leading this country into the wilderness, and postponing indefinitely the demand of the Irish people for liberty.

79 After a dramatic prison escape from Lincoln Jail in February 1919, de Valera went in disguise to the United States, in order to collect funds. He returned to Ireland before the military repression in the form of 'Black and Tans' was ended with the truce of 1921. He appointed plenipotentiaries to negotiate in London but he repudiated the Treaty they signed to form the Irish Free State, however, because it accepted the exclusion of Northern Ireland and imposed an oath of allegiance to the British crown. When Dáil Éireann, the assembly of Ireland, ratified the treaty in 1922, de Valera supported the republican resistance in the ensuing civil war. Imprisoned during William Cosgrave's Irish Free State ministry, he was released in 1924 and subsequently organised a Republican opposition party that would not sit in the Dáil. However, in 1927, he told his followers to sign the oath as a meaningless formula and his Fianna Fáil party, “Warriors of Ireland,” entered the Dáil. De Valera set about severing connections with Great Britain, his most famous parole – reminiscent of Jonathan Swift – being 'burn everything British except their coal.’ He withheld land payment of the land annuities and economic war resulted. Increasing retaliation enabled de Valera to expand on his programme of austere national self-sufficiency in a distinctly Irish-speaking Ireland. In 1937 the Free State declared itself a sovereign state, Eire, conceding voluntary allegiance to the British crown. De Valera’s prestige was enhanced by his role as president of the Council of the League of Nations in 1932 and of its Assembly in 1938. In 1939 he declared Ireland’s neutrality regarding the war and retained office in subsequent elections. In 1948 there was a reaction to the monopoly of power and patronage held by de Valera’s party and a coalition under John Costello formed an interparty government. This coalition collapsed within three years, ironically after declaring Ireland a republic by formal law, an act de Valera had studiously avoided. In 1959 de Valera agreed to stand as presidential candidate and resigned his position as Taoiseach, the head of government. He was subsequently elected president and re-elected in 1966. He retired in 1973 and died two years later. De Valera’s career therefore spanned the most dramatic periods of Ireland’s modern cultural and national resurgence, and he is rightly regarded as the anticolonial leader, skillful constitutionalist, and a symbol of national liberation. Cf., inter alia, Encyclopedia Britannica, 1996, and Tim Pat Coogan, De Valera: Long Fellow, Long Shadow (London, 1993).
accounted for ten, the unionists numbered eighteen and Sinn Féin seven. After the election, while the Unionists had increased their strength to twenty-six, the Independents and O’Brienites were completely wiped out and the once great parliamentary party was reduced to six seats, of which four were held in border constituencies which Sinn Féin and the party had agreed to divide among themselves without contests so as not to risk Unionist victories. Apart from these, all other seats, seventy-three in number, went to Sinn Féin.

It was by no means, however, a landslide victory, as about a third of the electorate did not cast a vote, and not even half the votes were in favour of Sinn Féin – but in 25 constituencies they were returned unopposed. And as some candidates, for example Eamon de Valera, were returned for more than one seat, the seventy-three constituencies were represented by sixty-nine members.

CE 30 December 1918
The Skeleton at the Feast
Intentions of Sinn Féiners
The “Daily Chronicle” says: - Ireland, like Great Britain, has been swept almost from end to end, but by Sinn Féin instead of by the Coalition. The only woman elected to the House of Commons is from Ireland, and is a Sinn Féiner. The largest single party elected outside the Coalition is from Ireland, and is Sinn Féin. If we do not know what Sinn Féin means to do there is no excuse for us, for we have been told plainly enough in hundreds of speeches and in dozens of newspapers in Ireland for the past eighteen months. The Sinn Féiners are Republicans, and they do not mean to come to Westminster and take the oath of allegiance and their salaries as M.P.s. They intend to meet in Dublin and pass resolutions with such authority as their elections – by overwhelming majorities be it noted – may have given them with their people. With all its causes for congratulations on this side of the Irish Channel, the late General Election in this one menacing aspect of it, is as sinister an incident as this generation has known.

CE 30 December 1918
Editorial
The “Victory” Election

---

80 CE 30 December 1918. Carson’s Message. Sir Edward Carson, in a message of thanks for his election to Parliament, says a Belfast telegram, observes: “As regards Ireland, the elections have cleared the air. The issue is as between an independnt Republic or Government under the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Every other alternative has proved to be a sham. As for Ulster, our simple demand is to be governed and treated as Great Britain is, and to share in the benefit of all her laws. We get nothing more and will take nothing less than the citizens of England and Scotland.”

81 CE 19 November 1918. Editorial. Ireland and the General Election. […] The Nationalists of the city of Cork are to meet to-morrow night to select candidates for the constituency, if in the meantime an agreement on national unity has not been reached. Mr. Wm. O’Brien, who has decided voluntarily to go down and out – a course which many will regard as a wise precaution – has issued another valedictory address which may be described as his expiring blow at the Nationalist Party.

82 Lyons, p.398.

83 Constance Markievicz.
The extension of the franchise was almost certain to bring about surprising changes, and it is most remarkable the different trend opinion took in Ireland and Great Britain. Here the old order changeth for the new with a vengeance, while across the Channel we find enthroned in place and power the very forces which the free people from all the ends of the earth armed themselves to overthrow when their Empire was in Central Europe. It is a result scarcely less surprising than the sudden crumbling of the Kaiser’s power. And it was brought about by very skillful, if very unscrupulous generalship. England was on the verge of a revolution it was shouted. It was sedulously preached that the Labour Party were out to bring the tactics of the Continental Bolshevists into the United Kingdom. Ireland has taken a course, however, for good or ill that completely breaks away from all her past. Maddened with the treachery of the “predominant partner,” growing tired of a party that she entrusted to do her work for over 35 years, and influenced by ideals that have sprung into activity by what is happening in the great world outside, to our thinking she has thrown discretion to the wind and at a very critical moment trusted her affairs to men of little experience. Isolated and alone, Ireland sternly, of all the British possessions, refuses to bow down before the might and power that exists in the War Cabinet. Strong in the justice of her cause, and we fear strong in that only, she has deliberately selected representatives virtually pledged to hold no parley with her de facto rulers.

It will be seen that the problem confronting the new party, led by Mr. de Valera, has no easy task before it. The aftermath of the war must bring in its train unemployment and misery such as heretofore we have not experienced. The shutting of America to emigrants for at least two years makes industrial development vital in this country – a question that up to now has not received an hour’s consideration. It is only fair to emphasise the gigantic task that now has to be faced by the party of Sinn Féin which has been returned triumphantly by Ireland. [Those] they have displaced harbour no bitterness against them. When vital work for the country has to be performed, if they require it they can rely on a ready response to any call for assistance. Young Ireland takes control with the best wishes of old Ireland, and if they can bring peace and happiness and goodwill to our people, none will bless them more fervently or hail their triumph with greater acclaim than those who have maintained the struggle through long and dark and evil days. May God grant that affairs will work out better for poor old Ireland than they look at the moment as a result of the “Victory” elections.

---

---

84 Ferriter, p.183: “The election was important not just in terms of providing a political mandate for the Sinn Féin party, but also because about 75 per cent of Irish adults now had a vote, compared with 25 per cent previously.”

85 CE 30 December 1918. Sinn Féin Success. Meeting on the Parade. At half past nine on Saturday night, a public meeting was held on the Grand Parade, and was addressed by the victorious candidates. The dimensions of the gathering were of an extremely overflow character, and the proceedings throughout were most enthusiastic. A number of brass, drum and fife, and pipers’ bands attended, and there was a profuse display of banners and Sinn Féin favours. Torches and tar-barrels were also borne amongst the crowd. Mr. John Good, P.L.C., who presided, said the new members fully realised what Labour meant to the Irish nation, and Labour had declared for an Irish Republic (cheers). They had proved to the world that they wanted no more English manufacture in this country (cheers). English Labour had by the returns of that day’s polls declared themselves tools of the capitalists, and they had shown that they did not want to be freemen in their own country. We had taught them a lesson, but we were going to teach them the further lesson that Ireland was going to be free and independent of all English control (cheers), and that whether President Wilson carried out the terms he laid down himself or not, Irishmen are going to keep on the fight until victory crowned their efforts (cheers). […] Mr. J.J. Walsh, M.P., who was
Regarding the Peace Conference, and the probability of a functioning League of Nations, the Irish press seemed already convinced at this stage that self-determination simply would not happen for Ireland. England, as ‘Empress of the World,’ appeared very unlikely to infringe upon its power voluntarily, and which remaining Power could possibly press upon her to relinquish a colony willingly? Clearly, the sum of national qualities bequeathed to the Irish race would not deliver her from suppression, and neither would her contribution to the wealth of the Empire inspire largesse. It appeared that, after all, only the subject nations of the conquered empires would receive a measure of recognition, such as the Czecho-Slovaks, and Ireland would remain a domestic affair.

CE 30 December 1918

**The Irish Issue in its International Aspect.**

[...] The task of the conferring Governments is to restore and to make permanent the peaceful equilibrium of the world. In the past, England has been the centre of that equilibrium which, when disturbed by Spain, Holland, France or Germany, led Britain to war; and the disturbing elements were thereby reduced to balanced proportions, in leagues, alliances, ententes, and associations. England, conqueror of Africa, Palestine, Arabia, Persia and the German Colonies;[^86] and possessor of Ireland, Canada, Newfoundland, the West Indies, Australia, New Zealand, India, Ceylon and Burmah, has now become Empress of the world. Yet it is actually proposed that she grant self-determination on the world and forgo her supremacy in favour of a league of which the component States, small and great, shall enjoy equality with her before the law of nations. In this League each nation will arm for domestic order only, and all will contribute to a common force that will guarantee the world’s peace. The unit of State proposed for the League is called a nation. It is implicit in the idea of a unit that it should be indivisible, self-supporting, and able to sustain its share of the common burden. This unit has been further qualified by people “governed only by the consent of the governed.”

**Amid the nations of the world the Irish are unsurpassed in the sum of their distinguishing characters of speech, race, customs and traditions.** They take historical precedence over all nations, except the nations of Greece and Italy; they inhabit a country unique in its geographical separateness from all others and greater in area than Greece, Serbia, Switzerland, Denmark, Holland or Belgium.

---

[^86]: CE 29 August 1918. *Future of German Colonies.* (P.A.War Special) Amsterdam, Saturday. – Captain Persius, writing in the “Berliner Tageblatt” in the spirit of a resigned pessimist regarding the future of the German colonies insists the Germany requires colonies from which to draw her supplies of raw materials, because she will be economically ruined if the ring of British world economy becomes actuality.

---
Ireland contains more people than Greece, Switzerland, Finland, Serbia, Denmark, or Norway. Unless the word nation has lost its traditional significance and has become a term of opprobrium conferred only upon peoples hitherto fighting in the service of the Central Empires, Ireland is a nation. The nationhood of Ireland is not dependent upon admission to any league of Powers. A league avowedly founded on nationhood undermines its own basis by the exclusion of Ireland; and its selective character makes it merely a league of rulers, an entangling alliance to embroil peaceful members in all wars on the seven seas.

In less than a century, Ireland, in addition to paying out of her own taxes the whole of her own cost, has been made to pay to the maintenance of the imperial army and navy of England a sum of L 325,000,000 ($1,725,000,000) (Mr. John Redmond, House of Commons, April 11, 1912). Ireland’s annual foreign trade almost exclusively monopolised by England, exceeds that of Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Greece or Serbia, and almost equals the foreign trade of Denmark (“Statesman’s Year Book, 1913). The exclusion of a great and historic nation, which is an indivisible State-unit, which even under present conditions is able to pay the sum exacted to support the one imperial navy of the world, and which has a yearly foreign trade of $737,750,000, would weaken the stability of any aggregation of less compact States, increase the pro-rate burden borne by the selected members for the support of the League, and deprive the League of a considerable part of the world’s commerce. The inclusion of Ireland as a nation would mean the loss to England of her most treasured possession. True, a war has just been fought in which English Statesmen from Sir Edward Grey to Mr. Lloyd George have avowed their essential purpose to be the freedom of small nations. But in a war between empires a subject nation forms a part where each empire is vulnerable, and where the victor can conveniently disarticulate the vanquished. A subject nation, such as Czecho-Slovakia, that has had the happiness to have been a component part of a defeated and dismembered empire thereby receives at least titular freedom.

The Fall of the House of Habsburg

In 1848 the threat of social revolution had rallied the possessing classes to the Habsburgs; now it had the opposite effect. Dynastic authority was obviously incapable of mastering the storm; new national states might do so. National revolutions were supported as the substitute for social revolution, particularly as even the most extreme Socialist leaders were, by the very fact of being educated, themselves nationally conscious.87

Early in January 1918, the Czech members of the Reichsrat demanded a sovereign state within the historic boundaries of the Bohemia and Slovakia, regardless if ‘Slovakia’ had never actually existed in history, marking the breach of the Czech capitalist and intellectual classes with the dynasty.88 Their émigré leaders, foremost Masaryk, were also able to convince the allies that they possessed the ‘authority’ to stave off Bolshevism. But the allies had by 1917 already included

87 Taylor, p.264.
88 Taylor, p.264.
the ‘liberation’ of the Czechoslovaks ‘from foreign rule’ among their war aims - if only by accident,\(^89\) and yet a year later, this decision was still considered compatible with the preservation of Austria-Hungary.\(^90\)

\[\text{CE 18 June 1918}\]

\textbf{The Crisis of Austria}

\textit{(From to-day’s “Daily Chronicle”)}

\textit{(Special Correspondent – Geo. Renwick, - Copyright).}

Amsterdam, June 16\(^{th}\) – “This is not a Parliamentary or a Cabinet crisis but a State crisis – the crisis of Austria. \textbf{The old Austria of the 1867 constitution has ceased to exist} […] People in Berlin must clearly recognise that this contracting party to the old alliance is no more, and that no power on earth, not even the might of German support, can restore it to life.” In these words, cautious and moderate, the Vienna correspondent of the “Berliner Tageblatt” sums up the Austrian situation, adding that the whole machinery of government has come to a standstill. […] There are three great factors in the Austrian situation. First and foremost comes that of the oppressed nationalities […].

It follows that the decisive blow for the Austrian Empire was felled with the organization of a Czechoslovak Legion in Russia.\(^91\) When the legion successfully fought against Bolsheviks, the enthusiasm of the allied statesmen could no longer be constrained.

\[\text{CE 19 August 1918}\]

\textbf{Russian Chaos}

\textbf{A New Allied Front}

\textit{(Exchange Telegraph)}

Paris, Saturday. – […] In a few months, at latest, there will again be an Allied front in Russia, on which there will be a Polish army carrying the glorious standard of ancient Poland and also the Czecho-Slovaks.

Given that the only other non-Bolshevik alternative were the Habsburgs, it was decided in the summer of 1918 that Masaryk and his National Council would

---

\(^{89}\) \textit{Taylor}, p.264: “The allies had meant to specify ‘Italians, South Slavs, and Roumanians’. The Italians objected to ‘South Slav’ and would swallow only vague ‘Slavs’; the French therefore added ‘Czechoslovaks’ to give the programme a more concrete look.”

\(^{90}\) CE 21 August 1918.An Austrian Opinion.Amsterdam, Tuesday. – According to a Vienna telegram the “Fremdenblatt” says – Our enemies lust of conquest, especially for the disintegration of Austria-Hungary, is the cause of continuation of the war and referring to Count Burian’s statement of July 16\(^{th}\) concludes – The principles expressed therein still hold good to-day – Reuter.

\(^{91}\) CE 13 July 1918.British Navy Help.(P.A. War Special) Rome, Friday. - The British monitors have been doing wonders on the Adriatic coast in helping the Italian advance, which is penetrating into the heart of Albania and threatening the town of Berat […]. \textbf{All the nationalities oppressed by Austria, such as the Serbs, Montenegrins, Czecho Slovaks and Jugo Slavs, are anxious to join in the fight, being sure that their compatriots will lend a hand in making the Austrians crumble away.} Austria is the Achilles heel of the enemy alliance, and they declare that if the Allies succeed in their attack on this vulnerable spot the whole Austro-German compact may collapse like a pack of cards.
become trustees of the future Czechoslovak government, with the support of England and France.

**CE 16 August 1918**

**Austria’s Shock**

(From To-day’s “Daily Chronicle” Special Correspondent. – Copyright.)

Milan, Thursday. – Great Britain’s formal recognition of the Czecho-Slovaks as a nation, entitled to equal rights with other belligerent members of the great alliance, is hailed with profound satisfaction in Italy. “Il Secolo” observes that England’s pact far surpasses in importance the military conventions with the Czecho-Slovaks, already signed by France and Italy. In view of the enormous prestige which Great Britain has always enjoyed within the Dual monarchy, and the tenacious hopes which numerous Austrian and Hungarian politicians continue to cherish on the subject of British benevolence, the effect of the Balfour proclamation on Austro-Hungarian opinion promise to be far reaching and incalculable. Undoubtedly the Hapsburg Empire would have been less surprised to hear the sentence “Dehenda Est Austria” from any other of the Allied belligerents than from its former upholder Britain.

Masaryk in turn was especially fortunate in the run of events following his visit to Czech legions in Russia.92

Visiting the Czechoslovak Legion there after the first Russian revolution, he was caught by the second; and had to return to Europe by way of Vladivostok and America. President Wilson, a professor in Politics, might easily have been taken in by the professors of the ‘Austrian mission’; instead, Masaryk, a professor greater than they, won Wilson for the cause of national self-determination according to his own interpretation – an interpretation that transformed historic Bohemia into the national state of the Czechoslovaks. Moreover Masaryk found in America Slovak and Little Russian communities – settlers from northern Hungary who had retained their national consciousness while growing rich in America. It had been a weakness of Masaryk’s position that the Slovaks and Little Russians in Hungary, being without political voice, could not give evidence of support for him; […] As it was, he could use the Slovak and little Russian emigrants in America as a substitute […]. Slav islands in an Anglo-Saxon world, they had a community of feeling with the Czechs which they had never felt at home, especially when Masaryk was able to offer them, prosperous citizens, a Czechoslovakia saved from Bolshevism.93

92 CE 29 August 1918. Czecho-Slovaks and Britain. Washington, Wednesday. – Appreciation of the aid rendered by Great Britain in recognising the Czecho-Slovaks as a nation is conveyed in a message received by the Czecho-Slovak National Council here. The cable, which is signed by four Army Commanders, is as follows: - “In the name of the Czecho-slovak army, which to-day by its efforts along the immense front stretching from the volga to the Pacific is contributing to the common victory in the fight against the Austro-German coalition, we ask you to convey to the government of Great Britain our sincere thanks for its declaration. At the same time, dear brothers, we express to you the heartfelt thanks of the Czecho-Slovak army for your great work, which is now crowned with success, and for your noble efforts in favour of our independence. It is unnecessary to assure you that the Czecho-Slovak army in Russia will fight under your direction to the end, and until complete victory.” – Reuter.

93 Taylor, p.265.
The last Habsburg stand came about at Brest-Litovsk, negotiating with Russia as a German satellite, where Czernin debated solemnly with Trotsky whether the principles of self-determination were applied in Austria-Hungary.

CE 18 December 1918
Czernin’s Revelations
(P.A. War Special)
Copenhagen, Sunday. – A Berlin telegram to the “Berlinske Tidende” says – In the concluding portion of the speech on December 10th, Count Czernin, Austro-Hungarian ex-Foreign Minister, in referring to the peace treaties of Brest Litvosk and Bucharest, made the following interesting revelations: - Count Czernin sought to prove that it was only under German pressure he agreed to the peace of violence at Brest Litvosk, and that he himself put forward proposals expressly stipulating that no cession of territory should take place; that no reimbursement of war expenditure should be demanded, and Poland, Courland, and Livonia should be granted the right of self-determination. [...] After the pause in the negotiations at the beginning of January, Count Czernin continued, Austria needed Germany’s assistance in the matter of food supplies, and consequently was obliged to drop the threat of a separate peace. [...] In conclusion the ex-Foreign Minister declared that the Emperor Charles, Count Tisza, the ex-Hungarian Premier, Count Clam Martinic, the ex-Austrian Premier, and he himself had all opposed the submarine war, but they had to yield in order not to risk a conflict with Germany.

Czernin’s actual concern was more pragmatic, to secure Russian wheat for the starving Viennese he eagerly welcomed the idea of a ‘Ukrainian’ republic to make peace apart from the Bolsheviks.

CE 21 June 1918
Vienna Situation Serious
(From to-day’s “Daily Chronicle”)
(Special Correspondent – George Renwick – Copyright).
Amsterdam, Thursday. To-day at all street corners in Vienna, notices have been posted up making known to the public the reduction of the bread ration to 90 grams (about 3 ozs) daily. The whole Press regards the matter as one of the utmost seriousness, and insists on Germany and Hungary coming to Austria’s help [...]..

94 CE 22 June 1918,(Through our Private Wire) “Examiner” Office, 2-4 Tudor Street
Friday Night. […] There is no doubt that conditions in Austria are worse than they have been at any previous time in the war. I have this on an authority which does not rely on the newspaper reports from Zurich and Rome – one who certainly ought to be well informed. He does not tell me that breaking point has been nearly reached, although I think he suspects that it has. Putting it laconically, he says : “Anything may happen, or nothing may happen.” That may sound like a platitude, but in this case it has a great deal of meaning. Curiously enough the success of the Central Empires in bringing down Russia has had an unexpected result. There was immense satisfaction that German and Austrian prisoners of war would by release be made available to increase the fighting forces, but a good many of those who have been brought back appear to be infected with Bolshevism. At any rate they have no enthusiasm to resume arms for an autocracy such as the Prussian domination means. The cynical way in which the German military authorities have set out to ride roughshod over the peoples of the East is ringing some recoil [...].. Then there was the indifference of Germany to Austrian hunger.
The German Press has little sympathy to give starving Austria in her ordeal. “Vienna,” says the “Kreuz Zeitung,” “is still eating her beloved cakes while Germany has difficulty in getting bread, and it waxes sarcastic about “Germany always having to help.” The “Taegliche Rundschau” reproaches Austria with having been behind in taking the steps demanded by the situation, and bids her appeal to her Hungarian and Czech friends, because “for two and a half years Germany has been living on a minimum of necessaries.”

However, this created new difficulties, as in currying favour with the Ukrainians, Czernin agreed to cede the district of Cholm, which was partly Polish. The Poles, in turn, rejected a Ukrainian republic that limited the dominion of a future Great Poland, and thus broke at last with the Habsburgs.

CE 26 June 1918
Austrian Cabinet Crisis.
Amsterdam, Tuesday. – A Vienna telegram states that according to the papers the majority of the Ministers in a Cabinet meeting declared against a “paragraph 14” regime. They pointed out the dangers of a non-Parliamentary regime in the present difficult situation whereupon the entire Cabinet tendered its resignation. The Poles expressed the hope that the Emperor would accept the resignation, and would entrust a new man with the formation of a Cabinet. The Chairman of the Polish Party, Dr. Tertal, assured the Deputy, Herr Waldner, that the Poles were ready to form a majority with the Germans.

CE 26 June 1918
Austrian Government Attackers.
(From to-day’s “Daily Chronicle”)
(Special Correspondent, Julius West – Copyright).
Zurich, June 24 (received yesterday). – The attack on the Austrian Government is proceeding satisfactorily on two fronts – The Polish Club has now concluded a working agreement with the Szechs [sic] and Southern Slavs, who will all cooperate in Parliament in future. At the same time the Vienna Labour Council is carrying on its own offensive. […] On Thursday the railway workers held a demonstration to protest against inadequate wages. Violent scenes were witnessed, and four persons were killed and nineteen wounded. The major who ordered the troops to fire on the workmen was also wounded. – Julius West.

The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk itself brought only short respite for the economic chaos of central Europe, and, moreover, prisoners of war returning from

---

95 CE 25 June 1918. Disorder in Vienna. (From Mr. A. Beaumont, Special Correspondent of the Press Association and the “Daily Telegraph”). Milan, Sunday. – From despatches to Swiss papers it is learned that the disorders in Vienna owing to the reduced bread rations have also been fomented by the discouraging impressions created by the failure of the offensive on the Italian front […]. Reading his last report to the Town Council the Burgomaster regretted that 29 cartloads of potatoes from Hungary had gone astray in Bohemia, but he ignored the fact that the people are starving in Bohemia, perhaps even more so than in Vienna […]. From many other parts of the empire similar reports of troubles and starvation have been received. The conditions at Prague and at Brunn and in places in Galicia are alarming.

96 Taylor, p.263.
Russia brought with them Bolshevik ideas, or at least contempt for ‘authority’ which broke the back of Austrian constitutionalism.

CE 11 September 1918

Anarchy in Russia. Austrian Exposure.

(From Mr. A Beaumont, Special Correspondent of the Press Association and “Daily Telegraph.”)

Milan, Tuesday. - An extraordinary official document published by the Austrian Office of Propaganda on the state of anarchy in Russia has just come to light in Switzerland. The pamphlet was drawn up by an official commission which visited Russia, and is intended to counteract the Bolshevik propaganda amongst the Austro-Hungarian troops by exhibiting in a crude light the abyss of anarchy into which Russia by its wild Socialism has fallen. Curiously enough the pamphlet begins by admitting that the Central Powers had used Lenin as their accredited agent to weaken Russia, dissolve its political institutions, and wipe out its army […]. The Soviet rule is based on bayonets and is worse than Czarism. The Bolsheviks represent no idealist system, no civil movement, but simply terrorism and the dissolution of all civilised society […]. Bolshevik ideas must not be allowed to penetrate into the Dual monarchy. Thus this official document contains a most scathing denunciation of the Lenin rule and anarchy in Russia, and hold it up as unworthy of any civilised nation, and yet Berlin and Vienna negotiate solemn treaties, and exchange embassies with the same Lenin and his associates.

Finally, Otto Bauer, just back from Russia, had his Social Democrats abandon ‘cultural autonomy’ and advocated ‘national self-determination’ instead. This again was a device to save the Germans of Bohemia from Czech rule.97

CE 11 July 1918

Austrian Crisis

(From Mr. A Beaumont, Special Correspondent Press Association and “Daily Telegraph”).

Milan, Wednesday – I have just received through a Swiss channel the contents of a private letter from one who is in personal touch with the Emperor Charles, which explains some of the intricacies of the Austrian political crisis and the recent attacks on the Empress Zita. The writer says the Emperor Charles

97 Taylor, p.264.
tried to be what in English is called a good-fellow, and wants to conciliate everybody, but he does not realise that he is surrounded by mediocrities in politics and by powerful men who seek only their personal interests [...] Fierce attacks were made upon him openly and secretly at the time of the revelation of the Prince Sixte letter, and now an insidious campaign of obloquy has been started against the Empress merely to create personal difficulties for the Ruler and to keep him in subjection to the mysterious influence at work. The blow was struck not against the Government, but against the emperor’s position as head of the dynasty by what might be called an under Austrian camarilla, composed only in part of Austrians, and for a large part comprising secret pro-German influences. The camarilla is composed chiefly as regards its Austrian members of some archdukes and generals of the old school, who have a spite against the Emperor for his youth and his somewhat easy character. Their attacks on the Empress have so far failed to influence the vast majority of the people, who, on the other hand, rather took her part at once, because they felt that she was humane and sincerely desired peace; that she was using all her influence at Court to attain it, and in the meantime to mitigate the horrors of war. Everybody is tired of the war and wants peace, as does the empress – not a German peace, but one which will make just concessions and be based upon mutual understanding and reconciliation, of the actual belligerents. This also explains why the Karolyi Party and all the Ententeophiles in Hungary passionately took the part of the Empress, and showed it much more than is revealed in the published reports of the debate in the Hungarian Chamber. On the other hand, the Germanophile Germans of Austria and Germany, who are kept thoroughly in hand by German and Pan-German influences, pretend chiefly to express their protests against the alleged false rumours, in order to enhance the prestige of the Hapsburg rulers as a dynasty which was found to give them exclusive satisfaction [...]. I do not believe she sought to influence any Austrian statesman or general directly, as rumours all over the country asserted, still I have no doubt she is doing all in her power to influence her husband, and this excites the bitter ire of the Germans. She is the strongest advocate of an understanding with the entente, with or without Germany’s consent, but her husband unfortunately cannot break loose from German hands. Until recently the members of the camarilla above-mentioned were themselves not particularly favourable to direct German interference, but I foresee that influences will be used by Germany, especially by flattering their vanity and ambitions, and by promising them the realisation of their personal aspirations under German protection. This is how Germany extends her grip over Austria and fetters the hands of the young Hapsburg Monarch. The tenor of this letter is strongly confirmed to-day by denials which come from Vienna that such sweeping changes had been made as were announced last week by Munich papers, whose correspondents in Vienna are all violent Pro-Germans if not outright German or Pan-German agents.

98 The time of this revelation, March 1918, is generally believed to be the turning point in the already strained relationship between the Allies and Austria-Hungary. The Austrophile tendency in Western Europe and the United States diminished noticeably after Karl corroborated his support for his German comrade in arms. Cf. Kleindel, Österreich, p.310, inter alia.

99 CE 13 July 1918.The Austrian Defeat.(P:A. War Special) From the P.A. Special Correspondent), Italian Headquarters, July 10. – [...] The losses suffered by the enemy appears from a careful comparison of the prisoners’ statements to have considerably exceeded the original official figures issued by Dr.Weckerle. Two hundred and fifty thousand men represents the present estimate. Among the troops exists a growing conviction that they are being used merely as a catspaw for German ambition.
This newfound nation now had to be unified and defended, against possible attacks from without and within, for as the old order was collapsing the new had not yet been secured.

CE 21 August 1918
Czecho-Slovak Nation

Berne, Tuesday. – M. Prasek, Czech Deputy, in a recent speech to his constituents at Nymburg, said Austria has learned nothing from the war, but it has taught a great lesson to the Czecho-Slovaks nation. From the ranks of the people the Czecho-Slovak Union has been formed and placed under the control of the whole nation. The nation would stand together as one man against anyone who might insidiously attempt to undermine our solidarity. Each one of you will be at his post when called to unfurl and defend the banner of the Czech national liberty. Our strongest ally is our own people united and animated by the great idea of the nation whose component parts understand without speaking. When the decisive hour comes we shall raise the cry – “Every man to his post; now or never.” – Reuter. 100

At this time nearly all of Central Europe was exposed to the aftermath of war: unemployment, social unrest, and famine. And each nation, vanquished or victorious, had to contend with pressing problems on its own doorstep, never mind the ideologies propounded by their neighbours. 101

CE 21 August 1918
Famine in Austria

Zurich, Wednesday. – The Prague “Vecenek” says all the miners in the Proborow State mines, numbering some 2,300 men, having reported themselves ill, the doctors after examination, certified that 60 per cent of them were suffering from underfeeding and were absolutely incapacitated for work. The “Neue Freie Presse” says the number of cases of sickness and death from starvation in German districts of Bohemia increased during July last from 60 per cent to 100 per cent. The paper also furnishes statistics received from sixteen towns, which disclose a total of 1,758 cases of sickness, 40 of which terminated fatally. – Reuter.

Equally so, Russia revolutionaries were experiencing unexpected problems themselves, lacking international support on the one hand and national credence on the other.

---

100 CE 5 December 1918. Czecho-Slovaks Called to Colours. (P.A. War Special) Amsterdam, Friday. – The “Cologne Gazette” to-day publishes a telegram from Prague stating that the new Czecho-Slovak Government has called to the colours all men between the ages of 18 and 45.

101 Interestingly, Ireland was also soon to be hit by an exceptionally virulent epidemic, claimed by some to be worse than the Famine, as death came with dramatic suddenness, often within 24 hours. Cf. Ferriter, p.185: “In the midst of all this political upheaval, devastation was caused by the outbreak of the influenza epidemic that ravaged the world between the spring of 1918 and early 1919.”
CE 7 September 1918
Bolshevists & Germans

Reuter's Agency has received from a prominent Englishman who has just arrived from Moscow and Petrograd an expression of opinion on the situation. He says the Bolshevists are in truth the instruments of Germany. Their leaders are not mere Russians but renegade Jews. The leading Hebrews in Russia are as antagonistic to the Bolshevists as anyone. Trotsky is in hiding.

CE 11 September 1918
Allied Advance in Russia
(P.A. War Special.)

(“Times” War Telegram, per P.A. – Copyright.)

Vladivostok, September 4th. - [...] The unexpected exploit of the Western Siberian Czecho-Slovaks in bursting through has caused a sensation in Vladivostok. It is an event of the greatest significance, and the Japanese expedition into Khabarovsk pales into insignificance as Bolshevism at Blagovestcherisk and Kharbarovk being cut off from the West, will die a natural death. Thus the realisation of a reconstituted Russian front will be brought nearer.102

With the Eastern frontier now also open to Allied forces, the chances of German success had drastically declined. Given the circumstances, a sensible approach to peace seemed not only natural but essential.

CE 15 September 1918
London Letter
Through our Private Wire

“Examiner” Office, 2-4 Tudor Street,

Sunday night. - It is a matter of much interest, though no surprise, that Austria should have chosen this moment to make a bid for peace. It cannot be doubted that the move has been made in full conjunction with the German Government, and it is characteristic of the latter that it should have taken advantage of the fact that the Austrian Government bears less odium in the eyes of the world than does the Kaiser and his War Council. It is in effect an admission of

---

102 CE 11 September 1918. Road to Siberia Open. ("Times" War Telegram per Press Association – Copyright.) Vladivostok, September 3. – The fact that the Czech forces have virtually effected a junction and that the road to Siberia is open raises issues of the first importance. Intervention at Vladivostok was undertaken for the express purpose of releasing the Czech contingent here for operations for the relief of their beleaguered compatriots in Siberia. Intervention for the wider purpose of penetration into Serbia and the formation of a new fighting line against Germany was not primarily intended whatever the expectations may have been behind the execution of the minor plan. The Czechs to all appearances have now been relieved, and in these circumstances it is apposite to enquire whether the Allied forces new here having apparently succeeded in their immediate object of extricating the Czechs are to be withdrawn, and the Czechs allowed to retire from the Volga to the Far East, leaving East Russia and Siberia open to exploitation by Germany. Obviously it cannot be the intention to pursue so disastrous a policy, and to throw away results arising from the providential appearance of the Czechs at a critical moment. The enormous value of the new threat against Germany from the East when her power in the West is weakening is manifest, and the Allies now have a God sent opportunity to make such a threat on a grand scale. Judging by the celerity of the Czechs’ Eastward movement the Siberian railway is practically intact and with the Czech army firmly established on the Volga the concentration of a substantial Allied army in their rear is rendered comparatively simple. Military observers are insistent that the development of a new Russian army is largely dependent on the the presence of Allied forces.
defeat, but it is clearly an offer which demands close scrutiny before it could be touched at all […]\(^{103}\)

The only points to be scrutinised would be of course the nullification of military ties to the ally Germany,

CE 17 September 1918
London Letter
(Through our Private Wire)
“Examiner” Office, 2-4 Tudor Street.
Monday Night. - It is pointed out to-day by an acute critic that a good deal depends on whether the Austrian peace Note was or was not issued with German sanction […]. Briefly it may be taken for granted that the voice is the voice of Austria alone. There is no inherent improbability about this. Austria is far more war weary than Germany. The people of the Dual Empire have suffered much more, and are much nearer – if they have not already reached – the point of exhaustion. This suggests the reception of the note in an entirely different spirit from that which would be necessary on the assumption that Germany was concerned. For it would be quite possible to deal separately with Austria with a view to detaching her from her partner. And the serious questions which arise between the world and Germany do not directly arise between the world and Austria. Her position is that of an accessory after the crime- grave enough in all conscience, but still different from that of the actual criminal. At all events there seems an opportunity for the Allied diplomatists to handle. **Even if the offer had to be rejected, it could be done in such a way as to discriminate between Austria and Germany, and thus indicate to the former that the easiest road to peace for her would be by way of a breach with her neighbour […]**.

And unconditional surrender, even at the cost of total dismemberment,

CE 18 September 1918
(P.A.War Special)
New York, Tuesday. – It is generally believed that the German and Austrian military leaders will point to the American reply as evidence that they have done everything possible to bring about peace, and thus try to strengthen their people for another winter campaign. According to another view there is more than a possibility of a disruption of the Quadruple Alliance, and that **Austria, having gone through the form of proposing peace, has cleared the way for the next step – unconditional surrender on President Wilson’s terms**. - Reuter.
Washington, Tuesday. – Unqualified endorsement of President Wilson’s rejection of Austria-Hungary’s proposal for an unbinding peace discussion was given to-day by Senator Lodge, the Republican floor leader, when addressing the Senate […]. Senator Lodge declared that the Kaiser had insulted Belgium with his separate peace offer. He praised President Wilson for his recognition of the

\(^{103}\) CE 17 September 1918. Austria-Hungary’s Position. The Austrian peace move continues to evoke widespread interest and comment […]. Neither American nor British Press opinion sees in the Austrian note any genuine indication that Austria has yet developed the mood upon which it would be possible to lay the foundations of a lasting peace […].
Czecho-Slovaks, and urged going farther and recognising the Jugo-Slavs and Poles. Referring to the Poles, he said they alone could make a peaceful State in Central Europe that would forever be a bar to Germany from Eastern Europe.

In the hope of salvaging some vestige of pride and territory, Austria turned to a neutral mitigator to secure some guarantee of lenient measures in the light of its ‘defensive’ actions.

CE 7 October 1918
Enemy and Wilson.
Points Accepted. Armistice Demanded.

Berne, Saturday. – A Vienna telegram announces that the Austrian Minister at Stockholm has requested the Swedish Government to transmit to President Wilson a telegram stating that Austria-Hungary, which has never waged war except on the defensive, and has several times shown her desire to put an end to the present bloodshed, and to conclude a just and honourable peace, proposed that President Wilson should immediately conclude a general armistice with her and her allies, and open negotiations for peace without delay.

However, no-one but Austria seemed to cherish any illusions as to the future of the Empire, its obvious ruin now engendering new essence to fortify emerging nations.

CE 14 October 1918
The New Austria
(From to-day’s “Daily Chronicle.”)
(Special Correspondent, George Renwick – Copyright.)

Amsterdam, October 12th. – “There can be no doubt about it the outline of new Austria begins to be everywhere visible among the ruins.” So declares the Berlin “Lokalanzeiger” in dealing with “that thunderous voice of a great Slavdom which will stretch itself from the Dantzic to the Adriatic Sea.” Certainly there can be no doubt about it. The ramshackle Empire is in the throes of a new birth, and what one or two German papers during the past few months have endeavoured to point out to the German public, fed on official declarations, that the “Dual Monarchy is true to the German alliance,” and that Austria-Hungary would weather the storm aroused by the suppressed and oppressed nationalities, is now admitted to be a fact. Old Austria exists no longer. From all quarters come signs of

---

104 CE 5 November 1918. Czecho-Slovaks in Russia. Amsterdam, Sunday. – M. Tchitcherin, People’s Commissary for Foreign Affairs has telegraphed to the Provincial Czecho-Slovak Government at Prague, according to the “Wiener Journal,” offering to allow Czecho-Slovaks in Russia to return home after laying down their arms and to guarantee their safety. – Reuter.

105 CE 18 September 1918. Angry German Comment. Amsterdam, Monday. – The “Rheinisch Westfälische Zeitung” comments angrily on the Austrian Note [...]. After referring to “an Empire whining for peace,” the paper continues: “If representatives of the Powers do meet to discuss peace aims, the result would only be enormously to widen the cleft separating the groups, unless it be that Austria is ready for large cessions of territory. It assures the Austrians that Italy will make increased demands, and that the Entente will demand the creation of a South Slav State, and an independent Bohemian State with a Czech colouring. If Austria, it proceeds, agrees to these demands she can, perhaps, have peace, but she will simultaneously have renounced her position as a great power […].
a great approaching disruption, of the creation of a new Austria actually, and of new Slav States, free of the yoke of Vienna, Budapest, and Berlin. What the Government and the ruling powers will do is not yet clear, but a scheme is said to have been worked out by Count Silva Tarouca, Minister of Agriculture, for the formation of a new Austria on the basis of the right of self-determination. How far any such scheme will meet the conditions remains to be seen, but there are many indications that the various nationalities will take matters in their own hands.

Furthermore, President Wilson could only hope to act realistically with the full consent of the Allied nations, some of these now being reshaped remnants of the Austrian Empire.106

CE 23 October 1918
Austria and President Wilson
Amsterdam, Tuesday. – According to a Vienna telegram the newspapers there unanimously assert that President Wilson’s reply to Austria-Hungary is in no way a reply to the Dual Monarchy’s proposals, and say that President Wilson’s arguments are in contradiction to the reply which the United States Government made on September 15th to Count Burian’s peace proposal. The papers refer to the claim of the Czech National Council in Prague to be the sole representative body of the Czech nation, and they deduce from President Wilson’s recognition of the Czecho-Slovak National Council in Paris that the President rejects the demand of the Prague Council for an international settlement of the Czech question. They furthermore declare that in view of the announcement in the imperial manifesto of a settlement of the reciprocal relations between various Austrian nationalities by agreement, and the formation of a Federal State, there is no reason to connect this question of the relationship between these nationalities with the armistice question, which they say would only mean the adjournment of peace sine die.

The populace could therefore not hope for either political, financial or famine respite in the near future and social unrest gave way to revolution.107

---

106 CE 5 November 1918.Hitherto all imports into Bohemia and Moravia came through Hamburg and Bremen, consequently these countries were in a state of complete commercial dependency on Germany – a condition which must now be absolutely ended. The new States must have their own ports of entry, for Poland Danzig, for the Jugo-Slav countries Fiume, for Bohemia the Danube waterway from the Black Sea, and Fiume for Bohemia.

107 CE 2 November 1918.Red Banner Unfurled.Copenhagen, Thursday. – An Agency telegram to the “Rheinische Westfaelische Zeitung” states that all the Honved troops at Agram, including their officers, took the oath to the national Council on October 29. The disturbances in Slavonia territory have increased, and the town of Rasic (Krain) is in flames. The castles belonging to Baron Guttmano and count Pejasevich have been plundered and set on fire. Deserters are everywhere plundering and burning. – Reuter.

Further reports, which should perhaps be taken with reserve of plundering and incendiarism in Slavonia, are published in the Serbian Press.

A Budapest telegram to the “Cologne Gazette” says – Shops have been plundered at Pozega, Esseg, Pakracz, and other places belonging to Hungarians, Germans and Jews have been burned. Not only military but civilian prisoners are being released. The mob is marching on Verocze. Telegraphic and telephonic communications are interrupted and railway traffic is suspended. The Fiume passenger trains have again been plundered. – Reuter.
CE 2 November 1918
Revolution in Austria & Hungary.
Count Tisza Killed. Big Blows in West.
Though direct news is lacking, there is little doubt that grave events are happening in Austria and Hungary. **Count Tisza, who is believed to have been responsible for the war, has been assassinated in Vienna.** Berlin papers declare that a Provisional Government has been set up. A Constitution is to be drawn up excluding the Monarchy. In Budapest there is open revolution. The troops have joined the populace, and the Hungarian National Council have taken over the Government. Count Karoli has formed a new Ministry.

CE 2 November 1918
Revolution in Vienna. Emperor in Flight.
Copenhagen, Friday. – A Vienna telegram to the “Berliner Tageblatt” says a revolution has broken out in Vienna.
The National Government has resumed control of the National Congress, and has agreed to draw up a Constitution, which will exclude the Monarchy.
Demonstrations are continually taking place in favour of a Republic.108
The black and yellow standard of the Parliament building has been replaced by the National colours. The Socialist, Herr Victor Adler, has been appointed Foreign Minister of the new State Government […]. The Emperor is said to have fled to Godello Castle. Public opinion is divided between adhesion to Germany and to a German-Austrian Federative State […].109

Thus, there appeared no more to be done than to accept the new situation as dictated by the Allies, and new unblemished governments in the conquered countries would find it easier to determine the damage and assess adaptation procedures.

CE 5 November 1918
Czecho-Slovak State
Amsterdam, Sunday. – A Prague telegram says the German Consul-General called on the leaders of the National Committee and announced an independent Czecho-Slovak State, and would be pleased to welcome the Ambassador of the Czecho-Slovak State in Berlin at the earliest possible moment. – Reuter.

CE 5 November 1918
Disarming Germans
(P.A. War Special)

---

108 CE 5 November 1918. **Dr. Adler Liberated.** Amsterdam, Saturday. – The liberation of Dr. Friederich Adler, who shot Count Stuerghk, was announced at the Congress of the German-Austrian Social Democracy by Dr. Adler’s counsel, Dr. Harper. According to a Vienna telegram, the announcement was greeted with frantic applause. – Reuter.
109 CE 5 November 1918. Dr. Adler. Amsterdam, Monday. – According to a Vienna telegram to the “Vossische Zeitung,” Dr. Friederich Adler, who shot Count Stuerghk, and has now been released, has been **elected to the Party Executive by the German-Austrian Socialist Congress.** – Reuter.
A Prague telegram to the “Lokal Anzeiger” says – The Czech National Committee with the help of Czech troops is disarming German, Austrian, and Hungarian troops in the Czech towns of Bohemia and Moravia. The Czechs have obtained possession of several German towns with the help of Czech garrisons, whilst the Czech National Committee is said to intend to undertake the fresh calling up of troops. **Almost incredible helplessness is shown on the German side, both in German Bohemia, German Moravia, and Silesia.**

**CE 14 November 1918**
**German-Austrian Republic**
Copenhagen, Tuesday. – A telegram from a Vienna semi-official news agency states the Bavarian troops on Monday left the Tyrol. The State Council has laid before the National Convention a Bill providing for the proclamation of a German-Austrian Republic, adherence to the German Republic, and general suffrage. – Reuter.

One of the focal points of modification was the monarch himself, who was forced to abdicate:

**CE 14 November 1918**
**Abdication of Austrian Emperor**
(P.A. War Special)
Copenhagen, Tuesday. – It is officially announced in Vienna that the Emperor Charles has abdicated.\(^\text{110}\)

**CE 15 November 1918**
**Karl’s Abdication Sequel**
Amsterdam, Wednesday. – Vienna papers, according to a Vienna telegram, state that the Emperor’s renunciation of his rights as a ruler has resulted in the retirement of the joint Austro-Hungarian Minister for War, General Stoeger Setiner, as well as the resignation of the Lamasch Cabinet. – Reuter.\(^\text{111}\)

**CE 18 November 1918**
**Karl and Hungary**
Copenhagen, Saturday. – It is announced from Budapest that the Emperor Karl has relinquished the Throne of Hungary. – Reuter.

The Cork Examiner, as a moderate, liberal newspaper, educated its readers continually on the usefulness of judicious and temperate politics, reflected at this time in the projection of a League of Nations to consolidate Europe and prevent another world war in earnest.

---

\(^{110}\) CE 14 November 1918. Rumours of Counter-Revolution. Copenhagen, Tuesday. – A Vienna telegram yesterday says that the guards of the military commands in Vienna, the former War Ministry, the Hofburg and Schoenbrunn Castle are occupied by civil guards. The newspapers learn that the occupation took place with the consent of the Army Department in consequence of rumours of a monarchical counter-revolution.

\(^{111}\) CE 19 November 1918. Austrian Government. Copenhagen, Sunday. – A Vienna telegram says that Dr. Otto has been appointed Minister for Foreign Affairs in succession to Dr. Victor Adler. – Reuter.
CE 14 November 1918
League of Nations as Practical Politics

A League of Nations to ensure, and if necessary, to enforce peace, has long been the dream of idealist statesmen and other interested in the welfare of mankind. The idea itself defers back at least to the time of Erasmus, who [sic] treatise “A Complaint of Peace,” ranks even to-day as one of the most formidable indictments of international war ever penned, and invokes a union of people, not of their rulers, to prevent it. [One] attempt to embody the idea in concrete form was the Holy Alliance of 1815. This effort failed miserably, partly because the alliance was not sufficiently comprehensive, but mainly because it was a league merely of governments with narrow views and aims, lacking the force behind it of an international public opinion. It was indeed a league of Governments against Nations, not a League of Nations inspired by their own practical experience and moral conviction. Another step in this direction was the inauguration of the Hague Conference. There the aim was more modest. The Holy Alliance had sought by repressing nationality to prevent war, the Hague tribunal confined itself to an effort to mitigate its horrors. But it had no power to enforce its rulings and the history of this most ruthless of all European conflicts has proved to the whole world the futility of any peace tribunal issuing palliative regulations without the sanction of armed force behind them.

Within the past four years there has been a revival of the older idea of a League of Nations as a preventive of future wars. In June 1913, the first “League to Enforce Peace” was formed in the United States, and adopted proposals were at once endorsed by President Wilson. In Great Britain the main idea had already taken root. As early as September, 1914, Mr. Asquith placed high in the category of his country’s war aims “the substitution for force, for the clash of competing ambitions, for grouping and alliance and a precarious equipoise, of a real European partnership, bound on the recognition of equal rights, established and enforced by a common will.” Speaking again in December, 1917, he said, that since the entry of America into the war this league must be not only European but a world-wide partnership”; and added that such a League was “the avowed purpose from the very first; of the Government and the people of the United Kingdom of the Empire.” […]

Until a time as such an ideal could be established and anchored securely in politics and populace, the pendulum was still swinging between pandemonium and peace, equilibrium not to be truly found until about thirty years later.

CE 15 November 1918
Disturbances in Vienna

Copenhagen, Wednesday. – A Vienna telegram states that in the course of disturbances in and before the Parliament building a huge multitude was seized with panic and twenty persons were injured in the crush. The panic, however, quickly subsided. A detachment of Red Guards demanded that the German-Austrian flag over the Town Hall should be lowered, but this was not done. – Reuter.

CE 16 November 1918
Red Guards in Vienna
Amsterdam, Wednesday. – A Vienna telegram states that during the sitting of Parliament on Tuesday a detachment of the Red Guards entered the editorial room of the “Neue Freie Presse” and compelled the editors of the paper to work under the control of Communist editors. The Red Guard issued a special edition of the “Neue Freie Presse” announcing this fact. – Reuter.

The Examiner was also concerned about any allegiance the future Irish government may still have felt towards Germany, publishing an article on the incompatibility of the German and Irish races.

CE 19 November 1918

**Aims of the Pan-Germans**

The completeness of their victory in the war of 1870/2 so stimulated German national ambitions that the leaders of the people lent ready ear to the political philosophers of the schools of Nietzsche and Treitschke, who taught that the German race was sent by Providence to dominate the world in politics, trade, industry, and culture. This teaching was accepted more and more by the learned men of Germany and particularly of Prussia. [...] When Silesia, Seleswig-Holstein and Alsace-Lorraine had been annexed, the Pan-Germans directed their eyes of covetousness on Austria-Hungary. They maintained that German control of the non-German regions within the Austrian Empire was necessary for German development and maintenance of her position as a great Power. The “Alldeutscher Verband”, the most powerful Pan-German society, outlined the plan of annexations to include the Russian Baltic Provinces, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, North-Eastern France, and the Germanic Cantons of Switzerland. [...] The Kaiser encouraged the organisation and work of the “Alldeutscher Verband,” which arranged thousands of lectures and scattered millions of pamphlets to spread Pan-German doctrine. And which arranged that all the Germans outside the empire, particularly in Austria-Hungary, the United States, England and Turkey were formed into a systematic organisation for the present war. [...] The Russian defeat of 1905, the annexation by Austria of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1909, and the abandonment by Russia, France, and England of all opposition to the scheme of the Bagdad Railway led to the completion and perfection of the Pan-German plan in 1911. [...] To ensure, therefore, a reasonable guarantee that the Prussians may not again provoke so atrocious a war, and that millions of the flower of mankind shall not again be sacrificed to the Moloch of Pan-Germanism, the scheme of domination from Hamburg to the Persian Gulf must be ended. The various nationalities constituting the Empire of Austria-Hungary must be given freedom to constitute independent States should they so decide. That will provide a series of national barriers against future German aggression, and will not prejudice the legitimate interests of the German people. A fusion of any portion of Austria-Hungary into the German Empire would militate against the interests of the Allies and against the peace of the world. **The Pan-German ideal is hostile to the interests and to the ideals of all small peoples and small States.** The people of Ireland would have felt the weight of the German heel if the Allies had not been victorious. **German method and efficiency would not have tolerated the leisurely methods of the Irish.** The German Government possessed a detailed survey of Ireland under which the country would have been ruthlessly planted with German colonists, native property owners would have been dispossessed; the machine-gun would have been the soothing political argument, and the Irish
population generally would have been tolerated only as far as they seemed fit to act as “hewers of wood and drawers of water” for the advantage and glory of Germany.

Austrians themselves seemed vulnerable to the even greater threat of being incorporated into a German union.

CE 21 November 1918
Germany and Austria
In the House of Commons last evening.
Colonel Wedgwood asked the prime Minister whether he was aware that attempts had been made by German agents to drive Austro-Germans into union with Germany. Mr. Bonar Law – Yes, sir, my attention has been drawn to that matter. Rumours seem to have been spread by German agents alleging that Great Britain was trying to prevent Austro-Germans entering a union or federation, or to prevent them joining Germany if they wish to do so. These rumours have no foundation.

Against all odds, and the wishes of the privileged German-Austrian elite, the former Empire transmuted into a respectable republic, sans provinces, raw material and resources, but with a bloated administration, inflation and fatigue.

CE 21 November 1918

German Austrian Republic
Amsterdam, Sunday. – A semi-official telegram from Berlin to the Dutch newspapers states Dr. Ellenbogen has been appointed Foreign Secretary of the new German Austrian Republic. – Reuter.

As Wilson’s original plan of ensuring the right of self-determination of all peoples proved ineffectual in the face of the traditional division of the spoils of war, there was much reason to believe that national unrest was bound to continue unabated in some European regions, such as Ireland and Bohemia, and this could, in turn, tragically impede the progress of peace along civilised lines. An honest and critical contemporary look at the national questions left unanswered may have prevented the regional and future international savagery that ensued.

CE 19 December 1918
As the Germans See It
One of the many minor signs of the German Revolution is the reappearance of articles by Prince Lichnowsky in print, says the “Manchester Guardian.” He has a typical one in a recent issue of the “Berliner Tageblatt,” entitled “Problems of Peace,” in the course of which he discusses the settlement to be desired between Russia and Poland [...]. Lichnowsky strongly opposes the secession of Posen and Silesia to Poland, for, he says, it would really only be equivalent to Germany’s asking for German Switzerland or German Austria.
On the other hand, he says he is unable to support the joining of German Austria to Germany. He writes:

“The Alpine districts with their prevailing Roman Catholic population and outspoken Austrian character would only be a burden to us. Vienna has been a capital too long to be satisfied with the part of a provincial town. The geographical position, separated from us by Bohemia and Moravia, is absolutely against conjunction, which would be bound to involve us in quarrels with the Czechs, Magyars, Slovenes, and Italians. Either the new State of German Austria should stand by itself, with Vienna as its capital, or else join up with the Czechs, and perhaps with the Hungarians and Slovenes, Swiss fashion, on a Federalist basis. “In the north of Bohemia there live three million Germans who depend geographically and economically upon Austria and Bohemia, but not upon us. If the Czecho-Slovak State is formed according to the wishes of the politicians of Prague, then the Germans of North Silesia would have to submit to oppression. A complete severance of national boundaries would be difficult to establish owing to economic and geographical considerations, and is indeed also repudiated by the Czechs. The most favourable solution, therefore, would be the reamalgamation of the Alpine and Sudetic lands on a wholly new basis with a national autonomy, and indeed, including the Slovenes with Trieste, whose territory is threaded with Germans and Italians. Thereby, of course, the new State would get access to the sea. But, for the present, neither the Germans (even the Conservative clerical groups), nor the Slavs, nor the Italians in Trieste desire this. The old Austro-Hungarian policy is everywhere in disfavour, but it is possible that these people will find their way back to one another when they find that they cannot exist alone.” Lichnowsky says that there are problems that cannot be solved according to a theory or scheme, but only by compromise, provided that force is left out of the question. To these belong the Irish, the Austrian, the Bohemian, and the Polish questions.

112 CE 24 December 1918.Czechs and Bavaria.(P.A. War Special) Reuter is informed that the Bavarian Government has issued the following statement in the German newspapers: - In order to dispose of rumours spread broadcast, the source of which we have been able to trace back to clerical circles, concerning the pretended Czecho-Slovak intentions to occupy or annex Bavarian territory, and also regarding the alleged excesses of Czecho-Slovak troops occupying Northern Bohemia, we are in a position to establish authentically that the Czecho-Slovak Government has no intention to annex Bavarian territory, and thus augment our national distress. Not even a temporary occupation is intended. News announcing the occupation of the Bavarian town of Fiewith by the Czechs is nothing but an invention emanating from the enemies of the Bavarian Government. We also have been able to establish that in the districts of Bohemia where there are Germans, occupied by the Czecho-Slovak troops, peace and perfect order prevail, and between the Czechs and Germans of Bohemia a peaceful exchange of food and other commodities has taken place.

113 CE 27 December 1918.Czechs and Hungary.Amsterdam, Tuesday. – Budapest papers report that the entente High Command has fixed a demarcation line in Upper Hungary to which the Czech troops may advance. This action was taken after the Hungarian Government had failed to reach an agreement with the Czech military representatives. The demarcation line will bring the Czechs within thirty kilometres of Budapest.

114 CE 24 December 1918.Central Europe.Conflicting Claims.(P.A. War Special) Vienna, December 20. – The Cracow newspapers publish an important statement by M.Wasilewski, the Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs, regarding the Czech claims in Austrian Silesia and the Ukrainian claims in Galicia. “Poland,” he declares, “is most anxious to reach an amicable settlement with the Czechs in a diplomatic manner. The Poles especially claim territory around Spitz Annorava where the population is predominantly Polish. A deputation is shortly going from Warsaw to Prague to discuss the matter of the settlement of this question and clear up the present somewhat obscure relations between the Czechs and the Poles.” Continuing, however, the Minister did not attempt to conceal the fact that the matter at issue had reached a very critical stage. […] M.Wasilewski’s utterances regarding the situation in Bohemia will doubtless received the attention of the Czecho-
Regarding the Republic of Austria, its status and utility were indeed questioned seriously – Vienna, the capital, a citadel of civilisation in Central Europe, could at this time not concern itself solely with prestige and pretexts of power, it had to feed a starving multitude and lacked the traditional breadbasket of Bohemia, itself blasted and starved.

CE 20 December 1918
Future of Vienna
(Press Association Foreign Special)

Vienna, Dec. 17th. – The future fate of Vienna and of German Austria is one of the main subjects of consideration and discussion in this capital. I have had a prolonged conversation on this subject with a high official, who represents the views of what are now the leading Government circles here. In reply to questions, he said a return to the monarchical system was, in Austria, out of the question. The Dynasty had lost nearly all its popularity during the war, whilst Republican ideas had made extraordinary progress, even in the remotest parts of the country. Added to this, the mass of the people was certainly not inclined to contribute to the cost of keeping up an expensive Royal Court after the enormous financial sacrifices entailed by a most unhappy and calamitous war.

It should be understood that Vienna is the heart of German Austria, and consequently all that relates to the commerce and prosperity of this part of the old Austrian Empire is of burning interest. On this matter the high official said: “German Austrian industries require capital in the form of raw materials and machinery, which only Germany can supply. The industries of German Austria were developed in full reliance upon the demands of a large home market. Her paper mills, her leather and woodware manufactures, her agricultural machinery and engineering works and especially her electro-technical establishment are all of a magnitude sufficient for the requirements of a great Empire. The entire German Austrian market would be quite unable to absorb such an output as they give. The former markets of the monarchy will probably no longer be open to German Austrian manufacturers unless the situation materially changes. The Czecho-Slovaks, the Poles, the Hungarians, and the Jugo-Slavs will all erect Customs barriers tending to exclude German Austrian goods. Besides this Austria will have to meet formidable Czech competition in Poland, and will also be shut out of the Bohemian market in all commodities manufactured in both countries owing to the cheaper cost of living in Bohemia and the proximity of coal supplies. The German Austria industries are crowded into her easternmost corner, a circumstance which is unfavourable alike for the import of raw materials and the export of her manufactures to western countries. Apart from the magnetite ores in Styria, German-Austria is poor in natural resources, whilst her stocks of raw materials are at present more depleted than those of any other country in Europe. Only close union with Germany can produce credit for the cheap raw material which the country requires to save her from her currency difficulties. Other nationalities – The Yugo-Slavs, the Italians, the Poles, the Transylvanian Rumanians – are all to be permitted to achieve their aspirations. Why should not German-Austria also be allowed to decide her own fate. As for German imperialism being strengthened by Slovak President, Professor Masaryk. The entire Polish Press agrees that the next step rests with him.
this is absurd. German imperialism is a dead power. The Junker class is destroyed, and a union with German-Austria would only tend to increase the democratic pacifist forces in Germany. [...] Regarding the Peace Conference the official said: “German-Austria’s programme for the Peace Conference has already been determined upon in principle – the right to self-determination of her individual States and to self-determination in defining her territorial limit, and in the settlement of her internal affairs. This means in short that she should receive all her territories of the old monarchy clearly inhabited by German-Austrians. She asks for no historical, no geographical, and no strategical frontiers, and as regards the settlement of disputed districts she suggests a plebiscite held under the control of neutrals.\textsuperscript{115}

Though disarmed, Vienna still possessed its disarming charm, and fortunately the Allies were prepared to help those left most wretched in the winter of 1918. The Red Cross and British Mission offered aid readily to Austrians and Allied citizens alike, liking also to stress the benevolence was bestowed upon deserving people, so unlike their northern cousins.

\textbf{CE 21 December 1918}

\textbf{In Vienna.}

\textbf{Appalling Conditions.}

(P.A. War Special)

\textbf{Vienna, Dec. 19th.} – Colonel Summerhayes, Chief of the British Mission to the prisoners of War in Austria-Hungary, to-day visited the principal hospitals in Vienna, where he found an appalling condition of affairs. Starving mothers are unable to nurse their infants, who, unable to obtain other milk, are literally dying by hundreds. The mothers are also entirely without swaddling clothes for their babies, who are wrapped in rags, and frequently only in newspapers. Colonel Summerhayes telegraphed asking the Red Cross to send immediately aid to those unfortunate people.

Another batch of British civilians interned in Austria-Hungary will leave Vienna for England on December 27\textsuperscript{th}. \textbf{They all say they have been exceedingly}

\textsuperscript{115} CE 24 December 1918. Peace Conference. Right of Peoples to Dispose of their own Destinies. (P.A. War Special) Paris, Monday. – The “Matin” says it is able to set forth the stages by which the Society of Nations will be established. Its constitution, the journal says, will comprise three articles as follows. In the first place the Governments of the Entente are in agreement among themselves on the principles of a Society of Nations, and have laid down the fundamental rule – the right of peoples to dispose of their own destinies. It is probable the Entente will pledge itself to include the limitation of armaments and compulsory arbitration in the terms of the peace preliminaries. This appears from the statements made by M.Clemenceau to the Bureau of the French Association and its President, M.Bourgeois. The second article provides for the notification of the enemy Powers of the fundamental principles inscribed in the peace preliminaries, and for demanding their adhesion to these principles without discussion. The third article will be drawn up subsequent to the signature of the peace treaty, when a world conference will regulate the new relations between the peoples. Neutrals will be admitted, but no nation will be regarded as a member of the Society of Nations, or have equal rights with other nations, unless it gives guarantees which are considered satisfactory. Germany will only be considered the equal of other nations when she has discharged her debts, and besides collective penalties against the German people, the question of individual penalties against the Kaiser and other responsible persons will be settled. In the meantime, the other peoples united by former plegdes will create a world peace, and institute an international tribunal which will, as far as possible, do away with the spectre of war.
well treated by the Austrians and Hungarians alike. Col. Summerhayes says that throughout his visits to the military prisoners and interned civilians he received only one complaint of ill-treatment. There is a marked contrast between the stories told by British prisoners coming from Austria and those from Germany, who say that even now the Germans are treating them just as brutally as at any time during the war, keeping them at work in the mines and factories. They are starved, and their food parcels never reach them.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁶ CE 24 December 1918. Starvation in Vienna. (P.A. War Special) Vienna, December 20. – After visiting some of the poorer districts of Vienna, Colonel Summer Hayes, the Chief of the British Red Cross Mission to the prisoners of war in Austria, says it is his deliberate opinion as a doctor, that unless food is sent to Vienna immediately at least 200,000 people out of a total population of some 2,250,000 will die as soon as the cold weather sets in. Vienna, hedeclares, is not on the verge of starvation, but is actually starving, and people are now dying like flies. During the whole of his fifteen years medical experience in India, he says that he never witnessed such sights as he has seen in Vienna to-day.
9. Ireland and the Austrian Empire after The Great War  
Part VI – 1919

At the beginning of the year, in Berlin, the so-called Spartacist revolt breaks out as German Marxists attempt to seize power. This Bolshevik revolt is suppressed by the right-wing Freikorps militia and Spartacist leaders Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg are murdered. The constant threat of communism has many Europeans incline towards political parties of the extreme right. The Peace Conference opens under the chairmanship of French Prime Minister Clemenceau, in whose wake the League of Nations will attempt to lay the foundations for world peace. Settling the terms of peace with Germany is the first challenge. The Weimar Republic appears to return Germany to its former glory of humanism and learning, yet another revolt in Munich, again suppressed by the Freikorps units, creates a haven for right-wing nationalists dedicated to the destruction of the Weimar regime. Though the means of communication have been improved, the Allies also are unable to cooperate in seeing through the terms of peace signed by Germany and Austria respectively. The national questions left unanswered in 1918 continue to exact a toll on lives and liberty. In Ireland, Sinn

---

1 CE 7 January 1919. Wireless Telephony. By the time peace is signed we shall be talking across the Atlantic by wireless. One day in the not far distant future, I think, we shall walk about with wireless telephones – they are very small and light – attached to our bodies, and we shall be able, staying, say, in Picadilly Circus, to call up a friend who is flying somewhere. Or one may have an invitation by wireless telephony from a friend flying in France to join him at dinner in the evening.”

These are some of the prophecies made by Mr. Godfrey Isaacs in an interview with a representative of the “Evening News,” as to the future of wireless telephony. […] It will be possible for important speeches to appear in the press simultaneously all over the world without the present delays. Communications for trade and industry will be greatly expedited, and there will be a big saving of time and of money in consequence.”

2 CE 2 January 1919. Perusal of the latest Irish-American papers to reach this side of the Atlantic leaves no doubt, whatever, as to the intense interest which our brethren over there are taking at present in the fate of Ireland. The general feeling amongst the Irish-Americans appears to be that all the pressure possible should be brought to bear on President Wilson to get him to insist on the Irish question being settled, outside or inside the Peace Conference, to the satisfaction of the majority of the Irish race. A contributor to the “Chicago Citizen” examines the question: “Can President Wilson get the Peace Conference to take cognizance or jurisdiction of Ireland’s plea for freedom of self-determination.” The writer of the article is evidently under no delusion as to the difficulties which Wilson would have to overcome to insist on the settlement of the Irish problem, but having considered its many aspects, arrives at the conclusion that the President can succeed if he only tries. The only question that remains now for answer is whether the President will take such a course. The Irish-Americans seem quite optimistic on the subject. We do not seek for a moment to minimise the immense influence which they wield in the States, and their good will towards Ireland cannot be questioned. President Wilson, too, is undoubtedly sincere in concern for the freedom of all small nationalities; but to paraphrase M. Clemenceau’s words, we are living much nearer England than our friends in America, and have, perhaps, a more intimate experience of the methods which English politicians and diplomats adopt to out-maneuvre and circumvent well-intended reformers and idealists. Judging from his public utterances President Wilson is a convinced advocate of open argument and an opponent of secret treaties and understandings. Secret diplomacy has been too long
Féin members who have been elected to Parliament refuse to take their seats in Westminster and proclaim an independent Irish Republic with its own parliament, the Dáil, in Dublin. A Republican attack on policemen in Co. Tipperary marks the start of the Irish War of Independence, its army, the Irish Volunteers, now renamed the Irish Republican Army (IRA). This Anglo-Irish War is a campaign of guerrilla attacks on the representatives of the Crown, mainly the Royal Irish Constabulary (RIC), who are seen as enforcing Britain’s illegal rule in Ireland.

CE 1 January 1919
Editorial
The year that commences to-day gives promise of great happenings which may influence not only the fate of Europe but of the whole civilized world. The outlook is anything but clear, and even the most daring of political prophets, or the most adventurous of crystal gazers would scarcely attempt to forecast with assurance what the year 1919 has in store for mankind. An armistice has succeeded the greatest war in the world’s history, but the work of concluding a peace based on justice, and one which give security for the future, still remains to be done. Unrest in various forms has manifested itself in different European countries, and the established in England to be discarded in a hurry. Diplomacy, like every other trade, has its vested interests, and these will not readily agree to radical changes in the system of intercourse and communication between Governments. All available strings will be pulled to keep the Irish problem out of the Peace conference, and to misrepresent the Irish delegates should they find an entrance. At the same time it is gratifying to find the Irish-Americans have not been hoodwinked by all the anti-national propaganda conducted amongst them for the past eighteen months, and that they are still faithful to the cause of the land of their ancestors. It is to be hoped that their efforts to get President Wilson to handle the Irish question may be successful.

3 CE 2 January 1919. Nationalists and Parliament. A Dublin message says: - There appears to have been no ground whatever for the suggestion recently published to the effect that the Nationalists returned to represent Irish constituencies at the election would probably resign for the purpose of leaving a clear field to the Sinn Féin Party. Inquiries made in quarters where the mind of the Nationalist members is generally understood elicited the response that if they refused to take their seats they would place themselves in the same category with the Sinn Féiners, and their action would be regarded as an acceptance of the Sinn Féin policy, to which, on this point, they have always been opposed. Members of the Nationalist Party have expressed the intention of taking their seats when Parliament assembles.

4 CE 2 January 1919. Sinn Féin Warning. “Prepare for Dark Days.” Our Dublin Correspondent, writing last night at Ballina, Mr. Conor A. Maguire, agent for Dr. Crowley, M.P., said the people of this constituency and the people of Ireland must not think that by the victory recorded at the polls in Ireland all has been done. You must remember that you have got to steel your hearts and prepare for dark days ahead, because there is no doubt whatever that if England can she will by every means in her power, crush and break us if we let her, and therefore I say to you that you must not look for the fruits of Sinn Féin to-day or to-morrow, next year, or the year after; but as you have stepped forward to take part in marching towards freedom, you must be prepared to continue to march, no matter how long the way or weary the struggle, till our freedom has been achieved.

5 Cassell’s Chronology, pp.485-487.

6 CE 22 January 1919. Bolsheviks Expelled from German-Austria. British Soldiers in Vienna. (From the Press Association’s Special Correspondent) Vienna, January 21 – The presence of a number of Russians in Vienna has long been a source of anxiety to the German-Austrian Government, which suspected them of carrying on a Bolshevik propaganda. To-day 47 Russians, who were found to be adherents of the Bolshevik party, who were in Vienna as a commission for the relief and exchange of Russian prisoners of war, were formally expelled from German-Austria, and sent by way of Hungary and the Ukraine to Russia. Three waggons loads of clothing and a million crowns, which they refused to take with them, were handed over to the Danish Red Cross.
dawn of 1919 finds the world restless and disturbed like a throbbing sea over which a violent storm had passed. Nothing is now precisely the same as it was a year ago - values have altered, man’s outlook on life and living has changed, old systems have been scrapped, old politicians and statesmen no longer wield the power they formerly held, the world may be said to be in a state of flux, and new ideas are superseding those which did service in less strenuous times. […] While Europe is thus reforming itself and preparing for the Elysian days that are to come, or which at any rate the optimists hope can be secured by the prevention of wars in the future, and the recognition of the rights and liberties of individuals in all countries, there is no sufficient reason why as an earnest of her good intentions and as evidence of her bona fides, Great Britain should not adopt methods with regard to Ireland and Irishmen that would make her position at the Peace Conference somewhat less humiliating than that position owing to her dealings with this country and judged by the ordinary standards of justice would otherwise necessarily be. While **Martial Law exists in Ireland and untried Irishmen remain in English gaols**, the position of Great Britain at the Peace Conference championing the rights of small nations would obviously be too paradoxical for such an astute politician as Mr.Lloyd George to attempt to justify. […] A general amnesty of the Sinn Féin prisoners in English gaols would be an act of justice, and though some may not regard it as such, as these prisoners have never been afforded as open trial, still their release now would only be in keeping with the spirit of the times – an act that even from the Government’ point of view, and with the Peace conference in sight, would be desirable. […] Count Plunkett has already been

---

A Budapest telegram to the “Der Abend” of Vienna, states that the French General Bartholomy has arrived in Budapest to investigate the **Bolshevist peril in Central and Eastern Europe**. Troops are already collected in Northern Italy in readiness to be despatched under the command of General Bartholomy to various centres, especially Poland. Naturally these must proceed by way of Hungary in which case the greater part of Hungary, including Budapest, will be occupied. A detachment of the Warwickshire Regiment, which brought Lord Cavan’s food tram to Vienna last week, to-day returned to Italy. During their stay the British soldiers have been most hospitably received in Vienna. The regimental band gave a concert on Sunday in the presence of a crowded audience for the benefit of a fund for providing free breakfasts to Viennese school children. The officers of the regiment afterwards entertained the Burgomaster of Vienna and prominent State officials to dinner at the hotel Bristol. A football match arranged between soldiers and the Vienna Football Club for Sunday afternoon had to be postponed owing to the wet condition of the ground.

7 CE 22 January 1919.**Germany and Ireland.** U.S. Charge.New York, Monday. – The Federal Grand Jury have indicted for treason a man named J. William Robinson, who is alleged to have carried messages in invisible ink between a man named O’Leary and other persons in the United States, and German agents in Holland. One message from O’Leary and John L.Ryan asked Germany what assistance she could give the Irish Revolution. Germany replied that she sympathised with Ireland, but suggested deferring action until the Peace conference, when Germany would support the Irish claims. Robinson was formerly connected with O’Leary’s newspaper. The charges against him maintain that he conveyed the letter mentioned above to Holland in April, 1917. He was indicted along with O’Leary, Ryan and others on the charge of treason on June 7th, 1917. To-day’s indictment, however, first disclosed the details of the case against him. O’Leary is still confined in Tombs Prison. Ryan is believed to have fled to Mexico. His absence is given by the Government’s attorney as the reason for the delay in the conspiracy trials. – Reuter.

8 CE 2 January 1919.**Hunger Strike at Mountjoy.** Wiring last night our Dublin Correspondent said – Eamon Corbett, County Galway, who was sentenced to five years penal servitude recently, went on hunger strike for some days, after committal to Mountjoy Prison, where he is at present confined pending transfer to Maryborough. He has been removed to the prison hospital. His condition is said to be not serious. It is stated that he has not been asked to wear prison garb. Three other Sinn Féin prisoners brought from Derry, who went on hunger strike, are also receiving hospital treatment in Mountjoy.
released and reached Dublin yesterday and it may be hoped that the Government will be wise enough to act similarly in the case of the prisoners still detained.\textsuperscript{9}

9.1. The Republican Campaign

The post-1916 British government responded to Irish republicanism in the context of a world war: an administration directing the largest army in British history, having executed some rebels in 1916 and avoided others at the ill-fated Convention of 1917 and 1918 boycotted by Sinn Féin. The government had developed a picture of republicans as misguided, if not unintelligent, which was not publicly modified until 1921. The Irish populace, in turn, were experiencing an unprecedented unity through frequent raids and searches, commemorations of 1798, the Boer War, and, of course, the Rising itself. The leading lights of the Sinn Féin movement left uncaptured were forced underground and intensified their determination to break police intelligence systems.

Their clandestine activity underlined the simplicity of the attitude evident in the London \textit{Daily News} in 1919 whose contributor wondered whether a ‘respectable’ group of idealists at the top would be submerged by grass-roots hot heads with little grasp of the reality of power politics. […] Walter Long\textsuperscript{10} was crucial in convincing the government in the autumn of 1919 that any offer of dominion status would be transformed by Sinn Féin into complete separation, depicting them as extremists to be crushed rather than coalition to be persuaded to compromise. The problem with British policy was that heavy-handed tactics to deal with the so-called extremists merely brought more so-called ‘moderates’ into Sinn

\textsuperscript{9} CE 1 January 1919. An anniversary takes place to-day for which the vast majority of the Irish people all over the world will feel no reason to rejoice. This is the anniversary of the Union of Ireland with Great Britain. On the first day of January, 1801, the formal legal union of the two countries began, and few events occurred during the past 118 years to disunite them more than this “triumph” of the Pitt-Castlereagh policy. It is a strange irony of history that no section of the Irish people were more strenuously opposed to the Union than the Ulster Presbyterians and Episcopalians, who now allow themselves to be led by bigots in opposition to its dissolution. The immediate effects of the Union on the economic and social life of the country has been often related, and there is no necessity to recount them here. Suffice it to say that for three-quarters of a century the common people of Ireland were impoverished, while England increased in prosperity by leaps and bounds. The Union certainly did not bring to Ireland the benefits promised by its promoters. It had nothing to do with the establishment of religious liberty; that only came when the common people under the leadership of O’Connell determined to have freedom of religion. The Union did not bring about the amelioration of the lot of the agricultural population. That was brought about by the strenuous policy of Parnell and Davitt, followed by Redmond. The Union did nothing for the education of the common people. This was only taken up by the State when it perceived that the voluntary system, or rather systems, did not tend to train subjects “loyal” to the English connection. And the system of primary education established by the State failed to achieve the main object of its promoters – the transformation of Irish pupils into good English children.

CE 1 January 1919.\textbf{Cork Explosion}.No developments have arisen in connection with the explosion at the monument to the Boer War dead in Connaught Avenue on Saturday night, but so far no arrest has been made.

\textsuperscript{10} Prominent British Conservative M.P. and spokesman for southern Unionists.
Féin’s realm, making a mockery in Irish eyes (and ultimately, beyond Ireland) of the idea that the government was involved in extending protection to a law-abiding majority against violent corner-boys.11

In reality, the campaign that turned into a war was, as most wars, a mixture of bravery, bluster, and brutality, coinciding with strategic planning and the support of the population. The flawed military tactics of the British establishment caused widespread revulsion, and their ineptitude to read the Anglo-Irish problem correctly lead to racial and religious prejudice reminiscent of nineteenth century politics. Even viceroy Lord French seemed sincerely convinced that the Irish race was ‘peculiarly liable to be influenced by their immediate environment,’ so that Irish people had to be freed from ‘the terrorism of the few self-seeking hot heads.’12 In March 2003 the Bureau of Military History opened its files to researchers, a massive collection initiated in the 1940s, compromising 1,773 statements of those involved in the revolutionary era from 1913 to the Truce of 1921. These have allowed historians to trace regional histories as well as developments within the IRA, the role of women and cultural organisations in the wider context of social and political upheaval. The attitude of the Catholic Church may also be reassessed through these statements, many defensive in tone, but unlikely to deliver concrete information particularly as contributor during the ensuing civil war. The involvement of the Catholic Church at this time was as ever a delicate one, with senior clergy often reluctant to comment publicly on events,13 defending the rights of prisoners, yet tentatively diffusing the causes provoking violent reaction, such as the death of hunger strikers in British gaols.

CE 2 January 1919
Bishop Hallinan’s Letter
A public meeting was held on Tuesday night at the O’Connell Monument, in the Crescent, Limerick, Rev. J.A.O’Connor presiding. The meeting was arranged on short notice to protest against the treatment of the Belfast political prisoners, and there was a large attendance, including local bands. At the opening of the proceedings the following letter was read from the Bishop, Most Rev. Dr.Hallinan: - Corbally, Limerick, 31 December, 1918.

11 Ferriter, p.232.
12 Ferriter, p.220.
13 Ferriter, p.197: “Fr.Michael O’Kennedy, a prominent Sinn Féin activist, was later to comment that ‘it is a pity to mix up Sinn Féin in that land question. Of necessity questions of land, food, and industries turn up, but all are of secondary importance and none must obscure our objectives.’ The practicalities of politics wer thus remived from the theory and thekind of propaganda contained in de Blacam’s What Sinn Féin Stands For when he wrote of ‘distributivism’ – the system which Catholic social workers proposed in opposition to communism and capitalism. This was, he maintained, distinct from religious dogma so that even ‘an aetheist can admire it.’”
Dear Mr.O’Mara – The meeting to which I am invited, but at which I cannot be present, commands my full sympathy. It is, I am informed, to protest against the gross breach of the promise made by the Government in Ireland on the sad occasion of the death of Thomas Ashe, that in the future political prisoners in Ireland would be treated as such, and not be compelled to associate with ordinary criminals. This promise has, it appears, been flagrantly broken in the case of the prisoner John Doran, now in Belfast Jail, and this breach of promise has led to the present very serious state of affairs there. As you are aware, since I spoke my first words in public in favour of the Sinn Féin policy I have more than once warned its followers to beware of two scares, namely, armed rebellion and secret societies. Sinn Féin is an open, clean and legal movement springing from the very hearts of the Irish nation, otherwise it would not have swept the country as it has in the elections just over. Now deportations and continued imprisonment in British dungeons on a bogus charge without trial or semblance of conviction of the leaders of that movement and the degradation of more of them, such as that of Mr. Doran in Belfast Jail, are calculated to stir to their very depths the feeling not only of Sinn Féiners, but of every right-minded person who loves justice and fair play. There is, I believe, a unison of feeling, which is becoming every day more intense, amongst the masses of the Irish people at this continued injustice and breach of faith of the British Government towards the political prisoners which even their best advisers may find it hard to restrain. I fervently hope that such will not be the case and that Sinn Féin, which has during all these months, in the face of great provocation, displayed such common sense, self-control and splendid discipline, will continue to be true to itself. At the same time I take this opportunity of solemnly warning the Government that there are limits to the powers of human patience and endurance. – Yours faithfully, D.Hallinan, Bishop of Limerick […].

No resolution was adopted. The Irish National Volunteers were a strong body in attendance, and after the meeting was concluded they marched to Bank Place. Everything passed off quietly.

Many of the revolutionary generation, and it was indeed a revolution of the young, had grown up on a diet of propaganda and literature emphasising Ireland’s exclusivity in the annals of heroism and culture. Historical fiction conjured up romantic fantasies of the landscape, the ancient Celtic nature of the inhabitants and the racial traits specific to a Gaelic and Catholic nation: A civic rather than individualistic tradition where ownership of land was central. This was conducive regarding tourism…

CE 10 January 1919
Ireland for Holidays

The manager of a tourist agency in London told a “Chronicle” representative that many inquiries are coming in about Irish tours, the reason, doubtless being that the Continent is barred for the purpose. “Whatever the Irish may think of the English politically,” he said, “they are always charming to English tourists in their delightful land. Hotel accommodation has improved greatly in recent years, and for people who want an entire change of surroundings in quiet, restful spots, with opportunities for golf and fishing, Ireland is just the place.”
… as well as establishing national assertiveness in the wider aspect of world culture,\(^{14}\) and indeed establishing the Gaelic tongue as national language.

**CE 15 August 1919**

**“No Language, No Nation”**

Sir, - It is nearly five months since the Sinn Féin Leader sent the following letter to the Irish people – “To save the national language is the special duty of this generation. The ultimate winning back of our Statehood is not in doubt. Sooner or later Ireland will recover the sovereign independence that she once enjoyed. Should we fail, a future generation will succeed; but the language – that must be saved by us or it is lost for ever.” Any Irishman who read that great and historic message from this man, should surely do all in his power to learn Irish. I regret to say that there are many men who advocate the Sinn Féin policy who never think of learning Irish. There is something more necessary than waving flags and playing dunce. No man can say he is really an Irishman unless he has upon his tongue the language that God gave as a gift to our ancestors, and unless he has the spirit of that language in his heart and in his mind – the language St.Patrick used, the language of St.Bridget and St.Colmbkille, the language of Red Hugh and Owen, and of Pearse, McDonagh, and Tom Ashe. Perhaps it is not yet too late to ask those who do not know Irish to start a branch of the Gaelic League in their respective districts, especially now when the nights will be getting long, and do something at least to revive our own sweet musical tongue. I would ask parents who can speak Irish to speak nothing else but Irish to their children, as the children who learn Irish from their parents have by far a greater advantage and a better knowledge of Irish than those who learn Irish at school, and, above all, let them say their Rosary in the same tongue as our noble ancestors said it in other days. […] - Fear Eireannaig [“an Irishman”]

Besides the language, a code of ethics was central to the Sinn Féin agenda. Temperance was a key issue, and had been for some time, and would now be grounded in the law. The courts system established by the Dáil was very similar to that in operation under the British administration, and by June 1919, instigated by Arthur Griffith as early as 1905, national arbitration courts were present in every county, ranging from civil to criminal courts, parish and district courts, circuit courts presided over by a judge, and a supreme court in Dublin. However, the issue of law and order became increasingly difficult due to a preponderance of vigilantism, causing ‘utter confusion in distinguishing between the authority of the IRA and the republican police force (IRP) when it came to such issues as the

---

\(^{14}\) CE 30 December 1918. The Irish Issue in its International Aspect.[] Amid the nations of the world the Irish are unsurpassed in the sum of their distinguishing characters of speech, race, customs and traditions. They take historical precedence over all nations, except the nations of Greece and Italy; they inhabit a country unique in its geographical separateness from all others and greater in area than Greece, Serbia, Switzerland, Denmark, Holland or Belgium. Ireland contains more people than Greece, Switzerland, Finland, Serbia, Denmark, or Norway. Unless the word nation has lost its traditional significance and has become a term of opprobrium conferred only upon peoples hitherto fighting in the service of the Central Empires, Ireland is a nation.
enforcement of the licensing laws.'\textsuperscript{15} The courts could not, under the circumstances, have effectively tackled the social problems of the era but they certainly managed to contain them temporarily, regarding foremost in their work on licensing laws, property and protecting women from abusive language. Temperance was advocated by many religious activists, and a resolution was drawn up by the Catholic Total Abstinence Federation in June 1919, expressing the hope that ‘the paralysis of British rule in Ireland does not allow Ireland’s worst domestic enemy, the liquor traffic, to tighten its stronghold’.\textsuperscript{16}

\begin{flushright}
CE 21 June 1919
Catholic Total Abstinence Federation.
The September Congress.
At the quarterly Executive meeting it was definitely decided to hold the Second Triennial Congress of the C.T.A. Federation in the Mansion House, Dublin, on the 9th and 10th September. The sermon at the opening High Mass in the Pro-Cathedral on Tuesday, 9th, will be preached by the Most Rev. Dr. Codd, Bishop of Ferns. A public meeting will be held in the Round Room of the Mansion House on Tuesday night. The programme for the two days’ sessional meetings will include the following papers – A paper in Irish by Eoin MacNeill, T.D.E., on “The Nation and the Drink Problem”; a paper on “Woman’s Place in the Temperance Movement,” by Miss Catherine Mahon Birr; a paper on “The Social and Labour Aspect of the Drink Problem,” by Mr. J.P. Dunne; a paper on its Medical and Health Aspect, by Dr. D.T. Barry, Cork; a paper on “Temperance Teaching in Schools,” by Rev. R. McCullen; and a paper on “The Prohibition Movement and Temperance Legislation,” by Rev. Dr. Dineen, Charleville. About a thousand delegates, representing affiliated T.A. Societies throughout the country, are expected to take part in the proceedings. […]
\end{flushright}

National and international recognition of the Irish nation was another key element in the newly politicised country. Through the Irish revolution and Civil War, the definition of ‘Irish nation’ was not a generous one, and the Irish were no more ‘blessed’ or ‘noble’ than their European counterparts, with up to 25 million people enjoying minority status after the First World War, the most notable examples being Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.\textsuperscript{17} Sinn Féin postponed arraying the disparities between nationalism and republicanism until after independence had been secured.

On being elected President of Sinn Féin on 25 October 1917, Eamon de Valera had insisted he stood for an Irish republic as a monument to the dead, and that an Irish republic was the pious wish of every Irish heart. But the key aim was

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{15} Ferriter, p.201.
\textsuperscript{16} Ferriter, p.204.
\textsuperscript{17} Ferriter, p.191.
\end{flushleft}
the international recognition of an Irish republic – de Valera insisted that, having achieved that, the Irish people should be allowed to decide on whatever form of government they wished. If they got a republic, he insisted, they could agree to differ afterwards. It is doubtful during these optimistic days that anyone foresaw just how savage these disagreements would be. But de Valera’s discourse drew attention to two things that were to be again controversial: the need to secure international recognition, particularly in the context of the changed post-war world, and the question of the commitment to democracy.\textsuperscript{18}

Regarding international recognition, although fobbed off by Wilson at the Peace Conference, \textit{Irish-American involvement} in Irish politics was a credible and financially resourceful fact.

CE 3 January 1919
An Irish Settlement.
American Workers’ Resolutions. Appeal to President Wilson.
The Central Federated Union of New York, the largest body of representatives of Organised Labour in the United States, at its regular meeting, passed strong resolutions in favour of Self-Determination for Ireland.

[We] hereby resolve
1. “That we appeal to President Wilson, on the eve of his departure for France, to take part in the forthcoming Peace Conference, to bring before that body the claim of Ireland to National Independence, and to demand for her people the right of Self-Determination, to which he has repeatedly declared that all peoples are entitled, and to secure which for the downtrodden populations of the Old World he has proclaimed to be one of America’s objects in the war. […]

2. “Belgium, Serbia, and Rumania, whose territory was overran and occupied by the forces of the Central Powers, have been cleared of the invader; the Poles, \textit{Czecho-Slovaks}, Jugo-Slavs, and Lithuanians have been liberated by the victory of the United States and the Allies over Germany and Austria […].

Irish nationalism had become a mass movement in America by 1920, but owing to the disputes between Irish-American factions\textsuperscript{19} a lot of contributions raised towards the Irish cause never reached Ireland’s shores. One must stress here also the lesser known European empathy with Irish problems. The hunger strike of Cork’s Lord Mayor, Terence MacSwiney, attracted international attention, for example in France and Spain. As an instance of French perspective, Henri Béraud wrote of a hunger strike he witnessed in Cork at the same time as MacSwiney’s hunger strike in London:

\textsuperscript{18}Ferriter, p.193.
\textsuperscript{19}Ferriter, p.198: “The Friends of Irish Freedom, established in 1916, claimed nearly 300,000 members by 1919, while the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, founded in 1920, had 700,000 members by 1921. A much smaller group, the Irish Progressive League, kept the Irish republican cause alive in the face of increased governmental intolerance and US entry into the First World War.”
On a September evening, I mingled with the crowds of the faithful who were praying in front of Cork Prison, where twelve Sinn Féiners, refusing all food, were waiting for death. It was a medieval sight: the crowd were kneeling in the rain, in the mud; thousands of mothers carried their infants in the folds of their black shawls; the entire crowd [...] were singing hymns gently and poignantly. In the first row, at the very foot of the prison walls, were six or seven cowled Franciscan monks, girt with rope belts; tall and strong-looking, these tonsured giants were beating time with their black crucifixes. [...] Then the monks left and the crowd hurried after them. If an English soldier were touch one of these clerics, it would have meant instant death. Once, apparently, a policeman dared place his hand on the shoulder of an ‘Irish priest’. He was immediately killed.20

9.1.1. The Opening of the Dáil

While it may be argued that the word ‘revolution’ does not really hold true for this period in Irish history, it has also been credibly argued that the social changes brought about by republicanism caused Ireland’s major social and political institutions to revise their programme21 to such a degree that the profound alterations to Irish political organisation merited the term. With the absence of Labour representatives, the first Dáil represented the lower-middle-class establishment, its Democratic Programme ambiguous regarding land distribution and modern industry. The Programme did reflect some elements of Utopian Socialism, as a mark of respect to James Connolly, but British sanctions inhibited financial autonomy during the War of Independence.22

Many of the revolutionaries were low- and middle-ranking government employees whose information was essential for Collins’ intelligence network. Tom Garvin suggested that many of the putative revolutionaries had also been profoundly influenced by their primary school teachers [...]. Teachers were chronically discontented and also thoroughly subordinated. They were spread about the country and had a pervasive effect on the young and in the long run on the general political culture of the entire nation [...]. This was one reason why so many ordinary people got involved. It was also the case, as pointed out by David Fitzpatrick, that not all could take to the hills: ‘as long as there were cows to milk,
hay to save and women to order about, the vast majority of volunteers would have to remain part-timers.\textsuperscript{23}

Analogue to the representative elite, there was little middle- or upper-middle-class participation in the ranks; neither very poor nor very well off, but a central stratum of plain people, abundantly young, literate, unmarried, practicing Catholics. Cork volunteers in particular tended to be sons of publicans and trades people, few unemployed or casual labourers.

CE 21 January 1919

The National Assembly.

To-day’s Opening Meeting.

Our Dublin Correspondent wired last night: - In connection with Dáil Eireann, which opens at the Mansion House tomorrow at 3.30, there were hundreds of callers at the Sinn Féin headquarters in Harscourt street to-day, the demand for tickets being so great at an early hour notices had to be posted up in the entrance hall intimating that no more tickets of admittance were available for members of the public. The M.P.s, of F.D.Es (Feisire Dáil Eireann) as they will be known in future, have each been supplied with a number of tickets, and their immediate friends alone occupy a large share of the available accommodation.

From a newspaper point of view the proceedings will be unique as far as gatherings in Ireland are concerned. French, American, Dutch, Belgian, South African and Canadian newspapers will be represented by special correspondents. Nearly all the leading English newspapers have sent special reporters, and they are already on the spot. It is estimated that between 50 and 60 journalists will be present. The proceedings will be conducted partly in the Irish language, are expected to last about two hours, after which an adjournment will take place to a date to be fixed by the Assembly. The Dáil Eireann will open with the election of a Speaker. The word speaker, however, will not be used, but the Irish equivalent. A committee having been appointed to arrange Irish titles for the different offices afterwards.


A Press Association telegram says – In connection with the opening of the Republican Parliament in Dublin to-day, one thousand tickets have been issued to visitors. The proceedings, which commence at 3.30 o’clock, are expected to occupy a couple of hours. The opening portion of the business will most probably be conducted in Irish, but at a later stage the English language will be employed during the discussion of several matters embodied in the programme. The programme includes the drawing up of the Standing Orders to regulate procedure,

\textsuperscript{23} Ferriter, p.197.
ratification of the appointment of delegates to the Peace Conference, a declaration of independence, and a message to the free nations of the world. 24

CE 22 January 1919
Editorial
Dáil Eireann

The Irish historian of the future will, no doubt, regard the 21st January, 1919, as a date that marked a turning point in the political history of this country – a new departure that influenced Ireland’s outlook and helped to mould her fate. The opening of An Dáil Eireann yesterday must be regarded as a political event of the first importance, as it connotes the breaking away from the methods that secured the full adherence of some of the greatest Irishmen of the past half century, and the establishment in Ireland of a Constituent Assembly as an alternative method of dealing with the country’s affairs. If the Assembly at the Mansion House in Dublin yesterday be merely regarded as the end of the latest chapter of Irish history, which is a record of constitutional effort ending in British pledge-breaking and the holding up of the Act that remains on the Statute Book as documentary evidence of the insincerity of British Ministers in their dealing with Ireland, it still ranks as an event of the first importance, marking the parting of the ways. It demonstrates to the world that Ireland no longer places any confidence in the pledges of British Governments or of British Statesmen, and that she openly declares that their juggling and bad faith have warranted her in discarding the constitutional methods that have been associated with the names of Butt, Parnell, McCarthy and Redmond.

Not alone did the Dáil declare a lack of faith in British policies, it immediately became active in establishing Irish agencies abroad to counteract British propaganda on its ‘domestic affairs’ and secure a hearing for Irish interests

---

24 CE 22 January 1919. London Letter. (Through our Private Wire) “Examiner” Office, 2-4 Tudor Street. Tuesday Night. - Considerably more space is given in the English Press to-day to the Dáil Eireann, and a good deal of interest seems to have been awakened among the public to the parallel which a number of morning papers make with the act of Sir E. Carson and his confederates in September, 1913, when they declared their Provisional Government established in Belfast. The “Westminster Gazette” draws the moral once that a declaration is urgently needed from the Government of its Irish policy, especially having regard to England’s position at the Peace conference. “The delegates,” it says, “not only from the United States, but from Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, are all conscious that the Irish question affects their policies at home, and they would all welcome some settlement which would placate Irish opinion.” I might say that I have found in Irish circles herea good deal of satisfaction this evening not only at the fact that all went smoothly at the proceedings in Dublin, but also at the declarations officially made at the Dáil Eireann. One who has been for many years associated with the constitutional movement, and is by no means a Sinn Féiner, observed to me that he considered it by no means a disadvantageous thing that Ireland’s full claim (“which, of course, was the basis of every Irish movement,” he added in parenthesis) should once more be re-stated, and related by a body entitled to speak with authority. “I have never at any time,” he said, “ceased to believe that there is only one solution of the Irish difficulty that is inevitable, and that is a friendly partnership with England, by which Irishmen will have complete control of their own affairs, and yet have very close relations with the country whose interests are necessarily so closely allied with theirs. Even if an Irish Republic were actually in operation to-morrow I believe it would be only a stepping stone to that solution. But that is no reason why England and the rest of the world should not hear the truth frankly told, that no Government has or can have any shadow of right to rule in Ireland unless that has the consent of the Irish people, and that consent the British Government has never had.”
in even regions remotely concerned. The following is a copy of a Dáil report on foreign policy successes since its establishment in January 1919:

**Dáil Eireann Report on Foreign Affairs**


Dublin, June 1920

The work of the Department of Foreign Affairs does not lend itself easily to the presentation of a detailed report. The following is however a brief summary of the most important of its activities since last session and any further information which members may desire will be given verbally.

**Paris:**
The work of the delegation in Paris has for the most part consisted of propaganda work amongst the French Press and People. The strongest force in France at present is the fear of Germany, and although England’s actions in connection with the Treaty of Versailles and the negotiations following upon the Armistice have aroused distrust of her in the French mind, the fear of Germany is so great that France is very anxious not to break with England. Hence official France is not prepared to take the side of Ireland in her present struggle. The Paris Press is for the most part governed in its outlook by the prevailing official viewpoint and is accordingly very guarded in its expressions on Irish questions. In the provinces, the Press exercises enormous influence; the views of the peasantry are largely derived from their paper. Generally speaking the French Peasant knows very little about Ireland. Your delegation has been engaged by means of special articles, by the supply of items of news-interest, the correction of false reports by English propagandists, interviews with journalists and editors etc, in an endeavour to induce the French Press to adopt a friendly tone in dealing with Ireland. Their efforts have so far been attended with considerable success. A number of influential Paris and provincial papers have from time to time been induced to publish articles of a very useful and informative character and the general tendency to accept British slanders as correct is rapidly decreasing. To meet the international situation and to supplement the work of the Paris mission, arrangements have been made to supply needed information and to attack the source of English misrepresentations by getting directly at the representatives of the Foreign Press in London. This activity comes however more properly under the head of Propaganda. An ambitious scheme of establishing a press bureau in Paris in connection with the French delegation was suggested by Mr. Duffy, but it has not been found practicable to undertake this — mainly owing to the difficulty of securing suitable French assistance for the purpose. [...]  

**Italy:**
Mr. D. Hales, the Consul in Italy, has done a very large amount of propagandist work in the Italian Press. The tone of the Press of Italy is very friendly, and the papers are very willing to publish material about Ireland, but there as in France, false statements about our Cause are introduced under cover of ‘news’ and are contested daily by Mr. Hales. On the occasion of the beatification of Blessed Oliver Plunkett, a delegation consisting of Count O’Byrne, Professor Stockley and Art O’Brien and I as a member of the Ministry went to Rome on behalf of the Dáil to represent the Government of the Republic at the beatification ceremonies. Sean T. O’Kelly and Mr. D. Hales also took part in the delegation. The effect of this official

25 Available online [http://www.oireachtas.ie/viewdoc], 01.02.07.
visit was very useful and was of great assistance in counteracting a very strong British campaign which was for some time being carried on in Vatican circles. Members will already have realised from the British Press that high hopes had been based upon this campaign, and that very great disappointment has been felt by the enemy at its failure. I was also received by the Pope in private audience, and His Holiness showed an acute and lively interest in the affairs of Ireland.

Other European Countries:

So far beyond an endeavour to secure a favourable press for Ireland which has been more or less successful in Switzerland, Spain and other Countries, no great progress has been made. The position in Germany has hitherto been such that it is very difficult to make much headway. A number of our most suitable pamphlets have been translated into German for the purpose of circulation in Austria, Germany, Switzerland and in the other German-speaking Countries.

The Ministry are of opinion that the time is now ripe for appointing Consuls and diplomatic agents in various European Countries with a view to preparing the way for the presentation of a formal demand for recognition, and acting on the advice of the President, they will ask you to select a number of suitable persons for such posts, and to make the necessary appropriations for the appointment of such agents in Russia, France, Spain, Italy, Austria, Denmark and Switzerland. The President is very anxious that the Delegation should proceed at once to Russia, and a proposal in connection with this matter will be laid before the House.

United States:

The President as the members are aware, is still in the United States. He has made a tour of practically the entire country and has been received everywhere with great enthusiasm. In addition to his tours, and to the launching of the Bond Drive, he has busied himself in keeping the Irish Claim before the Congress of the United States. The Presidential election campaign is now in full swing and is claiming his attention. He attended the Republican Convention held in Chicago a few weeks ago, and laid before them the Irish demand. [...]

Your representative in the Argentine Republic was, shortly after his arrival, conscripted under the Military Service Acts of that country. He has now, however, been released from service and is endeavouring to organise Irish opinion there. He is much handicapped by the want of a suitable paper to educate public opinion. He has laid before the Ministry a proposal for the establishment of a Review to be printed in Spanish for this purpose. The Ministry are in communication with the President regarding this project. In conclusion I wish to say that the President has expressed himself as extremely satisfied with the manner in which the fight has been carried on in Ireland during his absence. The constructive side of the activities of the Dáil and the ever increasing extent to which they are assuming the functions of a de facto government is one of the greatest arguments for Recognition. So far a formal demand has not been presented to any country, but the opportunity for this may occur very shortly. The numerous resolutions of local public bodies pledging their allegiance to the Dáil will be of great value in support of such a demand.

Socialism may not have had a solid base in Irish politics, but it could no longer be ignored on an international scale. In the US, for example, most leaders of Irish-American associations were lawyers, but Irish-American labour groups were also active for Ireland when at the period in question, 1916 to 1920, US trade union
membership had doubled.\textsuperscript{26} Europe was more acquainted with organised labour and the International Labour Conference of 1919 attracted also Irish media interest, if only in a self-serving manner.

CE 3 May 1919

International Labour Conference.
Self-Determination for Ireland.

Our Dublin correspondent wired last evening – Mr. William O’Brien, Secretary of the Irish Labour Party and Trades Union Congress, states that a telegram has been received by the party to-day from Amsterdam announcing that the Permanent Commission appointed by the Berne International Labour and Socialist Conference has unanimously passed a resolution demanding that the principal of self-determination must be applied to Ireland immediately, and reaffirming the right of Ireland to political independence if so determined by the free equal adult and secret suffrage, without any military, political or economic pressure from outside, without reservation or restriction imposed by capitalist or imperialist governments, and influenced by the power of any force of occupation, and calling upon the Peace Conference in Paris to make good this rightful claim.

The Irish labour movement faced not only class prejudice but the difficulty of integrating class conflict and ‘redistributivism’ within the national movement solely concerned with cultural and racial unity.

Likewise the partition of the country militated against an alliance between industrialised craft workers and semi-skilled and general workers, which as a feature of other parts of Europe in the early decades of the twentieth century. In the context of labour history, the shipyard workers of Belfast represented the greatest concentration of unionised skilled labour in Ireland, numbering 36,000 in 1919, though unionist leaders had successfully moved in 1918 to establish a unionist labour organisation in order to stem an independent labour movement challenging its political hegemony. This occurred because it was recognised by unionists that the Northern labour force was a highly complex social group with many divisions and antagonisms.\textsuperscript{27}

Returning to more mundane matters at home, after ‘the laughter that greeted Edward Carson’s name in the roll call of the first Dáil in January 1919 came the serious business of wrestling administrative control from the British government, under what were essentially emergency conditions.’\textsuperscript{28} The statements collected by

\textsuperscript{26} Ferriter, p.198: “The Irish-American Chicago Federation of Labour, for example, condemned the execution of Irish republican ‘prisoners of war.’ Despite a bitter history of racial conflict between Irish and black workers in the city, there was some support for a boycott campaign of British goods and blackdockers joined a strike in the wake of the death of Terence MacSwiney. In 1919, a rally of 8,000 Polish-American workers in the stockyards of Chicago unanimously called for the recognition of the Irish republic, while James Larkin was also active in the States in perpetuating the memory of James Connolly.”

\textsuperscript{27} Ferriter, p.215.

\textsuperscript{28} Ferriter, p.199.
the Military Bureau also revealed a widespread naivety concerning the position of Northern unionists,

CE 3 May 1919
Mr. Arthur Griffith and Ulster

Mr. Arthur Griffith, M.P., speaking at a great Sinn Féin meeting at Lisnakeen, at which Rev. Father Caulfield, C.C., presided, said they were fighting to renounce the British Parliament. The great argument was that if Ireland left the British Parliament, Ireland would no longer be heard of in the world. **Who would say that Ireland has not been more heard of in the world since the last election than it had been in the past?** Ireland was now one of the great determining questions of international interest. It was agitating America and France, and was being discussed in Italy and other parts of the world. It was regarded as a **problem equal of Bohemia and Poland**, and they intended to keep it so. They were not going to compromise. **They were going to stand for the same principles that Bohemia and Poland stood for.** They in Ireland were entitled to have the question settled on the basis of national independence (cheers). Dealing with the Ulster opposition, he said under an independent Ireland Ulster would be guaranteed equal rights and opportunities with the rest of Ireland, but no ascendancy and no privilege. They would give them equality, but ascendancy must go for ever. Never in their history were the Irish people nearer to the achievement of their freedom than they were to-day. They had only to maintain the same spirit of quiet, calm courage and restraint and brainy activity that Ireland had shown for the past few years. **“Maintain that,”** said Mr. Griffith, **“for the next few years and the fight is won.”**

CE 23 August 1919
Situation in Ireland

**“Carson and Carsonism Dominate”**

Dublin, Thursday. – In his letter from Dublin to the “Daily News” Mr. Hugh Martin speaks of a “feeling abroad that there are things (possibly dreadful things) to be found behind the veil, and if the world knew about them history might be different,” but asserts that “there is nothing except the evil things that are bound to be there under the existing regime, and those evil things are pretty equally distributed among the governors and the governed.” **“The reappearance of a sensational symptom like the Easter Week Rebellion is,”** he continues, **“in the opinion of all competent judges improbable. True, the Volunteers who represent the physical force side of the Sinn Féin movement are exceedingly restless. Largely owing to the stories of harsh treatment brought back from prison week after week by the innumerable men who spend a large part of their time under lock and key, but the Sinn Féin Executive, which has sufficient sense of responsibility to oppose useless slaughter, still has these young fellows well enough in hand to prevent anything worse than local outbreaks. How long it will continue to exercise that control if a policy of provocation is deliberately indulged in by the Castle – a contingency than can never be quite disregarded over here – remains to be seen,**

---

29 Ferriter, p.201: “The heightened profile of the Irish situation was also a reflection of the exhaustive work being done by the department of publicity and propaganda, which had its origins in the aftermath of the 1918 election. At this time, a foreign-relations committee of Sinn Féin had been formed to prepare a series of pamphlets on various aspects of the Irish question. By the summer of 19121 they claimed an *Irish Bulletin* was being sent weekly to 900 newspaper world-wide.”
for, unfortunately, the Executive is largely composed of second rate men, a number of the ablest adherents of the movement being either in gaol or 'on the run.'

By far the most important factor in this matter of the Volunteers, as in other connections, is the Government’s Ulster policy. Carson and Carsonism dominate Ireland. If Carson is permitted to reorganise his Provisional Government and its armed forces while the Gaelic League is suppressed in Clare and Irish members of Parliament have to live like hunted animals no executive sitting in Dublin will be able to prevent trouble. The very threat of a reconstitution of the Ulster Army has, I am told, doubled in some districts the weekly enrolments in the Irish Volunteers. That is, of course, precisely what the Orangemen calculated. By merely standing at their arms (or as near their arms as General Hackett Pain thinks it expedient that they should get at the moment) they can do much to raise the South and West is suicidal rebellion. See how Orange Covenanters hold Nationalist Ireland in the hollow of their hands. It was Sir James Campbell, legal advisor to the Ulster Provisional Government, who as Lord Chancellor signed the latest proclamation in County Clare; it was General Hackett Pain, one of the same “Government’s” military advisers, who signed the recent proclamation in Derry, it is Field Marshall Sir Henry Wilson, another military advisor, who controls from Whitehall the British army of occupation. Mr. Bonar Law leads the British Parliament and Lord Birkenhead the British Bench. Can anybody wonder if rebellion is fashionable? Against these violent inducements to violence there is set one thing – hope. America keeps hope alive in Ireland. If Ireland – and I speak now of all Nationalist Ireland – did not believe that England will ultimately be forced to yield under pressure from America hope would give way to despair, and from despair would spring, not submission, but a nightmare fury of blind rage. America is doing us that inestimable service. But to yield what? Englishmen ask. Complete separation. A sovereign Republic? Only those who do not know the unpublished

---

30 CE 26 June 1919. From To-day’s “Daily News”. By Special Arrangement (Through our private wire). Plans of De Valera. Loan for the “Irish Republic”. New York, Wednesday. – Mr. De Valera’s visit means the end of Sinn Féin influence here, and the only fear is that his blunders will injure genuine American sympathy with the legitimate Irish cause. To begin with, newspaper men have forced him to confess that he is an American citizen, and not an Irishman, and this point has an important bearing on American sentiment. His mother, Mrs. Wheelwright, married a second time, and is pure American. Next, in asking for L1,000,000, half of it to be raised here, he cannot guarantee the interest which is to be payable six months only after the British troops evacuate the country. American journalists are naturally much interested in this proposal. For the first time De Valera has had to face cross-examination. He denies that he has received Russian or German money. When asked whether the suggested loan would be a violation of American laws leading to serious complications with Great Britain, he replied: “The law of humanity is more fundamental, and I would appeal to that. When municipal and international laws conflict with humanity I regard them as no law.” He was asked: “Will American money obtained through bond sales be used to buy guns for the Irish Volunteers?” He answered: “It will be used for the Irish Republic,” and when pressed to say whether this included the maintenance of a military establishment, he answered: “It will be used for the full administration of the government of Ireland.” These statements would appear to indicate the intention to foment trouble between the United States and Britain, and it is significant that newspapers like the “New York Times,” which most earnestly desire Anglo-American friendship, are giving de Valera the greatest prominence, and emphasising the pronouncements, while in the current issue of the “New York Call,” which is Socialist, he is left severely alone. All this does not affect the fact that the Irish question ought to be settled. Organs like the “Evening Post” and the “New York Times,” which attack De Valera, even suggesting that he has German sympathies, urge Great Britain to establish Dominion Government. With the signature of peace, all friends of England here hope that this will be done. – P.W. Wilson, “Daily News.”
details of recent Irish politics ask the question seriously. Ireland demands a Republic and will accept a Dominion. The evidence is conclusive.31

An Irish National War Memorial was not particularly high in the agenda of the newly installed Irish government. Given their origins in the Easter Rising, it seemed improbable that the Dáil would consider the erection of a monument remembering the Irish who fell in a British campaign a pressing issue amid their own agendas. Yet the Cork Examiner, an early advocate of voluntary recruitment, is not slow to publicise the intention of honouring those who gave their lives to liberate small nations such as theirs.

CE 26 June 1919
Irish War Memorial
Viceroy’s Appeal.
We have received the following: -
There is a great desire amongst the people of Ireland to signify in an unmistakable way their pride in and their appreciation of their brave fellow-countrymen who have fallen in the war, and it appears to be the universal wish than an Irish National War Memorial should be erected for this purpose. His Majesty the King has been graciously pleased to express his sympathy and approval in the movement and his deep interest in the scheme here outlined. It is proposed that the Irish memorial of the great war should perpetuate the name of every fallen Irish soldier or sailor or airman, that it should be an imposing structure which will be worthy of their memory and a building closely identified with the life of living soldiers and sailors.

CE 21 August 1919
Ireland’s Part in the War
Meeting in Dublin.
A meeting was held in the Dublin Chamber of Commerce in support of the Irish national war memorial. […] The Chairman explained the object of the meeting which, he said, was to give an opportunity to the members of expressing

---

31 CE 1 September 1919.Irish Situation.Mr.G.B.Shaw’s Suggestion.Mr.G.Bernard Shaw, in a letter to the “Irish Statesman” says his conviction is that the way to help Ireland is not to propose solutions, but to draft a Bill, and continues: - “A centre Party ought to be founded by a group of men of all opinions except the rigidly Conservative-Unionist opinion which, being fixed and published, does not seek discussion. Its organisers should follow the precedent of the Convention (which is also the normal order of public meeting on the Continent) as to the first stage of their proceedings: that is, talk all round the subject without being tied by resolutions. But they should not, like the Convention, be free to run away from their work when they were tired of talking, leaving the chairman to save their face by pretending, with his well-known literary charm and skill, that they had arrived at a conclusion when they had flatly refused to do anything of the sort. They should pledge themselves to sit until they had produced a draft Bill, That Bill would be the answer to the English complaint that we were asked what we wanted and couldn’t or wouldn’t say. It would be the programme of the Centre party which, until the Bill existed should have no programme. It would be a Dominion Bill, a Federal Bill, a Nationalist Bill, and International Bill, a Sinn Féin Bill, and an Ulster Bill. And it would also be a sort of bill that could never have come out of these sections separately – in short, an Irish Bill. The end of that would be that it would be an English Bill too.
their sympathy with and give support to the Irish National War Memorial which the Lord Lieutenant had inaugurated. **Surely if ever a cause ought to appeal to Irishmen it was this memorial.** The Lord Chancellor complimented the members on their war-work, and said that thanks to their recruiting efforts the city and county had contributed by no means an unworthy proportion to the troops for the struggle. The history of the war, he proceeded, would contain no more creditable or honourable record than that of the Ulster and Irish Divisions – All those units of the Inniskillings, the Dublins, the Munsters, and the Connaught Rangers, and the others whom they might recall. Nor did he think a finer glory could ever be preserved as an inspiration and incentive and hope for the future generations of Ireland than in the record short but glorious of the Pals’ Brigade, and the unselfish devotion and outstanding sacrifices of Redmond, Kettle, and O’Neill (applause).

It was left to the discretion of later generations to honour these dead and for bereaved families, ‘the rituals and monuments which assuaged grief elsewhere in the United Kingdom were often denied them.’

The war was soon perceived as the wrong war, fought in the wrong place, and against the wrong foe – a view which became political orthodoxy as Sinn Féin won a victory over the Home Rule party in the general election of December 1918, and was set in tablets of stone when, after three years of terror and counter-terror, the Irish Free State was established on the ruins of the British administration. Irish ex-servicemen were not on the whole subject to vendettas, though some did suffer at the hands both of the Black and Tans (recruited by the British government to fight the war against the IRA) and the IRA itself. Nor did they seek to form a special political group, though some of them joined the IRA. Most of them inclined towards Labour and socialist politics. Their urban recruiting origin in any case rendered them marginal in an Ireland where the countryside has, at least until very recent times, shaped the character of Irish politics.

Closing thus the chapter midway on the Irish revolution, the following article recognises the omens of evil times to come most clearly, Ireland’s Dáil will be driven underground, the Black and Tans unleashed, and the population will experience not only the claw of colonialism relinquishing its grasp, but in its stead the merciless closure of national discussion in the Civil War.

CE 1 September 1919
Nearing a Crisis
Hints from a London Paper.

There are, says the “Globe”, indications that the Irish situation is moving towards a crisis. It is established that there is a considerable movement of troops from England and from Germany to Ireland, and it is suggested that this is taking

---

33 Irish Independent, 1 July 2006, Review, “‘A Hero - At Last.’ 90 years ago today this Irish boy lost his life on the Somme. He was but one of thousands.”
place in conformity with a decision by the Irish Government and the War office to increase the military strength to the extent of two divisions. We confess that this seems a much more likely theory than the suggestion that troops are being sent thither merely for convenience of demobilisation. That, as Mark Twain observed on a famous occasion, is “very pretty, but too thin.” Again we read of a “mystery ship” laden with munition for Sinn Féiners, and of a watch being kept in the Liffey and around the coast. We note also that the Ulster Unionists, alert as ever, project a series of political meetings next month throughout the province by way of a campaign against Home Rule. While we do not necessarily attach to these various events an exaggerated importance, we are constrained to regard them as signs of opinion on the spot, if not as portents.

9.2. The Republic of ‘German’ Austria

Self-determination for nations applied only to what were considered to be viable nations: culturally, and certainly economically […] The inhabitants of rump Austria almost unanimously desired integration into Germany, because they simply could not believe that a small state such as theirs was independently viable as an economy (‘lebensfähig’).

Ethnically motivated and ideologically titled, ‘German’ Austria, the amalgamation of the provinces left unclaimed by Wilsonianism, could not immediately inspire nationalist fervour and for some time the population displayed symptoms of profound confusion and apprehension at their lot. And while the Allies dismembered the monarchy, the familiar figure of German might could neither offer hope nor inspiration, itself in the throes of post-war political trauma.

CE 3 January 1919
German Austria.
Question of Union with Germany.
Amsterdam, Tuesday. – A Vienna telegram says: - The movement in German Austria towards union with Germany has become much weaker than it was a month ago. So long as Germany remains under the Socialist reign of terror there can be no question of the Tyrol, Vorarlberg, Salzburg, and other Austrian districts allowing themselves to be united to Germany.36 Recently the idea has been

35 Hobsbawm, p.32, who continues: “It is only since 1945, and even more since decolonization, that we have made way in the community of nations for entities like Dominica or the Maldives or Andorra.”

36 CE 7 January 1919. “Society of Equals.” German Austria’s Future. (P.A.War Special) Amsterdam, Monday. A Berlin telegram says – Count Von Brockdorff Kantaa, the German Foreign Secretary, in an interview with the representative of the “Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung,” made the following statement regarding the speeches of the French Foreign Minister, M.Pichon, and the future of German Austria: - M.Pichon has openly declared that France will not tolerate the union of German Austria with Germany. There was nothing in M. Pichon’s speech as to how the special qualities of individual nations could be rendered most serviceable to the welfare of mankind, for which the whole world yearns. The idealistic forces, just those which base their hopes for the German-speaking countries upon the right of self-determination of peoples, believe that the phrase of might, which also means right, can have no place in the new world, in whose reconstruction they would like to collaborate and which they understand as a society of equals. Incompatible with this,
coming more and more to the fore of the possibility of a loose union of the religions\(^{37}\) which hitherto made up the Dual Monarchy. That would mean an Austria-Hungary in a new form, in which neither the Germans nor Hungarians, but the Slavs, would have the leadership. - Reuter.

Regardless of how the elite might manage future affairs, the immediate problems facing the population in the whole of Europe were far more humble in design. Mere want of food and manpower was the gravest concern to be dealt with, and although the prospect of famine was shared by all, new frontiers and loyalties had to be overcome to come to grips with the threat of starvation.

The situation in Europe at the time of the armistice was one of unexampled misery and confusion. The vanquished Empires had crumbled to pieces and the new Republics had yet to acquire authority and confidence. And meanwhile, with government all over central and eastern Europe at its lowest point of experience and efficiency, with loyalties uncertain and divided, with frontiers fluctuating and unsettled, and with exhaustion as the last surviving ally of social order, a task was imposed upon philanthropists and statesmen calculated to strain and indeed to overpower the remedial resources of mankind. Eight million young men, the best and most vigorous of their generation, had been killed in the war. A greater number had been permanently disabled. Equally, if not more, serious, were the losses consequent upon starvation, malnutrition, and disease. Particularly were these evils terrible in Russia, where the horrors of cholera, typhus, and food shortage were aggravated by revolution and continuing war: but they were great all through central and eastern Europe, […] in Austria, where, since the factories were devoid

however, is the suggestion that the Slav nations should reserve the unrestricted right of self-determination while it is refused to German Austria. The Note of German Austria to the Entente appears to me therefore permeated with a spirit of sincerity in which the right of self-determination for German Austria is unambiguously claimed. If every German in the empire to-day stands shoulder to shoulder with the Germans of Austria in this demand it is not the idea of power or of any alliances which prompts him, but he is inspired by the consciousness of a common spiritual treasure, which was acquired by long historical development. If the Entente really wants a lasting peace of right, conciliation, security, freedom and self-determination of nations it will not be able to oppose such a fraternal union. The German Austrians are, therefore, assured of the full moral and political support of the German nation and the German Government in their endeavours. A national Assembly will form a basis. The desire of the German Government to meet the wishes of the German-Austrian people is shown in the projected regulation concerning elections to the German National assembly, which gives the German Austrians living in the German Empire the right of voting for the German National Assembly.


CE 21 August 1919. Planning a Catholic State. According to a Budapest telegram in the “Zwaefahrblatt,” [sic] the alleged plan of the ex-Emperor Karl to form a big Catholic State, compromising German Austria, Bavaria, and the remainder of Hungary, has been discussed during the last few days in Budapest political circles, and more particularly by Monarchists. The plan is said to have been received with sympathy at the Vatican, and a lively agitation for its realisation has already been begun in Bavaria, the telegram asserts, under the direction of monsignor Maglione. – Reuter.
of coal and raw material, every poor home was menaced by the spectre of famine […] 38

A special role in the alleviation of hunger and associated distress in Austria and the new Slav states was borne by the British Mission. 39 Originally created to mitigate the hardships of British citizens and p.o.w.’s on enemy territory, the Mission soon undertook the task of feeding both friend and foe in a spectacular example of humanitarianism and enlightenment. Although it must be added that the relief brought to Austria and its former provinces is qualified by the same insistence on Austrian national characteristics which have accompanied this motley assemblage since Metternich and, indeed, beyond.

CE 7 January 1919

British Mission in Austria

Vienna, January 4th – The administrative work done by the British Mission to the British prisoners of war in Austria, under the command of Major Bethell, R.F.A., deserves wider recognition than it has hitherto received. In the short time since the mission was despatched from Lord Cavan’s headquarters in Italy it has been called upon to perform multifarious duties requiring tact, infinite patience, untiring energy and organising capacity. […] Arrived at Vienna the Mission immediately undertook the relief of the British interned ex-war prisoners and of the British colony in Vienna which has suffered greatly from lack of food during the war. The prisoners of war and the interned civilians were nearly all sent home free of cost by special trains supplied with food. The Mission is now feeding over 200 persons daily, sending rations to those unable to fetch them from the depot. The British motor lorries carrying food are surrounded by crowds of Viennese who freely express their envy of the British, whom they see getting such food, and for nothing. Well-to-do persons, even princesses in jewels and costly furs come to the depot begging the Tommies to sell them food. Among the crowd gathered at the depot this afternoon were haggard fathers of families, careworn teachers in their bare clothing and cheerful jockeys – many of them seemed unable to realise that such good things were being given away by the British Government. It was pathetic to see an elderly father of six who was eagerly packing into a sack the week’s rations of his family, weep and say “God bless you” to the corporal in charge when the latter told him there was nothing to pay. The heartiness and simplicity and the entire absence of red tape with which all this work was carried out was remarkable. These rations consist of sugar, jam, flour, cheese, bacon, pork and beans, veal and ham, condensed milk and biscuits. Upwards of a hundred French citizens in Vienna are also being supplied with these rations. […] Major Bethell says that the mere appearance of the Mission is sufficient to quell disorders though its members go about unarmed. Their popularity is almost remarkable. In Vienna on New Year’s Eve, Major Bethell and Captain Fitzwilliams were surrounded in the Graben

38 Fisher, p.1156.
by the traditional Vienna New Year’s crowd which danced around them while some of the women embraced and kissed the officers.  

CE 10 January 1919
Inter-Allied Council for Relief.
(P.A.War Special).

The Associated Government have decided to establish a supreme Command, consisting of two representatives of France, Italy, the United States and Great Britain, to deal with the questions of food, finance and shipping resources, in relation to the revictualling and supply of liberated and enemy territory, and to co-ordinate such supplies with supplies for Allied and neutral countries. [...] As regards Austria-Germany, an Inter-Allied Commission has been at work for some time, Sir William Beveridge of the Ministry of Food, being the British representative, and has met representatives of Vienna and of the Austro-German territories at Berne. The Commission has since proceeded to Vienna and Prague. The food situation in these territories is serious, and is rendered the more serious by transport and financial difficulties.

CE 10 January 1919
Bohemia Affected.

Amsterdam, Wednesday. – Meetings of a revolutionary character have been held at Prague. The Cabinet had a long council in consequence of the food scarcity. – Central News.

Hobsbawm argues that nationalism was victorious in the formerly independent nationalities of belligerent Europe, ‘to the extent that the movements which reflected the real concerns of the poor people of Europe, failed in 1918.’ Here the middle and lower middle classes of the oppressed nationalities were able to establish themselves as the ruling elite of the new petty states. Thus, national independence without social revolution and linked to Allied victory was a feasible compromise. However, in the defeated or semi-defeated belligerent states no such fall-back position existed and their collapse led to social revolution. These often

---

40 CE 9 January 1919. Feeding Europe. Washington, Wednesday. – Mr.Hoover cables that 1,400,000 tons of foodstuffs are required to feed the European populations so far investigated, until next harvests. Milk fats and meat shortage are greatly impairing the health of the people and infantile mortality is appalling, the menace being aggravated by the threatened spread of Bolshevism. He specially instances the serious situation in Finland, the Baltic States, Servia, Jugo-Slavia, Tyrol, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Armenia and the Czecho-Slovaks. – Reuter.


42 CE 3 March 1919. Czecho-Slavs Famine. Reuters Agency is informed by the Czecho-Slovak Legation that, according to the journal “Ceske Slovo,” Prague and the entire Czecho-Slovak Republic are on the verge of famine. Flour, fat, vegetables and meat are nowhere obtainable. All stocks are exhausted and the population cannot hold out until the new harvest.
short-lived soviet republics were not to be found among the Czechs and Croats, ‘but in Germany, German Austria, Hungary – and their shadow rested on Italy.’

CE 21 January 1919
Situation in Austria.
Issue between Republic and Anarchy. (P.A.War Special)
(From the Press Association’s Special Correspondent).
Vienna, Sunday – Speaking at an election meeting in Vienna Burgomaster Herr Weiskirchner said that the most urgent question was no longer whether there should be a Republic or a monarchy, but the issue was between a Republic and anarchy. Everything must be done, he said, to erect a bulwark against Bolshevism. If by Easter the wave of Bolshevism should have swept further west, culture and civilisation would be buried for decades, perhaps even for centuries. Vienna might again become the bulwark for the whole of Western Europe and in that case the Entente might be thankful to her. The Burgomaster added that the difficulties of this transition period have been increased through the shortage of food, and the number of unemployed in Vienna, which is growing every day, and is now estimated at 80,000, including 30,000 women. The perils arising from unemployment are greater than those attendant on the shortage of coal or bread. Unless the Entente soon raises the blockade our outlook will be gloom indeed.

It is interesting to note what Henry Wickham Steed, editor of the influential Times, has written in his memoirs on the Peace Conference in reference to the American angle on Bolshevism in Russia. While Western Europe was busy plotting Austria’s political future to their own advantage, the most westerly Ally was immersed in higher politics of its own. Recognition of the Bolshevist government

---

43 Hobsbawm, p.130: “Nationalism there re-emerged not as a milder substitute for social revolution, but as the mobilization of ex-officers, lower middle and middle-class civilians for counter-revolution. It emerged as the matrix of fascism.”
44 Cf. Gábor Bátonyi, Britain and Central Europe, 1918–1933 (Oxford Historical Monographs/ New York: Clarendon Press/ Oxford University Press, 1999). In a review of his book it has been stated that the popular belief persists that for Britain between the wars, Eastern European countries were ‘far away places about which Britons knew nothing.’ However, Bátonyi's monograph cites numerous British Foreign Office personnel thought and insight into the peoples and problems of Central Europe after 1918. For Bátonyi, Foreign Office talk of "Central Europe" expressed a wish to treat the fragments of the former Habsburg Empire as one territorial unit, tracing his argument in three parallel case studies of British policy to Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. While some historians have more recently stressed that Britain had clear goals at the postwar peace conferences, Bátonyi finds confusion and contradiction in Whitehall, occasionally relieved by the ‘pet projects’ of influential individuals. Thus Hugh Seton-Watson's "New Europe" group was bent on thwarting German schemes for Central Europe/Mitteleuropa, and the British military representative in Austria, Sir T. Montgomery-Cunninghame, pushed for a Danubian confederation. On the whole, however, British officials favored Vienna above all as the place to secure a strong British position in Central Europe, but it this depended on Austria having good relations with both Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Bátonyi also uses Foreign Office pen sketches of European statesmen to telling effect, for example, Eric Philipps, Assistant Secretary to the Foreign Office, commented on "K. Renner's reputation for stupidity" being "well founded" (p. 37).
was a passing thought associated with world finance and early American intervention.

But, before matters could proceed far, a flutter was caused by the return from Moscow of Messrs. William C. Bullitt (descendent of Hyam Solomon) and Lincoln Steffens who had been sent to Russia towards the middle of February by Colonel House and Mr. Lansing, “for the purpose of studying conditions, political and economic, therein for the benefit of the American Commissioners plenipotentiary to negotiate peace.” Mr. Philip Kerr and, presumably, Mr. Lloyd George knew and approved of this mission. Mr. Bullitt was instructed to return if possible by the time President Wilson should have come back to Paris from the United States. Potent international financial interests were at work in favour of the immediate recognition of the Bolshevists. Those influences had been largely responsible for the Anglo-American proposal in January to call Bolshevist representatives to Paris at the beginning of the Peace Conference — a proposal which had failed after having been transformed into a suggestion for a Conference with the Bolshevists at Prinkipo. The well-known American Jewish banker, Mr. Jacob Schiff, was known to be anxious to secure recognition for the Bolshevists, among whom Jewish influence was predominant; and Tchitcherin, the Bolshevist Commissary for Foreign Affairs, had revealed the meaning of the January proposal by offering extensive commercial and economic concessions in return for recognition. At a moment when the Bolshevists were doing their utmost to spread revolution throughout Europe, and when the Allies were supposed to be making peace in the name of high moral principles, a policy of recognizing them, as the price of commercial concessions, would have sufficed to wreck the whole Peace Conference and Europe with it. At the end of March, Hungary was already Bolshevist; Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and even Germany were in danger, and European feeling against the blood-stained fanatics of Russia ran extremely high. Therefore, when it transpired that an American official, connected with the Peace Conference, had returned, after a week's visit to Moscow, with an optimistic report upon the state of Russia and with an authorized Russian proposal for the virtual recognition of the Bolshevist regime by April 10th, dismay was felt everywhere except by those who had been privy to the sending of Mr. Bullitt. Yet another complication, it was apprehended, would be added to the general muddle into which the Conference had got itself, and the chances of its succeeding at all would be seriously diminished.

On the afternoon of March 26th an American friend inadvertently gave me a notion that a revival of the Prinkipo proposal, in some form, was in the air. That evening I wrote to Northcliffe: The Americans are again talking of recognizing the Russian Bolshevists. If they want to destroy the whole moral basis of the Peace and of the League of Nations they have only to do so.

And, in the Paris Daily Mail of March 27th, (1919) I wrote strongly against any proposal to recognize the desperadoes whose avowed aim is to turn upside down the whole basis of Western civilization. President Wilson's phrase that the object of the war was to make the world “safe for democracy” has been much derided. Nevertheless, it expresses a fundamental truth which only needs accurate definition to become axiomatic. Historically, “democracy” is a negative concept. It implied the imposition of restrictions upon absolute or arbitrary rule. It was the negation of the doctrine of Divine Right. Its purpose was to protect communities and their individual members against the dangers inherent in government by
monarchs or oligarchies. But it remains to be proved that the transformation of this original, negative conception of democracy into a positive doctrine that, the wider the “bounds of freedom” are drawn, the safer and the healthier a community will be, is a sane and sound development. The battle between the representative system in democracy and the tendencies which aim at “direct” government “by the people,” has yet to be fought out; and, before it is won, the principles of individual liberty may need to be stated afresh. Here, again, issue is joined between negative and positive concepts. Broadly speaking, liberal principles imply the removal of as many restrictions upon the freedom of individuals as the welfare of the “greater number” may permit. They are incompatible with the more modern tendencies which would establish the tyranny of organized masses, or of armed “popular” dictatorships over individual citizens, no matter whether those tendencies take the form of “Bolshevism” or of “Fascism.” The world cannot be “safe for democracy” until these tendencies have been vanquished or placed under restraint for the general good.

Hungary was one of the most noted examples of soviet government in post-war Europe, its peasantry typical for most of Central and Eastern European rural standards.

The explosive situation in the Hungarian countryside towards the end of the 19th century is adequately conveyed in an official report of the powerful landowners' association, the OMGE, written in 1894: The population of the great plain consists of civil servants, rich peasants and the agrarian proletariat, who all live isolated from each other, hating each other. "The civil service regards the Hungarian agricultural districts as colonies, and their own jobs as colonial service. The rich peasants are somehow lodged in an unassailable and stable conservatism, while the land-workers remember the big historical revolutions and regard the future without hope. Nevertheless, their revolutionary ambitions are still alive. 46

A wave of farm labourers' strikes swept the country in the earlier years of the 20th century which often led to pitched battles with the police, culminating in the strike of 10,000 estate workers in 1905 and the general strike of 100,000 "free labourers" in 1906, broken by calling up the strikers into military service. Thus the only escape from misery proved once again to be emigration. Between 1891 and 1914 nearly two million Hungarians, mostly peasants, left the country on crowded ships bound for the USA.

The social problem in Hungary was exacerbated and complicated by the existence of the national minorities. In 1910, out of 21 million people living in Hungary, there were 10 million Hungarians, 2.5 million Croats and Slovenes, 3

---

million Rumanians, 2 million Germans, and the rest were made up of Slovaks, Serbs, Ukrainians and other smaller peoples.47

The national problem was not confined to her semi-colonial dependence on Austria, but included the national oppression of the non-Magyars. The development of capitalism bound Hungary still closer to Austro-German imperialism, with the feudal Hungarian aristocracy also tightly enmeshed with big business and the banks. On the eve of the Revolution, Hungary presented the most backward half of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and because of this was that part where social tensions most quickly reached boiling point, ‘and where the ruling class was least able to resist the onrush of social change.’ The Hungarian proletariat was a later developed and less powerful class than its Austrian and German counterpart, making up only 17% of the population in 1919 which in industry, and of these 49% worked in factories of less than 20 workers.

But in Budapest and the surrounding area, large-scale industry had sprung up, nurtured by vast infusions of foreign capital. More than 50% of industry was concentrated here. Moreover, the uneven development of industry is illustrated by the fact that 37.8% of the total workforce was concentrated in big factories of more than 500 workers. These giant bastions of labour were to play a decisive role in the events of 1918-1919. 82 giant cartels controlled the whole of Hungarian industry (26 of them Hungarian and 56 Austro-Hungarian).48

The October Revolution in Russia had also had its effect on Hungary. The demand for a "peace without annexations and indemnities" was demanded by rural and urban populations alike, and under the pressure of the masses the Hungarian anti-war party led by Karolyi, the "Hungarian Kerensky", pressed their demands more strongly. A general strike against the war was called out in Budapest on January 18th 1918, which sparked off other mass meetings in which many soldiers participated. The January strike swept like wildfire through Austria, Hungary and Germany, and finally obliged the Austrian representative at Brest-Litovsk, Czernin, to adopt a conciliatory position vis-à-vis the Bolshevik government, although this was overruled in the end by the German General staff. Similarly, the Hungarian government extended the right to vote. As the history of Anglo-Irish relations confirms, the ruling class is only prepared to grant serious reforms when threatened with the loss of power and privileges. In spite of these reforms, on 28 October 1918 there was a mass demonstration in Budapest demanding Hungarian independence.

47 Idem. 48 Idem.
and a day later Hungary was declared a republic, to be followed by an uprising in Budapest of workers, soldiers and students. When the cause of the monarchy was finally lost in November, the reactionary elements of society gathered round the republic represented by Karolyi and the Social Democrats.

The government of Karolyi was a government in name only. It had no reliable army to rest on. Arms were in the hands of the workers. The economy had virtually collapsed. Hungary was blockaded by the Allies. The food situation was critical. In an attempt to pacify the masses, the Karolyi government drew up a land reform programme aimed at distributing to the land workers estates exceeding 500 acres with compensation to be paid by the government. Karolyi, himself a landowner, gave his estate to the peasantry. But his example was not followed by the rest of his class. Like all the other measures of this government, the land reform remained on paper. [...] As Karolyi himself later complained: "The situation had now radically changed, and what might have appeared to us an extremely liberal offer had become entirely anachronistic. The minorities of yesterday justly regarded themselves as the victors of tomorrow, and refused to envisage any solution within the framework of the Crown of St. Stephen, the very name of which was an offence to them."  

March 20th, 1919 the ultimatum presented on behalf of the Allies to the Karolyi regime, demanding that Hungary accept a new line of demarcation caused the fall of the government. Karolyi suggested a referendum, which was refused, and undermined by pressure within and without, Karolyi refused to take responsibility for the affairs of the nation and resigned. The following day the Soviet Republic was proclaimed, the proletariat coming to power without firing a shot.

But the new parties of the Communist International in most cases were made up of young, raw and untested recruits who had moved over to Bolshevism in the stormy period opened up by the October Revolution. They had not had time to get their bearings and acquire the necessary experience and authority in the eyes of the masses when they were plunged into the turbulent revolutionary movement of 1918-1920. Nowhere was the transition so abrupt as in Hungary. [...] Following the example of Noske and Scheidemann in Germany where in January Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht had been murdered at the instigation of the Social Democratic leaders, the SDP leadership whipped up an anti-Communist campaign which culminated in a provocation similar to the July Days in Russia, and the arrest of the leadership of the CP. Bela Kun and his comrades were subjected to savage beatings in prison.

However, not unlike the situation following the execution of the Irish rebels of the Easter Rising, the government had miscalculated. The moods of the masses

49 Idem.
50 Idem.
changed rapidly, the arrest serving to spotlight the counter-revolutionary role of the SDP leaders in the government. The CP, like Sinn Féin, profited by this turn of events and secured majority support in the key areas of the workers' movement, and previously respected public representatives from the now found themselves shouted down at public meetings.

The new workers' government in Hungary had a series of important advantages. The revolution, contrary to all the arguments always advanced by the reformists about violence, was entirely bloodless. The bourgeoisie was too demoralised and shaken to offer resistance. The mass of the population undoubtedly identified with the new government, not only the workers and poor peasants but also, unlike in Russia, a big section of the intelligentsia which, partly because of the old national-revolutionary traditions, supported the revolution. On the other hand, the Hungarian Workers' Republic was born at a critical moment in the life of world imperialism. The very foundation of the system appeared to be collapsing under the hammer-blows of the revolution. 1919 was a fateful year in the history of mankind. After the revolutionary upheavals in Berlin in January, Austria entered into a stage of revolutionary ferment. A short-lived soviet republic was proclaimed in Bavaria.51

Meanwhile, the Allied powers at the Paris Peace Conference understood the danger posed by the "Hungarian question" and the possibility of armed intervention was raised but ultimately cast aside. Instead one relied on the services of the Czechs and Romanians to sort out the high-spirited Hungarians. On 15 April the Romanians launched their attack on the Hungarian soviet republic. The "Red Army", made up of troops and officers of the old regime crumbled before the offensive, a number of sections even going over to the enemy. The Romanian army penetrated deep into Hungarian territory without serious resistance, while the Serbs invaded southern Hungary, the Czechs attacking in the West with troops commanded by French and Italian officers. The Times of 7 May 1919 demanded the surrender of Hungary, the disarming of the Red Army, and the resignation of the government and the occupation of the country by Allied troops.

CE 3 May 1919
Hungary’s Climb Down.
Offer to Czechs and Rumanians.
Copenhagen, Friday. – A telegram of yesterday’s date from Budapest via Vienna says – Bela Kun has addressed to all the workers of the world a message

51 Idem: “In France, the period of demobilisation was accompanied by extreme tension. In Britain, the shop stewards' movement and the Triple Alliance were at their height. There was the struggle for the 40 hour week and the "Hands Off Russia" movement, mutinies in the army and the revolt on the Clyde.”
stating that to-day he has sent the Czecho-Slovak and South Slav and Rumanian Governments a note in which he declares on behalf of the **Hungarian Soviet Government** that it acknowledges all territorial and national claims of the Governments named, but in return requests the immediate cessation of hostilities, and non-interference in Hungarian domestic affairs. He also demands facilities for transit traffic and the conclusion of economic agreements. If the Governments named, he says, are in earnest in the assurances they have given peace can be restored from the present hour between them and Hungary. – Reuter.

However, the Red Army reorganised and the Budapest workers pushed back the invading forces along all lines. In a seven-day campaign, the proletarian Red Army passed over from the defensive to the offensive, recapturing many towns and villages against overwhelming odds.

CE 7 June 1919
Alarm at Prague. “Republic in Danger.”

Vienna, Wednesday. – The remarkable success which the **Hungarian Red Army** has achieved over the Czecho-Slovak forces has occasioned excitement here. The latest reports state that the Red Army advance in Slovakia continues. Two-thirds of Slovakia are occupied. A Hungarian official report says: “We are advancing according to plan. The Szecho-Slovak [sic] forces are retreating along the whole line.” To-day’s Prague newspapers call on the Government and the public to sink internal differences and unite against the well-armed Bolshevik army. Various political parties at Prague have issued proclamations to the population. The club of the National Democratic Deputies states: “Not only our Slovak brothers, but the whole Czecho-Slovak Republic is in danger.” Many Czechs left here to-day to enlist. - J.C.Segrue in the “Daily News.”

The Czech army was thrown into a panic, and large areas of Slovakia were now occupied by the Hungarians, and on 16 June 1919, a Slovak soviet republic was proclaimed.

---

52 CE 10 June 1919. **Czechs and Hungary.** Copenhagen, Monday. – A Vienna telegram of to-day’s date says – According to reports to Prague, the Czecho-Slovak Government has issued a decree suspending the general rights of citizens. Civilians committing offences against the Military authority will be subject to the military judicial system, and a Conscription Act is to come into force immediately. The “Neue Freie Press” thinks this decree has some connection with the Czecho-Slovak declaration of war on Hungary, which is said in Prague to be impending. – Reuter.

CE 11 June 1919. **Hungarian Attack on Czechs.** Reuter learns that the Rumanians have received information that the Hungarian offensive against the Czecho Slovak was made by about 5,000 Hungarians belonging to the regular army. Hungarian officers however state there are three times that number, with eight batteries of 75mm guns against the Czecho-Slovaks. General Pelle, the French General in charge of the Czecho-Slovak General Staff, has at his disposal enough troops to meet the emergency which is not regarded in French military circles as really serious. All Czecho-Slovak troops to the east of Patnek, the most seriously threatened sector, are under a French General, those to the west of that point being under the Italian command. It is curious that the Hungarians instead of threatening any vital point of Czecho-Slovakia, are pressing at a north-westerly direction, evidently for the purpose of getting into touch with the bolshevists in Podalia, Volhynia and Galicia, and of separating the Rumanians from the Czecho-Slovaks.
The activities of the SDP in the government provided the green light for imperialism. On the initiative of the "people's champion", President Wilson, the Paris Peace Conference, now thoroughly alarmed at the successes of the Red Army, sent a further ultimatum to Budapest on June 8th, demanding a halt to the Red Army's advances and inviting the Hungarian government to Paris to "discuss Hungary's frontiers." The note was followed by a second ultimatum, threatening the use of force if these terms were not accepted.53

Bela Kun advocated a truce. With foreign armies still on its soil, negotiations were started, and the Red Army began to withdraw. The ill-fated Slovak Soviet Republic was at an end. On 24 June 1919, there was an attempted counter-revolution in Budapest led by "National Social Democrats", which was put down within 24 hours. And on 20 July, Clemenceau issued a note, demanding the formation of a new government excluding the CP and composed of "responsible labour leaders," which the SDP again accepted. Another coup d'état had been accomplished without firing a shot. Summing up, the old governments of Russia, Germany, and Austria-Hungary had disappeared and the Poles, the Czechs, the Romanians, and the Serbs were setting up new national governments in their place.

If the allied statesmen in Paris had desired to check these nationalist movements, they could have enforced their will only by armed force. And where could they have found that force? [...] Not for a moment would the United States have assented to the employment of even a single American division in campaigns to thwart the national aspirations of the Poles or the Czechs. A second circumstance was the temper which then prevailed in the European belligerent countries [...]. They held Germany responsible for the war. They observed that it was not the Serbs who had invaded Austria, nor the Belgians who had attacked the Germans, and that it was the government of the Kaiser which had declared war on Russia, Belgium, and France. They were angry, vindictive, unquiet. They wanted redress and safety. No statesman in a democratic age, however independent, can prevail against the clear and passionate wishes of his countrymen [...]. Thirdly, it was unfortunate that the Conference should have been held in a capital which was still reeling under tragedies of the war and the shock of bombardment. In the inflamed atmosphere of Paris the ideals of appeasement fought an unequal battle with those of retribution. The cooler air of a Swiss city, as recommended by the British, would have been more conducive to a happy end.54

CE 29 May 1919
Austrians Annoyed
Vienna, Monday. – The Vienna newspapers suggest to the German Austrian Peace delegates who left here for Paris just a fortnight ago to-day, innocently believing that the Peace terms would be handed them shortly after their arrival that they had better come home and wait until the Entente Powers have composed their apparent differences of opinion on the nature of the terms to be proposed.

53 Idem.
54 Fisher, p.1158.
The growing tension of public opinion at the long delay, the expense of keeping a
large and inactive delegation at Versailles, and the urgency of official department
work which awaits them in Vienna are the reasons advanced for suggesting a
temporary return to Vienna. – J.C.Segrue in the “Daily News.”

Council of Four.

Delivery of Austrian Peace Terms.

Paris, Tuesday. – The Council of Four, the Leaders of the Governments, has
decided to deliver the Entente Peace Terms to the Austrian delegation at the
Chateau at St.Germain at noon on Friday. Only representatives of those powers
who have broken off relations with Austria will be present at the meeting, namely:
Great Britain, France, United States, Italy, Japan, Serbia and Rumania, as well as
the newly created States which formed part of Austria-Hungary, like Czecho-
Slovakia and Poland.55 Representatives of the Press will be admitted to the
meeting. Probably ten journalists will be granted admission instead of five as was
the case on the occasion of the delivery of the German terms. The Austrian Treaty
is almost complete, at all events as far as the territorial, military, naval, aerial and
war prisoners clauses are concerned, while the financial section is hardly likely to
be finished by Friday, and will be handed to the Austrians later. The question of
Fiume was not discussed yesterday. The treaty, which will be communicated the
day after to-morrow to the Austrian delegates, will fix the frontiers of Austrian-
Austria, which has been reduced to a country of about seven million inhabitants.
The rough outline of the boundaries of the new State towards Germany, Czecho-
Slovakia, Italy, the State of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, and Hungary, is already
known.

The Austrians were not inclined to accept these conditions, particularly
considering that the rump of the empire was to shoulder the burden of a multiethnic
taskforce, which caused the havoc to begin with:

CE 21 June 1919
Austrian Delegation
Protest to Peace conference. (P.A. War Special).
Saint German, Friday. – The Austrian delegation has sent a fourth note to
the Peace Conference protesting against the Austrian Republic being made heir to
all the responsibilities of the Austro-Hungarian Empire of the States formerly
belonging to which it is the smallest, poorest, most peaceful and most liberal. The
delegation points out that at the time war was declared the foreign Minister and
his two principal collaborators, and almost all the Ambassadors were
Hungarians, maintains that the responsibilities were common to all the States
forming the Empire, and expresses confidence that the spirit of justice inspiring the
conference will not let the whole burden be thrown upon Austria. 56

55 Fisher, p.1160 : “For the Peace Treaties bear Wilson’s mark. The new map of Europe was drawn
according to that principle of self-determination (a phrase borrowed from the Bolsheviks) which the
President had proclaimed as the clue leading through a labyrinth of evils to justice and peace. Over
the Poles and their Corridor, as over the Czechs and the Slovaks, he cast his peculiar benediction,
perhaps desiring to right the errors of history, but perhaps also recalling how useful was the polish
vote at home, and how numerous and weighty were the Czechs in the city of Chicago.”
56 CE 24 January 1919.German-Austria.P.A.War Special (From the Press Association’s Special
Correspondent) Vienna, Thursday. – The German-Austrian Financial Commission, appointed to
ascertain the amount of national obligations of the former States of Austria-Hungary, estimates the
One had to allow for some measure of apparent unfairness, but, according to Fisher, a contemporary, had it not been for the American President the Covenant of the League would not have been drafted then, and placed within the framework of the Treaties, thus providing a forum for international discussion.

The idea of a League of Nations was not original with Wilson, but was an Anglo-Saxon conception, foreign to the Latins, which had germinated during the course of the war in many peace-loving minds, both in England and America, and had led to the formulation of definite proposals, the most important of which were drafted by Lord Phillimore and General Smuts [...]. It is not, therefore, true to say that the Peace Treaties are lacking in idealism, or that they are destitute of principle. They contain an ideal in the Covenant. They follow a principle in self-determination. But the ideal was not one generally shared on the continent: and the principle, albeit just, was full of danger and innovation, for it led to the erection of five new states all of questionable stability, and to large transfers of territory and population at the expense of the Teutonic and Magyar races. The war against the German Empire ended in a radical and revolutionary peace drawn up by democratic politicians. It recognized the liberation of nations, canonized new republics, provided for the protection of minorities. The general trend of Europe towards nationalism and democracy, which had made itself felt ever since 1848 with steadily increasing emphasis, seems to culminate naturally in Mr. Wilson’s peace.  

As correctly identified by Fisher, neither Magyars nor Teutons were thrilled at the prospect of voluntarily shrinking their perimeters, Austria feeling especially vulnerable at having to recompense the victors from the dismal resources at its disposal.

CE 9 August 1919
German-Austrian Note

---

**total national debt of the old monarchy** on October 31, 1918, at 127,983,000,000 crowns […]. German-Austria’s share of these liabilities, assuming the other States of the former monarchy assume their full proportionate shares, will amount to about 25,000,000 of crowns. How German-Austria can possibly meet such enormous obligations is difficult to perceive. The latest official estimates of the budget of the New State give the total revenue from direct and indirect taxes, Customs duties and other sources, at a milliard crowns, whilst the payment of the civil employees alone will absorb 993,000,000 crowns, leaving only 7,000,000 crowns to meet all other expenses.  

57 Fisher, p.1161. Cf. also p.1168: “The treatment of Hungary under the Treaty of Trianon is of all parts of the peace settlement that which has aroused most misgiving. The Hungarians were stripped of Slovakia, which was transferred to the Czechs, of Transylvania, which was conquered by the Roumans, and of Croatia, which now became part of Yugo-Slavia in the Serbo-Croat-Slovene Kingdom. Some six hundred thousand men and women of Magyar race, some four and a half million of former subjects of the Hungarian crown, passed under alien domination. To the proud Magyar aristocracy the spoliation of their ancient kingdom by peasant democracies without lineage or distinction seemed an intolerable affront. Lost, too, was the lovely mountain region of Transylvania, where the Magyar noble was wont to take his pleasure in sport. His sentiments may be imagined. As easily would the owner of a Scottish deer forest welcome the news of its forced partition among the Irish immigrants into Lanark.”
Copenhagen, Thursday. – The German-Austrian note presented to the Peace Conference, a summary of which has been telegraphed here from Vienna, after protesting against territorial conditions of the Peace Treaty, says: - If German-Austria’s territorial demands are fulfilled to that minimum extent which is maintained in the appendix to the note, German-Austria will make efforts to believe that she can live independently and in peace in this territory. She expects the League of Nations will hear her in her hour of distress. On the other hand, German-Austria is still firmly convinced that the economic burdens imposed on her by the treaty cannot really be carried out, and that if they are not substantially lightened she is bound to collapse.

Furthermore, Austria’s last vestige of hope, the incorporation of the obviously ‘German’ Austria into greater, viable Germany, had similarly to be abandoned.

CE 13 August 1919
Republic of Austria
Peace conference Rejects Title of “German-Austria”
Paris, Monday. – I hear that the conference has come to a final decision on the name of the Austrian State. It must be known as the Republic of Austria, and not German-Austria. The Austrians have insisted in their notes on calling themselves German Austrians, and have actually suggested the remodelling of many clauses of the Treaty for no other reason than to substitute the title of German-Austria for the Allied description. The incident is illuminating, and the present decision is significant. “Daily News” Special Correspondent.

CE 13 August 1919
Austrian Republic
Recognised by Supreme Council (P.A. War Special)
Paris, Tuesday. – The Inter-Allied Supreme Council has to-day decided to recognise the new Austria as the Austrian Republic. This decision has been arrived at as the result of notes submitted by the Austrian delegation, in which they referred to their Government as German Austrians. The notes related to the proposed changes in the Austrian treaty, and in some cases the only alteration in the clause was the change from the Austrian Government’s name to German Austria.

58 Hobsbawm, p.92: “The present writer recalls being submitted [a] piece of (unsuccessful) political invention in an Austrian primary school of the middle 1920s, in the form of a new national anthem desperately attempting to convince children that a few provinces left over when the rest of a large Habsburg empire seceded or was torn from them, formed a coherent whole, deserving love and patriotic devotion; a task not made any easier by the fact that the only thing they had in common was what made the overwhelming majority of their inhabitants want to join Germany. ‘German Austria,’ this curious and short-lived anthem began, ‘thou magnificent (herrliches) land, we love thee,’ continuing, as one might expect, with a travelogue or geography lesson following the alpine streams down from glaciers to the Danube valley and Vienna, and concluding with the assertion that this new rump-Austria was ‘my homeland’ (mein Heimatland).”
The Austrian Republic now represented a nation. Or did it? In a review of Ian Reifowitz’ *Imagining an Austrian Nation,* Maureen Healy, Oregon State University, states in ‘The Nation That Wasn't,’ how widespread the pairing of "imagining" and "nation" had become in the wake of Benedict Anderson's landmark study of nationalism, *Imagined Communities.*

Was not Habsburg Austria precisely not a nation but a state? Has not one historiographical debate of the past eighty years been about whether Austria did (or could have, or utterly failed to) successfully integrate its constituent nations? Is it not a given that when we list the officially recognized nationalities of the Habsburg Monarchy "Austria" is not among them? Reifowitz [makes] clear that in the rich literature on national identity, Austria requires more imagination than most.

This "history of ideas" centres on the work of Joseph Samuel Bloch, an Austrian Jew who lived from 1850 to 1923. Bloch was a prolific advocate for "civic Austrian nationalism." Born in East Galicia, Bloch later served as a Reichsrat deputy in Vienna (1884 to 1895), co-founded the Österreichisch-Israelitische Union, and worked as editor and publisher of the weekly Österreichische Wochenschrift (1884 to 1920). His conception of ‘Austrianness,’ and his successful transition from Galicia to Vienna, make him an ideal subject matter for the study of nation, state, and identity in Central Europe. The book deals with Bloch's intellectual trajectory, and explores the problems that racism and anti-Semitism posed for his conception of an Austrian nation.

The Austrian nationhood Bloch envisioned "centred on the shared rights of individual citizens but also recognized the equal worth of the Monarchy's cultural groups as collective entities". He believed not only that Habsburg Jews would benefit from a "supraethnic Austrian nationhood" but also that only the development of such a nation could save the Austrian state from being torn apart by exclusionary forms of racial nationalism. The state was central to his project: for civic nationalism to flourish the state would have to cultivate a sense of unity among its citizens based on the fact that they were citizens of the same state, "as opposed to ties that link members of an ethno-cultural or religious group". Following recent theorists of nationalism, Reifowitz calls this awareness "civic nationalism," while Bloch in his day called it "Austrian state patriotism." Long ago scholars [identified] the lack of such a shared state consciousness as a central factor in Austria-Hungary's demise. […] Fischhof, whom Bloch admired, and whom Reifowitz considers to be "more supportive of the rights of the non-German peoples of Austria than any other German liberal politician of the post-1848 era",

60 April, 2005.
61 Idem.
proposed a decentralized Austrian state in which each of the nationalities would flourish as autonomous bodies at the crownland and local levels. He wrote, "Austria is not a state body, but a system of state bodies, each of which rotates on its own axis". But unlike Bloch, who identified culturally as a Jew, Fischhof (also a Jew) identified throughout his life as a German. Fischhof's compassion towards the Slavic nationalities within Austria was partially driven by an underlying German-centric belief in the mission of the Austrian state. Winning the Austrian Slavs over was ultimately a way to "win them over to the German side in a war against Russia". According to Reifowitz, Bloch did not see Austria's mission in this way. His liberalism was universalist, derived in part from Jewish thought, and "did not contain within it a hidden racism or a cultural egoism of any kind". [...] In his newspaper columns, Bloch castigated late-nineteenth-century antisemites, among them Georg von Schönerer, for falsely recasting culture as race and promoting exclusionary theories of racial purity. Of German nationalists who were themselves Jews Bloch was also critical. Reifowitz explains that Bloch advocated for a truly "supraethnic Austrian identity," in opposition to the "German-Austrian consciousness" of Vienna's Jewish political establishment. He urged Jews to embrace Jewish ethnic identity rather seeing themselves as Jewish members of the German, Czech, or Polish nations.

The United States had managed to create such state patriotism out of ethnic diversity, thus Bloch proposed a citizenry devoted not to a dynasty, i.e. ‘Habsburgtreu,’ but to a constitution that transcended any particular government, a decentralized state where restrictive Heimatrecht rules would be lifted so that even poorer citizens could move and reside freely throughout the country. He also supported bilingual education.

With the reform plans of Bloch and numerous other thinkers floating around during the reign of Franz Joseph, why did the Emperor and his advisors not seize on them? Reifowitz comes down hard on the Emperor; the dissolution of his state was a matter of choice: "A multiethnic Austrian nation could have been built on the foundation of the Austrian state, just as a French nation was so created, a British nation was so created, and an American nation was so created. The Emperor and the men who held power chose not to try. Their choice, not its diversity, condemned Austria-Hungary to dissolution". [...] In the end, Austria was a nation that never happened. But reading about how it was imagined reminds us of how vexing "the nation" was and is.

In this respect, it is understandable that any manifestation of statehood, aside from an ‘Austrian Republic’, was worthy of contemplation:

CE 16 August 1919
Hungarian Plot to Re-Establish the Hapsburgs
(P.A. War Special)
(‘Times” War Telegram, per Press Association - Copyright)
Prague, August 14. – The “Venkoc” publishes an exposure of a plot for the re-establishment of the Hapsburgs, naming as the principal conspirators, besides
the Hungarian nobility, certain renegade Croatians, such as Gagliardi and Baditch, and Czechs such as Count Czernin. It accuses many Jews and the Christian Socialist party in Vienna, Yugo Slavia and Hungary. It appears that several prominent Yugo Slavs were sent to Czecho Slovakia to create agitation and hundreds of agents were sewing discord between the Serbs, Croatians and Slovenes and the Montenegrins. At the end of May Gagliari came to Prague as the bearer of a petition from the Hungarian aristocracy to form an army in Slovakia to operate against Budapest. The Minister of the Interior, M. Sochla, who represented the Foreign Minister, refused to receive him. The “Venkow” states that his plan of sending armed Hungarian forces into Slovakia was sponsored by certain Allied circles in Vienna, but that the Government was convinced from the beginning that the whole scheme was centred on the person of the ex-Emperor Charles.

CE 16 August 1919
Hungarian Coup.  
A Deep Impression. (P.A. War Special)
Paris, Friday. – Dr. Benes, the Czecho-Slovak Minister of Foreign Affairs, in an interview in the “Petit Parisien,” says – the coup d’état brought about by the Archduke Joseph in Hungary has made a deep impression in Bohemia and all the former States of the Hapsburg monarchy. In its note the Czecho-Slovak Government asks the Allies not to recognise the Government of the Archduke Joseph, and not in any case to support an attempt to restore the monarchy. The Czecho-Slovak Government has given it to be understood that it refuses to enter into relations with the Government of the Archduke.

In the words of British contemporary historian H.A.L. Fisher,

Austria, the prime mover in the war, was the greatest sufferer through its miscarriage. Dynasty, army, empire disappeared in the whirlwind. The Hungarians declared themselves independent and were invaded by the Roumans. The Czechs and Slovaks broke away. The Serbs exploited their victory in the south. In the end a small republic of six million souls, specifically forbidden under the terms of the Treaty of St. Germain to join itself with Germany, save with consent, only to be obtained by a unanimous vote, of the League of Nations, was all that remained of the famous polity which had ruled over fifteen races and given the law to central Europe. With a capital city many times too great for its contracted needs, with a Civil Service framed for a wide Empire, with enemy neighbours killing trade

62 CE 25 August 1919. Notes and Comments. Seventy years ago, Louis Kossuth escaped from Hungary after Gorgel’s surrender of Villagos and fled to Turkey, where he was made a prisoner. Afterwards released, he came to England, and lived here for several years, keeping closely in touch with Mazzini. He was one of the early champions of the freedom of the Press, and served a sentence of four years’ imprisonment for publishing reports of the debates of the National Assembly. Afterwards he became one of the leaders of the National Movement, and in 1848, Minister of finance. Though permitted to remain in England, he was cold-shouldered by the old Tory crowd, who looked askance on all “rebels.”

63 CE 21 August 1919. Hungarian Government. (P.A. War Special) Berlin, Wednesday. – Vienna newspapers continue to represent the new Hungarian Government as on the verge of falling, attributing this to the Entente’s pressure, due to the energetic representations in Paris by the Czecho-Slovaks. The “Ungarische Post” learns in Entente quarters that the Supreme Allied Council, in its reply to the Archduke, said that in accordance with the principles which it had hitherto followed, the Entente could recognise no Government which was not authorised by a Parliament which was not authorised by a Parliament which was the outcome of a general election and a deputation could not be invited to Paris until the elections had been held, and such a deputation had been expressly authorised by the National Assembly.
with their tariffs, with a city population bitten with Bolshevism, and a peasantry as mediaeval and superstitious as any in Europe, Austria was plunged into the pit of despair. In the face of the fierce nationalism of the new states a Danubian Zollverein was impossible to impose or to sustain. In the dark landscape there were only two gleams of light, the opera in Vienna and the remedial action of the League of Nations, which at the crisis of its fortunes (October, 1922) saved the new Republic from bankruptcy.  

CE 21 August 1919  
**The Peace with Austria**  
(P.A. War Special)  
Paris, Wednesday. – The Commission for the co-ordination of the treaty with Austria completed the reading of the reports of the various Commissions this morning and commenced the drafting of the covering note. The question of the participation of Austrian labour in the devastated regions has now been completely settled, and the Austrian trade union delegates are leaving to-night for Vienna.

CE 29 August 1919  
**Peace with Austria**  
Date of Signature  
Paris, Thursday. – The “Petit Parisien” says that owing to the various amendments affecting the territorial clauses, it is scarcely probable that the peace with Austria will be signed before September 10th. – Reuter.

The German ‘Austrians’ had not appeared irreconcilable, the republic established genuinely democratic and belief in democratic cooperation between Vienna and Prague not unfounded. Yet, according to A.J.P. Taylor, the Austrian Social Democrats never forgot their German Nationalism, regarding the German republic with exaggerated sympathy and Czechoslovakia with exaggerated suspicion, Hungary the only neighbour they regarded with any sympathy. The ‘Austria’ to which they were loyal was a historical memory, not a territorial state, the ‘pure’ Austrians the debris of the old Empire – bureaucrats, army officers, and priests. But ‘by an absurd misunderstanding, every inhabitant of these seven German provinces was supposed to possess the ‘Austrian’ qualities, which had been in reality class characteristics of state officials and territorial nobility; every ‘Austrian’ had to be easy-going and flirtatious, to love music, and to wear Tyrolese costume. It would have been as sensible to dress English factory-workers in pink hunting-coats.  

---

64 Fisher, p.1166-68.  
65 Taylor, p.278.
settled, Eastern Europe was still no closer to an agreeable compromise which the principles of self-determination delineated, and yet paradoxically prevented.

CE 20 June 1919
Eastern Europe
Chaos and Conflict
Paris, Tuesday Night. — The state of affairs in Czecho-Slovakia is, unhappily, very unsatisfactory. The Slovaks, despite close kinship of language, are alleged to be not enthusiastic about union with the Czechs, and many Slovak troops went over to the Hungarian Bolshevik enemy in recent encounters. On the other hand, over three million annexed Germans are plotting against the young Republic, which sorely needs the material and moral support of powerful protectors. The League of Nations, on which devolve all the problems which the Conference found insoluble, may be compelled by circumstances to exert action, so continuous in support of necessitous clients, that it will be virtually governing Europe. Certainly, it will be obliged to intervene in the domestic affairs of the Eastern nations at every hand’s turn, and if the difficulties of enforcing obedience are overwhelming to-day, when it disposes of formidable armies, what will they be when the foreign armies have departed? Extremist organs predict further wars. — Dr. E. J. Dillon, in the “Daily Telegraph.”

As a last entry in this study of international intrigues and national illusions, the author has come across an example of direct comparison between the status quo of fettered Irish and free Czechs in mid 1919, the closing point of this work. Both incidences involve sport and its nationalist connotations, and in the words of Hobsbawm, ‘the imagined community of millions seems more real as a team of eleven named people.’ What makes sport so effective in inculcating national feeling is the ease with which even the least politically inclined can identify with the nation as ‘symbolized by young persons excelling at what practically every man wants, or at one time in life has wanted, to be good at.’ And thus the supporter also becomes a symbol of his nation himself.

CE 25 August 1919
Czechs and Germans Squabble
Regrettable Incident (P.A. War Special)
From the Press Association’s Special Correspondent, Vienna, August 24. — A regrettable incident, which is likely again unfavourably to influence the relations

---

66 Taylor, p. 267: “On 4 October, Austria-Hungary accepted Wilson’s fourteen points and left it to Wilson to determine the future form of the monarchy. Henceforth, as a Vienna newspaper wrote: ‘Austria has a Prime Minister who resides at Washington. His name is Woodrow Wilson’.”

67 Hobsbawm, p.143 : “The present writer remembers nervously listening to the radio transmission of the first Anglo-Austrian football international played in Vienna in 1929 in the house of friends, who promised to take revenge on him if England beat Austria, which, on the record, seemed very probable. As the only English boy present I was England, as they were Austria. (Fortunately the match was a draw.) In this manner did twelve-year-old children extend the concept of team-loyalty to the nation.”
between Czecho-Slovakia and German-Austria, occurred to-day at the Vienna
North-western railway station. About 300 Czech gymnasts, who wished to travel to
Znaim, in Moravia, to attend a fete arranged by the gymnasts, or sokols, of that
town, were made the object of a hostile demonstration by a number of German
railway workers, who had recently been expelled from Czecho-Slovakia, and some
German Nationals, because some of the would-be travellers were wearing Sokol
costumes. Noisy scenes ensued, and, notwithstanding the intervention of a force of
police, some 300 Czechs were not permitted to travel on the train, as they refused
to comply with the demand of the railwaymen either to remove their national dress
or hide it under their civilian clothes. The Charge d’Affairs at the Czecho-Slovak
Legation here, Dr.Fidles, and his wife, also intended to travel by the same train to
Znaim, but abandoned their intention in view of the occurrence. There is, however,
no truth in the report that the Charge d’Affairs and his wife were insulted by the
demonstrators.

CE 27 August 1919

Sinn Féin Flag Incident at Buttevant.

On Saturday evening, on the arrival at Buttevant of the 5.30 p.m. passenger
train from Cork, an incident occurred which, were it not for the intervention of a
military officer, might have ended with unpleasant consequences. A number of
Cork hurlers and their supporters, who were proceeding to Limerick for Sunday’s
match, had a Sinn Féin flag displayed from the windows of the train, when a
military sergeant, who was on the platform, seized hold of the same. Immediately a
number of men jumped out of the carriage and remonstrated with the soldier for his
action; but the timely intervention of an officer who came on the scene was the
means of separating the parties.
10. Conclusion

Primary and secondary source analysis for this study basically ended in 2006, followed by extensive processing and proofreading, and thus, from the vantage point of 2008, the present author concludes this paper with the hindsight provided by recent research, or newly acquired publications of the period. One contemporary work, in particular, has proved beneficial to the closure of this study, Anzacs and Ireland,\(^1\) which delves into the relations and common experiences of volunteer soldiers from both hemispheres, and strengthens also the awareness of 1915 as a turning point in nationalist exploit and expression. Additional insight could also be gleaned from a bibliography\(^2\) published within two decades of the events unfolding from the enactment of Home Rule for Ireland to Irish Civil War, particularly regarding political and constitutional questions of the period.

This thesis has endeavoured to trace the development of political and cultural national awareness of mid-nineteenth and early twentieth-century Ireland, the unifying elements and the ultimately irreconcilable differences, in contrast and comparison with the contemporary blossoming of Czech nationalism, in a time frame of seventy years. The news of local and continental affrays has been supplied by and analysed from the perspective of a popular provincial newspaper, the Cork Examiner, providing both national and international information for politically moderate, generally liberal Irish readers of predominantly Catholic persuasion, and soon to become the most popular national newspaper outside Dublin.

Besides the rigorous censorship of the press from 1914 to 1921, established under the Defence of the Realm Act and continued after the Great War, it goes without saying that any publications on Irish government and the phases of the Irish National movement, regardless if books, pamphlets, bulletins, reports, reviews, political journals, or weekly or daily paper, as in this case, were issued in times of civil disturbance and must be read with regard to the position and purpose of the writer/editor and the political conditions at the time of going to press.

The Cork Examiner, founded 1841 by John Francis Maguire, MP, leant itself to the causes of Home Rule, trade and industry, and abstention. Sober Irishmen peacefully plying a trade, promoting industry, and paying taxes to an own government were the aims supported by this daily paper, whose readership

---

\(^1\) Jeff Kildea, Anzacs and Ireland (Cork University Press, 2007).

\(^2\) James Carty, Bibliography of Irish History 1912-1921 (Dublin, 1936).
continually expanded not only in adjacent Irish counties, but also reached the reading rooms of Birmingham and Boston. The Examiner provides a useful perspective for determining, and at times divining, the majority consensus of the period. It combined the relatively objective stance of a politically liberal paper in the face of advanced nationalism, more specifically, the advent of violent separatism in the late nineteenth century. The paper reflected the temperate voice of Irishmen, content to argue reasonably on the issues of Home Rule and the extension of Ireland’s role and responsibilities in an established Empire.

Why and how the Cork Examiner presented national and international events may first be traced directly to its proprietor editor, John Francis Maguire, a member of the educated, urban, Catholic middle class. The son of a merchant of Cork, he established the Cork Examiner in 1841, as an organ of O’Connellite nationalism. Unsuccessful in contesting the borough of Dungarvan as a Repealer of the Act of Union in 1847 and 1851, he won it for the new Independent Irish Party instead. He held the seat until 1865, after which he represented Cork City until his death in 1872. Maguire had used the Independent Irish Party as a bargaining tool for eliciting abortive land bills and minor concessions in the Catholic interest. After the early demise of his party, he sat as a Liberal from 1859. Maguire embodied the Catholic element in O’Connellite nationalism, defending contemporary papacy and its threatened temporal power, as published in Rome and its Ruler (1856), for which Pope Pius IX awarded him the order of St Gregory. Maguire also played a part in agitating for disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Ireland. Pressing for land reforms as a Liberal, Maguire joined other O’Connellite MPs in the National Association of Ireland, established 1864, to offer a moderate alternative to Fenianism at home, and to call the attention of British Liberals to Ireland’s problem in the 1860s. Maguire spent six months travelling in North America to assess the lifestyle of Irish emigrants, publishing his findings in another book, Ireland in America (1868), to highlight that industry and order were the true characteristics of the Irish once liberated from injustice, an endeavour which influenced Gladstone’s opinion on the nation. When Gladstone’s Land Bill of 1870 proved disappointing, Maguire enrolled in the Home Government Association of Isaac Butt and canvassed for the home-rule candidate at a by-election, signalling thereby the end of reconciliation between O’Connellite nationalism and British Liberalism. However, upon his death in 1872, Queen Victoria and other political opponents
contributed to the subscription for Maguire's wife and seven children, who had been left in straitened circumstances.

Maguire had also been prominent in his native Cork, serving as mayor in 1853 and in 1862–4, using his parliamentary influence to promote the construction of a naval harbour in the port and attempting to introduce the linen industry into the south of Ireland. And the post-famine recovery of the Irish economy was helped by Maguire seeking help from the government to secure a mitigation of the Irish poor law. Besides editing the Cork Examiner, Maguire was also a prolific writer, publishing, for example, The Industrial Movement in Ireland (1852), to coincide with the Industrial Exhibition. Among his other publications was a popular biography of the Cork ‘apostle for temperance,’ Father Mathew: a Biography (1863), to further the cause of teetotallers; and on a fictional note, a three-volume novel, The Next Generation (1871).

Finally, it may be said that late twentieth century historians, in reassessing the work of the Independent Irish Party and the National Association of Ireland have conceded their legitimacy in the national struggle and benefited the reputation of John Francis Maguire as a result.

While this study does not purport to analyse theories on nationalism, it does offer a perspective on provincial politics that have been founded on ethnic principles. As this is a relatively new form of state creation, it has been edifying to learn of the origin of Irish nationalism, during the closing decade of the eighteenth century, and trace its development and significance through the last two hundred years or so, in contrast and comparison to Czech nationalism in Central Europe. Inspired by the French Revolution, Theobald Wolfe Tone, Protestant and progressive, founded the interdenominational Society of United Irishmen to end sectarian division and establish an Irish Republic. However, promised French naval aid floundered and the uprising of 1798 was repressed and Tone hung as traitor. Thereupon the Irish Parliament, a corrupt body by most any standard, was abolished in the Act of Union of 1801, Ireland henceforth ruled directly by Britain. It became clear that pacifist actions of Daniel O'Connell and his Repealers could not persuade Parliament further, and so the Young Irelanders, established 1842 by educated and privileged idealists, and encouraged by European operations, defended their cause with physical force and a journal of their own, The Nation. This was a romantically inspired movement, believing Ireland should return to the
old ways predating the British invasion, and remained, therefore, a distinctly minority opinion. And with Church and populace supporting moderate reformist nationalism, the 1848 rebellion began and ended as a minor disaster. A far greater impression was made upon the minds and memories of Irishmen by the Great Famine, which struck between 1845 and 1848, and halved a nation of 8 million through starvation and emigration. Although famine was prevalent on a European scale, Ireland was hit hardest, as the majority of the rural population depended solely upon the potato crop for survival, which was wiped out by the blight. The bitterness exported along with the available, though not affordable, foodstuffs created a cult of wrath in the New World, which found a vent in funding campaigns, from nineteenth century Home Rule movements, to twentieth century NORAID.

Modest offshoots of the industrial revolution affected economic and political development in Ireland. Paper making processes had changed dramatically and reduced paper prices, as well as advancements in the printing process, which increased production capacity and circulation. The end of stamp duty and other bureaucratic hindrances enabled an unprecedented growth of print media and established the spread of national as well as regional papers, coinciding with the reaffirmation of nationalist ideals in post-famine Ireland. Education Acts for Ireland had spread the use of English in schools and literacy levels increased, however, at the expense of the native Gaelic, and with rare exceptions, the rise of regional newspapers printed in the English language contributed towards the marginalisation of the national tongue.

Journalism became a respected profession and allowed reporters to work on a fulltime basis, editors enjoying social status and the ownership of newspapers added a further dimension in the struggle for recognition of national aspirations. And with growing levels of literacy came political awareness, and through improved modes of transport and communication, the spread of newsprint enabled the propagation of nationalist ideals among even the most rural regions of Ireland. The advent of railroads and telegraph poles, however, not only brought the tenant farmer in touch with international intelligence, but also more directly with the Victorian tourist. The county of Cork, and its neighbouring county, Kerry, still attract international visitors to the tourist trails established under the reign of Queen
Victoria, and the Cork Examiner leant its support to the growth of local industry along the tracks of the railroad and the Bianconi carriages.

Cork, county and city, the focal point of this study, had reached a comfortable level of existence by the 1860s, agricultural innovation and land clearances having eliminated the vestiges of peasant poverty on a large scale, and rebellion against British might was not a primary concern of its citizens. But while the Cork Examiner encouraged its readership to practice moderation in politics as well as drink, it was nonetheless quick to defend the young and inexperienced rebels of ‘67, who were seen as deliberately ‘misguided’ by American-Irish Civil War veterans and their US based militant movements. The 1867 rising, organised by the Irish Republican Brotherhood, or ‘Fenians’ as they were popularly known, originated in the States and ended, nonetheless, in disaster. James Stephens, one of the men of ’48, founded the movement in 1850, with the aim of forming an international league against British rule in Ireland. The Fenians were organised in Australia, South America, Canada, and above all, the United States, basically any larger country that had adopted Irish emigrants. A radical journal propagated the cause and foreign financing bought arms, but informers proved invaluable and the paper was suppressed, leaders fled or faced prison, and the rising failed. The IRB, however, remained in tact, albeit underground.

Ireland, besides inspiring the righting of wrongs, was experiencing an agricultural boon and the advancement of tourism, which could not be jeopardized. Henceforth, a constitutional means of securing Irish interests in a British Parliament took precedence and the idea of an Irish Parliamentary Party was born. Created originally as a loose home rule association by Isaac Butt, Protestant and luminary of Trinity College, Dublin, and a former Tory who had converted to Irish nationalism, the movement soon made history in the House of Commons under its radical wing, who sought to impede parliamentary business by obstruction. Its popularity climaxed in the 1880s under the leadership of Ireland’s ‘uncrowned king,’ Protestant landowner Charles Stewart Parnell. A radical of gentry stock, Parnell had successfully amalgamated the goals of the Irish Land League as well as the IRB. The Land League had been established by Michael Davitt, who set about a pragmatic scheme for securing the same solid advantages conducive to higher productivity, as enjoyed by the tenant farmers of Ulster, for the rest of Ireland: fair rent, free sale and fixity of tenure, with the ultimate goal of ridding Ireland of
landlordism and establishing the Irish farmer as owner of the land. In and out of favour with the Catholic hierarchy and thus, by association, the Cork Examiner, Parnell, elected President of the Land League, planned his campaign along constitutional lines, but was not averse to violence. Coinciding with the extension of the franchise, the Home Rule movement became the most popular concern since Daniel O’Connell and Catholic Emancipation, attracting finance in America and attention in Europe. The advancement of media and mass communication allowed the Home Rulers an unprecedented upsurge in followers, reading of impending rallies, perusing over political speeches, and buying souvenirs of national symbols. The ‘national anthem’ and the green flag on St. Patrick’s Day, or on the memorial days of the Manchester martyrs and a whole iconography of national heroes, meant tokens of nationalism to be taken home and revered, alongside the available cheap literature on Brian Boru, Thomas Davis, and Daniel O’Connell, among others. Parnell also tapped into this source of enterprising enigma by extolling his family tradition of opposition to the English, and using the ‘ethics of kingship’ to create for himself a legend of an extraordinary public persona. Not only nationalist, but also liberal and unionist papers reported regularly on his activities, thus ensuring constant propaganda for his campaign, with both supporters and detractors promoting Parnellism on an impressive scale. Land agitation had taken on formulated rituals, great pseudo-militaristic gatherings, similar to those held in Europe, streets bedecked in bunting and flags and the railroad transporting massive loads of supporters and marchers from far and wide. Even the Continental press, harried by disturbances of their own, took note of proceedings in Ireland and published interviews with Parnell. Though wary of his tactics, their interest alone credited the Home Rulers with active displays of obstinate endurance of international repute. The murders of the Chief and Under Secretary of Ireland, however, dampened their esprit, but Parnell was nonetheless able to utilize the backlash in reconstructing the national movement along more conservative lines.

Unfortunately, the leadership of the party became a point of dispute when Parnell, envied for his magnetic personality and manipulation of the media, fell prone to British morals on account of his private life, his partnership with a married woman. Under the more sedate leadership of John Redmond, the movement eventually put Home Rule on the Statute Books. However, the beginnings of a new political movement could be deduced from the celebrations held in 1898 to
commemorate the centenary of the ’98 insurrection. Various clubs formed that year were actually centres of IRB activity, with the United Irish League openly supporting the Boers in 1900. An own weekly journal, The United Irishmen, was edited by Arthur Griffith, and from 1899 to 1911 this journal, and its successor Sinn Fein, were the chief inspiration of all extreme propaganda and discussion in Ireland. In general, however, the nationalist daily and weekly newspapers adhered to the policy of the Irish Parliamentary Party, and, when in 1910, the prospects of Home Rule became brighter, the publication of Sinn Fein literature almost ceased until the outbreak of the European war.

The general expectancy of changes in Irish government, from the beginning of the 19th century, encouraged enquiries into administration, finance, and social problems as they might be affected by the restoration of Irish legislature. Irish studies by recognised authorities on these issues surrounding Home Rule assumed a briefer and sharper style of writing and speaking by 1913. A volunteer force had been established and armed in the North when it was feared that Home Rule would be enforced on the entire island, and when the South armed in reaction the spectre of civil war loomed far more visibly on the horizon of 1913 than the events unfolding on Continental Europe. Though established as a popular notion across Europe, not all Irishmen were attracted by the devise of Home Rule for their country. Ireland had been subjected to centuries of biased British trade programmes, the northeastern province profiting and thus advancing the most. Unionism, the wish to remain under direct British rule, was deemed a just cause for a minority centred in Ulster, consolidated by a pledge and protected by the volunteers. The propaganda of the Ulster Unionist Council in 1912-1914 attained large dimensions, dwelling mainly on the superiority of Belfast and Eastern Ulster to the rest of Ireland in wealth, trade and industrial enterprise, and on the alleged lack of appreciation among Irish Nationalists of Ulster’s economic and social interests, and on Protestant fears of a Roman Catholic ascendency. Founded upon the lore of massacres and counter massacres of the 17th and 18th century, the Orange Order became the prime political, economical and strategic force behind Unionism. However, it was not until Edward Carson was authorised to lead the loyalists of Ulster that the movement became a tightly organised political and military unit, a force to be reckoned with in Parliament as well as on the streets: ‘Fear God, Honour the King, and follow Carson’ their pledge, ‘Home Rule is Rome
Rule’ their creed. Ulster Catholics were terrorised and driven out of their homes, any advances of international socialism into non-denominational solidarity of workers impeded by the lure of Orange lodges, where Protestants of all classes could mix socially – and secure employment and advancement over Catholic co-workers (but it was the spleen created by Carson’s unpunished threat of siding with Germany, if Ulster’s demand of remaining within the United Kingdom was not met, that reaffirmed the view of perfidious Albion in the minds of Irish nationalists).

While the Ulster Volunteer Force was prepared to march on Cork to halt Home Rule, the Southern Irish Volunteers were prepared to stop them. The leaders the Irish Volunteers were young, little known, but relatively educated men, teachers, writers and lecturers. Several of the most determined were members of the Irish Republican Brotherhood, expressing their manifold opinions in ‘Irish Freedom.’ Although similar in many respects to ‘Sinn Fein,’ this paper favoured a republic rather than a monarchy, stressing armed rather than passive resistance to English rule, and sympathising with the newly founded Irish Labour Party and the Transport and General Workers’ Union. However, the Irish nationalist press in general supported the Irish Parliamentary Party under John Redmond. Following the Larne gunrunning incident and the increasing hostility of Westminster towards Home Rule, Irish newspapers that had previously shunned or condemned the Volunteers now reported their progress enthusiastically. When war broke out the political situation was transformed, with about half the nationalist press siding with the liberal and conservative papers supporting the war effort, and about half following the Sinn Féin policy of “Ireland is not at war.” And when Redmond proffered the services of the Irish Volunteers to fight alongside its UVF adversary in the British army, the majority of Volunteers were prepared to follow him. But when the Irish North and South went off to fight in the Great War they did not march together. Over 250,000 Irishmen enlisted in Kitchener’s army and filled the ranks of the nationalist 10th and 16th and the loyalist 36th Ulster Division. 30,000 died in the same battles fought to free oppressed nationalities and yet each believed themselves to be the worthy recipient of self-rule. Their tents were ‘divided by politics’, as would be their country. Although Irishmen served in other formations also, these three divisions were the most closely identified with Ireland’s military manpower, the 16th Division seen as most nearly fulfilling the Redmond’s wish for
an Irish Brigade. But for both military and political reasons, Kitchener and the War office were unwilling to allow Irish Volunteers *en bloc*, complete with officers, to be converted into units of the British army. There were disputes about the commissioning of officers and even the design of a distinctively Irish divisional badge.\(^3\)

When war broke out, Carson was called into the Coalition Government, and Redmond was not. Though some confusion exists concerning an invitation to Redmond to join the War Cabinet, it remains a fact that he was not a part of it, merely rallying support for the British and the Allies in heading recruiting drives, most notably at Woodenbridge, Co.Wicklow, when he asked Irishmen not only to protect their native shore, but to go wherever the firing line extended. It was this seemingly impetuous call to arms in support of a ‘foreign’ power, which had not yet appeased its ‘domestic affairs,’ which galled nationalists to the point of splitting the Volunteers into a majority following Redmond’s brother into France and Flanders, and a minority which were to follow the call of Pearse and Connelly into the capital to establish a Republic of their own. It is upon this point in time this conclusion shall dwell most prominently, seeking to establish the year 1915 as more crucial than hitherto stressed in breaking the waves of volunteers steered towards the battlegrounds of Europe, undermining not only the numbers in rank and file und provoking the call for conscription, but also creating the backwash of tolerance and eventually support for anti-recruitment activists and their programme of revolt and republicanism.

Long before the lore of the Rising of 1916, advanced groups were cultivating the seeds of separatism through an increasing number and circulation of small journals, such as The Spark, The Worker’s republic and Nationality. These seditious weeklies, as well as a considerable number of pamphlets and papers, were given considerable attention in the Proceedings of the Royal Commission on the Rebellion. It is of interest to note that although publication of these tracts began in February 1915, their circulation was its height from autumn to April of the following year. The time frame is significant in that it coincides with the disillusionment of the Irish population in general, following the disastrous Suvla Bay Campaign of August 1915, among others, which claimed an unparalleled loss of young Irish lives; and the dramatic fall in recruitment and subsequent threat of

conscription, with its total disregard for the principles of Home Rule, a law without leverage.

Tracing the steps that brought conscripted Czech Legions to forego their oath of allegiance to an Austrian monarch and ultimately to clear the path for the Allies in Siberia, this study endeavours to affirm the year 1915 as pivotal regarding Continental machinations also. That separate yet overtly similar actions on the most western and the most eastern regions of warfare would have such opposing outcomes could not have been clear at the time – in fact, Roger Casement, one of the principal agents of the Easter Rising, drew parallels between the actions of the lauded legions of the Czechs and the imprisoned and executed revolutionaries at home in a bid to save his life and the honour of his country. Nothing, however, came of it at his trial for treason, and nothing except incredulity resulted at his demise. After all, the Czechs would be granted a republic, and the Irish the Black and Tans.

Research has shown that despite early contacts between Ireland and the Austrian province of Bohemia, there was very little knowledge and therefore even less empathy for its peoples by the time educated elites had manifested their revolutionary programmes and print media had efficiently communicated them to increasingly literate masses all over Europe. From the 16th century onwards, the military and religious orders of the Austrian Empire offered placements and prestige to displaced Irishmen, ranging from the Catholic aristocracy that were settled on Wallenstein’s estates, the Field Marshals that fought alongside Radetzky, to the Premier who presided under Franz Joseph. And though this select circle never severed their familial ties, neither were they ever in a position to lend anything but spiritual aid to their oppressed countrymen.

The lands of the Bohemian Crown had, in their time, been useful to Irishmen who had lost their territorial rights upon the settlement of Protestant planters on their native soil, since Henry VIII had declared himself not only Lord but also King of Ireland in 1541. Munster, Leinster and, finally, Ulster were consecutively allotted to British adventurers, until a hundred years later, in Oliver Cromwell’s phrase, there was only ‘Hell, or Connaught’ left for the native Irish. While peasants adjusted, the local aristocracy had been forced or encouraged to flee to Continental Europe, and for another hundred years Catholic Powers welcomed the waves of Irish military migrants, known to the world as the Wild
Geese. By 1648 the Habsburgs were ready to colonise their ‘reformed’ Czech provinces with loyal Catholics, and vast estates were granted to Irish peers, such as the Walshes and Butlers. The Imperial Army fostered great Field Marshals such as Brown, O’Donnell and Nugent. Religious orders under Irish patronage also flourished in Bohemia, Franciscans not only educating the offspring of the less prosperous elite, but training young men for the priesthood and the missions: in this case, their home country. Tormented by Penal Laws since the 14th century, Catholic families were obliged to send their sons abroad to receive an adequate education, and it was not until Catholic Emancipation was achieved in 1829 that this practice came to a halt. Although, in general, this broader education nullified the use of Gaelic and reinforced the downward spiral of the native tongue, the college at Prague specifically invested its trainees with a good grasp of Irish, so as to enable them to preach to their future flocks competently and appreciate their concerns.

While Ireland had many times unsuccessfully sought the military aid of foreign powers, Catholic powers such as France and Spain, the Austrian Empire lay too far afield to inspire the image of abettor. In fact, ‘Austria’ conjured up rather different images over the decades this study has dealt with: the merciless tyrant of the nineteenth century giving way to an older picture of music-loving hedonists purported by the later Pope Pius X.: ‘gaiety’ gaining ground over the garrison, until by the time the Great War broke out, it was near impossible to admonish the antagonist, and the once highly respected German arbitrator became demonised instead. The hybrid Austrian Empire was popularly envisaged as bumbling along under the kindly gaze of its ineffectual though pious rulers, none more esteemed than Franz Joseph, the epitome of Catholicism and personal courage. His spouse, the Empress Elisabeth, was a cherished visitor to Irish shores, renowned as formidable rider of hunts, contributing partially to royally approved tourist trails in a fledgling Victorian industry, but unforgettable in her right as Catholic monarch to attend mass among a people who had endured the Penal Laws. Were all imperial military losses greeted with scorn and derision, the family tragedies within the House of Habsburg inspired pity and compassion in the Irish press, most readily in the Cork Examiner.

How could restless young Czechs compare in appeal, regardless of the affinity of their aims? Self-determination, or rather ‘Home Rule,’ were the catchwords of both Irish and Czech national movements, the Czechs even
borrowing the ‘Tabor’ idea of mass rallies from Daniel O’Connell’s successful monster meetings to emancipate Catholics. However, after the Catholic gentry were no longer forced to educate their sons abroad, the Colleges and Universities of Bohemia became irrelevant to the Irish cause. A significant difference between the Irish and Czech national movements in their early stages was the role of native tongue. While the Czechs wished to revive their rural patois and lend it credence in urban and educated settings, the Gaelic language was deemed impractical to the progress of emancipation and emigration. Late nineteenth-century Protestant elites had ventured in vain to save the native Irish language from extinction by equating it with nation and state, but it failed to unify the population as effectively as its Czech counterpart, and other oppressed ethnic tongues in Central Europe.

Who were these submerged nationalities that required the entire might of the British Empire to secure their state rights and economic and cultural freedom? From the mid-nineteenth century onwards, when national and regional newspapers where coming into their own to influence and shape political landscapes, the avid reader could follow the plight of the Poles and the Italians, great Catholic nations, suffering under the heel of despotic Austrian tyranny. Enlightened Germany, Protestant, industrially developed and culturally the home of philosophers and artists of world renown, was held in high esteem both in Britain and Ireland, and the Kaiser portrayed as a man of principles in whose reign had been achieved comfortable living standards for the population. The German Empire was thus the antithesis to the Austrian ‘Völkerkerker.’ However, once the revolutionary period of 1848/49 passed, Austria was, in comparison with Britain, exaggeratedly portrayed in the press as a sanctuary of liberalism under its neo-absolutist young sovereign, the Emperor Franz Joseph. Britain’s censorship laws seemed mightily oppressive when contrasted with Austrian liberality on this point.

Being German was, however, at the time still considered a class-name, evoking images of cultural standard-bearers, the middle-classes and gentry, and not until the masses intruded upon the political stage did it ever refer to them. Only after the ’48 revolution, when, for example, multi-ethnic peasants poured into ‘German’ citadels of the East, did towns take on the nationality of the countryside, and, once literacy levels rose, the ideas born by urban intellectuals created a peasant nationalist movement in turn. As the Bohemian example shows, the Diet of 1846, composed of great landowners of varied ethnic descent, had merely played at
local patriotism and demanded their old privileges prior to the Battle of the White Mountain; not unlike the farce of landowners of foreign descent claiming the right to independence in eighteenth century Ireland.

While ethnic heritage in Ireland was a relatively straightforward matter of conqueror and conquered and ensuing intermarriage to blend the old lines of combat, with the obvious exception of Ulster, where planters soon outnumbered displaced natives and no longer interbred, the lines of national conflict in the Austrian Empire were manifold and complex. The German ‘nation’ was considered superior to any other nation, with the possible exception of the Magyars in Hungary, who in turn marginalized any cultural diversity within their own realm. In contrast, the Slavs were only beginning to aspire to national consciousness, challenging the historic Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation and thus at a distinct disadvantage when portrayed in the press. Here also one must differentiate among the Slav conglomerate, the Poles receiving better press than the Czechs, or any of the lesser-known Slav peoples, such as the Croats or Illyrians. Indeed, it transpires that regardless of the seemingly identical struggle for national independence fought for by Irish and Czech nationalists of either pacifist or violent persuasion, the Irish perspective on Slavs remained at this time deeply rooted in the British Imperialist notion of inferior, peasant peoples unable to rule themselves. With rare exceptions, it seemed to escape the notice of Irish editors that their own lot was tragically the same.

A new era began for the Austrian Empire and its peoples upon the ascension of Franz Joseph to the throne and the drafting of a constitution. Though the political gains were minimal, the debates surrounding the draft at least opened perspectives on each other’s interests and prejudices and highlighted forthcoming adjustments to power sharing between central and provincial authorities. Finally, in the 1860s, following half-hearted Federalism and Parliamentary Centralisation, neither Slavs nor Magyars accepted Germany hegemony any longer and demanded parliaments of their own, openly rejoicing Austrian defeat at Magenta and Solferino. The German population, on the other hand, was determined to preserve their position in the Empire and their connection to Germany. However, the treaties of Prague and Vienna ended Austrian involvement in Germany and Italy respectively, and the time had come to analyse the true definition of the term ‘Austria.’ This appeared to signify a dual monarchy, the ‘Ausgleich’ of 1867, of
German and Magyar majorities in their respective parliaments, and without Slav input. However, the state of things was changing, the previous underworld of Slav minorities divided by language, customs and geography, now resolved into a Slavonic movement, soon directly influenced by Muscovite policy. Once again, the Austrian Empire appeared to be on the verge of dissolution, the sick man of Europe, no longer able to divide and conquer, to set one race against the other in an era of the Rights of Man. The Austrian army was still dotted with descendents of the Wild Geese, however, and at least on this point received good press for the valour of its officers and their success in battle. And while Magyars and German Austrians divided the Empire amongst themselves, Czechs did them a favour and absented themselves from the Reichsrath for over ten years.

This did not mean that Czech nationalists were inactive. On the contrary, they modelled their mass movement upon the Irish monster meetings of the 1820s and 1840s, rallying protesters in their thousands to places of historic significance and giving the Young Czechs enough impetus to push through resolutions of their own. However, following the Hungarian example, the Young Czechs aligned themselves with their aristocracy in the belief that their common demand for Bohemian autonomy gave them common ground to fight on. Clam-Martinic, head of the Bohemian noble party of interests, simply wanted a feudal state run without bureaucratic interference, hardly to be reconciled with the modern Czech demands for cultural emancipation and the right to political participation in the Empire. Language was one of the major stumbling blocks in the struggle to align the multicultural population along imperial directives. German was the language of state, but in the campaigns to adopt Czech as a ‘provincial’ language, the problem was similar to the tongue of the Gaels: Czechs would learn German to partake, albeit modestly, in the running of their country, but Germans would harangue against the learning of Czech. Moreover, Franz Joseph was successfully encouraged to be crowned King of Hungary, but no such symbolic gesture was bestowed upon the Czechs. And finally, the resuscitated Poles were willing to become Austria’s ally against the invasive flood of Pan Slavism, the imagined horror of uniformity and vastness of the age. However, in 1868, after the creation of a bourgeois ministry, imperial politics demanded the return of the Czechs to counter the German block.
When Maximilian of Mexico, brother to Franz Joseph, died in front of a firing squad it appeared to be a crisis affecting only the House of Habsburg, in a long line of family tragedies to ensue. In the Irish press, however, the significance of British horror at the barbarous deed of Mexican militants could only be construed as open hypocrisy in the face of executed Fenians in British gaols. Although public outrage at Fenian activity was great, given the remarkably comfortable state of affairs in Ireland at the time, it was also tradition to honour the memory of martyrs who had died for Ireland’s cause. Thus the roll call of nationalist heroes was extended from the men of ’98 and ’48, to ’68. Adding to the growing antagonism was also the fact that the Austrian Empire granted a general amnesty to its political prisoners, and the British Government did not.

Rieger, the most prominent leader of the Czechs, continued to evoke the aid of Russia, itself unwilling at the time to disrupt the Austrian Monarchy, and thereby alienated also the Bohemian aristocracy. Eventually, the absentees from the Reichsrath demanded equal rights for Czechs in Bohemia and electoral reform, with the support of Taaffe, who wished to consolidate the empire. Count Taaffe, an aristocrat of Irish descent, was popular with German Liberals, Czech intellectuals and the Emperor himself, and though not friendly to federalism, he wished to placate the antagonists through fair play. However, the conflict did not simply boil down to the rivalry between German and Czech, but the more daunting standoff between the descendents of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, and the historic Kingdom of Bohemia respectively.

The era of Victoria and Franz Joseph marked the beginning of the integration of local worlds into larger entities, in Ireland dividing the loyalty of the populace between the Empire of Great Britain and that of Rome. Travel and tourism were still reserved for the elite, but through improvements to transport and communication those partaking in elitist indulgences were growing in number to support an entire industry. While Ireland was being chronicled by wealthy Americans and their European counterparts, so, too, Austria was becoming a popular resort of tourism, a major stopover on the Grand Tour. Vienna the last bastion of western civilisation and gateway to the east. Travelogues of the period, primarily turn-of-the-century publications for the Anglophone world, cast Austria, more particularly Vienna, in the image of bonhomie gaiety with a wealth of culture, history and ethnicity – a generous, if limited, picture that would endure through the
imperialist arms race and the war itself. The magnificence and splendour of buildings, and the libraries and concert halls they housed, went a long way in establishing a people where no heart seemed sad and no brow clouded with care.

Ireland, by contrast, could not invoke such hearty response. Both American and Central European travellers were both titillated and repelled by the lack of civilised amenities, yet touched by the near archaic amity of its people, their piety and preference of idleness to industry. The feudal land system was not mentioned in guidebooks on the whole, nor how Belfast had accomplished industrious success and the lamentable market town of Cork had not.

Agitation was widespread in Austria in the 1870 also, and although universal suffrage was still no contender, an extension of the franchise at least left Czechs in control of the Bohemian Diet. The progress of political knowledge among the masses was unstoppable and the ultimatum of Count Beust, the Imperial Chancellor, to resign if concessions were made to the Czechs, a possible pretext to civil war. As such, Beust’s resignation was accepted and the German population of Bohemia feared the worst: the loss of ascendancy privilege. When the demand for Czech autonomy was again refused, the Reichsrath changed the rules, introducing the direct vote and thus able to ignore local legislature.

Amid the controversies of power sharing at home and abroad, it was always a pleasure for the Examiner to feature the exploits of the highly popular Austrian Empress Elisabeth during the Irish hunting season, who bestowed not only the benefit of her majestic presence upon a fettered nation, but also her interest as a Catholic visitor to Maynooth, the seminary which received her and her symbolic gifts of embroidered vestments, as a gesture of personal interest and a token to a shared faith. The imperial silver wedding also received much press in the Examiner, as did the betrothal of their tragic son. Unfortunately, when Count Andrassy, Beust’s successor, retired from active politics, the new ministry under Taaffe received little attention in comparison, no mention of his Irish connections being made in the Examiner. The feat of returning the Czechs to the Reichsrath, however, was well covered and the possible reconciliation of German and Czech perhaps overlaid with sentiments regarding controversy of unsolved domestic issues at home.

In the 1880s, governments of both Britain and Austria resorted to censorship and incarceration of adamant nationalist or liberal newspapers and their
editors, the Cork Examiner evading confiscation due to their adamant refusal to print inflammatory speeches and to incite to violence, reserving, however, the right to expound on the notorious campaign of the Special Commission of '88 endeavouring to link nationalism to crime and thus incriminate and persecute Home Rulers. By 1889 the expenditure of the Secret Service in Ireland under Balfour was double in comparison with the annual outlay of previous administrations.

Much like the Biedermeier experience in Austria, Irish intellectuals who could or would not upset the established Empire, turned to art and culture in a bid to revive Irish language and literature. Societies for the preservation of the Gaelic language had multiplied in the '70s and successful pupils in Irish examinations in national schools were regularly featured in the press. By the 1880s and '90s the Irish literary renaissance was under way, boosted by the activities of gifted Protestant Anglo-Irish poets, playwrights and scholars, such as William Butler Yeats, Standish O'Grady and John Millington Synge. In 1893 Douglas Hyde inaugurated the Gaelic League, which in connection with the Gaelic Athletic Association, founded 1884, restored a dignity and pride in Irish culture and customs. So successful was this endeavour that soon political activists returned to the question of self-government and, moreover, self-reliance, and demanded – on the 'Hungarian' principle – full statehood, political proprietorship, or, in Gaelic, 'sinn féin'.

Meanwhile, nationalist ambitions of Poles, Czechs and Hungarians were clouding over the Taaffe era, forcing the Government’s hand on security issues, as well as controversy in the Balkans, in which the British Government under Gladstone was want to support the Serbian agenda. Impressive, perhaps, was the news that the Czechs were willing to return to the Reichsrath, the Old Czechs lead by Rieger, the Young Czechs by the youthful and radical Karel Kramar. Their cause had been strengthened by measures similar to the Irish cultural revival, with the building of a Czech national theatre through popular subscription, and the establishment of a Czech University in 1882.

The greatest amount of print space at this time was reserved, though, for another Habsburg tragedy: the sudden death of Crown Prince Rudolph, popular in his own right at the English court, and through the mystery surrounding his demise, occupying the headlines of ‘foreign news’ for over a week.
The 1890s marked a time of anarchy in Austria, involving conflicting interests between Czech and German deputies; the struggle for manhood suffrage; school reform along a Roman Catholic design; and strikes and riots among the workforce and state employees. Finally, wishing like his predecessors to settle the language question, the Premier, Count Badeni, created the ordinance of 1897 that decreed Czech and German to be both official languages of the ‘inner’ service in Bohemia, thus creating a veritable explosion of German resentment. The ‘people of state’ behaved like an oppressed minority, modelling their tactics on Westminster obstructionism, and caused a severe ministerial crisis. Representatives of true minorities acted, in turn, like their Irish counterparts and left the country. These immigrants to the New World created a platform for the demands of the old country, in which their culture was not allowed to flourish, developing recognisable political entities that held more sway as electoral minorities then they had ever had a chance to achieve in the old country as a majority. And, in keeping with migrant tradition, they supported both culturally and, more important, financially the campaigns of national self-determination, and paved the way for American intervention in the Great War.

Anarchy was apparently also the reason why the Empress Elisabeth of Austria was brutally and senselessly assassinated in ’98. The reader of the Examiner was not merely offered the facts surrounding the horrific act of calumny, but received insight also into the strength of character of the aging ruler, undaunted in his faith, unbroken by successive personal tragedy, surrounded by loving daughters. The Editorial of 15 September 1898 relayed not only the deepest sympathy for the monarch’s loss, but also the country’s condolences to an Empire which had gladly adopted Irishmen into military and state service and acknowledged their contribution with grace.

The progress of the press at the turn of the century saw, through the introduction of the rotary printing machine, a production of 12,000 sheets of the Cork Examiner news per hour, to be upgraded by electroplates and faster machines to 24,000 sheets in the same time frame. The new owner and editor in chief, Thomas Crosbie, received the distinction of being chosen President of the Journalistic Association of Great Britain for a year, the only Irish journalist ever to have received this particular honour at the time.
Both Ireland and the Austrian Empire were preoccupied with language questions and Home Rule in the years leading up the First World War. John Redmond, now leading the Irish Party at Westminster, drew parallels between Ireland’s and Bohemia’s problems, rather than Hungary’s, in respect to social conditions and politics. Also the policy of abstention, now advocated by Sinn Féin, had proved a disaster for Bohemia, and she had returned to constitutional methods, as advocated by Redmond and his party. The great divide still was, of course, the language issue, the Czechs having fundamentally elected Czech as their national tongue, the Irish having abandoned their native tongue too soon – and thus effectively fighting the English in English. The Gaelic League had over 200 branches by 1900, 500 by 1905, but, as J.M. Synge once pointed out, there was a distinct gap between enthusiasm and competency. Others, like the intellectual Thomas Kettle, believed Ireland should first and foremost become a part of Europe, sharing in a multifarious heritage, to avoid the narrow perspective of Irish-Irelandism.

A further facet of Irish nationalism at the time was its alliance with religion. The fact that new mass movements, regardless if nationalist, socialist, confessional or otherwise, were in competition for the same masses, suggests that their followers were prepared to entertain various alliances. James Connolly’s idea of unity of socialist and nationalist liberation was based on Polish ideologist, Colonel Pilsudsky, leader of the Polish Legion. The Catholic Church has had to the present day an enormous impact on the image of Ireland at home and abroad, with religion and war combining to shape an identity of Irishness most visible in a study of nationalism. Though intentionally non-sectarian at its outset, the brand of nationalism created by Wolfe Tone was bequeathed to the idealized IRA of the 1919-1921 War of Independence, and has routinely passed unchallenged; also the impact of the notorious Penal Laws was periodically glossed over, the past apparently sanitized to allow the crisis in Northern Ireland to de-emphasize Sectarianism. However, the synergy of religious and political identity has been rediscovered in recent histories, tracing the increasingly intense merger of Irishness and Catholicism to an absence of a Gaelic-speaking community, and thus coming closest to the European sense of a cultural nation, a ‘Volk.’ In this sense, the influence and popularity of the Ancient Order of Hibernians may be properly

---

4 The supremacy of national over class appeal had been established for the Habsburg Empire, whereby major national dissidence was to be found among the Czechs.
understood, for theirs was a battle for racial pride and national existence. Given also the popular nationalism of a Catholic flavour preached by the burgeoning nationalist press, it is small wonder that one of the fears expressed by the Protestant community of the North was that Home Rule meant Rome Rule. Although it was clear that Protestants basically feared the loss of privileges and not the persecution of their faith, it was a popular slogan to rally the masses and threaten Civil War. The race on arms inspired the south to act likewise, which also imported arms from Britain and Germany, until a halt was called by the Government in December 1913. While Carson called the native Irish rascals and rogues, little better than savages, Redmond hurried to defend his countrymen against misrepresentation and calumny. And when war broke out, each leader offered the services of his army to the Allied cause; each hoping the blood sacrifice would further their own cause and establish self-determination as a reward.

Not all Irishmen agreed with this train of thought. Men such as Roger Casement, for example, who, based on his experiences as Consul in South America, believed the Germans to be a nobler people than the English. A faction of the American-Irish, readily impressed by his lecture tours and willing to collect money for arms, if not men, from Germany, strengthened his belief. Casement, in fact, did no less than the lionized Masaryk and his Czech Legion. Hundreds and thousands of Czechs were either being recruited from camps in Russia or joining the Allies immediately as whole contingents upon contact or capture. In comparison, the contribution of enlisted Irishmen to the rank and file of the British army was never believed to have been conspicuously appreciated at the time, and when the republican goals achieved more popular appeal then loyalty to the crown, even the memory of these volunteers fell into disregard. Casement’s exploits at the POW camps in Germany had been an embarrassment, the pride in the Allied cause seemingly overriding nationalist sentiments, the loyalty among the soldiers apparently too great.\(^5\) If this Irish loyalty to the crown could not be shaken on battlefields or prison camps, it could be called in question at home. There has been a plethora of history books of late, bestowing special attention on the disastrous effects of the Suvla Bay campaign of August 1915 upon the spirit of

\(^5\) James Connelly believed opposition to republicanism was stifled by ‘economic conscription,’ cf. Jeffery, Ireland and the Great War, p.47.
nationalism and recruitment drives. These losses, which were the first experienced as such since recruitment of volunteers began in August 1914, had a deeper impact at home than previously imagined. The Cork Examiner, as supporter of John Redmond and his party politics, continued to print speeches at recruitment drives, which invariably placed the loss and carnage suffered by Irish soldiers within its mythic perspective of the fighting Irish. Although there was public outrage at the criminally inept military handling of the Dardanelles debacle, it was the failure of government, War Office and British press to publicly acknowledge the valour of Irish troops at Suvla Bay among others, which caused lasting resentment. The links between the Great War and the republican rising were symbiotic, the world war providing both opportunity and timing for the rebellion, ‘a continuation of politics by other means.’ A September 1914 conference of revolutionary leaders, including Pearse and Connelly and other members of the IRB, agreed that the war would define the moment for an Irish insurrection. Germany, England’s enemy, was a source of arms for both unionist and nationalist paramilitaries, and more internationalist republicans believed that the destruction of the British Empire would enhance freedom generally. ‘Once the chief factor governing the conflict is perceived,’ declared Casement in an anonymously published pamphlet, ‘namely the British claim to own seas and to dominate the commercial intercourse of the world, then the cause of Germany becomes the cause of European civilisation at large.’

After a week of fighting in the capital, all the captured leaders of the Rising, except de Valera, were executed in front of a firing squad, Casement hung. By tradition, they would have immediately become martyrs, but the population was at first aghast at the sight of a wrecked city, stunned at the betrayal of Irish soldiers fighting on the front. But the inept handling of the event by General Maxwell, the long drawn out killing of the men who had withstood the British army for almost a week, Casement who converted to Catholicism in prison, stunned the nation even more. The rising had successfully revolutionised Irish feeling, Catholic moral law transformed being but one aspect of a larger transformation; the rebellion had profound ideological consequences through its appropriation of the idiom of sacrifice, modern Irish nationalism to become utterly changed by the premeditated cult of 1916. By the 1918 General Election, Sinn Féin had profiting the most by the rebellion. Their policy had rallied a large section of the population to the cause of

---

6 Cf. Also Kildea, p.47: For some it was Gallipoli rather than the Easter Rising of 1916 that marked ‘the moment their feelings towards the British began to turn.’
separatism, espousing neutrality in the face of enforced conscription. The Irish Parliamentary Party was still in existence, but the radical views of Sinn Féin affected also their leader, John Dillon, who in a flourish on patriotic duty sided with Sinn Féin in a general strike. What was to become of Irish statehood when the war was over? Home Rule was on the Statute Books, legalized, awaiting implementation.

In contrast to the Irish rank and file, Czech soldiers in combat had readily reneged on their oath of loyalty to the Austrian Empire. When war broke out, Czech-German relations had similarly been the object of endless negotiation, Count Stürgkh, another bureaucrat Prime Minister, declaring in 1914 that Czechs and Germans were separated by a wall the thickness of a piece of paper. Yet Germans had become more assertive by the strengthening of national feeling in Germany, while the Czechs had become more apprehensive of having to fight on the German side. Thus 1915 proved a turning point in Central Europe also, the Austrian army losing more men to political bathos than battle. Austrians, awed by the Emperor, celebrating a jubilee around the same time as Queen Victoria, could not imagine Central Europe without a dynasty. Masaryk convinced his people they could. Given the economic hardships the population had to bear, it is little wonder that the seeds of political upheaval took root in the minds of civilians so quickly.

In 1918, while Sinn Féin candidates were successfully pulling in votes at by-elections, the Czech Legion in Russia was gathering momentum also, clearing the way for Allied troops and an Allied victory, which, with the organised voting unity of American Slavs, completed their run on republican rewards. Given that the only alternative to Bolshevism in Central Europe were the Habsburgs, Masaryk’s National Council became trustees of the future Czechoslovak government, with the support of England and France. Austria, shocked at Britain’s stance and facing famine, could only hope to stave off the worst, bearing less odium in the eyes of the world than Germany and receiving sympathetic press coverage in the Examiner, for one, throughout the trials of Versailles. After an unconditional surrender, the former empire experienced revolution, truncation, and abdication, losing its name, its ally and its king. Yet, refreshingly, the press reports on post-war Austria dispel much of the doom and gloom which could have settled on a vanquished nation, opening once more the perspective of an epicurean Alpine people, content in their culture of Catholicism and charm.
The Czechs meanwhile had to contend with over three million Germans unwilling to become incorporated into their state, the principle of self-determination merely reaching the Ulster enclave and not the Sudeten range. The settlement of the Anglo-Irish War engendered the bloodier Civil War, as the Treaty stipulated a boundary limiting the Free State to twenty-six counties only, six counties of Ulster henceforth remaining politically bound to Great Britain, as demanded by its loyalist population. The Sudeten German minority of Bohemia received no such protection, their industrialised regions too isolated from each other to allow substantial defence of their interests and loyalties, their inclusion in a Czech state too great a boon to ignore. Finally, on an international level, the strategic importance of the Czech lands, in comparison to Ireland, lent themselves more readily to convoke agreement, however convertible that treaty proved.

The author of this study hopes that the reader has been offered an adequate glimpse into the image of Irish and Czechs nationalism of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, as portrayed in the Irish provincial press. Advanced nationalists of both nations shared a spirit of romantic idealism, yet remained mindful of pragmatic demands; both peoples were wont to behold the uniqueness of their case, seldom striving to assist another in a common cause; and their respective traitor-patriots paved the nation’s way to statehood, through blood sacrifice, unholy alliances and the immigrants’ vote. The Cork Examiner has been an invaluable source of contemporary perspective, providing not only the essentials of information, but highlighting, moreover, an age of progress in politics and print.
Appendix

President Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points

(Delivered in Joint Session, January 8, 1918)

Gentlemen of the Congress:

Once more, as repeatedly before, the spokesmen of the Central Empires have indicated their desire to discuss the objects of the war and the possible basis of a general peace. Parleys have been in progress at Brest-Litovsk between Russian representatives and representatives of the Central Powers to which the attention of all the belligerents have been invited for the purpose of ascertaining whether it may be possible to extend these parleys into a general conference with regard to terms of peace and settlement.

The Russian representatives presented not only a perfectly definite statement of the principles upon which they would be willing to conclude peace but also an equally definite program of the concrete application of those principles. The representatives of the Central Powers, on their part, presented an outline of settlement which, [...] seemed susceptible of liberal interpretation until their specific program of practical terms was added. That program proposed no concessions at all either to the sovereignty of Russia or to the preferences of the populations with whose fortunes it dealt, but meant, in a word, that the Central Empires were to keep every foot of territory their armed forces had occupied -- every province, every city, every point of vantage -- as a permanent addition to their territories and their power.

It is a reasonable conjecture that the general principles of settlement which they at first suggested originated with the more liberal statesmen of Germany and Austria, the men who have begun to feel the force of their own people's thought and purpose, while the concrete terms of actual settlement came from the military leaders who have no thought but to keep what they have got. The negotiations have been broken off. The Russian representatives were sincere and in earnest. They cannot entertain such proposals of conquest and domination.

The whole incident is full of significances. It is also full of perplexity. With whom are the Russian representatives dealing? For whom are the representatives of the Central Empires speaking? Are they speaking for the majorities of their respective parliaments or for the minority parties, that military and imperialistic minority which has so far dominated their whole policy and controlled the affairs of Turkey and of the Balkan states which have felt obliged to become their associates in this war?

The Russian representatives have insisted, very justly, very wisely, and in the true spirit of modern democracy, that the conferences they have been holding with the Teutonic and Turkish statesmen should be held within open not closed, doors, and all the world has been audience, as was desired. To whom have we been listening, then? To those who speak the spirit and intention of the resolutions of the German Reichstag of the 9th of July last, the spirit and intention of the Liberal leaders and parties of Germany, or to those who resist and defy that spirit and
intention and insist upon conquest and subjugation? Or are we listening, in fact, to both, unreconciled and in open and hopeless contradiction? These are very serious and pregnant questions. Upon the answer to them depends the peace of the world.

But, whatever the results of the parleys at Brest-Litovsk, whatever the confusions of counsel and of purpose in the utterances of the spokesmen of the Central Empires, they have again attempted to acquaint the world with their objects in the war and have again challenged their adversaries to say what their objects are and what sort of settlement they would deem just and satisfactory. There is no good reason why that challenge should not be responded to, and responded to with the utmost candour. We did not wait for it. Not once, but again and again, we have laid our whole thought and purpose before the world, not in general terms only, but each time with sufficient definition to make it clear what sort of definite terms of settlement must necessarily spring out of them. Within the last week Mr. Lloyd George has spoken with admirable candour and in admirable spirit for the people and Government of Great Britain.

There is no confusion of counsel among the adversaries of the Central Powers, no uncertainty of principle, no vagueness of detail. The only secrecy of counsel, the only lack of fearless frankness, the only failure to make definite statement of the objects of the war, lies with Germany and her allies. The issues of life and death hang upon these definitions. No statesman who has the least conception of his responsibility ought for a moment to permit himself to continue this tragical and appalling outpouring of blood and treasure unless he is sure beyond a peradventure that the objects of the vital sacrifice are part and parcel of the very life of Society and that the people for whom he speaks think them right and imperative as he does.

There is, moreover, a voice calling for these definitions of principle and of purpose which is, it seems to me, more thrilling and more compelling than any of the many moving voices with which the troubled air of the world is filled. It is the voice of the Russian people. They are prostrate and all but hopeless, it would seem, before the grim power of Germany, which has hitherto known no relenting and no pity. Their power, apparently, is shattered. And yet their soul is not subservient. They will not yield either in principle or in action. Their conception of what is right, of what is humane and honourable for them to accept, has been stated with a frankness, a largeness of view, a generosity of spirit, and a universal human sympathy which must challenge the admiration of every friend of mankind; and they have refused to compound their ideals or desert others that they themselves may be safe.

They call to us to say what it is that we desire, in what, if in anything, our purpose and our spirit differ from theirs; and I believe that the people of the United States would wish me to respond, with utter simplicity and frankness. Whether their present leaders believe it or not, it is our heartfelt desire and hope that some way may be opened whereby we may be privileged to assist the people of Russia to attain their utmost hope of liberty and ordered peace.

It will be our wish and purpose that the processes of peace, when they are begun, shall be absolutely open and that they shall involve and permit henceforth no secret understandings of any kind. The day of conquest and aggrandizement is
gone by; so is also the day of secret covenants entered into in the interest of particular governments and likely at some unlooked-for moment to upset the peace of the world. It is this happy fact, now clear to the view of every public man whose thoughts do not still linger in an age that is dead and gone, which makes it possible for every nation whose purposes are consistent with justice and the peace of the world to avow nor or at any other time the objects it has in view.

We entered this war because violations of right had occurred which touched us to the quick and made the life of our own people impossible unless they were corrected and the world secure once for all against their recurrence. What we demand in this war, therefore, is nothing peculiar to ourselves. It is that the world be made fit and safe to live in; and particularly that it be made safe for every peace-loving nation which, like our own, wishes to live its own life, determine its own institutions, be assured of justice and fair dealing by the other peoples of the world as against force and selfish aggression. All the peoples of the world are in effect partners in this interest, and for our own part we see very clearly that unless justice be done to others it will not be done to us. The program of the world’s peace, therefore, is our program; and that program, the only possible program, as we see it, is this:

I. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

II. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

III. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

IV. Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

V. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined.

VI. The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest cooperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.
VII. Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored, without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired.

VIII. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly fifty years, should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all.

IX. A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

X. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity to autonomous development.

XI. Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea; and the relations of the several Balkan states to one another determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guarantees of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan states should be entered into.

XII. The Turkish portion of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantees.

XIII. An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

XIV. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

In regard to these essential rectifications of wrong and assertions of right we feel ourselves to be intimate partners of all the governments and peoples associated together against the Imperialists. We cannot be separated in interest or divided in purpose. We stand together until the end. For such arrangements and covenants we are willing to fight and to continue to fight until they are achieved; but only because we wish the right to prevail and desire a just and stable peace such as can be secured only by removing the chief provocations to war, which this program does remove. We have no jealousy of German greatness, and there is nothing in
this program that impairs it. We grudge her no achievement or distinction of learning or of pacific enterprise such as have made her record very bright and very enviable. We do not wish to injure her or to block in any way her legitimate influence or power. We do not wish to fight her either with arms or with hostile arrangements of trade if she is willing to associate herself with us and the other peace-loving nations of the world in covenants of justice and law and fair dealing. We wish her only to accept a place of equality among the peoples of the world, -- the new world in which we now live, -- instead of a place of mastery.

Neither do we presume to suggest to her any alteration or modification of her institutions. But it is necessary, we must frankly say, and necessary as a preliminary to any intelligent dealings with her on our part, that we should know whom her spokesmen speak for when they speak to us, whether for the Reichstag majority or for the military party and the men whose creed is imperial domination.

We have spoken now, surely, in terms too concrete to admit of any further doubt or question. An evident principle runs through the whole program I have outlined. It is the principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities, and their right to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether they be strong or weak.

Unless this principle be made its foundation no part of the structure of international justice can stand. The people of the United States could act upon no other principle; and to the vindication of this principle they are ready to devote their lives, their honour, and everything they possess. The moral climax of this the culminating and final war for human liberty has come, and they are ready to put their own strength, their own highest purpose, their own integrity and devotion to the test.7

7 World War I Document Archive [http:www.lib.byu.edu.] 10.05.07.
Czecho-Slovak Declaration of Independence

“At this grave moment when the Hohenzollerns are offering peace in order to stop the victorious advance of the Allied armies and to prevent the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary and Turkey, and when the Habsburgs are promising the federalisation of the empire and autonomy to the dissatisfied nationalities committed to their rule, we, the Czecho-Slovak National Council, recognised by the Allied and American Governments as the Provisional Government of the Czecho-Slovak State and nation, in complete accord with the declaration of the Czech deputies in Prague on January 6, 1918, and realising that federalisation and, still more, autonomy mean nothing under a Habsburg dynasty, do hereby make and declare this our Declaration of Independence:

“Because of our belief that no people should be forced to live under a sovereignty they do not recognise and because of our knowledge and firm conviction that our nation cannot freely develop in a Habsburg confederation which is only a new form of the denationalising oppression which we have suffered for the past three centuries, we consider freedom to be the first pre-requisite for federalisation and believe that the free nations of Central and Eastern Europe may easily federate should they find it necessary.

“We make this declaration on the basis of our historic and natural right: we have been an independent state since the seventh century, and in 1526 as an independent state, consisting of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia, we joined with Austria and Hungary in a defensive union against the Turkish danger. We have never voluntarily surrendered our rights as an independent state in this confederation. The Habsburgs broke their compact with our nation by illegally transgressing our rights and violating the constitution of our state, which they had pledged themselves to uphold, and we therefore refuse any longer to remain a part of Austria-Hungary in any form.

“We claim the right of Bohemia to be reunited with her Slovak brethren of Slovakia, which once formed part of our national state, but later was torn from our national body and fifty years ago was incorporated in the Hungarian State of the Magyars, who by their unspeakable violence and ruthless oppression of their subject races have lost all moral and human right to rule anybody but themselves.

“The world knows the history of our struggle against the Habsburg oppression, intensified and systematised by the Austro-Hungarian dualistic compromise of 1867. This dualism is only a shameless organisation of brute force and exploitation of the majority by the minority. It is a political conspiracy of the Germans and Magyars against our own as well as the other Slav and Latin nations of the monarchy.

“The world knows the justice of our claims, which the Habsburgs themselves dare not deny. Francis Joseph in the most solemn manner repeatedly recognised the sovereign rights of our nation. The Germans
and Magyars opposed this recognition, and Austria-Hungary, bowing before the Pan-Germans, became a colony of Germany and as her vanguard to the East provoked the last Balkan conflict as well as the present world war, which was begun by the Habsburgs alone without the consent of the representatives of the people.

“We cannot and will not continue to live under the direct or indirect rule of the violators of Belgium, France and Serbia, the would-be murderers of Russia and Rumania, the murderers of tens of thousands of civilians and soldiers of our blood, and the accomplices in numberless unspeakable crimes committed in this war against humanity by the two degenerate and irresponsible dynasties of Habsburgs and Hohenzollerns. We will not remain a part of a state which has no justification for existence and which, refusing to accept the fundamental principles of modern world organisation, remains only an artificial and immoral political structure, hindering every movement towards democratic and social progress. The Habsburg dynasty, weighed down by a huge inheritance of error and crime, is a perpetual menace to the peace of the world, and we deem it our duty towards humanity and civilisation to aid in bringing about its downfall and destruction.

“We reject the sacrilegious assertion that the power of the Habsburg and Hohenzollern dynasties is of divine origin. We refuse to recognise the divine right of kings. Our nation elected the Habsburgs to the throne of Bohemia of its own free will and by the same right deposes them. We hereby declare the Habsburg dynasty unworthy of leading our nation and deny all their claims to rule in the Czecho-Slovak land, which we here and now declare shall henceforth be a free and independent people and nation.

“We accept and shall adhere to the ideals of modern democracy as they have been ideals of our nation for centuries. We accept the American principles as laid down by President Wilson, the principles of liberated mankind of the actual equality of nations and of governments, deriving all their just power from the consent of the governed. We, the nation of Comenius, cannot but accept those principles expressed in the American Declaration of Independence, the principles of Lincoln and of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen. For these principles our nation shed its blood in the memorable Hussite wars five hundred years ago. For these same principles beside her Allies our nation is shedding its blood to-day in Russia, Italy and France.

“We shall outline only the main principles of the constitution of the Czecho-Slovak nation. The final decision as to the constitution itself falls to the legally chosen representatives of the liberated and united people. The Czecho-Slovak State shall be a republic in constant endeavour for progress. It will guarantee complete freedom of conscience, religion and science, literature and art, speech, the press and the right of assembly and petition. The Church shall be separated from the State. Our democracy shall rest on universal suffrage; women shall be placed on an equal footing with men politically, socially and
culturally, while the right of the minority shall be safeguarded by proportional representation. National minorities shall enjoy equal rights. The government shall be parliamentary in form and shall recognise the principles of initiative and referendum. The standing army will be replaced by militia. The Czecho-Slovak nation will carry out far-reaching social and economic reforms. The large estates will be redeemed for home colonisation, and patents of nobility will be abolished. Our nation will assume responsibility for its part of the Austro-Hungarian pre-war public debt. The debts for this war we leave to those who incurred them.

“In its foreign policy the Czecho-Slovak nation will accept its full share of responsibility in the reorganisation of Eastern Europe. It accepts fully the democratic and social principle of nationality and subscribes to the doctrine that all covenants and treaties shall be entered into openly and frankly without secret diplomacy. Our constitution shall provide an efficient, national and just government which will exclude all special privileges and prohibit class legislation.

“Democracy has defeated theocratic autocracy, militarism is overcome, democracy is victorious. On the basis of democracy mankind will be reorganised. The forces of darkness have served the victory of light, the longed-for age of humanity is dawning. We believe in democracy, we believe in liberty and liberty for evermore.

“Given in Paris on the 18th October, 1918.

(Signed) “PROFESSOR THOMAS G. MASARYK,
Prime Minister and Minister of Finance.
GENERAL DR. MILAN STEFANIK,
Minister of National Defence.
DR. EDWARD BENES,
Minister for Foreign Affairs and of the Interior.”

---

Proclamation of the Republic of Ireland

The Proclamation of the Republic, more commonly known as the "Easter Proclamation", was a document read by Padraig Pearse at the start of the Easter Rising in Ireland in April 1916.

POBLACHT NA H EIREANN
THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT
OF THE
IRISH REPUBLIC
TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND

IRISHMEN AND IRISHWOMEN: In the name of God and of the dead generations from which she receives her old tradition of nationhood, Ireland, through us, summons her children to her flag and strikes for her freedom.

Having organised and trained her manhood through her secret revolutionary organisation, the Irish Republican Brotherhood, and through her open military organisations, the Irish Volunteers and the Irish Citizen Army, having patiently perfected her discipline, having resolutely waited for the right moment to reveal itself, she now seizes that moment, and, supported by her exiled children in America and by gallant allies in Europe, but relying in the first on her own strength, she strikes in full confidence of victory.

We declare the right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland, and to the unfettered control of Irish destinies, to be sovereign and indefeasible. The long usurpation of that right by a foreign people and government has not extinguished the right, nor can it ever be extinguished except by the destruction of the Irish people. In every generation the Irish people have asserted their right to national freedom and sovereignty: six times during the past three hundred years they have asserted it in arms. Standing on that fundamental right and again asserting it in arms in the face of the world, we hereby proclaim the Irish Republic as a Sovereign Independent State, and we pledge our lives and the lives of our comrades-in-arms to the cause of its freedom, of its welfare, and its exaltation among the nations.

The Irish Republic is entitled to, and hereby claims, the allegiance of every Irishman and Irishwoman. The Republic guarantees religious and civil liberty, equal rights and equal opportunities to all its citizens, and declares its resolve to pursue the happiness and prosperity of the of the whole nation and of all its parts, cherishing all the children of the nation equally, and oblivious of the differences carefully fostered by an alien government, which have divided a minority from the majority in the past.

Until our arms have brought the opportune moment for the establishment of a permanent National Government, representative of the whole people of Ireland and elected by the suffrages of all her men and women, the Provisional Government, hereby constituted, will administer the civil and military affairs of the Republic in trust for the people.
We place the cause of the Irish Republic under the protection of the Most High God, Whose blessing we invoke upon our arms, and we pray that no one who serves that cause will dishonour it by cowardice, inhumanity, or rapine. In this supreme hour the Irish nation must, by its valour and discipline and by the readiness of its children to sacrifice themselves for the common good, prove itself worthy of the august destiny to which it is called.

Signed on behalf of the Provisional Government

Thomas J. Clarke,
Sean MacDiarmada, Thomas MacDonagh
P.H. Pearse, Eamon Ceannt
James Connolly, Joseph Plunkett

Irish Declaration of Independence

21st January 1919 First Dáil Eireann.

Enacted by the Parliament of the Republic of Ireland.

'Whereas the Irish People is by right a free people:

'And whereas for seven hundred years the Irish People has never ceased to repudiate and has repeatedly protested in arms against foreign usurpation:

'And whereas English rule in this country is, and always has been, based upon force and fraud and maintained by military occupation against the declared will of the people:

'And whereas the Irish Republic was proclaimed in Dublin on Easter Monday, 1916, by the Irish Republican Army, acting on behalf of the Irish People:

'And whereas the Irish People is resolved to secure and maintain its complete independence in order to promote the common weal, to re-establish justice, to provide for future defence, to ensure peace at home and good will with all nations, and to constitute a national policy based upon the people's will with equal right and equal opportunity for every citizen:

'And whereas at the threshold of a new era in history the Irish electorate has in the General Election of December, 1918, seized the first occasion to declare by an overwhelming majority its firm allegiance to the Irish Republic:

'Now, therefore, we, the elected Representatives of the ancient Irish People in National Parliament assembled, do, in the name of the Irish Nation, ratify the establishment of the Irish Republic and pledge ourselves and our people to make this declaration effective by every means at our command:
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'We ordain that the elected Representatives of the Irish People alone have power to make laws binding on the people of Ireland, and that the Irish Parliament is the only Parliament to which that people will give its allegiance:

'We solemnly declare foreign government in Ireland to be an invasion of our national right which we will never tolerate, and we demand the evacuation of our country by the English Garrison:

'We claim for our national independence the recognition and support of every free nation in the world, and we proclaim that independence to be a condition precedent to international peace hereafter:

'In the name of the Irish People we humbly commit our destiny to Almighty God Who gave our fathers the courage and determination to persevere through long centuries of a ruthless tyranny, and strong in the justice of the cause which they have handed down to us, we ask His Divine blessing on this the last stage of the struggle we have pledged ourselves to carry through to freedom.'

(Dáil Eireann: Minutes of the Proceedings of the First Parliament of the Republic of Ireland, 21st January 1919.)

[http://www.wikpedia.en.org/] 02.05.06.
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Abstract

This thesis looks at the closing years of the Austrian Empire, principally 1848 – 1918, and the growth of Czech nationalism, in contrast and comparison with the development of Irish nationalism, as perceived and reflected in a provincial Irish newspaper, the Cork Examiner. And, moreover, and how discernible the question of Ireland was on a Continental scale and in view of a World War.

The Great War marks the primary time-span on which this work is based, the years 1914 to 1918 pivotal to many nationalist aspirations in Europe, be they Panslav or Irish; and the Cork Examiner, first published 1841 and founded like many other papers at a time when nationalist sentiment among the literate masses was globally detectable, is the primary source of information this study relies on.

By way of introduction, the first part of this project reviews Irish nationalism on a cultural as well as political level, offering a glimpse of local Cork history and a national look at the development of mass media. Next in focus are the pre-war contacts between Catholic Ireland, a British colony, and Catholic Austria, the absolutist Empire, whereby the focus lies on Bohemia – colonized by dominant neighbours, nominally exposed to self-government and achieving small state independence approximately as hazardous and haphazard as Ireland. These first links were religious, military and educational in origin, and spanned several centuries, but being based on an elite level, the significance of Bohemian politics for the Irish masses was minimal. Parallels between Ireland and any insurgent East European nation were once eagerly drawn, and the nineteenth and early twentieth century offer a stock of literature comparing the struggles of oppressed peoples in distant empires, irredentist or otherwise, with the plight of the Irish. The Poles always figured largely in this context, as did the Hungarians, but it is the appraisal of Czech nationalism from an Irish perspective that is the object of this study.

As this thesis juxtaposes Ireland and Bohemia, former colonies in former empires, their common cause (independence), their ‘patriot-traitors’ (Casement and Masaryk), their miscellaneous failures (risings) and individual success (international recognition), it is of particular interest to note the quality and quantity of interest they showed in each other’s destinies, or, indeed, lack of it. According to the cross-section of press, pamphlets, and related printed matter
explored, there existed, apparently, merely spasmodic sympathies at the best of times, negation of nationhood aspirations at worst. It has been my purpose to highlight the images these nations nurtured about each other at the time of the Great War – in particular the year 1915 as crucial to nationalist and, moreover, separatist policy – in their respective historical dimensions and their popular intentions, specifically in relation to a representative sector of Irish society, viz. Cork city and county.

Though their histories intertwine at moments of social and political upheaval, the Irish and the Czechs remained, it seems, essentially alien to each other. The reasons for this literally distant relationship are manifold, some probable, some obscure, ranging from perceptions of religion, to pragmatism and patriotism. And even if their political struggles remained curiously identical, they were but occasionally called to the Irish public’s attention. The language issue was a popular motif, but also more obviously a stumbling block. In a subdued state, the Czech patois was superceded by German and – given the Germanophile tendency across Europe before the Great War – communication of interesting events went via the German speaking Press and its foreign correspondents, thus overshadowing Czech sentiment; and when the Czech language established itself more firmly, the revitalisation was lauded but the new language barrier did not induce further interest, except on a theoretical basis. Had the use of the Irish tongue, native to parts of the county of Cork to the present day, reached a similar stage of success, the positive reaction this would have entailed would, no doubt, have been similar in Eastern and Central European sentiment.

In conclusion, given the historical and subsequently genealogical associations, the geographic, denominational and thus cultural distance between Ireland and Bohemia seems to have proved too great to allow satisfactory monitoring of potentially mutually supportive political movements, essentially nationalist and separatist in nature.
Abstract (dt.)

Diese Arbeit bezieht sich auf die letzten Jahre der österreichischen Monarchie und wie sie in The Cork Examiner, einer irischen Provinzzeitung, und von verschiedenen historischen Figuren Irlands rezipiert wurde, und schlussendlich wie die Frage Irlands vom Festland aus betrachtet und später in Beziehung zu einem Weltkrieg gebracht wurde.


revolutionären Kossuth vor. Das Wirken der Tschechen aus der Sicht der Iren entspricht der Aufgabe dieser Studie: d.h. die Gemeinsamkeiten dieser beiden ehemaligen Kolonien, die kulturellen und folglich politischen Bestrebungen ihrer Völker, ihre Patrioten, die gleichzeitig Verräter der Übermacht darstellten, ihre Erfolge und Misserfolge, and wie sehr oder überhaupt sie sich gegenseitig beeinflussten. Überraschenderweise, trotz jahrhundertlanger Verbindungen, die auch durch familiäre Beziehungen der Adelsschicht entstanden sind, ergaben sich wenige Sympathien zwischen den Ländern, manchmal eher Negierung als Unterstützung der nationalen Bestrebungen im jeweiligem Land. In der vorgegebenen Zeitspanne sollen die positiven als auch negativen Bilder der gegenseitigen Wertschätzung in ihrer historischen Dimension untersucht und gedeutet werden.

Zusammenfassend darf gesagt werden, dass die geographische Distanz zwischen Irland und Böhmen die historischen und in folge die genealogischen Verbindungen untergraben hat und die Möglichkeiten einer beiderseitigen Unterstützung im nationalen Bestreben nach Unabhängigkeit versäumen ließ.
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